CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion presented in the previous chapters, it can be concluded that the multiple-choice questions used in the Grade 5 English summative assessment at Agape Elementary School only partially comply with the established principles and standards of good multiple-choice question (MCQ) construction. A detailed examination of each principle and standard demonstrates that, although some technical aspects of the questions were applied appropriately, many essential components of effective MCQ design were not consistently implemented. These weaknesses influenced the overall quality, clarity, and instructional value of the assessment.

Based on the analysis of the multiple-choice questions used in the Grade 5 English summative assessment at Agape Elementary School, it can be concluded that the principles of good multiple-choice question (MCQ) construction were not consistently applied across all test items. Each principle reveals specific strengths and weaknesses that influence the clarity, fairness, and instructional quality of the assessment. The conclusions for each principle are presented as follows:

1. Clarity of the Stem

The principle of stem clarity was only partially fulfilled. Items 1–5 contained incomplete stems that merely instructed students to “look at the picture” without clearly stating the task, which limited students’ understanding of the questions. In contrast, items 6–10 presented clearer and more focused questions that better

guided students in selecting the correct answers. This indicates inconsistent application of this principle.

2. Quality of Distractors

The quality of distractors was not adequately addressed in any of the analyzed items. Most distractors were weak, implausible, or unrelated to the stem, making the correct answers easy to identify through guessing rather than language knowledge. As a result, this principle was not fulfilled.

3. Accuracy of the Correct Answer

The principle of accuracy of the correct answer was fully met in all items. Each question contained one clearly correct answer, indicating that the content of the questions was generally accurate. However, accurate answers alone were insufficient to ensure high-quality items when other principles were not consistently applied.

4. Length and Format Consistency

Most items demonstrated consistency in the length and format of answer options. However, items 6 and 10 showed inconsistencies in grammatical form, which could lead students to choose answers based on form rather than understanding. Therefore, this principle was only partially fulfilled.

Overall, the multiple-choice questions analyzed only partially met the principles of effective MCQ construction. Although the accuracy of correct answers and some aspects of format consistency were satisfactory, weaknesses in stem clarity and distractor quality reduced the effectiveness of the assessment. Greater attention to all principles of MCQ construction is necessary to improve the quality of future English summative assessments.

Based on the analysis of the multiple-choice questions used in the Grade 5 English summative assessment at Agape Elementary School, it can be concluded that the test items do not consistently meet the established standards of good multiple-choice question construction. Each standard reveals specific shortcomings that collectively reduce the effectiveness and instructional value of the assessment. The conclusions for each standard are explained in detail as follows:

1. Conformity with Learning Indicators

This standard was only partially met. Items 6–10 were aligned with the Grade 5 English learning indicators, particularly vocabulary-related competencies. However, items 1–5 did not reflect clear learning indicators, as they only required students to identify pictures without a specific linguistic objective.

2. Clarity and Accuracy of Stems

The clarity and accuracy of stems were applied inconsistently. Items 6–10 contained clear and explicit questions, while items 1–5 used vague instructions that did not clearly indicate the expected task. As a result, this standard was only partially fulfilled.

3. Distractor Quality

The standard of distractor quality was not fulfilled. Most distractors were weak, implausible, or unrelated to the stem, allowing students to identify correct answers through guessing rather than language knowledge.

4. Correctness of the Answer Key

This standard was fully achieved. All items contained one correct answer, and no ambiguous answer keys were found. However, this strength did not compensate for weaknesses in other standards**.**

5. Proportion of Cognitive Levels

The assessment did not meet this standard, as all items were limited to the C1 (Remembering) level of Bloom's revised taxonomy. The lack of cognitive variation reduced opportunities for students to demonstrate deeper language understanding.

6. Consistent Grammar and Format

This standard was partially fulfilled. Most items showed consistent grammar and formatting, but some inconsistencies were found in items 6 and 10, which could influence students' answer choices.

Overall, the multiple-choice questions only partially met the standards of effective MCQ construction. While the answer keys were accurate and formatting was generally consistent, significant weaknesses were found in learning indicator alignment, stem clarity, distractor quality, and cognitive-level distribution. Therefore, improvements in item construction are necessary to enhance the quality and effectiveness of future English assessments.

Based on the principles and standards of multiple-choice question construction discussed in the theoretical framework, it can be concluded that the application of multiple-choice question writing guidelines is essential to ensure assessment quality. Fundamental principles such as stem clarity, distractor quality, accuracy of the correct answer, and consistency in option format contribute to the objective, fair, and accurate measurement of students' abilities. Without the comprehensive application of these principles, multiple-choice questions may introduce measurement bias and encourage guessing rather than genuine understanding.

Furthermore, the standards of multiple-choice question construction function as evaluative benchmarks to determine the alignment of test items with learning objectives and overall assessment quality. Standards related to alignment with learning indicators, clarity of language, effectiveness of distractors, correctness of answer keys, and representation of cognitive levels emphasize that multiple-choice questions must be not only technically sound but also pedagogically meaningful. Therefore, the consistent application of both principles and standards is necessary to ensure that summative assessments provide a comprehensive representation of students' learning outcomes and effectively support instructional goals.

Suggestions

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, several suggestions are proposed to enhance the quality of multiple-choice question construction in future English summative assessments at the elementary school level as follows:

First, teachers are strongly advised to formulate stems that are clear, complete, and explicitly focused on the linguistic objectives being assessed. Each stem should guide students to demonstrate specific English skills, such as vocabulary recognition, meaning identification, or word relationships, rather than providing vague or incomplete instructions.

Second, greater attention should be given to the development of distractors. Distractors should be plausible, contextually relevant, and grammatically parallel to the correct answer so that all options function effectively. Teachers are encouraged to design distractors based on common student errors observed during classroom instruction, as this approach can increase the quality of the questions and promote more careful student thinking.

Third, all test items should be aligned with the learning indicators stated in the curriculum. Teachers are advised to prepare a test blueprint before constructing assessment items to ensure that each question corresponds to a specific instructional objective and that no items are included without clear educational purpose.

Fourth, future summative assessments should include items that represent a broader range of cognitive levels. In addition to questions that assess recall of information, teachers are encouraged to develop items that measure basic understanding and simple application of language in context. This will allow assessments to better reflect students' overall English learning and support the development of higher-level thinking skills.

Fifth, consistency in grammatical structure, wording, and formatting among answer options should be carefully maintained. All options should be similar in length and form to prevent students from identifying correct answers based on patterns or visual cues rather than content knowledge.

Sixth, based on the research findings, special attention should be given to the background of the teacher who prepared the assessment items. The teacher responsible for constructing the test items was still a university student, although already actively teaching at the school. This condition may have influenced the level of professionalism in developing assessment instruments, particularly in applying the principles and standards of good item construction. Therefore, the school is advised to provide continuous academic support, supervision, or professional guidance for the teacher, either through mentoring by senior teachers or through training related to test and item construction. Such support is expected

to help improve the teacher's professional competence in developing high-quality assessment instruments that meet established evaluation standards.

Finally, future researchers are encouraged to conduct further studies that not only focus on analyzing the quality of test items but also examine factors that influence teachers' ability to construct assessment instruments, such as educational background, teaching experience, and institutional support from the school.