

Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology


Volume 14, Issue 4
October 2015

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman
Editor-in-Chief

Prof. Dr. Jerry WILLIS - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson - AECT President
Editors

Assist.Prof.Dr. Fahme DABAJ - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC
Associate Editor

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan
Assistant Editor





**THE
TURKISH ONLINE
JOURNAL
OF
EDUCATIONAL
TECHNOLOGY**

October 2015

Volume 14 - Issue 4

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İşman
Editor-in-Chief

Editors

Prof. Dr. Jerry Willis
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson

Associate Editor

Assist. Prof. Dr. Fahme Dabaj

Assistant Editor

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu

ISSN: 2146 - 7242

Indexed by

Education Resources Information Center – ERIC
SCOPUS - ELSEVIER

Copyright © THE TURKISH ONLINE JOURNAL OF EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

All rights reserved. No part of TOJET's articles may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Published in TURKEY

Contact Address:
Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN
TOJET, Editor in Chief
Sakarya-Turkey

Message from the Editor-in-Chief

Dear Colleagues,

I am very pleased to publish v14i4, 2015 issue. As an editor of The Online Journal of Educational Technology, this issue is the success of the reviewers, editorial board and the researchers. In this respect, I would like to thank to all reviewers, researchers and the editorial board.

The v14i4, 2015 issue covers different research scopes, approaches which subjects about new developments in education educational technology by valuable researchers. The editorial team will be pleased to share various researches with this issue as it is the miracle of our journal. All authors can submit their manuscripts to tojet.editor@gmail.com for the next issues.

TOJET, Governor State University, Sakarya University and Vienna University of Technology will organize International Educational Technology Conference-2016 (www.iet-c.net) between February 04-06, 2016 in Dubai, UAE.

Call for Papers

TOJET invites article contributions. Submitted articles should be about all aspects of educational technology and may address assessment, attitudes, beliefs, curriculum, equity, research, translating research into practice, learning theory, alternative conceptions, socio-cultural issues, special populations, and integration of subjects. The articles should also discuss the perspectives of students, teachers, school administrators and communities.

The articles should be original, unpublished, and not in consideration for publication elsewhere at the time of submission to TOJET.

October 01, 2015

Editor in Chief

Prof. Dr. Aytekin ISMAN

Editorial Board

Editors

Prof. Dr. Aytekin İŞMAN - Sakarya University, Turkey
Prof. Dr. Jerry WILLIS - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA
Prof. Dr. J. Ana Donaldson – AECT, Past President

Associate Editor

Assist.Prof.Dr. Fahme DABAJ - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC

Assistant Editor

Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan

Editorial Board

Prof.Dr. Ahmet Zeki Saka - Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Akif Ergin - Başkent University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Ali Al Mazari - Alfaisal University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia
Prof.Dr. Ali Ekrem Özkul - Anadolu University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Antoinette J. Muntjewerff - University of Amsterdam
Prof.Dr. Arif Altun - Hacettepe University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Arvind Singhal - University of Texas, USA
Prof.Dr. Asaf Varol - Fırat University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Aytekin İşman - Sakarya University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Brent G. Wilson - University of Colorado at Denver, USA
Prof.Dr. Buket Akkoyunlu - Hacettepe University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Cengiz Hakan Aydın - Anadolu University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Chang-Shing Lee - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Charlotte N. (Lani) Gunawardena - University of New Mexico, USA
Prof.Dr. Chi - Jui Lien - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Chih - Kai Chang - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Chin-Min Hsiung - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Colin Latchem - Open Learning Consultant, Australia
Prof.Dr. Colleen Sexton - Governor State University, USA
Prof.Dr. Demetrios G. Sampson - University of Piraeus, Greece
Prof.Dr. Dimiter G. Velev - University of National and World Economy, Bulgaria
Prof.Dr. Don M. Flournoy - Ohio University, USA
Prof.Dr. Dongsik Kim - Hanyang University, South Korea
Prof.Dr. Enver Tahir Rıza - Dokuz Eylül University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Eralp Altun - Ege University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Feng-chiao Chung - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Ferhan Odabaşı - Anadolu University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Finland Cheng - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Fong Soon Fook - Uniiiversiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
Prof.Dr. Francine Shuchat Shaw - New York University, USA
Prof.Dr. Gianni Viardo Vercelli - University of Genova, Italy
Prof.Dr. Gwo - Dong Chen - National Central University Chung - Li, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Hafize Keser - Ankara University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Halil İbrahim Yalın - Gazi University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Heli Ruokamo - University of Lapland, Finland
Prof.Dr. Henry H.H. Chen - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Ing. Giovanni Adorni - University of Genova, Italy
Prof.Dr. J. Ana Donaldson - AECT President
Prof.Dr. J. Michael Spector - University of North Texas, USA
Prof.Dr. Jerry Willis - ST John Fisher University in Rochester, USA
Prof.Dr. Jie-Chi Yang - National central university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Kinshuk - Athabasca University, Canada
Prof.Dr. Kiyoshi Nakabayashi - Chiba Institute of Technology, Japan
Prof.Dr. Kumiko Aoki - The Open University of Japan, Japan
Prof.Dr. Kuo - En Chang - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Kuo - Hung Tseng - Meiho Institute of Technology, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Kuo - Robert Lai - Yuan - Ze University, Taiwan

- Prof.Dr. Liu Meifeng - Beijing Normal University, China
Prof.Dr. Marina Stock Mcisaac - Arizona State University, USA
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Ali Dikermen - Middlesex University, UK
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Çağlar - Near East University, TRNC
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Gürol - Firat University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Mehmet Kesim - Anadolu University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Mei-Mei Chang - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Melissa Hui-Mei Fan - National central university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Min Jou - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Ming - Puu Chen - National Taiwan Normal University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Murat Barkan - Yaşar University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Mustafa Murat Inceoğlu - Ege University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Mustafa Şahin Dündar - Sakarya University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Nabi Bux Jumani - International Islamic University, Pakistan
Prof.Dr. Nian - Shing Chen - National Sun Yat - Sen University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Paul Gibbs - Middlesex University, UK
Prof.Dr. Petek Aşkar - Hacettepe University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Ramdane Younsi - Ecole polytechnique de Montreal, Canada
Prof.Dr. Rauf Yıldız - Çanakkale 19 Mart University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Roger Hartley - University of Leeds, UK
Prof.Dr. Rozhan Hj. Mohammed Idrus - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
Prof.Dr. Saedah Siraj - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Prof.Dr. Sello Mokoena - University of South Africa, South Africa
Prof.Dr. Servet Bayram - Yeditepe University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Shan - Ju Lin - National Taiwan University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Sheng Quan Yu - Beijing Normal University, China
Prof.Dr. Shi-Jer Lou - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Shu - Sheng Liaw - China Medical University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Shu-Hsuan Chang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Stefan Aufenanger - University of Mainz, Germany
Prof.Dr. Stephen Harmon - Georgia State University, USA
Prof.Dr. Stephen J.H. Yang - National Central University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Sun Fuwan - China Open University, China
Prof.Dr. Sunny S.J. Lin - National Chiao Tung University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Teresa Franklin - Ohio University, USA
Prof.Dr. Toshio Okamoto - University of Electro - Communications, Japan
Prof.Dr. Toshiyuki Yamamoto - Japan
Prof.Dr. Tzu - Chien Liu - National Central University, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Ülkü Köymen - Lefke European University, TRNC
Prof.Dr. Vaseudev D.Kulkarni - Hutatma Rajjguru College, Rajguruunagar(Pune),(M.S.) INDIA
Prof.Dr. Xibin Han - Tsinghua University, China
Prof.Dr. Yau Hon Keung - City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong
Prof.Dr. Yavuz Akpınar - Boğaziçi University, Turkey
Prof.Dr. Yen-Hsyang Chu - National central university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Yuan - Chen Liu - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Yuan-Kuang Guu - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Prof.Dr. Young-Kyung Min - University of Washington, USA
- Assoc.Prof.Dr. Abdullah Kuzu - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Adile Aşkı Kurt - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ahmet Eskicumalı – Sakarya University
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Aijaz Ahmed Gujjar - Sindh Madressatul Islam University, Pakistan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Aytaç Göğüş - Sabancı University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Chen - Chung Liu - National Central University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Cheng - Huang Yen - National Open University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ching - fan Chen - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ching Hui Alice Chen - Ming Chuan University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Chiung - sui Chang - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Danguole Rutkauskienė - Kauno Technology University, Lietvenia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. David Tawei Ku - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Meng - National pingtung university, Taiwan

- Assoc.Prof.Dr. Eric Zhi Feng Liu - National central university, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Erkan Tekinarslan - Bolu Abant İzzet Baysal University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ezendu Ariwa - London Metropolitan University, U.K.
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Fahad N. AlFahad - King Saud University
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Fahriye Altınay - Near East University, TRNC
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Gurnam Kaur Sidhu - Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hao - Chiang Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hasan Çalışkan - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hasan KARAL - Karadeniz Technical University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hsin - Chih Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Huey - Ching Jih - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Huichen Zhao - School of Education, Henan University, China
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Yaratın - Eastern Mediterranean University, TRNC
Assoc.Prof.Dr. I - Wen Huang - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. I Tsun Chiang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ian Sanders - University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
Assoc.Prof.Dr. İsmail İpek - Fatih University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Işıl Kabakçı - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Jie - Chi Yang - National Central University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. John I-Tsun Chiang - National Changhua University of Education, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ju - Ling Shih - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Koong Lin - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Kuo - Chang Ting - Ming - HSIN University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Kuo - Liang Ou - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Larysa M. Mytsyk - Gogol State University, Ukraine
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Li - An Ho - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Li Yawan - China Open University, China
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Manoj Kumar Saxena - Central University of Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala, Kangra, India
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Mike Joy - University of Warwick, UK
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ming-Charng Jeng - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Murat Ataizi - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Nergüz Serin - Cyprus International University, TRNC
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Norazah Mohd Suki - Universiti Malaysia Sabah, Malaysia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Normaliza Abd Rahim - Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Oğuz Serin - Cyprus International University, TRNC
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ping - Kuen Chen - National Defense University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Popat S. Tambade - Prof. Ramkrishna More College, India
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Prakash Khanale - Dnyanopasak College, INDIA
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Pramela Krish - Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, Malaysia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Tzu - Hua Wang - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Vincent Ru-Chu Shih - National Pingtung University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Wu - Yui Hwang - National Central University, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Ya-Ling Wu - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Yahya O Mohamed Elhadj - AL Imam Muhammad Ibn Saud University, Saudi Arabia
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Yavuz Akbulut - Anadolu University
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Zehra Altınay - Near East University, TRNC
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Zhi - Feng Liu - National Central University, Taiwan
- Assist.Prof.Dr. Aaron L. Davenport - Grand View College, USA
Assist.Prof.Dr. Andreja Istenic Starcic - University of Primorska, Slovenija
Assist.Prof.Dr. Anita G. Welch - North Dakota State University, USA
Assist.Prof.Dr. Betül Özkan - University of Arizona, USA
Assist.Prof.Dr. Burçin Kısa Işık - Gaziantep University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chiu - Pin Lin - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chun - Ping Wu - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chun - Yi Shen - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Chung-Yuan Hsu - National pingtung university, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Dale Havill - Dhofar University, Sultanate of Oman
Assist.Prof.Dr. Ferman Konukman - College of Arts and Science, Sport Science Program, Qatar University
Assist.Prof.Dr. Filiz Varol - Firat University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Guan - Ze Liao - National Hsinchu University of Education, Taiwan

Assist.Prof.Dr. Hsiang chin - hsiao - Shih - Chien University, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Huei - Tse Hou - National Taiwan University of Science and Technology, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Hüseyin Ünlü - Aksaray University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Jagannath. K Dange - Kuvempu University, India
Assist.Prof.Dr. K. B. Praveena - University of Mysore, India
Assist.Prof.Dr. Kanvaria Vinod Kumar - University of Delhi, India
Assist.Prof.Dr. Marko Radovan - University of Ljubljana, Slovenia
Assist.Prof.Dr. Min-Hsien Lee - National central university, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Mohammad Akram Mohammad Al-Zu'bi - Jordan Al Balqa Applied University, Jordan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Muhammet Demirbilek - Süleyman Demirel University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pamela Ewell - Central College of IOWA, USA
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pei-Hsuan Hsieh - National Cheng Kung University, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Pey-Yan Liou - National central university, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Phaik Kin, Cheah - Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Perak
Assist.Prof.Dr. Ping - Yeh Tsai - Tamkang University, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. S. Arulchelvan - Anna University, India
Assist.Prof.Dr. Seçil Kaya - Anadolu University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Selma Koç Vonderwell - Cleveland State University, Cleveland
Assist.Prof.Dr. Sunil Kumar - National Institute of Technology, India
Assist.Prof.Dr. Tsung - Yen Chuang - National University of Taiwan, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Vahid Motamedi - Tarbiat Moallem University, Iran
Assist.Prof.Dr. Yalın Kılıç Türel - Fırat University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Yu - Ju Lan - National Taipei University of Education, Taiwan
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zehra Alakoç Burma - Mersin University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zerrin Ayvaz Reis - İstanbul University, Turkey
Assist.Prof.Dr. Zülfü Genç - Fırat University, Turkey

Dr. Arnaud P. Prevot - Forest Ridge School of the Sacred Heart, USA
Dr. Balakrishnan Muniandy - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
Dr. Brendan Tangney - Trinity College, Ireland
Dr. Chen Haishan - China Open University, China
Dr. Chin Hai Leng - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Dr. Chin Yeh Wang - National Central University, Taiwan
Dr. Chun Hsiang Chen - National Central University, Taiwan
Dr. Chun Hung Lin - National central university, Taiwan
Dr. Farrah Dina Yusop - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Dr. Hj. Issham Ismail - Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia
Dr. Hj. Mohd Arif Hj. Ismail - National University of Malaysia, Malaysia
Dr. I-Hen Tsai - National University of Tainan, Taiwan
Dr. Jarkko Suhonen - University of Eastern Finland, Finland
Dr. Li Ying - China Open University, China
Dr. Norlidah Alias - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Dr. Rosnaini Mahmud - Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia
Dr. Sachin Sharma - Faridabad Institute of Technology, Faridabad
Dr. Seetharam Chittoor Jhansi - Pushpa Navnit Shah Centre for Lifelong Learning, India
Dr. Tam Shu Sim - University of Malaya, Malaysia
Dr. Tiong Goh - Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand
Dr. Vikrant Mishra - Shivalik College of Education, India
Dr. Zahra Naimie - University of Malaya, Malaysia

Table of Contents

Computer-Assisted Pronunciation Learning in a Collaborative Context: A Case Study in Taiwan <i>Tsai Pi-HUA</i>	1
Electronic Continuous Professional Development (E-CPD) for Teachers: Bridging the Gap between Knowledge and Application <i>Rafiza Abdul RAZAK, Farah Dina YUSOP, Siti Hajar HALILI, Sri Raman CHUKUMARAN</i>	14
Empowering English through Project-Based Learning With ICT <i>Ardi MARWAN</i>	28
Establishing a Multidimensional Interaction in Science Instruction: Usage of Mobile Technology <i>Özkan YILMAZ</i>	38
Factors Related to Faculty Members' Attitude and Adoption of a Learning Management System <i>Saovapa WICHADDEE</i>	53
For Effective Use of Multimedia in Education, Teachers Must Develop their Own Educational Multimedia Applications <i>Mohd. Elmagzoub A. BABIKER</i>	62
Integrating Computer-Assisted Language Learning in Saudi Schools: A Change Model <i>Saleh ALRESHEED, Marilyn LEASK, Andrea RAIKER</i>	69
Integration of Technology Enhanced Learning within Business Organizations: Which Strategy to Choose? <i>Lina KAMINSKIENĖ, Aušra RUTKIENĖ, Elena TREPULĖ</i>	78
Mathematics and Children's Literature Linked by E-Books <i>Helena CAMPOSA, Euridice TEIXEIRA, Paula CATARINOA</i>	93
Mobile Applications' Impact on Student Performance and Satisfaction <i>Maha. ALQAHTANI, Heba. MOHAMMAD</i>	102
Modification of Delon and Mclean Model in the Success of Information System for Good University Governance <i>Muhammad TAJUDDIN</i>	113
Perceptions of Teachers and Students towards Educational Application of SNS and its Educational Effects in Middle School Class <i>June LEE, Yunoug LEE, Mi Hwa KIM</i>	124
The Comparison of Accuracy Scores on the Paper and Pencil Testing vs. Computer-Based Testing <i>Heri RETNAWATI</i>	135
The Effects of the Constructivist Learning Approach on Student's Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis Study <i>Mehmet Fatih AYAZ, Hanifi ŞEKERCI</i>	143
The Role and Use of E-Materials in Vocational Education and Training: The Case of Slovenia <i>Jasna MAŽGON, Mojca Kovač ŠEBART, Damijan ŠTEFANC</i>	157
<i>University Social Responsibility (USR): Identifying an Ethical Foundation within Higher Education Institutions</i> <i>Shu-Hsiang (Ava) CHEN, Jaitip NASONGKHLA, J. Ana DONALDSON</i>	165
Using ICT-Supported Narratives in Teaching Science and their Effects on Middle School Students <i>Fatma TAŞKIN EKİCİ, Sultan PEKMEZCİ</i>	173

The Comparison of Accuracy Scores on the Paper and Pencil Testing vs. Computer-Based Testing

Heri Retnawati

*Mathematics and Science Faculty, Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia
heri_retnawati@uny.ac.id*

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to compare the accuracy of the test scores as results of Test of English Proficiency (TOEP) based on paper and pencil test (PPT) versus computer-based test (CBT). Using the participants' responses to the PPT documented from 2008-2010 and data of CBT TOEP documented in 2013-2014 on the sets of 1A, 2A, and 3A for the Listening and Reading section, the researcher estimated the reliability estimation results using classical test theory and the value of information function and on the item response theory on PPT are then compared with CBT, which has the greater reliability and the value of information functions is said to be more accurate. The study shows that with the classical test theory approach, the reliability coefficients between the scores of the results of PPT and those of CBT are almost the same, and using the item response theory, it was found that although the value of the information function on PPT and CBT relatively similar in several subtests, there is a tendency for participants with the moderate ability that CBT is more accurate than PPT, and for the low and high ability of participants, PPT tends to be more accurate than CBT.

Keywords: accuracy, reliability, value of information function (VIF), paper and pencil test (PPT), computer based test (CBT)

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, the development of science and technology is advancing. This has an impact on life, including on education. The presence of technology in education is used to assist and improve the quality of learning (Woolfolk, 2007). More specifically, this technology can be utilized in educational assessment, namely the implementation of the test. The utilization of technology in educational assessment is aimed at the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of the test (Chee and Wong, 2003; Towndrow & Vallenge, 2004).

At first, the test for assessment which is popular is paper and pencil test. Along with the development of the Internet and intranet networks, the access to information inside and outside the school becomes easier. This tool can also be used for other purposes, for example, for the examination based on computer and the Internet, for example, known as Computer Based Testing (CBT). However, the utilization of computers for CBT has not been optimal yet in Indonesia in various tests.

In 2007-2010, the association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language in Indonesia (TEFLIN) in collaboration with the Directorate General of Senior High school developed a test to measure English competency, later called as the Test of English Proficiency (TOEP). TOEP was developed based on constructs should be measured in a language test that is often referred to as communicative competence (Bachman, 1990; Bachman & Palmer, 1996). The development of the items of TOEP is based on the taxonomy in language proficiency from Munby (1983) which has identified micro-language proficiency skills which include listening, speaking, reading and writing. From 2006 to 2010, eight sets were developed for PPT to TOEP which have proved equivalent (Retnawati, 2014a). Subsequently in 2012, funded by the Department of Higher Education, the CBT system of TOEP was pioneered in using the sets used in PPT, which was then implemented from 2013 on Listening and Reading subtests.

On the preliminary study, there were some technical problems faced in the implementation of TOEP based CBT. The test participants were not familiar with the implementation of the CBT, and they often did the tests based on PPT. The difficulties in the implementation of CBT included the difficulty to log in, use a headset for listening, use the mouse to answer, and in some areas there was a problem about the availability of electricity and the access to Internet. These constraints led to the testees' doubt of the accuracy of the results of the test, moreover, there were several sets of TOEP being used in the administration of the test. Related to the above, the present study investigated the comparison the accuracy of TOEP scores of the PPT and CBT.

There are many advantages and disadvantages of using computer assessment compared with paper based task (Noyes & Garland, 2008). The advantages of online assessments are (1) the richness of the interface, for example, the use of graphics allows a dynamic presentation of the test content, (2) the user population, computer-based

testing via the internet allows a more diverse sample to be located, (3) standardisation of test environment, that is, the test is presented in the same way and in the same format for a specified time, (4) online scoring, this results in faster feedback and (5) greater accuracy, that is, reduction in human error. In the other hand, the disadvantages of using computer in assessment are (1) lack of a controlled environment with responses being made at various times and settings and perhaps not even by the designated individual, double submissions may also be a problem, (2) computer hardware and software, these may be subject to freezing and crashing; in the test setting, time can be wasted when computers have to be restarted or changed, (3) the computer screen, for longer tests, it may be more tiring to work on the computer than on paper, (4) serial presentation, it is difficult to attain equivalence with computer and paper presentation, (5) confidentiality.

In its developmental process, TOEP considers the item difficulty by using both the classical test theory and the Rasch model of the modern test theory. Accordingly, the accuracy of CBT and PPT is determined by using two theoretical approaches, the classical test theory and item response theory.

The accuracy in the classical test theory is determined by the value of the standard error of measurement (SEM). SEM is estimated in the following formula

$$\sigma_E = \sigma_x \sqrt{1 - \rho_{xx'}}$$
 (1)

where σ_x is standard deviation of total score and $\rho_{xx'}$ is the reliability coefficient (Allen & Yen, 1979; Crocker & Algina, 1986). The formula shows that the higher the reliability coefficient, the smaller the SEM, and vice versa. The reliability coefficient can be estimated, by the formula such as Cronbach's alpha (Ebel and Frisbie, 1991; Reynolds, Livingstone, Willson, 2010).

In the modern approach, a well-known formula in the measurement involving the level of difficulty commonly is called the Rasch model (Hambleton, Swaminathan, and Rogers, 1991). The model of the relationship between chance to answer correctly (P), ability scale (θ) and item difficulty to-i (b_i), e natural number, and n items in the test is expressed in the following equation:

$$P_i(\theta) = \frac{e^{(\theta - b_i)}}{1 + e^{(\theta - b_i)}} \quad , \text{ where } i : 1,2,3, \dots, n$$
 (2)

The b_i parameter is a point on a scale of abilities in order to the probability a testee respond properly is 50%. Suppose a test item has a parameter $b_i = 0.4$. This means that the minimum ability required to have 50% probability to answer correctly is 0.4 on a ability scale. The greater the value of the parameter b_i , the greater the ability needed to answer correctly with a 50% probability. In other words, the greater the value of the parameters b_i , the more difficult the item is.

In the item response theory, there is the value of information function. The information function item is a method to describe the strength of an item on the test, the selection of items, and the comparison of several sets of test. The item information function expresses the strength or contribution of test items in uncovering latent trait measured by those tests. If I is an information function, $P_i(\theta)$ is the probability to answer correctly for participants θ with the ability to answer correctly point I, $Q_i(\theta)$ opportunities θ participants with the ability to answer one item I, mathematically, the item information function satisfies the following equation.

$$I_i(\theta) = \frac{[P_i'(\theta)]^2}{P_i(\theta)Q_i(\theta)}$$
 (3)

The test information function is a function of the number of items constructing the test information (Hambleton and Swaminathan, 1985: 94). Associated with this statement, the function of test information will be high if the items of the test have information function which is also high. The test information function can mathematically be expressed as follows.

$$I_i(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n I_i(\theta)$$
 (4)

The difficulty index of item parameter and ability parameter of participants are estimated. Because these are the result of estimation, the nature of true parameters is probability and it is not free from by measurement error. In the item response theory, the standard error of measurement (SEM) is closely related to the function information. SEM has an inverse quadratic relationship with information function, the greater the value of information

function, the smaller SEM or otherwise (Hambleton, Swaminathan, and Rogers, 1991, 94; Retnawati, 2014b). If the value of the function information is represented by $I_i(\theta)$ and the estimated value of SEM is revealed by $SEM(\theta)$, then the relationship between the two, according to Hambleton, Swaminathan, and Rogers (1991: 94) is expressed by

$$SEM(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{I(\theta)}} \quad (5)$$

De Gruijter & Van der Camp (2005: 118) stated that the value of the function information item and also the value of the test information function, depend on the latent ability. The value of item information is invariant, so that the ratio of the value of the two items' information functions is also invariant. The ratio of the information value of the two items is stated as follows:

$$\frac{I_{i_1}(\theta^*)}{I_{i_2}(\theta^*)} = \frac{I_{i_1}(\theta)}{I_{i_2}(\theta)} \quad (6)$$

for all the transformations of θ^* of θ . The invariant properties of the ratio of the value information function is used to determine the relative efficiency of the test. The relative efficiency of the two tests is defined as the ratio of the variance mistakes or, equivalently, the ratio of the value of the information function (McDonald, 1999: 279). This value can be compared when two tests measure the same attributes. The same thing is done by Lord (1980: 83) and also Stocking (1999), but it has a different symbol. Conventionally, the relative efficiency of test A and test B is written as:

$$ER(f,A,B) = \frac{I_A(\theta)}{I_B(\theta)} \quad (7)$$

so if the ratio is less than one, then test A is said to be less efficient providing less information, or equivalently have a larger error in measurement compared with test B. The comparison of information value of both tests is used to compare the score of the PPT and CBT on TOEP.

The comparison of the administration of PPT and CBT has been investigated by many researchers. Al-Amri (2007) explored the comparison of paper and computer-based testing in reading context and the impact of test takers' characteristics. The results are there are no significant differences between paper and computer-based testing in reading context. Jamil, Tariq, & Shami (2012) reported teachers' perceptions of computer-based (CB) vs. paper-based (PB) examinations. The results showed that overall sampled teachers' attitudes were positive towards CB examination systems but in some situations they preferred PB. Comparatively for female participants had highly ranked, highly qualified, less experienced, teachers who have computer training certificate or degree, and teachers who have CB examination experiences were more positive towards CB examinations.

The comparison of the administration of PPT-based and CBT has been studied by many experts. Al-Amri (2007) tapped the comparison of paper and computer-based testing in reading context and the impact of test takers' characteristics. The results are there are no significant differences between paper and computer-based testing in reading context. Jamil, Tariq, and Shami (2012) reported teachers' perceptions of computer-based (CB) v. paper-based (PB) examinations. The results showed that overall the sampled teachers' attitudes were positive towards CB examination systems but in some situations they preferred the New Testament as well. Comparatively female, highly ranked, highly qualified, less experienced, teachers who have computer training certificate or degree, and teachers who have CB examination experiences were more positive towards CB examinations.

Maguire, K.A., Smith, D.A., Brailler, S.A. (2010) examined the difference in test scores for students who engaged in proctored course assessments electronically via computer interface compared to students who took proctored assessments through a paper and pencil format in the classroom. The results indicated that students who completed all assessments electronically scored significantly higher than those students completing all assessments via pencil and paper. No interaction was present between test format and test number, suggesting that none of test format had a more severe learning curve. The findings of this study, taken into conjunction with those of previous studies, suggest that proctored CBT provides an accurate assessment of a student's abilities.

Coniam (2006) describes an English language listening test intended as computer-based testing material for secondary school students in Hong Kong, Test takers generally performed better on the computer-based test than on the paper-based test. Interviews with test takers after taking both tests indicated an even split in terms of

preference, with boys opting for the computer-based test and girls the paper-based test. Choi (2003) verified the comparability of paper-based language test (PBLT) and computer-based language test (CBLT) on the basis of content analyses, correlational analyses, ANOVA, and construct-related validation studies. The content analyses revealed that the sample tests representing 316 *Comparability of two types of language test* PBLT and CBLT were highly comparable in terms of content and linguistic features. The dimensionality check also revealed that the results did not violate the strong assumption of unidimensionality required by IRT, thus ensuring the appropriate application of IRT. The overall results of construct-related validation studies indicate comparability of the subjects' scores across CBLT and PBLT modes. The grammar test showed the strongest comparability, and the reading comprehension test the weakest comparability. The pattern of correlations among subtests, disattenuated correlations, and confirmatory factor analyses support to a certain extent that CBLT and PBLT subtests measure the same constructs.

The results of the existing studies indicate that the test scores of PPT and CBT are comparable and the differences are not significant, neither is the construct validity. From the mean score of the acquisition of PPT and CBT, there is research that concludes that the average scores of CBT results are higher, and also there is positive perception of the administration of CBT. These results seem contradictory, and need to be strengthened by the results of other studies on the comparison of CBT and PPT.

METHOD

This study was conducted using the quantitative approach, by comparing the reliability and value of the test information function of CBT TOEP and PPT TOEP. The data are in the form of responses of TOEP test takers from all provinces in Indonesia, documented in 2008-2010 for PPT and documented in 2013-2014 for CBT, a sample of 600 test takers for each set of TOEP was established randomly. Three sets of TOEP, set 1A, 2A, and 3A for Listening and Reading section were analyzed.

The accuracy of PPT and CBT TOEP is known by comparing the reliability using the classical test theory approach and comparing the value of information function of both tests directly and through its relative efficiency. The reliabilities are estimated by calculating the reliability using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. On the item response theory, the item difficulty is estimated first before the value of the function information is. The estimation of item difficulties on Rasch model are done using the QUEST program (Adams & Khoo,1993). The value of test information function in every sets is estimated based on the difficulty index of the items on PPT and CBT.

The results of the estimation of the reliability and the value of the information function on PPT and CBT are then compared directly and by using the graphs. The administration of the test that has a greater value of information function is more accurate. The comparison of the value of the information function between PPT and CBT is also served as the relative efficiency of CBT to PPT, which is illustrated with graphs to be interpreted. If the relative efficiency is greater than 1, then CBT is more accurate than PPT. But on the contrary, if the relative efficiency is less than 1, then the PPT is more accurate than CBT.

RESULT

Using the participant's responses to TOEP set 1A, 2A, 3A both in listening and reading subtests, based on PPT or CBT, the reliabilities' estimation is done. More results are presented in Table 1. The results show that the reliability of TOEP scores tend to be stable at a high category, all of which are not less than 0.90. On set 1A, the reliability score on CBT is lower than the PPT and set 3A, both Listening and Reading-based PPT is slightly lower than in the CBT.

Table 1. Reliabilities of Score on Listening dan Reading Subtests Based on PPT dan CBT


Set	Subset	PPT	CBT
1A	Listening	0.99	0.90
	Reading	0.99	0.99
2A	Listening	0.99	0.99
	Reading	0.99	0.99
3A	Listening	0.98	0.99
	Reading	0.98	0.99

Based on the test takers' response to the set tests, the difficulty index is estimated by using the Rasch model. Using the parameters of these items, the value of information function (VIF) are estimated, with the abilities ranging from -4 to +4, both on the Listening and Reading subtests, based PPT and CBT. The estimation results for each subtest are presented in Figure 1.

On Listening sets 1A and 2A, and Reading set 3A, there is a tendency which is almost the same. On the scale of the ability approach to the average (on a scale of 0), the value of information function on the CBT is higher than that on PPT. But on a low and high ability scale, the value of information function on PPT is higher than on CBT. This shows that in the ability scale approaching 0, CBT is more accurate than PPT, and on the low or high ability scale, PPT is more accurate than CBT.

On Reading 1A and 2A, and Listening 3A, the results show different things. On this set, the value of information function on the PPT and CBT is almost the same. This shows that in the three sets, namely Reading 1A, Reading 2A, and Listening 3A, there is the same accuracy scores obtained by TOEP takers between PPT and CBT.

These results are supported by the comparison between value of the information function obtained on PPT and that on CBT. On the Listening subtest 3A, the relative efficiency is relatively stable to the value close to 1, so it can be said the accuracy of the scores on Listening set 3A on PPT and CBT is almost the same. On the Listening sets 1A and 2A, on the ability around 0, the relative efficiency values of more than 1 indicates that CBT is more accurate than PPT. But on the contrary, on a scale approaching abilities approaching -4 and +4, the value of relative efficiency is less than 1. This indicates that the PPT is more accurate than the CBT. More results are presented in Figure 2.






Figure 1. Value of Information Function (VIF) on Subtest Listening and Reading of TOEP based on PPT and CBT

Similar result occurs to Reading subtest. On Reading set 1A, the relative efficiency is around 1, except for high abilities. This shows that the accuracy of PPT and CBT is almost the same, except for the high abilities, in which reading ability is measured more accurately using PPT compared with CBT. On set 2A and 3A, there is a tendency that on the medium ability, the relative efficiency is more than 1, which shows that CBT is more accurate than the PPT. As for the low and high abilities, there is a tendency that PPT is more accurate than CBT. More results are presented in Figure 3.




Figure 2. Relative Efficiency on Listening Subtest between CBT to PPT

The results of the analysis based on the classical test theory shows that the reliability scores on TOEP based on PPT and CBT are almost the same. This shows that, the accuracy of the score on PPT and CBT can be compared and the value is close to 1. With the high reliability, fewer measurement errors and higher accuracy of a test set will be obtained.




Figure 3. Relative Efficiency on Reading Subtest between CBT to PPT

In the estimation of the reliability and value of information function, the concern is the acquisition of scores, which does not overly affect the accuracy of measurement of the listening and reading abilities of the test takers of TOEP on PPT and CBT. This is in line with the finding of the research by Al-Amri (2007), which states there is no significant difference in scores of PPT and CBT and by Choi (2003), which proved that there is no difference between the construct validity of PPT and CBT. But the results of this study are different from the results of the study by Maguire, KA, Smith, DA, Brailer, SA (2010) which shows that students who completed all assessments electronically scored significantly higher than those students completing all assessments via pencil and paper.

The research finding from observing the comparative value of the information function, shows that though the value of function information on CBT and PPT is relatively similar in several subtests, there is a tendency that for test takers with moderate ability, CBT is more accurate than PPT, but for test takers in the low and high ability, PPT tends more accurate than CBT.

On the implementation of CBT, there are many obstacles that could hinder the test takers to do the tests. These constraints include test takers' unfamiliarity with the implementation of the CBT, the difficulty to log in, the difficulty using a headset for listening, using the mouse to answer, essentially related to the ability of the test takers using the information technology. Besides the obstacles, in some areas the availability of electricity and the slow internet network is a constraint in the implementation of CBT. The constraints in the administration of CBT in this study are in line with the opinion Noyes & Garland (2008).

CONCLUSIONS

The study shows that with the classical test theory approach, the reliability coefficients between the resulting scores of PPT and CBT almost the same, and using the item response theory, the researcher was found that although the value of the information function of PPT and CBT is relatively similar in several subtests, there is a tendency for testees with the moderate ability that, CBT is more accurate than PPT, and for those with the low and high ability, PPT tends to be more accurate than CBT.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. J., & Khoo, S. T. (1993). *Quest: The interactive test analysis system*. Hawthorn: Australian Council for Educational Research.
- Al-Amri, S. (2007). Computer-based vs. paper-based testing: does the test administration mode matter?. *Proceedings of the BAAL Conference 2007*.
- Allen, M. J. & Yen, W. M. (1979). *Introduction to measurement theory*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Bachman, L. F. & Palmer, A. S. 1996. *Language testing in practice*. Oxford: Oxford.
- Bachman, L. F. 1990. *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chee, T.S., & Wong, A.F.L. (2003). *Teaching and learning with technology*. Singapore: Prentice Hall.
- Choi, I.C. (2003). Comparability of a paper-based language test and a computer-based language test. *Language Testing* 20(3) 295-320.
- Coniam, D. (2006). Evaluating computer-based and paper-based versions of an English-language listening. *ReCALL* 18(2):193-211.

- Croker, L. & Algina, J. (1986). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston Inc.
- De Gruijter, D.M. & van der Kamp, L.J.T. (2005). *Statistical test theory for education and psychology*. Retrieved from <http://www.tu-dresden.de/erzwiae/ewmm/lehre/> in June 10, 2006.
- Ebel, R.L. & Frisbie, D.A. (1986). *Essentials of educational measurement*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hambleton, R.K. & Swaminathan, H. (1985). *Item response theory*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Inc.
- Hambleton, R.K., Swaminathan, H., & Rogers, H.J. (1991). *Fundamental of item response theory*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication Inc.
- Jamil, M., Tariq, R.H., & Shami, P.A. (2012). Computer-based vs paper-based examinations: Perceptions of university teachers. *The Turkish Online Journal Technology*. October 2012, Volume 11 Issue 4.
- Lord, F.M. (1980). *Application of item response theory to practical testing problems*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Maguire, K.A., Smith, D.A., Brailier, S.A. (2010). Computer-based testing: a comparison of computer-based and paper-and pencil assessment. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, Volume 14, Number 4.
- McDonald, R.P. (1999). *Test theory: A unified treatment*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Elrbaum.
- Munby, J. (1981). *Communicative syllabus design: a sociolinguistic model for defining the content of purpose-specific language programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noyes, J.M. & Garland, K.J. (2008). Computer-vs. paper-based task: Are they equivalent? *Ergonomic*. Vol. 51. No.9 September 2008, 1352-1375.
- Retnawati, H. (2014a). The Equating of the test of English proficiency (TOEP). Paper. *Proceeding ICEEPS Tokyo Japan 2014*.
- Retnawati, H. (2014b). Teori respons butir dan penerapannya (untuk peneliti, praktisi, pengukuran, dan pengujian, mahasiswa pascasarjana. Yogyakarta: Parama.
- Reynolds, C., Livingstone, R.B., Willson, V. (2010). *Measurement and education*. Upper Sadle River, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Stocking, M.L. (1999). Item response theory. In Masters, G.V. dan Keeves, J.P. (Eds). *Advances in measurement in educational research and assessment*. Amsterdam: Pergamon.
- Towndrow, P.A., & Vallenge, M. (2004). *Using IT in the language classroom: A guide for teachers and students in Asia* (3rd ed.). Singapore: Longman Pearson Education South Asia Pte. Ltd. University Press.
- Woolfolk, A. (2007). *Educational psychology* (10th ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.