

**UNIVERSITY STUDENTS'
ASSESSMENT OF GENERAL ENGLISH SUBJECT**

*English for
General,
Summative
test, Essay,
Grammar*

Paryati; Laily Nur Affini

Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas PGRI Semarang
paryati996@gmail.com ; lailynuraffini@upgris.ac.id

111

Abstract- *This study analyzed students' final test in English for General subject, including the students' overall scores, understanding the essay instruction, and grammar mistakes found in their essay. This research was conducted using a qualitative descriptive method. The researchers employed document analysis to find related information from the research objectives naturally. The instrument used for the data collection was the students' answer sheets from the final test, and a summative test was employed as the approach. There were fifty students of non-English Department Study Programs as the participants. The scores achieved conclude that the mean score achieved by the students is in the lowest category. It implies that they still need to improve their writing, such as sentence arrangement, grammar, and vocabulary selection. Furthermore, most students were mistaken in understanding the essay instruction and resulted in incorrect essays.*

Keywords: *English for General, Summative test, Essay, Grammar*

INTRODUCTION

Language learning is significant for humans in social events and academic settings. Learning English is not only taught in English language study programs. However, students from other study programs are required to take English classes. They come from various departments like Mathematics, Physics, Biology, Psychology, Physical, Javanese and Indonesian education department, and others. They are students who study English in this setting, and they participate in a subject, namely General English. Since studies that concern the general English subject are considered still a few, on that reason, the researchers conducted a study on the English achievement possessed by non-English students in Education Programs in the subject.

The sample data was taken from the final test semester test to measure the students' material mastery using a summative assessment approach. To know the non-English Department students' achievement in mastering the lecture of General English. It was done by analyzing the students' final test of students the subject. In line with what

was stated by Setiyana (2016) that teachers need to conduct an assessment in order to find out the extent to which the level of student achievement is an important element in the implementation of learning. Therefore, the writers would like to investigate the following research objectives: 1) the students' achievement as reflected in the final exam, 2) the students' comprehension in understanding the essay instruction, and 3) the students' grammar mistakes found in their essay. The study results serve data representing an actual situation towards the students' mastering General English subject in a higher education setting. It found out that the consequence brought unsatisfactorily, the mean score achieved by the students is low in the category.

It began with a continued situation that the final semester score of students who study English in higher Education from a non-English Education program with the subject General English is below the average. As it further elaborated, the result was revealed from an assessment as one of its goals is to figure out the students' achievement, implemented by the lecturers, teachers, or instructors. Instructors ought to be careful of their appraisal objectives and how they plan to utilize assessment results to select the most delicate devices to achieve the goal at hand. Teachers are mindful that they must prepare an assortment of appraisal errands for students. The two most common types are developmental (scheduled primarily to move forward learning) and summative (outlined basically to judge understanding). There has been a consistency within the prove displayed within the higher instruction learning and educating writing over the past decade to show that students' learning results may be essentially moved forward through the arrangement of developmental appraisals coupled with opportune criticism (Gibbs 2006; Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick 2006).

In an instructive environment like in a higher education setting, summative assessment is commonly used to assess students' grades for a course. Furthermore, since the summative test becomes, accumulation stages of learning in a course to judge the students learning result at the end of the semester, therefore this assessment is a suitable strategy. The test strategy expressed as learning assessment is an evaluation method used for certification of learning, submitting reports to students and their families about student improvement, and giving Signs to students about their position compared to other students (Earl, 2004, p. 22). On that ground, the researchers employed the summative test from this consideration, gained from the students' final

examination from one of the general subjects at a university, English for General. This course covers English in general that the students study Basic English for Present, Past, Present perfect, present future tenses, and the genre texts: descriptive, recount, and procedure. Those basic tenets were employed since they are occupied in English journal text. Therefore, to link back with the case, it is necessary to probe the causes that caused the non-English students to keep getting the low score for the majority.

METHODS

Research Design

A research design is the arrangement, structure, procedure, and examination concaved to get guaranteed to look and control change, proposed by Smash (2010). The investigate employments clear subjective inquire about which implies the information is considered subjective since they are written and talked (words) instead of numbers. Jameel & Shaheen (2018:1) gave additional clarification that subjective examination looks to answer questions related to socialconduct and interpersonal shrewdly that drive certain social wonders. The addressed task is essentially concerned with the conclusions and feelings of people.

Calculating test scores is prominent to be analyzed because it serves innumbers that represent the achievement. The technique used in this research was random sampling, analyzed answer sheets were selected randomly. The occupied instrument in collecting the data used the summative test for the final test of non- English instruction majors at a university in Semarang in the odd semester of 2018. Types of questions and the scoring system shown in the table below:

Table 1. Scoring

Part	Point	Calculation
Fill in the blank	1x30	30
Reading	4x5	20
Writing (essay)	2,5x20	50
Total	100	100

There were thirty questions filled in the blank of the final test sheet, five questions for the reading text, one writing instruction essay, and twenty questions to fill in the blank type. The question types are used to determine the comprehension of the materials learned during the semester in a grade.

Data Collection

External validity captures the extent to which inferences were drawn from a given study's sample apply to a broader population or other target populations. The distinction was made between a more general population and other target populations because external validity takes on two different forms. Generalizability refers to inferences based on a sample drawn from a defined population (Lesko et al. 2017). Transportability refers to assumptions based on a selection but targeted at a different population (Pearl & Bareinboim 2014). Based on this theory, the researcher uses an external validity instrument. The utilized tool in collecting the information was English summative final test sheets from university students from non-English Department study programs. Question sheets were distributed in the final exam for the students to complete the test. The question sheets were then submitted and analyzed to be scored and analyzed based on the research objectives.

Data Analysis

In data collection, Moeleong (2000) clarified that data examination is the strategy of organizing and sorting the data into a plan, categories, and fundamental unit of examination in orchestrating to find the subjects and hypothesis based on the data suggest. The researchers analyzed the data assembled in organizing to answer the questions characterized inside the issue enumerating. Miles and Huberman (1994) portray three primary stages in information investigation: data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusion and verifying.

The first stage was undertaken by selecting the data filtered from 100 students' answer sheets as the population. There were elected randomly, reduced into 50 answer sheets, taken as the sample. The selected answer sheets were analyzed to find the answer to the research objectives. After seeing the result, it then continued the second step to display the data. The findings as the narrative content were organized and composed to be informed into the table. Lastly, with the narration supported by the table, which served as the quantitative data, it then appeared to capture the conclusion that helps the researchers understand the overall data.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The researchers analyzed the students' answer sheets under the indicators given by the lecturers as the first objective. They wanted to know the extent of the students' understanding in answering the questions given on the question sheet. To get the data, the researchers took a summative English answer sheet. In this section, the researchers figured out the students' problems in answering the test. The majority of the students failed and reached scores below the good category.

Table 2. The elaboration is described quantitatively

NO	Number Value	Letter Value	Number of Students	Quality mention
1	85 - 100	A	0	Very good
2	75 - 84.9	B+	2	Between very good and good
3	70 - 74.9	B	1	Good
4	65 - 69.9	C+	0	Between Good and Fair
5	60 - 64.9	C	1	Fair
6	55 - 59.9	D+	2	Between Fair and Insufficient
7	50 - 54.9	D	2	Insufficient
8	0 - 49.9	E	42	Failed
Total number of the students = 50				

The second objective is based on the available data; the students did not understand the questions and the instructions given and answered not according to the essay instruction. As a result, only nine students for the 18% who were correct in following the instruction to compose the essay part. The rest of the students, with 41 of the 82% as the majority were failed to write the essay as instructed. It is then presented in the following table.

Table 3. Students understand the essay instruction

	Number of Students	Percentage
Correct	9	18%
Incorrect	41	82%

The third objective is about the grammar mistakes occurred from the students' essay. It found out that some students still could not understand and perform the structure correctly in their essay. The grammar mistakes made by each student were various. The following table shows the kinds of errors as they appeared in their essay.

Table 4. Grammar mistakes found in the students' essay

No	Kinds of mistake	Number of Mistakes	Rank
1	The use of s/es	13	1
2	The use of have/has	10	2
3	The use of articles	7	3
4	The use of To be	6	4
5	The use of verb-ing	6	4
6	The use of -ed	2	7
7	The use of preposition	3	6
8	The use of conjunction	5	5
9	The use of affixes	2	7
10	The use of verb	2	7
11	The use of Pronoun	2	7

Based on the table above, the majority of the students perform the grammar mistakes with the use of s / es. The second rank is the use of has / have, and the third rank is in the use of articles. The fourth rank is the use of To be, and the fifth rank is the use of verb-ing. The sixth rank is the use of -ed, and the seventh rank is the used of preposition. The eighth rank is the use of conjunction, and the ninth rank is the use of affixes. The tenth rank is the use of verb, and the last rank is the use of pronoun.

Discussion

In this study, from the first objective, the researchers analyzed using the summative test strategy which resulted the students majoring non-English Education learning achievement, performed with score. The test results achieved by the students in the English course were not satisfactory because none of the students got the highest criteria and only the minority of the students' scores reached higher criteria. Unfortunately, the minority of the students who got the good criteria only three students. The researchers described from the above table, and the further details found in the test result carried out by the non- English Department students as follow. The test contains thirty questions: fill in the blank, readings, and an essay. There are 50 students as the research participants; none of the students got an A, two students got a B +, one student got a B, zero students got a C+, zero students got a C, two students got a D+, two students got a D, and forty-two students got an E. With an average class score 32.33%, it means

that the average class got an E grade, the percentage of students' scores with A: 0%, B +: 4%, B: 2%, C +: 0%, C: 2%, D+ :4%, D: 4% and E: 84%.

Elaborating the second objective, there was a problem in understanding an essay instruction so that the given answer was not connected with the instruction. The research carried out on the student answer sheet was taken from fifty students, and each student had almost the same mistakes, namely confused writing and incorrect wording. Besides, the mistakes that existed in each student answer sheet performed incorrect grammar and most of them, failed to understand the commands to answer the questions well. Consequently, the answers were incorrect. This situation is equally reflected by (Ahmed, 2021; Roebli et al., 2002) that it shows the inability of university students as English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in the context of successful and advanced reading comprehension.

The third objective informs that nine students can understand the instructions well to answer the questions correctly, while in the table, we can see that forty students answered incorrectly. Forty students were unsuccessful in understanding the given instruction of the essay part. On average, students got the lowest score, which means that they still have to learn more to reach the set standard value. The researchers underline that the average number of the students of the non-English Department fail, which also means unsatisfactory. This case appears to be a mutual case faced by other university students as EFL learners. They still have insufficient understanding of grammar rule performed in writing where the majority of the grammar mistakes appeared to be similar with other EFL students from different university (Fauzi, 2014).

CONCLUSION

The researchers analyzed students' answer sheets based on the applied indicators. In this section. This section, the researchers found some difficulties and students' knowledge of their English proficiency. It could be seen from the mean score that reflected their comprehension of the test, and it found out that the students' have grammar mistakes that existed in essay writing and the lowest category of the achieved score. Therefore, students need to improve their understanding of reading, writing, and grammar to understand the text and write correctly. It is advisable to enhance the students' knowledge of tenses to understand English, especially in reading and writing.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, W. M. A. (2021). Exploring EFL university learners' acquisition of advanced readingskills in the Yemeni context. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(3), 771–781. <https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v10i3.31765>
- Ala-Mutka, Kirsti M. 2005. "A Survey of Automated Assessment Approaches for Programming Assignments." *Computer Science Education* 15(2): 83–102.
- Alderson, J. Charles, and Jayanti Banerjee. 2001. "Language Testing and Assessment (Part I)." *Language Teaching* 34(4): 213–36.
- Amin, Zubair, and Khoo Hoon Eng. 2003. "Formative and Summative Assessment." *Basics in Medical Education*: 261–65.
- Black, Paul et al. 2010. "Validity in Teachers' Summative Assessments." *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 17(2): 215–32. <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09695941003696016>.
- Clapham, Caroline. 2000. "Assessment and Testing." *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 20: 147–61.
- Dixson, Dante D., and Frank C. Worrell. 2016. "Formative and Summative Assessment in the Classroom." *Theory into Practice* 55(2): 153–59.
- Fauzi, I. (2014). Grammar Errors in Interlanguage Performed By English Learners of Indonesian College Students. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(4), 135-145.
- Findley, M. G., Kikuta, K., & Denly, M. (2021). External Validity. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 24, 365-393.
- Foyewa, D R. 2015. "Testing and Evaluation in English Language Teaching-a Case of O Level English in Nigeria." *International Journal of English Language Teaching* 3(6): 32–40.
- Joughin, Gordon. 2010. "The Hidden Curriculum Revisited: A Critical Review of Research into the Influence of Summative Assessment on Learning." *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education* 35(3): 335–45.
- Moss, Connie M. 2013. "Research on Classroom Summative Assessment." *SAGE Handbook of Research on Classroom Assessment*: 235–56.
- Pratiwi, Veronika Unun, Purwani Indri Astuti, and Sari Handayani. 2015. "Kemampuan Membaca Teks Bahasa Inggris." *Magister Scientiae* 0(38): 132–42. http://journal.wima.ac.id/index.php/Magister_Scientiae/article/view/789.
- Roehl, K. M., Shiue, C., & John, S. (2002). Developing Reading Comprehension Skills inEFL University Level Students. 177–186.
- Scarlet, Douglas. 2013. Qualitative Research Resign : An Interactive Approach Applied Title: Social Research Methods Series. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*
- Setiyana, Rusma (2016). Analysis of Summative Tests for English. *English Education Journal*, 7(4), 433–447.
- Shibliyev, J., and I. Gilanlioglu. 2008. 63 *ELT Journal Language Testing and Assessment: An Advanced Resource Book*.
- Thomas, Vijatha, and Arun Mithrason. 2018. "Summative Evaluation of Teaching Using Student Feedback." (January 2016).

- Yüksel, Hidayet Suha, and Nevin Gündüz. 2017. "Formative and Summative Assessment in Higher Education: Opinions and Practices of Instructors." *Tojet - The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology* 3(8): 336–56.
- Yulia, Yuyun. 2013. "Teaching Challenges in Indonesia: Motivating Students and Teachers' Classroom Language." *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics* 3(1): 1– 16.