

**THE EFFECT OF THE SURVEY, QUESTION, READ, RECALL, AND  
REVIEW (SQ3R) METHOD ON STUDENTS READING  
COMPREHENSION AT GRADE X OF SMA  
AL-MA'SHUM SIDODADI  
IN ACADEMIC YEAR  
2016/2017**

**Oleh:**

Dian Anggraini Harahap  
Dosen Universitas Asahan  
diananggrainiharahap123@gmail.com

**Abstract**

The aim of this study is to discover the effect of applying SQ3R method in reading comprehension. Experimental research design is used as the research method. This research took place at SMA al-mashum sidodadi. The population of this research was taken from the grade X of SMA Al-Ma'shum Sidodadi. There were 2 classes, X-1 and X-2 chosen as the sample with 30 students in each class. The classes were divided into two groups namely experimental and control group. The experimental group taught by using SQ3R method and the control group was taught by using conventional method. The instrument used to collect the data was a set of essay tests, which divided as pre test and post test. The result of the research the students who use SQ3R method with a sample of 30 students obtain an average value of 80,66, while the students who use the conventional way with a sample of 30 students obtain an average value of 76,66. So SQ3R method significantly improves the student's reading comprehension.

*Key words : reading, descriptive text, SQ3R method, Experimental Research Design*

**Introduction**

Language is a system of communication by human beings all over the world. Each country has a special language. A language of a country is different with other countries. For example, Indonesian language is a language which is used only in Indonesia. There is not another country which used Indonesian language as its formal language. But, there is a language which is used by other countries, not only a country, namely English.

English is a language which is used by many countries, such as England, United States, Singapore, etc.

Problem in teaching speaking is complex. It is not only related with the students' factor but also about context outside. In the internal aspects, the problems occurred are related with native language, age, exposure, innate phonetic ability, identity and language ego, and motivation and concern for good speaking. The points of those

problems are related with condition of the students.

Students of SMK Negeri 1 Pulau Rakyat have problems in their speaking. They can't speak English correctly and fluently. The effect of them are the listener (commonly the teacher) doesn't understand what they said, and of course, the goal of the curriculum can't be reached maximally.

Practice - Rehearsal pairs model in teaching English especially on students' speaking ability. Practice Rehearsal pairs is a learning model where students are grouped in pairs (paired) which one of them there are observes and the other practice. The purpose is to convince each pairs can do with the right skills. This model can increase ability to practice and the students are expected to be able to teach how to make do something. This model is interesting and suitable as one of way to teach English subject especially the material psychomotor. That's way in this research will choose this model conduct this research.

The objective of this study is to find out whether PRP Effect Students' Speaking Ability of Procedure Text at grade X TKJ-1 of SMK Negeri 1 Pulau Rakyat in Academic Year of 2016-2017.

Speaking is defined as an interactive process of constructing meaning that involves producing, receiving and processing information. Its form and meaning are dependent on the context in which it occurs, the participants, and the purposes of speaking (Burns & Joyce, 1997).

Speaking is defined operationally in this study as the secondary stage

students' ability to express themselves orally, coherently, fluently and appropriately in a given meaningful context to serve both transactional and interactional purposes using correct pronunciation, grammar and vocabulary and adopting the pragmatic and discourse rules of the spoken language. In other words they are required to show mastery of the following sub competencies/ skills:

**Linguistic competence:** This includes the following skills: Using intelligible pronunciation. Following grammatical rules accurately. Using relevant, adequate and appropriate range of vocabulary.

**Discourse competence:** This includes the following skills: Structuring discourse coherently and cohesively, Managing conversation and interacting effectively to keep the conversation going

**Pragmatic competence:** This includes the following skill: Expressing a range of functions effectively and appropriately according to the context and register.

**Fluency:** This means speaking fluently demonstrating a reasonable rate of speech.

### Elements of Speaking

Harmer (2003:267) state that the ability to speak fluently presupposes not only knowledge of language features, but also the ability to process information and language 'on the spot' among the elements necessary for spoken production (as

opposed to the production of practice examples in language drills for examples), are the following :

1. Connected speech : effective speakers of English need to be able not only to produce the individual phonemes of English (as in saying *i would have gone*) but also use fluent 'connected speech' (as *i'd've gone*). In connected speech sounds are modified (assimilation), omitted (elision), added (linking r), or weakened (through constrictive and stress patterning). It is for this reason that we should involve students in activities designed specifically to improve their connected speech.

2. Expressive devices : native speakers of English change the pitch and stress of particular parts of utterances, vary volume and speed, and show by other physical and non-verbal (paralinguistic) means how they are feeling (especially in face interaction). The use of these devices contributes to the ability to convey meaning. They allow the extra expression of emotion and intensity. Students should be able to deploy at least some of such suprasegmental features and devices in the same way if they are to be fully effective communicators.

3. Lexis and grammar : spontaneous speech is marked by the use of a number of common lexical phrases, especially in the performance of certain language functions such as agreeing or disagreeing, expressing surprise, shock, or approval. Where students are involved in specific speaking

context such as job interview, we can prime them, in the same way, with certain useful phrases which they can produce at various stages of an interaction.

4. Negotiation language : effective speaking benefits from the negotiator language we use to seek clarification and show the structure of what we are saying.

### **The Research Method**

The research takes place in SMK Negeri 1 Pulau Rakyat. Time of this research is when and how long this research will be conducted. It must be explained clearly. The time of this research was begun at February until April 2017. The population that is chosen by writer is grade X of SMK Negeri 1 Pulau Rakyat the Academic Year 2016/2017. That consists of 3 classes, each of class consists of 36 students. So, the number of population in this study was 108 students. Then, the sample was divided into two groups. They are experimental group and control group which consist about 36 students in each group. The experimental group will be taught speaking by using Practice-Rehearsal Pairs Model, and the control group will be taught speaking by using Conventional Model.

This study was conducted with experiment research. The design of the research was Randomized Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design (Nana:2011). The sample was divided into two groups, they were control group and experiment group. Here was the procedure of the research:

Table 3.1 Research Design

	Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
A	X-1 (Experiment)	X <sub>1</sub>	PRP Model	X <sub>2</sub>
B	X-2 (Control)	Y <sub>1</sub>	Conventional Model	Y <sub>2</sub>

Group A and B have same characteristics or homogen, because they were chosen randomly, from a homogen population. In this design, both of groups were given a pre-test with the same test. Then, Group A as a experiment group was given a special treatment (in this case, it's taught by PRP Model Learning) and Group B was given conventional model.

After a few meetings, both of groups were given a same test as a post-test. The result of their tests was compared with the pre-test of each group. The significant difference of the post-test results, and between pre-test and post-test of experiment

group, shows the influence of treatment given.

To collect the data, this study will use test in questions form. These test were divided into two forms, that were pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was given to know the understanding of students about a material which was taught by conventional Model. The post-test was given to know the understanding about a material after taught by PRP model.

### The Result and Discussion

The following is the result of Experiment Class and Control Class

**Table 4.1 The Result of Experiment Class**

No	Name	Score of											
		Pre-Test						Post-Test					
		F	V	G	C	P	Total	F	V	G	C	P	Total
1	AfarlianiSrgr	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
2	Agun.S	10	20	20	20	20	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
3	AgungBudi.P	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
4	Agusman	10	20	20	20	20	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>

5	Bambang.R	10	20	20	20	20	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
6	Bayu Akbar	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
7	Daniel Rizky	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
8	DewiFitriana	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
9	Dian Nugraha	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
10	Diana Sari	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
11	Dimas Arfian	20	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
12	Dwikurnia.S	20	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
13	Fernando.B	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
14	FirmanSyah	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
15	Firmansyah	20	20	10	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	20	<b>100</b>
16	Hana Destiani	20	20	20	10	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
17	IkaRahmana	20	20	20	10	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
18	Imelda. N	20	20	10	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
19	LalaAnisa	10	20	20	20	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
20	Lela Adila	10	20	20	20	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
21	Mario Zeylani	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
22	M. Hanafi	10	10	10	20	10	<b>60</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
23	M.Toby	10	20	10	10	10	<b>60</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>

24	NurUmida	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
25	NurinAmiliun	20	10	10	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
26	PutriSantika	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
27	RadenBagus	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
28	Rena Nuranri	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
29	SellyAgustina	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
30	Shella. M	10	10	10	5	5	<b>40</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
31	SilfiAndriani	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
32	SitiMaulida	5	10	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
33	Taufik. G	10	10	10	10	10	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
34	WindaSantika	10	15	10	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
35	WiwikSantika	5	5	5	-	5	<b>20</b>	10	10	10	20	10	<b>60</b>
36	YulicaDesty	5	5	5	-	5	<b>20</b>	10	10	10	20	10	<b>60</b>
Total							<b>2480</b>	Total					<b>3190</b>

Table 4.3  
 The Result of Control Class

No	Name	Score of											
		Pre-Test						Post-Test					
		F	V	G	C	P	Total	F	V	G	C	P	Total

1	Ade Dili	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
2	Adelia. L	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
3	Aidil.F	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
4	AldiNur	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
5	Amri.F	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
6	Anggi Mei	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
7	Anggi .S	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
8	Annisa. K	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
9	April.N	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>	20	20	20	20	10	<b>90</b>
10	Afrika.F	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
11	Ellen .R	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
12	Gebby. N	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
13	Hotman	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
14	Icha. A	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
15	Ira. Z	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
16	JelitaOkta	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
17	Jhordy .A	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
18	JuliWulan	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
19	Charisma	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>

20	Lestari. F	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
21	M. Habil	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
22	Mulia. R	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	20	10	<b>80</b>
23	Novira .D	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
24	Nurhasanah	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
25	Nurmia .S	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
26	Rahma. S	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
27	Revi. A	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	20	20	10	10	<b>70</b>
28	Rifki .D	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>
29	Rika. S	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>
30	Rini. S	10	5	10	10	5	<b>40</b>	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>
31	RiniKurnia	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>
32	Ryo Alzura	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	20	10	10	<b>60</b>
33	Sindi .N	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>
34	SitiMardia	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>
35	TaufikFahri	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>
36	Togu.J	5	5	10	5	5	<b>30</b>	10	10	15	10	5	<b>50</b>

Where:

F : Fluency

V : Vocabulary

G : Grammar

C : Comprehension

P : Pronunciation

From the table above, it got that  $t_{counting}$  (3.33) is bigger than  $t_t$



(2.00 or 2.65) at significance 5% or 1%, so Null Hypothesis (There is no effect of Practice-Rehearsal Pairs (PRP) on the students' speaking skill at grade X of SMK N 1Pulau Rakyatin Acaemic year 2016-2017) was rejected. It means, between X variable and Y variable, there is a significant different mean.

Generally, since Practice-Rehearsal Pairs Model Learning was given to the experimental group, the achievement of the students was higher than the control group which taught by conventional method. It can be proofed by seeing the students' score obtained where the student of experimental group got higher score than student of control group. The highest position of the score from the test, in experimental group 100, while in control group 80, the lowest score of test in experimental group is 60 and the lowest score of test in control group is 20. The score in experimental group showed that the students' achievement increase in high level. This score can be influenced by explanation of the material and how to use Practice-Rehearsal Pairs on increasing students' achievement in speaking before the post test. In control group students' score can be influenced by transferring the material to students because in control group applied conventional method where just focused on speaking material and asked the student answer question as usual without taught how to answer easier and faster. The students' just given the material practiced to answer the question.

## References

- Arikunto, S. 2006 *Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation*. Jakarta: BinaAksara.
- Author," The Use of Games: *for vocabulary presentation and revision*.  
Accessed on 22 february 2014.
- Brown, D. 2000. *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey : Englewood Cliffs.
- Brown, H. 2000. *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Fransisco: Longman.
- Byrne, D. 2003. *Teaching Oral English*. Hongkong: Wait Tai Cheung Printing Co Ltd.SixImpresion.
- Harmer, J. 2003. *The Practice of English Language Teaching. Malaysia Person Education Limited*.
- Istarani, 2003. *Model-Model Pembelajaran*. Yokyakarta: InsanMadani.
- Hughes, A. 2001. *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Prees.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary: Seventh Edition.
- Sudjana. 2005. *Metoda Statistika*. Jakarta: BumiAksara.
- Sugiono. 2004. *Metophel*. Jakarta: BumiAksara.

Sukardi. 2003. *Methodology  
Penelitian Pendidikan*.  
Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Swales, J W. 1990. *Genre Analysis*.  
New York: Cambridge  
University Press.

[http://iteslj.org/Article/Kayi-  
Teaching-Speaking.html](http://iteslj.org/Article/Kayi-Teaching-Speaking.html).

Accessed on 1 st November  
2014

[http://edukasi.kompasiana.com/2011/  
10/17/main-berpasangan-  
cara-asyik-belajar-speaking-  
404221.html](http://edukasi.kompasiana.com/2011/10/17/main-berpasangan-cara-asyik-belajar-speaking-404221.html). Accessed on 1  
st November 2014.

([http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/EUSIA  
/forum/vols/vol36/nol/p20.htm](http://dosfan.lib.uic.edu/usia/EUSIA/forum/vols/vol36/nol/p20.htm))



*Jurnal Language League*  
*Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan*  
*Universitas Asahan*

Jalan: Jend. A. Yani Kode Pos 21224 Kisaran – Sumatera Utara

---

**SURAT KETERANGAN**

**Nomor: 004/LL-III-2/FKIP-UNA/2017**

Saya yang bertandatangan di bawah ini:

Nama : Paisal Manurung., S.S.,M.S  
NIDN : 0127078206  
Jabatan : Ketua Redaksi  
Alamat Kantor : Jend. A. Yani Kode Pos 21224 Kisaran – Sumatera Utara

dengan ini menyatakan bahwa:

Nama : Dian Anggraini Harahap., S.Pd., M.Hum  
NIDN : 0111028504  
Alamat Kantor : Jend. A. Yani Kode Pos 21224 Kisaran – Sumatera Utara  
Judul Penelitian : **THE EFFECT OF THE SURVEY, QUESTION, READ, RECALL, AND REVIEW (SQ3R) METHOD ON STUDENTS READING COMPREHENSION AT GRADE X OF SMA AL-MA'SHUM SIDODADI IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2016/2017**

ISSN : 2338-2546 Vol: III Nomor: 2 Maret 2017

Adalah benar telah menulis karya ilmiah yang tersebut di atas. Demikian kami sampaikan dengan harapan Surat Keterangan ini dapat dipergunakan sebagaimana mestinya.

Kisaran, Maret 2017  
Ketua Redaksi Jurnal Language  
League

Dtt

Paisal Manurung., S.S., M.S  
NIDN: 0127078206