A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF READING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES USED BY GOOD AND POOR READERS AT THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MAN MODEL PALANGKA RAYA

THESIS

Presented to the Departement of Education of the State Islamic College Of Palangka Raya in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Sarjana Pendidikan Islam

By.

PITHRIANI
SRN.0801120362

THE STATE ISLAMIC COLLEGE OF PALANGKA RAYA
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
THE STUDY PROGRAM OF ENGLISH EDUCATION
1435 H/2014 M
Title of the Thesis: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF READING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES USED BY GOOD AND POOR READERS AT THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MAN MODEL PALANGKA RAYA

Name: Pithriani
SRN: 0801120362
Department: Education
Study Program: English Education
Level: (S.1)

Palangka Raya, 17 September 2014
Approved by:

Advisor I, Advisor II,

Santi Erliana, M.Pd
ORN. 19801205 200604 2003
Luqman Baehaqi, S.S., M.Pd
ORN. 19800823 201101 1005

Vice Director Academic Section and Institution Development,
Chairwoman of Educational Department,

Drs. Fahmi, M.Pd
ORN. 19610520 199903 1003
Triwid SN., M.Pd
ORN. 19710914 200312 2001
OFFICIAL NOTE

Case : Examination of  
Pithriani’s Thesis

Palangka Raya, 17 September 2014

To : Director of the State Islamic  
College of Palangka Raya

in-  
Palangka Raya

Peace be into you and God’s mercy and blessing as well.

By reading and analyzing of thesis revision, we think that the thesis in the 
name of:

Name  
Pithriani

Student Registration Number  
0801120362

Title of the Thesis  
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF READING  
COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES USED  
BY GOOD AND POOR READERS AT  
THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF  
MAN MODEL PALANGKA RAYA

Can be examined in partial fulfillment of the Degree of Sarjana Pendidikan  
Islam in English Education of the Department of Education STAIN Palangka  
Raya.

Thank you for your attention

Peace be with you and God’s blessing.

Advisor I,  
Santi Erliana, M.Pd  
ORN. 19801205 200604 2003

Advisor II,  
Luqman Baehaqi, S.S., M.Pd  
ORN. 19800823 201101 1005
LEGALIZATION OF THESIS EXAMINING COMMITTEE

This thesis entitled A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF READING COMPREHENSION STRATEGIES USED BY GOOD AND POOR READERS AT THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF MAN MODEL PALANGKA RAYA. In the name of Pithriani, and her Student Registration Number is 0801120362. It has been examined by Board of Examiners of the State Islamic College of Palangka Raya on:

Day : Monday
Date : 20th October 2014

Palangka Raya, 20 Oktober 2014
Board of Examiners

1. Dr. H. Abdul Qodir, M.Pd ( .......................... )
   Chairman/Member

2. Sabarun, M.Pd ( .......................... )
   Member

3. Santi Erliana, M.Pd ( .......................... )
   Member

4. Luqman Baehaqi, SS., M.Pd ( .......................... )
   Secretary/Member

The State Islamic College of Palangka Raya
Director,

Dr. Ibnu Elmi A.S. Pelu, SH, MH,
ORN. 19750109 199903 1 002
The study was aimed at investigating the difference of reading comprehension strategies between good and poor readers at the second year students of MAN Model Palangka Raya. It is because they have different score in their reading comprehension test. The study used quantitative comparative approach with Expost Facto design in finding out the answer of problem of the study. The population of the study consisted of seven classes at the second year students of MAN Model Palangka Raya. The total number of students was 224 students. The students were given reading comprehension test. Based on the test scores, they were selected into two groups namely, good readers that consists of 40 students and poor readers that consists of 40 students as the sample in order to be given questionnaire. The sample was determined by using purposive sampling technique. After getting the data of reading strategy questionnaire score, the writer analyzed the data using the independent t-test formula to test the hypothesis and to find the mean difference between good and poor readers. It was found that the result using SPSS 16 program calculation showed that for the first before reading-strategies, it was found the result of $t_{\text{observed}}$ was -5.37 and the $t_{\text{table}}$ was 2.04 at 5% of significance level with the degree of freedom (df) was 38. It showed that $t_{\text{observed}}$ was greater than $t_{\text{table}}$. The second while reading-strategies, it was found the result of $t_{\text{observed}}$ was -4.11. It was greater than $t_{\text{table}}$ at 5% of significance level. The third after reading-strategies, it was found the result of $t_{\text{observed}}$ was -3.24. It was also greater than $t_{\text{table}}$ at 5% level of significance level. It means that there is difference of Reading comprehension strategies used between good and poor readers.

The result of testing hypothesis determined that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) stated that there is significant difference of Reading Comprehension strategies used by good and poor readers at the second year students of MAN Model Palangka Raya was accepted and the null hypothesis (H₀) stated that there is no significant difference rejected. In conclude, there is significant difference of Reading Comprehension strategies used by good and poor readers at the second year students of MAN Model Palangka Raya. Based on the result of the study, good readers used more strategies in their Reading Comprehension. For the poor readers, it is recommended to develop kinds of reading strategies in their learning of Reading Comprehension activities. The study suggests that reading strategies are important study for reading comprehension.
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SEBUAH STUDI PERBANDINGAN STRATEGI PEMAHAMAN BACAAN YANG DIGUNAKAN OLEH PEMBACA YANG BAIK DAN PEMBACA YANG KURANG BAIK PADA SISWA KELAS II DI MAN MODEL PALANGKA RAYA

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menyelidiki perbedaan strategi pemahaman Bacaan antara pembaca yang baik dan yang kurang baik pada siswa kelas II di MAN Model Palangka Raya. Hal ini karena mereka memiliki nilai yang berbeda dalam tes pemahaman bacaan. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan komparatif kuantitatif dengan desain ex post facto dalam mencari jawaban dari masalah penelitian. Populasi penelitian terdiri dari 7 kelas pada kelas II siswa MAN Model Palangka Raya. Total jumlah siswa adalah 224 siswa. Para siswa diberi tes Pemahaman Bacaan. Berdasarkan hasil tes, mereka dipilah menjadi dua kelompok yaitu, pembaca yang baik yang terdiri dari 40 siswa dan pembaca yang kurang baik terdiri dari 40 siswa sebagai sampel untuk diberikan kuesioner. Sampel ditentukan dengan menggunakan teknik purposive sampling. Setelah mendapatkan skor kuesioner, penulis menganalisis data dengan menggunakan rumus t-test independen untuk menguji hipotesis dan untuk menemukan perbedaan rata-rata antara pembaca yang baik dan yang kurang baik. Ditemukan bahwa hasil perhitungan menggunakan SPSS 16 Program menunjukkan bahwa untuk pertama strategi sebelum membaca, ditemukan hasil \( t_{hitung} \) adalah -5.37 dan \( t_{table} \) adalah 2.04 pada tingkat keyakinan 5% dari dengan tingkat kebebasan \( (d_k) \) adalah 38. Hal ini menunjukkan bahwa \( t_{hitung} \) lebih besar dari \( t_{table} \). Yang kedua strategi selama membaca, ditemukan hasil \( t_{hitung} \) adalah -4.11. Itu lebih besar dari \( t_{table} \). Ketiga strategi setelah membaca, ditemukan hasil \( t_{hitung} \) adalah -3.24. Itu juga lebih besar dari \( t_{table} \) pada tingkat keyakinan 5%. Ini berarti bahwa ada perbedaan strategi Pemahaman Bacaan digunakan antara pembaca yang baik dan yang kurang baik.

Hasil pengujian hipotesis ditentukan bahwa hipotesis alternatif (Ha) menyatakan bahwa ada perbedaan yang signifikan dari strategi Pemahaman Bacaan digunakan oleh pembaca yang baik dan yang kurang baik pada siswa kelas II di MAN Model Palangka Raya telah diterima dan hipotesis nol (Ho) menyatakan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan yang signifikan ditolak. Jadi kesimpullannya, ada perbedaan yang signifikan dari strategi Pemahaman Bacaan digunakan oleh pembaca yang baik dan yang kurang baik pada siswa kelas II di MAN Model Palangka Raya. Berdasarkan hasil penelitian, pembaca yang baik menggunakan banyak strategi dalam Pemahaman Bacaan. Untuk pembaca kurang baik, dianjurkan untuk mengembangkan jenis strategi membaca dalam kegiatan pembelajaran Pemahaman Bacaan. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa strategi membaca adalah studi penting untuk pemahaman bacaan.

Kata Kunci: Pemahaman Bacaan, Strategi Membaca, Pembaca yang baik, Pembaca yang Kurang Baik
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