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ABSTRACT


Advisor: Dr. Bartholomeus Budiyono
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Nowadays, many teachers still used the conventional test called paper-pencil test. The minimum design of paper pencil test decreased the willingness of the examinees to read the passages; as a result many of them got bad score in their reading test. In order to solve this problem, we needed a new, comfortable, and effective reading test in technological system called computer based test. The need of this new invention was influenced by the development of digital era including the development of the use of computer in education, including English language teaching itself.

In this study, the writer administered 2 different test modes for reading in order to find out whether there was a significant difference between those who did their test using computer based reading test and paper pencil based reading test. The writer used case study with an accessible group. The subject of this study was Reading II C students. The writer did the two different modes reading test once in 4 continuation weeks. After doing the test, the subjects would be given a questionnaire to confirm and strengthen the writer’s hypotheses.

Moreover, the writer used t-test to analyze the data. The type of t-test was called two sample assuming two unequal variances. The writer found that the value of $p = 0.622$ where the $p$-value was greater than 0.05 so it was said to be that there was no significant difference and therefore $H_0$ was accepted. In conclusion, the two different test modes didn’t affect the students’ reading performance.