

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

The data of this study was gathered at four schools in Banjarmasin, which are; SMPN 16 Banjarmasin, SMPN 18 Banjarmasin, SMPN 25 Banjarmasin, and SMPN 27 Banjarmasin. The subjects applied for current research are 216 total students; 18 students ranging from grade 7, 8, and 9. Within each schools and for each grades the number of 18 students as basis samples. For the last, these samples were the students who underwent second semester year 2020/2021 in Banjarmasin Regency junior highschools at the time this data was gathered.

The purposes of this study were to investigate the most and least metacognitive reading strategies used and what classification of metacognitive reading strategies most preferred by the Banjarmasin junior highschool students.

1. The Most and Least Metacognitive Reading Strategies Used

The result for students' overall score by using MARSI Questionnaire were presented by the following table:

Table 4.1 The Overall Result from Total Sample using MARSI

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Nama	216			
Gender		1	2	
School		1	4	
Class		1	3	
Q1	216	1	4	1,851852
Q2	216	1	3	1,759259

Q3	216	1	3	1,726852
Q4	216	1	4	1,787037
Q5	216	1	4	1,62963
Q6	216	1	3	1,787037
Q7	216	1	3	1,712963
Q8	216	1	5	2,537037
Q9	216	1	3	1,685185
Q10	216	1	5	1,694444
Q11	216	1	5	2,444444
Q12	216	1	3	1,574074
Q13	216	1	3	1,75
Q14	216	1	5	1,689815
Q15	216	1	5	2,333333
Q16	216	1	5	1,861111
Q17	216	1	5	1,634259
Q18	216	1	5	2,342593
Q19	216	1	4	1,638889
Q20	216	1	4	1,75463
Q21	216	1	3	1,712963
Q22	216	1	4	1,652778
Q23	216	1	5	1,625
Q24	216	1	5	2,523148
Q25	216	1	5	2,083333
Q26	216	1	3	1,888889
Q27	216	1	5	2,541667
Q28	216	1	3	1,722222
Q29	216	1	4	1,87963
Q30	216	1	4	1,824074

*Blue Shading : The High Score of Reading Strategies

*Yellow shading : The Low Score of Reading Strategies

The result of this table is the “mean” score taken from the total answers given by the students’ for each questions. For the detailed score for each students can be seen in appendices.

From this result the highest score could be infered is the Q27 with result 2,541667 and followed by a bit lower but similar result Q8,

Q11, Q15, Q18, Q24, Q25, Q27, the result are highlighted with blue shading. And for the lowest score is Q12 with result 1,574074 and followed by Q5, Q9, Q10, Q12, Q14, Q17, Q19, Q22, Q23 with yellow highlighted shading.

The preview of dominant result:

PROB 8. I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I'm reading.

PROB 11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.

SUP 15. I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read.

PROB 18. I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading.

SUP 24. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.

GLOB 25. I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information.

PROB 27. When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.

The preview of the low result

SUP 5. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.

SUP 9. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.

GLOB 10. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.

SUP 12. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.

GLOB 14. I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.

GLOB 17. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.

GLOB 19. I use context clues to help me better understand what I'm reading.

GLOB 22. I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.

GLOB 23. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.

The mean score for the three categories of MARSII concluded so far for GLOB with 1,7589, PROB with 2,12674, SUP with 1,86317 and the total mean with 1,8883, for further stats can be checked at appendix.

The result of GLOB, PROB, and SUP score obtained by summing the whole score from questionnaire related to the each of the three classification, and the result are divided by 13 for GLOB, 8 for PROB, and 9 for SUP as total questionnaire for each categories.

Based on the result , the score then compared to the standard key averages based on MARSII 2002 score as basis of this study, the average key are:

Table 4.2 Frequency of strategy use

Mean Score	Frequency Scale	Evaluation
4,5-5,0	High	Always or almost always used
3,5-4,4		Usually used
2,5-3,4	Medium	Sometimes used
1,5-2,4	Low	Only Occasionally
1,0-1,4		Never or almost never used

Comparing the key averages, the result of the study appears to be that students still in low level with several strategies has high and low tendencies.

Table 4.3 The Overall Result Grade 7 Sample using MARSI

Descriptive Statistics Grade7				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Name	72			
Gender		1	2	1,5
Schools		1	4	2,5
Class		1	1	1
Q1	72	1	4	1,763889
Q2	72	1	3	1,652778
Q3	72	1	3	1,527778
Q4	72	1	3	1,638889
Q5	72	1	3	1,458333
Q6	72	1	3	1,597222
Q7	72	1	3	1,666667
Q8	72	1	5	2,083333

Q9	72	1	3	1,5
Q10	72	1	3	1,513889
Q11	72	1	5	2,111111
Q12	72	1	3	1,402778
Q13	72	1	3	1,652778
Q14	72	1	3	1,583333
Q15	72	1	5	2,041667
Q16	72	1	3	1,763889
Q17	72	1	3	1,472222
Q18	72	1	5	2,222222
Q19	72	1	3	1,555556
Q20	72	1	4	1,638889
Q21	72	1	3	1,597222
Q22	72	1	3	1,472222
Q23	72	1	3	1,361111
Q24	72	1	5	2,430556
Q25	72	1	3	1,902778
Q26	72	1	3	1,763889
Q27	72	1	5	2,222222
Q28	72	1	3	1,555556
Q29	72	1	3	1,680556
Q30	72	1	3	1,638889

Table 4.4 The Overall Result Grade 8 Sample using MARSI

Descriptive Statistics Grade 8				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Name	72			
Gender		1	2	1,5
Schools		1	4	2,5
Class		2	2	2
Q1	72	1	4	1,847222
Q2	72	1	3	1,763889
Q3	72	1	3	1,777778
Q4	72	1	4	1,833333
Q5	72	1	3	1,583333
Q6	72	1	3	1,819444
Q7	72	1	3	1,722222
Q8	72	1	5	2,541667

Q9	72	1	3	1,694444
Q10	72	1	3	1,75
Q11	72	1	5	2,305556
Q12	72	1	3	1,625
Q13	72	1	3	1,763889
Q14	72	1	3	1,666667
Q15	72	1	5	2,375
Q16	72	1	3	1,819444
Q17	72	1	3	1,611111
Q18	72	1	5	2,361111
Q19	72	1	4	1,638889
Q20	72	1	3	1,708333
Q21	72	1	3	1,75
Q22	72	1	3	1,638889
Q23	72	1	3	1,527778
Q24	72	1	4	2,5
Q25	72	1	5	1,972222
Q26	72	1	3	1,902778
Q27	72	1	5	2,444444
Q28	72	1	3	1,722222
Q29	72	1	4	1,902778
Q30	72	1	4	1,833333

Table 4.5 The Overall Result Grade 9 Sample using MARSI

Descriptive Statistics Grade 9				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Name	72			
Gender	0	1	2	1,5
Schools	0	1	4	2,5
Class	0	3	3	3
Q1	72	1	4	1,944444
Q2	72	1	3	1,861111
Q3	72	1	3	1,875
Q4	72	1	3	1,888889
Q5	72	1	4	1,847222
Q6	72	1	3	1,944444
Q7	72	1	3	1,75
Q8	72	1	5	2,986111

Q9	72	1	3	1,861111
Q10	72	1	5	1,819444
Q11	72	1	5	2,916667
Q12	72	1	3	1,694444
Q13	72	1	3	1,833333
Q14	72	1	5	1,819444
Q15	72	1	4	2,583333
Q16	72	1	5	2
Q17	72	1	5	1,819444
Q18	72	1	5	2,444444
Q19	72	1	3	1,722222
Q20	72	1	3	1,916667
Q21	72	1	3	1,791667
Q22	72	1	4	1,847222
Q23	72	1	5	1,986111
Q24	72	1	5	2,638889
Q25	72	1	5	2,375
Q26	72	1	3	2
Q27	72	1	5	2,958333
Q28	72	1	3	1,888889
Q29	72	1	3	2,055556
Q30	72	1	3	2

Once the questionnaire phase completed, researcher conducted structured interview by asking each individuals who have already participated in previous questionnaire session. As mentioned in chapter 3, the point of applying this structured interview is as closer approach to know their use and preferences of reading strategies, and at the end the result will be compared to the first questionnaire to know how close the comparison of their use and preferences in reading strategies. The result can be seen below:

2. The Preferred Classification Metacognitive Reading Strategies

Table. 4.6, Overall Interview Result of Students' Reading Strategies

Preferences

GLOB			
No	Questions	Total	Percentage
1	I have a purpose in my mind when i read.	96	42,5%
3	I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.	74	32,7%
4	I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it.	60	26,5%
7	I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.	62	27,4%
10	I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.	62	27,4%
14	I decide what to read closely and what to ignore	68	30,1%
17	I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.	66	29,2%
19	I use context clues to help me better understand what I'm reading.	66	29,2%
22	I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.	62	27,4%
23	I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	42	18,6%
25	I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information.	112	49,6%
26	I try to guess what the material is about when I read.	60	26,5%
29	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.	62	27,4%

PROB			
No	Question	Total	Percentage
8	I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I'm reading.	156	69,0%
11	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	118	52,2%
13	I adjust my reading speed according to what I'm reading.	70	31,0%
16	When text becomes difficult, I pay closer attention to what I'm reading.	60	26,5%
18	I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading.	106	46,9%
21	I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.	68	30,1%
27	When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.	104	46,0%
30	I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	70	31,0%

SUP			
No	Questions	Total	Percentage
2	I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.	68	30,1%
5	When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.	74	32,7%
6	.I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text.	94	41,6%

9	.I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.	96	42,5%
12	I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.	78	34,5%
15	I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read.	122	54,0%
20	I paraphrase (restate ideas in my own words) to better understand what I read.	60	26,5%
24	I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	122	54,0%
28	I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text.	70	31,0%

*Bolted strategies: highest score recorded among all the reading strategies

B. Discussion

Based on the findings on the questionnaire given to the students, the researcher found the overall average score of reading strategies for the total students was 1,8883 as stated in the previous findings, by this score it meant their result was low as categorized from the original assessment for metacognitive reading strategies of this paper. The range of score can be achieved from this assessment ranging from 0 – 5. Score 0 – 2,4 classified as low, 2,4 until 3,4 classified as medium, and 3,4 to 5 considered as high.

From this result the highest score could be inferred was the Q27 with result 2,541667 and followed by a bit lower but similar result Q8, Q11, Q15, Q18, Q24, Q25, Q27. And for the lowest score was Q12 with

result 1,574074 and followed by Q5, Q9, Q10, Q12, Q14, Q17, Q19, Q22, Q23 as similar low score.

The preview of dominant result:

PROB 8. I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I'm reading.

PROB 11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.

SUP 15. I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read.

PROB 18. I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading.

SUP 24. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.

GLOB 25. I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information.

PROB 27. When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.

The preview of the low result

SUP 5. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.

SUP 9. I discuss what I read with others to check my understanding.

GLOB 10. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.

SUP 12. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.

GLOB 14. I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.

GLOB 17. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.

GLOB 19. I use context clues to help me better understand what I'm reading.

GLOB 22. I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.

GLOB 23. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.

The prominent score were dominated by (PROB) Problem-Solving Strategies with 4 result which are Q8, Q11, Q18, Q27. 2 result from (SUP) Support Reading Strategies which are Q15 and Q24 , and the only one dominant for (GLOB) Global Reading Strategies is Q25. These dominant result mostly were able to reach score more than 2,0.

On the other hand what appeared to be the low scores from this questionnaire were dominated by (GLOB) global reading strategies with 4 result; Q10, Q14, Q17, Q19, Q22, Q23, 3 result for (SUP) support reading strategies; Q5, Q9 and Q12 with all average scores were under 1,7. Suprisingly there are no similar "weak" score like mentioned before found

for PROB type of strategies within the result, overall score of PROB at least never reach below 1,7. The average score can be checked at appendix:

For comparison across the three grades the researcher found similar tendencies of use in (PROB) Problem-Solving Strategies as dominant use among the three types and followed by (SUP) Support-Reading Strategies and (GLOB) Global Reading Strategies. Each of mean score for the three types of strategies manifested slow but sure progress of development in their reading strategies within those 3 years of education comparison. The comparison can be seen in the following tables:

Table 4.7 Overall mean score for Grade 7

GRADE 7 AVERAGE SCORES							
GLOB SCORE	PROB SCORE	SUP SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	GLOB MEAN	PROB MEAN	SUP MEAN	TOTAL MEAN
20,90278	15,29167	15,27778	51,47222	1,607906	1,911458	1,697531	1,715741

Table 4.8 Overall mean score for Grade 8

GRADE 8 AVERAGE SCORES							
GLOB SCORE	PROB SCORE	SUP SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	GLOB MEAN	PROB MEAN	SUP MEAN	TOTAL MEAN
22,79167	16,81944	16,79167	56,40278	1,753205	2,102431	1,865741	1,880093

Table 4.9 Overall mean score for Grade 9

GRADE 9 AVERAGE SCORES							
GLOB SCORE	PROB SCORE	SUP SCORE	TOTAL SCORE	GLOB MEAN	PROB MEAN	SUP MEAN	TOTAL MEAN
24,90278	18,93056	18,23611	62,06944	1,915598	2,366319	2,026235	2,068981

Although, the score still can be considered as low, in researcher perspective, it is pretty reasonable that students in this level of education have low scores on this field of knowledge because considering the materials given to them practically were still at beginner level, had never been taught explicitly and their behavior of using reading strategies seems to be still unconsciously applied or realized.

The result of interview at this research also indicated similar outcome that the frequently used strategies mentioned at the questionnaire mostly reveals at least about above 40%-60% of total samples proclaimed those each major strategies as preference. Overall if we compare the both result of instruments, the patterns seems to be identical as the high and low result from questionnaire compared towards the percentage of samples who claim themselves prefer the certain reading strategies shown in interview finding sub-chapter.