

# JETLi

## Journal of Language Teaching and Linguistics

<https://ejournal.unida-aceh.ac.id/index.php/jetli>

### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SQ4R COOPERATIVE LEARNING METHOD ON READING LEARNING FOR EFL STUDENTS

<sup>1\*</sup> Maulizan ZA, <sup>2</sup> Khatmi

<sup>1</sup> STKIP Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Aceh, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup> SMK-PP Negeri Saree, Aceh Besar, Aceh, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author: [maulianza@gmail.com](mailto:maulianza@gmail.com)

#### Abstract

The aim of study is to determine the effectiveness of the SQ4R method in learning to read comprehension at SMAN 1 Darul Imarah. This study used a pre experimental design with a One Group Pretest Posttest Design design. The subjects of this study were students of class X (IPS 1) at SMAN 1 Darul Imarah. Data were analyzed using Effect Size. The results showed that the pretest mean score before using the SQ4R method was 62.59 and the posttest mean score was 82.76. Based on the calculation of Effect Size, where the Effect Size value between the pretest and posttest is 1.28 with a large category, meaning that there is the effectiveness of the application of the SQ4R method on student learning outcomes in learning reading comprehension in class X (IPS 1) SMA Negeri 1 Darul Imarah.

**Keywords:** *Cooperative Learning, Reading Learning, SQ4R, EFL Students.*

#### 1. Introduction

Learning English in schools is less attractive and students consider English lessons to be a difficult subject. This is confirmed by the opinion of Li Bin (2010) that although English is easy to learn, English is difficult to master. There are even students who consider English lessons to be a burden that will not be solved. The attitude of students who tend to be apathetic towards English lessons is caused by many factors, both internal and external. External factors, for example, are related to the presentation of English subject matter which tends to be in the form of boring word formulas, learning methods that are not in accordance with the substance of the subject matter, lack of supporting learning facilities, the performance of English teachers which is the main factor tends to be unsatisfactory, and it has an impact. It also the less conducive process of learning English. While internal factors include students' attitudes towards lessons which tend to be less positive, as well as low interest and motivation. Therefore, the teacher must make the students learn so the

good result of teaching learning process will be reached well (Sariakin, & Rizka: 2020).

There are many learning models or methods that teachers can apply in teaching, but not all learning models will match the type of subject matter presented in front of students. So, every teacher must be able to choose a method or learning model that is in accordance with the subjects commonly used or the subject matter to be taught. Bonner (1999) states, the choice of teaching method should be based primarily on the type of learning objectives. One of the learning models commonly used in learning English that provides opportunities for students to learn to think, solve problems, learn to apply knowledge, concepts, and skills is to use the SQ4R learning model (Survey, Question, Read, Reflect, Recite, Review).

There are 4 language skills in listening, speaking, reading and writing. Reading skills need to be developed, with reading skills will improve students' ability to understand what they read. Reading is a process both cognitively and emotionally for the reader. In line with this idea, in reading, students are asked to understand the message from the author, construct meaning, identify main ideas and supporting ideas, and analyze vocabulary to find out contextual meaning (Shea & Roberts, 2016). So, it can be concluded that reading is an important process that readers go through to get information from various reading sources to form a new understanding.

Reading comprehension is defined as the process of receiving and integrating information from printed media (Zhang, 2018). It can be concluded that reading comprehension is the process of receiving written information that readers understand from written language related to the reader's language skills and previous knowledge. This means that readers seek to understand the text by interpreting and understanding the text using their previous language skills and knowledge.

SQ4R is a strategy especially designed for the use in explanatory and descriptive texts (Epcacan, 2009: 2016). Initially, it occurred as the SQ3R strategy. It became SQ4R after the Reflect step was added by Applegate et al. (1994). The steps of this strategy are as follows:

First, the Survey stage is an activity before reading the text by communicating through the reading text, by reading the title and predicting the information that will be conveyed by the reading text, studying the title, reading the introductory and closing sections, or seeing any visual aids such as pictures, graphics, or illustrations. even. It can be concluded that a survey is a pre-reading activity by looking at the title, introduction section, closing section, and pictures to find information in the reading text.

Second, the question stage, students develop questions that they can answer when they read the text. Students can write questions about what, why, who, when, where from the title or the main idea they got from the previous step.

Third is reading. Readers read to find answers before reading questions (Coon & Mitterer, 2013). In this case, students are advised to read the material in each section to answer the questions they have formulated during the question stage.

The fourth is reflect which is a unit with a reading step. Carter cited by Basar & Gurbuz (2017) argues that students think about and evaluate information obtained from reading and to find relationships with the reader's available knowledge. They can make correlations between their notes and their lives to help them easily remember the answers they made in the previous step.

The fifth is recite. According to Carter cited by Basar & Gurbuz (2017), recite is a step to remember the main points of reading text without reading the text. When students complete a passage, they must read the main points of the passage. If they fail, then they must go back and reread the passage, then back again and read again.

The sixth is a review. Based on Carter cited by Basar & Gurbuz (2017), in the last step, the reader performs a repetition process to learn. Students look at their notes or even reread the text, but students are better off using their notes rather than reading text to refresh their memory. It can be concluded that reviewing the reading text (review) aims to understand the important points of the reading text to answer reading text questions.

Reading as an active process that involves the reader and the reading material in building meaning (Anderson, 1999). It is a process to grasp the message, which delivered through words or written language. Reading is very important for students who are learning foreign language. Grabe and Stoller (2001) ranked reading as the number one skill that FL students' wish to gain mastery. In addition, Spivey (1991) claimed that other than representing peoples' literacy, reading could also "builds a representation of meaning in response to discourse goals, using previously acquired knowledge to operate on and to embellish, the minimal cues provided by the text."

Alderson also defines reading as "...an enjoyable, intense, private activity, from which much pleasure can be derived, and in which one can become totally absorbed (2000:28)." Reading means different things to different people, for some it is recognizing written words, while for others it is an opportunity to teach pronunciation and practice speaking.

Peregoy & Boyle (2017) defines reading as an interactive process in which readers of first and second language use knowledge of sounds, symbols, word order, sentence structure to predict and get meaning. Readers use their initial knowledge of the topic of a text together with language knowledge and reading strategies to achieve reading goals. For example, readers usually read a lot of text but they lose their meaning. This means that they are unable to translate words. Finally, they lose connection with their meaning.

Comprehension includes the ability to understand what has been read or heard not only individual sentences but also longer discourse such as sections of text or long reading texts (Spear, 2015). Whereas Snow (2002) argues that reading comprehension is a process of extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. It is also the process of understanding the author's writing. Starting with the eye being processed into the

brain or the process of changing information from the author to the reader. From reading one can understand the main sources of written language.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that reading comprehension is written information obtained by readers by understanding written language which is influenced by the reader's language skills and their previous knowledge.

Hennings (1997) adds that there are three levels of understanding, namely: understanding the meaning of words, understanding sentences, understanding paragraphs and understanding the entire text. Meanwhile, according to Barret cited by Brassell & Timothy (2008), there are three levels of understanding, namely: literal understanding, namely the ability to understand information stated directly / explicitly in the text, inferential understanding, namely the ability to understand information that is stated indirectly in the text. text, and critical understanding, namely the ability to evaluate text material.

## 2. Research Method

This study uses a Pre-experimental Design because it does not use a control group. To determine the effectiveness of the application of the learning model on student learning outcomes, it was obtained from the pre-test and post-test data using the effect size analysis. Effect size is a measure of the magnitude of the effect of a variable on other variables, the magnitude of the difference and the relationship, which is free from the influence of the size of the sample. Calculating the effect size using Cohen's formula as follows:

$$d = \frac{M_{\text{posstest}} - M_{\text{pretest}}}{\sqrt{\frac{SD^2_{\text{Posstest}} + SD^2_{\text{Pretest}}}{2}}}$$

Ket:

d = effect size

M = Average of Test Score

SD = Standard deviation

The results of the effect size calculation are interpreted using the classification according to Cohen (Becker, 2000), namely:

**Table 1. The Effect Size Criteria**

NO	Effect Size (d)	Category
1	$d \geq 0,80$	Big
2	$d > 0,5, d < 0,8$	Moderate
3	$d < 0,5$	Small

(Source: Lee A. Becker 2000:2)

### 3. Results and Discussion

The results of this study were obtained from the learning outcomes data of class X students of SMAN 1 Darul Imarah in English, while the initial data obtained were the results of student pretest learning, amounting to 36 people. The pretest value is the value obtained before the learning process is carried out using the SQ4R method, the value ranges from 40-77. Then for the final data, the posttest was carried out after the implementation of the learning method using the SQ4R method, the students' posttest scores ranged from 68-93. Based on the pretest data analysis, the students' average score ( $\bar{X}$ ) was obtained as can be seen in table 2.

**Table 2. The Summary of the highest, lowest, average pretest values and standard deviation.**

Class	the highest Score	The Lowest Score	X	N	S
X	77	40	62,59	36	8,84

Based on table 2, it can be seen that the results of the initial test (pretest) or those held before students were given the treatment obtained the highest score = 77 and the lowest score = 40 with 36 students. With statistical calculations, the average pretest value was = 62.59. The distribution of frequency data can be seen in the following Frequency Distribution t-table.

**Tabel 3. Frequency of Pre-tests Distribution.**

No	Interval Score	Middle Score	Frequency
1	42-48	45	2
2	49-55	52	5
3	56-62	59	9
4	63-69	66	11
5	70-76	73	7
6	77-83	80	2
<b>Total</b>			<b>36</b>

Based on Table 3, we can see that the distribution of the pretest scores for class X can be seen that students who get 42-48 scores are 2 people, 5 scores of 49-55, 9 scores of 56-62, 11 scores of 63-69, 70 -76 as many as 7 people and the value of 77-83 as many as 2 people. The highest frequency achieved by students in the value interval is 63-69. There are still many students who have not yet achieved completeness. It is proven by the mean score of 63 which is still below the KKM, which is 75. Based on the posttest data analysis, the students' mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) and standard deviation (s) were obtained as can be seen in the table below.

**Table 4. The Summary of the highest scores, lowest score, average and standard deviation of each posttest.**

Class	Highest Scores	Lowest Score	X	N	S
X	93	68	82,74	36	7,56

Based on Table 4, it can be seen that the student learning outcomes in the research subject class. The results of the posttest tests that were held after students were treated with SQ4R learning methods, obtained the highest score = 93 and the lowest score = 68 with 36 students. With statistical calculations, the average posttest score is = 85 and the standard deviation (s) = 5.35. The distribution of posttest frequency data can be seen in Table 5.

**Table 5. Posttest Frequency Distribution.**

No	Interval Score	Middle Score	Frequency
1	63-69	66	2
2	70-76	73	6
3	77-83	80	10
4	84-90	87	12
5	91-97	94	6
<b>Total</b>			<b>36</b>

Based on table 14 we can see that the distribution of the pretest scores for class X can be seen that students who get a score of 63-69 are 2 people, 6 people score 70-76, 10 people score 77-83, 12 people score 84-90 91-97 as many as 6 people. The highest frequency achieved by students in the value interval is 84-90. Many students have achieved the minimum completeness, as evidenced by the average score of 85 which is above the KKM, which is 75. This illustrates the level of KKM achievement is more than the pretest score. There are 29 students who have fulfilled the KKM and 7 students who have not fulfilled the KKM.

#### 4. Conclusions

Referring to the findings and data analysis that has been carried out on student learning outcomes in Reading comprehension learning, it was found that the effectiveness of the SQ4R learning method on student learning outcomes with a value of 1.28 in the large category using effect size analysis. The effectiveness of the SQ4R learning method on learning outcomes can be seen from the initial process carried out is to do a pretest to see students' initial abilities before being given treatment. Based on the pretest that has been done, the average value of student learning outcomes is 62.59. After seeing the initial ability, it was given treatment for 4 meetings then given a posttest. From the results of data calculation after treatment, the posttest average value is 82.76. Then the average pretest and posttest results were analyzed using the Effect Size, it was obtained an average increase in student learning outcomes with a large category.

## References

- Anderson, N. J. (1999). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and Strategies*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Alderson, J.C. (2000) *Assessing Reading Cambridge*. C.U.P.
- Applegate, M., Quin, K., & Applegate, A.J. (1994). Using Metacognitive Strategies to Enhance Achievement for at-risk Liberal Arts College Students, *Journal of Reading*, 38(1), pp. 32-42.
- Basar, M., & Gurbuz, M. (2017). Effect of the SQ4R Technique on the Reading Comprehension of Elementary School 4th Grade Elementary School Students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 10(2), pp. 131–144. [http://www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji\\_2017\\_2\\_9.pdf](http://www.e-iji.net/dosyalar/iji_2017_2_9.pdf)
- Becker, H. J. (2000). Findings from The Teaching, Learning, and Computing Survey. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8 (51), pp. 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v8n51.2000>
- Bonner, S. E. (1999). Choosing Teaching Methods Based on Learning Objectives: An Integrative Framework. *Issues in Accounting Education*, 14(1), pp. 11-15. <https://doi.org/10.2308/iace.1999.14.1.11>
- Brassell, D., & Timothy, R. (2008). *Comprehension that Works Taking Students Beyond Ordinary Understanding to Deep Comprehension*. Shell Education.
- Coon, D., & Mitterer, J. O. (2013). *Psychology: A Journey*. Cengage Learning.
- Epçaçan, C. (2009). Okuduğunu Anlama Stratejilerine Genel Bir Bakış. *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 2(6), pp. 207-223. [https://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt2/sayi6pdf/epcacan\\_cevdet.pdf](https://www.sosyalarastirmalar.com/cilt2/sayi6pdf/epcacan_cevdet.pdf)
- Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. L. (2001). Action Research as Reflective Teacher Practice in The Context of L2 Reading Classrooms. *Journal for Language Teaching= Ijenali Yekufundzisa Lulwimi= Tydskrif vir Taalonderrig*, 35(2-3), pp. 97-109. <https://journals.co.za/content/journal/langt>
- Hennings, D. C. (1997). *Communication in Action: Teaching Literature-Based Language Arts (Sixth Edit)*. Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Li Bin. (2010). Bahasa Inggris Mudah Dipelajari tetapi Sulit dikuasai. *Overseas English*, (1X), pp. 24-25.
- Peregoy, S. F., & Boyle, O. F. (2017). *Reading, Writing, and Learning in ESL: A Resource Book for Teaching K-12 English Learners (Seventh Ed)*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Sariakin, S., & Rizka, B. (2020). A Study on The Teaching and Learning Process of Reading Skill at Mathayum Islam Bachok Wittaya School Thailand. *JETLi: Journal of English Teaching and Linguistics*, 1(1), pp. 55-62. <https://ejournal.unida-aceh.ac.id/index.php/jetli/article/view/11>
- Shea, M., & Roberts, N. (2016). The Fives Strategy for Reading Comprehension. *Learning Sciences International*.
- Snow, C. (2002). *Reading for Understanding: toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. RAND.

- Spivey, N. N. (1991). The Shaping of Meaning: Options in Writing the Comparison. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 25(4), pp. 390-418.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40171203>
- Spear, S. L. (2015). *The Power of RTI and Reading Profiles. A Blueprint for Solving Reading Problems*. Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co., Inc.
- Zhang, L. (2018). *Metacognitive and Cognitive Strategy Use in Reading Comprehension*. Springer Nature Singapore Pte Ltd.