CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents two parts. The first part is the summary of the findings and the second part is suggestions.

5.1 Conclusion

This study was aimed to find out whether there was a significant difference on the college students' reading performance between those who attended computer based reading test and paper pencil based reading test. The subjects of this study were 24 students of Reading II C class from academic year 2015/2016.

According to the above discussion, it could be said that there was no significant difference between students who did their reading test using computer based reading test and those who did their reading test using paper pencil based reading test. The number of students who chose paper pencil based reading test were dominant in both two groups. However, B group was much more dominant in choosing paper pencil based reading test than A group.

The common reasons why they didn't really like computer based reading test was commonly not from the materials inside the test but the lack of experience in doing computer based reading test, the risk of reading using computer in long time and the quality of the computers in the Digital Language Laboratory themselves and they should be renewed.

Although, the students' reasons and their test score stand on the paper pencil based reading test, the fact that digital era was developing day by day couldn't be denial. Hence, the existence of computer based reading test in Digital Language Laboratory should be maximized by both of the students and lecturers in order to be able to follow the development of the digital era as one of the basics of the 21st century teaching and learning activity besides the cooperative learning and student centre techniques.

5.2 Suggestions

The writer divided the suggestions into two parts. The first was suggestions from the writer to the English Department lecturers. The second was from the writer to further studies.

5.2.1 The Writer's Suggestions for English Department Lecturers

In line with the writer's finding that there is no significant difference between those two different reading test modes, the English Department lecturers should apply both CBT and PPBT in their teaching and testing activities. The application of the CBT and PPBT should be done equally to make the students more enthusiastic in following both the lesson and the test.

5.2.2 The Writer's Suggestions for Further Studies

The result of the study is there is no significant difference in the test result of the two different test modes. There are some suggestions that should be considered by

further studies as the cause of unexpected result. Therefore, for further studies, the writer has some recommendations, as follows:

1. The number of the subjects should be statistically sufficient.

2. There should be more detailed and specific discussion focusing on the reliability of the test materials.

3. A comparative study should be conducted between the computer based reading test examinees and paper pencil based reading test examinees in more clear time-series design.

Bibliography

Anonymous. (2004). *T-Tests, P-Values, and Statistical Significance*. http://mathforum.org/library/drmath/view/65472.html. Retrieved on January 11, 2017.

Anonymous. (2005) .*Reading Comprehension Success in 20 Minutes 3rd Edition*. Learning Express. New York.

Anonymous. (2015). *Buku Pedoman Akademik FKIP*.

Adisutrisno, W. 2015. *Discourse Analysis*.

Akyol, Z. (2009). *Examining Teaching Presence, Social Presence, Cognitive Presence, Satisfaction and Learning in Online and Blended Course Contexts*. (Ph.D Thesis, Middle East Technical University).

Balajthy, E. (2007). *Technology and Current Reading Literacy Assessment Strategies*. The Reading Teacher. 61*(3)*, 240-247.

Bulger, M. (2006). *Beyond search: A Preliminary Skill Set for Online Literacy*. The Transliteracy Project. Retrieved July 1, 2016 from http:www.transliteracies.english.ucsb.edu

Brown, J.D, 1992. *Computers in Language Testing:Present Research and Some Future Directions*.University of Hawai'i at Manoa.

Dong, B. (2011). *A Content Validity Study of TEM-8 Reading Comprehension (2008 - 2010)*.   http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:428958/FullText01.pdf. Retrieved: on August 31, 2016.

DePersio, G. (2015). *What Are the Advantages of Using a Simple Random Sample to Study a Larger Population?*. http://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/042915/what-are-advantages-using-simple-random-sample-study-larger-population.asp. Retrieved: on April 18, 2017.

Dziuban, C. (2004). *Blended learning*. Educause, 2004*(7)*. 1-12.

Educational Testing Service. (1996). *TOEFL: Announcing Computer-Based Testing*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Gomez. (2007). *Reading for Learning*. The Phi Delta Kappan, 89*(3)*, 224-228.

Harmon, M. (2011). *T-test in Excel the Excel Statitiscal Master*. http://excelmasterseries.com/D-_Loads/New_Manuals/t_Testing_in_Excel.pdf. Retrieved on January 10, 2017.

Hoffmann, T., Russell, M,. Higgins, J..2005. *Examining the Effect of Computer-Based Passage Presentation on Reading Test Performance*, Boston College (2005). Retrieved: on April 11, 2017.

Hosseini, M., Jafre Zainol A.M., Baghdarnia, M..2014. *Comparability of Test Results of Computer Based Tests (CBT) and Paper and Pencil Tests (PPT) among English Language Learners in Iran.* University Sains Malaysia (USM), 11800, Penang, Malaysia (2014).

Kim, J. Y., & Anderson, T. (2011). *Reading Across the Curriculum: A Framework for Improving the Reading Abilities and Habits of College Students.* Journal of College Literacy & Learning, 37, 29-40.

Latham, P., & Gross, M. (2008). *Broken links: Undergraduates Look Back on Their Experiences with Information Literacy in K-12 Education*. Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University, School of Information.

National Endowment for the Arts (2007, November). *To Read or Not to Read*: A question with national consequence. (Research Report #47) Washington, DC: Library of Congress. New Jersey Department.

O'Brien, D., & Scharber, C. (2008). *Digital Literacies Go to School: Potholes and Possibilities.* Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52*(1)*,66-68.

Ngadiman, A. 2006. *The Functions of Schemata in Reading Comprehension and the Implication for Teaching EFL Reading Comprehension.* Magister Scientiae edisi No.19 – Maret 2006.

Peak, P. (2005). *Recent Trends in Comparability Studies.* Retrieved on September 2, 2016 from http://www.pearsonedmeasurement.comldownloads/researchlRR_05_05.pdf.

Pinner, R. (2011). Computer-Based Testing Vs. Paper-Based Testing: *What are the advantages, disadvantages and what is the future of language testing?* International Journal of Electrical & Computer Sciences, 10*(1)*, 56-59. Retrieved on March 13, 2016.

Schwantner, U., Toferer, B., & Schreiner, C. (Eds.).2013. PISA 2012. *International Comparison of Students' Performance.* First Results. Math.Reading. Science. https://www.bifie.at/system/files/buch/pdf/pisa12_erste_ergebnisse_2013-12-03.pdf. Graz, Austria: Leykam. Retrieved on August 18, 2016.

Sharpe, P. (2007). *How to Prepare for the TOEFL*[®] *iBT, 12th Edition*. Binarupa Aksara.

Walker, J. B. (2000). *Diagnostic Teaching of Reading: Techniques for Instruction and Assessment* (4th ed.)*.* OH:Merril.