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Abstract. The main purpose of this study is to answer the following question; is there any difference between international students’ perceptions of teacher guide on learning to read to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the 2018 average Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) score? The data in this study taken from PISA 2018 data that has been released to the public and has been permitted for research and development purposes. The population of this study was 15-year-old students (SMP) throughout the world who were studying in 2018, while the sample was 15-year-old students. PISA test participants was spread in 80 countries. The sample was students who participated in the 2018 PISA test. The data in this study were taken from the students’ test scores and questionnaires that were answered by 612,004 students from 80 countries. Based on the results of the analysis of variants of one path obtained the following results; there is a statistically significant difference (p<0,000) between students’ perceptions of countries below and above the PISA average on the following issues; (1) teacher feedback, (2) improvement of material, and (3) performance improvement in reading, learning to meet real life challenges where the country's position is above and below the average score average PISA 2018, (Sig. 0,000). The conclusion indicates that teachers in countries above the PISA average often provide feedback and provide improved reading material to their students compared to teachers in countries below the PISA average. Teachers in countries below the PISA average provide feedback for performance improvement more often than to teachers in countries above the PISA average. Because the learning dependence of students in countries above the PISA average is higher than students in countries below the PISA average, the frequency of feedback is considered unnecessary.
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INTRODUCTION

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) is the OECD’s international student assessment program. The PISA test measures the ability of 15-year-old students to use reading, math and science skills to meet real life challenges. In this paper the authors only focus on research on reading skills. The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is an organization for cooperation and economic development consisting of 36 European and North American countries plus Japan and South Korea. Indonesia, together with Brazil, India and China (BRIC) became key partners of the OECD, which was founded in 1961 and based in Paris. The report of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD) revealed that the Indonesian economy is growing healthy when measured by several economic key indicators, including stable inflation rates, poverty and inequality and fiscal deficits declining, and the right monetary policy response in a dynamic economic situation.

The focus of this research is related to teacher guide on learning to read in order to meet real life challenges. Teachers, especially in Indonesia, reading literacy at the international level, PISA, always develops each period, Table 1.
Table 1. International Literacy Reading Objectives

| Year     | PISA Literacy Reading                                                                 |
|----------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1997-2000| Reading literacy is understanding, using, and reflecting written texts to achieve one's goals, develop one's knowledge and potential and to participate in society. |
| 2009, 2012, 2015 | Reading literacy is understanding, using, reflecting and engaging with written texts, to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential, and to participate in society. |
| 2018     | Reading literature is understood, using, evaluating, pondering, and engaging with texts to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge and potential and to participate in society. |
| 2021     | Creative thinking is the competence to engage productively in the generation, evaluation and enhancement of ideas that can produce original and effective solutions, progress in improving ideas, which can produce original and effective solutions, progress in knowledge and expression of imagination. |

Source: OECD 2018

Figure 1. Examples of Questions for Creative Thinking in 2021

Based on Table 1 and Figure 1, the form of teacher guide must adjust to the development of reading at the international level. In the learning process, the form of teacher guidance can be in the form of providing corrections to student errors so students can correct them (Kaur, 2005; Lewis, 2002; Supriatna, 2015). Because this activity is the responsibility of the teacher (Kahyalar & Yilmaz, 2016). The teacher gives feedback to students about various issues such as the content of the text, the arrangement of ideas, and the suitability of the vocabulary used (Rajagopal, 2015).

Harmer (2004) says that giving comments is a strategy of providing indirect feedback. Students receiving feedback from the teacher are very important in the teaching and learning process, Keh (1990) considers feedback as input which is usually reflected as comments, questions, and suggestions given. Ferris (1999) says that feedback is error correction that can help improve the accuracy of student work, but Truscott (2007) disagrees because feedback does not directly provide error correction that is ineffective, even dangerous. Jalaluddin's research results (2015) found that giving feedback was more helpful in correcting students' language errors and making them understand what they did wrong. He specifically uses direct and indirect feedback as a technique to improve students' writing skills. The results of Wijayanti & Mujiyanto's research (2015) found that students often make grammatical mistakes. Giving feedback can also be used by students through peer feedback. This technique shows that students are more active, showing positive behavior, emotional and cognitive involvement in learning activities (Astrid, Rukmini, Sofwan, & Fitriati, 2017; Burksaitiene, 2011).

In formative assessment, feedback is needed to determine the learning progress and learning achievements of each student (Rushton, 2005; Nicol & Macfarlane-Dick, 2006; Sadler,
1998; Black & William, 1998; Irons, 2008). Because formative assessment is designed to inform teachers about student status and the next steps in learning (Heritage, 2007). Formative assessment, according to Black & William (1998) is an assessment activity carried out while the program is running which is used to improve the teaching-learning process.

In the teaching and learning process, there are two types of written feedback, direct and indirect. Direct feedback is a direct feedback strategy that helps students correct mistakes students have made. In this direct feedback, the teacher immediately corrects the wrong words or vocabulary in students’ writing (Ferris, 2012). In practice, Ferris (2002, 2003) categorizes direct feedback into four categories, namely removal, insertion, replacement, and reformulation. Ferris and Roberts (2001) also state that direct feedback provides the correct form in student writing, so students only need to write down the correction given by the teacher into the final version of their writing. Ellis (2008a) mentions that written feedback is divided into six types, including: (1) direct feedback, ie direct teachers provide the correct form of the corrected word, (2) indirect feedback, ie the teacher shows errors that appear in writing but does not provide actual form, (3) metalinguistic, namely the teacher gives a kind of metalinguistic clue about errors in writing students, (4) focus of feedback, i.e. this is related to whether the teacher tries to correct all (or most) student errors or choose one or two specific types of errors to be corrected, (5) electronic feedback, teachers point out mistakes made by students in their writing and provide hyperlinks to related files that provide the correct form of use, and (6) reformulation or rewriting, i.e. workmanship repeat all student texts to make the language used looks like the one used by native speakers to maintain con ten original writing remains intact.

The second type of written feedback is indirect feedback. According to Ferris and Roberts (2001), indirect feedback is given by the teacher by simply indicating that there is an error without giving a correct statement, but letting students identify and correct it themselves. The teacher only provides corrections and students must revise their writing into correct writing. Ferris (2002, 2003) divides three types of indirect feedback; coded indirect feedback, and comments. In indirect coded feedback, the teacher only underlines errors in writing students and the teacher writes symbols or codes above writing errors made by students. Harmer (2004) says that giving comments is a strategy of providing indirect feedback. The teacher provides comments about students’ writing related to what they have written and what they must write to improve it (Harmer, 2004). Hyland and Hyland (2006) state that written feedback from teachers plays an important role in writing classroom language. The teacher can provide feedback in two general ways that are direct or indirect. The results revealed that 90% of students wanted to be corrected when they had an error. The majority of students show a preference for correction after completing the change politely and kindly. The results indicate that teachers must be aware of students' attitudes towards verbal corrective feedback, (Sakiroglu, 2020).

From the various descriptions above, the problem in this study is whether there is a difference between international students' perceptions of teacher guide on learning to read in order to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the average value of the 2018 Program for International Student Assessment (PISA).

**RESEARCH METHOD**

The research method used is exploratory method. The basis for using this method is adapted to the main purpose of this study, among others, is to obtain facts from the symptoms that exist and look for information factually based on research data. The data in this study use PISA 2018 data that has been released to the public and has been permitted for research development purposes. The study population was 15-year-old students (SMP) throughout the world who were studying in 2018, while the sample was 15-year-old students (SMP) PISA test participants in 80 countries. The reason for selecting the sample is students who are taking the PISA test in 2018. The data in this study took the form of questionnaires that were answered by students in 80 countries, namely 612004 students from 80 countries. The questionnaire contained 3 main subjects, namely: (1) the teacher gives student feedback on their strengths in the subject, (2) the teacher tells student in which areas they can still improve, and (3) the teacher tells students how they can improve their performance. Complete data as in Table 2 below.

**Table 2. List of PISA Participating Countries and Number of Students**

| No. | Country         | Frequency | No. | Country       | Frequency | No. | Country    | Frequency |
|-----|----------------|-----------|-----|---------------|-----------|-----|------------|-----------|
| 1.  | Albania        | 6359      | 28. | Hong Kong     | 6037      | 55. | New Zealand| 6173      |
|     | Arab Emirates  | 19277     | 29. | Croatia       | 6609      | 56. | Panama     | 6270      |
| 3.  | Argentina      | 11975     | 30. | Hungary       | 5132      | 57. | Peru       | 6086      |
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The analytical method used in this study is a one-way variant analysis. One-way ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) was used to compare the difference of the international students’ perceptions about teacher guides on learning to read to meet real life challenges between the countries below and above the average of PISA score year 2018. So that the results of the analysis of this study can be obtained accurate, then all data in this study were processed or analyzed using the SPSS 22.00 program.

RESEARCH RESULT

Based on the percentage of the number of students who have filled out the questionnaire 612004 students from 80 countries is as follows.

| No. | Country                  | Frequency | No. | Country                  | Frequency | No. | Country                  | Frequency |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------|-----|--------------------------|-----------|-----|--------------------------|-----------|
| 4.  | Australia                | 14273     | 31. | Indonesia               | 12098     | 58. | Philippines             | 7233      |
| 5.  | Austria                  | 6802      | 32. | Ireland                 | 5577      | 59. | Poland                   | 5625      |
| 6.  | Belgium                  | 8475      | 33. | Iceland                 | 3296      | 60. | Portugal                 | 5932      |
| 7.  | Bulgaria                 | 5294      | 34. | Israel                  | 6623      | 61. | Qatar                    | 13828     |
| 8.  | Bosnia and Herzegovina   | 6480      | 35. | Italy                   | 11785     | 62. | Baku (Azerbaijan)        | 6827      |
| 9.  | Belarus                  | 5803      | 36. | Jordan                  | 8963      | 63. | B-S-J-Z (China)         | 12058     |
| 10. | Brazil                   | 10691     | 37. | Japan                   | 6109      | 64. | Region (RUS)            | 2016      |
| 11. | Brunei Darussalam        | 6828      | 38. | Kazakhstan              | 19507     | 65. | Tatarstan (RUS)         | 5816      |
| 12. | Canada                   | 22653     | 39. | Korea                   | 6650      | 66. | Romania                  | 5075      |
| 13. | Switzerland              | 5822      | 40. | Kosovo                  | 5058      | 67. | Russian Federation      | 7608      |
| 14. | Chile                    | 7621      | 41. | Lebanon                 | 5614      | 68. | Saudiarby                | 6136      |
| 15. | Colombia                 | 7522      | 42. | Lithuania               | 6885      | 69. | Singapore               | 6676      |
| 16. | Costa Rica               | 7221      | 43. | Luxembourg              | 5230      | 70. | Serbia                   | 6609      |
| 17. | Czech Republic           | 7019      | 44. | Latvia                  | 5303      | 71. | Slovak Republic         | 5965      |
| 18. | Germany                  | 5451      | 45. | Macao                   | 3775      | 72. | Slovenia                 | 6401      |
| 19. | Denmark                  | 7657      | 46. | Morocco                 | 6814      | 73. | Sweden                   | 5504      |
| 20. | Dominican Republic       | 5674      | 47. | Moldova                 | 5367      | 74. | Chinese Taipei          | 7243      |
| 21. | Spain                    | 35943     | 48. | Mexico                  | 7299      | 75. | Thailand                | 8633      |
| 22. | Estonia                  | 5316      | 49. | North Macedonia         | 5569      | 76. | Turkey                   | 6890      |
| 23. | Finland                  | 5649      | 50. | Malta                   | 3363      | 77. | Ukraine                  | 5998      |
| 24. | France                   | 6308      | 51. | Montenegro              | 6666      | 78. | Uruguay                  | 5263      |
| 25. | United Kingdom           | 13818     | 52. | Malaysia                | 6111      | 79. | United States           | 4838      |
| 26. | Georgia                  | 5572      | 53. | Netherlands             | 4765      | 80. | Vietnam                  | 5377      |
| 27. | Greece                   | 6403      | 54. | Norway                  | 5813      | Total                    | 612004    |

Source: OECD 2019

Table 3. Percentage of Students' International Perceptions of Giving Feedback on Reading Materials for the Reading Test above and below the OEDC Mean

| Reading Test              | Never/almost never | Some Lessons | Many Lessons | Every Lessons/almost Every lessons | Total   |
|---------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| Above Mean OECD           | 35058               | 56021        | 40688        | 18448                              | 15021   |
| Percent %                 | 6.3%                | 10.1%        | 7.4%         | 3.3%                               | 27.2%   |
| Below Mean OECD           | 108603              | 153217       | 92950        | 47182                              | 40195   |
| Percent %                 | 19.7%               | 27.7%        | 16.8%        | 8.5%                               | 72.8%   |
| Total                     | 143661              | 209238       | 133638       | 65630                              | 55216   |
| Percent %                 | 26.0%               | 37.9%        | 24.2%        | 11.9%                              | 100.0%  |
Table 3 informs that the majority (37.9%) of the students stated that giving feedback on reading material provided by the teacher was "little" even "never" (26%). Students who stated "some" were few (24.2%) and those who stated "each lesson" were the least (11.9%). For countries above the OECD average in the largest to smallest states: few (10.1%), some (7.4%), never (6.3%), and each lesson (3.3%), whereas in countries that are below the OECD average in the largest to smallest states: few (27.7%), never (19.7%), some (16.8%), and each lesson (8.5%). For more details as a whole can be seen in the following Figure 2.

![Figure 2. Percentage of International Student Perceptions of Giving Feedback on Reading Materials](image)

There are 22 countries where PISA test results for reading tests above the OECD average (score 487) are: Canada, Switzerland, Czech Republic, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, United Kingdom, Hong Kong, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Macao, Norway, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, BSIZ (China), Singapore, Sweden, Chinese Taipei, and the United States. The countries with PISA test results for reading tests below the OECD average (score 487) are 58 countries: Albania, United Arab Emirates, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Belarus, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Spain, Georgia, Greece, Croatia, Hungary, Indonesia, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Lebanon, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Latvia, Morocco, Moldova, Mexico, North Macedonia, Malta, Montenegro, Malaysia, Netherlands, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Baku (Azerbaijan), Moscow Region (Rus), Tatarstan (Rus), Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, Uruguay, and Vietnam.

Here are the results of ANOVA analysis: (1) How often does the teacher give feedback on reading lesson material to students:

| Source             | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.  |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|---------|-------|
| Corrected Model    | 577,872                 | 1  | 577,872     | 636,469 | .000  |
| Intercept          | 2612628,137             | 1  | 2612628,137 | 287755,338 | .000  |
| READING_2          | 577,872                 | 1  | 577,872     | 636,469 | .000  |
| Error              | 501008,282              | 551812 | .908       |         |       |
| Total              | 3754202,000             | 551814 |           |         |       |
| Corrected Total    | 501586,154              | 551813 |           |         |       |

Table 4 shows that the difference between students’ perceptions of teacher feedback on learning to read to meet real life challenges whose country position are above and below the 2018 PISA average value is evident. This means that there is a statistically significant difference (P <0.000) of students' perceptions of teacher feedback on reading learning to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average value (Sig. 0.000). For more details, see Figure 3 below.
Figure 3 shows that teachers in countries above the PISA average often provide feedback on reading subject matter to their students compared to teachers in countries below the PISA average.

Table 5. Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

| Source         | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F       | Sig.  |
|----------------|--------------------------|----|-------------|---------|-------|
| Corrected Model| 577,872                  | 1  | 577,872     | 636,469 | .000  |
| Intercept      | 2612628,137              | 1  | 2612628,137 | 2877556,338 | .000  |
| READING_2      | 577,872                  | 1  | 577,872     | 636,469 | .000  |
| Error          | 501008,282               | 551812 | .908       |
| Total          | 5754202,000              | 551814 |           |
| Corrected Total| 501586,154               | 551813 |           |

a. R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

Table 5 shows that the difference between students' perceptions of material improvement in reading learning to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average value is proven. This means that there is a statistically significant difference (P <0.000) students' perceptions of material improvement in reading learning in order to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the average value of PISA 2018, (Sig. 0.000). For more details, see Figure 4 below.
Figure 3 shows that teachers in countries above the PISA average often provide increased reading material to their students compared to teachers in countries below the PISA average.

(3) How often the teacher tells students how to improve student performance.

| Source             | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F         | Sig.    |
|--------------------|-------------------------|----|-------------|-----------|---------|
| Corrected Model    | 28,323                  | 1  | 28,323      | 30,464    | ,000    |
| Intercept          | 272,8351,893            | 1  | 272,8351,893| 293,4663,721| ,000    |
| READING_2          | 28,323                  | 1  | 28,323      | 30,464    | ,000    |
| Error              | 512,307,463             | 551,047 | ,930      |           |         |
| Total              | 396,4239,000            | 551,049 |           |           |         |
| Corrected Total    | 512,335,785             | 551,048 |           |           |         |

a. R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = ,000)

Table 6 shows that the difference between students' perceptions of performance improvement in reading learning to meet real life challenges whose country position are above and below the PISA 2018 average is evident. This means that there is a statistically significant difference (P<0,000) of students' perceptions of performance improvement in reading learning to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average value (Sig. 0,000). For more details, see Figure 5 below.

**DISCUSSION**

Based on the recently released PISA report, Tuesday 3 December 2019, Yuri Belfali (OECD Head of Early Childhood and Schools) in her initial presentation conveyed the reading ability of Indonesian students to be below the PISA average including countries such as Saudi Arabia, Morocco, Kosovo, The Dominican Republic, or Kazakhstan and the Philippines. The average reading ability of OECD countries is 487, Indonesia's score is 371. China is the highest (555), followed by Singapore (549) and Macau (525). Indonesia has experienced a decline since following the PISA assessment in 2000 for literacy reading. Indonesia's initial score in the PISA test was 371 and an increase of 382 (2003), 393 (2006) and 402 (2009), then continued to decline by 396 (2012), 397 (2015), and the lowest point 371 (2018). Totok Suprayitno (Head of the Ministry of Education and Development of the Ministry of Education and Culture) explained that the results of PISA 2018 were an early alarm to change the paradigm of education in Indonesia. Based on the results of the PISA test for Indonesia. This shows that reading ability is still uneven. Only 30 percent of Indonesian students meet the minimum reading ability competency. The picture is still found high disparity (distance) quality and educational
outcomes of each region. The results of PISA 2018 show that student achievements in Jakarta and Yogyakarta are close to the OECD average and can be compared with Malaysia and Brunei for all PISA literacy test materials. DKI and Yogyakarta scored 410 and 411 on reading. With a low total yield of all regions of Indonesia, this shows the high gap/distance in the quality of education between regions in Indonesia (Harususilo, 2019). Indonesia needs to completely overhaul its education system if it wants the quality of its education to be aligned with countries above the OECD average. Teachers must often provide feedback, provide material improvement, and increase independence or free learning on reading lessons to their students like teachers in countries above the OECD average. Activities like this must be done both national and national exam results such as PISA. Reportedly the Minister of Education and Culture Nadiem Makarim will revoke the National Examination in 2021 and replace it with the Minimum Competency Assessment and Character Survey. Based on all the descriptions above, the results of the study can be concluded with the Nadiem policy will be tested in the PISA 2024 survey later.

In connection with the results of this study, it is possible for teachers in Indonesia in particular and at the international level generally have done learning and guide or feedback to their students, but the teacher concerned: (1) teachers did not understand that reading literacy are continually changed and develop, so that the material or the competencies they teach are still using a old period, for example 1997-2000; (2) teachers are not familiar to create test items like PISA, the questions given to students are still conventional models, so students have difficulty answering PISA questions; (3) conventional teaching, so that between learning in the classroom and PISA questions are not aligned; (4) in making daily problems at school they are still paper based, whereas PISA questions are computer based, so students feel unfamiliar with answering questions with computers.

CONCLUSION
Based on all the descriptions above, the results of the study can be concluded with the findings and suggestions as follows:

(1) Most students (37.9%) stated that giving feedback on reading material provided by the teacher was "a little" and even "never" (26%). Students who stated "some" were few (24.2%) and those who stated "each lesson" were the least (11.9%). For countries above the OECD average in the largest to smallest states: few (10.1%), some (7.4%), never (6.3%), and each lesson (3.3%) ), whereas in countries that are below the OECD average in the largest to smallest states: few (27.7%), never (19.7%), some (16.8%), and each lesson (8, 5%).

(2) There is a difference between students' perceptions of teacher feedback on reading learning in order to meet real life challenges where the position of the country above and below the PISA 2018 average is proven. This means that there is a significant difference ($P <0,000$) student perceptions of teacher feedback on reading learning to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average value, (Sig. 0,000). This shows that teachers in countries above the PISA average often provide feedback on reading subject matter to their students compared to teachers in countries below the PISA average.

(3) There is a difference between students' perceptions of material improvement in reading learning to meet real life challenges where the position of the country above and below the PISA 2018 average is proven. This means that there is a statistically significant difference ($P <0,000$) between students' perceptions of material improvement in learning to read to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average score. This shows that teachers in the country those above the PISA average often provide increased reading material to their students compared to teachers in countries below the PISA average.

(4) There is a difference between students' perceptions of performance improvement in learning to read in order to meet real life challenges where the country's position above and below the PISA 2018 average is proven. This means that there is a significant difference ($P <0,000$) students' perceptions of performance improvement in learning to read to meet real life challenges whose country position is above and below the PISA 2018 average value, (Sig. 0,000). This shows that teachers in the country which is below the average PISA teacher often provide improved performance in reading lessons to students compared to teachers in countries above the PISA average.

SUGGESTION
Based on the research results above, there are important suggestions like the following. We should be thankful for the existence of PISA, which is one of the indexes for measuring the level of Indonesian literacy compared to other countries. It is hoped that with the existence of PISA, we can improve education methods because through education can contribute in increasing interest in
reading and making Indonesian citizens smart so that they can improve the economy and prosperity later.

Low reading interest is a serious problem for the Indonesian people and it is our responsibility to change it. Reading habits arise from the upbringing of the immediate environment, namely the family environment. Parents should allocate special time to read consistently so that children are accustomed to reading. For the government, the distribution of regional libraries should be improved so that remote areas can participate in increasing Indonesian literacy for the sake of national intelligence as well.

The role of educators / schools is very important including: (1) teachers / schools must follow the development of the world about changes in literacy reading with the ability to: (a) find information: access and retrieve information in a text, search for and choose relevant texts; (b) understand: represent the literal meaning, integrate and produce conclusions; (c) evaluate and reflect: assess quality and credibility, reflect on content and forms, detect and resolve conflicts; (2) it is time for teachers / schools to be able to make questions such as PISA tests for the purposes of daily, semester, and grade improvement or graduation through text classification: (a) text format: continuous, non-continuous, mixed; (b) type of text: description, narration, exposition, continuous, mixed; (b) environment such as author or message based; (3) the teacher / school must apply creativity in PISA questions into daily learning; (4) it is time for schools to facilitate computers for their students, so that in daily, semester, grade-up tests they are accustomed to using computers; (5) the form of questions used include: (a) simple multiple choice: choosing one answer from 4 or more choices, choosing a "hot spot" or answer that is the part that can be chosen in a graphic or text; (b) complex multiple choice: choice of a series of "Yes/No" questions presented in one item, selection of more than one response presented in a list, completion of sentences by selecting a drop-down option to fill in several blank spaces.
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