

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF STRATEGY-BASED READING INSTRUCTION (SBRI) ON IMPROVING STUDENTS' READING PROFICIENCY AND THEIR PERCEPTION TOWARD THE READING INSTRUCTION.

Semi Sukarni.

*Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris. Universitas Muhammadiyah Purworejo.
semisukarni@yahoo.com.*

Abstract

The objective of the study is to investigate the effectiveness of *Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI)* on improving Students' Reading Proficiency. It also has a purpose to examine the students' Perception toward the implementation of the Reading Instruction. The model of strategy-based instruction that can help students to read more effectively and become independent learners was suggested by Chamot (2008) namely Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). There are five phases of the instructional sequence, namely Preparation, Presentation, Practice, Self-evaluation and Expansion. The study involved one class which consists of 28 students. The instruction was carried-out for 12 meetings with one meeting each week. There were two instruments for collecting the data namely: reading comprehension test and a questionnaire of students' perception toward the instruction. The finding of the study shows that the students' reading proficiency increases. The mean score of the experimental group is 66.46 as it is the good level, while the mean score of the control group is 61.4 as it is in the sufficient level. The inferential statistics shows that the t-test is 2.27 higher than the t-table 2.00 with the significant level 0.027 (< 0.05). The students found that *Strategy-based Reading Instruction* was helpful and practical for solving reading comprehension difficulty.

Keywords: SBRI, reading comprehension, proficiency, perception

1. INTRODUCTION

As the country becomes more developed the need of English skills is urgently required. Reading as one of the skills is badly needed to advance the new knowledge and technology mostly written in English. Reading has many purposes. Reading for searching information, reading to learn from text and reading for general comprehension (Grabe and Stoller, 2013). These give reasons why people read.

However, reading in foreign language such English as not as easy as reading in the first language. These are often hindered by limited vocabulary knowledge, lack of fluency, lack of familiarity with subject matter, readability in text level, and inadequate use of effective reading strategies (Westwood, 2008). In order to be able to read more effectively in foreign language, learner must be trained with explicit instruction in reading comprehension.

Many studies on reading have been done by focusing of Language Learning Strategy (LLS) in the form of explorative studies by using Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL). These learning strategies have been issued by Oxford which cover Direct Strategies and Indirect Strategies. Direct Strategies include Memory Strategies, Cognitive Strategies and Compensation Strategies, while Indirect strategies cover Metacognitive strategies, Affective strategies and Social Strategies (Oxford, 1990).

Research in reading had been more developed into the explicit instruction of teaching learning strategies, particularly reading through proposed frameworks, among which is Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach/CALLA (Chamot, Ph, Robbins, & Ph, n.d.). Based on the CALLA

framework, there are five stages in teaching the strategies i.e. Preparation, Presentation, Practice, Self-evaluation and Expansion. In this research, the researcher adopted this framework to give instruction in reading comprehension in the term so called Strategy-based Reading Instruction (Chamot, 1995).

In Strategy based Reading Instruction, reading strategies are taught explicitly; students are told the names of particular strategies; they are given the reasons for using the strategy; they observe the teacher modeling the strategy; and they are given opportunities to practice the strategies (Cohen, 1996).

There are some earlier research using this strategy (SBRI). Among them are firstly Yousefvand and Lotfi (2011) focused on investigating reading comprehension of graduate students and their attitude. The findings of the research show that most of students improved their reading comprehension and their attitude towards reading becomes more positive (Yousefvand & Lotfi, 2011). Secondly, Medina (2012) focused on investigating the effect of strategy instruction of EFL reading of effectiveness of this strategy in improving reading comprehension of undergraduate students of Colombian university. The result shows that reading instruction is really useful and students become more self-confident and enhanced their motivation (Medina S. Lopera, 2012). Thirdly, Kashef et al. (2014) focused on investigating the impact of SBRI on students' reading strategy use. The result of the study shows that the teaching intervention had a significant effect on the use of strategy in reading. The fourth study is research by Mohammadi et al. (2015) focusing on investigating the impact of teaching learning strategy on reading comprehension ability and the learners' belief. The result of the study shows that the strategy instruction could boost the reading comprehension ability and it could change the learners' belief (Mohammadi, Birjandi, & Maftoon, 2015). Finally Alkhawaldeh (2015) focused on investigating the effect of reading strategy-based EFL program on reading achievement of high school students and their awareness of strategies. The finding shows that students had better understanding on texts (Alkhawaldeh, 2015).

The five earlier studies shows that Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI) has showed its effectiveness in improving students reading ability particularly in EFL context. In line with the previous studies above the researcher conducts a research with the aim to investigate effectiveness of *Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI)* on improving Students' Reading Proficiency and find out the students' perception toward the instruction.

The following research questions were formulated to serve the objective pursued the study.

- a. How is the effectiveness of *Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI)* on improving students' reading proficiency?
- b. How is the students' perception toward *Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI)* for teaching reading comprehension.

Research Hypothesis

Ho: The use of SBRI is not effective on improving students' reading proficiency.

Ha: The use of SBRI is effective on improving students' reading proficiency.

The result of this study is expected to be beneficial as a valuable input for teaching reading comprehension. English teachers and lecturers may learn about various learning strategies and explicit strategy training for teaching reading comprehension. The students' perception may also give teachers input about what the students think of the application of the instruction.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

The research was carried out through experimental design pretest and posttest control group. The researcher used this design because she investigated the effectiveness of strategy based reading instruction on the students' reading comprehension ability. There are two groups as one group is

experimental group receiving a treatment where the other group-control which was taught by the existing method.

The research was conducted in English Education Program of Muhammadiyah Purworejo University involving the fifth semester students. Sixty three students participated in this research; 28 students were in the experimental group and 35 students were in the control group.

The data of this study are in the form of test score and students' perception toward the implementation of the Reading Instruction. So, the instruments used are reading comprehension test and student' perception questionnaire. The reading test was adopted from TOEFL and FCE which consists of 40 items. The student' perception questionnaire consists of 12 items.

The data were analyzed by both descriptive and inferential analysis. The descriptive analysis includes determining the mode, median and mean of the students' reading proficiency. The inferential analysis was applied using using SPSS verse 22. T-test independent sample was used to determine the effectiveness of the treatment.

The research procedure was started by choosing the participants by purposive sampling. There are class A and C of the fifth semester of English Education Program of Muhammadiyah Purworejo University. Class A consists of 28 students as experimental group while class C consists of 35 students as control group. Pretest was conducted to both groups before treatment. The experimental group received treatment using Strategy- based reading instruction, while the control group was taught reading comprehension using reciprocal teaching method. The treatment was done for 12 meetings in 12 weeks, one meeting each week for 100 minutes. After the treatment completed, the both groups were given posttest. The experimental group was given students' perception questionnaire.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Students' Reading Proficiency

The data of reading proficiency was taken from the pretest and posttest result of reading reading proficiency test both in experimental group and control group. To make classification of students' reading proficiency the researcher adopted from the Classification students' Achievement by Arikunto (2009:245). The classification can be seen as follows.

Table 1. Classification of students' achievement

Score	Grade	Level
80-100	A	Excellent
66-79	B	Good
56-65	C	Sufficient
40-55	D	Fairly-sufficient
30-39	E	Low

3.1.1 Students' Reading Proficiency in Experimental Group

The data of reading proficiency in experimental group were taken from the result of pretest before giving the treatment and posttest was given after the treatment. The different scores between pretest and posttest can be seen in the following table.

Tabel 2. Frequency and percentage of pre-test

Interval	Interpretation	Grade	Frequency	Percentage
80 – 100	Excellent	A	0	0%
66 – 79	Good	B	5	17.85 %
56 – 65	Sufficient	C	6	21.42%
40-55	Fairly Sufficient	D	12	42.85 %
30-39	Low	E	5	17.85 %
Total			28	100 %

The table shows the pretest score of 28 students in experimental group. It can be seen that five students belong to good category; six students belong to sufficient category, twelve students belong to fairly sufficient category; five students belong to low category and none of student belongs to excellent category.

Tabel 4. Frequency and percentage of post-test

Interval	Interpretation	Grade	Frequency	Percentage
80 – 100	Excellent	A	3	10.71%
66 – 79	Good	B	8	28.57 %
56 – 65	Sufficient	C	13	46.42%
40-55	Fairly Sufficient	D	4	42.85 %
30-39	Low	E	0	0 %
Total			28	100 %

The table shows the posttest score of 28 students in experimental group. It can be seen that there are three students belong to excellent category, eight students belong to good category, thirteen students belongs to sufficient category, four students belong to fairly sufficient category, and none of students belongs to low category.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental group

Descriptive Statistics of SBRI Class

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
Pretest	28	47,00	30,00	77,00	1414,00	50,5000	2,42097	12,81059	164,111
Posttest	28	35,00	53,00	88,00	1861,00	66,4643	1,80350	9,54320	91,073
Valid N (listwise)	28								

Based on the descriptive analysis of pretest and posttest experimental group, there are different scores before and after the treatment of teaching Reading Comprehension by using Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI). Before treatment the minimum pretest score is 30 and after treatment the posttest score is 53. The maximum pretest score is only 77, while in posttest is 88. There is also a difference in mean score; the pretest is only 50.50, while the posttest is 66.46.

Based on achievement category, the students reading proficiency belongs to good.

Figure 1 Chart of Reading Proficiency in Experimental Group

3.1.2 Students' Reading Proficiency in control group

The data of Reading Proficiency in control group were taken from the result of pretest and posttest. In the experimental group the lecturer taught reading comprehension using Strategy-based Reading Instruction, while in control group the students were taught reading by using Reciprocal Teaching. The different scores between pretest and posttest can be seen in the following table.

Tabel 6. Frequency and percentage of pre-test

Interval	Interpretation	Grade	Frequency	Percentage
80 – 100	Excellent	A	1	2.85%
66 – 79	Good	B	3	8.57 %
56 – 65	Sufficient	C	7	20%
40-55	Fairly Sufficient	D	21	75%
30-39	Low	E	3	8.57%
Total			35	100 %

The table shows the pretest score of 35 students in control group. It can be seen that one student belongs to excellent category, three students belong to good category, seven students belongs to sufficient category, twenty-one students belong to fairly sufficient category and three students belong to low category.

Tabel 7. Frequency and percentage of post-test

Interval	Interpretation	Grade	Frequency	Percentage
80 – 100	Excellent	A	1	10.71%
66 – 79	Good	B	10	28.57 %
56 – 65	Sufficient	C	14	40%
40-55	Fairly Sufficient	D	10	28.57 %
30-39	Low	E	0	0 %
Total			35	100 %

The table shows the posttest score of 35 students in control group. It can be seen that one student belongs to excellent category, ten students belong to good category, fourteen students belong to sufficient category, ten students belong to fairly sufficient category and none of the student belongs to low category.

Table 8: Descriptive Statistics of Pretest and Posttest in Control group

Descriptive Statistics								
	N	Range	Mini- mum	Maxi- mum	Sum	Mean	Std. De- viation	Vari- ane
Pretest	35	53,00	30,00	83,00	1779,00	50,8286		123,676
Posttest	35	33,00	50,00	83,00	2149,00	61,4000	8,16449	66,659
Valid N (listwise)	35							

Based on the descriptive analysis of pretest and posttest in control group the minimum pretest score is 30 and the posttest score is 53. The maximum pretest score is 83 and the same score gotten in posttest. There is a difference in mean score; the pretest is only 50.82, while the posttest is 61.40. Based on achievement category, the students reading proficiency belongs to sufficient.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic
SBRI	28	35	53	88	1861	66,46	1,803	9,543	91,073
RT	35	33	50	83	2149	61,40	1,380	8,164	66,659
Valid N (listwise)	28								

Based on the descriptive analysis, there are different scores in experimental and control group. The minimum score of experimental group is 53, while the minimum score of control group is 50 and the maximum score of the experimental group is 88 while maximum score of the control group is 83. There is a different mean score too; the experimental group is 66.46, while in the control group is only 61.40. Based on achievement category, the students' reading proficiency in of experimental group belongs to "Good", while in the control group is "Sufficient".

The researcher used t-test for the inferential analysis which is done using SPSS Verse 22. T-test is used to test the different means between the experimental group and the control group. The result of the t-test can be seen in the table below.

Table 10. Group Statistics

Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Exp	28	66,46	9,543	1,803
Control	35	61,40	8,164	1,380

Table 11. Statistical Analysis of Hypothesis

Hypothesis	t-value	t-table	Note
Hypothesis 1	2.269	2.000	Ha: accepted

Based on the analysis using t-test, it is found that t-value of t-observe 2.27 is higher than the t-table 2.00 with the significant level 0.027 (< 0.05). It means that the use of Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI) is effective to teach reading comprehension. So, H_0 which says "the use of

SBRI is not effective on improving students' reading proficiency. *Ha* is accepted. It means the use of SBRI is effective on improving students' reading proficiency.

This finding is in line with earlier studies related to strategy-based reading instruction in foreign language learning context. In Yousef and Lotfi study (2011) after training by strategy-based reading instruction most of their students improved their reading comprehension. This is similar to the finding on a study of the "Effects Of Metacognitive Strategy Instruction" conducted by Wichadee (2011) that shows after the instruction, the reading score and metacognitive strategy use were significantly higher.

The finding of the study also supports Medina research's finding (2012) as the result showed that reading strategy is really very helpful to students and can reduce the use of dictionary. And finally the finding also supports the result of research conducted by Mohammadi et al. (2015) as the result suggested that the instruction of learning strategies changed the students' belief about learning and the instruction could boost their reading comprehension ability.

3.2 Students' Perception toward Strategy-Based Reading Instruction

To answer the second research question, the researcher used the data of the students' perception taken from the students' questionnaire of SBRI class. The questionnaire covers a statement and 5 responses with five rating scales. Strongly Agree (SA) rates 5; Agree (A) rates 4; Neutral (N) rates 3; Disagree (D) rates 2 and Strong Disagree (SD) rates 1. The researcher calculates the score of each statement from the students' responses. Then, she finds the mean score by dividing the total score by the total number students. The table of class interval and category can be seen as follows.

Table 12: Category Criterion based on Class Inverval

Class Interval	Category
1.00 – 1.79	Totally (Disagree/Bad/Dislike)
1.80 - 2.59	Disagree/Not Good
2.60 – 3.39	Sufficient/Neutral
3.40 – 4.19	Agree, Good, Like
4.20 – 5.00	Totally (Agree/Good/Like)

Silaen & Widiyono (2013) The result of the students' perception can be seen as follows.

Table 13. Students' perception toward Strategy-Based Reading Instruction

No	Statement	SA	A	N Score	D	SD	Total	Mean
1	Through SBRI you can improve in comprehending reading texts.	7	20	1	0	0	118	4,214
2	Presentation of the strategies, modeling and discussion are carefully organized and planned in coheren manner.	5	21	2	0	0	115	4,107
3	Clear explanation to help students connect new and challenging materials through relating your background knowledge.	5	21	2	0	0	115	4,107
4	Lecturer presents the materials clearly.	5	19	4	0	0	113	4,036
5	Lecturer gives attention and entuasiam during the reading instruction.	10	15	3	0	0	119	4,25

6	Through SBRI you can practice the reading strategies for completing the reading exercises.	9	17	2	0	0	119	4,25
7	Lecturer encourages active involvement, participation and interaction of students during the class.	5	20	3	0	0	114	4,071
8	Lecturer provides clear guidance for learning and stimulates learning environment.	7	19	2	0	0	117	4,179
9	Lecturer provides constructive feedback on the students' work so students can learn by mistakes.	8	18	2	0	0	118	4,214
10	Through SBRI you can do self-evaluation on your vocabulary, answer completion and strategy use.	4	20	4	0	0	112	4
11	After following the reading instruction, you can expand your knowledge and reading skills to complete reading proficiency exercises.	2	26	0	0	0	114	4,071
12	After following the reading instruction, when you encounter difficulties while reading English, you will use the reading strategies that the teacher taught to solve problems.	2	19	7	0	0	107	3,821

The table shows that there are 4 statements in the questionnaire (S1, S5, S6 and S9) that can be interpreted that the students *totally agree* to certain condition in the instruction or the students have “Very Good” appraisal to Strategy-Based Reading Instruction (SBRI) as the mean is in the class interval between 4.2 – 5. Eight statements in the questionnaire (S2, S3, S4, S7, S8, S10, S11 and S12) can be interpreted that the students “Agree” to the condition as the mean is in the class interval between 3.40 -4.19.

Through Strategy-Based Reading Instruction the students feel that they can improve their comprehension; they can do self evaluation on vocabulary, answer completion and strategy use; they can expand their knowledge and reading skills to complete reading comprehension exercises and when they encounter difficulties they can use the reading strategies that the teacher taught to solve problems.

The perception toward the lecturer in the SBRI class is “Good”. The students think that the lecturer presents the materials clearly, encourages active participation during the class, provides constructive feedback on the students' work so that students can learn by mistakes.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, the conclusion is made as follows.

Strategy-based Reading Instruction (SBRI) is effective for teaching reading comprehension as it can be proven by the different mean scores of reading proficiency between the experimental group and the control group. The mean score of the experimental group is 66.46 as it is the good level, while the mean score of the control group is 61.4 as it is in the sufficient level. The inferential statistics shows that the t-test is 2.27 higher than the t-table 2.00 with the significant level 0.027 (< 0.05). So, *H₀* which says “the use of SBRI is not effective on improving students' Reading Proficiency” is rejected. *H_a* is accepted. It means the use of SBRI is effective on improving students' Reading Proficiency.

The overall students' perception toward Strategy-Based Reading Instruction is “Good”. With the reading strategy they can overcome the difficulty in reading text and they feel that they can improve their comprehension.

5. REFERENCES

- Arikunto. 2009. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Aneka Cipta. Jakarta.
- Alkhalwaldeh, A. (2015). The Effect of an EFL Reading Strategies-Based Instructional Programme on Reading Achievement and Awareness of Reading Strategies among Jordanian High School Students, *23(5)*, 962–973. <http://doi.org/10.5829/idosi.mejsr.2015.23.05.22237>
- Chamot, A. U. (1995). ACADEMIC LANGUAGE LEARNING APPROACH : *The Bilingual Research Journal*, *19*, 379–394.
- Chamot, A. U., Ph, D., Robbins, J., & Ph, D. (n.d.). The CALLA Model : Strategies for ELL Student Success Workshop for Region 10 New York City Board of Education New York , NY Presented by.
- Cohen, W. & Tao. (1996). The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language, (June).
- Medina S. Lopera. (2012). Effects of Strategy Instruction in an EFL Reading Comprehension Course : A Case Study, *14(1)*, 79–89.
- Mohammadi, M., Birjandi, P., & Maftoon, P. (2015). Learning Strategy Training and the Shift in Learners ' Beliefs About Language Learning : A Reading Comprehension Context. <http://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015579726>
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- Silaen. Sofar & Widiyono. 2013. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial untuk Penulisan Skripsi dan Tesis*. In Media. Jakarta.
- Westwood, P. (2008). *What teachers need to know about Reading and writing*. Camberwell, Australia: ACER Press, an imprint of Australian Council for Edu Research Ltd.
- William Grabe and Fredrica L. Stoller. (2013). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. New York 10017 USA: Routledge.
- Yousefvand, Z., & Lotfi, A. R. (2011). The Effect of Strategy-Based Reading Instruction on Iranian EFL Graduate Students ' Reading Comprehension and Their Attitudes toward Reading Strategies Instruction, *1(December)*, 39–55.