CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1 CONCLUSION

Some students find reading difficult especially if the text is in a foreign language but if they want to read better they must have some techniques which they can apply to make them understand the text better. One of the techniques is students' generated questions before reading which is applied for their pre-reading activities. According to the theory of schemata, people understand a text better if their background knowledge support them in reading and in order to make use of this background knowledge it must be activated first before reading the text (Bransford, 1985; Norris & Phillips, 1987 in http: //www.ericdigests.org/pre-9213/schema.htm). Students' generated questions before reading can be used to activate their prior knowledge and it is already proven that the class which applied students' generated questions before reading significantly increased the students' comprehension.

Students' generated questions before reading not only activate a reader's prior knowledge but it also prepares his mind for the incoming information in the text. Rather than decoding word by word which slows down and hinders comprehension, a good reader makes interactions with the text because he knows that reading is an active process not a passive one in which a reader receives information. A good reader makes links between the new information in the text and the background knowledge he possesses. If he can match the new information

in the text with his prior knowledge, comprehension occurs. Students' generated questions before reading is one type of questioning before reading that helps a reader set reading purposes for himself and he tries to find the answers to his questions in the text he is reading. The answers are needed to understand the text.

It has been previously described that metacognitive skills are important to a reader as a mature reader is aware of and has a degree of control over his metacognitive activities (Brown in Spiro, et al, 1980, p.454 in Ngadiman, 2001). It means that a reader can get the most of a text if he knows he has the metacognitive skills that he can employ while he is reading a text. Some of the metacognitive skills that are used are overview text before reading, employ context clues such as titles, subheading, charts etc, infer main ideas and use strategies to remember text for example: summarizing, self-questioning etc (Aebersold & Field, 1997; Pressley & Afflerback, 1995 in http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal). It is clear that self-questioning which is students' generated questions before reading in this study increases students' comprehension.

This theory is supported by the findings of this study which reveals that students' generated questions before reading enhanced students' comprehension. Comparing the pre-test and post-test results of the management students of class H, this study found that there was a significant difference between the pre-test and post test scores in general and for each question type after students were treated with students' generated questions before reading. It could be interpreted that students' generated questions before reading, one of reading techniques, helped

motivate readers to read a text because it developed a sense of curiosity to get the answers to their questions.

5.2 Suggestions

Based on the study conducted to the Management students of class H, it was found that students' generated questions enhanced students' ability in comprehending texts and in line with the findings of the study, the following suggestions are made:

As the first finding showed that students' generated questions before reading could increase students' comprehension, it is suggested that students are trained with students' generated questions before reading so that they will have better understanding on the text written in English and become more active, self-motivated and efficient readers. It is also suggested that this study will be continued further with different levels of students as samples to see if this technique works well for any level of students' ability in English.

The second finding indicated that the students' performance in each type of question got better. Three types of questions, that is literal comprehension, reorganization and inference increased significantly while two other types of questions did not. The interpretation was that students could understand text better after the treatment of students' generated questions before reading but they had problems in the language. They had difficulties in expressing themselves in English and this could be seen from the results of their tests. It is suggested that before the treatment of students' generated questions before reading students are

trained with English sentence patterns and vocabulary. This will help students produce correct grammatical and meaningful sentences that can represent what they have in mind about the answers to the questions and enhance their self-confidence in giving answers.

The third finding showed that the management students of class H generated more literal comprehension questions than any other question type. This finding was in line with the significant difference between their pre-test and post test scores meaning that the more questions they generated during the treatment the better their comprehension in answering that specific question type. The evaluation and personal response questions were the less question types generated by students and this was in line with the results of the pre-test and post-test scores which were not very significant. It is then suggested that future studies pay more attention to these question types. Students should be trained more questions on reorganization, inference, evaluation and personal question and not only on literal comprehension because students understand texts much better if they can generate more questions on these question types.

In general, it is also recommended that the treatment of students' generated questions before reading, which in this study lasted for seven weeks, be prolonged to twelve weeks in order to get more reliable data for the study because the longer the treatment the better achievement students make. In addition to that, it is also suggested that the future studies use the quasi-experimental or true-experimental research designs with control groups in order that findings can be more accurate and reliable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alderson, J. Charles & Urquhart, A.H. (1984). *Reading in a Foreign Language*, London: Longman.

Ammon, M.S. (1987). Patterns of Performance Among Bilingual Children Who Score low in reading. In Goldman, S.R & Trueba, H.T (Eds.). *Becoming Literate in English as A Second Language*, 71-105. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Arieta C., *College Active Reading Skills*, Available: (http://www.landmark.edu/institute/assistive_technology/reading_overview.html 8/28/2008),

Baker and Brown, (1984), Baumann, Jones, & Seifert-Kessel, 1993. Available: (http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal 10/9/2008)

Boulware-Gooden & Carreker et al. (2007). Available: (http://www.readingrockets.org/article/21160#strategies 9/5/2008)

Bransford, J., et al, (1982), *Schemata Theory and Roger Schank.* Available: (http://www.hi.is/-Joner/eaps 8/2/2008)

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practice*, Longman.com

Brown, J. D. (1996). *Testing in Language Program*, Prentice Hall Regents, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458

Campbell & Stanley. (1963), Cook & Campbell. (1979). Available: (http://www.creative-wisdom.com/teaching/WBI/threat.shtml 12/13/2008)

Carrell, P.L. (1981). Culture-Specific Schemata in L2 Comprehension. In Orem, R. & Haskell, J. (Eds.). Selected papers from the Ninth Illinois TESOL/BE Annual Convention, *First Midwest TESOL Conference*, 123-132. Chicago: Illinois TESOL/BE.

Carrell, P.L. (1984). The Effects of Rhetorical Organization on ESL Readers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 18, 441-469.

Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse in language teaching: A scheme for teacher education.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Day, Richard R & Park, Jeong-suk. Available: (http://nflrc.hawaii.edu/rfl/april2005/day/day.html 11/5/2008)

Dhieb-Henia, Nebila. (2006). Applying Metacognitive Strategies to Skimming Research Articles in an ESP Context, *English Teaching Forum no. 1*

Elder, L. & Paul, R. Available:
(http://potomac.hs.groupfusion.net/modules/cms/pages.phtml?pageid=8168
10/6/2008)

Flavell, J.H. (1976). Available: (http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/won01419.htm 8/18/2008)

Harmer, J. (2001). *How To Teach English*, Pearson Education Limited, England

Hedge, T. (2004). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*, Oxford
University Press, New York

Heilman, A. W. & Blair, T. R. (1981). *Principles and Practices of
Teaching Reading*, Charles Merrill Publishing Co. A Bell & Howell Company
Columbus, Ohio 43216

Hennings, D. G. (2002). *Reading with Meaning: Strategies for College Reading*,
Kean University, Prentice Hall Pearson Education, Inc

Hutchinson, T. & Waters, A. (1991). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-
centred Approach*, Cambridge University Press

Indawati, S. (1990). *The Effects of Before Questions on Students' Reading
Comprehension*, S1 Thesis, English Department of Unika Widya Mandala
Surabaya

Keene & Zimmermann. Available:
(http://www.**marblehead.com**/staff/mvoss/**goodreaders**.html -
9/12/2008Cached)

Kurland, H. (2001). Available:
(http://www.utoronto.ca/writing/critrdg.html10/5/2008)

Lewis, N. (1978). *How To Read Better and Faster*, Thomas Y.Crowell Harper &
Row, Publishers, New York, 10022

Maria, K. (1990). *Reading Comprehension Instruction, Issues & Strategies*. Parkton, MD:
York Press

Mc.Laughlin, B. & Allen, E. (2002).

Available: (http://www.readwritethink.org./lessons/lesson- view.asp?id=227 10/12/2008)

Ngadiman, A. (2001). The Importance of Metacognitive Skills in Reading
Comprehension, *Magister Scientiae*, FKIP Unika Widya Mandala Surabaya

Ngadiman, A. (2005). *The Effects of Teacher's Provided Questions and Students'
Generated Questions on Reading Comprehension Achievement*, English
Department of Unika Widya Mandala Surabaya

Nist, S.L. & Mealey, D.L. (1991). Teacher-directed Comprehension Strategies. In Flippo, R. & Caverly, D. (Eds.). *Teaching Reading and Study Strategies at the College Level.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Nunan, D. (1991). *Language Teaching Methodology*, Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd

Parish, B. (2006). *Teaching Adult ESL: A Practical Introduction*, The McGraw Hill New York

Paris, B. & Meyers, A. (1981). Available: http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/singhal 8/ 18/2008

Peterson, P. W. (Gen.Ed.). (1986). *ESP in Practice*, English Language Program Division Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs United States Information Agency, Washington D.C

Richards, J. C. & Renandya, W. A (Eds.). (2005). *Methodology in Language Teaching*, Cambridge University Press, New York

Richards, J.C. in Alderson & Urquhart. (1984). *Barrett's Taxonomy.* Available: (http://www.belvoirparkprimary.org/barrett.htm 7/15/2008)

Robinson, A. & Nurrenbern, J. Available:

(http://jchemed.chem.wisc.edu/JCEDLib/OBank/collection/CQandChP/CQs/WhatAreSQs.html 3/9/2009)

Rumelhart, D.E. (1977). Understanding and Summarizing Brief Stories. In LaBerge, D. & Samuels, S.J (Eds.). *Basic Processes in Reading.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rumelhart, D.E. (1980). Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition. In Spiro, R., Bruce, B. & Brewer, W. (Eds.). *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension.* Hillsdale, NJ.

Smoak, R. (2003). Metacognitive Strategies in ESP Context, *English Teaching Forum no 2.*

SPSS Available: (http://www.mnstate.edu/wasson/ed602excelss11.htm 12/12/2008)

Stone, C. (1985). Available: (http://www.gse.uci.edu/ed168/resume.html 10/11/2008)

Swanson, H.L. & De La Paz, F. (1998). Available: (http://www.aare.edu.au/01pap/won01419.htm 10/9/2008)

Theodore, L. (1990). *The Effects of Pre-questioning on the Students' Reading Comprehension*, S1 Thesis, English Department of Unika Widya Mandala Surabaya

Thomson, B. The Reading Process, Available: (http://www.palomar.edu/reading/R110Hybrid/Module1/mod1.1ReadingProcess.htm 9/5/2008)

Walsh, B. & Schwartz, P. (1990). Available: (http:// www.cwu.edu/-jefferis/PEHL557/pehl557-exp design.html 11/2/2008).

Widdowson, H.G. (1983). *Learning Purpose and Language Use*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.