TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION ON RECOUNT TEXT THROUGH HEADING INTO QUESTIONS

A JOURNAL

By :

EKA YULIANI

F12108052

ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM

LANGUAGE AND ARTS EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

TEACHER TRAINING AND EDUCATION FACULTY

TANJUNGPURA UNIVERSITY

PONTIANAK

2013

TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION ON RECOUNT TEXT

THROUGH HEADING INTO QUESTIONS

A JOURNAL

Jurisdiction Responsibility by:

EKA YULIANI
F12108052

Approved by:

Supervisor 1

Dewi Novita, S.Pd, M. AppLing
NIP. 197208172003122001

Supervisor 2

Drs. Luwandi Suhartono, M. Hum
NIP. 196211011990021001

Legalized by:

Dean of Teacher Training
and Education Faculty

Dr. H. Aswandi
NIP. 195805131986031002

The Head of Language and Arts
Education Program

Drs. Nanang Heryana, M.Pd
NIP. 196107051988101001

TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION ON RECOUNT TEXT THROUGH HEADING INTO QUESTIONS

Eka Yuliani[1], Dewi Novita[2], Luwandi Suhartono[3]
Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Tanjungpura University, Pontianak
e-mail: edlewayz@yahoo.co.id

Abstrak: Mengajarkan Memahami Bacaan pada Teks Recount dengan Menggunakan Heading into Questions. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui efektifitas dari Heading into Questions di dalam mengajarkan cara memahami bacaan pada teks recount. Penelitian ini menggunakan metode quasi-eksperimen. Subjek penelitian ini adalah kelas VIII D (kelas eksperimen) dan kelas VIII E (kelas kontol). Kedua kelas diberikan pretes dan postes yang sama, tetapi mereka diterapkan perlakuan yang berbeda. Kelas eksperimen diterapkan pengajaran menggunakan Heading into Questions, sedangkan kelas kontrol menggunakan tekhnik konvensional. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa nilai yang dicapai di kelas eksperimen lebih baik daripada kelas kontrol.

Kata Kunci: Pengajaran membaca, Tehnik Heading into Questions

Abstract: Teaching Reading Comprehension on Recount Text Through Heading into Questions. The purpose of this research is to know the effectiveness of the teaching reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions. This research was conducted as a quasi-experimental research. The research subjects were class VIII D (experimental class) and VIII E (control class). Both classes were given the same pretest and posttest, but they were given different treatments. Experimental class was given Heading into Questions and control class was given conventional treatment. The research findings showed that the achievement in experimental class was better than that of control class.

Key word: Teaching reading, Heading into Questions

Reading is an important aspect in language learning. Mikulecky and Jeffries (1986: 1) explain, "there are some reasons for the importance of reading in language learning such as: reading helps us learn to think in the new language, helps us build a better vocabulary, and makes us more comfortable with written English." It means that by reading more, the reader can increase his or her acquisition in the new language as he or she can get new vocabulary, knowledge, idea, and information from the reading text. In addition, reading is also a medium for the writer to communicate with the reader. Thus, the writer can share his or her idea, opinion, and think into writing which is read by the reader, so that the reader can catch the information.

Then for students, reading is an important skill that must be mastered. By reading, students will get a lot of useful information for their learning. The information can enrich their knowledge. They also can share their information that they got from reading to others. In order to know the meaning of the text, students have to comprehend their reading text. Reading comprehension is the ability of someone to understand deeper what has been read. Based on Lems, et al (2010: 170), "Reading comprehension is the ability to construct meaning from a given written text." Moreover, Lems, et al (2010:170) explain that reading comprehension is not a static competency; it varies according to the purposes for reading and the text that is involved. In short, if people comprehend their reading, they will understand deeply about the content and meaning of their reading material. In addition, the purpose and genre of the text also influence competence of someone to understand the content of the reading material. For example, students in Junior High School will feel difficult to understand about the text genre which is taught in Senior High School. But, they will feel easy to understand the text genre which is appropriate with their grade.

Based on School-Based Curriculum, there are two types of text genre which are taught in the first semester of the eighth grade students of Junior High School. Those are descriptive and recount. In this research, the writer chose recount text as a genre of reading text to be researched on reading comprehension. Based on Arif (2011: 17), "Recount text is one of the text that should be mastered by the eighth grade students of Junior High School." Furthermore, Priyana, et al (2008: 69) say that the purpose of recount text is to document a series of events and evaluate their significance in some ways. Thus, recount text is a text which is taught in the eighth grade students of Junior High School where its content to inform the reader about something or sequence of events which happened in the past time.

The writer chose recount text because students felt more difficult to understand recount text than descriptive text. This information was gotten based on the explanation of the teacher when the writer conducted observation in SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak. There were some difficulties which were faced by students on recount text. The first, students were difficult to identify the information in generic structure of recount text like orientation, events, and re-orientation. The generic structures inform the readers about information when the event happened, where the event happened, who was involved in the event, what was the series of events that happened, how and why did the events happen, and how was the ending of the event. The second difficulty was students did not really understand about language features on recount text, for example using of past verb form as well as the first and the third person pronoun on recount text. The third difficulty was students lack of vocabulary. On recount text, sometimes students did not know the meaning of past form and specific words which appear in the text. The last, students had difficulty in inferring significant information in the text, especially to infer the implicit meaning and conclusion of the text.

As a good reader, students must have ability to identify the information in the generic structure and language features. Then, students also have to infer the word

and conclusion in a text. Those abilities make students anticipate the information which appear in a text. If they know those aspects, it can help them to comprehend the information in a text easily.

Therefore, teacher needs technique to help her or his students to solve their difficulties in reading comprehension on recount text. Many techniques can be used by teacher to increase students' reading comprehension. One of them is Heading into Questions. Actually Heading into Questions is a strategy, but the writer modifies it to be a technique in implementing of this research. Vogt and Echevarria (2008: 163) adapted from Angie Medina, Long Beach Unified School District say, "Heading into questions guide students to look at the bold heading to predict the types of questions that may be asked about the information in the text. Initially this activity should be modelled for the entire class: with the text copied on transparencies, demonstrate how to turn the headings and sub headings in a chapter into questions using words such as who, what, where, when, why, and how. These questions become the focus and purpose for the subsequent reading. Students use them to monitor their comprehension throughout the text."

In this activity, the writer also modified this technique by asking students to read the title and the first sentence of the recount text. Next, teacher divided students into groups. Every group consisted five or six students. Then, students could create the questions based on the title and the first sentence of recount text. After that, they present their questions in front of the class.

Those questions were modified to be quizzes. Thus, they could ask to other groups to answer their questions. It is an active reading technique for students. This technique encourages students to comprehend their reading especially on recount text through collaboration because they can collaborate and discuss with their friend to make questions and to answer the questions.

By using this technique, the students were able to predict the questions about explicit and implicit information of generic structure, language features, vocabulary and the conclusion of the recount text. Those questions become focus for their reading. Next, they can find the answers by reading all of content of the text. In the end of lesson, students can comprehend and solve their problem on reading recount text.

Based on the explanation above, the writer applied Heading into Questions to teach reading comprehension on recount text to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013 in order to know the effectiveness of this technique to increase the reading comprehension of students on recount text.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

This research was conducted to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013 from October 24th, 2012 until November 10th, 2012. This research used a quasi experimental design. The technique of data collecting applied in this research is measurement technique to measure the students'

reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions. The writer used pretest and posttest as tool for tool of data collection. The total number of questions are thirty questions with four alternatives. The pretest is similar questions to the posttest because the writer want to measure the effectiveness of the technique that applied to the students.

In this research, the writer used purposive sampling to choose one of the classes into experimental group (VIII D) which consists 34 students and the other one into the control group (VIII E) which consists 36 students. The classes were be taken from the population. After that, the writer gave pretest for two classes and measured the student's individual score and means score of students. Then, the writer gave treatment (Heading into Questions) to the experimental group and conventional technique (teacher gives explanation and asks questions to the students, the students answer the questions from the teacher, if they feel confused, they can ask to the teacher) to the control group. Next, posttest was be given to the both classes. The last, the writer measured and compared the result of the test, whether there is different significance between experimental group and control group or not. By comparing them, we exactly know the effectiveness of the technique that have used.

RESEARCH FINDINGS

This research was conducted to get precise data about the difference of teaching reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions and without through Heading into Question to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013.

 In this research, the first, the writer administered the pretest to both classes. Then, the different treatments were given three times to both classes. Experimental class was given treatment of Heading into Questions and control class was given treatment of conventional technique. In experimental class, students were active and enthusiastic. They felt fun studied reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions. Whereas, in contol class, students were less active, but they listened carefully the explanation of the teacher. Next, the writer gave post test to both classes. The purpose of the post test is to know the different result of both classes.

After conducting the research, the writer found that 22 students did not pass in pretest of experimental class, 26 students did not pass in pretest of control class, 3 students did not pass in posttest of experimental class, and 13 students did not pass in postest of control class. Then, the mean score of pretest of experimental class is 73.52, while control class is 69.44. The mean score of posttest of experimental class is 83.14, while control class is 76.31. For more detail, the writer analyzed her finding as follows:

1. **The Analysis of the Students' Individual and Mean Score**
   a. The Analysis of The Students' Individual and Mean Score of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Class

   The score of pretest in experimental class is *2499.7*. Thus, the mean score is *2499.7 / 34 = 73.52* (the criteria is "Not achieving passing grade"). Whereas, the score of posttest in experimental class is *2826.9*. Thus, the mean score is *2826.9 / 34 = 83.14* (the criteria is "Achieving passing grade").

   b. The Analysis of The Students' Individual and Mean Score of Pretest and Posttest In Control Class

   The score of pretest in control class is *2499.9*. Thus, the mean score is *2499.9 / 36 = 69.44* (the criteria is "Not achieving passing grade"). Whereas, the score of posttest in control class is *2747.1*. Thus, the mean score is *2747.1 / 36 = 76.31* (the criteria is "Achieving passing grade").

2. **The Analysis of the Students' Interval Score**
   a. The Analysis of Students' Interval Score of Pretest-Posttest in Experimental Class

   The interval of the students' mean score in experimental class as follow:

   $MD = M_2 - M_1$ (Arikunto, 2006: 307)
   $MD = 83.14 - 73.52$
   $MD = 9.62$

   Table 1
   The students' criteria score of pretest and posttest in experimental class

Test	Mean Score	Criteria
Posttest (M_2)	83.14	Achieving passing grade
Pretest (M_1)	73.52	Not achieving passing grade
Interval Score	**9.62**	

   b. The Analysis of Students' Interval Score of Pretest-Posttest in Control Class

   The interval of the students' mean score in control class as follow:

   $MD = M_2 - M_1$
   $MD = 76.31 - 69.44$
   $MD = 6.87$

Table 2
The students' criteria score of pretest and posttest in control class

Test	Mean Score	Criteria
Posttest (M_2)	76.31	Achieving passing grade
Pretest ($M_\square$)	69.44	Not achieving passing grade
Interval Score	**6.87**	

The tables above show that the interval score of experimental class is higher than the interval score of control class. It means that the experimental class has better result than the control class.

3. **The Analysis of the Difference Between the Two Classes;   Experimental Class and Control Class**
T- test formula is used for analyze the different significance between the mean score of experimental class and control class. The result of t-test is 4.65. It is higer than t – table with the df 68 = 1.66757 (Junaidi, 2010: 2). It means that the hyphothesis of this research (Heading into Questions is effective to increase students' reading comprehension on recount text of the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013) is accepted.

4. **The Effect Size of Treatment**
Based on the calculation, the writer got the effect size is 1.12. According to Cohen in Muijs (2004: 139) the category of effect size is "strong effect" (1.12 > 1). Thus, the use of Heading into Questions is very effective to increase students' reading comprehension on recount text.

5. **The Analysis of The Students' Correct Answers and the Percentage Based on the Aspect of Reading Comprehension**
The writer conducted pretest to the experimental class to know the ability of students before giving treatment. The result of the experimental students' ability in answering the questions of pretest based on the aspects of reading comprehension can be described as follow:
1. Vocabulary (past verb form) $= \dfrac{1642.87}{34} = 48.32\%$
2. Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event) $= \dfrac{2866.71}{34} = 84.32\%$
3. Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)

$= \underline{2614.23} = 76.89\%$
       34

4. Pronoun Reference (relate to the participant in the events)

$= \underline{2771.4} = 81.51\%$
       34

The writer also conducted pretest to the control class to know the ability of students before giving treatment. The control students' ability in answering the questions of pretest based on the aspects of reading comprehension can be described as follow:

1. Vocabulary (past verb form) $= \underline{1485.72} = 41.27\%$
                                          36

2. Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event) $= \underline{2988.94} = 83.03\%$
                                                      36

3. Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)

$= \underline{2485.69} = 69.05\%$
        36

4. Pronoun Reference (relate to the participant in the events)

$= \underline{2899.95} = 80.55\%$
         36

After conducting pretest and treatment, the writer gave posttest to the experimental class. From the result of posttest, the writer analyzed the percentage of aspects of reading comprehension based on the students' correct answer. The experimental students' ability in answering the questions of posttest based on the aspects of reading comprehension can be described as follow:

1. Vocabulary (past verb form) $= \underline{2228.57} = 65.55\%$
                                          34

2. Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event) $= \underline{3133.36} = 92.16\%$
                                                      34

3. Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)

$= \underline{2785.67} = 81.93\%$
        34

4. Pronoun Reference (relate to the participant in the events)

$= \underline{3071.37} = 90.33\%$
         34

The writer also conducted the posttest to the control class. The purpose is to know wether there is different significance result to the experimental class or there is not different significance. After conducting posttest, the writer analyzed the result of percentage of aspects of reading comprehension based on the

students' correct answer. The control students' ability in answering the questions of posttest based on the aspects of reading comprehension can be described as follow:

1. Vocabulary (past verb form) $= \dfrac{1757.15}{36} = 48.81\%$

2. Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event) $= \dfrac{3266.7}{36} = 90.74\%$

3. Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)
   $= \dfrac{2714.23}{36} = 75.4\%$

4. Pronoun Reference (relate to the participant in the events)
   $= \dfrac{3099.97}{36} = 86.11\%$

DISCUSSION

This research was applied to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013. This research used a quasi experimental design. According to Best (1977 : 92) an experiment involves the comparison of the effects of a particular treatment with that of a different treatment or of no treatment. In this research, the writer compared the result of experimental and control class. The experimental class was applied technique of Heading into Question and the contol class was applied conventional technique (teacher gives explanation and asks questions to the students, the students answer the questions from the teacher, if they feel confused, they can ask to the teacher).

The writer divided the students into two classes. The first class (VIII D) was choosen as the experimental class and the second class (VIII E) was choosen as control class. Before giving treatment for both classes, the writer gave pretest to each class. After calculating the result of pretest, the writer applied treatment for both classes. The control class was treated by conventional technique (teacher gives explanation, asks questions, and the students answer the questions) to understand the reading on recount text. Meanwhile, the experimental class was treated by Heading into Questions to understand the reading on recount text. Treatment was given three times for each class.

In control class, students listened to the explanation of the teacher (researcher). Then, teacher did questions-answer to them. After that, they had chance to ask about the lesson that they were still confused. In the first meeting, students were very calm. They just listened the explanation of the teacher. They answered the questions if the teacher asked them. In the second meeting, students began active to ask things that they did not really know. They were also more enthusiastic toward the lesson. In the third meeting, students were more serious to listen the explanation of teacher. They

asked many things, such as about vocabulary, pronoun referrent, and the order of events.

In experimental class, students read the recount text by using Heading into Questions technique. Students read the text from its heading (title and the first sentence of a passage). From the heading, they made prediction of questions. After made the questions, they used the questions as their guide to more focus on reading text. After they read all of the contain of the text, they discussed with their friends in group. Their discussion had to about their questions and answers. Their questions also had to include the vocabulary, the supporting details which contain information in generic structure, implicit information (inference), and reference pronoun of the text. In the first meeting, students was still confused how to conduct the technique. They asked many questions to the teacher, for instance, how to read the heading and make questions from heading ,what type of questions that they have to make, and how to present their questions. In the second meeting, students began used to with the technique. Group discussion was more intense and active. They were more understand about how to make the questions. In the third meeting, students were also very active and enthusiastic. They were happy when they presented their questions in front of the class. As a whole of meetings, students looked enthusiastic and active to conduct this technique. They felt fun to make the questions and to answer the questions from their friend in the other groups.

Then, the writer administered the posttest toward both classes. It is to know whether there is the different achievement of both classes or not. From the result of posttest, the writer knew that there is different significance achievement of both classes. It was proved by the result of mean score of posttest in experimental class is **83.14** and the interval score is **9.62**. Whereas the result of mean score of posttest in control class is **76.31** and the interval score is **6.87**. Next, those results computed into t-test formula. The t Test formula compares two different treatments and makes general conclusion (Subana, et al, 2005: 168). The t-value is **4.65**. This value could accept the hypothesis of this research. Beside that, the value of the effect size treatment is **1.12**. It showed that the treatment had strong effect (**1.12 > 1**). It indicated that teaching reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013 is effective.

Based on the aspects of reading comprehension, students' percentage also improved. The improvement of students' ability in answering the aspects of reading comprehension in pretest and post-test can be described as follow:

1). Experimental Class:

Aspect of Reading Comprehension	Pretest	Posttest	Interval
Vocabulary (past verb form)	48.32%	65.55%	17.23%
Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event)	84.32%	92.16%	7.84%
Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)	76.89%	81.93%	5.04%
Pronoun Reference(relate to the participant in the events)	81.51%	90.33%	8.82%

2). Control Class:

Aspect of Reading Comprehension	Pretest	Posttest	Interval
Vocabulary (past verb form)	41.27%	48.81%	7.54%
Supporting Details (information about where, when, why and how event happened, what the events which happened in the text, and how was the ending of event)	83.03%	90.74%	7.71%
Inference (implicit information and the conclusion of the text)	69.05%	75.4%	6.35%
Pronoun Reference (relate to the participant in the events)	80.55%	86.11%	5.56%

Generally, the aspects of reading comprehension in experimental class is more improve than control class. It showed that the implementation of Heading into Questions is success to increase the reading comprehension on recount text.

CONCLUSION

Referring to the research findings and the analysis of the students' test result, the writer can draw some conclusions about this research (Teaching Reading Comprehension on Recount Text through Heading into Questions to The Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak in academic year 2012/2013). The first conclusion is the use of Heading into Questions can increase the achievement of the eighth grade students (VIII D) of SMP Negeri 1 Pontianak on comprehension of reading recount text. Then, there is different significance between teaching reading comprehension on recount text through Heading into Questions and without Heading into Questions. It was shown by the students' mean score of posttest in experimental class is higher than control class. The mean score of posttest in experimental class is **83.14**, with the interval score of pretest and posttest is **9.62**. Meanwhile, the mean score of posttest in control class is **76.31**, with the interval score of pretest and posttest is **6.87**. Furthermore, the result of t value is **4.65**. It can be used to accept the hypothesis of this research.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Arif. 2011. *Increasing Students' Mastery of The Simple Past Tense by Using Recount Text.* Pontianak: Thesis FKIP UNTAN.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Best, J. W. 1977. *Research in Education (Third Edition).* New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc .

Junaidi. 2010. *Titik Persentase Distribusi t d.f = 1 – 200.* Retrieved on February 19th,2013 at 20.56 p.m.
from http://junaidichaniago.files.wordpress.com/2010/04/tabel-t.pdf

Lems, Kristin, et al. 2010. *Teaching Reading to English Language Learners Insights from Linguistic*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Mikulecky, Beatrice S. & Jeffries, Linda. 1986. *Reading Power, Reading Faster, Thinking Skills, Reading for Pleasure, Comprehension Skills*. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Muijs, Daniel. 2004. *Doing Quantitative Research in Education*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Priyana, Joko, et al. 2008. *Scaffolding (English for Junior High School Students Grade VIII).* Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Subana, et al. 2005. *Statistik Pendidikan.* Bandung: Pustaka Setia.

Vogt, MaryEllen & Echevarria, Jana. 2008. *99 Ideas and Activities for Teaching English Learners with the SIOP Model*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.