Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan
ISSN 2615-0891 (Media Online)
http://ejournal.jayapanguspress.org/index.php/cetta

The Relationship Between Language Learning Strategy And Reading Comprehension Students Of Sman 1 Unaaha

Sukmawati
Universitas Lakidende
wsukma521@yahoo.co.id

Abstract

The following objectives of this study are (1) to investigate whether between language learning strategy and reading comprehension has a significance correlation or not; (2) to examine how far learning strategy affects students reading comprehension (3) to examine what learning strategy and reading comprehension are mostly employed by the students of SMA 1 Unaaha, (4) to examine of the sixth aspect of language learning strategy which aspect correlate more strongly to reading comprehension. The result in the first hypotesis shows that there is a significance correlation language learning strategy to reading comprehension. The second hypothesis the contribution of language learning strategy to reading comprehension is only 14.8% and 85.2% is explained by the other factor that is not include in the model. The result of the third hypothesis indicates that most of English Department students in SMAN 1 Unaaha Employed metacognitive strategy, cognitive and memory strategy very often in learning English as a foreign language than the other strategy; affective, social and compensation strategy. The last hypothesis shows that the stronger correlation between the six aspects of learning strategy to the levels of reading comprehension lie on the correlation between metacognitive to literal comprehension, metacognitive to interpretive comprehension and the last is the correlation between cognitive to literal comprehension.

Diterima : 29 April 2018
Direvisi : 22 Mei 2018
Diterbitkan : 1 Juni 2018

Key words: Language Learning Strategy. Reading Comprehension

Introduction

Nowadays, there is no disagreement regarding the fact that language learning amongst the most essential aspect in our life. Language has been considered as the medium of conveying knowledge; so language learning takes an important role in all aspects of life. Since 2001s, a lot of writers start trying to find out the teaching methods, and directional courses with the objective of earning language instruction precisely.

Nevertheless, despite the whole experiment there has been a developing focus that learners have not progressed as much as it was anticipated. The teaching process need to be paying attention to the individual distinction either gender, age, social status, motivation, attitude, aptitude, culture, etc.; what acts for a student not acts for other students. In short, no one method and technique has shown could be used for longer time, in all classes, with all learners. This idea is supported by Grenfel & Harris (2004) claims that approach could not stand as a single alternative in terms of language learning

Refer to this idea many scientists shift the focus on research from the methodology of language teaching to the way of how a student learn a language and the variables affecting language learning. The shift of the research done by scholars, it encourages some researcher to conduct the study on students' characteristic in foreign or second language learning. Besides, Language Learning Strategies (LLS) has become one of the most familiar factor scientists have concentrate on. However, they have not been investigated on their own. Some other variables that affect them such as gender, achievement, motivation, career orientation, national origin, aptitude, learning styles, etc. have also been taken into consideration while doing research in order to reveal whether there is any relationship between the LLS choice and variables.

On the other hand, a lot of researchers and teachers have attempted hard to find out possible ways to help students read successfully in English, but there are many factors affect the reading proficiency of a second language. They are text types, school and social environments, student's intelligence, learning motivation, teaching method, and so on. One of the most important factors is learning strategy. From the previous studies, it demonstrates that reading performance relates to the use of reading strategies. The reading strategies used by efficient and inefficient learners were different (Block, 1986; Singhal, 2001). With effective study strategies, the learners gain better achievement (Ley & Young, 2008; 89). The point from this statement is that there is no guarantee that one reading strategies will work for all students and therefore it need teacher creativity and ability for

designing the learning process and providing a better strategy or an interesting topic discussion based on students' strategy or prefernces.

However most of technical college students are unfamiliar with the utilization of English reading strategies, and it reduces their reading comprehension. Recently, we no longer ask the students to obtain knowledge by parroting, but to learn with organized and strategically approaches. Some researchers found that structured reading strategies can act as learning guidance (Bereiter & Bird, 2005: 92). Therefore, besides student's diligence, teachers can teach learning strategies to help students read effectively. From above description, the researcher formulates some of the research problems for this study, as follows:

1. Is there a significance correlation between learning strategy to reading comprehension?
2. To what extend does learning strategy affect students reading comprehension?
3. What learning strategies and reading comprehension are commonly employed by the students?
4. Of the six aspects of learning strategy which aspects correlate more strongly to reading comprehension

Method

There were 97 the participant of this research which derived from two classes and they were the students IPA 1 and IPA 2. These classes divided into class A that consist of fifty students and class B forty seven students.

1. Sampling Technique

In sampling technique, this research used random sampling. In this case, the researcher unintentionally selected the students for being the sample of the study. The researcher took the sample randomly which means that the entire participants had the same chance of being selected to be the sample of this study. The reason of choosing random sampling due to the consideration of the representativeness from the two classes as the population of the study.

2. Research Instruments

There were two kinds of tests used in this research. One is questionnaire form of learning strategy that adopted from Oxford (2004) and the one is reading comprehension test that adopted from Longman Complete course for the TOEFL test (2001). To investigate the students' learning strategies, the writer used close ended questionnaire as the instruments.

The questionnaire consists of the aspects that assess student's kind of language learning strategies preferences. The writer provided 50 numbers of questionnaires or statement answered by the learners. The writer provided 5 options to be chosen which show the students perception during English teaching learning activities.

3. Technique of Data Collection

In this research data was collected by using two kinds of instrument. Before distributing the two instruments to the students, the researcher informed the students that their identities would be kept confidential and that no information revealing their identity would be used in the research. Additionally, the researcher divided the testing into two sections. First, the researcher distributed 44-items questionnaire for measure students' Learning strategy (see appendix 1). The researcher gave them one hour accomplish the test. After all the participants had finished the test, the students' answers were collected by the researcher. Then, the researcher distributed 30-item test multiple choice to measure students' reading comprehension (see appendix 2). Researcher gave students forty minutes to accomplish the test.

4. The Result of Language Learning Strategy

Reid (1998: 9) had commented that learning strategies were different from learning styles. Additionally, she noted that learning style tended to inner skills or skill based characteristic and it not accepted or used directly by the students. While learning strategy, stand as external skills and it often applied by the learners consciously in supporting the extending of their learning. As for the rough picture of the result, the table of descriptive statistic of the students' score is presented below, which shows the minimum score is 160, maximum score is 193, mean score is 1.76 and standard deviation is 8.29

Tabel Descriptive Statistic of Learning Strategy

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Learningstrategy	80	160.00	193.00	1.7625E2	8.29900
Valid N (listwise)	80				

The researcher also classified the score of English Language Learning Strategy (see appendix 6 page 111) based on the table 3.4 page 55.

5. The Result of Reading Comprehension Test

This research was conducted on May 02nd, 2016. Before simple regression analysis conducted, the scores of two variables in the research, the researcher calculate the total of raw scores of reading comprehension test by using Microsoft excel 2013 *(see appendix 7 page 130)*. Then, the researcher determined mean and standard deviation from reading comprehension scores and the scores were calculated in order to display the level students' reading comprehension. From calculation in SPSS the researcher found the mean of raw score was 79.1250 and the standard deviation was 7.54627 such a table output SPSS below:

Table Calculation of Mean and Standard Deviation of Reading Comprehension

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Reading.Comp	80	60.00	96.00	79.1250	7.54627
Valid N (listwise)	80				

Based on the table descriptive statistic of reading comprehension, the researcher calculated the mean and standard deviation by using formula in table 4.4 page 52 the researcher classified the scores of reading comprehension into three categories: high, moderate and low.

Result And Discussion

1. Result

a. Result of Hypothesis Testing

Table Test of Significance Model (F-Test)

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	532.716	1	532.716	10.477	.002[a]
	Residual	3966.034	78	50.847		
	Total	4498.750	79			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learningstrategy

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	532.716	1	532.716	10.477	.002[a]
	Residual	3966.034	78	50.847		
	Total	4498.750	79			

b. Dependent Variable: Readingcomprehension

From the table, sig. value is 0.002 (less than 0.05), so it means that there is a significant effect between learning strategy to reading comprehension. With this result, then we also can continue to see the outcomes in the table correlation coefficient between learning strategy and reading comprehension bellow.

Table Correlation Coefficient between Learning strategy and Reading Comprehension

Correlations

		Learningstrategy	Reading.Comp
Learningstrategy	Pearson Correlation	1	.384**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	5441.000	1887.750
	Covariance	68.873	23.896
	N	80	80
Reading.Comp	Pearson Correlation	.384**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	Sum of Squares and Cross-products	1887.750	4436.488
	Covariance	23.896	56.158
	N	80	80

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Preliminary analyses had shown that there are no violations of the assumptions of normality and linearity. As is shown in the above table there was a significant, positive

correlation between the two variables, r= .384, n= 80, with the probability level .000, with high level of level of learning strategy associated with high reading comprehension. This indicates that the Ho is rejected and there is a significant relationship between students' learning strategy and their reading comprehension.

b. Hypothesis Testing for the Second Research Question

To answer this hypothesis, the researcher analyzed the data between predictor variable and constant variable by using simple regression analyses. Regression analysis used to make a quantitative prediction of the effect from one independent variable to a dependent variable. Furthermore, simple regression analysis used to estimate the range value of dependent variable influenced by independent variable.

The above question can be answered in the following model summary table below;

Table The Contribution of Language Learning Strategy to Reading Comprehension

Model Summary[b]

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.384[a]	.148	.137	6.96284	.148	13.509	1	78	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Learningstrategy

b. Dependent Variable: Reading.Comp

From the above table we can see the range score about to what extent language learning strategy may affect students' reading comprehension. There are two important information in the Model Summary table, they are *R* and *R2 (R Square)*. *R* represents the correlation between the observed value (Language Learning Strategy) and the predicted value of the dependent variable (Students' Achievement), while *R Square* is the square of *R* which tells us the proportion of variance in the dependent variable (Students' Achievement) influenced by the independent variable chosen for the model (Language Learning Strategy)). As can be seen, the *correlation coefficient* (*R*) between students' learning strategy and students' reading comprehension is 0.384. *R square* value is 0.148 which means 14.8% of students' reading comprehension is influenced by language learning strategy.

Then, to know the regression equation ($\check{Y} = \alpha + bX_1$) we can refer to outcomes in table 4.12 bellow. This also informs us the effect of a unit change in predictor variable has on the criterion variable. The further analysis can be seen on the following table:

Table Regression equation for the data (T-test) ($\check{Y} = \alpha + bX_1$)

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	18.213	16.655		1.094	.278
	Learningstrategy	.347	.094	.384	3.676	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Reading.Comp

Refers to the above table we know that the score of constant is 23.976 (symbolized with α in equation), while the coefficient of regression of language learning strategy (symbolized with b) is 0.347. So, this result means if the students' learning strategy (X_1) increases one unit, it will be followed by an increase in reading comprehension (Y) as much as 0.347. The final simple regression equation is $Y = 18.213 + 0.347X_1$.

In short, this result indicates that there is a contribution of language learning strategy to reading comprehension, or H_{0a} was rejected and H_{1a} hypothesis was accepted. The contribution of language learning strategy to reading comprehension is 34.7%, and the rest 63.3% is explained by the other factors in outside of the model.

c. Hypotesis Testing for the third Research Question

To answer the third research question of the study, the researcher presented table descriptive statistic bellow. The researcher calculated the overall findings of all participants included in this research, as well as their preferences and performance in each learning strategy by using descriptive statistical analysis on SPSS 16.

Table Mean Analysis of Language Learning Strategy

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Memory	80	30.00	64.00	4132.00	50.6500	3.52902
Cognitive	80	40.00	57.00	4014.00	51.1750	7.68292
Compensation	80	28.00	50.00	3320.00	41.5000	4.23966
Metacognitive	80	52.00	80.00	5460.00	68.2500	5.02525
Affective	80	26.00	50.00	3324.00	41.5500	4.38611
Social	80	30.00	66.00	3936.00	49.2000	8.60733
Valid N (listwise)	80					

The above table indicated that the most preferred learning strategy was metacognitive strategy (mean 68. 28), followed by cognitive strategy (mean 51.17) and memory took the third position (mean 50.650), social strategy took the forth position (mean 49.20), affective strategy (mean 41.55) and compensation strategy (mean 41.50) were in the lower preference.

Besides that in order to know which reading comprehension were mostly employed by the students in SMAN 1 Unaaha, the researcher presented the table descriptive statistic bellow:

Table Mean Analysis of Reading Comprehension

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Interpretive	80	14.00	24.00	19.3500	2.39778
Literal	80	12.00	26.00	19.9500	2.69974
Critical	80	4.00	10.00	8.2250	2.03747
Valid N (listwise)	80				

In the above table shown that most of the students in SMAN 1 Unaaha were employed literal comprehension (mean 19.95) and interpretive comprehension (19.35). The lower comprehension that less used by students were critical comprehension (mean 8.22).

d. Hypothesis Testing for the fourth Research Question

To answer the fourth hypothesis, the researcher used Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient to analyze the data. The following tables showed the correlation coefficient between of the six aspects of language learning strategy to reading comprehension. To begin with the relation between memory strategy to the levels of reading comprehension

Table Correlation Coeficient between Memory strategies to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Memory	Literal	Interpretive	Critical
Memory	Pearson Correlation	1	.101	-.069	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.371	.544	.803
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	.101	1	.128	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.371		.258	.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	-.069	.128	1	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.544	.258		.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.028	.020	.207	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.803	.857	.066	
	N	80	80	80	80

From above table we can see that not all of aspects of reading comprehension have a significant effect to reading comprehension. In the above table indicated that the value in the Pearson correlation between memory strategy to literal comprehension is 0.101, memory to interpretive is -.069 and memory to critical comprehension is 0.028. So this score shown that memory strategy had stronger correlation to literal comprehension than the other level of comprehension. The weaker correlation is the correlation between memory strategy to interpretive comprehension.

Table Correlation Coeficient between Cognitive strategy to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Cognitive	Interpretive	Literal	Critical
Cognitive	Pearson Correlation	1	.228*	.054	.173
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.042	.632	.124
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	.228*	1	.128	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042		.258	.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	.054	.128	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.632	.258		.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.173	.207	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.124	.066	.857	
	N	80	80	80	80

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

From the above table indicated that cognitive strategy had a significant correlation to the levels of reading comprehension. The value in the Pearson Correlation shown that the correlation between cognitive strategy to literal comprehension is 0.228, then cognitive strategy to interpretive comprehension is 0.054 and the last the correlation between cognitive strategy to levels of critical comprehension is 0.173. Therefore, the stronger correlation from this aspect was the correlation between cognitive strategy to literal comprehension.

Table Correlation Coeficient Compensation strategy to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Compensation	Interpretive	Literal	Critical
Compensation	Pearson Correlation	1	.082	.095	.037
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.469	.401	.747
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	.082	1	.128	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.469		.258	.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	.095	.128	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.401	.258		.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.037	.207	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.747	.066	.857	
	N	80	80	80	80

Refer to the above table we can see that not all of levels of reading comprehension have a significant effect to compensation strategy. In the above table indicated that the value in the Pearson correlation between compensation strategy to literal comprehension is 0.095, compensation to interpretive is 0.082 and compensation to critical comprehension is 0.037. So this score shown that compensation strategy had stronger correlation to literal comprehension than the other level of comprehension. The weaker correlation is the correlation between memory strategy to critical comprehension.

Table Correlation Coeficient between Metacognitive strategy to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Metacognitive	Interpretive	Literal	Critical
Metacognitive	Pearson Correlation	1	.253*	.229*	.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.023	.041	.996
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	.253*	1	.128	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023		.258	.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	.229*	.128	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	.258		.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.000	.207	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.996	.066	.857	
	N	80	80	80	80

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the above table indicated that cognitive strategy had a significant correlation to the levels of reading comprehension. The value in the Pearson Correlation shown that the correlation between metcognitive strategy to literal comprehension is 0.229, then cognitive strategy to interpretive comprehension is 0. 253 and the last the correlation between cognitive strategy to levels of critical comprehension is 0.000. Therefore, the stronger correlation from this aspect was the correlation between metacognitive strategy to interpretive comprehension and the weaker correlation is the correlation between metacognitive to critical comprehension.

Table Correlation Coeficient between Affective strategy to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Affective	Interpretive	Literal	Critical
Affective	Pearson Correlation	1	.102	.049	.006
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.369	.664	.959
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	.102	1	.128	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.369		.258	.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	.049	.128	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.664	.258		.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.006	.207	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.959	.066	.857	
	N	80	80	80	80

From above table we can see that not all of levels of reading comprehension have a significant effect to affective strategy. In the above table indicated that the value in the Pearson correlation between affective strategy to literal comprehension is 0.049, affective to interpretive is 0.102 and affective to critical comprehension is 0.006. So this score shown that affective strategy had stronger correlation to literal comprehension than the other level of comprehension. The weaker correlation is the correlation between memory strategy to critical comprehension.

Table Correlation Coeficient between Social strategy to level of reading comprehension

Correlations

		Social	Interpretive	Literal	Critical
Social	Pearson Correlation	1	.212	-.004	.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.058	.972	.392
	N	80	80	80	80
Interpretive	Pearson Correlation	.212	1	.128	.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.058		.258	.066
	N	80	80	80	80
Literal	Pearson Correlation	-.004	.128	1	.020
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.972	.258		.857
	N	80	80	80	80
Critical	Pearson Correlation	.097	.207	.020	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.392	.066	.857	
	N	80	80	80	80

Refer to the above table we can see that not all of levels of reading comprehension have a significant effect to social strategy. We can see the value in the Pearson correlation between social strategy to literal comprehension is 0.094, social to interpretive is 0.212 and social to critical comprehension is 0.097. So this score shown that social strategy had stronger correlation to interpretive comprehension than the other level of comprehension. The weaker correlation is the correlation between social strategy to literal comprehension.

2. Discussion

This study used descriptive statistic and inferential statistic. The purpose of this research was to identify students' perceptual learning styles, language learning strategies, and most importantly to investigate the relationship between language learning strategies

and reading comprehension among the English majors at Lakidende University. Two kinds of instruments were used for data collection. The quantitative data were collected through questionnaires of Language Learning Strategy and Reading Comprehension test. The total sample involved in the study was 80 students by using randomization. To obtain information about students' language learning strategy to reading comprehension, the division is done by distributing questionnaires to each student or respondent. To avoid errors or misunderstandings in the answer, the questionnaire inserted by Indonesian version.

The findings of this research indicated that there was a significant and positive contribution between language learning strategy to reading comprehension with R = 0.344. Meanwhile, the coefficient determination (R^2) is 0.118 which means 11.8% of reading comprehension was explained by language learning strategy, and the rest was explained by the other factors not include in the model. This finding drew the same lines as the theories from many expert stated. Keefe (1987) emphasizes learning styles as cognitive, affective, and psychological traits that serve as relatively stable indicators of how learners perceive, interact with, and respond to the learning environment. In other words, learning strategy is one tool in dealing with many situations and learning process. Hence, the effective and efficient the students process the input of what they learn, their achievement would increase. Because learning process not only a process to get the information from what the material they learn, but also they should aware how to process the input effectively.

Language learning strategy is one of the best variables that can improve students' reading comprehension. The distribution of level between students' language learning strategy and students' reading comprehension can be influenced not only from learning style, language learning strategy but also other factors because learning style and language learning strategy are not the only factor that can be correlated with English achievement. It proved form the result of language learning strategy at the value of determinant coefficient (R2) is 10.4%. There are some factors that can influence students' reading comprehension. In this study, the researcher explained two factors only.

In order to answer the second research question, the data obtained from language learning strategy questionnaire mentioned above were analyzed. Based on the cut off points stated in the scoring sheet of the questionnaire, it was found that it seemed that only the mean scores of descriptive statistics was used to identify the general tendency of strategy preferences of the participants in this study. The results of the descriptive statistics conducted to identify the general tendency of strategy preferences of the participants indicated that the most preferred strategy category of all, with a mean score of 68. 25 was

the one related to Metacognitive strategies. Cognitive strategies ranked the second with an average of 51.17 The third place in the ranking order was taken by the memory strategies with a mean score 50.65. The fourth place in the ranking order was taken by the social strategies with a mean score49.20. The fifth rank was taken by the affective strategies with a mean score 41.55. Finally, the least preferred strategies were the compensation strategy with the mean score was 41.50.

The difference of correlation the six aspects of language learning strategy with reading comprehension can be caused by some factor. To begin with memory strategy, it can be seen that the correlation between memory to literal comprehension is about, *r=0.101*, inference to interpretive comprehension is *r*=-0.069, while memory to critical comprehension is 0.028 and the total respondent is *n= 90*, then the correlation between cognitive to literal comprehension is *r= 0.228,* cognitive to interpretive comprehension is 0.054 and cognitive to critical comprehension is 0.173. While, the correlation between compensation strategy to literal comprehension is *r=0. 095,* compensation to interpretive comprehension is 0.082, compensation to critical comprehension is 0. 037. Furthermore, the correlation between metacognitive to literal comprehension is *r= 0. 229,* metaconitive to interpretive comprehension is 0.253, to critical comprehension is 0. 0 and then the correlation between affective literal comprehension is 0.049, affective to interpretive comprehension is 0.102; the correlation between affective to critical comprehension is 0.006 and the last is the correlation between social strategy to literal comprehension is 0.212; social to interpretive comprehension is 0. 004, and to interpretive comprehension is 0.097.

The are some factor that can influence students' reading comprehension. **First factor** is students' reading attitude. Attitudes strongly influence motivation and affect achievement in reading. Students who see themselves as readers have positive attitudes toward reading. They are motivated to read and they read for a variety of purposes. These students also set goals for their reading and are engaged with texts. In short, they are more likely to read. Students with poor attitudes toward reading will usually read only when they have to and will often "fake it" during independent reading. Due to their lack of reading experience, they will likely not be able to comprehend complex texts beyond a literal level.

Second factor is Efective Comprehension strategies. Research indicates that good readers of all ages engage in conscious, active comprehension strategies before, during, and after reading (Pressley & Wharton-McDonald, 1997). Before reading, for instance, they may define their goals for reading and consider what they already know about a topic and the structure of a text. During reading, they typically activate relevant prior knowledge, make

connections among important ideas, construct and test hypotheses, paraphrase key points, and try to resolve any comprehension difficulties that arise. As they read, they may make notes in the margins or underline portions of a passage. After reading, they may reread or skim the passage, summarize it, or take notes. The contribution of the other factors toward students' reading comprehension cannot be presented statistically here. This study cannot determine which factor is more dominant than the others. In addition, the result of this study only works at students from the two classes of SMAN 1 Unaaha which involve in the study. Due to this study only used two classes as the population and did not involve large population to generalize the result. If the similar research is conducted using sampling technique from larger population, the findings of the research might be different.

References

Chang, L. U. (2007). The Cross-Cultural Background Knowledge in the EFL Reading Comprehension. *Chia-Nan Annual Bulletin*(33), 383-393

D.H. Brown, *Strategies for Success: A Practical Guide to Learning English*, (2002), New York: Addison Wesley, Longman, Inc.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (2003). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *The Modern Language Journal*(74), 311-327.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. (1995). Cognition plus: correlates of language learning success. *The Modern Language Journal*(79), 67-89.

Ehrman and Oxford (2003) conducted a study about the relationship between gender and strategy used by applying a mixed method design.

Fahimeh Marefat (2009) conducted a study related to the relationship between out-of-class language learning strategy and reading comprehension ability.

Gove., M. (2007). Clarifying teachers' beliefs about reading. *The Reading Teacher*(37), 261–267.

Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2002). *Teaching and researching reading*. britain: A Pearson Education Company.

Grease, A. F. (2007). *Model comprehension strategy lesson plan for I could not keep silent: The life of Rachel Carson*.

Hamed, & Reza. (2012). Critical Thinking: A Reading Strategy in Developing English.

Hosseini, E., Khodaei, F. B., Sarfallah, S., & Dolatabadi, H. R. (2012). Exploring the relationship between Critical Thinking, Reading Comprehension and Reading Skill in English University students. *World Applied Sciences Journal, 17*(10), 1356-1364.

Hossein Tavakoli (2014) investigated the Effectiveness of metacognitive strategy awareness in reading comprehension

Küpper, & chamot. (2005). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly* (19 (3)), 557-584.

Kricjie, & Morgan. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *30*, 607-610.

McNeil, J. D. (2002). *Reading Comprehension: New Directions for Classroom Practice, third ed*: Harper Collins Publishers.

N. Fewel, Language learning strategies and English language proficiency: An investigation of Japanese EFL University students, *TESOL Journal*, 2(2010), 159-174.

Nakayanti, A. R. (2018). Pelaksanaan Pendidikan Budi Pekerti Di SD Negeri 8 Sumerta Kecamatan Denpasar Timur. *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *1*(1), 16-25.

Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (2003). Research on language learning strategies: methods, findings, and instructional issues. *The Modern Language Journal*(73 (4)), 404-419.

Oxford, R., & Crookall, D. (2009). Learning strategies: You can take it with you:Variables afecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *The Modern Language Journal* (73 (3)), 291-300.

Panel, N. R. (2000). *teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.

Pang, S, E., Muaka, A., Bernhardt, E. B., & Kamil, M. L. (2003). *Teaching reading. Geneva: The International Academy of Education.*

Sarah, E. (2009). Knowledge for teaching reading comprehension mapping the terrain. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Michigan: U.S.A.

Sudarsana, I. K. (2018). Optimalisasi Penggunaan Teknologi Dalam Implementasi Kurikulum Di Sekolah (Persepektif Teori Konstruktivisme). *Cetta: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *1*(1), 8-15.

T. Hedge, *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*, (2008), Oxford University Press