

**THE EVALUATION OF *ENGLISH FOR HOLIDAY 2010*
ENGLISH EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, FBS, UNY**

Nur Hidayanto PSP

Abstract

The teaching and learning of English in Indonesia has enjoyed prosperity since it gets more and more positive response from the society. It can be seen from the high percentage of parents sending their children to formal and informal institutions to learn English from early childhood. However, the children still find it difficult to use their English since they do not have a place or environment where they can use their English. To help overcome those problems, English Education Department of UNY conducts English for Holiday annually. It is a program aimed at helping students use what they have learnt at school in their daily life. This program has not been evaluated seriously before so that its strength and weaknesses have not been measured.

The evaluation of EFH 2010 was conducted in the English Education Department of UNY from July to November 2010. It was carried out to evaluate the preparation, the process, as well as the result of EFH 2010 teaching and learning process. The data was collected with observation, documentation and questionnaire given to parents and teachers of EFH 2010. The data was then analyzed and described to find the result.

The result shows that the preparation of EFH 2010 is categorized as “good”. However, it still needs improvement especially in the facilities which support the teaching and learning process. The process itself is categorized as “good” even though from the questionnaire, it was found that the committee did not help the teachers much in solving the teaching and learning problems. The evaluator found that EFH needs a good system of assessing the participants’ performance at the beginning of the program as well as at the end of the program so that the participants development in English mastery can be recognized.

Keywords: evaluation, English for Holiday, preparation, process, result

INTRODUCTION

The teaching and learning of English in Indonesia has enjoyed prosperity since it gets more and more positive response from the society. It can be seen from the high percentage of parents sending their children to formal and informal institutions to learn English from early childhood. Moreover, today Elementary Schools also arrange English instruction to the pupils as a local wisdom subject. The existence of English instruction in the elementary school is supported by the curriculum and it is also a good idea as the early age is the golden age to learn language.

However, the implementation of English instruction for the elementary school students in Yogyakarta factually shows a less satisfying result as it has many weaknesses due to the teachers, methods, teaching materials and facilities. It can be understood as the implementation of this English instruction is still relatively new in most of elementary schools in Jogja. Therefore, the need of a good program to facilitate the learners to learn English in a fun situation is urgent. The English Education Department of Yogyakarta State University realizes the phenomenon. To help the learners learn in a fun situation, the department holds an annual program named English for Holidays (EFH). However, the program is considered less effective due to some problems, both in the process and the product. Therefore, the need of program evaluation to see the effectiveness of EFH is urgent.

The focus of *English for Holiday Program Evaluation* is on *Process and Product Evaluation (CIPP)*. The research questions which are tried to answer on this Program Evaluation as follows:

1. Does the EFH 2010 preparation fulfil the good criteria to support the EFH 2010 program?
2. Does the implementation of EFH 2010 fulfil the good criteria?
3. Does the result of EFH 2010 meet the expectation?

The objectives of this program evaluation are as follows:

- a. To investigate the process of the program implementation, including the quality of the teachers who teach the children
- b. To investigate how far the participants of *EFH* master the target.

The program evaluation used one of the descriptive quantitative approach, that is the survey, especially descriptive survey. This evaluation was conducted in English Education Department of FBS UNY from June to July 2010. The population of this evaluation study were the parents of the participants and teachers of EFH 2010. This evaluation program could explain the situation of this group only and it could not be generalized to other groups. In this case, the program evaluation was expected to find the better ways to improve the EFH only (Sax, 1980: 588). Thus, this evaluation study could only describe or give information about how well the EFH program, related to its context, input, process and result and further the information could be use as consideration whether this program is a worth thing to be held

next year. Beside the survey, the data were collected through the interview. Interview was conducted to the parents of the participants and teachers of EFH 2010. The result of the interview was used as the supporting data of this evaluation.

D. The Subject of the Study

The subject of this evaluation study were 6 of the parents of 180 participants of EFH 2010 and 8 of the 20 teachers of EFH 2010. The parents and the teachers were given a questionnaire in the terms of preparation, process and result of EFH 2010. In order to motivate the subject of this study, the evaluator gave a small set of stationery for their children. Also, the subjects of this evaluation study were interviewed in order to get deeper direct responses.

FINDINGS

Data Description

The data of this EFH program evaluation were collected through: (1) documentations, (2) observation, (3) three questionnaires which administered a) preparation of EFH 2010, b) process of EFH 2010, and c) result of EFH 2010. The questionnaires were given to both the parents of the participants and the teachers. The questionnaire used were the four-scale questionnaire i.e. Very bad, Bad, Good and Very good.

Below are the descriptions of the documentations, observations, and questionnaires of EFH 2010 program evaluation:

1. Data of Documentations

The data collected through the documentations are as follows:

a. Preparation of EFH 2010

The data collected from the documentations of the EFH 2010 preparation included the publication of EFH 2010 program through online publication and brochures, the availability of information through online publication and brochure, the readiness of the materials, and the readiness of the supporting facilities. After the data were collected and analyzed, the result were presented on the table as follows:

Table 1

Result of documentation of EFH 2010 Preparation

No	Interval	Gained score	Percentage of the score	categories
1	1 – 6	0	0	Very bad
2	7 – 12	2	33,33	Bad

3	13 – 18	4	66,67	Good
4	24 – 19	0	0	Very good

Table 3 showed that the score for the documentation of EFH 2010 preparation were 4 or 66, 67%. Thus, it can be categorized as Good..

b. Process of EFH 2010

The data collected were in the form of the administration of the EFH 2010 opening ceremony, the teachers competencies and assessments from the teachers, the EFH learning materials of each level, and the committee's administration of the EFH impelmentation. The data were collected and analyzed and the result was presented in the table as follows:

Table 2

Result of documentations of EFH 2010 process

No	Interval	Gained score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	1 – 7	0	0	Very bad
2	8 – 14	3	42,86	Bad
3	15 –21	4	57,14	Good
4	22 – 28	0	0	Very good

Table 4 showed that the the score for the documentation of EFH 2010 preparation were 4 or 57,14 %. Thus, it can be categorized as Good.

c. Result of EFH 2010

The data collected from the documentation of the EFH result covered the participants' certificate, the increase of the participants' oral competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of participants writing competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of the motivation to learn English of the participants after participating in EFH 2010 and the increase of EFH participants confidence to use English. The data were collected and analyzed and the result were as follows:

The result of documentations of Result of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	1 – 7	0	0	Very bad

2	8 – 14	1	20	Bad
3	15 –21	4	80	Good
4	22 – 28	0	0	Very good

Table 3 showed that the score for the documentation of EFH 2010 result were 4 or 80 %. Thus, it can be categorized as Good.

2. Observation Data

The data collected from the observation of EFH 2010 were as follows:

a. Preparation of EFH 2010

The data collected from the observation on the Preparation of EFH 2010 covered the publication of the information about EFH 2010 through the online publications and brochures, the availability of the information about the activities in EFH 2010, the easiness to access the information about the activities in EFH 2010 via telephone or on its the registration site, the service of EFH 2010 registration, the readiness of the classes used, the learning materials, the leveling of EFH 2010 participants, and the readiness of supporting facilities both for academic and non-academic activities. The data were collected and analyzed and the results were presented on the following table:

Table 4
Result of the Observation for the Preparation of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	1 – 7	0	0	Very bad
2	8 – 14	6	42,86	Bad
3	15 –21	8	57,14	Good
4	22 – 28	0	0	Very good

Table 6 showed the score for the observation of EFH preparation were 8 or 57.14%. Thus, it can be categorized as Good.

b. Process of EFH 2010

The data collected from the observation to the Process of EFH 2010 covered the opening ceremony of EFH 2010, the learning materials, and the leveling of the participants, the teachers, the committee, the

non-academic activities (tour and BBQ party) and the facilities. The data were collected and analyzed and the results were presented on the following table:

Table 5

Result of the Observation on the Process of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	1 – 7	0	0	Very bad
2	8 – 14	16	44,4	Bad
3	15 –21	20	55,6	Good
4	22 – 28	0	0	Very good

Table 7 shows that the score for the observation of the EFH 2010 process were 8 or 55.6%. Thus, it can be categorized as Good.

c. Result of EFH 2010

The data collected from the observation on the Result of EFH 2010 covered the participants mastery of EFH learning materials, the increase of the participants' oral competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of participants writing competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of the motivation to learn English of the participants after participating in EFH 2010, the increase of EFH participants confidence to use English, EFH 2010 attractiveness, benefits gained by the participant in using English, and the opinions of the parents for the next EFH. The data were collected and analyzed and the results were presented on the following table:

Table 6

Result of the Observation on the result of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	1 – 7	0	0	Very bad
2	8 – 14	1	12,5	Bad
3	15 –21	7	87,5	Good
4	22 – 28	0	0	Very good

Table 6 showed that the score for the observation of the EFH 2010 result were 8 or 87.5%. Thus, it can be categorized as Good.

3. Data of parent questionnaires

In order to collect the data, the evaluator distributed 20 questionnaires to the parents of the EFH participants. However, there were only 6 questionnaires which is returned on time. The other five questionnaires were returned after the data has been analyzed so that they were not included. The data collected were as follows:

a. Preparation of EFH 2010

The data collected from the parent questionnaires about the Preparation of EFH 2010 covered the readiness of the classes used in the EFH, course design of EFH, the meetings between the EFH committee and the teachers which discuss about the EFH learning materials, the leveling of the participants, and the readiness of the supporting facilities of EFH 2010 teaching and learning process. The data were collected and analyzed and the result were as follows:

Table 7
Result of parent questionnaires of the Preparation of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	$X \geq 40,62$	2	33,3	Very bad
2	$40,62 > X \geq 37,83$	0	0	Bad
3	$37,83 > X \geq 35,04$	3	50	Good
4	$X < 35,04$	1	16,7	Very good

Table 7 showed that the score for the parent questionnaire of EFH 2010 preparation were 2 or 33.3% for very bad, 3 or 50% for good, and 1 or 16,7% for very good.

b. Process of EFH 2010

The data collected from the parent questionnaires about the Process of EFH 2010 covered the opening ceremony of EFH 2010, learning materials of EFH 2010, teachers of EFH 2010, committee of EFH 2010, non-academic activities EFH 2010 (tour and *BBQ party*), and the facilities of EFH 2010. The data were collected and analyzed and the result as follows:

Table 8
Result of parent questionnaires of the Process of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	$X \geq 80,95$	1	16,7	Very bad
2	$80,95 > X \geq 72,17$	1	16,7	Bad
3	$72,17 > X \geq 63,39$	4	66,7	Good

4	$X \leq 63,39$	0	0	Very good
---	----------------	---	---	-----------

Table 8 showed that the score for the parent questionnaire of EFH 2010 process were 1 or 16.7% for very bad, 1 or 16.7% for bad, and 4 or 66.7% for very good.

c. Result of EFH 2010

The data collected from the parent questionnaires about the Result of EFH 2010 covered the participants mastery of EFH learning materials, the increase of the participants' oral competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of participants writing competency after participating the EFH 2010, the increase of the motivation to learn English of the participants after participating in EFH 2010, the increase of EFH participants confidence to use English, EFH 2010 attractiveness, benefits gained by the participant in using English, and the opinions of the parents for the next EFH. The data were collected and analyzed and the result were as follows:

Table 9

Result of the Parent Questionnaires of the Result of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	$X \geq 24,89$	1	16,7	Very bad
2	$24,89 > X \geq 23,17$	2	33,3	Bad
3	$23,17 > X \geq 21,45$	2	33,3	Good
4	$X < 21,45$	1	16,7	Very good

Table 9 showed that the score for the parent questionnaire of EFH 2010 result were 1 or 16.7% for very bad, 2 or 33.3% for bad, 2 or 33.3% for good and 1 or 16.7% for very good.

4. Data of teacher questionnaires

In order to collect the data, evaluator distributed 10 questionnaires to the teachers of EFH 2010. However, there were only 8 questionnaires which was returned on time. The other two questionnaires were returned after the data has been analyzed so that they were not included. The data collected were as follows:

a. Preparation of EFH 2010

The data collected from the teacher questionnaires about the Preparation of EFH 2010 covered the readiness of the classes used in the EFH, course design of EFH, the meetings between the EFH committee and the teachers which discuss about the EFH learning materials, the leveling of the participants, and the readiness of the supporting facilities of EFH 2010 teaching and learning process. The data were collected and analyzed and the result were as follows:

Table 10
Result of Teachers' Questionnaires of Preparation of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	$X < 17,54$	2	25	Very bad
2	$18,6 > X \geq 17,54$	0	0	Bad
3	$19,66 > X \geq 18,6$	5	62,5	Good
4	$X \geq 19,66$	1	12,5	Very good

Table 10 showed that the score for the teacher questionnaire of EFH 2010 preparation were 2 or 25% for very bad, 5 or 62.5% for good, and 1 or 12.5% for very good.

b. Process of EFH 2010

The data collected from the teacher questionnaires about the Process of EFH 2010 covered the learning materials of EFH 2010, EFH 2010 committee, EFH non-academic activities (tour and BBQ party) and the facilities of EFH 2010. The data were collected and analyzed and the result were as follows:

Table 11
Result of teacher questionnaires of Process of EFH 2010

No	Interval	Gained Score	Percentage of the score	Categories
1	$X < 38,63$	1	12,5	Very bad
2	$40,4 > X \geq 38,63$	4	50	Bad
3	$42,17 > X \geq 40,4$	2	25	Good

4	X \geq 42,17	1	12,5	Very good
---	----------------	---	------	-----------

Table 11 showed that the score for the teacher questionnaire of EFH 2010 process were 1 or 12.5% for very bad, 4 or 50% for bad, 2 or 25% for good, and 1 or 12.5% for very good.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The finding of the research shows some facts related to EFH 2010, they are:

- a. The preparation for EFH 2010 was too short and seemed to be in a hurry. The result shows that the publication was only in the brochure and university website. There should be some more media to announce the program to the future customer.
- b. The program itself ran well, especially in the opening, classroom activities, outdoor activities, games and the closing ceremony. However, the result shows that the committee need to give more hands to the participants and the teachers, especially in handling the kids under the age of 6 years.
- c. The outcome of EFH 2010 is considered good by the parents. They appreciate the changes in their children, especially in using English. The parents also look forward the EFH 2011.

The result of the evaluation shows that the next EFH need to get some longer preparation as well as pre-test and post-test to check the participants improvement. Some more coordination with some different institutions is also required due to the limited publication in EFH 2010.

REFERENCES

- Djemari Mardapi. 2008. *Teknik penyusunan instrumen tes dan nontes*. Mitra Cendikia: Yogyakarta.
- Jogiyanto. 2008. *Pedoman Survey Kuesioner*. Badan Penerbit Fakultas Ekonomika dan Bisnis UGM: Yogyakarta.
- Kasihani E. Suyanto. 2002. Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di Sekolah Dasar: kebijakan, implementasi, dan kenyataan (Pidato Guru Besarnya Prof. Kasihani)
- Sax, Gilbert. 1980. *Principles of Educational and Psychological Measurement and Evaluation*. Wadsworth Publishing Company: California.