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#### Abstract

The aim of the study wasto find out whether there is any significant difference between students' reading comprehension using Save the Last Word for Me strategy and students' reading comprehension using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy through assessment of their reading comprehension. The study utilized Quasi Experimental Design Non-equivalent Pre-test and Post-test Group Design. The participants of the study comprised 76, year two students of Junior High School 1 Teluk Pinang. Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategies were used on two experimental groups which experimental group $1(\mathrm{n}=38)$ using Save the Last Word for Me strategy and experimental group 2 ( $\mathrm{n}=38$ ) using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy. Data were collected using pre-test and posttest of students' reading comprehension test. Quantitative data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The finding showed significant difference in reading comprehension score between the experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 through Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategies.
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## INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of skills that should be mastered by students. It is very important to get information through many kinds of books or passages. In addition, a reading ability is needed by a reader to get information, to get more knowledge, for pleasure, or for interest. Linsestates that reading is a set of skills in
getting meaning from printed word and also getting sense(Linse, 2005). In the same view, Murcia claims that reading is an interactive, socio cognitive process, involving a text, a reader and a social context with in which the activity of reading takes place(Celce-Murcia, 2001). Reading skill becomes very important in educational field. Therefore, students need to be exercised and trained in order to have a
good reading skill not only that but also with reading students can increase their knowledge and know many things.

In order to support the students' need of reading, English syllabus provides reading as one of the English standard competences that must be taught and learned at SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang that one of Junior High Schools in Indragiri Hilir Regency. As a formal education, English is also taught at SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang. At this school, reading has been taught since the first year of English teaching program and the goal of the learning process is to develop the skills of communication. It means that not only develop students' skill in reading but also in speaking, writing, and listening. Concerning with the standard competency of reading ability, the students should be able to understand and express the meaning in the written functional text and short simple mologue in the form of descriptive and recount to interact with environment(Husni, 2017). They should be able to reach the standard of minimal score that is 73 .

Based on the preliminary observation done on February 12 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2016$ at SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang,it is discovered that more students are not able to determine the factual information of the text, and theyarenot able to determine the main idea, reference, inference, Generic structures of the reading text and they are also lack of vocabularies. Metra in her paper claims that one of problems in reading is lack of vocabularies that make the students difficult to understand the text(Metra Jevitsa, 2015).

The other problem comes from the teachers themselves. It is difficult for the teachers to find and choice an interesting strategy for teaching reading comprehension. The teachers still use unappropriate strategy in teaching reading. Further, the teacher does not pay attention to her appropriate strategy in teaching and learning process of reading and the teacher also still implements teacher center instruction.

Solving the problems, the writer applies two strategies and then compares it. The strategies are Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD). Crawford states that Save the Last Word for Me strategy is a strategy which provides a framework for class discussion of a text, either narrative or expository (fiction or nonfiction). This
strategy is particularly helpful in getting the quieter and more reluctant students to participate in class discussions. In The Save Last Word for Me strategy teaches students to identify issues of interest to them in a text they read and to take responsibility for a whole-class discussion. The purpose of this strategy is to enhance text understanding, to foster group interaction and problem-solving, to provide a "scaffold" for text material, and to encourage purposeful notetaking(Crawford, Saul, Mathews, \& Makinster, 2005).

On the other side, According to Julie and Emanuellisten-read-discuss (LRD) strategy is a literacy strategy which helps students comprehend text. Before reading, students listen to a short lecture delivered by the teacher. The students then read a text selection about the topic. After reading, there is a large group discussion or students engage in small group discussions about the topic. During the discussion, students compare and contrast the information from the lecture with the information they read. LRD is also flexible strategy can be used across all curriculum areas with almost any text(Lester, H, Ellott, Pesek, \& Trowbridge, 2002).

The purpose of this research is to find out whether there is any significant difference between students' reading comprehension using Save the Last Word for Me strategy and students' reading comprehension using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy through assessment of their reading comprehension

## METHOD

The design of the research is a Quasi Experimental Design Non-equivalent Pre-test and Post-test Group Design" Twogroups served as experimental groups.Experiment is the proof of a hypothesis which seeks to make up two factors into a casual relationshipthrough the study of contrasting situations which have been controlled on all factors the one of interest,the latter being either the hypothetical cause or the hypothetical effect (Singh, 2006). In other sides, Arystates that quasi experimental design is used where true experiment design is not feasible(Ary, Jacobs, Sorensen, \& Razavieh, 2010).

The subject of this research is the second year students at SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang in Indragiri Hilir regency and the object of this research is comparison between using Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss strategies toward students' reading comprehension. The location of this research is SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang. It is located in Indragiri Hilir Regency. The duration of time to conduct this research is within two months starting on September $22^{\text {th }}$ up to October $18^{\text {th }} 2016$.

The population of this research is the second year students of SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang in the academic year $2015-2016$ which consist of 356 students distribute into six classes.The kind of research sample is a cluster sampling which means that one class is appointed to be the participantsof this research. In this research, the samples are 64 students which are group I consist of 38 students as an experimental group 1 and group J consist of 38 students as an experimental group 2.

The research instrument uses observation and test. Observation The observation will carry out to observe the implementing of teaching learning English by using Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss strategies will be achieved. The observation also will carry out to assess students' reading comprehension. Test used to know students' reading comprehension before and after given treatment.

In analysing the data, the researcher uses scores of pre-test and post-test of an experimental group 1 and an experimental group 2 . This score is analyzed statistically for both descriptive and inferential statistics. To find out whether there is a significant difference or there is no a significant difference between two or more variables analysed by using Independent Sample $\mathrm{t}_{\text {test }}$ and to compare a single groups' performance on pre-test and post-test or on two different treatments analyzed by using NonIndependent Sample $t$-t test is also knows as Paired-Sample $\mathrm{t}_{\text {test. }}$

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

$\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathbf{1}$ :There is no a significant difference on students' reading comprehension pre-test means score between an experimental group 1 by using Save the Last Word or Me Strategy and an experimental group 2 by using Listen-ReadDiscuss (LRD) Strategy.

An independent $t$-test was conducted to determine any significant difference between pre-test reading comprehensions meansscore of experimental group 1 and experimental group 2.The result of pre-test reading comprehension testfor experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 without considering students group or school category was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test, and presented at the Table 4.36. table 4.36 presents the findings as follows:

Table 4.36. The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Pre-test score between Experimental group 1 and Experimental Group 2

| Subject | Research <br> Groups | Means | Standard <br> Deviation | N | df | T | Sig.(2- <br> tailed) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Pre-Test | Experimental <br> Group 1 | 67,14 | 7,189 | 38 | 73 | 0,307 | 0,760 |
|  | Experimental <br> Group 2 | 66,63 | 7,038 | 38 |  |  |  |

Table 4.36 indicates thatthere is no significant difference is found at pre-test reading comprehension between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. T-test result is $-0,307$, its df was 73 , significance is 0.556 , mean difference is 0.504 , standard error is 1,643 , the lower difference interval is 2,770 and the upper difference interval is

3,778 . So, in the conclusion $p=0.760$, the 2 tailed value is more than 0.05 ( $\mathrm{p}>0.05$ ). The result shows that the mean scores do not differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were equivalent before giving the treatment at the second year students of Junior High School 1 Teluk Pinang.
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$\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{2}$ :There is no a significant difference on students' reading comprehension pre-test and post-test mean score on an experimental group 1 by using Save the Last Word for Me strategy.

A Paired-sample t-test was conducted to determine any significant difference
between pre-test and posttest reading comprehensions meansscore of experimental group 1.The result of pre-test and posttest reading comprehension testfor experimental group 1 was analyzed by using Paired-Sample T-test, and presented at the Table 4.37. table 4.37 presents the findings as follows:

Table 4.37. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-test and Post-test on students reading comprehension for Experimental Group 1 Paired Samples Test

| Subject | Group Score | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | N | df | T | Sig.(2- <br> tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Experimental } \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Pre-test Score | 66,74 | 7,504 | 38 | 37 | -11,728 | 0,000 |
|  | Posttest Score | 85,00 | 6,234 | 38 |  |  |  |
| From the table 4.37 above, the $\quad$Eta-squared $=\tilde{\omega}^{2} \times 100 \%$ <br> Eta-squared $=0.78796449 \times$ <br> $100 \%=78,79 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

output of paired sample test shows that the ttest result is 11,728 , itsdf is 37 , significance is 0.000 , mean difference is 18,263 , standard error mean is 1,557 , the lower difference interval is 21,418 and the upper difference interval is 15,108 .

By comparing number of significance, if probability $>0.05$, null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected. If probability $<$ 0.05 alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{2}\right)$ is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference between before and after the use of Save the Last Word for Me strategy on students' reading comprehension through students' reading activities. Because the significance was $0.000<0.05$, thus, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted while $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was rejected.

Then, it was found out by the researcher the percentage of significant effect between pre-test and post-test of experimental class by looking for the effect size or etasquared as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1} \\
& \tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{(11,728)^{2}}{(11,728)^{2}+38-1} \\
& \tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{137,4907}{137,49907+37} \\
& \tilde{\omega}^{2}=0.78796449
\end{aligned}
$$

The value of eta square ( $\mathbf{0 . 7 8 7 9}$ ) is categorized as large/strong effect (see table III.6). Therefore, the Ho2 hypothesis is rejected and $\mathbf{H a 2}$ is accepted that there is significant effect of using Save the Last Word for Me strategy toward students' reading comprehension on descriptive text for experimental group 1.Holandiyah claims that there was a significant difference on students' reading comprehension achievement taught using Save the Last Word for me strategy and strategy that usually used by teacher of SMP N 7 Palembang (Holandiyah \& Utami, 2015).
$\mathbf{H}_{0} 3$ :There is no a significant difference on students' reading comprehension pre-test and post-test mean score on an experimental group2 by using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy.

The result of the effect on implementing the treatment of Listen-ReadDiscuss (LRD) strategy on students reading comprehension of descriptive text for experimental group 2 of the composite comparing score for both pre-test and post-test was analyzed by using Paired Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table:

Table 4.38. The Analysis of Paired Sample T-test Between Pre-test and Post-test on students reading comprehension for Experimental Group 2 Paired Samples Test

| Experimental <br> $\mathbf{2}$ | Group <br> Score | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | N | df | T | Sig.(2- <br> tailed) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Pre-test | 66,63 | 7,038 | 38 | 37 | $-9,025$ | 0,000 |
|  | Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Post- | 76,42 | 6,293 | 38 |  |  |  |
|  | Test <br> Score |  |  |  |  |  |  |

By comparing number of significance, if probability $>0.05$, null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ is rejected. If probability $<0.05$ alternative hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}\right)$ is accepted. Because the significance is $0.000<0.05$, thus, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ was accepted while $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was rejected. It means that there is a significance difference between before and after usingListen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy on students' reading comprehension through students' reading activities. Because the significance was 0.000 $<0.05$, thus, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ is accepted while $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ was rejected.

Then, the writer found out the percentage of significant effect between pretest and post-test of experimental class 2 by looking for the effect size or eta-squared as follows:
$\tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{t^{2}}{t^{2}+n-1}$
$\tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{(9,025)^{2}}{(9,025)^{2}+38-1}$
$\tilde{\omega}^{2}=\frac{81,45062}{81,45062+37}$
$\tilde{\omega}^{2}=0.68763$
Eta-squared $=\tilde{\omega}^{2} \times 100 \%$
Eta-squared $=0.68763 \times 100 \%=68$,
76\%
The value of eta square ( $\mathbf{0 . 6 8 7 6}$ ) is categorized as large/strong effect (see table III.6). Therefore, the Ho3 hypothesis is rejected and $\mathbf{H a 3}$ is accepted that there is
significant effect of using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy on students' reading comprehension of descriptive text for experimental group 2.Metra said that using LRD and FQR can build the students' prior knowledge before they read a text, it helps the students to comprehend the material presented orally and improve student's reading comprehension, then the students have critical thinking and creative in learning and understanding the text because they have give opinion and response about what they read, they can integrate their ideas (Metra Jevitsa, 2015).
$\mathbf{H}_{0} 4$ :There is no a significant difference on students' reading comprehension post-test means score between an experimental group 1 by using Save the Last Word or Me Strategy and an experimental group 2 by using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) Strategy.

The result of post-test reading comprehension testfor experimental group 1 and experimental group 2 without considering students group or school category was analyzed by using Independent Sample T-test, and presented at the following Table:

Table 4.39. The Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-test score between Experimental group 1 and Experimental Group 2

| Subject | Group Score | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation | $\mathbf{N}$ | df | T | Sig.(2- <br> tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Post- <br> test | Experimental <br> Group 1 | 85,03 | 6,318 | 38 | 73 | 6,052 | 0,000 |
| Experimental <br> Group 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 74,63 | 6,318 |
|  | 38 |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Based on Independent T-test analysis for post-test reading comprehension of experimental 1 and experimental groups 2 on Table 4.32 above, it is showed that there is significant difference is found at post-test reading comprehension between experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. T-test result is 6,052 , its df is 73 , significance is 0.000 , mean difference is 10,395 , standard error is 1,718 , the lower difference interval is 6,972 and the upper difference interval is 13,819 . So, in the conclusion $p=0.000$, the 2 tailed value is smaller than $0.05(p<0.050)$. The result shows that the mean scores did differ much between both groups. It could be determined that the subjects in both groups were equivalent after giving the treatment at the second year students of Junior High School 1 Teluk Pinang.

Based on the analysis of Table 4.39, of the fourth hypotheses Ha4 is accepted and Ho4 is rejected. So, it can be inferred that there is any significant difference of students' reading comprehension between the students who are taught by using Save the Last Word for Me strategy and those who are taught by using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy at the second year of SMPN 1 Teluk Pinang.

## CONCLUSION

The findings indicate the effectiveness of using Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategies on students' reading comprehension. Further implementation of this strategies module with more differentiated sample groups should be conducted. The findings indicated that using Save the Last Word for Me strategy was better than using Listen-Read-Discuss (LRD) strategy. Futher improvement of using Save the Last Word for Me and Listen-ReadDiscuss (LRD) strategies from results received can be implemented in teaching reading comprehension.
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