

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter covers the conclusions of the study and some suggestions related to the conclusion.

5.1 Conclusions

This study answers the main problem of this study that is categories of questions used in Reading examinations at the English Department of Widya Mandala Chatolic University Surabaya and raises some thoughts about several possible reasons of the finding. Here are the conclusions of the study:

(1) All categories of comprehension questions belonging to Barrett Taxonomy were used in the Reading examinations at the English Department in academic year of 2011/2012, 2012/2013, and 2013/2014. They were literal, inference, evaluation and appreciation. Out of 627 comprehension questions in the Reading examinations, 290 items were literal, 314 items were inferential, 22 items were evaluative and 1 item was appreciative. In the percentage, from 100% comprehension questions, 46% was on literal, 50% was on inference, 4% was on evaluation and 0% is on appreciation. From the numbers and percentages, a tendency of question categories used in the Reading examinations at the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University is concluded. Literal and inferential questions always dominate comprehension questions whereas evaluative and appreciative questions always appear in too small numbers in the Reading examinations

(2) The finding of this study may be caused by several reasons. The discussions are as follows:

(a) All forms of questions found in the Reading examinations such as Multiple Choice, True or False, Wh questions, and Instruction generate big numbers of literal and inferential questions. Evaluative questions are generated in a small numbers through the use of True or False, Wh questions and Instruction. Meanwhile, appreciative question is generated in one Wh question item only.

(b) The distribution for the use of question categories which is implicitly written through the syllabuses' basic competences has not been set proportionally as there were too many basic competences belonged to inference, while two basic competences belonged to literal, one basic competence belonged to evaluation and no basic competence belonged to appreciation.

5.2 Suggestions

As the writer hopes that this study becomes a contribution for any improvement in the Reading subject of the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, helpful suggestions following the conclusions are delivered for the Reading lecturers and the English Department. Recommendations for the next study are also delivered.

5.2.1 Suggestions for the Reading Lecturers

When looking back to the explanation in Chapter 2, forms of question have functions that give a chance for various categories of questions to be produced. True or False is a form of question that can produce literal, inferential,

evaluative and appreciative questions. Multiple Choice is a form of question that can produce literal and inferential questions. Wh Question is a form of question that is perfect for producing literal, inferential, evaluative, and appreciative questions. Instruction is also perfect for producing literal, inferential, evaluative and appreciative questions. Based on that, various forms of questions help to achieve good distribution of all question categories.

As explained in Chapter 2, skills of remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating need to be learnt at the same time, not in a hierarchical time since they together are used in any stages of problem solving process of the students. For that purpose, the use of question categories should not be ordered in hierarchical sequence. Literal, inferential, evaluative and appreciative questions must be actively used in the Reading examinations of any levels. Even they may not appear in totally the same numbers in any teaching-learning activities, they all have the equal importance to be distributed in any teaching-learning process. Finally it is suggested that forms of questions should be used optimally following the functions that each has and the need of distributing all question categories. As the numbers of evaluative and appreciative questions are too small as compared to those of literal and inferential questions in the Reading examinations, it is wise to add the numbers of evaluative and appreciative questions in True or False, Wh questions and instructions so that the students have better reading competences.

In producing evaluative and appreciative questions, a suitable scoring system needs to be applied. Since the answers that may come from the two

categories of questions are subjective arguments, then precise score that is for scoring textual answers is not suitable be used. In this case, reading rubric is recommended. In rubric, the score is in term of scale. For example, 5 means excellent, 4 means great, 3 means good, 2 means not good enough, 1 means poor. In scoring subjective arguments that may be raised through evaluative and appreciative questions, lecturers may classify the students' arguments into the scale based on its criticism, logic, creativity, innovation, moral value and etc.

5.2.2 Suggestion for the English Department

As basic competences in Reading syllabus show what will be achieved after students join the Reading class, the questions in the Reading examinations should totally follow the recommendation which is implicitly taken from the basic competences. When it happens, lecturers can score whether the students have achieved the basic competences or not. As the lecturers should look to the Reading syllabus, specifically toward the basic competences when making questions, the Reading syllabuses are expected to be the ideal guidance. Therefore, evaluation toward the syllabuses needs to be done periodically following the recent situation and the need of distributing all question categories actively.

Talking about the ideal portion that should be given for each question category, even Barrett Taxonomy did not mention it. There is no theory mentioning that literal, inferential, evaluative and appreciative questions must come about one fourth each. Therefore, they may not appear in totally the same

numbers in any teaching-learning activities. However the distribution for literal, inferential, evaluative and appreciative questions in any level of Reading must be balanced.

As the students join all levels of Reading course in which the difficulty level of passages is keep being increased, it is good for the students to have all their competences are developed well in each level. Therefore, it is suggested that basic competences in the Reading syllabuses that belong to inference should be decreased so that basic competences that belong to evaluation and appreciation can be added as the basic competences that belong to literal has been set in a proper number.

5.2.3 Recommendations for Further Study

As this study has explained the tendency of question categories used in the Reading examinations at the English Department of Widya Mandala Surabaya Catholic University, it is recommended that more studies explaining the use of question categories in the teaching – learning process of the Reading subject should be conducted. Next researchers can study on the course books, discussion activity, or quizzes. By having series of studies evaluating the tendencies of question categories used in the Reading subject, the English Department and the Reading lecturers may do a maximal evaluation and improvement toward the course so that the students develop a better reading competence.

BIBIOGRAPHY

- Abeyrathna, P. H. A. S. (2004). *A Study on Leisure Reading Habits and Interests Among Secondary school Students in Sri Lanka*. University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Adisutrisno, D. W. (2002). The Limitations of the Short-Term Memory in Reading. *Magister Scientiae*, 12.
- Anderson. R. D. (1994). *Issues of Curriculum Reform in Science, Mathematics and Higher Order Thinking Across The Diciplines*. Diane Publishing.
- Armbruster, B. B., & Ostertag, J. (1989). *Questions in Elementary Science and Social Studies Textbooks*. Illinois, Urbana Champaign.
- Barrett, T. C. (1976). Increasing Reading Comprehension Using Information Literacy Skills. Retrieved 15 November 2013
- Blachowicz, C. L. Z., & Ogle, D. (2008). *Reading Comprehension: Strategies for Independent Learners*: Guilford Press.
- Budiono, D. (2001). Teaching Reading Through Narrative Literary Texts by Using Barrett's Taxonomy-Based Questions. *Magister Scientiae*, 10.
- Brown, H. D. (1994). *Teaching By Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. United States of America: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Cain, K. (2010). *Reading Development and Difficulties*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Caldwell, J. A. S. (2008). *Comprehension Assessment: A Classroom Guide*: Guilford Publications.
- Cheryl L. Champeau De Lopez, G. M. B., and Maria E. Arreaza-Coyle. (1997). Evaluating Reading Comprehension in EFL *A Taxonomy*, 35(2).
- Day, R. R., & Park, J.-s. (2005). Developing Reading Comprehension Questions. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 17(1).

- Dubuis, M. M., & Askov, E. N. (1982). *Content Area Reading: An Individualized Approach*. Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Gosher, B. & Gosher, S. (2007). *X-Kit FET Grade 11& 12 English Home Language*. Pearson.
- Humos, O. A. (2012). An Evaluative Analysis of Comprehension Questions' Level of Difficulty: A case of 12th Grade Palestinian English Student's Textbook. *An - Najah Univ. J. Res. (Humanities)*, 26(3).
- Hunaifi, A. A. (2008). An Analysis Of Levels of Questions Toward Language Testing Using Barrett's Taxonomy. The State Islamic University, Malang.
- Jones, D. (2004). *Painless Reading Comprehension*: Barron's.
- Krathwohl, D. R. (2002). A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy: An Overview. *Theory into Practice*, 41(4).
- Laughlin, M. M. (2014). International Reading Accosiation : The World's Leading Organization of Literacy Proffesionals. Retrieved 17 of March, 2014, from <http://www.reading.org/general/AboutIRA.aspx>
- McKenna, M. C., & A, K. & Stahl, D. (2012). *Assessment for Reading Instruction*. Guilford Publications, Inc.
- McNamara, D. S. (2012). *Reading Comprehension Strategies: Theories, Interventions, and Technologies*: Taylor & Francis.
- Mohammed, N. (1992). *Levels of Questions: A description of Textbook and Exam Questions in Higher Secondary Schools*. Addis Abba University.
- Moreillon, J. (2007). *Collaborative Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension: Maximizing Your Impact*. United states of Amerika: American Library Association.
- Ngadiman, A. (2001). The Importance of Metacognitive Skills in Reading Comprehension. *Magister Scientiae*, 10.
- Overbaugh, R. C., & Schultz, L. (n.d.). Bloom's Taxonomy. Retrieved 30 April 2014, from http://ww2.odu.edu/educ/roverbau/Bloom/blooms_taxonomy.htm
- Silalahi, U. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Sosial*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Unsworth, L. (2005). *Researching Language in Schools and Communities: Functional Linguistic Perspectives*: Continuum International Publishing Group, Limited.