PROMOTING LECTURER'S IELTS SCORE THROUGH SUPER INTENSIVE (SUPIN) IELTS PREPARATION PROGRAM

Krisna Satria Perbowo
University of Muhammadiyah Prof.Dr.HAMKA
krisna_satrio@uhamka.ac.id

Bita Dwi Rahmani
University of Muhammadiyah Prof.Dr.HAMKA
bitadwi@uhamka.ac.id

Trisna Roy Pradipta
University of Muhammadiyah Prof.Dr.HAMKA
troymth@uhamka.ac.id

Abstract: One of the efforts to improve language skills of the lecturers is by joining IELTS Preparation program organized by one of the International Education institution (IEDUC) located in Bandung. This research aims to find out whether there is a correlation between the results of the Super-IELTS Intensive program (SUPIN) lecturer final score with the real International Test score in sort of the evaluation process on that program. The subject was taken from two classes program comprising 19 lecturers as participants. The data in this study were obtained from the pre and post-test score during SUPIN program and the score on the real International test conducted by the British Council. The result of the research revealed the fact that listening test obtained the highest gain while speaking got the lowest gain during the program. The further analyzing on Variance got a significant linier regression by having 0.959 as a coefficient correlation. It means that there is a significant correlation between final score of SUPIN program (X) and International test score (Y) which contribute 92.1% toward the International test score. Meanwhile, only 7.9% was contributed by other factors. In other words, the SUPIN program is effective to increase Lecturer's skill on doing IELTS test.

Keywords: *IELTS, Supin Program, correlation, evaluation*

INTRODUCTION

Are you ready to face the 21st century? What skills are needed mostly? Both those questions are frequently asked by many people particularly educator in universities who really are struggling to face the challenge in 21st century. They need to improve their ability such as the communication skill in English. Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education is really aware on preparing the lecturers to handle that challenge by striving hardly to enhance their quality. It is stated on the new enactment number 44 of 2015 which to complement the previous Law No. 12 of 2012 and Law No. 14 of 2005that "lecturers are required to have minimum academic qualifications of master for diploma or undergraduate and doctoral programs for postgraduate programs as well as the sufficient English skill both in spoken and or written (focusmedia: 2009). The enactments states also the program in

facilitating the lecturers to get scholarships both at homecountry or abroad to continue their studies where English skill is always badly needed on it.

Therefore, it is very welcomed by Indonesian universities, including Prof. Dr. Hamka Muhammadiyah University (UHAMKA), that they sent their lecturers from many different backgrounds to join IELTS (*International English Language Testing System)* preparatory training program *at IEDUC Bandung to enhance their ability in English.*

*IELTS is a English skill test that measures listening, reading, writing, and speaking comprehensions (Suminto, 2010:1475). This international and English skill test is run by Cambridge University, British Council and IDP Educational Australia, (Wikipedia.com). UHAMKA prefers IELTS over other International Tests due to its certificates are more acceptable to most educational institutions in Australia, the UK, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand, and South Africa academia, also more than 3,000 academic institutions in the United States and other European countries.*Generally speaking, overseas universities require different IELTS scores but the minimum score for the graduate program applicants ranges from 6 to 7. The score is the average score of the four aspects tests namely Listening, Reading, Speaking and Writing. In addition, Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education also sets a minimum score for lecturers who will apply for scholarships such as Excellence Scholarship Indonesian Lecturers Abroad which is 6.0 for each minimum score (BLNDIKTI: 2017). On the other words, each of lecturers should have an adequate minimum English requirements to study abroad. Therefore, the super intensive training program is needed to do for UHAMKA's lecturers to face the real International test. Therefore, this research was conducted to investigate on how the English basic competence of UHAMKA lecturer before and after IELTS training and what the correlation of UHAMKA lecturer's super-intensive training program in IEDUC on the real International Test score is. This research gains some merits not only for UHAMKA as a part of evaluation program but also for other universities who will do the same preparation program for their lecturers in IELTS.

The Role of Educational Institution to Improve English Language Ability

A private course or private institution may contribute to the nation by running a non-formal education (Article 13 paragraph 1 of Law No. 20 of 2003). Non-formal education can serve as a complementary for formal education. In other words, the non-formal education can present subjects or learning activities that have not been included in the formal education curriculum

(Sudjana, 2004 in Hidayatullah 2008).It is undeniable that the role of non-formal education institutions, especially English language education institutions is very important to improve the learners competence. In fact, there are various English institutions in Indonesia, some of which are English First (EF), LIA (Indonesian-American Institute) and IEDUC (International Education Center). However, UHAMKA chosed IEDUC which located on Jl.Cimanuk no.32 Bandung since it is proven that many previous learners got adequate score in real IELTS test. By having a motto to be one step ahead, IEDUC had been successfully to help the students in preparing themselves to study abroad by providing various learning programs as follows:

Table 1. English Language Programs in IEDUC

CLASSES	DURATION	DAYS	TIMES	PROGRAMS
REGULAR/ SEMI INTENSIVE	2 months (20x meeting)	3 days a week	• 1,5 hours/day • 3 hours/day • 6 hours/day	• IELTS Preparation • TOEFL Paper-based/iBT Prep. • TOEIC Preparation • GMAT/GRE/SAT Prep. • Communicative English • Conversation • Teenagers • KIDS/Children
INTENSIVE	1 month (20x meeting)	Study Everyday (5 days a week)	• 1,5 hours/day • 3 hours/day • 6 hours/day	• IELTS Preparation • TOEFL Paper-based/iBT Prep. • TOEIC Preparation • GMAT/GRE/SAT Preparation • Communicative English • Conversation • Teenagers • KIDS/Children
GROUP / COMPANY / INSITUTION	1-6 months/ Time is negotiable	Negotiable	Negotiable	• IELTS Preparation • TOEFL Paper-based/iBT Prep. • TOEIC Preparation • GMAT/GRE/SAT/NCLEX Prep. • Communicative English • Conversation • Teenagers/KIDS/Children • English for Bussiness • Giving Presentation • Others as required

Source: http://www.ieducindonesia.com/index.php

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The quantitative method is used to analyze the significantt differences of the mean score on pre and post-test. The data gathered from the score on IELTS Super Intensive Program in IEDUC and real International score from British Council as the legal institution who held the IELTS International test. The descriptive statistics was conducted to describe the data in table, chart as well as diagram. In addition, the inferential statistical was undergone to do statistical parametric such as normality, linearity, regression and correlation test to see the correlation between SUPIN-IEDUC program toward the real IELTS score.

RESULT

The preliminary data of lecturers score on pre-test conducted in IEDUC Super Intensive Program class (SUPIN), obtained 4.6 out of 7.0 for the highest and 1.7 out of 7.0 for the lowest one with the mean score 3. In addition, the Speaking test reached the highest mean score 3.72 while listening got the lowest mean score i.e. 2.4. However, after some weeks, the progress test one was held to predict the lecturer's score on IELTS. Based on the first progress test, it showed the progress on the IELTS score where it obtained 5.5 for the highest score and 2.9 for the lowest score with the score mean 4.5 where the Reading test was dominated by getting high score (4.71) and writing score become the lowest score (3.95) obtained on first progress test. The improvement was seen on the second progress test where the mean score increased to 4.9. The highest score is on Reading (5.5) while writing still gained the lowest score (4.37) among others. Finally, after two months intensive Super Intensive Program class (SUPIN), the final test scores gain a significant improvement. On final test, the participant attained 6.2 for the highest score and has still the same score (3.5) for the lowest one with the mean 5.39. Moreover, in the real of International test, the score achieves 7 as the highest and 4 for the lowest. Meanwhile, the mean score of the real test improves significantly to 5.7. However, the highest score is gained on writing test (5.82) and speaking gained as the lowest score (5.5) unexpectedly. All the data can be seen on the following table

Table 2. The description of the score gained on all tests

No	Test	Highest Total Score	Lowest Total Score	Mean Score	Highest Skill	Lowest Skill
1	Preliminary Test	4.6	1.7	3	Speaking(3.72)	Listening(2.4)
2	Progress 1	5.5	2.9	4.5	Reading(4.71)	Writing(3.95)
3	Progress 2	5.8	3.5	4.9	Reading(5.5)	Writing(4.37)
4	Final	6.2	3.5	5.39	Reading(5.39)	Writing(4.57)
5	International Test	7	4	5.7	Writing(5.82)	Speaking(5.5)

In addition, the normality and linearity of the test had been conducted as the preliminary test before further analysis. By using SPSS software, the result indicated that the data are normal distributed and normally. Next, the normalized Enhancement Data (N-Gain) test is also done to identify the significant improvement from preliminary test to IELTS real test as well as investigate the biggest upward trend among all skills. The result showed that that the average N-Gain of the preliminary test to progress test 1 is 0.199. Meanwhile, from progress test 1 to progress test 2 achieved 0.133 as the average N-Gain.The average N-Gain of progress test 2 to final test is 0.045 and the average N-Gain of final test to international test is 0.156. The four averages N-Gain is categorized in low category. However, the N-gain of preliminary test to the real International test, it gained 0.247 which will go to the average category. See the table below for the detail of N-Gain of all tests.

Tabel 3. *N-Gain* Data Score IELTS Lecturer *BatchII*

Moreover, this research is able to identify the biggest and the lowest of average N-gain that acquired

No	Label	Gain				Category				Mean	Preliminary Test N-Gain to International Test
		I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV		
1	R1	0.239	0.056	0.093	0.135	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.131	0.437
2	R2	0.106	0.122	0.043	0.095	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.092	0.321
3	R3	0.235	0.113	0.024	0.130	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.126	0.424
4	R4	0.130	0.180	0.025	0.226	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.140	0.462
5	R5	0.167	0.098	-0.009	0.099	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.089	0.317
6	R6	0.269	0.149	0.007	0.184	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.152	0.496
7	R7	0.215	0.112	0.026	0.140	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.123	0.416
8	R8	0.245	0.179	-0.014	0.167	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.144	0.476
9	R9	0.152	0.146	0.023	0.186	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.127	0.424
10	R10	0.228	0.151	-0.021	0.167	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.131	0.442
11	R11	0.256	0.075	0.101	0.248	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.170	0.535
12	R12	0.147	0.068	0.117	0.114	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.111	0.378
13	R13	0.251	0.088	0.039	0.060	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.110	0.383
14	R14	0.185	0.116	0.106	0.021	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.107	0.369
15	R15	0.199	0.099	0.118	0.286	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.175	0.545
16	R16	0.133	0.061	0.065	0.161	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.105	0.362
17	R17	0.160	0.150	0.014	0.172	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.124	0.417
18	R18	0.295	0.087	0.089	0.248	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.180	0.559
19	R19	0.163	0.100	0.012	0.125	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.100	0.349
avg		**0.199**	**0.113**	**0.045**	**0.156**						

by Listening test as the biggest average N-Gain score (0.478) and speaking test got the lowest average

N-Gain score(0.349) among others. It can be seen on the following table:

Table 4. N-Gain Listening Score Dataof IELTS Lecturer Batch II

No	Label	Gain				Ccategoryy				Gain
		I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	Average
1	R1	0.257	0.000	0.091	0.200	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.137
2	R2	0.277	0.000	0.167	0.000	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.111
3	R3	0.408	0.111	0.000	0.125	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.161
4	R4	0.143	0.167	0.100	0.111	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.130
5	R5	0.304	-0.091	0.250	-0.222	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.060
6	R6	0.375	0.222	-0.143	0.000	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.114
7	R7	0.257	0.000	0.182	0.111	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.137
8	R8	0.429	0.250	-0.167	0.000	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.128
9	R9	0.236	0.273	-0.125	0.222	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.152
10	R10	0.508	0.000	-0.167	0.429	Average	Low	Low	Average	0.193
11	R11	0.403	0.125	0.143	-0.167	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.126

12	R12	0.091	0.200	0.000	0.125	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.104
13	R13	0.365	0.000	0.125	0.000	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.123
14	R14	0.286	0.222	0.286	-0.200	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.148
15	R15	0.333	0.000	0.333	0.000	Average	Low	Average	Low	0.167
16	R16	0.111	0.000	0.250	0.167	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.132
17	R17	0.167	0.333	-0.167	0.143	Low	Average	Low	Low	0.119
18	R18	0.429	0.250	0.167	0.200	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.261
19	R19	0.397	-0.143	0.125	0.000	Average	Low	Low	Low	0.095
										0.478
	AVG									

Table 5. N-Gain Speaking Score Data of Batch II Lecturers

No	Label	Gain				Category				Rata-rata
		I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	Gain
1	R1	0.200	0.115	0.022	0.222	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.140
2	R2	0.031	0.127	0.091	0.000	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.062
3	R3	0.145	0.043	0.044	0.070	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.076
4	R4	0.021	0.087	0.048	0.250	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.101
5	R5	0.147	0.141	0.055	0.038	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.095
6	R6	0.135	0.067	0.095	0.079	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.094
7	R7	0.226	0.063	0.022	0.205	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.129
8	R8	0.185	0.091	0.050	0.079	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.101
9	R9	0.182	-0.022	0.087	0.167	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.103
10	R10	0.044	0.116	0.053	0.306	Low	Low	Low	Average	0.130
11	R11	0.146	0.024	0.125	0.286	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.145
12	R12	0.086	0.094	0.104	0.070	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.089
13	R13	0.104	0.023	0.095	-0.053	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.043
14	R14	0.073	0.118	0.111	-0.125	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.044
15	R15	0.075	0.108	0.000	0.242	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.106
16	R16	0.024	0.073	0.079	0.143	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.080
17	R17	0.023	0.070	0.125	0.286	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.126
18	R18	0.106	0.048	0.175	0.242	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.143
19	R19	0.065	0.047	0.024	0.250	Low	Low	Low	Low	0.097
										0.349
	AVG									

In addition, the further data analysis see the correlation between the super intensive IELTS program to the real International test by doing the regression test. The result obtained

the regression equation $\hat{Y} = 0,166 + 0,867.X$. It meansthe result of the final test score is positively correlated with the result of International test score. The regression equation shows that each addition of one score of final test result followed by the improvement of result of International test of lecturers equal to 0,867 with constant 0,166. Next, the further analysis of data obtained the coefficient correlation indicate how big is the contribution of super intensive IELTS program toward real IELTS test. It can be seen on the following table

Table 6. Model Summary[b]					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.959[a]	.921	.916	.1857	1.285

a. Predictors: (Constant), International test score
b. Dependent Variable: final test score

Based on the test results in table 6, the correlation coefficient between the final test score (X) and the international test score (Y) lecturer is 0.959. It means that is there is a significant relationship between the final test score and the international test score of batch II lecturers.

Furthermore, to enhance how strong is the percentage of correlation between final test score and international test score, the calculating coefficient of determination (r2) is conducted. The calculation in Table 6 shows determination coefficient is 92.1% or $r^2 = 0.921$. This means that 92.1% of final test scores influence the international test scores. Meanwhile, 7.9% was contributed by other factors.

DISCUSSION

From the findings it is found that in the preliminary diagnostic test, the lowest ability is in listening skill with an average score of 2.4 and the highest on Speaking with an average score of 3.72. While in the first progress test, the lowest skill is in writing with an average score of 3.95 and the highest fixed is in Reading with an average score of 4.71. Furthermore, in progress

test 2, the lowest skillis in writing with an average score of 4.37 and the highest is in Reading with an average score of 5.55. For the final test, the lowest skill is in Writing with an average score of 4.57 and the highest is on Reading with an average score of 5.39. While on the International Test, the lowest skill is on listening with an average score of 5.55 and the highest is in Writing with an average score of 5.82. Moreover, from the results of the study, the skill that has the highest capacity increase in the SUPIN-IEDUC program is on listening ability, while the lowest increase is in speaking ability. In addition, the results of the research shows the evident that there is a positive correlation between final test score and international test score of batch II lecturer by getting coefficient of determination equal to 0,921. It means that the acquisition of final test score of SUPIN-IEDUC resulted in a positive contribution of 92.1% of the result of International Batch II lecturer's score.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the study, it can be concluded that the average score of batch II IELTS lecturers' initial skill is 3.2 which is included to low category, with the lowest skill is in listening and the highest is in speaking. After participatingin SUPIN- IEDUC program, the IELTS skill of batch II lecturers improved to mid categorized, especially in listening skill which experienced the highest increase meanwhile speaking gets the lowest gain score. Based on the result of the study, it is proven that there is a positive correlation between final test score and international test score of batch II lecturers. The result of SUPIN-IEUDUC final test score gave positive contribution to the result of batch II lecturers' international test score. The implication of this study is the revealing of lecturers' IELTS score prediction by looking at the regression equations. If it were targetedd to achieve score of 7, then the 7.5 up to 8 results of final tests score is needed.

SUGGESTION

From the result of the study, the researcher can put forward into some suggestions. It is necessary to do a further research as a comparison from the result of SUPIN-IEDHC I and II to see the development of IELTS lecturers. This is mainly due to differences in training duration between 2 months and 3 months.

REFERENCES

Hidayatullah, A.S. (2008).PerananLembagaKursus Bahasa Inggrisdalam Pembangunan PendidikanMasyarakatTulungrejo Pare Kediri (StudiKasus di SMART International Language College). http://karya-ilmiah.um.ac.id/index.php/disertasi/article/view/827. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2003). Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices. San Francisco: Pearson Longman.

BukuPedomanSertifikasiPendidikUntukDosen (Serdos) Terintergrasi. http://sdm.ugm.ac.id/web/dok/serdos-2013-buku-ii-penilaian-portofolio.pdf. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

Suminto. (2010). TOEFL, IELTS, atau TOEIC Instrumen yang TepatuntukMengukurKemampuan Bahasa InggrisMahasiswaPoliteknikNegeriSamarinda. JurnalEksis Vol.6 No.2, Agustus 2010:1440-1605. ISSN: 0216-6437. http://www.karyailmiah.polnes.ac.id.

Yusuf, A. Muri. (2014). MetodePenelitian: Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, &PenelitianGabungan. Jakarta: Kencana.

http://dimastidano.wordpress.com/2012/11/28/masyarakat-ekonomi-asean-2015-peluang-atau-14ancaman/. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://edukasi.kompas.com/read/2011/08/02/15113021/Yang.Perlu.Diketahui.tentang.IELTS. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://edukasi.kompasa.com/read/2011/09/26/21320318/Kemampuan.Bahasa.Inggris.di.Indonesia.Rendah. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://hypnocativespeech.com/article/323-apa-pentingnya-mengetahui-level-bahasa-inggris-anda.html). Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/IELTS. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.bantulonline.com/2012/05/perbedaan-toefl-ielts-dan-toeic-serta.html. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/TOEFL.Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://media2.ef.com/__/~/media/centralefcom/epi/downloads/full-reports/v4/ef-epi-2014-indonesian.pdf EF EPI. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://regional.kompas.com/read/2012/05/13/1701100/Inilah.Awal.Mula.Berdirinya.Kampung.Inggris. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://serdos.dikti.go.id. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://suarajakarta.com/2012/10/14/kesiapan-masyarakat-indonesia-menuju-masyarakat-ekonomi-asean-2015/. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.ets.org/toefl. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.ets.org/toeic. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.languagetesting.com/language-testing-and-assessment Language Testing and Assessment.Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.melab.org/.Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

http://www.vistaeducation.com/news/v/all/tingkat-kemampuan-bahasa-inggris-indonesia.Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

https://www.ielts.org/.Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.

https://www.press.umich.edu/pdf/0472032011-intro.pdf.Introduction to Issues in Language Assessment and Terminology. Diaksespada 12 Mei 2016.