

# THE EFFECT OF PRE-QUESTIONING TECHNIQUE ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENT

Karina Rabiula, Ujang Suparman, Huzairin

[karinarabiulah@gmail.com](mailto:karinarabiulah@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah (1) mencari proses penerapan tehnik *pre-questioning*. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di kelas dua, di SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung dan (2) mencari pengaruh signifikan dari tehnik *pre-questioning* pada nilai pemahaman membaca siswa. Data didapat dari soal-soal membaca, kuesioner, dan observasi. Data diolah menggunakan SPSS 16.0. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa t-rasion lebih besar daripada t-table ( $5.703 > 2.074$ ). Itu berarti ada pengaruh signifikan dari tehnik *pre-questioning* pada nilai pemahaman membaca siswa. Data menunjukkan bahwa peningkatan antara *pre-test* dan *post-test* adalah 1.08. Data dari kuesioner menunjukkan bahwa siswa merasa bosan untuk membaca, teks *narrative* adalah teks yang baik, mereka menyukai soal esei daripada pilihan ganda, mereka menggunakan *schemata* untuk membantu mendapatkan isi dari teks, dan mereka merasa tehnik *pre-questioning* adalah tehnik yang sangat baik.

The objectives of this research were (1) to find out the process of the implementation of *pre-questioning* technique and (2) to find out the significant effect of *pre-questioning* technique on students reading comprehension achievement. This research was conducted at the second grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung . The data were collected from reading tests, questionnaire, and observation. The data were computed by SPSS 16.0. The results showed that t-ratio was higher than t-table ( $5.703 > 2.074$ ). it means that there is a significant effect of *pre-questioning* technique on students' reading comprehension achievement. The data showed that the increase between *pre-test* and *post-test* is 1.08. The data from questionnaire shows that students felt bored to read, narrative text was good, they preferred essay questions to multiple choices, they used their *schemata* to help them to find out the content of the text, and they felt *pre-questioning* technique was very good technique.

**Keywords:** *pre-questioning* technique, reading, *schemata*.

## INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of four language skills that should be mastered by the learners. By reading, the learners will get a lot of important information. Reading can also open the world and make the learners get knowledge. Reading is one of language skills that use the critical thinking of the learners. Based on the researcher's pre-observation, it was found that there were several difficulties encountered by students, i.e. sometimes the text was very long and the topic was not suitable for the learners. On the other hands, the learners that did not like reading usually chose the simple text with simple content. They are forced by the duty to get the information to answer several questions from the teacher or educator. The English teacher also said that she never gave students pre-questioning technique. Thus, the researcher was interested to use pre questioning technique.

Based on Anderson & Pearson (1984) as quoted by Narvaez (2002), schemata is the process of connecting known information to new information takes place through a series of networkable connections. We have schemata to represent all levels of our experience, at all levels of abstraction. Finally, our schemata are our knowledge. All of our generic knowledge is embedded in schemata. Schemata are very important because every people have different schemata. Based on a lot of schemata from each student, reading is easier to be learnt. For example Lukman knows that Cinderella is a beautiful woman. And Lusi knows that Cinderella has cruel step mother and two step sisters. Lili knows that Cinderella is always pushed by her step mother and step

sisters. So, their schemata can make them easier to understand text well. The next concept is the concept of questioning. Pre- Questioning is a technique that uses several questions by using schemata and critical thinking to understand the content of the text. According to the Harmer (1985:153) as quoted Dewi (2013), there are four functions of pre-questioning, i.e. (1) To confirm expectation, in this case pre-questioning as a tool to encourage students to predict the content of the text, (2) To extract specific information, in this case pre-questioning as a tool to force students to get specific information from the text. Students should answer the question before read the text, (3) To obtain general comprehension, in this case pre-questioning as a tool to connect students' answer and to get main idea of the text, and (4) To gain detail comprehension, in this case pre-questioning as a tool to give students detail information from the whole important things in the text.

Therefore, the objectives of this research are (1) to find out the process of Pre-Questioning technique in teaching reading especially in identifying main idea, finding supporting detail, and finding inference at the second grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung and (2) to find out whether there is a significant effect of pre-questioning technique on students' reading comprehension or not.

## **METHOD**

This research was intended to investigate whether out whether there is a significant effect of pre-questioning technique on students' reading comprehension or not and

also to find out the process of Pre-Questioning technique in teaching reading especially in identifying main idea, finding supporting detail, and finding inference at the second grade of SMA. This research used embedded design, which is mixing between quantitative and qualitative design. For the quantitative, this research was conducted with *one group pretest – posttest*.

The design of this research: T1 X T2

The population of the research was students of the second year of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung in the second semester of academic year 2013/2014 which consisted of nine classes consisting of forty students in each class. The research was conducted into several procedures, they are determining the problems, determining and selecting the population and the sample, arranging the materials to be taught, arranging the try out test, administering the pre-test, conducting treatment, observing, administering the post-test, and administering the questionnaire.

The researcher conducted try out to know the validity, reliability, discrimination of power, and level of difficulty of the test. The pre test and post test used 31 items with the option A, B, C, and D. the system of the scoring is based on Arikunto (1997) with

the formula: 
$$S = \frac{R}{N} 100$$

With the note that **S** is the score of the test, **R** is the total of the correct number, and **N** is the total items.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### ***Results***

There were two research questions in this research, so there were two main results, that is (1) the process of pre-questioning technique and (2) the significant effect of pre questioning technique on students' reading comprehension achievement.

This section answers first research question. According to the questionnaire-based data, it was found that most students liked English and Reading, because they believed that English is an important subject and also important language. They also liked Reading because reading made their knowledge became wider. From the data, there are 14 students from 19 students that like English and Reading. In the others hand, there were 5 students that dislike with English, especially Reading. They said that reading was a bored activity and could waste the time. They also said that they hate reading because the text was too long for them. Then, from the data, it was also found that there were 15 students out 19 students or 78.94% that liked narrative text in reading task. They felt that narrative contained of funny stuff and the story was very interesting. From the data of questionnaire, the researcher found the students more like with essay questions. There were 13 students from 19 students that liked essay that multiple choices. They explained that sometimes multiple choices were confusing, than essay. They also stated that essay was simple also easy to understand. They also could answer with their own sentences.

Based on the data, the researcher also found that there were 5 students said that understanding vocabulary was the difficult aspect, because they lacked of them. In the second place the difficulty aspect is finding supporting detail. They felt that pre-questioning gave them a lot of benefit. They could understand the text well. They were able to predict by using several questions before reading the text. They felt that pre-questioning was one of good technique. In the others hand, there were several students that could not find the specific information, but it was only to be an outline for the text. Based on the difficulties of comprehending the reading text, the researcher tried to use pre-questioning technique in order to help them getting good achievement.

This section answers second research question. The results of pre-test and post-test showed that there was an increase on students' reading score. Students' pre-test score was 139.23 and post-test score is 167.93. It means that there is an increase of students' score for about 28.7 after giving treatments. The results also showed that the mean of pre-test is 6.32 and post-test is 7.63. It means that the increase of mean of students' score is 1.31.

It can be seen from Paired Samples Statistic, as follows:

**Paired Samples Statistics**

|  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--|------|---|----------------|-----------------|
|--|------|---|----------------|-----------------|

|        |          |        |    |         |        |
|--------|----------|--------|----|---------|--------|
| Pair 1 | Pretest  | 6.3286 | 22 | 1.16700 | .24881 |
|        | posttest | 7.4136 | 22 | .68221  | .14545 |

#### Paired Samples Correlations

|        |                    | N  | Correlation | Sig. |
|--------|--------------------|----|-------------|------|
| Pair 1 | Pretest & posttest | 22 | .648        | .001 |

#### Paired Samples Test

|        | Paired Differences |                |                 |   |          | t       | df     | Sig. (2-tailed) |      |
|--------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|---|----------|---------|--------|-----------------|------|
|        | Mean               | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |          |         |        |                 |      |
|        |                    |                |                 | Lower                                     | Upper    |         |        |                 |      |
| Pair 1 | Pretest – posttest | -1.08500       | .89233          | .19025                                    | -1.48064 | -.68936 | -5.703 | 21              | .000 |

### *Discussion*

#### **Determining Main Idea**

In determining main idea, there is an effect, but it is not significant effect. The students get 100 point in pre-test and 121 in post-test. It means that there is an effect in determining main idea by using pre questioning technique. It is because by using pre-questioning, students can catch a general perception about the text. It also helps them to relate information that they got from the text before making a conclusion (Harmer: 1985).

In the first treatment, the students have understood how to find main idea. It was because they have good ability in English. The researcher still tried to give them a text with several questions, but there were several students that could not find the main idea of the text. The text that the researcher gave to the students was “The King and the Stilts”. Before reading the text, the students told that the main idea was “*There is a King with a stilts*”. And it was wrong. So, they tried to think “*Who is the main character of the text? King? Or the others?*” After that they tried to read the text and they knew that the main character was Abunawas. It means that the title of the text influenced students’ critical thinking to make several questions to understand the text well.

In the second treatment, the researcher gave students a text entitled “The Keeper of the Geese”. The students tried to understand the text from the title, and they knew that the main idea of the text was “*The Keeper kept his geese*”, but actually the main idea is “*the man that helped an old woman and he got a price*”. The students still used pre-questioning and made questions “*Who is the main character? What is the main character do? etc*”. By using those questions the students could know the main idea of the text.

On the other hand, the students felt very happy and they could know the main idea of the last text in the last treatment. The title of the text was “The Legend of Surabaya”, and students told that the main idea was “The fight between Suro and Boyo.” The students knew the main idea because they used their schemata or their past information that Surabaya was Suro and Boyo. It means they brought information, knowledge, emotion, experience, and culture, (Brown: 2001).



### **Finding Supporting Detail**

From the results, finding supporting detail had an effect in reading comprehension achievement. In pre-test, the students got 193 point and post-test 230 point. It means there is an effect of pre-questioning technique. The effect of students' score in supporting detail is because pre-questioning technique helps students to get and extract specific information, and it is supported by Harmer's statement (1985).

In the first treatment, the students found supporting detail because they knew the meaning of supporting detail. The researcher gave the students a text that was "*The King and The Stilts*". Although the students answered right, but they were still confused to find out the supporting detail of the text. The students made several questions that is "who is the main character?, why the king got angry with Abu?, etc. In the second and third treatment, the students have understood the detail information of the text. In the second text, that was "*The Keeper kept his geese*", the students could not answer the question "What did the man do to the old woman?", they answered " The man helped the old woman". The answer of the students was not wrong, but it was the detail information. The correct answer was "The man helped the old woman; he brought the wood of the old woman". In the last treatment, the researcher told that to find out the supporting detail, the students might use several questions before reading. The last text was "*Surabaya*". In the last treatment, the students could answer the questions correctly. Pre-questioning can make students identify the supporting detail of the text. For example, in the last treatment, the students could answer "Who is the main character of the text?, and the answer is Suro and Boyo.

### **Finding Inference Meaning**

Pre-questioning was able to make students to get inference meaning of the text. Pre-questioning could make students used their schemata, it means that students can predict what will be faced by them in the reading text, so they could find inference meaning from the text (Brown: 2001). Therefore, the students' increase is about 19 point, from 81 for pre-test and 100 for post-test.

There is an increase in finding inference meaning of the text, although it is not significant. In the first treatment, the students got the question, "What is the moral value of the text?". Students could answer the question correctly, but not all the students. In the second treatment and last treatment, students could predict the moral value of the text. By using their schemata, the students could predict about "*The Legend of Surabaya*". The students' answer was "We may believe the others, but we do not use full belief.

### **Discussion of Data Collecting's Result**

At the beginning of the activity, pre test was administered to investigate the students' reading comprehension achievement before giving treatment. The average of students' score in the pre-test is 6.32 with the highest score gained was 8.38 and the lowest was 4.5. It means that the students' score did not exceed the standard score that was 70.

After conducting the pre-test, the next activity was giving the treatments to the class. Here, pre-questioning technique gave effect for the students' motivation in

developing their interest and activating their prior knowledge to predict the content of the text (Brown: 2001).

Pre-questioning also activates students' schemata therefore the students can predict what will be faced by them in reading text. Activating schemata or prior knowledge before reading helps students' brains get ready to read and get new information. Pre-questioning also can make students get specific information from the text (Harmer: 1985). Specific information helps students to comprehend the text.

In treatment process, especially in the first treatment, the researcher began the class by greeting the students and checking their attendance list. After that, the researcher asked them several questions, as follow:

*“Have you ever heard about Abunawas?”*

*“What is the characteristic of Abunawas?”*

In the text there was a picture related to the text that is a man stand on the stilt. Then, the researcher asked students several questions before reading. *“Can you predict the text from the picture or the title?”* The students answered that the topic was about the man and the stilt. *“Who is the main character of the text?”* The students answered that the main character of the text was the King, so the picture is King.

From the students' answers, the researcher found several difficult words. The researcher and the students discuss the difficult words together. By using their schemata, the researcher asked the general information from their prediction.

After those activity, the researcher asked students to read the text. In the last, students might answer several questions related to the text.

In the second treatment, before giving the text, the researcher told about the detail explanation of main idea, supporting detail, inference meaning, vocabulary, and reference. After that, the researcher gave the text entitled "*The Keeper of the Geese*". The almost same activity was applied from the beginning until the end. For the second treatment, pre-questioning was given to stimulate the students' comprehension toward the text. The purpose of the activity was to build up the students' critical thinking. In the second treatment, the class became active.

In the last treatment, the almost similar way of teaching learning process was conducted. The text that used by the researcher was "*The Legend of Surabaya*". The text was very familiar in students' schemata. Students got easier to understand the content of the text. They used their critical thinking and schemata to make several questions before reading. The questions given to them could build an image of what the text is going to discuss about. Then finally, can connect their schemata and the theme of the passages.

The next, post-test was administered to find out students' reading comprehension achievement after giving treatments. The average of students' score in the pre-test is 7.63 with the highest score gained was 8.7 and the lowest was 5.8. It means that the students' score could exceed the standard score that was 70. Since pre-questioning helps students in building the students' motivation in reading, activating schemata,

so, students can predict what will be faced by them in reading text (Brown, 2001: 176) and pre-questioning helps students get specific information from the text (Harmer, 1985: 153).

After administering the post-test, the questionnaire was administered to find out students' problems that were faced in reading comprehension and students' opinion about the use of pre-questioning technique. The data gained from the questionnaire showed that reading is a bored activity and can waste the time. They also said that they hate reading because the text is too long for them. They felt that narrative contains of funny stuff and the story was very interesting. From the data of questionnaire, it was found they like essay questions. They explain that sometimes multiple choices are confusing, than essay. They also stated that essay is simple also easy to understand. They also can answer with their own sentences.

They felt that pre-questioning gave them a lot of benefit. They can understand the text well. They also can predict by using several questions before they read the text. They felt that pre-questioning is one of good technique. In the others hand, there are several students that cannot find the specific information, but it is only to be an outline for the text. Based on the difficulties of comprehending the reading text, the researcher tried to use pre-questioning technique in order to help them to get good achievement.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the data, some conclusions are taken, they are (1) there is an active process in the teaching learning process through pre-questioning technique and (2) there is an

effect of Pre-Questioning Technique on students' reading comprehension achievement at the second grade of SMA Perintis 1 Bandar Lampung. The values of the two tailed significance is lower than level significance ( $0.01 < 0.05$ ). Besides questionnaire, the data also gained from the observation sheets. It was found that pre-questioning technique was very good technique, but it could waste the time and the condition of the class was very noisy.

## REFERENCES

- Anderson, R.C. and Pearson, P.D. 1984. *A schema-thematic view of basic processes in reading comprehension*. In P.D. Pearson, R. Barr, M.L. Kamil, & P. Mosenthal (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 255–291). New York: Longman.
- Arikunto, S. 1997. *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Brown, H. D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles. An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New York : Eddison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Dewi, R. A. 2013. *The Effect of Using Pre Questioning on Students' Reading Comprehension Achievement at the Second Grade of SMPN 1 Seputih Banyak*. Bandar Lampung: Universitas Lampung. (Unpublished)
- Harmer, J. 1985. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York: Longman, Inc.
- Narvaez, D. 2002. *Individual differences that influence reading comprehension*. In C.C. Block & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices* (pp. 158–175). New York: Guilford.