

**USING “SURVEY, QUESTION, READ, RECITE, REVIEW” IN  
IMPROVING STUDENTS’ READING COMPREHENSION NARRATIVE TEXT AT THE  
FIRST YEAR STUDENT OF SMAN 12 PEKANBARU**

AHMAD SALEH  
MAHDUM  
WIRDA BURHAN

E-Mail: ahmad\_saleh17@yahoo.com

**Abstract**

The objective of the research is to increase the students’ ability in comprehending narrative text of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru by using survey, question, read, recite, and review. The subjects were 35 students from X2 RSBI class at SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. In collecting the data, the writer gave pre-test to the students in class before treatment in order to get data that relates to the problem. Then, the writer gave post-test after treatment to know the improvement of the students. The aspects which were evaluated: factual information, generic structure, main idea, reference, and inference. Based on the result of teaching and learning process, the writer found that after doing the treatments, the achievement of the first year student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru in comprehending narrative text was increased. It could be seen from the comparison of result in the pre-test and the post-test. There were only 6 students who had passed minimum criteria in the pre-test. Then it was increase in the post-test. There were 33 students who had passed the minimum criteria (75) in the post-test. The significant improvement also can be seen from the result of total average score. In the pretest, it was 70.4 (average to good level) increased to 80.97 (good to excellent level). In conducting the research by using SQ3R method to increase students’ ability in comprehending narrative text, the writer also found some improvement of their activities in applying SQ3R method. It is shown the progress of students who follow the activities in every meeting of teaching and learning process from the first meeting to fourth meeting.

Key words: reading comprehension, survey, question, read, recite, review

## INTRODUCTION

It is widely acknowledged that reading is a vital skill for English language learners in today's world; it enhances the development of overall proficiency and provides access to valuable information at work and in school (Cevdet Yılmaz, 2012). Reading is often characterized as a receptive skill in which one looks at and attempts to understand what has been written. It is not only the process of recognition, perception, and interpretation of written materials, but an active one in that it includes the cognitive abilities such as guessing / predicting, checking, and asking questions.

Reading as an act of empowerment should provide the reader with access to a word universe that is, the readers' language used in his expression of his anxieties, fears, dreams and demands. The notion of semiotic budget is valuable to this paper as it encourages us to view our students' semiotic resources such as expressions of appreciation, empathy, understanding and host of other meaning making activities that represent their creative and critical thought. (Sivakumar Sivasubramaniam, 2009).

Reading is a complex process made up of several interlocking skills and processes. The sum of these pieces is a tapestry that good readers use on a day to day basis to process text in their world (Karen Tankersley, 2003). It is an all-important language skill that is now in more demand than in any time in our history. With the exposure of the Internet in a global arena, students need to master reading in order to understand the vast knowledge the world embraces them with. It has been said that the literate adult today is reading more in one week than their great-grandfather did in a whole year (Swalm and Kling, 1973). This fact places pressures on the student to perform at a higher level than the student before them.

Reading is one of the key skills in language learning. It reinforces the skills students acquire in speaking, listening and writing (Michelle Maxom, 2009). Of the four skills, reading plays its role as the skill people need to broaden their knowledge. Nowadays, there are a lot of materials that provided in English. Reading activity is actually a complicated process of human functions and considered essential by many experts. Reading is essential for students' academic achievement and involves a complicated process (Issa, 2009). Reading is the skill. Teaching students to unlock the full meaning of the texts they read is the single most powerful outcome a teacher can foster. If the students can read well, they can essentially do anything (Doug Lemov, 2010).

Reading is composed of two main processes: decoding and comprehension. These two processes are independent of one another, but both are necessary for literacy (Patricia Wolfe & Pamela Nevills, 2004). Decoding involves being able to connect letter strings to the corresponding units of speech that they represent in order to make sense of print. Comprehension involves higher-order cognitive and linguistic reasoning, including intelligence, vocabulary, and syntax, which allow children to gain meaning from what they read. We will begin with a look at the component skills of the decoding process.

According to the Rand Corporation, reading comprehension is "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language (Karen Tankersley, 2005). Good reading comprehension depends on understanding the words you are reading. The more words you recognize and understand in a

text, the better your comprehension will be. When you are reading in English, it is very important to notice collocations and to learn them together with the individual words (Beatrice S. Mikulecky & Linda Jeffries, 2009).

Comprehension is a process, not a product. Readers filter understanding through the lens of their motivation, knowledge, cognitive abilities, and experiences. Effective readers have a purpose for reading, and use their background knowledge and experiences to relate to the text ((Karen Tankersley, 2005). Teachers regularly do a great deal to create reading comprehension programs that work for their own students. Much of this comes almost automatically after a few years of experience. At first it may seem overwhelming (Camille Blachowicz & Donna Ogle, 2008). Acquisition of better strategies of reading comprehension may best be viewed as a lifelong mission (Danielle S. Mcnamara, 2007).

Comprehension is not always effortless and fast, of course. When beginning readers struggle over individual words, reading is slowed to a near halt and deeper levels of comprehension are seriously compromised. This happens when proficient adult readers struggle with technical expository text on unfamiliar arcane topics, such as a mortgage on a house or the schematics of computer's operating system. Cognitive strategies are particularly important when there is a breakdown at any level of comprehension (Danielle S. Mcnamara, 2007). During the reading process, teachers should explicitly teach words that are vital to the comprehension of the material being read so that students can relate these words to the content of the story (Karen Tankersley, 2003). Deep comprehension of the sentences requires the construction of referents of nouns, a discourse focus, presuppositions, and plausible inferences. The reader needs to distinguish given versus new information in the text and implicitly (Danielle S. Mcnamara, 2007).

To achieve reading comprehension, readers must concurrently process different levels of the text. "Reading the line" refers to a basic literal comprehension by using fundamental knowledge of a given language to understand the surface concept that the writers try to convey to readers. "Reading between the lines" involves background knowledge to comprehend the text (Kuang Yu Chen, 2011). The ability to comprehend written text is one of the most complex but critical activities people perform every day. From the time we wake up in the morning until the time we rest at night, we are bombarded with thousands of written messages. Although successful comprehension is often an easy job for skilled readers, the processes underlying the chain of activities which are mandatory for comprehension to take place are complicated (Karbalaee & Amoli, 2011).

There are four important factors influence reading comprehension (Karen Tankersley, 2005). They are; Command of the linguistic structure of the text, adequate vocabulary in the content area, adequate vocabulary in the content area, and adequate domain knowledge. Readers respond to a given text in a variety of ways as they seek to use and understand what they are reading. These include the reading situation and the structure of the text itself. All of these factors are regarded as important components of the reading process and were manipulated in the creation of the items used in the assessment (Fathur Rohim, 2009).

Reading comprehension becomes very important since reading section belongs to one of two skills that are examined in national final examination besides listening. Many students have difficulties when doing reading comprehension tests in the case of students fail on reading

comprehension test probably because there many words and phrases that they do not understand (Fatkhur Rozi, 2010). Students need to learn to adjust their reading according to the purpose, type of text, and comprehension level goal. They should realize that the speed and concentration level of their reading can affect their comprehension of the text (Khaterine wiesolek kuta, 2008).

We see the results of this weakness in our middle and high school classrooms every day. Students come to us without adequate background skills, so the act of reading is difficult and troublesome for them (Karen Tankersley, 2003). Focusing on major priorities and involving the students in creating their own reading programs can make teaching a most exciting and enjoyable collaboration (Camille Blachowicz & Donna Ogle, 2008). Reading can be challenging, particularly when the material is unfamiliar, technical, or complex. Moreover, for some readers, comprehension is always challenging. Reading is an extraordinary achievement when one considers the number of levels and components that must be mastered (Danielle S. Mcnamara, 2007).

Based on the writer interviewed with the English teacher of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru, there are several problems faced by students. First, the students have difficulties understanding the text on teaching material given. Second, they have difficulties in understanding exercise and the question. Third, majority of the students were not interested in reading a text. Fourth, there are some students still have below minimum criteria score. From these problems, the writer thought that they need a method to help them in improving reading ability.

Furthermore, the writer tried to find the method which is suitable for the students in this school to develop their ability in reading especially in narrative text. We know students learn to love reading when they find their own interests and “themselves “represented in the materials they read (Camille Blachowicz & Donna Ogle, 2008). So, the strategy must be simple and interesting. The teacher should be an active teacher, challenge to apply their main knowledge and new experience.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research is an action research. It is one type of the research design which has history and tradition that differs significantly from the other form of research is done to find or discovery new fact or to revise accepted theories. On the other hand, action research is done to acquire information in order to solve the problem that is faced in certain condition or situation. Action research is a form of collective self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situation in order to improve the nationality and justice of their own social or educational practices, as well as their understanding of these practice and the situations in which these practices are carried out (Kemmis & Mctaggart, 1988).

Action research has an applied focus. It uses data collection based on either quantitative or qualitative methods or both (Creswell, 2008). Action research designs are systematic procedures done by teachers (or other individuals in an educational setting) to gather information about, and subsequently improve, the ways their particular educational setting operates, their teaching, and their student learning (Mills,2000). The purpose of this research design are to improve the practice of education by studying issue or problems and reflect about these problems, collect and analyze data and implement changes based on educators’ finding (Creswell, 2008).

We use action research when we have a specific educational problem to solve. This problem may be the difficulties facing part-time faculty (Waters, Christensen, Arcodia, Ryan, & Weeks, 1998), ascertaining whether problem-based learning is superior to the traditional lecture (Dods, 1997), or discovering how literacy in writing emerges for first-grade students (Ceprano & Gran, 1998). Action research provides an opportunity for educators to reflect on their own practices. Within the scope of a school, action research offers a means for staff development, for teachers' development as professionals, and for addressing school-wide problems (Allen & Calhoun, 1998). Action research has been seen as a methodology through which the aspirations of critical theory, which is itself regarded as an increasingly important trend in the philosophy of social science and the study of education, might be realized (David Hopkins, 2002).

At the simplest level, action research entails a cyclical inquiry that involves planning, acting, observing and reflecting (Kemmis and McTaggart, 1988). It is a simple, helpful model of the continuous and interactive process. It involves research and development, intellectual inquiry and practical improvement, reflection and action.

The population of this research is all the first-year students of SMAN 12 in academic year 2012/2013. There are 5 classes in the first-year student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. There are 240 students in this grade. Since the population of this study was large and homogeneous because the students have the same characteristics. They are also taught by the same teacher, learn the same material. So, the researcher decides to use clustering technique in this study by taking one class as the sample of research. In clustering sampling, the researcher chooses a sample in two or more stages because either the researcher cannot easily identify the population or the population is extremely large (Creswell, 2008). Getting a complete list of groups or clusters in the population might be possible (Vogt, 1999).

The writer used SQ3R method in this research. The SQ3R strategy (which stands for Survey, Question, Read, Recite, Review) was developed by Robinson (1961) to provide a structured approach for students to use when studying content material. This reading method was developed to help students read with purpose and understand complex information. Many teachers have used the SQ3R reading strategy successfully for years. For new teachers, this can have a positive impact on whatever class, grade, or subject you are teaching. Reading is a vital skill in every class and every subject area, and a strategy to improve students' reading while working on specific class material is extremely beneficial (Frank Holes, 2010). The name comes from the first letters of the activities the student is asked to do in this method: Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review. It is particularly useful to help you get through your weekly set readings. This study method capitalizes on the predictable format in most traditional content textbooks (e.g., title, introduction, headings, subheadings, conclusion, etc.) The steps are: (1) Survey, (2) Question, (3) Read, (4) Recite, and (5) Review.

### **Survey**

1. Skim the title, headings, subheadings, captions, charts, graphs and any other visual material (this gives you a preview of the whole chapter before you read in full).
2. Look for any chapter or weekly tutorial questions, if applicable, (these will provide a focus before you start to read).
3. Read the introductory and concluding paragraphs and chapter summaries.

### **Question**

1. Turn the title, headings and subheadings into questions (this will focus your attention on what information to look for in that section).
2. Write down any questions you have as you are reading through the content (this helps develop your attention and concentration).
3. Ask yourself – How does this relate to the unit and what I already know?

### **Read**

1. Try to find answers to the questions you raised.
2. Try to answer the chapter and/or tutorial questions.
3. Pay attention to any underlined, italicized, bold words or phrases and graphic aids.
4. Slow down when reading difficult passages.
5. Break your reading into manageable size chunks.
6. Read small sections at a time and recite after each section.

### **Recite**

1. After you have read each section, ask yourself questions about what you have just read – try to answer in your own words.
2. Underline or highlight important points you have just read.
3. Take notes – use your own words.
4. In this way you use all your senses to take in the information.

### **Review**

1. This is an ongoing process.
2. Regularly review your notes.
3. Summarize what you have read at the end of each section.
4. Use concept maps and flash cards to help you remember what you have read.

Remember that think-aloud are more effective teaching tools if students do them in front of each other. Ask a student who's willing to act a bit to do a demonstration of SQ3R in front of the class. In advance, however, prepare the student so that he applies several great SQ3R moves and several moves that violate proper SQ3R protocols. When the student does his think-aloud, tell the rest of the class that they are looking for proper and improper techniques according to the SQ3R process. Afterward, let the class critique the student's demonstration (Rick Wormeli, 2005).

SQ3R is an instructional strategy for improving reading comprehension. Each of these activities focuses on a technique integral to the reading process. The uses in the language arts seem rather obvious, but SQ3R is great for other areas too. This can be used in social studies classes when reading through a new section of the text book (Frank Holes, 2010). To make the SQ3R technique easy to do and grade, we've created a form that is used through our school. It is specific enough to cover all of the areas, and yet general enough to allow individual teachers to adapt and customize this strategy to their class, students, or current assignments.

The survey, question, read, recite, review Method of reading sets the stage for interacting with your text material. As you go through the five steps you are gaining information, formulating questions, thinking about what you are reading, and trying to find answers to your

questions. Like many other techniques, SQ3R benefits from specific modeling. Think-aloud is a great way to do this (Wick Wormeli, 2005).

One of the best advantages of the survey, question, read, recite, review Method is that it allows for a great deal of repetition of the important survey, question, read, recite, review information in the chapter. Repetition is a key ingredient in learning. This strategy works well for students with learning disabilities that have difficulty comprehending and retaining the information they read in their textbooks (wiesendanger, 2001)

The writer analyzed the data based on the classification whether it is quantitative or qualitative. To know the students' score in answering the data, the writer divided the number of correct answer with the number of items (Gay, Mills & Airasian, 2009). To know of the students' ability in comprehending narrative text, the researcher used percentage grading. Good to excellent level for the students who got score in range 80-100. Average to good level for the students who got score in range 60-79. Poor to average level for the students who got score in range 50-59 and poor level for the students who got score in range 0-49 (Harris, 1986). To know the students' ability in pre-test and post-test, the data that had been collected are analyzed by dividing the sum of raw score with the total number of the students (Anas Sudijono, 2012). The research will be categorized success if 70% of the fifth grade students get the score higher than 75 as the minimal score (KKM) of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru.

The qualitative data was gathered through the checklist of the observation sheets and field notes. Gay in Jayus states the steps of qualitative data. First, prepare the data by making an organization of grouping data. The writer made a format for the data from observation sheet and field note. Second, the writer read and analyzed the data from observation sheets and field note deeply. Third, the writer described the data that she got from teaching and learning process in order to complete the information about arrange, participant and activity. Fourth, the writer put the data in category of the aspects of the data. Fifth, the writer knows the aspects and connection of the data in order to make a summary. The next step is writing a report of research in order to explain the research.

There are some components to the process of reading comprehension (King and Stanley, 1989). The writer would discuss six components in reading comprehension narrative text in this research which are appropriate with the senior high school curriculum. There are; identify factual information, finding main idea, identify generic structure, finding the meaning of vocabulary in context, identify reference, and making inference.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The writer started giving pre-test before applying the strategy to know the reading ability of the students in comprehending narrative text. The data was computed and discussed. Based on the on the pre-test result there are some students in the poor to average and in the poor level. There were only 2 students or 5.71% of them could get the good to excellent level while most of students (82.86%) were in the average to good level and 4 students or 11.43% were in the poor to average level. From that result, it can be conclude that the student's ability in comprehending narrative text is not satisfied.

From the data of correct answers in the pre-test, there were none of the students could answer the entire question correctly. Only 2 students could answer 25 of the total items correctly. Then 2 students could answers 24 items correctly, 2 students could answer 23 items correctly, 11 students could answer 22 items correctly, 11students could answer 21 items correctly, 1 student could answer 20 items correctly, 2 students could answer 19 items correctly. 3 students could answer 18 items correctly and 1 student could answer 16 items correctly.

There were six components of reading comprehensions that are needed to be identified. They are main idea, generic structure of narrative text, meaning vocabulary in content, reference, factual information and inference. There were three texts the writer used in this test to know the students ability in comprehending narrative text.

The writer also analyzed each component of reading comprehension. For the first text, there were 30 students or 85.71%% who could answer the question about main idea. There were 21 students or 60% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 24 students or 68.57% on average who could answer the question about meaning vocabulary in context. There were 32 students or 91.43% on average who could answer question about reference. There were 21students or 60% on average who could answer question about factual information and 19 students or 54.29% who could answer question about inference.

In the second text, there were 23 students or 65.71%% who could answer the question about main idea. There were 22 students or 63% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 27 students or 77.14% on average who could answer the question about meaning vocabulary in context. There were 29 students or 82.86% on average who could answer question about reference. There were 26 students or 74.26% on average who could answer question about factual information and 20 students or 57.14% who could answer question about inference.

For the third text, there were 26 students or 74.29%% who could answer the question about main idea. There were 24 students or 68.57% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 25 students or 71.43% on average who could answer the question about meaning vocabulary in context. There were 30 students or 85.71% on average who could answer question about reference. There were 21 students or 60% on average who could answer question about factual information and 17 students or 48.57% who could answer question about inference.

It can be seen from the three texts given to the students, most of them could answer question about main idea and reference. On the average, there were more than 26 students (26.3) or 74.29% who could answer question about main idea in the text. Then, more than 22 students (22.3) or 62.86% could answer question about generic structure of narrative text. Then, 25 students (25.3) or 71.43% could answer question about meaning vocabulary in context. Then, more than 30 students (30.3) or 85.71% could answer question about reference. Then, more than 23 students (22.7) or 65.7% could answer question about factual information. Then, there were only 19 students (18.7) or 54.29% could answer question about reference.

Based on the description above, the students' ability in comprehending narrative text in the pre-test was still low. It is showed that there are some of the students in the class still had low ability in comprehending narrative text. It can be conclude that the student's ability in

comprehending narrative text is not satisfied. Although most of the students were in the average to good level, but most of them (29 students or 82.85%) still had score below the standard criteria of first year student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru (75). The average score of the entire students is also low. It is only 70.4 and below the minimum criteria.

After doing pre-test, the writer began to apply SQ3R method to increase students' reading ability in comprehending narrative text at class X.2 SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. The research was conducted twice a week @ (2x45 minutes) and four times for treatments. The writer also asked for a help to collaborator in this research to observe the process of teaching and learning during the class. After everything was prepared, the writer began conducting the action. The writer began to apply SQ3R method through 5 steps activities.

In conducting the research by using SQ3R method to increase students' ability in comprehending narrative text, the writer found some improvement of their activity in applying SQ3R method. It is shown the progress of students who follow the activity in every meeting of teaching and learning process. It can be seen that the effectiveness in each activity from the first to the fourth meeting. In the first meeting, there were only 26 students or 74.29% who survey on part of the text guided by the writer and it increased to become 29 students or 82.86% in the second meeting, 31 students or 88.57% in third and 35 students or 100% in fourth meeting. The number of students who do activity "question" was 27 students or 77.14% in the first meeting also increased to 30 students or 85.71% in second meeting, 32 students or 91.43% in third meeting, 35 students or 100% in fourth meeting. "Read" activity was followed by 28 students or 80% in the first meeting, 30 students or 85.71% in the second meeting, 33 students or 94.29% in third meeting and 35 students or 100% fourth meeting. For "recite" activity, the number of the students who followed was 30 students or 85.71% in the first meeting, 31 students or 88.57% in the second meeting, 34 students or 97.14% in the third meeting and 35 students or 100% in the fourth meeting. The last activity "review" got excellent response. It is followed 32 students or 91.43% in the first meeting, 33 students or 94.29% in the second meeting, 34 students or 97.14% in the third meeting and 35 students or 100% in the fourth meeting.

The average percentage of the four meetings is 90.71%. Based on the result of the observation above, it can be proven that the use of SQ3R method increase the activeness of the students in comprehending narrative text.

In doing 4 meetings of treatment based on lesson plan that was designed, the writer asks the students to do some exercise. The score of students' comprehending narrative text four meetings can be seen that the first meeting showed that in the teaching process, only 2 students who got 'Good to Excellent'. 29 students or 82.86% got 'Average to Good', 4 students or 11.43% got 'Poor to Average'.

Next, in the second meeting, it can be seen that there was an improvement in students' comprehending narrative text score. 11 students or 31.43% who got 'Good to Excellent' and 24 students or 68.57% got 'Average to Good'.

In the third meeting of the treatment, it can be seen that there was also an improvement in students' comprehending narrative text score. 22 student or 62.86% who got 'Good to Excellent', and 13 students or 37.14% who got 'Average to Good'.

In the last meeting of treatment, it can be seen that there was also significant improvement. There almost all the students were in good to excellent level. Based on the students' comprehending narrative text score above, it can be proven that the use of survey, question, read, recite and review can increase the ability of the students in comprehending narrative text.

After the students had been taught through SQ3R method, the writer gave the post-test to the students to know their achievement in comprehending narrative text. The test items which are used at the end of this cycle are similar to those in pre-test. After that the writer computed the students' answers which are shown in the following table:

From the data, writer found that there were 18 students or 51.43% achieved the good to excellent level. Then, there were 17 students or 48.57% that reached the average good level and none of the students in the poor to average or poor level. This evidence showed that the writer has been success to help students in the class X.2 of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru in increasing the ability reading comprehension narrative text by using SQ3R method. The writer also analyzed the students' ability in answering the question.

The students' individual ability in comprehending narrative text has increased more than their ability in pre-test and the increase was really significant. There were 1 students could answer 29 question correctly. 2 students could answer 28 questions correctly. 4 students could answer 27 questions correctly. 1 student could answer 26 questions correctly. 10 students could answer 25 question correctly. 15 students could answer 23 question correctly. 1 student could answer 22 questions correctly and also 1 student can answer 21 questions correctly.

The writer also would like to show the result of the students' individual ability in each component of reading comprehension in the post-test. At the first text, there were 33 students or 94.29% who could answer question about main idea. There were 27 students or 77.14% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 27 students or 77.14% on average who could answer question about meaning vocabulary in content. There were 33 students or 94.29% on average who could answer question about reference. There were 27 students or 77.14% on average who could answer question about factual information. There were 27 students or 77.14% who could answer question about inference.

At the second text, there were 28 students or 80% who could answer question about main idea. There were 27 students or 77.14% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 28 students or 80% students who could answer question about meaning vocabulary in content. There were 32 students or 91.43% who could answer question about reference. There were 23 students or 65.71% who could answer question about factual information. There were 27 students or 77.14% who could answer question about reference.

At the third text, there were 28 students or 80% who could answer question about main idea. There were 28 students or 80% who could answer question about generic structure. There were 29 students or 82.86% on average who could answer question about meaning vocabulary in content. There were 33 students or 94.29% on average who could answer question about

reference. There were 28 students or 80% on average who could answer question about factual information. There were 26 students or 74.29% who could answer question about reference.

At the end of this cycle, the students' achievement in comprehending narrative text by using SQ3R was increasing. The increase was significant with average score increase from 70.4 to 80.97. This result showed that most of the students could reach the minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) for first year of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru (75). Therefore treatment was stopped and it is not necessary.

Based on the result of teaching and learning process, the writer found that after doing the treatments, the achievement of the first student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru in comprehending narrative text was increased. It could be seen from the result of the average score from the test.

The result of the pretest was 70.4 (average to good level) increased to 80.97 (good to excellent level), so it is high than criterion of successful (KKM) of the first year student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru for English subject (75).

In this research, the writer found an improvement to the students' ability in comprehending narrative text by using SQ3R method. It could be seen from the students' ability level in comprehending narrative text from the pre-test to the post-test. It shown that average to good dominated in pre-test with 29 students or 82.86%. There were 4 students or 11.43% in poor to average level. There were only 2 students or 5.71% in the good to excellent level. Then there are some improvements in in the post-test. Good to excellent dominated with 18 students or 51.43% in the post-test. There were 17 students or 48.57% in average to good level. There were none of the students in the poor to average or poor level.

The writer also analyzed the six components of reading comprehension from the pre-test and post-test. The six components are finding main idea, generic structure, meaning vocabulary in the context, reference, factual information and reference. At this point the writer would like to take comparison of the six components for the pre-test the post-test.

From the data, it shown that main idea could be answered by 28 students on average. Then reference could be answered by 32 students on average. It is mean that the main idea and reference were the easiest of the test item. Then either general structure or factual information could be answered by 25 students on average. Then vocabulary in content could be answered by 27 students on average. This means that these components were the in the middle categories. Then the question about inference was the most difficult for the students, there were just 22 students on average who could answer it.

Then, the writer would like to categories six components of reading comprehension as easy, moderate and difficult. Main idea and reference are easy; factual information, general structure and vocabulary in context are moderate; whereas inference is difficult.

At the end of the cycle, the writer reflected the students' achievement of their comprehension narrative text. The writer analyzed the observation sheet for the students' activities after conducting the research. The writer found that there were improvements to the

students' achievement in the classroom. Most of them become enthusiastic doing the exercise. Their activity in comprehending narrative text and the exercise improved.

Based on the result of the students' score in the pre-test and the post test, the average score of the students increased higher than successful criterion (75). It was increase from 70.4 (pre-test) to 80.97 (post-test). It can be concluded that the treatment given by the writer could improve students' comprehension narrative text of the first year student of SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. So, the result of the treatment has answered the question of this research.

In conducting the research, the writer found some strength during applying SQ3R method. First, the students were more motivated in following the lesson. Second, in that method student can practice speed reading by skimming the title, heading, subheadings, caption, etc. Third, the student was very enthusiastic in the recite step because they can use their sense to take the information. The students more enjoy the activity of learning process. Fourth, this method can be applied in the large group of students, small group or individually.

In the research, the writer also found some weakness such as follow; the students are not used to skim in reading, the students still had difficulties in making summary, it took more time to teach them the steps that difficult for them.

## **CONCLUSSION AND SUGGESTION**

Based on the data analysis of the pre-test and the post-test in the preview chapter, the writer concluded that SQ3R method can improve the students' reading ability in comprehending narrative text. It was proven by the increase in average scores of the students from pre-test to the post-test.

In addition, this method also helps improve the students' inters and motivation to red, especially in narrative text. It can be seen from the increasing number of participants involved in class activities from the first meeting to the end of the cycle.

After finding the result of the observation, some suggestions are given as follow. First, it is suggested in teaching reading, the English teacher may consider using SQ3R method as one of alternative strategies since the result can improve the reading ability. Second, while implementing SQ3R, the English teacher needs to apply the steps correctly in order that this method runs well. Third, the English teacher should be able to create interesting class room for the students. Fourth, teacher need to give a variety of teaching methodology which is appropriate to the material so that the students active and interested in following the English lesson. In this case, the writer suggests the use of SQ3R method in teaching narrative text. Fifth, it is better for teacher to find interesting material based on the topic in order to make the students enthusiastic in teaching learning process. The last, the teacher needs to give more attention to time management, to students and their weakness. To have the students feel appreciated, the teacher has to give reinforcement in every occasion to the students.

## Bibliography

- Al-Issa, Ahmad. (2006). *Schema Theory and L2 Reading Comprehension: Implications for Teaching*. United Arab Emirates: American University of Sharjah.
- Allen, L., & Calhoun, E. F. (1998). Schoolwide action research: findings from six years of study. *Pbi Delta Kappan*, 79(9).
- Blachowicz, Camille & Ogle, Donna. (2008). *Reading comprehension: strategies for independent readers*. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Ceprano, M. A., Garan, E. M. (1998). Emerging voices in a university pen-pal project: Layer of discovery in action research. *Reading Research and Intruction*, 38(1).
- Creswell, John W. (2008). *Educational research*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Dods, R. F. (1997). An action research study of the effectiveness of problem-based learning in promoting the acquisition and retention of knowledge. *Journal for the education of the Gifted*, 20(4).
- Gay, L. R., Mills, E. G., & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational Research: Competencies for analysis and application*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Holes, Frank . (2010). Revisiting SQ3R reading strategy. Retrieved December 15, 2011, from [www.scienceforamerica.com/reading-comprehension/revisiting-sq3r-reading-strategy.html](http://www.scienceforamerica.com/reading-comprehension/revisiting-sq3r-reading-strategy.html).
- Harris. D.P, (1986). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: MC Graw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
- Hopkins, David. (2002). *A teachers' guide to classroom research*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- King, C. and Stanley, N., (1989). *Insight and Strategies for Teaching Reading*. Sydney: Harcourt Brace Javanovich Group.
- Lemov Doug. (2010). *Teach like a champion: 49 techniques that put students on the path to college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Maxom, Michelle. (2009). *Teaching English as foreign language for dummies*. West Sussex: John wiley & sons. Ltc.
- Mcnamara, Danielle S. (2007). *Reading comprehension strategies*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.
- Mikulecky, Beatrice S. & Jeffries, Linda. (2007). *Advance reading power*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (1988). *The action research planner, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed*. Victoria: Deakin University.

- Karbalaei, A. & Amoli, F. A. (2011). The effect of paraphrasing strategy training on the reading comprehension of college students at the undergraduate level. *Asian EFL Journal*, 13.
- Robinson, F. P. (1961). *Effective study*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.
- Rohim, fathur. (2009). *Teaching reading*. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Rozi, Fatkhur. (2010). Improving students' reading comprehension competence by using the implementation of "crazy teacher reading technique" in a whole brain teaching classroom at sman 1 welahan jepara in the 2010/2011 academic year. *TEFLIN 57<sup>th</sup> International conference*, Bandung.
- Swalm, J. & Kling, M. (1973). Speed reading in the elementary school. *Elementary School Journal* 74 (3).
- Sivasubramaniam, Sivakumar. (2009). Issues and Insights for Promoting Agency, Voice and Subjecthood in Reading and Assessment. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11.
- Sudijono, Anas. (2012). *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Tankersley, Karen. (2003). *The tread of reading: strategies for literacy development*. Virginia: ASCD.
- Tankersley, Karen. (2005). *Literacy strategies*. Alexandria: ASCD.
- Vogt, W. P. (1999). *Dictionary of statistics and methodology: A non-technical guide for the social sciences (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Waters, J. J., Christensen, C., Arcodia, C., Ryan, Y., & Weeks, P. (1998). *Occasional visits to the kingdom*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wolfe, P & Nevills, P. 2004. *Building the reading brain*. Chicago: Corwin press.
- Iesendanger, Khaterine D. (2001). *Strategies for literacy education*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Wormeli, Rick. (2005). Summarization: in any subject, 50 techniques to improve students learning. Virginia: ASCD.
- Yılmaz, Cevdet. (2012). An investigation into turkish EFL students' attributions in reading comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(5).
- Yu Chen, Kuang. (2011). The impact of EFL students' vocabulary breadth of knowledge on literal reading comprehension. *Asian EFL Journal, Professional Teaching Articles*, 51.