CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter is divided into two parts, the first part is the summary of the research and the second is the recommendation.

SUMMARY

One can conclude from Chapter 4 that EPT Form I and II are generally reliable tests. The tests were correlated in as many ways as possible to show how reliable they are. Figure 3 is a graphical representation of the Research Questions (Chapter 1) that was formulated as a guideline to conduct the research and write the report, and the coefficients that have been obtained through the statistical procedures.

Figure 3. Research Questions in Graphic Form

1.	EPT Form I	-----**correlation**-----	EPT Form II	r = 0.935*
(a)	Section A	-----**correlation**-----	Section A	r = 0.886*
	Part 1	-----**correlation**-----	Part 1	r = 0.677*
	Part 2	-----**correlation**-----	Part 2	r = 0.710*
	Part 3	-----**correlation**-----	Part 3	r = 0.569*
(b)	Section B	-----**correlation**-----	Section B	r = 0.744*
	Part 1	-----**correlation**-----	Part 1	r = 0.636*
	Part 2	-----**correlation**-----	Part 2	r = 0.620*
	Part 3	-----**correlation**-----	Part 3	r = 0.186
(c)	Section C	-----**correlation**-----	Section C	r = 0.828*
	Part 1	-----**correlation**-----	Part 1	r = 0.697*
	Part 2	-----**correlation**-----	Part 2	r = 0.738*
(d)	Section D	-----**correlation**-----	Section D	r = 0.461*
	Question 1	-----**correlation**-----	Question 1	r = 0.359*
	Question 2	-----**correlation**-----	Question 2	r = 0.217

Figure 3. (continued)

2. (a)

EPT Form I		
Section A	}	**Reliability**
Section B	}	**Analysis**
Section C	}	$\alpha = 0.815$
Section D	}	

(i)

Section A		
Part 1	}	**Reliability**
Part 2	}	**Analysis**
Part 3	}	$\alpha = 0.770$

(ii)

Section B		
Part 1	}	**Reliability**
Part 2	}	**Analysis**
Part 3	}	$\alpha = 0.599$

(iii)

Section C		
Part 1	}	**Reliability**
Part 2	}	**Analysis**
		$\alpha = 0.786$

(iv)

Section D		
Question 1	}	**Reliability**
Question 2	}	**Analysis**
		$\alpha = 0.239$

2. (b)

EPT Form II		
Section A	}	
Section B	}	**Reliability**
Section C	}	**Analysis**
Section D	}	$\alpha = 0.787$

(i)

Section A		
Part 1	}	**Reliability**
Part 2	}	**Analysis**
Part 3	}	$\alpha = 0.757$

(ii)

Section B		
Part 1	}	**Reliability**
Part 2	}	**Analysis**
Part 3	}	$\alpha = 0.453$

Figure 3. (continued)

(iii)

Section C		**Reliability Analysis**
Part 1	}	
Part 2	}	$\alpha = 0.831$

(iv)

Section D		**Reliability Analysis**
Question 1	}	
Question 2	}	$\alpha = 0.661$

Additional question:

EPT Form I -----**correlation**----- ITM Final English Examination r = 0.551*

Note:

- *The words in bold (***correlation** *and* **Reliability Analysis***) are the statistical procedures*
- r = *Pearson's correlation coefficient*
- * = *Significance at 0.01 level.*
- α = *Cronbach's Alpha coefficient*

The summary in Figure 3 indicates that Section B, Part 3 and Section D, Question 2 seem to have insignificant Pearson's correlation coefficients. The Alpha for Section B for EPT Form I is 0.599 and EPT Form II is 0.453. Meanwhile the alpha for Section D for EPT Form I is 0.239 and EPT Form II is 0.661. From this information, we can sum that the Section B, Part 3 of EPT Form II and Section D, Question 2 of EPT Form I has to be reviewed. Otherwise, the results claim that these tests, EPT Forms I and II are reliable tests, with significant coefficients.

The additional question, testing the validity of EPT Form I, seem to be favourable as well, with a significant coefficient of 0.551. Thus, EPT Form I has predictive validity.

RECOMMENDATION

With great importance, the problems of the test paper should be addressed, particularly Section B, Part 3 and Section D, Question 2. Section B, Part 3 tests on Question Tags. It is recommended that firstly, the number of items should be increased. A correlation between EPT Form I and EPT Form II for this section should be analysed. Then, a Reliability Analysis should be administered for all the three parts of Section B for both tests separately. If the coefficients obtained are favourable, then increasing the number of items will be the best solution. The more questions in this part would suggest that the possibility for a student to get more correct answers is greater, and this could increase the coefficient. If the problem persists despite increasing the number of items, then another Structure-type item should be tested instead of Question Tags.

Practical considerations have limited the number of items used in each part. For scoring purposes, the total scores for each section is retained as 50, i.e. 1 mark per item.

The Writing Section, Section D, seems to be a problem too in this EPT, especially for Form I. From the explanation in Chapter 4, time is the root of the problem. The recommended time would be for Question 1 – 25 minutes and Question 2 – 35 minutes. There should not be any fuss on the sequence of the questions answered, just like the present instruction. Subsequently, the whole test will be for 2 hour and 20 minutes.

From the observations made during the administration of the test, it was noticed that students tend to complete the Structure (Section B) and Vocabulary (Section C) well before the time is up. So, it is highly recommended that once the students have completed a section, they can go on to the next section. If a student has completed

Section C, he can hand in his papers and take a break. Officially, there should be a ten-minute break between Section C and D. If a student completes Section C before the stipulated time, he then has a longer break. In this way, the student will be more relaxed when attempting the essay questions.

The other sections where the coefficients are relatively high and significant indicates that the type of items tested are good. This is very obvious in the case of Section C, Vocabulary. The use of appropriate words in context (statements) and paraphrasing (phrases) are better ways of testing this section.

It is recommended that for Section A, the recordings should be done by Malaysians with a variety of ethnic accents. The ones in EPT Forms I and II are of American accent. This is to rule out cultural bias as the students sitting for this test are Malaysians and they are more attuned to the local accents. To obtain better reliability results, it is also brought to attention that different items and methods could be tried out in testing the same construct (listening skills) for Part 3 of this section.

When conducting this placement test, the invigilator must ensure that the environment of the venue is non-threatening. There should not be any distractions in the vicinity of the venue. A suggestion is that the invigilator can put up signages around the vicinity of the venue to announce that the placement test is in progress and silence is appreciated.

Finally, the aspect of validity. The EPT Form II can be correlated with the ITM Final English Examination to ensure predictive validity. From this research only EPT Form I has been analysed for predictive validity. However this results cannot be compared to the existing predictive validity for Form I, because the sample background might be different. A suggestion to overcome this problem is a sample of students sitting for this placement test should be divided into 2 groups, one is given EPT Form I and the other, EPT Form II. At the end of the semester, the two groups will sit for the same ITM Final examination. Both the EPTs can be correlated with the ITM Final English examination separately and the coefficients can be compared. If they are high and significant, then it can be concluded that both forms of EPT have predictive validity.

In conclusion, this research has its limitations and setbacks despite having proved that EPT Forms I and II are reliable tests (with a reliability estimate of 0.935 between the two forms). There is always room for improvement and it is hoped that recommendations above are helpful for further studies.