

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF RESEARCH RESULT

A. Description of the Research Location

1. Brief History about English Department of Tarbiyah faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin.

Based on *Buku Kenang- kenangan 30 tahun Fakultas IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin*, English Department was found in 1984, the first head Drs. H. Abdul Kadir Munsyi, MA, There has six heads of English Department since 1984 until now. The description head of English Departments can be seen in the following table:

Table 4.1 The Description Head of English Departments

No	Name	Period
1	Drs. H. Abdul Kadir Munsyi, MA.	1984 – 1988
2	Drs. Syaifuddin Syukur, MA.	1988 – 1989
3	Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, MAg.	1997 – 2005
4	Drs. H. Isa Ansari, MA (ALM)	2005 – 2006
5	Drs. Anang Syaifuddin, MA.	January 2007 – September 2007
6	Dra. Nida Mufidah, MPd.	2007 – Until now

The main this purpose of this Department is to participate in developing this country especially in educational world it is based on the facts, that is still found many Islamic School without English Teacher who has educational background of English. This Tarbiyah Faculty: in this case English Department has a responsibility to provide English teachers.

Curriculum that is used in this Department contain 160 sks, that covers Institute subjects, Faculty subjects and major subjects. It takes about four years in finishing the study.

English Department has 19 lecturers from many different educational backgrounds and universities. There is the data about lecturers of English Department.

2. Description about lecturers and students condition

There are 18 lecturer from different educational backgrounds and 353 students of English Department of Tarbiyah faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in academic year 2007/2008. The description of lecturers and students can seen in the following table:

Table 4.2 The Description of Lecturer of English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008

No	Name	Graduated	Year
1	Drs. H. Ahdi Makmur, MAg.	S2 IAIN SYAHID Jakarta	2000
2	Drs. H. Syarifuddin Syukur, MA.	S2 Pakistan 1980/ 1981, S2 SUKA Yogya	1992
3	Dr. H. Husnul Yaqin, M.Ed.	S3 SYAHID	2008

4	Drs. Anang Syaifuddin, MA.	S2 The University of Colorado Boulder, America	1993
5	Drs. Saadilah	S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin	1989
6	Drs. Syaiful Bahri Djamarah, MAg.	S2 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin	2003
7	Dra. Dina Hermina, MPd.	S2 IKIP Yogyakarta	2002
8	Dra. Nida Mufidah, MPd.	S2 FKIP Unlam Banjarmasin	2005
9	Dra.Hj. Wardah Hayati, MA.	S2 Australia	2005
10	Nurlaila Kadariah, S. Ag.	S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin	1994
11	M. Nur Effendi, S.Ag. MPd.	S2 IAIN antasari Banjarmasin	2008
12	Dra. Andi Irlina, M. Hum.	S2 UNHAS Ujung Pandang	2002
13	Nani Hijriani, SPd.	S2 University of Canberva Australia	2008
14	Rusnadi, S.Pd. I.	S1 IAIN Antasari Banjaramasin	2002
15	Ridha Fadillah, S. Pd, M. Ed.	S2 Universitas Malaysia Utara	2008
16	Rahmila Murtiana, SS.	S1 Univ DiponegoroSemarang	1995
17	Raida Asfihana, Spd.	S1 FKIP Unlam Banjarmasin	2004
18	Puji Sri Rahayu, MA.	S2 University of Queensland Australia	2007
19	Nor Maulidiyah, MA.	S2 Malaysia University	2007

There are one Staff English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008 is Saidil Imani, Spd.I. He is Graduated from S1 IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin 2007

Table 4.3 The Number of Students of English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008

No	Generation	Sex		Total
		Male	Female	
1	1999/ 2000	2	0	2
2	2000/ 2001	6	3	9
3	2001/ 2002	8	1	9
4	2002/ 2003	13	21	34
5	2003/ 2004	13	52	65
6	2004/ 2005	17	27	44
7	2005/ 2006	17	42	59
8	2006/ 2007	19	48	67
9	2007/ 2008	27	37	64
10	2008/ 2009	20	45	65
Total		142	276	418

3. Description of Facilities English Department

Table 4.4 The Number of Facilities of English Department of Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008

No	Facilities	Number	Condition
1	Office	1	Good
2	Computer	1	Good
3	Laptop	2	Good
4	Language laboratory	1	Good
5	Class room	5	Good
6	Library	1	Good
7	Tape recorder	1	Good
8	Overhead projector	1	Good

B. Result of Research and Solution

All items of final test Structures D in the fifth semester of English Department Tarbiyah faculty academic year 2007 / 2008 are 50 items, it's consisted of 20 true-false items, 20 multiple choice items, and 10 error recognition items.

All of these items are analyzed and after that the result shall be as follows:

1. Validity

To determine validity of every items level, it's used formula of product moment correlation with harsh number. There is an example of validity calculating for the item number

Tables 4.5 The Validity of item test Structure D fifth Semester of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/2008

Students Number	X	Y	XY	X1	Y1
1	1	35	35	1	1225
2	0	37	0	0	1369
3	0	32	0	0	1024
4	0	26	0	0	676
5	0	41	0	0	1681
6	0	31	0	0	961
7	0	31	0	0	961
8	1	19	19	1	361
9	1	37	37	1	1369
10	0	32	0	0	1024
11	0	42	0	0	1764
12	1	15	15	1	225
13	1	42	42	1	1764
14	1	25	25	1	625
15	1	23	23	1	529
16	1	13	13	1	169
17	0	24	0	0	576
18	0	29	0	0	841
19	0	30	0	0	900
20	1	31	31	1	961
21	0	27	0	0	729
22	1	28	28	1	784
23	0	24	0	0	576
24	1	34	34	1	1156

25	1	39	39	1	1521
26	0	33	0	0	1089
27	1	41	41	1	1681
28	1	33	33	1	1089
29	1	32	32	1	1024
30	0	28	0	0	784
31	1	29	29	1	841
32	1	29	29	1	841
33	0	24	0	0	576
34	0	33	0	0	1089
35	0	29	0	0	841
36	0	27	0	0	729
37	0	33	0	0	1089
38	0	18	0	0	324
39	0	41	0	0	1681
40	0	25	0	0	625
41	0	34	0	0	1156
42	0	33	0	0	1089
43	0	26	0	0	676
44	0	33	0	0	1089
45	0	22	0	0	484
46	1	24	24	1	576
47	1	31	31	1	961
48	1	28	28	1	784
49	0	30	0	0	900
50	1	37	37	1	1369
51	0	28	0	0	576
52	0	25	0	0	625
53	0	29	0	0	841
54	0	30	0	0	900

55	0	34	0	0	1156
56	1	29	29	1	841
57	1	31	31	1	961
58	0	43	0	0	1849
59	1	26	26	1	676
60	0	34	0	0	1156
Total	24	1809	711	24	6815406

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2\} \{N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

$$= \frac{60 \times 711 - 24 \times 1809}{\sqrt{60 \times 24 - 576)(60 \times 6815406 - 46450758945836)}}$$

$$= 0,792$$

By N = 60 at tables of product moment of price r in significance level 5 % = 0, 254 it is valid if r calculate \geq r is small table. Because $r_{xy} = 0,792 \geq 0,254$ hence problem no 1 is valid. In the same way it is obtained r_{xy} value to entire item. After consulted to tables of price, it criticizes the product moment then the result of validity calculation to entire all items as follows:

Tables 4.5 The Qualification Validity of item test Structure D fifth Semester of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008

Items number	r Count	Qualification
1	0,792	Valid
2	0,778	Valid

3	0,783	Valid
4	0,774	Valid
5	0,774	Valid
6	0,773	Valid
7	0,778	Valid
8	0,775	Valid
9	0,777	Valid
10	0,782	Valid
11	0,787	Valid
12	0,781	Valid
13	0,786	Valid
14	0,777	Valid
15	0,779	Valid
16	0,782	Valid
17	0,780	Valid
18	0,775	Valid
19	0,787	Valid
20	0,775	Valid
21	0,789	Valid
22	0,772	Valid
23	0,773	Valid
24	0,772	Valid

25	0,782	Valid
26	0,779	Valid
27	0,782	Valid
28	0,777	Valid
29	0,777	Valid
30	0,774	Valid
31	0,772	Valid
32	0,776	Valid
33	0,781	Valid
34	0,778	Valid
35	0,781	Valid
36	0,775	Valid
37	0,779	Valid
38	0,773	Valid
39	0,790	Valid
40	0,777	Valid
41	0,768	Valid
42	0,777	Valid
43	0,776	Valid
44	0,771	Valid
45	0,770	Valid
46	0,775	Valid

47	0,774	Valid
48	0,778	Valid
49	0,770	Valid
50	0,782	Valid

At tables above we can see that from 50 final test item that used, there are all of items have r_{11} bigger than r table in the table of price of product moment.

Tables 4.6 The Conclusion validity of item test Structure D fifth Semester of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin in Academic year 2007/ 2008

No	Criteria	Frequency.	Percentage
1	Valid	50	100%
2	Invalid	0	0%

By interpretation the tables of r price of product moment with the belief interval 95 % for the participant 60 people, it obtained validity of each item

2. Reliability

To know the reliability of final test items of fifth semester English Department Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin that consist multiple choice items, essay items and error recognition items by using correlation score between anomalous cleft and even cleft that can see as follow:

Tables 4.7 The Calculation Reliability of Items Test.

Students number	Total score	anomalous cleft	even cleft.	X1	Y1	XY
-----------------	-------------	-----------------	-------------	----	----	----

1	35	17	18	289	324	306
2	37	16	19	256	361	304
3	32	14	18	196	324	252
4	26	10	11	100	121	110
5	41	19	22	361	484	418
6	31	11	12	121	144	132
7	31	12	17	144	289	204
8	19	12	7	144	49	84
9	37	18	19	324	361	342
10	32	16	16	256	256	256
11	42	18	24	324	576	432
12	15	7	7	49	49	49
13	42	20	22	400	484	440
14	25	15	10	225	100	150
15	23	13	10	169	100	130
16	13	9	4	81	16	36
17	24	14	10	196	100	140
18	29	16	12	256	144	192
19	30	16	14	256	196	224
20	31	16	15	256	225	240
21	27	14	13	19	169	182
22	28	15	13	225	169	195

23	24	12	12	144	144	144
24	34	15	19	225	361	285
25	39	20	19	400	361	380
26	33	16	17	256	144	272
27	41	22	19	484	361	418
28	33	16	17	256	144	272
29	32	17	15	289	225	255
30	28	14	15	196	225	210
31	29	13	16	169	256	208
32	27	12	15	144	225	180
33	24	14	10	196	100	140
34	33	18	15	324	225	270
35	29	14	15	196	225	210
36	27	14	13	196	169	182
37	33	15	17	225	144	255
38	18	10	8	100	64	80
39	41	21	20	441	400	420
40	25	10	15	100	225	150
41	34	15	19	225	361	285
42	33	16	17	256	289	272
43	26	13	13	169	169	169
44	33	17	16	289	256	272

45	22	11	11	121	121	121
46	24	10	14	100	196	140
47	31	15	16	225	256	240
48	28	15	13	225	169	195
49	30	13	17	169	289	221
50	37	18	19	324	361	342
51	28	12	16	144	256	192
52	25	14	11	196	121	154
53	29	14	15	196	225	210
54	30	13	17	169	289	221
55	34	16	18	256	324	288
56	29	11	18	121	324	198
57	31	13	18	169	324	234
58	43	20	23	400	529	460
59	26	15	11	225	121	165
60	34	17	17	289	289	289
Total	1807	879	909	13433	13308	13817

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2\} \{N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

$$= \frac{60 \cdot 13817 - 879 \cdot 909}{\sqrt{(60 \cdot 13433 - 180445489)(60 \cdot 14308 - 204718864)}}$$

$$= 19,1277$$

The result that be accurated only for a half of test. To find all of the reliability of the test that be used spearman-Brown formulator as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{11} &= \frac{2xr1/21/2}{1 + r_1/21/2} \\ &= \frac{2x19.1277}{1x 19.1277} \\ &= 0,782 \end{aligned}$$

Base on data calculation at the table above, with half – method and (divided into two part) and add – even method (add and even number, it is obtained the reliability of Structure D final test item of fifth Semester of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty of IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin, is 0,782 in product moment tables at signficance level 5 % for N = 60 is 0,254, it is reliable if the value r calculated \geq r table. Because $r_{11} = 0,782 \geq 0,254$ so that the item test is reliable.

A half method that used the correlation of product moment with harsh number so that criterion (similar to validity criterion). Wit value r_{11} 0,782 it meant the test used is reliable and having reliability.

3. Index difficulty

Index difficulty with quality of items test that used can be know from difficulty level of each item test. Item test can be said as good item test if they are not too difficult and too easy.

Index difficulty can be know by comparison between number of participants correct answer with the number all of students answer.

Following example is calculation of item difficulty for test of number 1. Sum up the students correct answer item number 1 as much 24 people from all of participant 60 people.

$$\begin{aligned}
 P &= \frac{B}{Js} \\
 &= \frac{24}{60} \\
 &= 0,4
 \end{aligned}$$

So the item number 1 have index difficulty 0,4. Result of calculating that interpreted with table index difficulty. And result of calculating for all of items that can see in table as follow:

Table 4.8. The Index difficulty item test Structure D Final test fifth semester English department Tarbiyah faculty at IAIN Antasari Banjarmasin academic year 2007/2008.

Item number	P (Index difficulty)	Qualification
1	0,4	Moderate
2	0,95	Easy
3	0,8	Easy
4	0,6	Moderate
5	0,43	Moderate
6	0,63	Moderate

7	0,55	Moderate
8	0,76	Easy
9	0,91	Easy
10	0,03	Difficult
11	0,81	Easy
12	0,8	Easy
13	0,38	Moderate
14	0,41	Moderate
15	0,76	Easy
16	0,68	Moderate
17	0,55	Moderate
18	0,68	Moderate
19	0,48	Moderate
20	0,28	Difficult
21	0,36	Moderate
22	0,4	Moderate
23	0,68	Moderate
24	0,6	Moderate
25	0,36	Moderate
26	0,78	Easy
27	0,96	Easy
28	0,73	Easy

29	0,1	Difficult
30	0,71	Easy
31	0,31	Moderate
32	0,73	Easy
33	0,98	Easy
34	0,45	Moderate
35	0,75	Easy
36	0,5	Moderate
37	0,81	Easy
38	0,3	Difficult
39	0,36	Moderate
40	0,66	Moderate
41	0,23	Difficult
42	0,56	Moderate
43	0,86	Easy
44	0,8	Easy
45	0,7	Moderate
46	0,68	Moderate
47	0,68	Moderate
48	0,48	Moderate
49	0,55	Moderate
50	1	Easy

From tables above we can see that from 50 items as much 18 items test categorized easy, 27 items test categorized moderate and 5 items test of difficult category.

Base on that obtained from table above that items test of difficulty criterion as much 10 %, items test of moderate criterion as much 54% and 36% at easy criterion.

Table 4.9 The Conclusion of index difficulty items test Structure D fifth Semester English Department Tarbiyah Faculty academic year 2007/2008

No	Criteria	Frequency	Presentation
1	Easy	18	36 %
2	Moderate	27	54 %
3	Difficult	5	10 %

4. Discriminating Power

Discriminating power is test ability in differently between students who have high score with students who have low score. To look for the discriminating power, all of students score arranged from the highest score until the lowest ones. Because the number of students less than 100 so all of students is taken. For students as much 60 people, it mean taken 50 % from the highest score and 50 % from the lowest score, following example for discriminating power calculation for test number 1.

$$D = \frac{Ba}{Ja} - \frac{Bb}{Jb} = PA - PB$$

$$= \frac{11}{30} - \frac{13}{30}$$

The result of calculation discriminating power item test the Structures D fifth semester of English department from item number 1 until number 50 can be seen at tables as follow:

Table 4.10 The Discriminating power item test Structure D fifth semester English department Tarbiyah faculty academic year 2007/2008

Items number	D	Qualification
1	- 0,06	Negative
2	0,03	Bad
3	0,07	Bad
4	0,27	Moderate
5	0,23	Moderate
6	0,26	Moderate
7	0,17	Bad
8	0,20	Bad
9	0,03	Bad
10	0,06	Bad
11	0,03	Bad
12	0,07	Bad
13	0,16	Bad
14	0,03	Bad

15	0,07	Bad
16	0,10	Bad
17	0,30	Moderate
18	0,24	Moderate
19	0,16	Bad
20	0,30	Moderate
21	-0,13	Negative
22	0,23	Moderate
23	0,30	Moderate
24	0,40	Good
25	0,10	Bad
26	0,16	Bad
27	0	Bad
28	0,20	Bad
29	0,07	Bad
30	0,30	Moderate
31	0,23	Moderate
32	0,34	Moderate
33	0,04	Bad
34	0,23	Moderate
35	0,10	Bad
36	0,27	Moderate

37	0,10	Bad
38	0,47	Good
39	0	Bad
40	0,20	Bad
41	0,34	Moderate
42	0,40	Good
43	0,27	Moderate
44	0,33	Moderate
45	0,40	Good
46	0,30	Moderate
47	0,16	Bad
48	0,30	Moderate
49	0,37	Moderate
50	0	Bad

From the tables above, it can be seen that items test which have good criterion are 4 items or 8 %, for moderate criterion are 19 items or 38 %, for bad criterion are 25 items or 50 % and for negative criterion are 2 items or 4 %.

Almost a half of items test have earned to differentiate students ability for 46% and items test which unable to differentiate students ability to 54 %.

Table 4.11 The Conclusion of Discriminating Power items test Structure D fifth Semester English Department Tarbiyah Faculty Academic year 2007/2008.

No	Criteria	Frequency	Presentation
1	Very good	-	0 %
2	Good	4	8 %
3	Moderate	19	38 %
4	Bad	25	50 %
5	Negative	2	4 %

Based on all data are item validity, index difficulty and discriminating power, so that it can be made hence can be made the tables of item acceptance like the following table:

Table 4.12 The Acceptance Items

Items number	Rxy	P	D	Acceptance items
1	Valid	Moderate	Negative	Accept
2	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
3	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
4	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
5	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
6	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
7	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
8	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
9	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
10	Valid	Difficult	Bad	Revised

11	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
12	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
13	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
14	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
15	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
16	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
17	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
18	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
19	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
20	Valid	Difficult	Enough	Accept
21	Valid	Moderate	Negative	Accept
22	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
23	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
24	Valid	Moderate	Good	Accept
25	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
26	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
27	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
28	Valid	Easy	Bad	Accept
29	Valid	Difficult	Bad	Revised
30	Valid	Easy	Moderate	Accept
31	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
32	Valid	Easy	Moderate	Accept

33	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
34	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
35	Valid	Easy	Bad	Accept
36	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
37	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised
38	Valid	Difficult	Good	Accept
39	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
40	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
41	Valid	Difficult	Moderate	Accept
42	Valid	Moderate	Good	Accept
43	Valid	Easy	Moderate	Accept
44	Valid	Easy	Moderate	Accept
45	Valid	Moderate	Good	Accept
46	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
47	Valid	Moderate	Bad	Accept
48	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
49	Valid	Moderate	Moderate	Accept
50	Valid	Easy	Bad	Revised

From tables above, it can be said that Structures D final in fifth Semester of English Department Tarbiyah Faculty Academic year 2007/2008 which can be accepted as much 36 items or 72 % and which must be revised as much 14 items or 28 %.

Based on the inferential of the table above, for the test which is revised as much 14 items, items number 2, 3, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 26, 27, 33, 37, 50 must be revised because they are too easy and almost of testee can answer correctly, and items number 10 and 29 are too difficult because almost of testee cannot answer's correctly.

The items that included must be revised are:

1. No. 2. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
2. No. 3. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
3. No. 8. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
4. No. 9. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.

5. No. 10. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too difficult where almost of testee cannot answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
6. No. 11. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
7. No. 12. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
8. No. 15. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
9. No. 26. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.
10. No. 27. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating

power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.

11. No. 29. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too difficult where almost of testee cannot answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item cannot be used in the next time.

12. No. 33. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item can't be used in the next time.

13. No. 37. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where almost of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item can't be used in the next time.

14. No. 50. The item should be revised or changed because its difficulty level is too easy where all of testee can answer it correctly. And its discriminating power is bad, the item cannot discriminate between the upper students and lower students, this item can't be used in the next time.