

I. RESEARCH METHOD

1.1 Research Design

This research was conducted based on quantitative research. In this research, the writer tried to identify the difference in using learning strategies among the groups of learners on students' reading comprehension of narrative text and to explore learning strategies used by each group learners. So, this research focused merely on the successful readers, mediocre readers and non successful readers language learners' strategies in comprehending narrative text based on the three category of learning strategies namely cognitive, metacognitive and social.

This research used "*Ex post facto* (non correlational study) research design", where "there no treatment and no control group given in this research, and the data were gathered after the fact" (Setiyadi, 2000: 41). There are stwo types of Ex post facto research design, "*co-relational study* – involves one group and *causal comparative study* – involves two group" (Setiyadi, 2000: 41-42). Since this research involved one class only, co-relational study was used with the formulas as follows:

X **Y**

where:

X = questionnaire of learning strategies as the Independent variable

Y = Reading test as the Dependent variable

These two variables were then analyzed using SPSS to find the significant difference.

Whereby, in collecting the data, the writer gave a reading test to see the students' reading comprehension. Based on the reading test scores, the writer can specify the learners into category successful readers, mediocre readers and non successful readers group. Before that, writer distributed the questionnaire in order to know the learning strategies employed by the language learners' in comprehending a reading text.

3.2 Population and Sample of the Research

The research was conducted at SMAN1 Natar Lampung Selatan. The population of the research was a class out of 9 classes of the second grade consisting of 37- 40 students in each class. The research used purposive random sampling technique. So, the researcher takes one class from the population as the sample, that is class XI IPS 2.

3.3 Source of Data

The population of this research was the second year of SMAN 1 Natar. As representative of the population, the writer took one class only based on technique of sampling. Then, in determining the class as sample of the research, the writer used lottery. Considering that not all of the learners in class XI IPS 2 were good in English, some might be good in Economics,

Geography, Sociology, etc. Reading test was undertaken. It was intended to know the students' achievement in English especially in comprehending a reading text. In other word, reading test was undertaken to determine the category the learners belong to, successful readers, mediocre readers and non successful readers group.

3.4 Data Collecting Technique

In collecting the data, the writer used some technique as follows:

1. Questionnaire

Questionnaire was given to language learners in an attempt to get data about the learning strategies employed by learners. In this case, the writer employed "close-ended structured questionnaire in which the options have been provided and there was no other alternative" (Setiyadi,2006: 54). The questionnaire used was cited from "Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire" (Setiyadi, 2004) which was modeled specially to search learning strategies employed by learners per skill. The writer administered Language Learning Strategy Questionnaire for reading skill only.

The questionnaire consists of 20 items, which was translated into Indonesian and answered in Indonesian to make the students understand the questionnaire easily. Those questionnaire items measured learning strategies under three categories, they were cognitive, metacognitive and social. The items No.1-11 measured cognitive category, No.12-17 measured metacognitive category and No. 18-20 measured social category.

Then, for judging the students' answer, the writer used "Likert scale" (Setiyadi, 2006: 58). A Likert rating scale was employed to indicate the subjects' responses to these statements with

1 “never or almost never do it” 2 “almost never do it”, 3 “sometimes do it”, 4 “ often do it” and 5” always do it”. There were five alternative responses provided for each statement. The score ranges from 1 until 5.

Strategy Classification of The LLSQ

Strategy Measured	Number of Questionnaire
Cognitive strategy	1-11
Metacognitive strategy	12-17
Social strategy	18-20

(Setiyadi, 1999:70)

To know the reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher used Cronbach’s alpha reliability, which was counted based on the correlation between each item of learning strategy scale and range of 0 to 1. It was used to analyze the instrument from ordinal data. According to Setiyadi, (2006: 190-191), the higher alpha is, the more reliable the questionnaire will be. The researcher considered the reliability of the questionnaire with the $\alpha \geq 0,70$. To increase validity aspect before the questionnaire was used, interrater validity was used to examine the indicators and the answer selections.

2. *Reading test*

Reading test was given to know students’ reading achievement for specifying the learners into successful readers, mediocre readers and non successful readers. The kind of reading test used was objective test, which consist of 30 items from 6 reading text.

In selecting reading text, the writer considered the text based on themes stated in curriculum for second years SMA (KTSP 2006). The texts used were taken from any “textbook” for second year SMA (Look ahead for SMA students Year XI, 2007).

The result of the reading test was used to determine the successful readers, mediocre readers and non successful readers in which the category in specifying them was based on “the magnitude of the gain” in reading test (Setiyadi, 1999:117). Then, the learners were divided into three similarly sized groups, they were the highest third group, the middle third group and the lower third group. The highest group represented the successful reader and the lower group represented non successful reader (Setiyadi, 1999:117).

The validity of the task was measured by content validity and construct validity. Content validity was obtained by choosing the texts based on School Based Curriculum (KTSP) for second grade of SMA. While construct validity was achieved by focusing the task in the gist of the text to show the students comprehending of it.

3.5 Criteria of Good Test for Reading and Questionnaire

A reading test will be said have a good quality if it has good validity, reliability, level difficulty and discrimination power (Heaton, 1991: 5). A questionnaire will be said have a good quality if it has good validity and reliability.

1. Validity of the Questionnaire

Validity refers to the extent to which the test measures what was intended to be measure. This means that is relates directly to the purpose of the test (Shohamy, 1985: 74). The

questionnaire used was LLSQ that developed by Setiyadi, it has been standardized so it has good validity.

2. Validity of the Reading Test

Validity refers to the extent to which the test measures what was intended to be measure. This means that is relates directly to the purpose of the test (Shohamy, 1985: 74). There are four types of validity: face validity, content validity, construct validity and empirical or criterion-related validity. To measure whether the test has good validity, the researcher used content and construct validity since the other two were considered be less needed. Face validity only concerns with the lay out of the test. Criterion-related validity is concerned with measuring the success in the future, as in replacement test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 251). The two type used in this research were:

a. Content Validity

Content validity is the extent to which the test measures a representative sample of the subject matter content. The focus of the content validity is adequacy of the sample and not simply on the appearance of the test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 251). Content validity is intended to know how whether the test items are good reflection of what will be covered. The test items are adapted from the materials that have been taught to the students should be constructed as to contain a representative sample of the course. (Heaton, 1975: 160). To know whether the test have a good content validity, the items of the test were discussed with the advisors and inter rater to measure the degree of agreement. The composition of the test items was presented in table 1: table of specification below.

No	Item Number	Skill of Reading	Inter-rater Judgment				Total Percentage
			R1	R2	R3	R4	
1	1	Determining Main Idea	25%	25%	25%	25%	100%
	6		25%	25%	-	25%	75%
	11		-	25%	25%	25%	75%
	17		25%	25%	25%	25%	100%

Table

1.

Specifi

cation

of the Validity Test.

No	Skills of Reading	Item Numbers	Percentage of Items
1	Determining main idea	1, 6, 11, 17	13 %
2	Finding specific information	8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27	30 %
3	Inference	4, 5, 9, 10, 24, 28, 29, 30	27 %
4	Reference	3, 19, 25	10 %
5	Vocabulary	2, 7, 12, 20, 21, 26	20 %

2	8	Finding Specific Information	25%	25%	25%	25%	100%	Table 2. Inter -rater Judgem ent.
	13		-	25%	25%	-	50%	
	14		25%	-	-	25%	50%	
	15		25%	-	25%	-	50%	
	16		25%	25%	25%	-	75%	
	18		-	25%	25%	25%	75%	
	22		25%	-	25%	25%	75%	
	23		25%	25%	-	25%	75%	
	27		25%	-	25%	25%	75%	
3	4	Inference	25%	25%	25%	25%	100%	
	5		-	25%	25%	25%	75%	
	9		25%	-	-	25%	50%	
	10		25%	25%	25%	-	75%	
	24		25%	25%	-	25%	75%	
	28		-	25%	25%	25%	75%	
	29		25%	-	-	25%	50%	
	30		25%	25%	25%	-	75%	
4	3	Reference	25%	25%	25%	-	75%	b. Con
	19		-	-	25%	25%	50%	
	25		25%	25%	-	-	50%	
5	2	Vocabulary	-	25%	25%	-	50%	struct
	7		25%	-	25%	25%	75%	
	12		25%	25%	-	25%	75%	
	20		25%	25%	25%	25%	100%	
	21		-	25%	25%	-	50%	
	26		25%	-	25%	25%	75%	

Constru

ct Validity is concerned with whether the test is actually in line with the theory of what it means to know the language (Shohamy, 1985: 74). Regarding the construct validity, it measures whether the construction had already in line with the objective of the learning (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 251). Basically, the construct and content validity are overlap. It is a representative of the material from the subject. In line with Nuttal (1985) the relation validity of the instrument refers to construct validity in which the question represents five of sort reading skills, i.e. determining main idea, finding the detail information, reference, inference and vocabulary. Skills of reading in the test were a part of the construct validity and the item numbers were a part of the content validity.

Beside the construct validity, the researcher used 4 inter rater to make the reading test more valid. They are Anidar, S.Pd, Syafruddin, S.Pd, Dra. Siti Rumini, and Dian Oktaviana S.Pd. the English teachers at SMAN 1 Natar. Since who have been teaching English more than 15 years it is understood they have a lot of experience in this field.

3. Reliability of the Questionnaire

Reliability refers to whether the test is consistent in its score and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score are (Shohamy, 1985: 70). To know the reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher used Cronbach's alpha reliability, which was counted based on the correlation between each item of learning strategy scale and range of 0 to 1. It was used to analyze the instrument from ordinal data. According to Setiyadi, (2006: 190-191), the higher alpha is, the more reliable the questionnaire will be. The researcher considered the reliability of the questionnaire with the $\alpha \geq 0,70$.

4. Reliability of the Reading Test

Reliability refers to whether the test is consistent in its score and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score are (Shohamy, 1985: 70).

A test is called reliable if the score gained by the examines is constant whenever and by whomever the test is conducted. A test will not be a good parameter unless the test is suitable or constant. To measure the reliability of the test, the researcher will use Spearman Brown formula. The formula is as follows:

$$R_k = \frac{2.r_l}{1+r_l}$$

R_k = The reliability of the test

r_l = The reliability of half the testss

The criteria are:

0.00-0.19	Very low reliability
0.20-0.39	Low reliability
0.40-0.59	Average reliability
0.60-0.79	High reliability
0.80-1.00	Very high reliability

5. Level of Difficulty

Level of difficulty relates to “how easy or difficult the item is from the point of view of the students who took the test. It is important since test items which are too easy (that all students get right) can tell us nothing about differences within the test population.” (Shohamy, 1985: 79).

Level of difficulty was calculated by using the following formula:

$$LD = \frac{R}{N}$$

LD = level difficulty

R = number of students who answers it right

N = total number of students

The criteria are:

LD < 0.30 = difficult

LD = 0.31- 0.70 = satisfied

LD > 0.71- 1.00 = easy

(Arikunto, 1997:214)

6. Discrimination power of the Test

Discrimination power refers to “the extent to which the item differentiates between high and low level students on that test. A good item according to this criterion, is one in which good students did well, and bad students failed.” (Shohamy, 1985:81)

The formula is:

$$DP = \frac{\text{Upper}-\text{lower}}{\frac{1}{2}(N)}$$

DP = discrimination power

Upper = proportion of “high group” students getting the item correct

Lower = proportion of “low group” students getting the item correct

N = total number of students

The criteria are follows:

LD = 0.00-0.20 = poor

LD = 0.21-0.40 = satisfactory

LD = 0.41-0.70 = good

LD = 0.71-1.00 = excellent

(Arikunto, 1997:223)

3.6 Scoring System

The researcher used Arikunto’s formula in scoring the students’ result of the test. The higher score will be 100

$$S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

S is the score of the test

R is the right answer

N is the total of the items

3.7 Research Procedure

In conducting the research, the writer used some procedures as follows:

1. Determining the subjects.
2. Distributing questionnaire to the subjects.
3. Distributing reading test to the subjects.
4. Collecting and scoring the result.
5. Analyzing the data.
6. Making the report of findings.

3.8 Data Analysis

Having collected the data, the writer analyzed the data by using the quantitative description. First of all, the result of questionnaire was scored based on Likert Scale (Setiyadi, 2006:58). The score ranges from 1 to 5. Having been scored, it is analyzed by using the “Cronbach Alpha Coefficient”. “The Cronbach alpha is the most common used to measure the consistency of the items of the questionnaire. The alpha ranges between 0 and 1. The higher the alpha, the more reliable is the questionnaire” (Setiyadi, 1999:77). Then, data from reading test – the gained scores, was systematically arranged from the highest until the lower one. It formed “magnitude of the gain score” in reading test that the researcher could determine the learners into three similar size groups, namely the highest, middle and the lower group.

Meanwhile, to answer research question number 1 the researcher analyzed the data from questionnaire and used One Way Anova to find out is there any difference in using learning strategies among the groups of learners on students' reading comprehension of narrative text.

3.9 Hypothesis Test

In order to prove hypothesis the difference in using learning strategies among the groups of learners on students' reading comprehension of narrative text, One Way Anova was used to draw the conclusion at the level of significant 0,05 ($p < 0,05$).

1. H₀: There is no significant difference in using learning strategies among the groups of learners on students' reading comprehension of narrative text.

H₁: There is a significant difference in using learning strategies among the groups of learners on students' reading comprehension of narrative text.