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ABSTRAK

Penyelidikan ini bertujuan mengkaji kebolehan pelajar-pelajar aliran Sains dalam membuat bacaan secara kritis berdasarkan soalan-soalan kefahaman yang dikemukakan untuk tujuan kajian ini. Soalan-soalan ini digubarkan berdasarkan Taxonomi Bacaan dan Kefahaman Barret. Dua jenis teks bacaan diberikan: jenis narrative dan expository. Pelajar-pelajar ini digolongkan dalam golongan yang mempunyai kefasihan Bahasa Inggeris yang baik berdasarkan keputusan Bahasa Inggeris mereka dalam Peperiksaan Penilaian Menengah Rendah (PMR). Mereka ini telah mencapai keputusan A, B atau C dalam keputusan Bahasa Inggeris peringkat PMR.


Analisa daripada kajian ini menunjukkan dalam menjawab soalan-soalan diperangkat evaluative dan appreciative, kebanyakannya daripada pelajar yang memperolehi A dalam PMR Bahasa Inggeris menggunakan lebih banyak jenis jawapan daripada kategori textually-scriptally implicit berbanding dengan pelajar-pelajar yang memperolehi keputusan B dan C. Bagaimanapun bagi jenis soalan peringkat literal dan inferential, tidak terdapat perbezaan yang ketara antara ketiga-ketiga kumpulan pelajar ini. Di peringkat evaluative dan appreciative, kumpulan yang memperolehi C merupakan kumpulan yang paling ramai mempunyai jawapan dari kategori tidak relevan atau tidak lengkap itu.
ABSTRACT

This study aims to gauge Form Five Science students of Sek. Men. Keb. Bukit Saujana's ability to read critically from their answers to given comprehension questions which were set based on Barrett's Taxonomy of Reading Comprehension (1968). Two types of texts were given: narrative and expository texts. These students were seen as proficient English Language students based on their results in the Penilaian Menengah Rendah (PMR) English Language examination which included A, B and C scorers.

The answers were analysed using the terms adapted from Pearson and Johnson (1978) for analysing answers to comprehension questions of various types. The terms that were adapted for analysing the answers in this study included the text explicit, text implicit, text-script implicit as well as the irrelevant or incomplete types.

Results from the study indicate that while for questions of the evaluative and appreciative levels that A scorers did use more of the text script implicit type of answers but for literal and inferential levels, there was only a marginal difference between the A, B or C scorers. The C scorers comprised the biggest group in giving irrelevant or incomplete category of answers to evaluative and appreciative level kinds of questions.
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