CHAPTER I

**INTRODUCTION**

This chapter presents (a) background of the study; (b) problem of the study; (c) objective of the study; (d) significance of the study; and (e) hypothesis of the study; (f) criteria for testing the hypothesis.

* 1. **Background of the Study**

 Language is the most important aspect in the life of all beings. Algeo (2010: 16) says that an important aspect of language systems is that they are “open.” That is, a language is not a finite set of messages from which the speaker must choose. Instead, any speaker can use the resources of the language—its vocabulary and grammatical Patterns to make up new messages, sentences that no one has ever said before. Because a language is an open system, it can be used to talk about new things. And finally, an important characteristic is that language is not just utilitarian. One of the uses of language is for entertainment, high and low: for jokes, stories, puzzles, and poetry.

 One of the languages is English. English is very important and has benefits for various aspects of life owned by human being. Reddy (2012: 1) states that the importance of the English language in educational field is clear from the fact that many countries have made English as an official language. Consequently, the English language teaching (ELT) has become one of the major growth industries around the world in the recent years. Besides, according to Lazaro (2004: 5), there

 are two potential benefits of learning English. First, English proficiency is needed to upgrade workers’ skills or to enable them to participate in workplace flexibility and multi-skill initiatives. Second, the knowledge and proficiency in English of its local workforce is undeniably a competitive advantage a country may have.

 In English there are four skills that should be mastered, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Harmer (2007: 265) states that speaking and writing are classified into *productive skills,* where language is actually being produced. Meanwhile, reading and listening are classified into *receptive skills*, where the meaning is extracted from the text or discourse.

 In studying the four English language skills, Reading is considered as an important tool to open the world’s knowledge. According to Hamka (2007: 1), by reading students get any advantages, the more they read the material, the more they get the information, by reading they will know and see everything that happened in the past, in the present or in the future. From the case above, we realize that reading is very important and become a part of our everyday life.

 In writer’s observation on the students’ problems in learning reading at the eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang, he found that many students know the meaning of words but they depend on teacher questioning to interpret the important information, most of students are not able to ask questions by themself to monitor what they need to remember when they read the text, and the students only try to remember all part of the text rather than focusing on important facts.

 Regarding to this reality, teachers need to think of some ways to improve the condition. One of them is applying an alternative strategy in teaching reading comprehension. As we know that there are various teaching strategies that are possible to be applied. The strategy that can help the students become more independent by having them write the questions and comparing their questions with the teacher’s questions, encourages the students to monitor their understanding by asking themself questions and by writing and comparing questions, they think about what is important to remember. Based on the problem, the writer wants to apply one of the strategy which is called Question Generation.

 According to Walker (1992: 206), question generation is writing postreading questions used by students to develop an understanding of the important information in the text. By deciding what to ask in their questions, students think about what is important in the text. Question generation is the purposefulposing and answering of questions about what is read, typically to make inferences or reveal details (why, how, when, where, who, etc.) and specific information needed to deeply analyze a body of knowledge or process (e.g, investigation, experiment, classification, comparison or contrast), thus promoting progress toward improved reading comprehension.

 Based on the description above, the writer was interested in applying Question Generation strategy to the eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang. So, the title of this study is “Teaching Reading Comprehension by Using Question Generation Strategy to the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Nurul ImanPalembang”.

* 1. **Problem of the study**

The problem of the study was formulated in the following question : Is there any significant difference on students’ reading comprehension achievement taught by using Question generation strategy than those who are taught by using the strategy usually used by teacher at SMA Nurul Iman Palembang?

* 1. **Objective of the study**

 Based on the problem above, the objective of this study was to find out whether or not there is a significant difference on students’ reading comprehension achievement who were taught by using Question generation strategy than those who were taught by using the strategy usually used by teacher at the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Nurul ImanPalembang?

* 1. **Significance of the study**

This study is expected to give some beneficial inputs for the following of English, especially those who teach English subject at SMA Nurul Iman Palembang. This study will give meaningful information to the followings:

1. For the teachers, the result of this study is expected to give information for the teacher of English that there is positive effect of using Question generation strategy toward students’ reading comprehension achievement. This study is useful for the teacher of English to improve their strategies in teaching reading comprehension especially by using Question generation to teaching and learning English.
2. For the students, the result of this study is expected to motivate them and to help them to study reading comprehension more deeply through Question generation strategy. It is expected that this study be useful for students in increasing their reading ability.
3. For the researcher, the result of this study is expected to enlarge his knowledge of teaching and enable to be good teacher in future.
4. For the next researchers, the result of this study is expected that it can help other researchers who conduct research at the same subject and can be reference.
	1. **Hypotheses**

According to Arikunto (2006: 71), hypothesis is simply put a prediction of some sort regarding the possible outcomes of a study. The writer proposes two hypotheses in this study; they are null hypothesis (Ho) and alternative hypothesis (Ha). The hypotheses of this study are stated as follows:

(Ho): There is no significant difference on students’ reading comprehension achievement who are taught reading comprehension by using Question generation strategy than those who are taught by using the strategy usually used by teacher to the Eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang.

(Ha): There is a significant difference on students’ reading comprehension achievement who are taught reading comprehension by using Question generation strategy than those who are taught by using the strategy usually used by teacher to the Eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang.

**CHAPTER II**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

This chapter discusses (a) Theoritical Description; (b) Previous Related Studies; and (c) Research Setting.

**A. Theoritical Description**

 **1. Concept of Teaching**

According to Brown (2007: 7), teaching which is implied in the first definition of learning, may be defined as ”showing or helping someone to learn how to do something, giving instructing, guiding in the study of something, providing with knowledge, causing to know or understand”.

 According to Moore (2005: 4), teaching as “the action of someone who is trying to assist others to reach their fullest potential in all aspects of development”. Teaching is a very professional career where an individual is held accountable through a series of tests, assessments and tools to gauge the achievement of students and their learning. Teachers utilize their skills to convey a variety of teachable subjects to students within the classroom from math, science, history, social studies, to music, art, and life skills. The list of subjects that are put into the hands and creative minds of educators could go on for great lengths.

Based on theory above, it can be inferred that teaching is a rewarding career matching teachers skills with the needs of students to succeed. Facilitates learners and guiding them that make them able to do something and also using strategy to increase and motivate the learners in learning. In this study the writer applies Question generation strategy.

 **2. Concept of Reading Comprehension**

According to Anderson (2003: 67), the aim of reading is comprehension. Some individuals equate decoding with reading. Just because a learner knows how to pronounce written words correctly, doesn’t mean that he can read. Reading comprehension refers to reading for meaning, understanding, and entertainment. It involves higher-order thinking skills and is much more complex than merely decoding specific words. Teaching students how to derive meaning as well as analyze and synthesize what they have read is an essential part of the reading process. Here are two reasons that people read: the first is for pleasure and the second is for information.

Hamka (2007: 2) states that reading is a complex ability, it is not only the activity to see or recognize the word or symbol in the text but also to comprehend those words and symbols become meaningful for readers. And reading activity can also be called active and respective, it is called active because in reading activity there is an interaction between the reader and the writer. And it is called respective because when the reader read, she/he can get the message through the text, as a direct communication between the readers and the writer.

 **3. Concept of Question Generation**

 According to Walker (1992: 207), question generation is most appropriate for students who have facility with word meaning but have difficulty studying for tests. For these students, this approach requires them to read the text in order to formulate questions about the important information in the text or important parts of the story organization. This reading comprehension strategy was designed to prompt students to generate "think-type" questions while reading, and in doing so encourage students to be more active readers and increase their awareness of whether they are comprehending or not.

 Question generation is the purposefulposing and answering questions about what is read, typically to make inferences or reveal details (why, how, when, where, who, etc.) and specific information needed to deeply analyze a body of knowledge or process (e.g., investigation, experiment, classification, comparison or contrast), thus promoting progress toward improved reading comprehension (Summer, 2004:1).

 According to Hernandez (2007: 1), generating questions is a wonderful strategy that can help students understand complicated text. By using the strategy for generating questions the students will spontaneously ask questions before, after, and during the text. This strategy is important because “Readers determine whether the answers to their questions can be found in the text or whether they will need to infer the answer from the text”, this helps readers activate and organize their thinking and learning. The act of composing questions focuses the student’s attention on content. It involves concentrating on main ideas while checking to see if content is understood. Question generation is one component of teaching students to carry out higher-level cognitive functions for themselves. This strategy can benefit to all students.

 **4. Benefits of Question generation**

According to Walker (1992: 207), Question generation has many benefits for the students. These three benefits are discussed as follow:

1. A successive learner who knows the meanings of words but depends on teacher questioning to interpret the important information. This technique helps the student become more independent by having him write the questions before comparing them with the teacher’s questions.
2. A simultaneous learner who has not learned to ask himself questions to monitor what he needs to remember when he reads. This technique encourages him to monitor his understanding by asking himself questions.
3. A passive learner who tries to remember all the details rather than focusing on important facts. By writing and comparing questions, he thinks about what is important to remember.

 **5. Teaching Procedures using Question generation strategy**

 According to Walker (1992: 206), the procedure of Question generation.

1. The teacher selects a text for the eleventh grade students.
2. The teacher discusses how to write questions:

a. A question has an answer.

b. A good question begins with a question word like who, what, when, where, or why.

c. A good question can be answered using information in the story.

d. A good question asks about important information in the story.

1. The teacher selects a short paragraph and models writing questions about the important information in the story.
2. The students write questions after they read a short paragraph.
3. The students answer their questions.
4. The students compare their questions and answers with the teacher’s questions and answers.
5. The teacher gives feedback about the importance of the questions.
6. The students write questions about the important information in their assigned text.
7. The students answer their questions.
8. The students compare their questions and answers with the teacher’s questions and answers.

**B. Previous Related Study**

There are two previous studies which are related to the writer’s present study. The first thesis title is ‘‘Effects of Pre-questioning on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of the Second Grade students at SMA 2 Jekan Raya in Academic Year 2006/2007.” The objective of the study is to investigate the effects of pre-questioning and students gender on the reading comprehension achievement of the second grade students at SMAN-2 Jekan Raya Palangkaraya in academic year 2006/2007. The result of this study shows that “the Pre-questioning has a significant effect on the students’ reading comprehension achievement”, “the students’ gender has no significant effect on students’ reading comprehension achievement”, and “there is no interaction effect between pre-questioning and students’ gender”.

 The similarities between this study and the previous study are both of these studies deal with teaching reading comprehension and by using Question strategy. The differences between this study and previous study are the previous study provided some questions before the students read the whole text, in order to build the reading schemata and background knowledge of the students and also to rise their interest, and their cognitive aspect to predict what will faced by them in the next whole text while this study students think about what is important in the text by deciding and write what to ask in their questions after the students read the text.

The second thesis is entitled ‘‘Improving Students’ Reading comprehension using Reciprocal Questioning Technique (A Classroom Action Research in SMK Diponegoro Salatiga in 2007/2008 Academic Year)" written by Ani Afida 2008. The result showed that the students were more highly interested and interactive in making reciprocal questions in all types of questions. For that reason, herringbone technique was able to stimulate students to do reciprocal questioning better. Based on t-test, it could be concluded that there was significant improvement between pretest and posttest.

The similarity between this study and the previous study is both of these studies using Question strategies deal with teaching reading comprehension and these are aimed to know whether questioning technique can improve students’ reading comprehension or not. The difference between this study and previous study are the previous study the students and the teacher answer the same questions in their own words while this study the students write and answering their own questions about what is read, typically to make inferences or reveal details (why, how, when, where, who, etc.).

 The third thesis is entitled “The effects of question generating strategy instruction on EFL freshmen’s reading comprehension and use of English tenses” written by Dentisak Dorkchandra 2010 . The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics including frequency, mean, and standard deviation. An independent samples t-test was used to test the hypotheses. The results were that the experimental group gained statistically higher scores from the post-tests of both reading comprehension and use of English tenses than the control group (p<.01).

 The similarity between this study and the previous study is both of these studies using Question Generation strategy deal with teaching reading comprehension. The difference between this study and previous study are the previous study measured the effects of Question generation instruction on reading comprehension and use of English tenses while this study only the use of Question generation strategy to teach reading comprehension.

**C. Research Setting**

SMA Nurul Iman Palembang is located in Jl. May Salim Batubara Kebon Semai No. 50 Palembang Sumatera Selatan with ZIP code 30126. SMA Nurul Iman has produced many graduates/ alumni spread across many major universities in Indonesia such as UI, STAN, UGM, ITB, UNSRI, etc.

The headmaster of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang is Drs. Kiagus Hasan. helped by 48 teachers as well as staff with different gender and education degree. These are Sumaisarah, S.P. M.M is as a curriculum staff, Erma Ekawati, S.Pd is as a students staff and Supardi, S.Ag is as a public relation staff and five teachers as administration staff.

The number of teacher in teaching at the appropriate teachers’ education background. There are 1 civics teacher, 2 religion teachers, 4 indonesian teachers, 2 history teachers, 3 english teachers, 2 sport teacher, 2 chemistry teachers, 2 economics teachers, 1 sociology teacher, 2 geography teachers, 2 art teachers, 4 math teachers, 2 physics teachers, 1 biology teacher, 2 computer teachers, 2 mulok teachers, 2 arabic teachers, 2 picket teachers 2 BP teachers and 2 BK teachers. The total of them are 40 teachers. The number of teachers and staff displayed in the following table :

**Table 1**

**The Number of Teachers and Staff SMA Nurul Iman Palembang**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No | **Name** | **Position** |
| 1 | Drs. Kiagus hasan | Headmaster |
| 2 | Sumaisarah, S. P. M.M | Curriculum staff |
| 3 | Erma Ekawati, S.Pd | Students staff |
| 4 | Supardi, S. Ag | Public relation staff |
| 5 | Mardjan Anang | Head Administration staff |
| 6 | Putriyani, S. Ag | Administration staff |
| 7 | Nurul Huda | Administration staff |
| 8 | Lia Maya Sari, S.E | Administration staff |
| 9 | Purwitaningsih, S. Pd | Administration staff |
| 10 | Fathullah, S. Ag | Sociology teacher |
| 11 | Abi hurairah | Sport teacher |
| 12 | Zulkifni, S. Ag | Arabic teacher |
| 13 | Aminah, S. Ag | Arabic teacher |
| 14 | Sartika, S. Pd | Economics teacher |
| 15 | Susi Apriani, S. Pd | Biology teacher |
| 16 | Dewi Chandra Kirana, S. Pd | History teacher |
| 17 | Uswatun Hasanah, S. pd | Physics teacher |
| 18 | Dian Andriani, S. pd | Math teacher |
| 19 | Yulis Suswita, S. pd | English teacher |
| 20 | Zaltama, S. Kom | Computer teacher |
| 21 | Dra. Pawaidah | BP teacher |
| 22 | Holilah, S. Pd | BP teacher |
| 23 | Umar Malik, S.Pd | BK teacher |
| 24 | Fajar Agustriono, S. Kom | Computer teacher |
| 25 | Fedria Arisanti, S. Pd | Indonesian teacher |
| 26 | Candra Fitriansyah, S. Pd | Math teacher |
| 27 | Dirgawaty, S. Pd | Physics teacher |
| 28 | M. Juari, S.Pd, M.M | Picket teacher |
| 29 | Okta Shufia, S. Pd. i | Picket teacher |
| 30 | Sri Rezeki, S.Pd | Indonesian teacher |
| 31 | Anugrah Agung, S. Pd | Civics teacher |
| 32 | Dwi Rahayu, S. Pd | Art teacher |
| 33 | Sulhayati Yatim, BA | Religion teacher |
| 34 | Dede Yuniarti, S. Pd | Math teacher |
| 35 | Yeni Mardaeni, S. Pd | English teacher |
| 36 | Henny Purwati, S. Pd | English teacher |
| 37 | Novi Oktarina, S. Pd | Sport teacher |
| 38 | Muhammad Imam Muhtadi | BK teacher |
| 39 | Agustriyanti | Economics teacher |
| 40 | Radita Ika Kusumawardani | Art teacher |
| 41 | Dra. Muslicha | Chemistry teacher |
| 42 | Ernawati, S.Pd | Chemistry teacher |
| 43 | Kurniawan, S. Ag | Religion teacher |
| 44 | Yosi Susanti, S. Pd | History teacher |
| 45 | Dra. Hj. Roro Erna Utami | Indonesian teacher |
| 46 | Nurleni, S.T | Math teacher |
| 47 | Marwati, S. Pd | Geography teacher |
| 48 | Nining Halimah, S. Pd | Indonesian teacher |
| 49 | Yeni Puspita Sari, S. Pd | Geography teacher |

 (*Source : School Administration of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang in the academic year 2013/2014)*

The total students in 2013/2014 period are 494 students consisting of 143 tenth grade students with the total 63 of male students and 80 for the female students. 157 of eleventh grade students with the total 81 of male students and 76 of female students. Then also, 193 of twelfth grade students with the total 87 of male students and 106 of female students. The number of Students displayed in the following table :

**Table 2**

**The Number of Students SMA Nurul Iman Palembang**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Class | Students  | Total |
| Male  | Female  |
| 1. | X  | 63 | 80 | 143 |
| 2. | XI  | 81 | 76 | 157 |
| 3. | XII | 87 | 106 | 193 |
|  | TOTAL OF STUDENTS | 494 |

Then, the total number is 35 rooms. There are 14 rooms consisting of 4 classrooms for tenth grade students, 5 classrooms for eleventh grade students, 5 classrooms for twelfth grade students. Then, there are 21 other rooms consisting a headmaster room, a teachers’ room, a library room, a science laboratory, a language laboratory, a computer laboratory, an art laboratory, a canteen, a TU room, toilets, an UKS room, an OSIS room, a BK room and a mushola.

**CHAPTER III**

**METHOD AND PROCEDURE**

This chapter presents (a) method of research; (b) variables of the study; (c) operational definitions; (d) population and sample; (e) techniques for collecting the data; and (f) techniques for analyzing data.

1. **Method of the Study**

This study was conducted through Quasi-experimental design. In Quasi experimental method, the participants cannot be randomly assigned to treatment level. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 242), quasi-experimental design does not include the use of random assignment. Researchers who employ these designs rely instead on other techniques to control (or at least reduce) threats to internal validity.

In this study, pretest-posttest nonequivalent groups design was used. There were two groups which both were given pretest and posttest. The experimental group was taught using Question generation strategy whereas, the control group was taught by using strategy that the teacher of SMA Nurul Iman usually used.

According to Best and Kahn (1995: 151), the form of this design is as follows:

 **O1 X O2**

 **O3 C O4**

Where :

**O1** : Pretest of experimental group

**O2** : Posttest of experimental group

**O3** : Pretest of control group

**O4** : Posttest of control group

**X** : Treatment of experimental group by using Question Generation

strategy

**C** : Treatment of control group by using strategy usually used by the

teacher of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang

1. **Variables of the Study**

Arikunto (2010: 161) says that ‘‘Variable is the object of the research or something which is being focused on the research’’.

According to Creswell (2005: 118), a variable is a characteristics or attribute of an individual or an organization that (1) researchers can measure or observe and (2) varies among individuals or organizations studied.

There are two kinds of variables in this study: independent and dependent variables. The independent variable is the treatment or the intervention, while the dependent variable is the outcome or the result that is important to the users, developers or researchers. The independent variable in this study is the use of Question generation and dependent variable of this study is improving reading comprehension.

1. **Operational Definitions**

 An operational definition describes exactly what the variables are and how they are measured within the context of your study (Cherry, 2014:3). The title of this thesis “Teaching Reading Comprehension by Using Question Generation to the Eleventh Grade Students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang”. To avoid misunderstanding, some terms are defined operationally.

1. **Teaching Reading Comprehension**

 According to Steve (2009: 1), comprehension is the only reason for reading. Without comprehension, reading is a frustrating, pointless exercise in word calling. It is no exaggeration to say that how well students develop the ability to comprehend what they read has a profound effect on their entire lives. A major goal of teaching reading comprehension, therefore, is to help students develop the knowledge, skills, and experiences they must have if they are to become competent and enthusiastic readers. In this study, the writer teaches reading comprehension by using narrative and spoof texts to help students develop their knowledge, skills, and experiences . It means that the students are expected to become competent and enthusiastic readers.

1. **Question Generation Strategy**

Question generation is the purposefulposing and answering of questions about what is read, typically to make inferences or reveal details (why, how, when, where, who, etc.) and specific information needed to deeply analyze a body of knowledge or process (e.g, investigation, experiment, classification, comparison or contrast), thus promoting progress toward improved reading comprehension (Summer, 2004: 1). Question generation is the kind of strategy used by teacher to improve the students’ reading comprehension through the students write and answer their own question about the reading text. So, the writer used Question generation strategy to help the students in comprehending the text.

1. **Reading Comprehension Achievement**

 Achievement is the result of what an individual has learned from some educational experiences (Travers, 1970:447). In this study, the researcher wants to improve students reading comprehension. The students’ reading comprehension achievement can be seen from the differences of students’ posttest score in experimental and control after giving the treatment.

1. **Population and Sample**

**1. Population**

The population is the group of interest to the researcher, the group to whom the researcher would like to generalize the results of the study (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990:68).

The population of this study was all of the eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang of the second semester in the academic year of 2014. The total number of the population which consist of five classes displayed in table 3.

**Table 3**

**The Population of the Study**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Class | Students  | Total |
| Male  | Female  |
| 1. | XI IPA Plus | 13 | 21 | 34 |
| 2. | XI IPA 1 | 8 | 22 | 30 |
| 3. | XI IPA 2 | 12 | 18 | 30 |
| 4. | XI IPS 1 | 25 | 8 | 33 |
| 5. | XI IPS 2 | 23 | 7 | 30 |
|  | TOTAL OF STUDENTS | 157 |

(*Source : School Administration of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang in the academic year 2013/2014)*

**2. Sample**

Sample refers to any group on which information is obtained. In this study, the writer used convenience sampling method to select the sample. According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 75), a convenience sample is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for study. The writer decided XI IPA 2 (control group) and XI IPA 1 (experimental group) as his sample. After the writer asked the teacher of English about the reading comprehension eleventh grade students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang. The sample of the study shown in the following table:

**Table 4**

**The Sample of the Study**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Class** | **Number of students** |
| 1. | XI IPA 1 (experimental group) | 30 |
| 2. | XI IPA 2 (control group) | 30 |
| Total | 60 |

1. **Techniques for Collecting the Data**
2. **Tests**

 Brown (2004: 3) states that test is a method of measuring a person’s ability, knowledge, or performance in a given domain. In this study, the test was administered twice. First, as a pretest that was given before the treatment and second, as a posttest that was given after the treatment in the experimental and control group. The test was a reading test in which the students were assigned to read the text or passage and then answer some questions related to the text that they had read before. During the treatment, the students were mainly focused on reading process. At the end of the treatment, a posttest was given to know the influence of the treatment received by the students.

1. **Research Instruments**

**a. Validity Test**

The validity is the most important idea to consider when preparing or selecting an instrument for use. The term “validity” as used in research, refers to the appropriateness, meaningfulness, and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make based on the data they collect (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990: 138).

1.Construct Validity

 According to Sugiyono (2008: 139), in order to estimate the construct validity, expert judgments is required. the number of experts to estimate the instrument at least three people. The writer asked his lecturers Renny Kurnia Sari, M.Pd as Validator I, Muhammad Holandyah, M.Pd as Validator II and Manalullaili, M.Ed as Validator III to estimate his instruments. Based on the assessment carried out by validator I and III, the research instrument can be used without revision and based on validator II it can be used with a few revision. It means that the research instrument can be applied in this research.

 2. One Shot Method

 In this study, the validity test was conducted by using (one shot method), where the measurements of the test is once only (Pratisto, 2004: 249). the writer had already tried out his research instruments of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Palembang. The try out of the test was carried out on Saturday, 5th of October 2013 at 10.00-11.30. The research instruments of the test were tested to 30 students of the eleventh grade students of science (XI IPA 4). The writer did the try out to find the validity instrument by using *Pearson Correlation* *Coefficient* formula in SPSS 16. There were 60 questions that given to the students. According to Basrowi and Soenyono (2007: 24), if the result of the test shows that rcount is higher than rtabel (0.254), it means that the item is valid.

 The result analysis of validity of multiple choice question was found that there were 44 questions item valid. They are questions item number 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 60. Then, there were 16 questions item invalid. They are questions item number 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 17, 19, 24, 27, 28, 42, 46, 55, 56, 58, 59. Therefore, since there were 44 questions item valid, the writer took 40 valid questions item. The result analysis of validity test in each questions item was displayed in the table 5. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 1.

**Table 5**

**Validity Test Result**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Question Items** | **Sig. (2-tailed) of Pearson Correlation** | **rtable** | **Result** |
| 1.2.3.4.5.6.7.8.9.10.11.12.13.14.15.16.17.18.19.20.21.22.23.24.25.26.27.28.29.30.31.32.33.34.35.36.37.38.39.40.41.42.43.44.45.46.47.48.49.50.51.52.53.54.55.56.57.58.59.60. | Item1Item2Item3Item4Item5Item6Item7Item8Item9Item10Item11Item12Item13Item14Item15Item16Item17Item18Item19Item20Item21Item22Item23Item24Item25Item26Item27Item28Item29Item30Item31Item32Item33Item34Item35Item36Item37Item38Item39Item40Item41Item42Item43Item44Item45Item46Item47Item48Item49Item50Item51Item52Item53Item54Item55Item56Item57Item58Item59Item60 | 00.2890.2350.4320.2350.2350.2350.6081.0000.4771.0000.5280.7400.6080.5050.5290.2500.8530.2500.6080.3520.7230.8710.1770.4140.6080.0660.1890.8750.6080.3340.7230.3520.7230.8530.7230.6080.7400.4320.8340.6080.1090.4320.4320.4770.2501.0000.8530.5290.4770.5290.6380.7540.8530.0570.0740.5050.1520.0280.608 | 0.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.2540.254 | InvalidValidInvalidValidInvalidInvalidInvalidValidValidValid ValidValidValidValidValidValidInvalidValidInvalid ValidValidValid ValidInvalidValidValidInvalidInvalidValid ValidValid ValidValid ValidValid ValidValid Valid ValidValid Valid Invalid ValidValid ValidInvalid ValidValid ValidValid ValidValid ValidValidInvalidInvalid ValidInvalidInvalidValid  |

 3. Content Validity

 The validity of a test is the extent to which test measure what is intended to measure. The specification for the test, it was formulated based on the curriculum or syllabus of English for eleventh graders of Senior High School. The writer estimated the content validity.

 Content validity refers to the nature of the content included within the instrument, and the specification the researcher used to formulate the content (Fraenkel, 1990:128). The writer used book for Senior High School: Daryanto and Darini (2012) and Widodo (2012). In order to know if the contents of the test items given were appropriate the students, the researcher arranged and presented the test items in the table of the test specification as shown in table 6:

**Table 6**

**Test Specification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective**  | **Materials** | **Indicators** | **Number of items** | **Total** | **Types of text** | **Answer key** |
| To measure the students’ comprehension in reading text focus on narrative and spoof texts | 1. The jackal
2. Ali Baba
3. Malin Kundang
4. What time is it?
5. The Smartest Parrot
6. The Hermit
7. The Princess and the frog
8. The zoo job story
9. A bear and rabbit
10. The three sheiks
 | The Students are able to:1. identify topic of the text
2. identify word/ sentence meaning
3. identify specific information
4. identify word reference
5. identify the purpose of the text
6. identify the moral value
7. identify event from the text
8. identify the rhetoric of text
9. making inference
 | 22, 24, 25,8, 27, 36, 1, 2, 3, 9, 13, 14, 20, 28, 29, 38, 405, 11, 1810, 16, 19, 23, 30, 3412, 35, 3732, 3317, 31 4, 6, 7, 15, 21, 26, 39 | 3311363227 | Multiple choice |   b, a, c, e, b, d c, a, c, e, c,  b, a, a,  a, d, e, a, b, b, d, c, a,  b, a, b d, a, a, a, e, c, a, c, c, c, d, e, a, c |
|  |  | **Total** |  | **40** |  | **40** |

**b. Reliability Test**

 According to Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 133), reliability refers to the consistency of the scores obtained, how consistent they are for each individual from one administration of an instrument to another and from one set of items to another. The concept of reliability is related to the consistency of the measurement when the testing procedure is repeated on a population of individuals or group.

To find out the reliability of the test, the writer tried out the test twice to the same students from the same school about the writer gave it in different time. The test consisted of 40 question items and these question tested to the eleventh grade students at MAN 2 Palembang. The instruments of the test were given to 37 students of social (XI IPS I). First, try out was carried out on Saturday, 12th  of October 2013 at 07.00-08.30 a.m. Second, try out was carried out on Saturday, 19th of October 2013 at 07.00 - 08.30 a.m. The result of the test was described in the Table 7.

**Table 7**

**The result of try out analysis at MAN 2 Palembang**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Student’s Name** | **Test Scores** |
| **Test 1** | **Test 2** |
| 1. | Abdillah Arief | 7.75 | 7.75 |
| 2. | Ainul Marissadya | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 3. | Aldy zulfan | 6.75 | 6.50 |
| 4. | Alfath Nur Hidayati | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| 5. | Amirul Haqqi S | 5.75 | 6.00 |
| 6. | Annisa Fadhilah Widianti | 7.50 | 7.75 |
| 7. | Apriyadi | 5.75 | 6.25 |
| 8. | Desi Okta Noviani | 4.50 | 4.00 |
| 9. | Dicky Achlis | 7.50 | 7.50 |
| 10. | Eki Budiman | 6.00 | 6.25 |
| 11. | Elda Rinanda | 5.00 | 5.25 |
| 12. | Ferlin Novia | 6.25 | 6.00 |
| 13. | Fitra Maulana | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 14 | Indriani | 5.00 | 5.75 |
| 15. | Jerry Arisandi | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| 16. | Kiki Retno Sari | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 17. | Lilis Julianti | 6.00 | 6.75 |
| 18. | Marlindah | 4.00 | 4.25 |
| 19. | M. Alhari Ramadan | 4.25 | 4.00 |
| 20. | Muhammad Sajili | 5.00 | 5.75 |
| 21. | Muhammad Nazirin | 4.00 | 4.50 |
| 22. | M. Khoiri Rido | 4.25 | 4.75 |
| 23. | M. Nopriansyah | 6.00 | 6.75 |
| 24. | Muhammad Viqi Satria | 5.00 | 5.50 |
| 25. | Putri Stela Aprianti | 6.00 | 6.25 |
| 26. | Rendi Septian | 4.00 | 4.25 |
| 27. | Rian Anggraini | 6.25 | 6.75 |
| 28. | Ridayan M Arif | 5.00 | 5.25 |
| 29. | Riki Juni Arsyah | 7.00 | 7.25 |
| 30. | Riski Anisa | 3.75 | 4.00 |
| 31. | Samsu Rizal | 7.50 | 7.75 |
| 32. | Satria Agung Dwisanto | 5.25 | 6.00 |
| 33. | Syairul | 6.00 | 6.25 |
| 34. | Syukron Siregar | 3.75 | 4.25 |
| 35. | Tri Septiani | 7.00 | 7.25 |
| 36 | Yani Anggraini | 4.25 | 5.00 |
| 37 | Zumiotul Fadhilah | 5.50 | 6.25 |

 Then, score in test 1 and test 2 were analyzed used Pearson Correlation Formula SPSS program. It was found that the coefficient reliability of the reading test items was 0.963. Fraenkel and Wallen (1990: 13) state that the score is considered reliable if the score of significance is at least or preferably higher than 0.70. Since the score was higher than 0.70. So, it can be assumed that this reading test was considered reliable for this study. The result was displayed in the table 8. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 2.

**Table 8**

**The Result of Reliability Analysis Using Pearson Correlation**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.**  | **Number of Test** | **N**  | **Pearson Correlation** | **Sig.** | **Result**  |
| 1. | Test 1 and Test 2 | 37 | 0.963 | 0.000 | Reliable |

**3. Research Treatments**

Treatments were given after pre-test. It was done to know the students’ achievement in reading comprehension by using Question generation strategy. The writer did an experiment by doing the actual teaching to the sample students. In experimental group the writer teaches the students by using Question strategy. Meanwhile, in control group, teacher of english used the strategy that usually used by the teacher of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang to teach the students.

There were twelve reading texts with different titles that the writer used as reading materials. The twelve texts that entitled The princess and the frog, The Legend of Golden Snail, [Saved by Stilts](http://spooftext.blogspot.com/2009/01/saved-by-stilts.html), The Bear Who Married a woman, The story of Toba Lake, The Magic Candle, Sangkuriang, The Necklace, Malin Kundang, Mr. and Mrs. Brown, Goat Jumping into a deep Hole, The Lost Ring. The twelve texts were taken by writer from a book. “I Can Do It English for Senior High School Grade XI” by Daryanto and Darini (2012). The reading texts were suitable for eleventh grade students that were displayed in the following table :

**Table 9**

**Reading Materials for Research Treatments**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Day / Date** | **Reading Text** | **Text Type** | **Time Allocation** |
| 1 | Saturday/Feb 15th 2014 | The princess and the frog | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 2 | Tuesday / Feb 18th 2014 | The Legend of Golden Snail | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 3 | Thursday / Feb 20th 2014 | [Saved by Stilts](http://spooftext.blogspot.com/2009/01/saved-by-stilts.html) | Spoof text | 2 x 45’ |
| 4 | Saturday / Feb 22th 2014 | The Bear Who Married a woman | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 5 | Tuesday / Feb 25th 2014 | The story of Toba Lake | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 6 | Thursday/ Feb 27th  2014  | The Magic Candle | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 7 | Saturday / Mar 1th 2014 | Sangkuriang | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 8 | Tuesday / Mar 4st 2014 | The Necklace | Spoof text | 2 x 45’ |
| 9 | Thursday /Mar 6th 2014 | Malin Kundang | Narrative text | 2 x 45’ |
| 10 | Saturday / Mar 8th 2014 | Mr. and Mrs. Brown | Spoof text | 2 x 45’ |
| 11 | Tuesday / Mar 11th 2014 | Goat Jumping into a deep Hole | Spoof text | 2 x 45’ |
| 12 | Thursday / Mar 13th 2014 | The Lost Ring | Spoof text | 2 x 45’ |

1. **Techniques for Analyzing the Data**

 In this study, the data obtained from Quasi-experimental study were submitted for statistical analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 16 software. The writer analyzed the data from the test (pre-test and post-test). First the data concerned with the post-test. In analyzing the data obtained from the text, the writer used some techniques, they are :

1. **Data Descriptions**

In analyzing the data description, there are two analyses to be done, they are distribution of frequency data and descriptive statistics.

1. **Distribution of Frequency Data**

 In distributions of frequency data, the students’ score interval, frequency, percentage are achieved. The distributions of frequency data are got from students’ pretest score in control group, students’ posttest score in control group, the students’ pretest score in control group, the students’ pretest score in experimental group, and students’ posttest score in experimental group.

1. **Descriptive Statistics**

 In descriptive statistics, number of sample, the score of minimal, maximal, mean, standard deviation, and standard error of mean are obtained. Descriptive statistics are got from students’ pretest score in control group, students’ posttest score in control group, students’ pretest score in experimental group, and students’ posttest score in control group.

1. **Prerequisite Analysis**
	* + 1. **Normality Test**

The normality test is based on the students’ pretest scores in the experimental and control groups and the students’ posttest scores in experimental and control groups were analyzed using *one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test* with an assist of SPSS 16. This test was used to find out whether or not the samples taken from the same population was normal and the distribution of data can be normal if the p-output was higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 levels.

* + - 1. **Homogeneity Test**

To determine the students’ scores are homogeneous or not, the students’ pretest and posttest scores in the experimental and control groups were analyzed using *Levene Statistic*. The students’ scores were considered homogeneous whenever the p-output is higher than mean significant difference at the 0.05 level.

1. **Hypothesis Testing** **in** **Measuring Significant difference On Students’ Reading Skill Average Scores Taught by Using Question generation Strategy**

 Significant difference is found from testing students’ posttest scores in experimental group and control group by using independent sample t-test. Significant difference is found whenever the t-obtained is equals or exceeds than t-table the degree of freedom (df) is *v =* 58 (60-2), the critical value is 2.021. The level of significance is 0.05 with two-tailed test.

**CHAPTER IV**

**FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS**

In this chapter, the writer presents: (a) findings; and (b) interpretations.

1. **Findings**

 The findings of this study were (1) data descriptions; (2) prerequisite analysis; and (3) result of hypothesis testing.

1. **Data Descriptions**

In data descriptions, there were two analyses to be done. They were distributions of frequency data and descriptive statistics. The scores were obtained from students’ pretest and posttest in control and experimental groups.

* 1. **Distributions of Data Frequency**

 In distributions of data frequency, the students’ scores were described in the form number of students who got a certain score, and score percentage from pretest scores in control group, pretest scores in experimental, posttest scores in control group, and posttest scores in experimental group.

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

 Based on the result analysis of students’ pretest scores in control group, it showed that there was one student who got 5 (3.3%), one student got 5.25 (3.3%), one student who got 5.5 (3.3%), four students who got 5.75 (13.3%), ten students who got 6 (33.3%), eight students who got 6.25 (26.7%), three students who got 6.5 (10.0%), and two students who got 6.75 (6.7%). The result of pretest scores in control group was displayed in Table 10. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 3.

**Table 10**

**Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores**  | **Frequency**  | **Percentage (%)** |
| 5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.25 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.75 | 4 | 13.3 |
| 6 | 10 | 33.3 |
| 6.25 | 8 | 26.7 |
| 6.5 | 3 | 10.0 |
| 6.75 | 2 | 6.7 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100.0** |

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

 Based on the result analysis of students’ pretest scores in experimental group, it showed that there was one student who got 5 (3.3%), one student who got 5.5 (3.3%), two students who got 5.75 (6.7%), twelve students who got 6 (40.0%), eight students who got 6.25 (20.0%), four students who got 6.5 (13.3%), and two students who got 6.75 (6.7%). The result of pretest scores in experimental group was displayed in Table 11. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 4.

**Table 11**

**Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores** | **Frequency**  | **Percentage (%)** |
| 5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.75 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 6 | 12 | 40.0 |
| 6.25 | 8 | 26.7 |
| 6.5 | 4 | 13.3 |
| 6.75 | 2 | 6.7 |
| **Total** | **30** | **100.0** |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

 Based on the result analysis of students’ posttest scores in control group, it showed that there were one student who got 5 (3.3%), one student who got 5.5 (3.3%), three students who got 5.75 (10.0%), two students who got 6 (6.7%), ten students who got 6.25 (33.3%), three students who got 6.5 (10.0%), eight students who got 6.75 (26.7%), and two students got 7 (6.7%). The result of posttest scores in control group was displayed in Table 12. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 5.

**Table 12**

**Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| 5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.25 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 5.5 | 3 | 10.0 |
| 5.75 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 6 | 10 | 33.3 |
| 6.25 | 3 | 10.0 |
| 6.75 | 8 | 26.7 |
| 7 | 2 | 6.7 |
| **Total**  | **30** | **100** |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

 Based on the result analysis of students’ posttest scores in experimental group, it showed that there were two students who got 6.25 (6.7%), one student who got 6.5 (3.3%), six students who got 7 (20.0%), four students who got 7.25 (13.3%), five students who got 7.5 (16.7%), two students who got 7.75 (6.7%), five students who got 8 (16.7%), three students who got 8.25 (10.0%), one student who got 8.5 (3.3%), and one student who got 8.75 (3.3%). The result of posttest scores in experimental group was displayed in Table 13. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 6.

**Table 13**

**Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Scores** | **Frequency** | **Percentage (%)** |
| 6.25 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 6.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 7 | 6 | 20.0 |
| 7.25 | 4 | 13.3 |
| 7.5 | 5 | 16.7 |
| 7.75 | 2 | 6.7 |
| 8 | 5 | 16.7 |
| 8.25 | 3 | 10.0 |
| 8.5 | 1 | 3.3 |
| 8.75 | 1 | 3.3 |
| **Total**  | **30** | **100** |

* 1. **Descriptive Statistics**

 In descriptive statistics, the students’ scores were described a number of students who got the lowest score, the highest score, mean score, and the score of standard deviation from students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups, students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

 **a. Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

 After the students’ pretest scores in control group were analyzed, it showed that the lowest score was 5.00, the highest score was 6.75, mean score was 6.0583, and the score of standard deviation was 0.38665. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group was displayed in Table 14. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 7.

**Table 14**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pretest Score** | **N**  | **Min**  | **Max**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation** |
| 30 | 5.00 | 6.75 | 6.0583 | 0.38665 |

**b. Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

 After the students’ pretest scores in experimental group were analyzed, it showed that the lowest score was 5.00, the highest score was 6.75, mean score was 6.1167, and the score of standard deviation was 0.35192. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in experimental group was displayed in Table 15. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 8.

**Table 15**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pretest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Pretest Scores** | **N**  | **Min**  | **Max**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation** |
| 30 | 5.00 | 6.75 | 6.1167 | 0.35192 |

**c. Students’ Posttest Scores in Control Group**

After the students’ posttest scores in control group were analyzed, it showed that the lowest score was 5.00, the highest score was 7.00, mean score was 6.3250, and the score of standard deviation was 0.46028. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in control group was displayed in Table 16. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 9.

**Table 16**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Pretest Scores in Control Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Posttest Scores** | **N**  | **Min**  | **Max**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation** |
| 30 | 5.00 | 7.00 | 6.3250 | 0.46028 |

 **d. Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

 After the students’ posttest scores in experimental group were analyzed, it showed that the lowest score was 6.25, the highest score was 8.75, mean score was 7.5000, and standard deviation was 0.62972. The result analysis of descriptive statistics in experimental group was described in Table 17. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 10.

**Table 17**

**Descriptive Statistics of Students’ Posttest Scores in Experimental Group**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Posttest Score** | **N**  | **Min**  | **Max**  | **Mean**  | **Std. Deviation** |
| 30 | 6.25 | 8.75 | 7.5000 | 0.62972 |

1. **Prerequisite Analysis**

In prerequisite analysis, there were two analyses to be done. They were normality test and result of homogeneity test. The scores were obtained from students’ pretest and posttest in both control and experimental groups.

* 1. **Normality Test**

In normality test, the students’ scores were described to see the normality test using Kolmogorov Smirnov Z from students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups, students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 After the students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups were analyzed, it showed that the normality test on students’ pretest scores in control group was 0.154 and experimental group was 0.069. From the result of the output, it could be stated that the students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups were normal. Since, it was higher than significant difference at 0.05. The result analysis was displayed in Table 18. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 11.

**Table 18**

 **Measuring Normality Test of Students’ Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using Kolmogorov Smirnov Z**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Student’s Pretest** | **N** | **Kolmogorov Smirnov Z** | **Sig.** | **Result** |
| **1.**  | **Control Group** | **30** | **1.132** | **0.154** | **Normal** |
| **2.** | **Experimental Group** | **30** | **1.297** | **0.069** | **Normal** |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 After the students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups were analyzed, it showed that the normality test on students’ posttest scores in control group was 0.173 and experimental group was 0.783. From the result of the output, it could be stated that the students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups were normal. Since, it was higher than significant difference at 0.05. The result analysis was displayed in Table 19. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 12.

**Table 19**

**Measuring Normality Test of Students’ Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using Kolmogorov Smirnov Z**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Student’s Posttest** | **N** | **Kolmogorov Smirnov Z** | **Sig.** | **Result** |
| **1.**  | **Control Group** | **30** | **1.106** | **0.173** | **Normal** |
| **2.** | **Experimental Group** | **30** | **0.656** | **0.783** | **Normal** |

* 1. **Homogeneity Test**

 In homogeneity test, the students’ scores were described to see the homogeneity test using Levene Statistics from students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups, students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups.

1. **Students’ Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 After the students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups were analyzed, it showed that homogeneity test of students’ pretest significant scores in control and experimental groups were 0.696. From the result of the output, it could be stated that the students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups were homogeny. Since, it was higher than significant difference at 0.05. The analysis homogeneity was displayed in Table 20. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 13.

**Table 20**

**Measuring Homogeneity Test of Students’ Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using Levene Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Students’ Pretest** | **N** | **Levene Statistics** | **Sig.** | **Result** |
| 1. | Control Group | 30 | 0.154 | 0.696 | Homogen |
| 2. | Experimental Group | 30 |

1. **Students’ Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 After the students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups were analyzed, it showed that homogeneity test of students’ posttest significant scores in control and experimental group were 0.090. From the results of the output, it could be stated that the students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups were homogeny. Since, it was higher than significant difference at 0.05. The analysis homogeneity was displayed in Table 21. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 14.

**Table 21**

**Measuring Homogeneity Test of Students’ Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups Using Levene Statistics**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Students’ Posttest** | **N** | **Levene Statistics** | **Sig.** | **Result** |
| 1. | Control Group | 30 | 2.975 | 0.090 | Homogen |
| 2. | Experimental Group | 30 |

1. **Result of Hypothesis Testing in a Significant Difference in Control and Experimental Groups**

 Significant difference is found from testing students’ pretest scores in experimental group and control group by using independent sample t-test. Significant difference is found whenever the t-obtained is equals or exceeds than t-table the degree of freedom (df) is *v =* 58 (60-2), the critical value is 2.021. The level of significance is 0.05 with two-tailed test.

**a. Students’ Pretest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 The result of the independent sample t-test from the analysis, it showed that the t-obtained was 1.182. It could be stated that there was no means significant difference on students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups. The result analysis in measuring significant difference was displayed in Table 22. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 15.

 **Table 22**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question Generation Reading Strategy** |  **Independent Sample T-Test** | **Ho** |
| **T** | **Df** | **Sig. (2-tailed)** |
| 1.182 | 58 | 0.242 | Accepted |

 **b. Students’ Posttest Scores in Control and Experimental Groups**

 The result of the independent sample t-test from the analysis, it showed that the t-obtained was 8.251. It could be stated that there was a significant difference on students’ posttest scores in control and experimental groups since the t-obtained was exceeds than t-table the degree of freedom (df) is *v =* 58 (60-2), the critical value is 2.021. The result analysis in measuring a significant difference was displayed in Table 23. The complete statistical can be seen in Appendix 16.

**Table 23**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question Generation Reading Strategy** |  **Independent Sample T-Test** | **Ho** |
| **T** | **Df** | **Sig. (2-tailed)** |
| 8.251 | 58 | 0.000 | Rejected |

1. **Interpretations**

 Based on the findings above, some interpretations were made as follows:

 First, from the result analysis of measuring a significant difference from students’ pretest scores in control and experimental groups, it was found that the t-obtained was 1.182. Since the t-obtained was lower than t-table the degree of freedom (df) is *v =* 58 (60-2), the critical value is 2.021. It could be interpreted that there was no significant difference on students’ scores.

Second, from the result analysis of measuring a significant difference from students’ posttest in control and experimental groups, it was found that the t-obtained was 8.251 Since the t-obtained was higher than t-table the degree of freedom (df) is *v =* 58 (60-2), the critical value is 2.021. It could be interpreted that Question Generation strategy gave significant difference to teach the students reading comprehension.

 After the treatment by using Question Generation strategy, students felt that they could answer questions about the reading text easier than before, they could identify and remember important information from the text and they became to be active readers. It is related to Summer (2004: 1), question generation is the *purposeful* posing and answering of questions about what is read, typically to make inferences or reveal details (why, how, when, where, who, etc.) and specific information needed to deeply analyze a body of knowledge or process (e.g., investigation, experiment, classification, comparison or contrast), thus promoting progress toward improved reading comprehension.

 Question Generation strategy made the students become more competent to face the reading test, encouraged the students to monitor their understanding, and they were thought about what was important to remember from the text. It is also supported by walker (1992: 207) who states that Question Generation is most appropriate for students who have facility with word meaning but have difficulty studying for tests. For these students, this approach requires them to read the text in order to formulate questions about the important information in the text or important parts of the story organization. This reading comprehension strategy was designed to prompt students to generate "think-type" questions while reading, and in doing so encourage students to be more active readers and increase their awareness of whether they are comprehending or not. Question generation is the kind of strategy is used by teacher to improve the students’ reading comprehension.

**CHAPTER V**

**CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

 In this chapter, the writer presents: (a) conclusions; and (b) suggestions.

1. **Conclusions**

 Based on the findings and interpretations in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that :

 Question generation strategy gave significant difference to the students’ reading comprehension achievement. It can be seen from the results of the study that the students who were taught by using Question generation strategy got higher score than the students who were taught by using the strategy usually used by teacher of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang. So, Question generation strategy is one of the reading comprehension strategies that can used by teacher to help the students comprehending the text.

1. **Suggestions**

From the conclusions above, the writer would like to offer some suggestions to the teachers of English and the students of SMA Nurul Iman Palembang:

1. **For Teachers of English**

 From the findings of this study, the writer suggests the teachers of English to use Question Generation as an alternative strategy to improve students’ reading comprehension achievement. It can be useful for the teachers of English in SMA Nurul Iman Palembang to improve their English teaching and learning especially for teaching reading comprehension.

1. **For Students**

 The writer suggests and motivate the students to improve their vocabulary, grammar and other aspects of reading in order to comprehend reading text. And use Question Generation strategy in increasing their reading ability. Besides, the students also should practice reading more. They should read any kinds of books, especially English books.
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