Jurnal TarbiyahMu
ISSN 2798-429X
Volume 3 Nomor 2
Juli 2023

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RECIPROCAL STRATEGY COMPARED WITH COGNITIVE STRATEGY TO TEACH READING COMPREHENSION OF STUDENTS WITH HIGH AND LOW MOTIVATION MTsQ DAARUL ISTIQOMAH BANJAR ACADEMIC YEAR 2021/2022

Oleh
Nana Supriatna[1], Aneu Sri Gusmayanti[2]
[1]STIT Muhammadiyah Banjar, MAS Darul Ulum Kota Banjar
alularajwamauludiah2016@gmail.com

This thesis is an experimental research with factorial design which aims at findings out the effectiveness of reciprocal strategies and cognitive strategies in teaching reading to the high motivated students and low motivated students of Mts Daarul Istiqomah Banjar.

The sample of the study were the class eight graders students of Mts Daarul Istiqomah Banjar academic year 2020/2021 consisting of 33 students. There are five classes at the eighth graders, each of classes consist of approximately 33 students. In this research, the writer took 2 classes namely VIII men and VIII women that divided into two classes as experimental and control group. After that, the researcher classified the students based on their motivation in reading. By using questionnaire, the researcher selected 8 students for high motivated and 8 students for low motivated. Based on the classifications, there are 16 students of experimental class and 16 students for control class. Therefore, the numbers of sample is 32 students. Four reading passages is selected, each passage followed by 10 multiple-choice reading comprehension questions, with the total number of 40 questions in a given test. The test lasted for around 60 minutes. In addition, greater care is needed in choosing passages so that the passage type matches the reading strategies taken. Students were asked to take the same comprehension test in the beginning (pre-test) and at the end (post-test). All the test papers were scored by the researcher, whereby subjects received one point if they chose the correct answer. To know the quality of the test, the writer held a test to measure validity and reliability of the test used in this research.

The result of the study revealed that in experimental group shows that, there was significant between the score pretest and posttest of high motivated students. It can be seen, there was increasing of score 14.375 point from pretest to posttest. Secondly, the reading test of low motivated students by using reciprocal strategy is 15.625 point. It means that, there was a significant increasing of score from pretest to post test. The result of test in control class showed that, there was significant the score pretest and posttest of high motivated taught by cognitive strategy. It can be seen, there was increasing of score 14.375 point from pretest to post test. And then, the reading test of low motivated students is 11.250 point. It means that, there was a significant increasing of score from pretest to posttest. And then, based on the hypothetical test, it was obtained Sig. 0.421 > 0,05. It can be concludes that Ho is accepted, and Ha is rejected. It means that, there was no significant students achievement in score between the use of reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy. The writer can explain that, the strategy in reading was not significant influencing students achievement in reading, but the fact show that, motivation has significant influence to the students reading achievement (see the table anova test). In this case, there were two kinds of motivation investigated namely high and low motivated students. Based on SPSS output, it was obtained F= 49,549 and value of Sig. 0,000 < 0,05. It means that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. Therefore, there was a significant of students achievement between high and low motivated students.

Referring to the result of the study, it is recommended that teachers should active students' awareness of using reciprocal strategies by Pre-test and Post – test in teaching reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy as the reading strategies to increase students' reading motivation.

Keywords: *Teaching reading strategies, reciprocal strategies, cognitive strategies, high motivated students, low motivated students*

INTRODUCTION

As the introduction, this part introduces any terms relate to the study that is going to conduct. This is purposed to construct both readers and the researcher's opinion about the research.

Reading is considered as one of the most important abilities in the educational development today, mastery of reading is unavoidable in learning all the school subjects. In English as foreign language context the students have to read a great number of English reading materials during their learning process, such as passage, text, letter, article, etc. Reading is the activity which involves two aspects: pronouncing the words and comprehending the content of the text However, even though the different aspects exist in reading, the main point is getting the information from the readable source by comprehending the content. By having comprehension, someone can be claimed that he has done the process of reading. By comprehension, too, people will get information stated in the text because most of the valuable information is stated implicitly. That is why the process of reading cannot be separated from comprehension because reading without comprehension is useless. Reading English as foreign language is one of the language skills that the students should master. It is one of learning ways for students to enrich their ability and knowledge.

The reason why the writer chooses this topic is because now English teachers have many problems to improve the students' ability in reading. It is based on the researcher's experience as an English teacher, many EFL students of *Junior High School Daarul istiqomah Banjar* may approach reading passively, relying on the use of a bilingual dictionary, thereby direct sentence – by – sentence translation.

Referring to those phenomena, this research attempts to investigate the application of reciprocal strategy proposed by Palinscar & Brown, 1986 as one of many ready strategies. This strategy intends to help students to improve their understanding of the texts. Reciprocal strategy provides personalized attentions to students who are drifting along, dreaming, or becoming disinterested in reading. Not only do they interact with the teacher but also they will get to turn a classroom tradition around and interrogate the teacher for change. The problems intends in the study of "The effectiveness of reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy on high and low motivated students to teaching reading comprehension: An Experimental Study of *a Junior High School MTs Daarul Istiqomah Banjar"* then the research questions are formulated as shown below:

1. How effective is reciprocal strategy compared to cognitive strategy to teach reading to high motivated students?
2. How effective is reciprocal strategy compared to cognitive strategy to teach reading to low motivated students?
3. How effective is teaching reading through Pre – test to high motivated students?
4. How effective is teaching reading through Pre – test to low motivated students?
5. How significant is the difference between high motivated students reading competence and low motivated students reading competence taught by using reciprocal strategies compared to cognitive strategies?
6. What is the interaction between reciprocal strategies and cognitive strategies for the high motivated students reading competence and low motivated students reading competence taught by using reciprocal strategies and cognitive strategies?

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter discusses some related theoretical aspects such as related literature. It consists of six sections, i.e. the definition of reciprocal strategy, cognitive strategy, teaching reading, the comparison of Reciprocal Strategy and cognitive strategy, motivation and theoretical framework.

Reading is an interactive process between the reader and the text, to have a comprehension (Grabe, 2002). The reader uses knowledge, skills, and strategies to determine what those meanings are. While Comprehension is when the reader constructs meaning by combining the ideas from the text with his own background knowledge. The reader must hold the meanings of the

words he has recognized in his brain—in the space known as working memory—until he can think about and understand their collective meaning (Baker, 1984:15). Comprehension requires the reader to combine the meanings of a number of words in his working memory until he can think about their collective meaning.

Reading is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately (Grabe and Stoller, 2002: 9). While, Bond (1979: 2) states that "reading is the recognition of printed or written symbols which serve as stimuli to the recall of meaning built up through the readers past experience". Harrys and Edward (1975: 21) says that "reading is the meaningful interpretation of written or printed verbal symbol". Hafner and Jolly in Burns, et al. (1984: 27) state that "reading is a process of looking at written language symbols, converting them into overt and covert speech symbols, and then manipulating them so that both overt (direct) and covert (implied) ideas intended by the author may be understood". In addition, Mc Whother (2005: 3) states that "reading is thinking and it is an active process of identifying important ideas and comparing and evaluating and applying them".

Davis (1968 in Alexander 1988) identifies eight comprehension skills through a factorial analysis procedure (factor analysis is a statistical procedure that attempts to identify the unique component elements of a competency) : (1) recalling word meaning: (2) drawing inference about the meaning of a word from context; (3) finding answer to question answered explicitly or merely in paraphrase of content ; (4) weaving together ideas in the content; (5) drawing inference from the content; (6) recognizing the writer's purpose, attitude, tone, and mood; (7) identifying a writer's technique; (8) following the structure of a passage. The aspects of comprehension mentioned above involve the ability to understand literal meaning, inferential meaning, to recognize the writer's purpose and to administer the prior knowledge in relation to the text. Those aspects reveal two main sources of information in comprehending a text, namely the information provided by a text and information acquired from their own personal experience.

From the definitions above, it can be concluded that reading is an interactive process in interpreting printed or written symbols that goes on between the reader and the text, resulting in comprehension.

METHODOLOGY

This part discuses about the some important elements related to research methodology is that the design of the study, subject of the study, data, technique of obtaining data, setting, scope of the study, unit of analysis, steps of data analysis, outline of the thesis report.

Here is the schematic representation for the experimental on the true design:

1. The effectiveness of reciprocal strategy compared with cognitive strategy to teach reading comprehension to the high and low motivated students: an experimental study of *Junior High School Mts Daarul Istiqomah Banjar.*

Treatment Group
G1 (random) T1 X T2

Control Group
G2 (Random) T1 T2

Explanation:
G1: Random
G2: Random
T1: Pre – Test
T2: Post test

X: Treatment using reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy in teaching reading comprehension to the high and low motivated students. According to (Farhady, 2001:98) the research design has the characteristics. The characteristics are: 1). It has two groups of subject namely experimental group and control group. 2). the subjects are taken randomly 3). Pretest is administered to capture to initial differences between the groups 4). The experimental group is manipulated with particular treatment. In this study, the experimental taught using Reciprocal strategy, while the control group is taught by cognitive strategy. 5). both groups are measured twice.

Techniques / Motivation	Reciprocal Strategy (X1)	Cognitive Strategy (X2)	
High motivated (Y1)	(X1,Y1)	(X2,Y1)	COMPARISON
Low motivated			

(Y2)	(X1,Y2)	(X2, Y2)	
	(Y1,Y2,X1,X2)	(X1,X2,Y1,Y2)	INTERACTION

Before collecting any data, it is important that researchers clearly define the population, including a description of the members. The designed experiment should designate the population for which the problem will be examined. The population of this research will be taken from *Junior High School Mts Daarul Istiqomah Banjar.*

The technique of sampling used random sampling; the purpose of random assignment is to assure that students in the treatment (experimental) group are as similar as possible to those in the control group so that if the results differ, these differences can be attributed to the different treatments rather than to diffrences between two group of students. There are five classes in this scchool namely VIII A, B,C,D,E, In this case, the researcher will take two of classes randomly. The two classes will be divided into experiment and control class.

The instrument is test in order to get the validity and the reliability of the Reading Comprehension test. The writer tried out the instrument to the sample that consists of 32 students who has similar characteristic in the same level.

In collecting the data, the researcher has three kinds of instruments namely: (1) material for conducting a treatment which is in the form of the lesson plan to teach reading; (2) pre-test and posttest item, and (3) questionnaires.

The technique of analyzing data used in this research were pre – test, post – test and questionnaire, they tried out to subject from the same population but did not include in the study samples, to make sure the validity and reliability of the instrument and the clarity of the instructions. Borg and Gall (1979: 547) claimed that this research has several characteristics, among others are: 1). having two subjects, they are the control and experimental groups. 2). Using experimental treatment for the experimental group and using another technique for control group. 3). Measuring and comparing the dependent variable of the experimental and control group in order to determine the effect of the experimental treatment upon the dependent variable. 4). Measuring the test twice for both groups, they are pre-test and post-test.

The formula is as follows.

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N(\sum XY) - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Where,

r_{xy} = the validity of item test

N = the number of the learners

X = number of learners who answered right

Y = the learners' scores

(Arikunto: 2002)

The writer will decide to use Kuder – Richardson formula 21 in measuring the reability of the test. The formula is mentioned as follows.

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{k}{k-1}\right)(1 - \frac{M(k-M)}{kV_{\square}})$$

Where,

r = reliability of the test

k = the number of the item test

M = the mean of the scores

Vt = the total variants

The quantitative data from pre and post test score is calculated using t-test. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 368-369), t-test is the most common statistic procedure for determining the level of significance when the two mean pretest and posttest mean are compared. They add that t-test also used to determine the probability of rejecting null hypothesis. Since the value of t observed is higher than t critic, the null hypothesis is safely rejected and the alternative hypothesis is accepted (Hatch and Farhady, 1981: 118). According to McMillan and Schumacher (2001: 620), the formula of *t*-test is mentioned as follows.

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N\,(N-1)}}}$$

Where

$$\bar{D} = \frac{\sum D}{N}$$

Notes:

$\bar{D}$ = the mean difference for all pairs of scores.

$\sum D^2$ = the sum of the squares of the differences.

$(\sum D)^2$ = the square of the sum of the differences.

N = the number pairs of score.

N-1 = the degrees of freedom.

Relevant to the research questions and the purpose of the research above, this research employs a quantitative research design in which factorial design groups pretest and posttest design is

chosen. In this design, the experimental group A and the control group B are selected with random assignment. Both groups take a pretest and a posttest and only experimental group received the treatment (Creswell: 1994:54). More over this research, there are two dependent variables and two independent variables. The two dependent variables are high motivated students and low motivated students and two independent variables are reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy. The data is analyzed by simple factorial. This design is possible to assess the effect or interaction (Tuchman, 1978:135). The minimum design is called a two by two (2 x 2) factorial design or ANOVA.

1. The total sum of sequences

$$\sum x_t^2 = \sum X_t^2 - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N}$$

2. The sum of sequences between group

$$\sum x_b^2 = \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{n_1} + \frac{(\sum X_2)^2}{n_2} + \frac{(\sum X_3)^2}{n_3} + \frac{(\sum X_4)^2}{n_4} - \frac{(\sum X_t)^2}{N}$$

3. The sum of sequences within group

$$\sum x_w^2 = \sum x_1^2 - \sum x_b^2$$

4. The sum between columns and sequences

$$\sum x_{bc}^2 = \frac{(\sum X_{c1})^2}{n_{c1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{c2})^2}{n_{c2}} - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N}$$

5. The sum between row and sequences

$$\sum x_{br}^2 = \frac{(\sum X_{r1})^2}{n_{r1}} + \frac{(\sum X_{r2})^2}{n_{r2}} - \frac{(\sum X_1)^2}{N}$$

6. The sum of square interaction

$$\sum x_{\text{int}} = \sum x_b^2 - \left(\sum x_{bc}^2 + \sum x_{br}^2\right)$$

They are two simple effects and two main effects.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter describes the research findings and the interpretation of the data analysed. The data are based on the result of the study at *Mtsq Daarul Istiqomah Banjar* including the result of test instrument analysis, pre-test data analysis, and post test data analysis. Before the reseracher tested the objects by using pre test and post test, he had classified experimental and control group by using questionnaire for motivation. It has purposed to know whether the students belong to high and low motivated students. There are five classes at the eighth graders, each of classes consist of approximately 33 students. In this research, the writer took 2 classes namely VIII C and VIII D that divided into two classes as experimental and control group. After that, the researcher classified the students based on their motivation in reading. By using questionnaire, the researcher selected 8 students for high motivated and 8 students for low motivated. Based on the classficition, there are 16 students of experimental class and 16 students for control class. Therefore, the numbers of sample is 32 students.

Further, the data were collected in a systematic way to find out the most effective technique between the use of reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy and to find out whether or not the use of reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy in teaching reading skills to the students both in category of motivation, those are high and low motivation.

The researcher has done the research in *MtsQ Daarul Istiqomah Banjar*. Based on the observations, the researcher has some finding as follow:

To test the instrument there are five steps that have been done by the researcher. They are the validity of the instrument, the reliability of the instrument, the practicality of the instrument, the difficulty level and the discrimination level. Here are the explanations:

The first step to test the instrument was by conducting validity of the test items. The research instrument was tried out to other group from the same level. The try out result was scored to test the validity of the instrument using SPSS for windows version 21.0

The calculation shows that the p value of the instrument item validity ranged from .000 to .844. The test item is considered to be valid if the *p* value is less than .05 and the test item is considered to be invalid if the p value is more than .05. Based on that calculation, there were five test items which were considered to be invalid and needed to be removed: questions no. 13 (p=.318), 17(p=318) 32 (p=.166), 33 (p=.282), 39 (p=109)

After removing the invalid test items, the writer recalculated the data using SPSS for windows version 21.0. From the second calculation, the *p* value of item validity ranged from .000 to .048. Since the *p* value of item validity was less than .05, these test items were considered to be valid and it can be used as the instrument for this study.

The Validity of the Test Items

Item		r table	Validity	

	Pearson Correlation	(N-2)	Criterion	Validity Classification
1	0.797	0.361	Valid	Moderate
2	0.481	0.361	Valid	Moderate
3	0.521	0.361	Valid	Moderate
4	0.703	0.361	Valid	High
5	0.808	0.361	Valid	High
6	0.844	0.361	Valid	High
7	0.725	0.361	Valid	Moderate
8	0.797	0.361	Valid	Moderate
9	0.468	0.361	Valid	Moderate
10	0.561	0.361	Valid	Moderate
11	0.725	0.361	Valid	Moderate
12	0.444	0.361	Valid	Moderate
13	0.318	0.361	Invalid	Low
14	0.725	0.361	Valid	Moderate
15	0.792	0.361	Valid	Moderate
16	0.656	0.361	Valid	Moderate
17	0.307	0.361	Invalid	Moderate
18	0.417	0.361	Valid	Moderate
19	0.606	0.361	Valid	Moderate
20	0.489	0.361	Valid	Moderate
21	0.404	0.361	Valid	Moderate
22	0.670	0.361	Valid	Moderate
23	0.640	0.361	Valid	Moderate
24	0.566	0.361	Valid	Moderate
25	0.474	0.361	Valid	Moderate
26	0.688	0.361	Valid	Moderate
27	0.457	0.361	Valid	Moderate
28	0.486	0.361	Valid	Moderate
29	0.696	0.361	Valid	Moderate
30	0.449	0.361	Valid	Moderate
31	0.445	0.361	Valid	Moderate
32	0.166	0.361	Invalid	Low
33	0.282	0.361	Invalid	Low
34	0.531	0.361	Valid	Moderate
35	0.786	0.361	Valid	Moderate
36	0.447	0.361	Valid	Moderate
37	0.566	0.361	Valid	Moderate
38	0.493	0.361	Valid	Moderate
39	0.109	0.361	Invalid	Low
40	0.580	0.361	Valid	Moderate

After calculating the validity of the instrument, the reliability of the instrument was calculated. As attempt to test the reliability of the instrument, the split half formula available in SPSS for windows version 21.0 was used.

Based on the calculation using split half formula, the result of the reliability test of the instrument is .861. According to Arikunto (2003), if the result of reliability is higher than .70 the instrument is reliable to be applied in scientific research.

The Reliability of the Test Items

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	30	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	30	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Part 1	Value	.924
		N of Items	20[a]
	Part 2	Value	.872
		N of Items	20[b]
	Total N of Items		40
Correlation Between Forms			.769
Spearman-Brown Coefficient	Equal Length		.869
	Unequal Length		.869
Guttman Split-Half Coefficient			.861

a. The items are: P1, P2, P3, P4, P5, P6, P7, P8, P9, P10, P11, P12, P13, P14, P15, P16, P17, P18, P19, P20.

b. The items are: P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30, P31, P32, P33, P34, P35, P36, P37, P38, P39, P40.

The instrument of the study is not only supposed to be valid and reliable but it also needs to be practical. Hatch and Farhady (1981, 254) mentions some practical considerations as follows: the test needs to be easily administered, it needs to be as inexpensive as possible, it needs to be easily scored, and the score needs to be easily interpreted. Considering requirements of the instrument practicality proposed by Hatch and Farhady (1981) above, it is assumed that the instrument of this study is practical.

The difficulty level was calculated using SPSS for windows version 21.0 in reliability command. Arikunto (2003) mentions the criteria which are used to determine the difficulty level of the test below.

a. 0.00 – 0.30 (easy)
b. 0.30 – 0.70 (moderate)
c. 0.70 – 1.00 (difficult)

Based on the calculation, the difficulty level of the test varies from 0.60 to 0.87 which indicates that the difficulty level of the test is at moderate level. In the other words, the test is able to be used for the students.

The Difficulty Level of the Test

Item Statistics			
	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
P1	.73	.450	30
P2	.67	.479	30
P3	.63	.490	30
P4	.70	.466	30
P5	.70	.466	30

P6	.73	.450	30
P7	.80	.407	30
P8	.73	.450	30
P9	.77	.430	30
P10	.67	.479	30
P11	.80	.407	30
P12	.60	.498	30
P13	.83	.379	30
P14	.80	.407	30
P15	.77	.430	30
P16	.63	.490	30
P17	.77	.430	30
P18	.80	.407	30
P19	.70	.466	30
P20	.67	.479	30
P21	.77	.430	30
P22	.67	.479	30
P23	.60	.498	30
P24	.83	.379	30
P25	.67	.479	30
P26	.70	.466	30
P27	.73	.450	30
P28	.80	.407	30
P29	.70	.466	30
P30	.73	.450	30
P31	.67	.479	30
P32	.87	.346	30
P33	.77	.430	30
P34	.70	.466	30
P35	.60	.498	30
P36	.83	.379	30
P37	.83	.379	30
P38	.63	.490	30
P39	.73	.450	30
P40	.80	.407	30

The discrimination level of the test was calculated after calculating the difficulty level of the test. As well as the difficulty level, the discrimination level was also calculated using SPSS for windows version 21.0 in reliability command.

According to Arikunto (2003), if the discrimination level (D) = 0.00-0.20 (poor level), D = 0.20 – 0.40 (satisfactory level), D = 0.40 – 0.70 (good level), D = 0.70 – 1.00 (excellent level). Based on the calculation, it is found that the discrimination level of the test ranges from 0.063 to 0.830 which indicates that the test was in good level and excellent level.

The Discrimination of the Test

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cornbrash's Alpha if Item Deleted
P1	28.40	91.352	.780	.	.939
P2	28.47	93.913	.443	.	.942
P3	28.50	93.431	.484	.	.941
P4	28.43	91.978	.678	.	.940
P5	28.43	91.013	.790	.	.939
P6	28.40	90.938	.830	.	.939
P7	28.33	92.575	.705	.	.940
P8	28.40	91.352	.780	.	.939
P9	28.37	94.447	.434	.	.942
P10	28.47	93.154	.527	.	.941
P11	28.33	92.575	.705	.	.940
P12	28.53	94.120	.402	.	.942
P13	28.30	96.010	.283	.	.943
P14	28.33	92.575	.705	.	.940
P15	28.37	91.689	.775	.	.939
P16	28.50	92.121	.627	.	.940
P17	28.37	95.826	.267	.	.943
P18	28.33	95.057	.383	.	.942
P19	28.43	92.875	.575	.	.941
P20	28.47	93.844	.450	.	.942
P21	28.37	94.999	.367	.	.942
P22	28.47	92.120	.642	.	.940
P23	28.53	92.189	.608	.	.940
P24	28.30	94.148	.539	.	.941
P25	28.47	93.982	.435	.	.942
P26	28.43	92.116	.662	.	.940
P27	28.40	94.386	.420	.	.942
P28	28.33	94.506	.453	.	.942
P29	28.43	92.047	.670	.	.940
P30	28.40	94.455	.412	.	.942
P31	28.47	94.257	.405	.	.942
P32	28.27	97.237	.132	.	.943
P33	28.37	96.033	.242	.	.943
P34	28.43	93.564	.496	.	.941
P35	28.53	90.740	.766	.	.939
P36	28.30	95.045	.415	.	.942
P37	28.30	94.148	.539	.	.941
P38	28.50	93.707	.454	.	.942
P39	28.40	97.490	.064	.	.944
P40	28.33	93.747	.551	.	.941

Data Analysis

After the reseracher classified them by using motivation test, the next step was doing pre test and gives the treatments for each group, after that the researcher held the post test. Below it can be seen the results of pre test and post test which had been done by the reseacher.

Pre Test Score for Experimental Group

No	*High motivated students*	*Score*	*Low motivated students*	*Score*
1	AA	70	AR	50
2	CS	75	AS	55
3	DM	75	DW	45
4	DT	65	FI	40
5	FT	60	MC	50
6	KA	65	RD	60
7	VE	70	SN	65
8	PA	75	SW	55

The table shows the result of pretest for experimental group. It has been done for both motivation students which are high and low motivated

students. The technique which is used for this group is by reciprocal strategy.

Pre Test Score for Control Group

No	*High motivated students*	*Score*	*Low motivated students*	*Score*
1	AT	70	AI	60
2	AS	75	DT	55
3	DL	65	FT	50
4	HM	80	MI	55
5	IM	65	MK	45
6	PL	70	PI	50
7	SM	65	TM	55
8	SD	75	ZR	60

The table shows the result of pretest for control group. It has been done for both motivation students which are high and low motivated students. The technique which is used for this group is by cognitive strategy.

The tables above shows the results of pre test in experimental and control Group. The next step is giving treatments for experimental group that is by applying the technique of story map in teaching reading skills. And the resarcher did not give treatments for control group, because the thesis is only focus on the use of story as a technique of teaching reading skills. The researcher eagers to know whether the use of story map is an effective technique to make them memorize well the basic component of story such as in narrative texts. Below are the results of Post test after the reseacher had given the some treatments for experimental group.

Post Test Score for Experimental Group

No	*High motivated students*	*Score*	*Low motivated students*	*Score*
1	AA	80	AR	60
2	CS	100	AS	65
3	DM	90	DW	70
4	DT	75	FI	60
5	FT	80	MC	70
6	KA	75	RD	75
7	VE	80	SN	70
8	PA	90	SW	75

Table shows the result of posttest for experimental group. It has been done for both motivation students, which are high and low motivated students. The technique that is used for this group is by applying reciprocal strategy.

Post Test Score for Control Group

No	*High motivated students*	*Score*	*Low motivated students*	*Score*
1	AT	80	AI	70
2	AS	85	DT	65
3	DL	80	FT	55
4	HM	100	MI	60
5	IM	80	MK	60
6	PL	90	PI	65
7	SM	80	TM	70
8	SD	85	ZR	75

The normality of distribution was calculated to know whether the sample belongs to the normal distributed population. According to Priyatno (2009), the criterion to determine normality distribution is as follows: if the level of significance is higher than 0.05 indicates that the sample belongs to the normal distributed population and the contrary if the level of significance is smaller than 0.05 indicates that the sample does not belong to the normal distributed population).

Hypothesis form of data normalization

Ho : Normalization of data distribution

Ha : Data which is not normal distribution

The result of the normality distribution could be seen in the following table.

Pre Test Data Analysis

No	*Pre Test*			
	Reciprocal strategy High motivated students	*Reciprocal strategy Low motivated students*	*Cognitive Strategy High motivated students*	*Cognitive strategy low motivated students*
1	70	50	70	60
2	75	55	75	55
3	75	45	65	50
4	65	40	80	55
5	60	50	65	45
6	65	60	70	50
7	70	65	65	55
8	75	55	75	60

The table 4.9 shows the data that have been tested on pretest for experimental and control group. It is for high and low motivated students.

Tests of Normality Pre Test Score in Experimental and Control Group

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test				
	Pre-test Experiment High Motivated	Pre-test Experiment Low Motivated	Pre-test Control High Motivated	Pre-test Control Low Motivated
N	8	8	8	8

Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	69.38	52.50	70.63	53.75
	Std. Deviation	5.630	8.018	5.630	5.175
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.216	.128	.216	.220
	Positive	.159	.128	.216	.155
	Negative	-.216	-.128	-.159	-.220
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.611	.361	.611	.623
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.849	.999	.849	.832
a. Test distribution is Normal.					
b. Calculated from data.					

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means that the data distribution is not normal.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means that the data distribution is normal.

Based on the calculation of SPSS above, it is known that the value Asym.sig. (2-tailed) all the data more than 0.05 (0.509, 0.705, 0.651 and 0.992 > 0.05). It can be concluded that the distribution of data is normal.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

Pre-test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.651	3	28	.589

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means that the data distribution is not homogen.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means that the data distribution is homogen.

Based on the SPSS output above, it is got the value of Levene Statistic 0,651 and sig.0.589, the value sig.a > 0.589 (0.589 > 0.05). it can be concluded that the data distribution is homogen.

Post Test Score for Experimental and Control Group

No	*Post Test*			
	Reciprocal strategy High motivated students	***Reciprocal strategy Low motivated students***	***Cognitive strategy High Motivated***	***Cognitive strategy Low Motivated***
1	80	60	80	70
2	100	65	85	65
3	90	70	80	55
4	75	60	100	60
5	80	70	80	60
6	75	75	90	65
7	80	70	80	70
8	90	75	85	75

Table above shows the result of posttest for both groups, they are experimental and control. They have been given reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy as the treatment.

Tests of Normality of Post Test in Experimental and Control Group

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
		Post-test Experiment High Motivated	Post-test Experiment Low Motivated	Post-test Control High Motivated	Post-test Control Low Motivated
N		8	8	8	8
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	83.75	68.13	85.00	65.00
	Std. Deviation	8.763	5.939	7.071	6.547
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.291	.249	.260	.152
	Positive	.291	.164	.260	.152
	Negative	-.159	-.249	-.240	-.152
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.822	.704	.736	.431
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.509	.705	.651	.992
a. Test distribution is Normal.					
b. Calculated from data.					

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means that the data distribution is not normal.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means that the data distribution is normal.

Based on the calculation of SPSS above, it is known that the value Asym.sig. (2-tailed) all the data more than 0.05 (0.509, 0.705, 0.651 and 0.992 > 0.05). It can be concluded that the distribution of data is normal.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances			
Post-test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
.651	3	28	.589

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means that the data distribution is not homogen.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means that the data distribution is homogen.

Based on the SPSS output above, it is got the value of Levene Statistic 0,651 and sig.0.589, the value sig.a > 0.589 (0.589 > 0.05). it can be concluded that the data distribution is homogen.

In the chapter I, the researcher has stated the hypothesis of this research. There are six statistical hypthesis determined. In this part, the researcher would like to show to answer of hypothesis, it is based on the statistical calculation by using SPSS version 21.0.

1) The answer of hypothesis number 1

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post-test Experiment High Motivated	83.75	8	8.763	3.098
	Pre-test Experiment High Motivated	69.38	8	5.630	1.990

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Post-test Experiment High Motivated & Pre-test Experiment High Motivated	8	.778	.023

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Experimentvated - Pre-riment High Motivated	14.375	5.630	1.990	9.668	19.082	7.222	7	.000

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means there is a significant differences.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means there is no significant differences.

Hypothesis:

Ho = there is no significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on experimental class.

Ha = there is significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on experimental class.

Based on SPSS output above, it is obtained Sig,0.000< 0.05, it can be concludes that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It means that, there is a significant between students pretest and posttest with high motivated students on experimental class, the range of pretest to posttest score is 14.375 point.

2) The answer of hypothesis number 2

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post-test Experiment Low Motivated	68.13	8	5.939	2.100
	Pre-test Experiment Low Motivated	52.50	8	8.018	2.835

Paired Samples Correlations				
		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Post-test Experiment Low Motivated & Pre-test Experiment Low Motivated	8	.563	.147

Paired Samples Test									
		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Post-test Experiment Low Motivated - Pre-test Experiment Low Motivated	15.625	6.781	2.397	9.956	21.294	6.517	7	.000

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means there is a significant differences.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means there is no significant differences.

Hypothesis:

Ho = there is no significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on experimental class.

Ha = there is significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on experimental class.

Based on SPSS output above, it is obtained Sig,0.000< 0.05, it can be concludes that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It means that, there is a significant between students pretest and posttest with high motivated students on experimental class, the range of pretest to posttest score is 15.625 point.

3) The answer of hypothesis number 3

Paired Samples Statistics					
		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Post-test Control High Motivated	85.00	8	7.071	2.500
	Pre-test Control High Motivated	70.63	8	5.630	1.990

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Post-test Control High Motivated & Pre-test Control High Motivated	8	.807	.015

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Post-test Control High Motivated - Pre-test Control High Motivated	14.375	4.173	1.475	10.887	17.863			
Pair 1	Post-test Control Low Motivated - Pre-test Control Low Motivated	11.250	4.432	1.567	7.545	14.955	7.180	7	.000

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means there is a significant differences.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means there is no significant differences.

Hypothesis:

Ho = there is no significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on control class.

Ha = there is significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on control class.

Based on SPSS output above, it is obtained Sig,0.000< 0.05, it can be concludes that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It means that, there is a significant between students pretest and posttest with high motivated students on control class, the range of pretest to posttest score is 14.375 point.

4) The answer of hypothesis number 4

Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Mean
Pair 1	Post-test Control Low Motivated	65.00	8	6.547
	Pre-test Control Low Motivated	53.75	8	5.175

Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Post-test Control Low Motivated & Pre-test Control Low Motivated	8	.738	.037

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences	t		

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means there is a significant differences.
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means there is no significant differences.

Hypothesis:

Ho = there is no significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on control class.

Ha = there is significant between students pretest and posttest score with high motivated students on control class.

Based on SPSS output above, it is obtained Sig,0.000< 0.05, it can be concludes that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It means that, there is a significant between students pretest and posttest with high motivated students on control class, the range of pretest to posttest score is 11,250 point.

4) The answer of hypothesis number 5

Group Statistics

Compare		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Compare	Experiment	16	75.94	10.835	2.709
	Control	16	75.00	12.247	3.062

Independent Samples Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			T-test for equality of Means						
compare	Equal variances assumed	F	Sig	T	DF	Sig(2-tailed	Mean s differen	Std errors differences	95% Confidence Interval of

							ces		the Difference	
	Equal variances not assumed								lower	upper
		.666	.421	.229	30	.820	.938	4.088	-7.411	9.286
			.229	29.561	.820	.938	4.088	-7.417	9.292	.292

Experiment Low Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	-15.625*	3.579	.001	-25.40	-5.85
	Control High Motivated	-16.875*	3.579	.000	-26.65	-7.10
	Control Low Motivated	3.125	3.579	.819	-6.65	12.90
Control High Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	1.250	3.579	.985	-8.52	11.02
	Control High Motivated	16.875	3.579	.000	7.10	26.65
	Control Low Motivated	20.000*	3.579	.000	10.23	29.77
Control Low Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	-18.750*	3.579	.000	-28.52	-8.98
	Control High Motivated	-3.125	3.579	.819	-12.90	6.65
	Control Low Motivated	-20.000*	3.579	.000	-29.77	-10.23

Examination criteria:

- If the value of signifancy / P-value < 0.05, it means there is a significant di
- If the the value of significany / P-value > 0.05, it means there is no significant differences.

Hypothesis:

Ho = there is no significant students score between experimental class and control class.

Ha = there is significant students score between experimental class and control class.

Based on SPSS output above, it is obtained Sig,0.421> 0.05, it can be concluded that Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. The result of hypothesis show that there is no significant of students score between students who taught by using reciprocal strategy (experiment) and those who taught by using cognitive strategy (control). The calculation show that, the strategy is not quite significant due to the students achievement in reading, but motivation has a significant due to students achievement in reading. It can be shown based on the comparison of strategy and motivation. The expalanation as in following table:

ANNOVA POST-TEST EXAMINATION

(I) Pretest	(J) Pretest	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experiment High Motivated	Experiment Low Motivated	16.875*	3.107	.000	8.39	25.36
	Control High Motivated	-1.250	3.107	.978	-9.73	7.23
	Control Low Motivated	15.625*	3.107	.000	7.14	24.11
Experiment Low Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	-16.875*	3.107	.000	-25.36	-8.39
	Control High Motivated	-18.125*	3.107	.000	-26.61	-9.64
	Control Low Motivated	-1.250	3.107	.819	-9.73	7.23
Control High Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	1.250	3.107	.985	-7.23	9.73
	Experiment Low Motivated	18.125*	3.107	.000	9.64	26.61
	Control Low Motivated	16.875*	3.107	.000	8.39	25.36
Control Low Motivated	Experiment High Motivated	-15.625*	3.107	.000	-24.11	-7.14
	Control High Motivated	1.250	3.107	.819	-7.23	9.73
	Control Low Motivated	-16.875*	3.107	.000	-25.36	-8.39

ANOVA PRE-TEST EXAMINATION

(I) Pretest	(J) Pretest	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Experiment High Motivated	Experiment Low Motivated	15.625*	3.579	.001	5.85	25.40
	Control High Motivated	-1.250	3.579	.985	-11.02	8.52
	Control Low Motivated	18.750*	3.579	.000	8.98	28.52

5) The answer of hypothesis number 6

Between-Subjects Factors			
		Value Label	N
Strategy	1	Story Map	16
	2	KWL	16
Motivation	1	High	16
	2	Low	16

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent Variable: Score

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.651	3	28	.589

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: Intercept + Strategy+ Motivated + Strategy* Motivated

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2583.594[a]	3	861.198	16.811	.000
Intercept	182257.031	1	182257.031	3557.784	.000
Methode	7.031	1	7.031	.137	.714
Motivated	2538.281	1	2538.281	49.549	.000
Methode * Motivated	38.281	1	38.281	.747	.395
Error	1434.375	28	51.228		
Total	186275.000	32			
Corrected Total	4017.969	31			

a. R Squared = .643 (Adjusted R Squared = .605)

1. Grand Mean

Dependent Variable: Score

Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
75.469	1.265	72.877	78.061

2. Strategy

Dependent Variable: Score

Strategy	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Story Map	75.938	1.789	72.272	79.603
KWL	75.000	1.789	71.335	78.665

3. Motivation

Dependent Variable: Score

Motivation	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High	84.375	1.789	80.710	88.040
Low	66.563	1.789	62.897	70.228

4. Strategy * Motivation

Dependent Variable: Score

Strategy	Motivation	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Story Map	High	83.750	2.531	78.566	88.934
	Low	68.125	2.531	62.941	73.309
KWL	High	85.000	2.531	79.816	90.184
	Low	65.000	2.531	59.816	70.184

Interpretation:

- Based on the result of test Homogeneity of Variance above, it shows that the value (p- value) 0,589, it is indicates that the data is based on homogenous sample.

Hypothesis 1:

Ho = there is no significant between the score of students who taught by using reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy.

Ha = there is a significant between the score of students who taught by using reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy.

Based on the output above, it is obtained the value F = 0,137 and the value of sig is 0.714. The calculation show that the value of Sig. 0.714, thus Ho is accepted and Ha is rejected. It means there is no significant of students achievement in reading who taught by using reciprocal strategy and compared to cognitive strategy.

Hypothesis 2:

Ho = there is no significant between the score of high and low motivated students.

Ha = there is a significant between the score of high and low motivated students.

Based on the output above, it is obtained the value F = 45,549 and the value of sig is 0.000. The calculation show that the value of Sig. 0.000 < 0.05, thus Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It means there is a significant of students achievement in reading between high and low motivated students.

The Examination between Strategy and Motivation

Based on statistical test, it is obtained the value Sig.0.395 > 0.05. Thus, the writer can concludes that there is no interaction between strategy and motivation, the statistical has prove it. As a matter of fact, it is show that, there is another factor which is influenced students achievement, for instance students interest in learning of certain subject matter.

The Correlation between Variable

The result of calculation above, the value of R square = 0,643. It is show that, there is a strong of correlation between variable. Because of the value of R square 0, 643, the range is in 0, 600 – 0,800. It means that, there is a significant correlation between strategy, students motivation towards students reading skills.

Discussion

In this research, the writer explored that the students from experimental group were accustomed to answer the reading test through Reciprocal strategy. During the process of treatment, the teacher give the example text of reciprocal strategy in teaching

reading. The purpose of reciprocal strategy is to identify the basic component of text such as summarizing, questions, clarification, and prediction. By doing this, the students were asked to make a reciprocal strategy in reading exercise. As a start, the teacher conducted a discussion to make a reciprocal strategy namely summarize, questions, clarification, and prediction..

On the contrary, the student from control group were accustomed to answer reading test through Cognitive strategy. Cognitive strategy is a method devised to teach students to read actively by engaging previous knowledge, asking questions, and recalling important information in the text to enhance comprehension. In the Cognitive strategy, the students are asked to list what they know about the subject and the questions they may have about the subject before reading the text selection. Then after reading the selection, the students are asked to write what they have learned about the subject. As a start, the teacher give an example of cognitive strategy chart on board, and invited the students to write what they have learnt about the lesson. In order to get the correct answer, the teacher explain what is meant by cognitive strategy and asked to the students to fill on charts. In the first column K, they filled what they known about the reading text. And then, in the second column W, they filled want they want to know about reading text. In this part, the teacher gave the explanation about teaching reading text. In the last column L, they filled what they have learnt about the reading text.

The result of test in experimental group shows that, there was significant between the score pretest and posttest of high motivated students. It can be seen, there was increasing of score 14.375 point from pretest to posttest. Secondly, the reading test of low motivated students by using reciprocal strategy is 15.625 point. It means that, there was a significant increasing of score from pretest to post test.

The result of test in control class showed that, there was significant the score pretest and posttest of high motivated taught by cognitive strategy. It can be seen, there was increasing of score 14.375 point from pretest to post test. And then, the reading test of low motivated students is 11.250 point. It means that, there was a significant increasing of score from pretest to posttest.

And then, based on the hypothetical test, it was obtained Sig. 0.421> 0,05. It can be concludes that Ho is accepted, and Ha is rejected. It means that, there was no significant students achievement in score between the use of reciprocal strategy and cognitive strategy. The writer can explain that, the strategy in reading was not significant influencing students achievement in reading, but the fact show that, motivation has significant influence to the students reading achievement (see the table anova test). In this case, there were two kinds of motivation investigated namely high and low motivated students. Based on SPSS output, it was obtained F= 49,549 and value of Sig. 0,000 < 0,05. It means that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. Therefore, there was a significant of students achievement between high and low motivated students.

There are two possible explanations for the achievement of high motivated students. Firstly, Brown (1980: 196) states that motivation is inner drive impulse, or emotion or desire that moves one to particular action. It means that, when people d The writer can say that, motivation is very important in our activity, especially in teaching and learning. Motivation is able to give spirit in every of our activity. In addition, motivation is very important for second language learning. On the activity they should be able to motivate themselves to finish their activity. Secondly, in reading, motivation is another key for the successful in reading, the high students motivation have, the better for their achievement in reading.

Thus, the result of research showed that there was no correlation between the use of strategy to the students motivation in reading. It means that, there is another factor influence of students achievement in reading, for instance students interest in certain lesson.

REFERENCES

Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Yogyakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Chatman, S.(1978). Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film. United States: Cornell University Press.

Clark, D.R. (2004). *Visual, Auditory, and Kinesthetic Learning Styles (VAK)*. Retrieved from http://nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadcon.html -See more at: http://sos.net/~donclark/hrd/styles/vakt.html)

Creswell, John W. (1994). *Research Design Qualitative and Quantitative Approach*. California: SAGE Publications.

Crown.(2008). Progression Narrative text. Available at Http:*engres.ied.edu.hk/.../progression_narrative.pdf. (accessed 5/03/2014)*

Derewianka, Beverly. (1991). "Exploring How Texts Works". Newtown: Primary English Teaching Association

Gal, Meredith D, Gal, Joyce and Borgh. Walter R. (2003). "Educational Research: an Introduction Seventh Edition".United States. Pearson Education. Inc.

Grace Fleming. nd. Learning Styles: *Know and Use Your Personal Learning Styles*. Available at www.homeworktips.about.com./od/homeworkhelp/a/learning style.htm.(accesed 17/12/2013)

Gibbon, E. (2005). *Narrative and Informational Text*. PBS.

Hatch, E. & Farhady, H. (1981). *Research design and statistics for applied Linguistics*. Los Angeles: Newbury House Publisher, Inc.

Harol Pashler et. Al.(2008). *Learning Styles: Concepts and Evidence*. *A Journal of The Association for Psychological Science*

Hazel, P. (2007). *Narrative: An introduction*. Swansea: Swansea Institute of Higher Education.

Herizona. nd. Teaching Reading Narrative Text by Combining Story Map and Beach Ball Strategies for Junior High School. A journal in English Education Department, STKIP PGRI Sumatra Barat.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2000). "Educational Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches". Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Baco

Idol, L. (l987). *Group story mapping: A comprehension strategy for both skilled and unskilled readers*. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 20, 196-205.

Khatib, M.(2012). *The Impact of Using Story Maps as Graphic Organizers on Development of Vocabulary Learning of EFL Learner*s. The Journal Language Teaching and Research.

Li, D.(2000). *Dissertation: Effect of Story Mapping and Story Map Questions on The Story Writing Performance of Students with Learning Disabilities*.

Lorna Idol et.al.(1985). *The effects of Training in Story Mapping Procedure On The Reading Comprehension of Poor*

Reader. Illinois: University of Illinois.

Maralafau et.al.(2013). Teaching Writing Narrative Text to Junior High School Students by Using Probable Passage Strategy. Journal of English Language Teaching.

Mc. Millan, James H., and Sally S. (2001). *Research in Education: Conceptual Introduction*. United States: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Fleming, N. (2011). The VAK Learning Style test. Available at http://www.vark-learn.com/english/page.asp?p=helpsheets

Patricia, et.al. (1997). Cooperative Story Mapping. Remedial and Special Education: Sage Publication.

Pimentel, S. (2007). *Teaching Reading Well.* United States: International Reading Association.

Sabri. (2013). *Story Map: How to Improve Writing Skill*. Academic Journal

Snow et.al. (2007). *The Teacher Makes The Difference*. The effective Reading Instruction.

Tatyana P.(2006). *The Importance of Learning Styles in ESL/EFL*. Available at www.iteslj.org/articles/putinseva-learning styles. html.

Tori Boulineau et.al.(2004). *Use of Story-Mapping to Increase The Story-Grammar Text Comprehension of Elementary Students with Learning Disabilities*. The Journal of Learning Disabilities Quarterly.

Yohan. (2009). *"Teaching Narrative Texts through Journal"* Thesis Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

_____.(2002). *Comprehension Instruction*. Texas: Texas Education Agency.

Langan, Jhon. 2002. *Reading and Study Skills.* New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.

Lazaraton, Anne and Hatch, Evelyn. 1991. *The Research Manual: Design and Statistics forApplied Linguistics.* New York: New bury House Publishers.

Maghsudi, M, Seyed, H.S.2009. The Impact of Lingualuity on The Cognitive and Metacognitive Reading Strategies Awareness And Reading Comprehension Ability. *Journal of Social Science. 18(2) p.119-126:2009*

Mc. Millan, James H. and Schumacher 2001. *Research in Education: Conceptual Introduction.* United States: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc

Nattinger. 1988. *Some Current Trends in Teaching Vocabulary*. In Carter and McCarthy (Eds),*Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. London: Longman.

Nunan, David. 1991. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook For Teachers.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Nutall, Christine.1996. *Teaching Reading Skills in A Foreign Language*. Oxford: Macmillan Publisher Limited.

Oxford, Rebecca. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.* Boston, Massachussets: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Oxford, Shearin:1994. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. International Reading Association Inc.

Oczuks, L. 2003. *Reciprocal Teaching At Work: Strategies for Improving Reading Comprehension*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Ogle, D. 1986 .*K-W-L: A Teaching Model that Develops Active Reading of Expository Text.* The Reading Teacher, 39, 564-570.

Orr, Janet K. 1999. *Growing up With English*. Washington: Office of Language Programs.

Palincsar, A. S. & Brown, A. (1984). *Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-Fostering and Comprehension Monitoring Activities. Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), pp. 87-105.

Peterson, Debra 2008 *"*What is the difference between a comprehension skill and a comprehension strategy*?" Minnesota Center for Reading Research. Available:http://www.cehd.umn.edu/reading/documents/FAQ/Comprehension.pdf*

Porter, Mike Hernacky. 2007. Quantum Learning. Bandung: Kaifa PT. MizanPustaka

Purves, at all. 1990. *How Porcupines Make Love II: Teaching A Response-Centered Literature Curriculum.* New York: Longman.

Pintrich & Schunk 2002 *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign" Language*. (3rd ed). Boston: Heinle&Heinle.

Rhoda, Coleman. 2010. *How Students Develop Academic Language in Social Studies. Social Studies Review , Vol. 51.* California: California Department of Education.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ruddell et al. 1994. *Theoretical Models and Processes of Reading*. 4th edition. Delaware:International Reading Association Inc.

Ruddell, R.B., Draheim, M., & Barnes, J.1990. *A Comparative Study of the Teaching Effectiveness of Influential and Noninfluential Teachers and Reading ComprehensionDevelopment*. In J. Zutell & S. McCormick (Eds.), *Literacy Theory and Research:Analysis From Multiple Paradigms*. Chicago, IL: National Reading Conference.94

Shang, H. F. (2007, May). Reading strategy training for the development of EFL reading comprehension. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China (ROC-TEFL)* 424-442, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan.

Shang, H. F. (2010, June). Reading Strategy Use, Self-Efficacy and EFL Reading Comprehension. *The Asian Journal Quartely. 12(2): Retrieved June 2010 from* http://www.asian-efl-journal.com

Shourafa.A. 2011. The Effect of Motivation on Jordanian 10th Grade Students' Writing Skill in English. *International Journal.*

Singhal M. 2001. Reading Proficiency, Reading Strategies, Metacognitive Awareness, and L2 Readers. The Reading Matrix. 1(1): *Retrieved April 2001 from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/ singhal.*

Smalley, R.L, Reutten, M.K., and Kozyrev, O.R.2001. *Refining Composition Skills: Rhetoric And Grammar*. Boston: Heinle&Heinle Publishing.

Smith, Frank. 1988. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis Of Reading And*

Learning To Read. 4th Edition. New Jersey: Lawrence Erbaum Associates Inc., Publishers.

Snow, C.E. 2002. *Reading for Understanding: Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Sugiyono, 2009.*Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatifdan R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta

Suyanto, Kasihani K.E. 2002. Penilaian Tindakan Kelas dan Refleksi Pengajaran Guru SLTP. *A Paper Presented At TOT of CTL. Bogor. 16-18 September, 2002.*

Tompkins, Gail E. and Hoskisson, Kenneth. 1991. *Language Arts: Content and Teaching Strategies.* Newyork: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Tuchman Bruce W. (1978) *"Conducting Educational Research"*NY.Harcourt Brace & Company

Tyson K. 2014 *9 Definition of Reading Comprehension.* http://www.learningunlimitedllc.com/2014/05/9-Definitions-Reading-Comprehension/

Urquhart, Weir, P.1996. *A Course In Language Teaching: Practice and Theory.Cambridge*: Cambridge University Press

Wallace, Catherine. 2003. *Reading: Language Teaching; A Scheme For Teacher Education.* NewYork: Oxford University Press.

Wallace, Michael J.1998. *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walter, E. Cranz, D. Glennon, D. Krajewska,D.B.2008. *Cambridge Advance Learner's Dictonary*.s Cambridge: Cambridge University press.

Weinstein, C. E., & Mayer, R. E. 1986. *The Teaching of Learning Strategies*. In M.

Winstead, L. 2004. *Increasing academic motivation and cognition in reading, writing, and mathematics: Meaning-making strategies*. Educational Research Quarterly, *28*(2), 30-49.

Wiriaatmadja, Rochiati. 2005. *Metode Penelitian Tindakan Kelas; Untuk Meningkatkan Kinerja Guru Dan Dosen.* Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Younis, M.A. 2013. The Effectiveness of Using (K.W.L) Strategy on Developing Reading Comprehension Skills for the Eighth Graders in Khanyounis Governorate Schools. *Al Azhar University –Gaza: A thesis*.

Yuvita. 2011 The Effectiveness Of Metacognitive And Cognitive Strategies In Teaching Reading For Higher And Lower English Achievement Students (The Experimental Research at the Fourth Semester Students of the English Department of Pancasakti University Tegal in the Academic Year of 2010/2011). *A Journal.*