

Terbit online pada laman web jurnal : <http://e-journal.sastra-unes.com/index.php/JIPS>

 <b>Fakultas Sastra</b> <b>Universitas Ekasakti</b>	<b>JURNAL JIPS</b> <b>(Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic)</b>	
	Vol. 3 No. 2 ISSN : 2579-5449 (media cetak)	E-ISSN : 2597-6540 (media online)

## THE EFFECT OF QUESTIONING STRATEGY AND STUDENTS' MOTIVATION TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION OF NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE ELEVENTH GRADE SOCIAL SCIENCE OF SMA NEGERI 1 TALAMAU PASAMAN BARAT

**Yessy Marzona, Widya Juli Astria**

Universitas Ekasakti

[yessy.marzona@gmail.com](mailto:yessy.marzona@gmail.com), [widyajuliastria@gmail.com](mailto:widyajuliastria@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

*In teaching reading comprehension, teaching strategy and motivation influence students' reading comprehension. Strategy which was used in this experimental research was Questioning strategy. Questioning strategy can be used as a variation of teaching strategy in teaching reading comprehension. The purpose of this research was to find out the effect of questioning strategy and students' motivation toward reading comprehension of narrative text. This research was an experimental research with factorial design 2x2. It was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat. The population of this research was eleventh grade social science students with total population of 40 students. The sample was taken by using total sampling; so all of population was taken as sample. XI IPS 2 was experimental class and XI IPS 1 as control class. The instruments of this research were reading comprehension test and questionnaire. The data was analyzed by two ways ANOVA (ANOVA 2x2). The results of this research are (1) Reading comprehension of students who are taught by questioning strategy is better than reading comprehension of students who are taught by conventional strategy.  $F_o = 196.582 > F_t = 2.69$ , it means that  $H_a$  is accepted. (2) There is no interaction between strategy and students' motivation toward reading comprehension.  $F_o = 0.012 < F_t = 2.69$ , it means that  $H_a$  is rejected. When no interaction is present it means that these two strategies did not influence each other so we do not need to continue for hypothesis 3 and hypothesis 4. In short; questioning strategy can be used as a teaching strategy in teaching reading comprehension at SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat. Other researchers are suggested to do futher research about questioning strategy dealing with of the skills.*

*Keywords: Questioning Strategy, Students' Motivation, Reading Comprehension of Narrative Text*

© 2019Jurnal JIPS

## **I INTRODUCTION**

Reading is one of the English skills that should be studied by all students in learning language. Reading can help the students to get much information through comprehending the text, because the important part of reading process is reading comprehension. One of the strategies that can help the students comprehend the reading text is by using questioning.

Questioning means that the students should answer some questions.

Nuttal (1996:181) states that "getting students to answer a question is one way for the teacher to get some access to what is going on in their minds". In addition, the questions are used to increase the students' cognitive ability. The cognitive questions are divided into two parts

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

Jurnal JIPS (Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Scholastic) Vol. 3 No. 2 (2019) ISSN : 2579-5449

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/).

namely low level and high level questions (Soetomo, 1993).

Based on the curriculum K13, the standard competence of reading skill for the second grade students of senior high school is for the students to be able to comprehend the meaning of short functional text and essay in a form of narrative, descriptive, recount, report, news item, exposition, explanation and discussion in daily life context as well as to access science. It means that they are not only expected to write a text in certain genre but they are also required to be able to understand some sort of texts.

According to the curriculum 2006, in the standard competency of senior high school, there are many genres that must be comprehended by the students. They are descriptive, exposition (analytical and hortatory), narrative, recount, review, spoof, report, news item, explanation, and discussion. From all the genres, exposition and narrative are considered as the most important ones to be taught to high school students of Indonesia since they are frequently found in every semester on National Curriculum. In this case, the researcher chooses narrative text because it is also offered in the curriculum for second semester at grade XI.

After having preliminary research at Grade X students of SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat on July 19<sup>th</sup> 2018, the researcher found that the English achievement was low. It was found 3.6 % students of Grade XI IPS 1 got 60-69 point, and 2.16 % got 70- 79 point, 2.16 % students of Grade XI IPS 2 got 60- 69 point and 1.44 % got 70- 79 point. However, there was no students got 80- 89 point. It was proved by the student's achievement when they were in the eleventh grade with the passing grade is equal with KKM (Minimum Achievement Criteria). The perfect score is 100 while the minimum of KKM is 75. According to English teacher the problem was in reading comprehension of the text.

Based on the preliminary research above, there were some problems found by the researcher, which were considered as the causes of the students' low reading comprehension. The problems were in the teaching reading comprehension itself. First, most of the students got difficulties in comprehending the text. They had lack of vocabulary. The students had limited prior knowledge with the text discussed in the

class. The students did not know the meaning of the text, and the teacher did not give scanning skill before reading the text. The teacher only focused on the question of text and the students did not comprehend the content of the text.

Moreover, students had low of motivation in reading. The students did not understand the text and the students did not give any feedback during teaching and reading process. When the teacher asked them to answer the question related to the text that they have read; only a few of them participated and most of them were lazy. In addition, the teacher only discussed the material based on the text without giving any various activities to make the students more motivated in reading.

Then, it was also found that during teaching reading in the classroom the teacher still used conventional strategy. It means that the students focused on reading text only. The teacher just simply gave some questions to the students based on the text itself without giving various questions to make the students more interested in the reading activity itself.

The problems above were caused by some factors and it influenced the students' low ability in comprehending English text. It can be caused of the teaching strategy that was used by the teacher in teaching reading comprehension. From the preliminary data, it was found that there were some factors that influence students' low ability in comprehending reading comprehension. The first factor was material. The students were not interested to the material because it was not related to the students' real lives and daily experiences. The students did not have any background knowledge about the material presented. Those factors made the students have difficulties in grasping the idea of the text. In short, the students felt reluctant, bored, uninterested and unmotivated during reading activity.

The second factor was that the teacher was unable to motivate the students in teaching reading. The teacher only used the text itself without media that can help increasing the students' motivation in reading. The third factor was related to the strategy used by the teacher in the classroom. The strategy was not varied (monotonous). The strategy that was used by the teacher is reading aloud. The teacher guided the students to the text as well as helped them to

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

translate the reading passage since the time was limited. The teacher also guided the students to text since the period of the time was limited. The teacher guided the students to find out the meaning and to understand the difficult words. Sometimes, even though the students had translated all the words, they still could not get the idea or concept of the text. As the result, this monotone activity made the students feel less interested doing the reading activity.

Based on the description above, the researcher assumed that questioning strategy can be considered as a strategy in teaching reading comprehension to make the students more active in the classroom. Brown (2001:169) states that "it is one of the best ways to develop teacher' role as an initiator and sustainer in the classroom discussion". In any teaching activities, questions played as an important role. By using questioning strategy, the teachers would be able to make their classroom discussion more effective and lively. In addition, especially in narrative text, according to Adler (2001) the researcher can use questioning strategy because one of the steps of questioning strategy is story structure instruction that ask the students to learn to identify the categories of content (generic structure) in the text. So this strategy matches with the text that the researcher used. Furthermore, the researcher was interested in doing a research by using questioning strategy to find out whether there were some effects of questioning strategy and students' motivation toward reading comprehension of narrative text at Eleventh Grade Social Science at SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat.

### 1. Questioning Strategy

According to Adler (2004: 2) there are seven steps of questioning strategy. First, monitoring comprehension. According to C.R. Adler (2001) students who are good at monitoring their comprehension know when they understand what they read and when they do not. They have strategy to "fix" problem in their understanding as the problem arise. Second, metacognition can be defined as "thinking about thinking". It means students think about and have control over their reading. Before reading, they might clarify their purpose for reading and previewing the text. During reading, they might monitor their understanding, adjusting their reading speed to fit the difficulty of the text and

"fixing" any comprehension problems they have. After reading, they check their understanding of what they have read (C.R. Adler, 2001). Third, graphic and semantic organizers illustrate concepts and relationships between concepts in a text or using diagrams. Graphic organizers are known by different names, such as maps, webs, graphs, charts, frames, or clusters. According to Adler (2001) graphic organizer can help students focus on text structure "differences between fiction and nonfiction" as they read, provide students with tools they can use to examine and show relationships in a text, help students write well- organized summaries of a text. Fourth, the question- answer relationship strategy (QAR) encourages students to learn how to answer questions better.

Fifth, generating questions make students become aware of whether they can answer the questions and if they understand what they are reading. Sixth, in story structure instruction, students learn to identify the categories of content (characters, setting, events, problem, resolution). Instruction in story structure improves students' comprehension. Seventh, summarizing requires students to determine what is important in what they are reading and to put it into their own words. In other words, this strategy can develop students interesting with the text.

### 2. Motivation

Motivation is a subject that provokes teachers because they realize from either their professional training or instinctively that this is an issue that has different meaning to success and failure in the classroom. Weiner (1990) notes that psychologists recently have focused on clarifying classroom goals (both teachers and students) in an attempt to improve students achievement.

Naiman et al (in Ur, 2000:275) state that the most successfully students necessarily are not those to whom a language comes easily. They are those who display certain typical characteristics as follow:

- a) Positive task orientation.
- b) Ego-involvement.
- c) Need for achievement.
- d) High aspirations.
- e) Goal orientation.

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

- f) Perseverance.
- g) Tolerance of ambiguity.

In conclusion, learning motivation refers to the students internal state that arouses sustains, directs, and integrates behavior to get successfulness in learning and the effort to get it. These indicators are positive task orientation, ego-involvement, need for achievement, high aspirations, goal orientation, perseverance, tolerance of ambiguity.

### 3. Reading Comprehension of narrative Text

According to Cain et.al (2004:32) “the component skills in reading comprehension are inference making, comprehension monitoring and understanding text structure”. Inferences are necessary to make sense of a text and that required either the integration of information among individual sentences in the text or the

integration of general knowledge within formation in the text. Comprehension monitoring is also known as cognitive monitoring (McWhorter, 1992:40). It means that the readers keep track or being aware of what is happening mentally as they read. In cognitive monitoring, the readers maintain an awareness of their level of understanding by picking up clues or signals that indicate whether they understand what they are reading. Knowledge about the organization of texts is skill that helping readers to invoke relevant background information and schemas to facilitate their construction of a meaning- based representation.

The researcher combines the explanations from the reading indicators of narrative Cain et.al (2004:32) as indicators of reading comprehension of narrative text which is based on syllabus of senior high school, such as: making inferences, comprehension monitoring, understanding text structure.

## II RESEARCH METHODS

This research was quasi- experimental research. Gay (2000: 37) states that “the quasi-experimental research is non- randomized”. The researcher used two classes. They were experimental class by using questioning strategy and control class by using conventional strategy. Both classes had the same material, length of time and the same teacher. This research only used post- test toward the two groups (experimental and control group). The researcher was used treatment factorial design by block (2x2) design which shows the effect of the variables. This research consists of three variables. Independent variable were questioning strategy and conventional strategy and dependent variable were reading comprehension, while students’ motivation as moderator variable.

This research was done at SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat. The population of this research was the eleventh grade social science students of SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat. There were 40 students who were divided into two classes; they are XI IPS 1 and XI IPS 2.

The researcher used total population as sample of the research. The sample of this research was selected by total sampling. By using this technique the existing class was taken.

According to Sugiyono (2011:124) “total sampling is tehniqe of sampling when the total of population was used sample of the research”.

In this research, questionnaire and reading comprehension test were used as the instruments to collect the data.

### 1. Questionnaire

In this research, the researcher had discussed the questionnaire with the expert judgment from the psychological field (Prof. Dr. Mudjiran, Ms.Kons). the researcher used Naiman et al in Ur, 2000: 275 as indicators of motivation.

### 2. Reading Comprehension

The researcher used a multiple choice test as the instrument. The test was aimed to measure the students’ reading comprehension. It was designed based on the indicator of reading comprehension. The test was tried out before it was used. It was done to know whether the instrument which was going to be used meet the criterion of a good test or not. Moreover, the instrument of the test also had been validated by an expert before it was used in the research. In technique of data analysis the researcher used lilliefors test to normally the data, used uji barlet to homogeneity testing and two ways ANOVA by Ferguson, 1976 to test the hypothesis.

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

### III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 1. Reading Comprehension

In this research, the data of the students' reading comprehension was taken from post- test. The summary of reading comprehension of narrative text score can be seen as follow:

**Table. The Summary of Reading Comprehension Narrative text**

Group	Reading comprehension	Total	Mean	Variance
Experimental	High	532	88.67	9.07
	Low	409	68	11.4
Control	High	504	84	25.6
	Low	379	63	9

The control and experimental groups were given different treatment. The experimental class was taught by questioning strategy, and control class was taught by conventional teaching. The students taught by questioning strategy were 20 students. In this research, the researcher gave 100 for maximum score of each student. The total of students' score in experimental group was 1576, with the mean score 78.80 and the variance 115.5.

In control class, the highest score of reading comprehension was 92, and the lowest score was 60. The total score of students' reading comprehension in control group was 1459, with the mean score 72.95 and the variance 81.6.

In this research, the researcher divided the reading comprehension score of experimental and control class into two groups. The first group consisted of students who had high motivation, and the second group consisted of students who had low motivation

#### 2. Motivation

The researcher divided the students' motivation into two categories. There was high and low motivation. Sudijono (2011) states that the numbers of the participants were taken 27% from each score of motivation. It needed 27% of the sample. So, students with high class participation were students who have score based on 27% amount of students who had high score of the observation. Meanwhile, students with low class participation were 27% amount of students who had low score. In this research, there were

six students in each group, high and low motivation.

**Table. Summary of Students' Motivation in Experimental and Control Class**

Group	Motivation	Mean	Max	Min	Std. dev	Variance	Sum
Experimental	High	125	132	121	4.05	16.4	750
	Low	92.7	102	89	4.97	24.7	556
Control	High	151	159	146	4.96	24.57	905
	Low	111.2	117	97	7.44	55.4	667

From the table above, it can be seen that the students' score of experimental class who had high motivation had the interval 121-132, and the variance was 16.4. The students who had low motivation had the interval 89-102 and the variance 24.67.

In the control class, the data of students' motivation was grouped into two; high and low motivation. The students' score of control class who had high motivation had the interval 146-159, and the variance of the score was 24.57. The students who had low motivation in control class had the interval 97-117 and the variance of motivation score was 55.4.

#### Hypothesis Testing

In this research, the researcher used ANOVA 2x2 formula *unweighted means* in analyzing the interaction between both of the strategy and motivation to students' reading comprehension. The purpose of this research was (1) to find out questioning strategy was better than conventional strategy to students' reading comprehension. (2) to find out whether there is interaction between teaching strategy (questioning strategy and conventional strategy) and motivation toward students' reading comprehension of narrative text.

**Table. The Result of ANOVA**

Sum of Variance	JK	D b	Varian ce	Fo	Ft
Inter-row (a)	2703	1	2703.00	196.582	2.69
Inter-	140.1	1	140.17	10.19	2.6

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

<b>column (b)</b>	<b>7</b>			<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Interaction (AxB)</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>0.012</b>	<b>2.69</b>
<b>Within cell</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13.75</b>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>2978</b>	<b>23</b>			

Based on conclusion ANOVA 2x2 above we could see:

1. Alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) explained that questioning strategy was better than conventional strategy to students' reading comprehension of narrative text.  $F_o > F_t$ .  $F_o = 196.582 > F_t = 2.69$ . It means that  $H_a$  was accepted and  $H_o$  was rejected.
2. Alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) explained that there is no interaction between teaching strategy (questioning strategy and conventional strategy) and students' motivation toward reading comprehension of narrative text.  $F_o < F_t$  ( $H_a$  rejected). Because  $F_o = 0.012 < F_t = 2.69$ .

The third row in table of ANOVA above showed that score of  $F_o$  was 0.012 and the score of  $F_{table}$  was 2.69. It can be concluded that  $F_o < F_t$ . It means  $H_o$  accepted, it could be said that there was no interaction between both of strategy and motivation to students' reading comprehension.

From the data above showed that there is no interaction between teaching strategy (questioning strategy and conventional strategy) and students' motivation toward students' reading comprehension of narrative text at grade XI of SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat, it was happened by some factors. They were the

#### IV CONCLUSION

Based on the research finding that was done for eleventh students of SMA Negeri 1 Talamau Pasaman Barat above, it can be concluded that:

1. Students who were taught by questioning strategy had better reading comprehension than students who were taught by conventional strategy. It can be

seen from the mean score in hypothesis. If  $F_o > F_t$ ,  $F_o = 196.582 > F_t = 2.69$ , it means that  $H_a$  was accepted.

#### Discussion

- a. Questioning strategy was better than conventional strategy to students' reading comprehension. From the result of first hypothesis, it could be seen that the mean score of experimental class which was taught by questioning strategy was higher than control class which was taught by conventional strategy. It can be concluded that questioning strategy gave significant effect toward students' reading comprehension. This finding was in line with the findings of research which was conducted by Dian Pramesti (2014). She found that the students' physic thinking that were taught by strategy learning by questioning was better than conventional teaching.
- b. There was no interaction between both strategy and students' motivation toward students' reading comprehension.

The second hypothesis of this research showed that the F count for interaction was lower than the F table value. It means that  $H_o$  was accepted, there was no interaction between both strategy and students' motivation toward students' reading comprehension. So, it can be said that this strategy can be used in teaching reading comprehension without considering the prerequisite of students' motivation in learning. In this case, it showed that motivation was not one of the variables that influence students' reading comprehension.

2. There was no interaction between strategy used and students' motivation toward students' reading comprehension. It happened because  $F_o < F_t$ ,  $F_o = 0.012 < F_t = 2.69$ . It means that  $H_a$  was rejected.

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)

### **Suggestion**

Based on the findings and conclusions above, the researcher would like to propose suggestions as follows:

1. Questioning strategy can be applied in teaching learning process, especially if it purposes to improve students' achievement and motivation.

2. Teachers should know the step of questioning strategy well before teaching reading.

It is suggested for further researcher to develop this research on larger population and sample in order to get the knowledge and the empiric data. Besides, they are also suggested to conduct the same research for other skills and other kind of text.

### Bibliography

- [1]Adler, C.R. 2001. *Put Reading First: The Research Building Blocks for Teaching Children to Read*, pp. 49- 54. National Institute for Literacy. Retrived Nov.1<sup>st</sup>, 2007, from [http://www.nifl.gov/partnershipforreading/publications/reading\\_first1text.html](http://www.nifl.gov/partnershipforreading/publications/reading_first1text.html).
- [2]Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to language Pedagogy*. 2<sup>nd</sup> eds. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- [3]Cain, K.E, Bryant, P.E & Oakhill, J. 2004. Children's Reading Comprehension Ability: Concurrent Prediction by Working Memory, Verbal Ability and component skills. *Journal of educational psychology 2004*, vol 96. Retrieved from [http://www.psych.lancs.ac.uk/people/upl\\_oads/KateCain20050929TI05101.pdf](http://www.psych.lancs.ac.uk/people/upl_oads/KateCain20050929TI05101.pdf). Retrieved on 25 January 2011
- [4]Gay, L.R, & Airasian, Peter. 2000. *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Application (6<sup>th</sup> ed)*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- [5]McWhorter, K. T. 1986. *Answer Key and Instructor's Manual to Accompany Guide to College Reading*. New York: Little Brown.
- [6]Nuttal, Christine. 1992. *Teaching Reading Skills in Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- [7]Suetomo. 1993. *Dasar- dasar Interaksi Belajar Dan Mengajar*. Surabaya: Usaha Nasional.
- [8]Ur, Penny.2000. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3378113)