The study was conducted to analyze the quality of the 2019 English Matriculation objective test for which the quality was not known. This research is quantitative descriptive. This test was followed by 768 students. The research determined by a simple random sampling technique. The percentage of leeway for accuracy is 10% so that the number of samples specified is 90 respondents. The data collection technique in this research is documentation. The analysis technique in this study was carried out by testing the validity, reliability, level of difficulty, distinguishing power, and deceitful effectiveness so that it can be used to describe the quality of the English Matriculation test. The research results obtained in this matter were good, there were only 1 item (2%), 22 items needed to be repaired (44%), and 27 items (54%) were eliminated / removed. The preparation of the English Matriculation test was conducted through a focus group discussion. Evaluation of English matriculation questions should be carried out periodically in order to provide an overview of the quality of the questions. The items that have failed should not be used anymore, and the revised questions should be corrected by looking at the indicators of the cause of the failure. Increasing competency in writing questions can be done by participating in item analysis training or through tutorials on electronic media.
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INTRODUCTION

One of the ways to find out the abilities of students studying at Dhyana Pura University is by holding English matriculation. In terms of gaps in this study, several universities did not use this English competency and also to see students' English skills so it was necessary to do this to determine student competence. At the end of the matriculation activity an evaluation was carried out using multiple choice objective tests. In the implementation of the English matriculation exam at Dhyana Pura Bali University, there has never been a comprehensive evaluation of several tests used to measure the extent to which student learning outcomes have been achieved. At the end of the matriculation activity an evaluation was carried out using a multiple choice objective test. In the implementation of the English matriculation exam at Dhyana Pura Bali University, there has never been a comprehensive evaluation of several tests used to measure the extent to which student learning outcomes have been achieved. This is due to limited time and energy from Dhyana Pura University to analyze the items used in the English matriculation test. Evaluation in learning needs to be done so that it can be used to determine the right alternative in decision making to improve performance in the unit. The evaluation in question is to look at the test items.

Quality tests according to (Arikunto, 2016); (Muttaqin & Kusaeri, 2017) must have requirements, namely validity, reliability, objectivity, practicality, and economics. The test is said to be valid if the test can provide appropriate information and can be used to achieve certain goals. The test is
said to be reliable if the test always gives the same results at different times or occasions. The test is said to be objective if in its implementation, there are no subjective factors that influence it, especially in the scoring system. The test is said to be economical if the test does not require a lot of money, effort and time. Question item analysis is defined by (Sudjana, 2011) as an assessment of test questions in order to obtain a set of questions of adequate quality. The purpose of analyzing the items according to narrative. How to assess the test is honestly examine the questions that have been compiled, conduct question analysis, hold validity checks, and hold reliability checks.

In point two is conducting a question analysis, there are three approaches that can be used is the level of difficulty, distinguishing power and distractor. So, analysis of test items is a series of processes or activities to identify a set of evaluation tools to determine the level of evaluation tools that have been made in order to obtain information about further action on these evaluation tools. Item analysis was carried out to obtain important information for the teacher regarding the quality of the questions he had made. From the results of this analysis, the teacher can make improvements or improvements to the questions he makes. Analysis of the items was carried out by examining the validity, reliability, distinguishing power, difficulty level, and deceptive effectiveness. Based on this, a research was conducted on the quality of the 2019 English Matriculation Objective Test at Dhyana Pura University. In this study, it is also seen by focusing on the quality of the objective items used in terms of the validity, reliability, difficulty level, distinguishing power, and distracting effectiveness.

METHOD

This research is intended to find out the information and data that can be used to describe the quality of the test (Wahidmurni, 2017). So this research uses descriptive quantitative (Treiman, D. J., 2014). As well as the data obtained in the form of numbers and analyzed statistically using Microsoft Excel program. This research was conducted at Dhyana Pura Bali University. Which is located at Jalan Raya Padang Luwih, Br. Tegal Jaya, Dalung, North Kuta, Badung, Bali. The data sources in this study were all the test results of students who took the English Matriculation Program at Dhyana Pura University in 2019 as many as 768 people. The research sample was determined randomly by the Slovin technique (Sevilla & City, 2017). Collecting data in this study using interview guidelines, observation, and documentation. Observation is included by loading activities attention to something the object by using all the senses. In carrying out the documentation method, the researcher investigates written objects such as questions and answer keys to answer the research objective.
FINDING AND DISCUSSION

This research was conducted to determine the quality of the multiple choice test in the 2019 English matriculation exam at Dhyana Pura University. From the results of the data processing of the English matriculation exam, the results is obtained by the validity and reliability of the questions, the level of difficulty, the distinguishing power, the effectiveness of the distractor are as follows

The results of the 2019 English Matriculation Exam

| No | Information                  | Total  |
|----|------------------------------|--------|
| 1  | Minimum learning completeness| 75     |
| 2  | Complete                     | 34 people |
| 3  | Not Complete                 | 56 people |
| 4  | Min                          | 24     |
| 5  | Max                          | 90     |
|    | Average                      | 64.6889 |

Source: processed data

From the data, the results of learning English matriculation from a sample taken of 90 people found that 56 out of 90 students obtained scores below the specified minimum learning completeness / learning completeness, was 70. In other words 62.22% of students who participated in the incomplete matriculation exam. In this study only focused on the analysis of the questions used to ascertain whether the quality of the questions was the cause of the minimum completeness of the study.

To determine the quality of this matriculation question, the researcher measured the value of validity, reliability, difficulty level, discrimination power, trick effectiveness, and the overall quality of the questions.

The Table of Validity Objective Score

| NUMBER | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| R-Calculate | 0.166 | 0.268 | 0.257 | 0.379 | 0.571 | 0.541 | 0.346 | 0.424 | 0.446 | 0.457 |
| R-Table   | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 |
| Validity  | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    |

| NUMBER | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  | 19  | 20  |
|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| R-Calculate | 0.472 | 0.180 | 0.702 | 0.415 | 0.434 | 0.436 | 0.176 | 0.272 | 0.552 | 0.274 |
| R-Table   | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 | 0.175 |
| Validity  | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    | v    |
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The Table of Reliability Test

\[ \sum pq = 9.07 \]

\[ \text{Score of variety } \sigma^2 = 65.40 \]

\[ \text{KR-20 } r_{11} = 0.87 \]

Source: processed data

The Table of The Difficulty of Level

| Category | TOTAL | NUMBER TEST | PERCENTAGE | DESCRIPTION |
|----------|-------|-------------|------------|-------------|
| Medium   | 26    | 5,7,10,11,13,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,23,31,32,36,38,40,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49 | 52% | Accepted |
| Difficult| 2     | 34,35       | 4%         | Rejected    |
| Easy     | 22    | 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 33, 37, 39, 41, 50 | 44% | Rejected |
| Total    | 50    |             | 100%       |             |

Source: processed data

The Table of Discrimination Power

| CATEGORY | TOTAL | NUMBER of TEST | PERCENTAGE | DESCRIPTION |
|----------|-------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| GOOD     | 1     | 5,6,7,9,10,11,15,16,18,19,20,21,22,24,25,29,35,36,40,42,43,44,45,46,47,48,49,50 | 2% | Accepted |
| MEDIUM   | 28    | 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12,14,17,23,26,27,28,30,31,32,33,34,37,38,39 | 56% | Rejected |
| BAD      | 21    | 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 12,14,17,23,26,27,28,30,31,32,33,34,37,38,39 | 42% | Rejected |

Source: processed data
### The Table of Analysis of Distractor Function

| CATEGORY       | TOTAL | NUMBER of TEST | DESCRIPTION |
|----------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| Total Test     | 50    |                |             |
| Total Option   | 200   |                |             |
| Distractor     | 150   |                |             |
| Correct Answer | 50    |                |             |

| CATEGORY       | TOTAL | NUMBER of TEST | DESCRIPTION |
|----------------|-------|----------------|-------------|
| Very Good      | 59    | 4A, 5B, 6A, 8C, 8D, 9A, 9B, 9D, 10A, 10B, 10D, 11D, 12A, 13A, 13C, 13D, 14C, 14D, 15A, 15B, 16B, 16C, 17A, 17B, 17D, 18D, 20D, 22B, 23C, 23D, 24A, 25B, 25C, 26B, 26C, 27B, 27C, 28C, 29A, 29B, 31D, 32D, 33C, 34C, 35B, 36D, 37A, 37C, 39A, 39B, 39D, 40B, 41B, 42B, 43C, 43D, 44A, 46A, 46D, 48B, 50A | 39,33% |
| Good           | 20    | 5A, 5C, 11C, 18A, 18B, 21C, 21D, 22A, 24B, 25A, 28A, 30A, 32C, 35C, 36C, 44D, 45D, 46C, 49D, 50D | 13,33% |
| Medium         | 20    | 7B, 11B, 12C, 19D, 20A, 20C, 22C, 32B, 33A, 38A, 38D, 40A, 42A, 42C, 43B, 44B, 45A, 47D, 48C, 49B | 13,33% |
| Fair           | 12    | 10A, 13D, 15C, 16A, 19A, 23B, 31B, 33B, 34D, 36B, 40C, 47A | 8% |
| Bad            | 39    | 45C, 47B, 48D, 49A, 50C | 26% |

Source: processed data

After being analyzed according to each criteria, the number test of the 2019 English Matriculation were then analyzed as a whole based on the criteria of validity, reliability, level of difficulty, discrimination power, and distractor effectiveness. From the results of the calculations that have been carried out, it should be able to be entered into a question bank that meets the requirements, that the items are classified as valid, have a moderate level of item difficulty, have good discrimination power, all distractors function properly.

Determining the quality of the items in this study is in line with the research conducted by (Rahayu & Djazari, 2016); (Istiyono et al., 2018); (Pasi & Yusrizal, 2018); (Wibawa, 2019); Sari (IK Sari et al., 2019); (Prabayanti et al., 2018); (Marhaman, 2018); (Yusdiana et al., 2019); (Tilaar & Hasriyanti, 2019); (Purba et al., 2019), (Heale & Twycross, 2015), L. Pecchia, P. Melillo, M. Sansone and M. Bracale (2011) Hingorjo, M. R., & Jaleel, F. (2012), that through testing the validity, reliability, level of difficulty, discrimination power, and distractor effectiveness. Likewise with research conducted by (Kusumawati & Hadi, 2018); (ASD Sari, Wardhana, Sentosa, Dewi. Analysis of..
In this study, whether or not the English matriculation questions in 2019 are determined by the criteria stated by Muhson (2015) are described as follows: the first item is accepted / good if the item has good / good enough discrimination power, moderate difficulty level, and all alternatives effective answer. Next, the item is revised if the item has good / good enough discrimination power, the level of difficulty is moderate, but some alternative answers are ineffective. Then, the item is good enough if the item has good / good enough discrimination power, but the difficulty level is easy / difficult. Furthermore, the item is not good if the item has bad discrimination power.

These criteria are used to determine the decision that the items used can be stored in the question bank, revised, or rejected. This is different from the findings of previous research. In this discussion, the English matriculation exam questions that meet the criteria for good questions, namely item number 13. Question number 13 can be directly stored in the question bank. Based on the results of interviews with the English matriculation committee at Dhyana Pura University, there has not been any management of the question bank related to the tests carried out. Management of the question bank is very important to do to improve the quality of learning instruments and evaluation. According to Santyadiputra (2019) stated that the management of question banks is very important to facilitate the management of assessment instruments, it is even better if the management of question banks is based on technology.

The questions included in the revision category consisted of 22 questions were the item number 5, 7, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 36, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49 can still be used but the distractor needs to be revised. Questions that deserve to be eliminated / removed are questions that are in the good enough and not good categories. The criteria for the eligible questions to be eliminated consisted of 27 questions or 54% of the total questions used for the English matriculation test. The questions in question include; 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 14, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,34, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 50. In the early stages of revising / developing questions, it is best done using the 4-D model which consists of the stages of define, design, develop, and disseminate. In addition, in the revision of questions, it is necessary to pay attention to the distribution of Bloom's taxonomy as an indicator in determining the level of difficulty of the questions. In this study the questions were not arranged based on a balanced cognitive proportion based on the formulations of C1 40%, C2 20%, C3 20%, C4 10%, C5 5%, C6 5%. In line with Lubis (2017), this question does not meet the criteria for a good question.
In the analysis of the English matriculation numbers, several causes of the failure of the English matriculation number can be identified in measuring the learning success of the English matriculation participants. Some of the causes of failure include invalid questions, having easy and difficult levels of difficulty, having moderate and bad discrimination power, and the distribution of the distractor function is not good and bad. The reliability value can also be used as one of the causes of the failure of the test function if the reliability value of the questions is <0.70. The factors causing the failure of the English Matriculation items in measuring learning outcomes in this study can be explained in the following table.

The cause of the failure of the items can be seen that the main cause of failure of the items is the distinguishing power that distinguishes between the upper and lower classes in learning English matriculation which are classified as less reliable. 49 questions or 98% have moderate and bad distinguishing power, only one question number 13 has good distinguishing power. Next is the distractor function that needs to be created / revised to make it better. 27 of them or 54% of the questions have to be eliminated. Next is the difficulty level of the questions that need to be considered, easy or too difficult questions are also not good. We recommend that the problem level is in the medium category. Meanwhile, for the validity test results, only 3 questions were invalid. The large number of items that failed in this study was due to the fact that the procedure for preparing the questions had not been carried out properly.

In accordance with other findings obtained by Iskandar & Rizal (2018) in their research entitled "Analysis of the quality of questions in tertiary institutions based on the TAP application", this study also found several distractors / distractors who were considered the key to the answer. There are 4 items that have the same or higher level of distractor effectiveness with the answer key can be seen in the following table.

Distractors whose effectiveness value is equal to or higher with the answer key functioning as a distractor are 31B, 33B, 34D, and 36B. In items number 31, 33, 34, and 36 there is a possibility that the item is incorrect in making the answer key, but if the answer key is correct, then a distractor whose effectiveness level is the same or higher than the answer key should be replaced.

CONCLUSION
From the results of research on the analysis of English matriculation objective test at Dhyana Pura University. It can be concluded that the quality of the questions is low and does not yet meet the good test preparation procedures. Thus, the cause of the high number of participants in the 2019 English Matriculation exam who did not complete the exam can be identified.
Based on that, it is better if the preparation of the English Matriculation test is carried out through a focus group discussion which will be validated by question compilers who have expertise in the field of English and are experts in the field of measurement and evaluation. From the research results, only 1 number can be stored in the question bank, so suggestions can be given to rearrange the English Matriculation exam questions for the coming period. Evaluation of English matriculation questions should be carried out periodically in order to provide an overview of the quality of the questions and can be used as an instrument in measuring the success of learning. The numbers tested that have failed should not be used anymore, and the questions that need to be revised should be corrected by paying attention to good test preparation procedures and looking at the indicators of the causes of failure. Increasing the competence of arranging questions for lecturers can be done by participating in item analysis training or through existing electronic tutorials, so that the ability of the lecturer or question drafting team can be improved.
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