The use of Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy (RCRR) to Improve the Ninth Year Students' Reading Comprehension of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare

Rubiah[1], Amaluddin[2], Ammang Latifa[3]
[1,2,3]Pascasarjana, Universitas Muhammadiyah Parepare, Indonesia
* Corresponding Author. E-mail: rabiahmuhlis@gmail.com.

Abstract

The objective of the research was to find out whether there was any significant difference between the students who were taught through Read, Cover, Remember, retell strategy (RCRR) and the students who were taught through Conventional Way (Collaborative Learning). This research used Quasi-Experimental Method. The population of this research was the nineth year students of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare. Total number of populations was 256 students and two classes of them were taken as sample by using cluster random sampling. One class was as experimental group (IX_5) and one class was as control group (IX_7). The numbers of each class were 32 students. The instruments used were reading comprehension test. The result of this research concludes that there was any significant difference between the students between the students who were taught reading through RCRR strategy and the students who were taught reading through Conventional Way (Collaborative Learning). It is proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in Experimental group was 85.46, while in Control group, the mean score of students' posttest was 80.15. The result of the t-test value (3.123) was greater than t-table value (2.000). This indicated that H_0 was rejected, and H_a was accepted.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Improve, RCRR

INTRODUCTION

Reading comprehension is the ability to read a text, process it and try to comprehend the meaning. Reading is an important skill in our daily life because it can give so many advantages for us. Through reading, students can obtain plenty of information which can expand their knowledge more and more. Besides, in learning English, being able to comprehend reading passage is a must. When the teacher gives text for the students to answer some questions, they possibly cannot answer it well if they do not comprehend reading passage well. It is like two aspects which cannot be separated. It is like fire and fume, two things that is inseparable. That is a fact in comprehending text that is absolutely needed.

Related with the present study, reading comprehension is not as simple as people imagination to achieve it. There are many aspects that must be considered if the teacher wants to successfully conduct the teaching learning process. One of the important aspects is giving the students a chance to read during the lesson and also make

sure that they completely understand what they read.

Reading was the major problem that was found in the nineth year students of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare. It is showed by their rate score on their reading achievement is 63.00. It was a reality found in SMP Negeri 2 Parepare. The cause of the students' reading achievement problem was the teacher's teaching method. It was not interesting. The data was taken from the questionnaire given to the students. About 60 % students said that they were bored when they studied English, especially reading. Because of that, this research will suggest the teaching of reading by using (RCRR) Read, Cover, Remember Retell strategy. This teaching strategy is good to improve the students' reading comprehension. The main problems of this research were as follows: Is there any significant difference between the students who were taught through RCRR strategy and the students who were taught through Conventional Way (Collaborative Learning)?

The objective of the research was to find out whether there was any significant difference between the students who were taught through RCRR strategy and the students who were taught through Conventional Way.

The significance of the research was divided into two parts. They were theoritically and practically:

a. Theoritical significance, this study will be worth for the other researchers in which hopefully it can be used as reference and also guidance in conducting the same study of observing reading comprehension. Some information and theories provided in this study can be taken to enrich the available reference. The other researchers are hoped can take the strength and add the weakness. Furthermore, the procedures of composing this research become a good guidance to be used to have a better result of doing research in teaching reading comprehension.

b. Practical significance, this research is expected:

1. For the English teacher, the result of the study was greatly expected to be useful when they conduct the lesson and manage the students in reading class. By using this technique, teacher can conduct the lesson since this technique is easy to be implemented in the teaching learning process.

2. For the students, they will have new experience and great improvement of reading comprehension when they join reading class. New experience is mainly felt since the technique used allows them to work together. With collaborative learning, the students are able to solve problems they face during the lesson by discussing with their friend. In addition, the students' ability in reading comprehension will gradually improve because they do not only read, but also try to understand what they read. This way is actually what they need in reading class.

3. For the next researcher, this research was expected to be meaningful information and to give motivation for the next researcher to create another research about teaching reading, especially for reading comprehension.

RESEARCH METHOD

The design of this research was Quasi-experimental method which applied two groups pretest and posttest, namely experimental and control group. The design was presented as follows (Gay, 1981:227) :

$$E : \quad O1 \quad X_1 \quad O2$$
$$\overline{C : \quad O1 \quad X_2 \quad O2}$$

There were two variables involved in this research, namely Independent and Dependent Variables. The independent variable was the use of RCRR strategy technique in teaching reading, and the dependent variable was the students' reading comprehension.

The population of this research was the nineth year students of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare. It consited of 8 classes where each class consisted of 32 students. Therefore, the total number of the population was 256 students. The sample was taken by using cluster random sampling technique. Two classes of the nineth year students of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare was taken as research samples, 2018/2019 academic year. Because the researcher used Quasi-experimental method, this research took class IX.5 as experimental group with 32 total number of students, and class IX.7 as control group with 32 total number of students.

The instrument used to acquire the data from the students was a test. It will be divided into two kind of test; pretest and posttest.

The procedures of collecting data were presented in chronological order as in the following:

a. Pretest

The researcher gave the pretest before giving treatment to the students. It aimed to define the students' prior ability of speaking. Reading test was a test applied in this research. The test consisted of 20 items. The test run during 2 x 40 minutes.

b. Treatment

The students learned reading through RCRR strategy. This treatment was conducted for four times. Each meeting run during 2 x 40 minutes.

c. Posttest

The posttest was given after the students getting the treatment. It aimed to know the significant difference between the students' skill before and after Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy. The test run during 2 x 40 minutes.

To analysis the data from the result of the pretest and posttest, some formulas were used here. The first was to calculate the students answer, the researcher used the formula from Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2005:28

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{The correct answers of the student}}{\text{Total number of item}} \times 100$$

The second was to classify the students score into four levels, the researcher used the classification level from Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, 2005:2 :

a. 86 – 100   classified as very good
b. 71 – 85   classified as good
c. 56 – 70   classified as fair
d. 41 – 55   classified as poor
e. ≤40   classified as very poor

Then, to calculate the rate percentage of students' score, the researcher used the following formula:

$$\% = \frac{F}{N} \times 100$$

The last, to collect the mean score between the result of pretest and posttest, the researcher used the formula from Gay, 1981: 198 :

$$\overline{X} = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

The researcher puts forward the hypothesis, namely:

a. H_0 : there was no any significant difference between the students who were taught through RCRR strategy and the students who were taught through Conventional Way.

b. H_i : there was any significant difference between the students who were taught through RCRR strategy and the students who were taught through Conventional Way.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

a. The percentage of students' reading comprehension for the pretest

Before conducting the treatment, the researcher administered achievement test of pretest to know the prior knowledge of the students in Experimental group and Control group. The analysis is shown in the following table and chart.

Table IV.1 The frequency and percentages of pretest score for both groups

NO	Range of Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
			F	P	F	P
1.	86 – 100	Very good	0	0	0	0
2.	71 – 85	Good	0	0	0	0
3.	56 – 70	Fair	8	25	3	9.38
4.	41 – 55	Poor	21	65.63	22	68.75
5.	≤ 40	Very Poor	3	9.37	7	21.87
	Total		32	100	32	100

b. The percentage of students' reading comprehension for the posttest

The result of the analysis of the students' reading comprehension after the treatment can be seen in the following table:

Table IV.2 The frequency and percentages of posttest score for both groups

NO	Range of Score	Classification	Experimental Group		Control Group	
			F	P	F	P
1.	86 – 100	Very good	12	37.5	2	6.25
2.	71 – 85	Good	20	62.5	27	84.37
3.	56 – 70	Fair	0	0	3	9.38
4.	41 – 55	Poor	0	0	0	0
5.	≤ 40	Very Poor	0	0	0	0
		Total	32	100	32	100

c. The mean score of students' of both groups

The test result of students' mean score of both groups is shown in the Table IV.3 below.

Table IV.3.   The mean score of students' in both groups

Group	Mean Score		Gained Score
	Pretest	Posttest	
Experimantal	51.87	85.46	33.59
Control	47.34	80.15	32.76

d. The standard deviation of students' posttest of both groups

The standard deviation of students of both groups was presented in the following table.

Table IV.4.   The standard deviation of students' of both groups

Group	Standard Deviation		Different Standard Deviation
	Pretest	Posttest	
Experimental	8.99	7.11	1.88
Control	7.39	6.55	0.84

e. The t-test value of students' pretest

To know the significant difference between the results of students' mean score of both groups on pretest, the researcher used t-test (test of significant). The result is showed on table IV.5 below.

Table IV.5.   The t-test value of the students' pretest

Test	t-test	df	t-table
Pretest	1.961	62	2.000

f. The t-test value of students' posttest

The mean score of two groups as the result of posttest then analyzed by using t-test value to see whether there is significant difference of students' reading comprehension between both groups after giving the treatment. The researcher found that the calculation of t-test value as follows:

Table IV.6.   The t-test value of the students' posttest.

Test	t-test	df	t-table
Posttest	3.123	62	2.000

In this section, the discussion deals with the application of RCRR strategy in teaching reading to improve the students' reading comprehension. Through this strategy can improve the students' score. It was proved by the result of the mean score rate of pretest of Experimental group was 51.87 and the mean score of posttests was 85.46 or increase 33.59 points.

The result of hypothesis testing showed that there was a significant difference between both groups. All groups got improvement but the improvement of students' reading comprehension in Eperimental is higher than Control group.

The comparison of the improvement of the reading comprehension achievement of both groups could be shown by analyzing the result of posttest. The students' result showed in posttest for Experimental group, there were 12 students (37.5 percents) were classified very good, 20 students (62.5 percents) classified good, no student was classified fair, no student was classified poor, and no student was classified very poor. Otherwise, the posttest result for Control group showed that There were two students (6.25 percents) were classified very good, 27 students (84.37 percents) classified good, three students (9.38 percents) classified fair, no student was classified poor, and no student was classified very poor.

After teaching by using RCRR strategy, the mean score of the students' posttest was 85.46 which was categorized as good classification. It means that the mean score increased about 33.59 points, while the mean score of the students' posttest of Control group was 80.15, which was categorized as good classification. It means that the mean score increased about 32.76 points. Furthermore, the score of students' reading comprehension in posttest of the two groups got improvement, but the improvement of the Experimental group is more progressed than Control group.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of the data analysis in the previous chapter, it is concluded that: The use of RCRR strategy can improve the students' reading comprehension of the nineth year students of SMP Negeri 2 Parepare. It is proved by the mean score obtained from the students' pretest at experimental group only 51.87 and control group was 47.34. In this case, both classes were not able to achieve the Criteria of Minimum Standard Achievement, was 80. After the

students were given treatments, the mean score of experimental group was 85.46 and control group was 80.15. The use of this strategy can improve the students' score. It was proved by the result of the mean score rate of pretest of Experimental group was 51.87 and the mean score of posttests was 85.46 or increase 33.59 points. In applying t-test of the students' posttest for both of the groups, it was found that the t-test value (3.123) was greater than t-table value (2.000).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

[1] Alyousef, Suleiman. 2005. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL Learners. The Reading Matrix. Vol. 5, No. 2.* (Online). http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/alyousef/article.pdf. Acce ssed on June, 25th, 2018.

[2] Anita. 2013. *The Effect of Using Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy toward Reading Comprehension of Second Year Students at Senior High School Sukaramai Tapung Hulu Kampar Regency*. Unpublished Thesis. Riau : FKIP STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM.

[3] Bielby, Nicholas. 1999. *Teaching Readingat Key Stage 2*. Wellington Stre et: Ellenborough House.

[4]Brummer, Trisha. 2004. *Reading Strate gies for Mathematics*. Shell Education: McREL.

[5] Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. 2005. *Peraturan Direktorat Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah. Nomor 506/c/Kep/2004. Tentang Penilaian Perkembangan Anak Didik*. Jakarta : Departemen Pendidikan Nasional..

[6] Harmer, Jeremy. 2003. *How to Teach English*. Longman: Cambridge University Press.

[7] Gay, and Peter, Airasian. 2000. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[8] Grabe, and Stoller. 2007. *Reading for Academic Process: Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties.* New York: The Guilford Press.

[9] Harris, Albert., and Sipay, Edward. 1980. *How to Increase Reading Ability. Seventh Edition*. New York : Longman Inc.

[10] Hoyt, Linda. 2008. *Revisit, Reflect, Retell: Time-Tested Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension*. Portsmouth: Heinemann.

[11] Irwin, Judith Westphal. 1986. *Teaching Reading Comprehension Processes*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

[12] Johnson, Andrew. 2008. *Teaching Reading and Writing: A Guidebook for Tutoring and Remediating Students*. United States of America: The Rowman and Littlefield Group, Inc.

[13] Klingner, Vaughn, a n d Boardman. 2007. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties.* New York: The Guilford Press.

[14] Kustaryo, Sukirah. 1998. *Reading Technique for Collague Students*. Jakarta : Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

[15] Listiani. 2014. *Improving Reading Comprehension Through Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy at the Eighth Grade Students of SMPN 2 Abiansemal.* Unpublished Thesis. Denpasar : FKIP MAHASARASWATI DENPASAR UNIVERSITY.

[16] Macceca, Stephanie. 2008. *Reading Strategies for Social Studies*. Huntington Beach: Shell Education.

[17] Macpherson. 2000. *Cooperative Learning Group Activities for Collage Courses : A Guide for Instructors*. Canada: Kwantlen **Polytechnic** University.

[18] Nunan, David. 2003. *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: Mc. Graw Hill.

[19] Pang, Muaka. Bernhardt., and Kamil. 2003. *Teaching Reading.* Chicago: The International Academy of Education (IAE).

[20] Pressley. 2005. *Striking A Balance The Quest for Effective Literacy Instruction*. Cambridge, MA: Brookline Books.

[21] Rebecca. 2003. *A Critical Handbook of Children's Literature.* Massachuset: Pearson Education, Inc.

[22] Roberts. 2004. *Online Collaborative Learning: Theory and Practice.* USA : Idea Group Publishing.

[23] Serravallo. 2010. *Teaching Reading in Small Groups*. United States of America : Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

[24] Team of Five. 2006. *Improving Reading Skill in English for University Students. Book Two & Workbook Two*. Jakarta: Kencana.

[25] Snow, Catherine. 2002. *Reading for Understanding toward and R&D Programming Reading Comprehension*. Arlington: RAND Education.

[26] Whother, and Kathleen. 2005. *Reading Across the Disciplines, Collage Reading and Beyond.* Pearson Longman.

[27] Yulimariza, Nova. 2015. *Teaching Reading Comprehension by Combining Read, Cover, Remember, Retell and Three Two One Strategies at Senior High School*. Unpublished Thesis. Sumatra Barat: FKIP STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat.