

# ***A STUDY ON THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMAN 1 PEKANBARU IN READING COMPREHENSION***

***Rahmatika Yuliani, Fadly Azhar, Masyhur***

*Email: rahmatikaayuliani@gmail.com, drfadly44@gmail.com, masyhurr20@gmail.com*

*Contact: 082283887804*

*Student of English Study Program  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Universitas Riau*

***Abstract:*** *This research aims to find out what is the learning ability of the second-year students of SMAN 1 Pekanbaru in reading comprehension about descriptive texts, narrative texts, and recount texts. This is descriptive research. The numbers of sample are 72 students chosen by using cluster random sampling. Reading comprehension test were used to collect the data. The data were collected through 42 multiple choice reading test to measure students' ability in comprehending descriptive, narrative, and recount texts. There were 8 components of reading that used: Factual Information (FI); Main Idea (MI); Guessing Vocabulary (V); Reference (R); Inference (I); Social Functions (SF); Generic Structure (GS); and Language Features (LF). The collected data were analyzed by using SPSS 26.0 and Microsoft Excel 2019. The result shows that the average score is 75.19 with 97.6 as the highest score and 30.9 as the lowest score. Thus, result indicates that the students' comprehension is at good level.*

***Key Words:*** *Ability, Reading, Comprehension*

# **STUDI TENTANG KEMAMPUAN SISWA KELAS XI SMAN 1 PEKANBARU DALAM PEMAHAMAN MEMBACA**

**Rahmatika Yuliani, Fadly Azhar, Masyhur**

Email: rahmatikaayuliani@gmail.com, drfadly44@gmail.com, masyhurr20@gmail.com

Contact: 082283887804

Mahasiswa Program Studi Bahasa  
Inggris Fakultas Keguruan dan  
Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Riau

**Abstrak:** Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui bagaimana kemampuan belajar siswa kelas dua SMAN 1 Pekanbaru dalam pemahaman membaca tentang teks deskriptif, teks naratif, dan teks recount. Ini adalah penelitian deskriptif. Jumlah sampel adalah 72 siswa yang dipilih dengan menggunakan cluster random sampling. Tes pemahaman membaca digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data. Data dikumpulkan melalui 42 pertanyaan dengan pilihan ganda untuk mengukur kemampuan siswa dalam memahami teks deskriptif, naratif, dan recount. Ada 8 komponen membaca yang digunakan: Informasi Faktual (FI); Ide Utama (MI); Menebak Kosakata (V); Referensi (R); Inferensi (I); Fungsi Sosial (SF); Struktur Umum (GS); dan Fitur Bahasa (LF). Data yang terkumpul dianalisis dengan menggunakan SPSS 26.0 dan Microsoft Excel 2019. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa skor rata-rata adalah 75,19 dengan skor tertinggi 97,6 dan skor terendah 30,9. Dengan demikian, hasil menunjukkan bahwa pemahaman siswa berada pada tingkat yang baik.

**Kata kunci:** Kemampuan, Membaca, Pemahaman

## INTRODUCTION

The goal of any reading activity is the comprehension of what we have read. This understanding comes from the interaction between the words that are written and how they trigger knowledge outside the text (Tompkin, 2011). If there is only one aspect of language that students could study (or that educators could teach), it will be reading comprehension. Reading comprehension is defined as the level of understanding of a text. It is generally believed that proficient readers depend on the ability to recognize words quickly and effortlessly (Adams, 1994). If word recognition is difficult, students use too much of their processing capacity to read individual words, which interfere with their ability to comprehend what is read. Many graduate students, even in language, have to struggle in order to understand the textbooks they are using. (Dardjowidjojo, 2003). This being the case, even if students read an English book every week, it does not help their learning much if they do not know what the words on the pages are saying. Susan and Carter (2012) emphasized that when a student reads a text, he or she is forced to absorb plenty of particular facts concerning seemingly random subjects (volcanoes, molecules, skateboarding, etc.) and grasp the content and draw conclusions. This means that reading comprehension is the ultimate test of student language skills because the worksheets teach students to think critically, draw inferences, understand the scope and global concepts, find or recall details, and infer the meaning of useful vocabulary words.

Based on the English curriculum 2013 that is applied in senior high school in Indonesia, the students are expected to comprehend the meaning of materials from various texts. It means that to understand the materials, the students have to have the ability to look at and get the meaning of the written text, which is called reading comprehension. Among various texts that should be mastered, the researcher purposely chose to rate students' skill in comprehending descriptive, narrative, and recount texts as the theme is about historical events. The writer has analyzed that the textbook they are using is focused heavily on descriptive, narrative, and recount texts that are linked to historical sources to help uncover the past. The survey that has been done at SMA 1 Pekanbaru shows the textbook they use mostly dealing with historical matters in order to increase their nationality.

In understanding any type of English texts, Rubin (1993) assume that the reading skills which usually find in the interpretation are as follow: (1) finding the main idea, (2) finding actual information, (3) making inferences, (4) identifying references, (5) finding the meaning of vocabulary, (6) finding general structures, (7) finding the language structures, and (8) finding the social function. Those 8 skills are measured specifically on comprehending reading texts as they were already taught in the first year of study.

The reason why the researcher chose SMAN 1 Pekanbaru as the research place is because English subject has been the main field to be advanced in this school. It can be proved on English Day every Saturday, where each class will take turns getting the opportunity to present drama, dance, singing performance, poetry reading, news, storytelling, and so on. The school also establishes an English club which often participates and wins in a number of local to national English olympiads. In October 2018, SMAN 1 Pekanbaru held an English Olympiad named Riau Smansa English Festival (Rise Fest) to commemorate Bulan Bahasa. Starting from the elementary to high school level, there are five championships; which are English debate, storytelling,

speech, scrabble, and ranking 1. It can be said that SMAN 1 Pekanbaru is a suitable place to conduct an English reading comprehension test.

The researcher intends to know how comprehending descriptive, narrative, and recount texts contribute to the students' English language competency and practices in the English subject. It is the opportunity for learners to practice reading descriptive, narrative, and recount texts to make learners be familiar with the English texts. Questions provided in the texts are important for measuring the achievements of students and in diagnosing all aspects, all strengths, and weaknesses in the teaching-learning processes. It implies that the reading test should be very well designed in order to lead students to be creative and to use critical thinking. The writer provides descriptive, narrative, recount texts along with objective questions regarding the texts to know the comprehension level of the students as the main learning ability in this research. From the explanation above, it is possible to conduct a research entitled **"A Study on the Ability of the Second Year Students of SMAN 1 Pekanbaru in Reading Comprehension"**.

## METHODOLOGY

This research was conducted to the second-grade students of SMAN 1 Pekanbaru, which is located at Jalan 159 Sultan Syarif Kasim, from Agustus 2019 to February 2020. In this study, the population of this research was the second-grade of SMAN 1 Pekanbaru. Where the second-grade students consist of nine classes and the population are 324 students. This research used cluster random sampling technique to choose the class to be the sample. Class XI MIA 1 dan XI MIA 2 were selected as the sample. There are 72 students from both of the classes, and all of them were taken as the sample of this research. In conducting the research, the researcher collected the data by reading comprehension test, in the form of multiple-choice questions. The data of this research analyzed and calculated by applying SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solution) 26.0 and Microsoft Excel 2019.

## RESEARCH FINDINGS

### Findings

The overall result shows in the following table below:

<b>Table 1. The Summary of the Reading Comprehension</b>				
<b>Participants</b>	<b>Average Score</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Max</b>	<b>Min</b>
<b>72</b>	75.19	11.13	97,6	30.9

In terms of the calculation of the students reading comprehension, the average of the total score is 75.19 and the standard deviation is 11.13. The maximum score obtained is 97.6 and the minimum score is 30.9. The classification of students reading

comprehension of descriptive, narrative, and recount text can be seen in the following table:

**Table 2. Students Reading Comprehension**

No	Mean	Frequency	Percentage	Description
1	81 – 100	16	22.22 %	Excellent
2	61 – 80	51	70.83%	Good
3	41 – 60	3	4.17%	Mediocre
4	21 – 40	2	2.78%	Poor
5	0 – 20	0	0%	Very Poor
Total means: 75.19			100%	Good

The table above indicates that the student's comprehension is at different levels. The highest number of students' reading comprehension is in the good category, which is 71% of the students. Meanwhile, the other is in the mediocre level category, 22% of the students. Therefore, it can be stated that students' reading comprehension in general is in a good level category.

From the scores that were collected above, it is needed to know the statistical scores of the data, such as mean, media, mode, and standards deviation of the scores. It is discovered that the scores of the students' in comprehending descriptive, narrative, and recount texts have been obtained. Therefore, to find out the statistical results, the data was analyzed using SPSS 26.0. The research findings are presented as follows:

#### Statistics

score		
N	Valid	72
	Missing	0
Mean		75.199
Std. Error of Mean		1.3119
Median		76.200
Mode		78.5
Std. Deviation		11.1314
Variance		123.909
Range		66.7
Minimum		30.9
Maximum		97.6
Sum		5414.3
Percentiles	10	62.620
	20	66.600
	25	66.600
	30	71.400
	40	74.280

50	76.200
60	78.500
70	80.900
75	80.900
80	83.300
90	88.100
100	97.600

The table above shows the mean score of Student's score is 75.19. The median is 76.20. The mode is 78.5. The highest score of habit is 97.6 while the lowest score is 30.9. The standard deviation is 11.13 with variance of 123.9.

It is important to note that designing a reading test instrument involves specifications, test construction, reading materials, try-out, analysis, and revision. By conducting a tryout. The researcher knows whether the material used is valid and reliable. Reliability is about the consistency of a measure, and validity is about the accuracy of a measure. To increase the instrument quality, item analysis is needed to make sure that the test is neither too difficult nor too easy. Tinambunan (1988) states that the reliability of the test is considered as follows:

- When the coefficient is 0.00-0.20, the reliability is low
- When the coefficient is 0.21-0.40, the reliability is sufficient
- When the coefficient is 0.40-0.70, the reliability is high
- When the coefficient is above 0.70, the reliability is very high

However, the result of calculation shows that the Cronbach's Alpha of the instrument is 0.722, categorized as very high reliability.

**Table 3. Students Learning Ability in Reading Comprehension**

Text	FI	MI	V	R	I	SF	GS	LF
Descriptive	59	36	51	61	43	60	69	46
Narrative	70	53	61	51	58	55	45	59
Recount	38	61	45	37	58	37	71	60

Table above indicates the students' learning ability in finding factual information (FI), the frequency of students' correct answer is 59 out of 72 students in descriptive, 70 in narrative, and 38 in recount text. The students' learning ability in finding the main idea (MI) in descriptive text is 36, 53 in narrative, and 61 in recount text. The students' learning ability in guessing vocabulary (V) is 51 in descriptive, 61 in narrative, and 45 in recount text. The students' learning ability frequency in finding reference (R) is 61 out of 72 students in descriptive, 51 in narrative, and 37 in recount text. The frequency of students' learning ability in guessing inference (I) is 43 in descriptive, 58 in narrative, and 58 in recount text. The frequency of students learning ability in social function (SF) is 60 out of 72 students in descriptive, 55 in narrative, and 37 in recount text. The frequency of students' learning ability in generic structure (GS) is 69 out of 72 students in descriptive, 45 in narrative, and 71 in recount text. The frequency of students'

learning ability in language features (LF) is 46 out of 72 students in descriptive, 59 in narrative, and 60 in recount text.

## **DISCUSSION**

This section presents the discussion based on the findings of the study. This study answered the research questions related to the students' learning ability in descriptive, narrative, and recount text. After analyzing the data, the researcher discovers that the students' learning ability in descriptive text is in the level of a good category. The students' highest ability in reading descriptive text is in answering the reference question. This finding is in line with Hartono (2005) who stated that a reference question is usually a pronoun, which is highlighted in the passage. Students are asked what the highlighted word refers to. If it's a pronoun then they need to identify what word the pronoun is replacing.

In the part of students' learning ability in comprehending narrative text, the writer finds out that the students are in the good level category in terms of finding information. Almost all students can answer the questions related to finding information about the text. The students can understand the text from the supporting details given in the narrative text. This finding is in line with Segretto (2002) who stated that supporting details give the reader more information about the main idea or subject of a passage.

Furthermore, the students' learning ability in comprehending the recount text is in the level of a good category. Almost all students can answer this learning ability in reading recount text. 71 or 98.61 % out of 72 students can answer the generic structure questions. This finding is in line as Lucy Hart (2004) stated that comprehension is affected by the reader's knowledge of the topic, knowledge of language structures, knowledge of text structures and genres, knowledge of cognitive and metacognitive strategies, their reasoning abilities, their motivation, and their level of commitment. Students who have trouble learning to decode and recognize words often will have difficulty with reading comprehension.

The lowest level category for the descriptive text is the "poor" category. The students cannot answer the question connected to find the main idea of the text. The students lowest level ability in narrative text is in finding the generic structure of the text. The students' level is in the category of mediocre. Only 45 students or 62.5% are able to answer the questions related to the finding generic structure of the text. The students' learning ability in comprehending the recount text is in the level of the poor category. 51.38% of students cannot find the social function of the text, 51.38% of students cannot find the reference of the text, and 57.77% of the students cannot find the factual information.

## **CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Conclusions**

This study aims to discuss and to find out the learning ability of the second-year students of SMAN 1 Pekanbaru in reading comprehension. The result of data analysis

showed the students' learning ability in descriptive text is in the level of good category. The students' highest ability in reading descriptive text is in answering the generic structure. 69 or 95.83 % out of 72 students can answer the generic structure questions. The students' learning ability in comprehending narrative text, the writer perceives that the students are in the good level category regarding finding information. 70 or 97.22% out of 72 students can answer the question about finding the information of the text. The students' learning ability in comprehending the recount text is in the good category. 71 or 98.61 % out of 72 students can answer the generic structure questions.

## Recommendations

The researcher recommended as follows:

1. Teachers are expected to give more English references so they can improve their ability in finding the social function, reference, and finding factual information of the text in reading descriptive, narrative, and recount text.
2. The students should be more practiced in improving their learning ability in reading comprehension by reading more text.
3. The school needs to provide more articles and books related to the genre text.

## REFERECES

- Anderson, K., (1997). *Text Types in English 3*. McMillan Education. South Yarra, Australia.
- Bigney, L., (2013). *The Components of Reading Comprehension*. Rhode Island Tutorial & Educational Services (RITES). Providence. Rhode Island.
- Brown, D., (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. Pearson Education. New York.
- Charles, (2004). *Qualities of Short Stories*. Indiana University. Bloomington.
- Dararat, T., (2012). *Cultivating a Love of Reading in Your Children*. University of Glasgow. Scotland.
- Dasrul, H., (2018). *Students Difficulties in Reading Comprehension at the First Grade of SMAN 1 Darussalam Aceh Besar*. The thesis is not published. Faculty of Education and Teacher Training Ar-Raniry State Islamic University. Banda Aceh.



- Dewi, R., (2013). *The Effect of Using Pre-Questioning on Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at Second Grade of SMPN 1 Seputih Banyak*. Lampung University Press. Bandar Lampung.
- Emilia, M., (2010). *The Motivational Factors that Affect Adolescent Readers Comprehension*. ERIC: Institute of Education Sciences. Saint Joseph's University. Philadelphia.
- Hafner, L., (2010). *Teaching Reading to Children*. Macmillan. University of Virginia. Charlottesville.
- Harmer, J., (2001). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Third Ed, (Cambridge: Longman). Cambridge. p.78.
- Harris, A.J., (1979). *Lateral Dominance, Directional Confusion, and Reading Disability*. Journal of Psychology. New York.
- Harrison, (2004). *Understanding Reading Development*. Sage Publications. London.
- Hartono, R., (2005). *Descriptive Text (Complete Explanation)*. Education Blog. (Online) <http://britishcourse.com/descriptive-text-complete-explanation.php>
- Hornby, (1998). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford University Press. Great Britain.
- Janette, K., (2007). *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. The Guilford Press. New York.
- Kane, M., (2004). *Executive Attention, Working Memory Capacity, and a Two-Factor Theory of Cognitive Control*. Academic Press: 145-199. New York.
- Lenz, K., (1990). *What factors affect reading comprehension?* The University of Kansas. Lawrence. Kansas.
- Linan, et al., (2007). *Research-Based Methods of Reading Instruction for English Language Learners*. ASCD Publication. Alexandria.
- Loveless, B., (2002). *Improving Reading Comprehension*. Education Corner. Utah.
- Lucy, H., (2004). *The Effects of an Early Reading Curriculum on Language and Literacy Development of Head Start Children*. Journal of Research in Childhood Education 18(3): 169-178. University of Montana. United States.

- Maria, I., (2015). *A Study on Reading Comprehension Ability of the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Swasta Beringin Kupang in the School Year 2015/2016*. The thesis is not published. English Study Program Faculty of Teacher Training and Educational Science PGRI University NTT. Kupang.
- Mariam, J.D., (2000). *Engaging young readers: Promoting Achievement and Motivation*. Guilford Press. New York.
- Mark, A., (2008). *Reader's Choice: Split Edition*. University of Michigan Press ELT. Ann Arbor. Michigan.
- Martin, D., (2003). *Cognition, Education, and Deafness: Directions for Research*. Gallaudet University Press. Washington D.C.
- Meyer, B., (2014). *Memory Improved: Reading and Memory Enhancement Across the Life Span through Strategic Text Structures*. Psychology Press. Purdue University. West Lafayette.
- Munand, A., (2013). *Narrative Text: Definition, Purposes, Generic Structures and Example of Narrative Text*. Education Blog. (Online) <http://duoulala.blogspot.com/2013/07/narrative-text-definition-purposes.html>
- Nathanson, S., (2008). *The Reading Habits and Literacy Attitudes of Inservice and Prospective Teachers*. Long Island University. New York.
- Normah, O., (2012). *Students' Perception on the Role of Library and Media Teachers*. Journal of Education and Practice 3 (8): 158-165. Sultan Zainal Abidin University.
- Pierson, P., (2007). *Daily Independent Reading Record and Journal, Grades 4-7*. Teacher Created Resources. Garden Grove. California.
- Priyana, J., (2008). *Scaffolding (English for Junior High School Students Grade VIII)*. Pusat Perbukuan, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. Jakarta
- Putra, A., (2012). *A Descriptive Study of Teaching Reading Comprehension in The Second Year of SMP 1 Polanharjo*. The thesis is not published. School of Teacher Training and Education Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. Surakarta.
- Regina, G., (2005). *Developing Reading Fluency: An Abundance of Technology Resources*. New England Reading Association Journal 41 (1): 57. West Hartford.
- Sasha B., (2016). *"What is Reading? - Definition & Process"*. McGill University. Chicago.

- Segretto, M., (2002). *Roadmap to 8<sup>th</sup> Grade Reading*. The Princeton Review. Toronto.
- Shane, M., (2015). *How to Write an Excellent Recount*. Education Blog. (Online) <https://www.literacyideas.com/recounts>
- Smalley, L., (1981). *Technology Education Symposium II*. Opinion Papers (120): 90. Wisconsin University. Madison.
- Swerling, L.S., (2006). *Assessment of Reading Comprehension*. Educational Service of Public Television Stations. Washington, D.C.
- Turnbull, J., (2009). *Oxford Wordpower Dictionary*. Oxford University Press. London.
- Wijaya, A., (2010). *What is the Significance of Rabbits' Large Ears?* Education Blog. (Online) <http://englishforjunio.blogspot.com/2010/09/what-is-significance-of-rabbits-large.html>