

# THE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF NOTE TAKING PAIRS IN TEACHING READING

*(Case Study in STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 Academic Year)*

*Marlina*

STAIN Pekalongan

**Abstract:** This research is intended to know whether: (1) Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading; (2) Students who have high interest have better reading skill than students who have low interest; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' interest in teaching reading. The method which was applied in this research was Experimental study. It was conducted at STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 Academic Year. The population was the English 3 Students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 Academic Year. It consists of four classes (128 students). The writer used cluster random sampling to get the sample. It consists of two classes: (1) 32 students of A class, and (2) 32 students of B class. The data analysis shows the following findings : (1) Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method for teaching reading to the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year; (2) The students who have high interest have better reading skill than the students who have low interest of the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year; and (3) There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' interest in teaching reading to the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year. Hopefully, the result of this research will be useful for lecturers in order to choose and determine the suitable teaching method used in their class.

**Key word:** note taking pairs, direct instructional method, interest

## INTRODUCTION

The ability to read and comprehend English text is an important skill for any students of English as a second language in improving their reading skill. Santrock (2008: 368) defines reading as an ability to understand

written discourse. It is a kind of activity to comprehend the writer's ideas or the way the writer communicates with the readers by way of the written or printed words. Moreover, success in schools and academic institutions is often measured by performance on standardized examinations that involve the reading of materials written in English language.

Reading is one of the complex activities in learning English for the Non English Department students. Their linguistics competency affects their reading comprehension. Some students who lack of grammar and vocabulary mastery, have difficulty to understand the meaning of the word, interpret the meaning of the sentences; even they are not able to catch the message of the passages at all. In summary, students met some difficulties in comprehending the text and their reading comprehension is low. Realizing this phenomenon, it is very crucial to know how to teach reading to the university students. The teacher's method in teaching is one of the factors that influence students' reading comprehension.

Some English lecturers in Indonesia still use Direct Instruction Method. Direct Instructional method is the product of a reform movement which is reacting to the restrictions of Grammer-translation (Harmer, 2007: 63). This method is less appropriate when the lecturer is trying to promote social skills or to teach creativity, higher-level thinking or abstract concepts and ideas. In teaching reading, the lecturer dominates almost all of teaching learning process, the lecturer translates word by words of the text. This method usually makes students get bored because it is monotonous and the students are not active.

One of the ways to make the teaching reading effective is making the students active so they enjoy learning and they can improve their reading skill. The method that will be used in teaching must also regard the level of the students. Note taking pairs is one of colaborative learning methods. This method implements a collaboration in education. Note Taking Pairs is designed to help the students improve their notes on reading assignments and other kinds of learning activities. Note Taking Pairs is a technique where student partners work together to improve their individual notes. Working with a peer provides students with an opportunity to revisit and cross-check notes with another source. Partners help each other acquire missing information and correct inaccurancies so that their combined effort is superior to their individual notes (Barkley, 2005: 135) .

Based on background of the study, problem identification, and problem limitation above, the writer formulates the problem of the study as follows:

1. Is Note Taking Pairs Method more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading skill to the English three students of STAIN Pekalongan?
2. Do students who have high interest have better reading skill than those who have low interest?
3. Is there any interaction effect between the methods of teaching and students' interest on the students' reading skill?

Based on the formulation of the problem above, the objectives of this study are knowing the effect of the methods of teaching and students' interest on students' reading skill. In a specific scope, this study is proposed to know whether:

1. Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading to the English three students of STAIN Pekalongan.
2. Students having high interest have better reading skill than those having low interest.
3. There is an interaction effect between the methods of teaching and students' interest on the students' reading skill.

## **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Research method that is used in this study is experimental research method. In an experimental study, researchers look at the effect of at least one independent variable on one or more dependent variables. The independent variable in experimental study is also frequently referred to as experimental or treatment variable. The dependent variable, also known as the criterion or outcome variables, refers to the result or outcomes of the study.

## **THE RESULT OF THE STUDY**

To achieve the research objectives, the writer conducts the hypothesis testing to get the answer, whether the proposed problems are proved or not. It is divided into four parts, namely: the description of the data, normality and homogeneity test, hypothesis test, and the discussion of the result of the study.

### Description of the Data

The data described here are the result of the reading test. The description includes the mean, mode, median, standard deviation, and frequency distribution followed by histogram and polygon. The description of the data includes the scores of reading test for each group in the (a) each column; (b) each row; and (c) each cell.

### Normality and Homogeneity Test

Before analyzing the data using inferential analysis, the sample must be in normal distribution and homogeneous. The normality test is to know that the sample is in normal distribution and the homogeneity test is to know that the data are homogenous. Each test is presented in the following section.

#### 1. Normality Test

The sample is in normal distribution if  $L_o$  (L obtained) is lower than  $L_t$  (L table),  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The word 'L' stands for Lilliefors.

#### 2. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is aimed at knowing whether the data are homogeneous or not. If  $\chi_o^2$  is lower than  $\chi_t^2_{(0.05)}$ , it can be concluded that the data are homogeneous.

Because  $\chi_o^2 = (6.04)$  is lower than  $\chi_t^2 (7.815)$ , the data are homogeneous.

### Hypothesis Test

#### Multifactor Analysis of Variance

A hypothesis test can be done after the normality and the homogeneity of the data are fulfilled. The hypothesis test is done by using multifactor analysis of variance 2 x 2. From the analysis, it can be concluded that  $H_o$  is rejected if  $F_o > F_t$ . It means that there are a difference and an interaction. If  $H_o$  is rejected, the analysis is continued using Tukey test. The function of this test is to test the difference of the mean of between cells. Furthermore, the multifactor analysis of variance 2 x 2 and Tukey test are described in the following calculations:

Table 1. The Summary of Multifactor Analysis of Variance

| Source of Variance                    | SS      | df | MS      | F <sub>o</sub> | F <sub>t(0,5)</sub> | F <sub>t(0,01)</sub> |
|---------------------------------------|---------|----|---------|----------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Between columns<br>(teaching methods) | 390.06  | 1  | 390.06  | 9.91           | 4                   | 7.08                 |
| Between rows<br>(interest)            | 351.56  | 1  | 351.56  | 8.93           |                     |                      |
| Columns by rows<br>(interaction)      | 2139.06 | 1  | 2139.06 | 54.34          |                     |                      |
| Between groups                        | 2880.69 | 3  | 960.23  |                |                     |                      |
| Within groups                         | 2361.75 | 60 | 39.36   |                |                     |                      |
| Total                                 | 5242.44 | 63 |         |                |                     |                      |

The table above shows that:

- a. Because F<sub>o</sub> between columns (9.91) is higher than F<sub>t(0,05)</sub> (4.0) and Ft(0.01) (7.08), H<sub>o</sub> is rejected and the difference between columns is significant. It can be concluded that methods of teaching differ significantly from one another in their effect on the performance of the subjects in the experiment. The mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of Note Taking Pairs is 68.25, while the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of Direct Instructional Method is 62.78. Thus, Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method for teaching reading.
- b. Because F<sub>o</sub> between rows (8.93) is higher than F<sub>t(0,05)</sub> (4.0) and Ft(0.01) (7.08), H<sub>o</sub> is rejected and the difference between rows is significant. It can be concluded that students having high interest and those having low interest are significantly different in their reading skill. The mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of students having high interest is 69.0, while the mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) of students having low interest is 63.09. That is why, the students having high interest have better reading skill than students having low interest.
- c. Because F<sub>o</sub> interaction (54.34) is higher than F<sub>t(0,05)</sub> (4.0) and Ft(0.01) (7.08), there is the interaction effect between methods of teaching and the degree of interest. It means that the effect of teaching methods on the students' reading skill depend on the degree of interest.

### Tukey Test

The  $q$  is found by dividing the difference between the means by the square root of the ratio of the within group variation and the sample size.

$$q = \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{\sqrt{s_w^2 / n}}$$

Table 2. The Summary of Tukey Test

| Between Group   | $q_0$ | n  | qt<br>(0.05) | qt (0.01) | Significantl<br>y | Meaning  |
|---|-------|----|--------------|-----------|-------------------|--|
| A <sub>1</sub> - A <sub>2</sub>                               | 4.45  | 32 | 2.89         | 3.89      | Significant       | A <sub>1</sub> > A <sub>2</sub>                                  |
| B <sub>1</sub> - B <sub>2</sub>                               | 4.23  | 32 | 2.89         | 3.89      | Significant       | B <sub>1</sub> > B <sub>2</sub>                                  |
| A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub> - A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub> | 10.52 | 16 | 3            | 4.13      | Significant       | A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub> ><br>A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub> |
| A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub> - A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub> | 4.22  | 16 | 3            | 4.13      | Significant       | A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub> ><br>A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub> |

a. Between columns  $q_0$

Because between columns  $q_0$  is higher than  $q_{t(0.05)} = 2.89$  and  $q_{t(0.01)} = 3.89$ , Note Taking Pairs differs significantly from Direct Instructional Method to teach reading. The mean score of the students who are taught through Note Taking Pairs is (69.13) is higher than that of the students who are taught through Direct Instructional Method is (64.19). It can be concluded that Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading.

b. Between columns  $q_{(HI)}$

Because between columns  $(_{HI}) q_0$  is higher than  $q_{t(0.05)} = 2.89$  and  $q_{t(0.01)} = 3.89$ , students who have high interest differ significantly from students who have low interest in their reading skill. The mean score of students who have high interest (69) is higher than that of those who have low interest (64.31). Students who have high interest have better reading skill than students who have low interest.

c. Between columns  $(_{LI})$

Since between columns  $(_{LI}) q_0$  is higher than  $q_{t(0.05)} = 3.0$  and  $q_{t(0.01)} = 4.13$ , Note Taking Pairs differs significantly from the Direct Instructional method to teach reading for students who have high

interest. The mean score of students having high interest who are taught by Note Taking Pairs (77.25) is higher than that of those who are taught by using Direct Instructional method (60.75). Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading for students who have high interest.

d. Between columns<sub>(L1)</sub>

Since between columns<sub>(L1)</sub>  $q_0$  is higher than  $q_{t(0.05)} = 3.0$  and  $q_{t(0.01)} = 4.13$ , Direct Instructional Method differs significantly from Note Taking Pairs for teaching reading for students who have low interest. The mean score of students having low interest who are taught by Direct Instructional Method (67.63) is higher than that of those who are taught by Note Taking Pairs (61). Direct Instructional Method is more effective than Note Taking Pairs to teach reading for students who have low interest.

## CONCLUSION, IMPLICATION, AND SUGGESTION

Based on the research findings on how to determine the effectiveness of Note Taking Pairs to teach reading viewed from students' interest, it can be concluded that:

1. Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method for teaching reading to the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year.
2. The students who have high interest have better reading skill than the students who have low interest of the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year.
3. There is an interaction between teaching methods and students' interest in teaching reading to the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year.
4. The research shows that the implications of teaching methods have a strong influence on students' interest. Note Taking Pairs is a very effective method for teaching reading in the English 3 students of STAIN Pekalongan in the 2013/2014 academic year;
5. The effectiveness of the method is influenced by the level of the students' interest. Note Taking Pairs is more effective than Direct Instructional Method to teach reading for students who have high interest. On the other hand, Direct Instructional Method is more

effective than Note Taking Pairs to teach reading for students who have low interest.

Having examined the research findings, there are some suggestions which are addressed to the teachers, students, and other researchers which can be listed as follows:

1. For the lecturers.
  - a. The results of this research prove that Note Taking Pairs is one of the effective methods to use in teaching reading. The writer recommends English lecturers to use this method.
  - b. Interest, as the psychological factor, should be considered before choosing an appropriate method to use.
  - c. Lecturers should always encourage students to get involved actively in a teaching learning process, especially for students having low-interest who tend to be passively engaged in the English class.
2. For the students.
  - a. The students must be more active in the learning process in order to improve their reading skill.
  - b. The students should be aware that interest in learning a foreign language is important. For low-interest students, they should encourage themselves and realize the importance of active involvement in the teaching learning process.
3. For other researchers
  - a. This research can be a reference for other researchers.
  - b. Other researchers are also able to create better studies after knowing the weaknesses of this study

## REFERENCES

- Aebarsold, Jo Ann, and Field, Mary Lee. 1997. *From Reader to Reading Teacher*. New York. Cambridge University Press.
- Alderson, J., Charles. 2000. *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Arends, Richard I. 1997. *Classroom Instruction Management*. New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies. Inc.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1992. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara



- Barkley, Elizabeth F, Cross, K. Patricia, and Major, Claire Howell. 2006. *Collaborative Learning Technique*. London: Pearson Longman
- Becker, Wesley C. 2001. *Journal of Direct Instruction* in <http://www.google.co.id/#hl=id&q=disadvantages+of+direct+instruction+method+in+teaching+reading.+pdf&meta=&aq=&oq=disadvantages+of+direct+instruction+method+in+teaching+reading.+pdf&fp=3c535af0b522fb05>
- Brown, H Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principle: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Second Edition*. New York. Addison Wesley Longman. Inc.
- 2004. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Carrell, P. L. 1988. *Some Causes of Text-Boondedness and Schema-Inference in ESL Reading*. In P. Carrell, J. Devine & D. Eskey (Eds), *Interactive Approches to Second Language Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Christensen, Larry B. 2000. *Experimental Methodology*. University Michingan: Allyn and Bacon, In corporated
- Colgan, Mark. 2010. *Ten Cooperative Learning Technique for Building Classroom Communities*. Taylor University, Upland. IN
- Crow L and Crow A. 1989. *Educational Psychology-translated by Abd Rachman*. Yogyakarta: Nur Cahaya
- DeBoer, John J, and Dallman, Martha. 1966. *The Teaching of Reading*. New York. Holt, Rinehart and Winson, Inc.
- Definition of need in aspect of interest*. <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/need>
- Ferguson, George and Yoshio Takane. 1989. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill, Inc
- Fraenkel, E Jack and Wallen, E Norman. 1993. *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. Mc Graw Hall
- Gersten, Russel & Carnine, Dauglas. 1986. *Direct Instruction in Reading Comprehension*
- Harmer, Jeremy. 1991. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Pearson Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching-fourth edition*. London: Pearson Longman

- Harrock & Mussman (In Developmental Trends in Wishes, Confidence, & The Sense of Personal Control from Childhood to Middle maturity in Journal of Psychology, 1973, 84, 241-252)
- Hornby, As. 2000. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary – sixth edition*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Hurlock, Elizabeth B. 1983. *Child Development*. New Jersey: Mc Graw Hill
- Johnson, D., R., Johnson, and K. Smith. 1998. *Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom, 2nd ed.*, Edina, MN: Interaction Book Co.
- Joyce, Bruce and Weil, Marsha. 1992. *Models of Teaching*. New Jersey. Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Kiewra, K. A. 1987. *The assessment of cognitive factors in academic abilities*. In R. R. Ronning, J. A. Glover, J. C. Conoley, & J. C. Witt (Eds.), *The influence of cognitive psychology on testing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kenny, Dianna T. 1980. *Direct Instruction: An Overview of Theory and Practice*. Journal of the Association of Special Education Teacher. in <http://www.google.co.id/#hl=id&q=definition+of+Direct+Instruction+method.+pdf&start=10&sa=N&fp=3c535af0b522fb05>
- Kozloff, Martin A and LaNunziata, Louise. 1999. *Direct Instruction in Education*. Wilmington. University of North Carolina in <http://www.google.co.id/#hl=id&q=definition++of+Direct+Instruction+method.+pdf&start=20&sa=N&fp=3c535af0b522fb05>
- Larsen-Freeman, Diana and Michel H. Long. 1991. *An Introduction to second Language Acquisition Research*. New York: Longman
- Lee, Chao & Chen in Global Journal of Engineering Education Vol 13, no. 3 2011
- Mason, Emanuel J. and William J. Brambel. 1997. *Research in Education*. Dubuque: Brown & Benchmark
- McKeachie, W.J, Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A., & Lin, Y.G. (1986). *Teaching and learning in the college classroom: A review of the research literature*. Ann Arbor, MI: National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning.
- Mehrens, William and Irvin J. Lehmann. 1978. *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*. New York: Holt. Rinehart and Winston
- Ngadiso. 2006. *Statistics-ELT Research II*. Surakarta: English Education Department

- Palincsar, A.S. (1986). *Reciprocal Teaching in Teaching Reading as Thinking*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory
- Pang, Elizabeth S, et al. *Teaching Reading*. France. SADAG. Bellegarde in <http://www.ibe.unesco.org/publications/EducationalPracticesSeriesPdf/prac12e.pdf>
- Princeton.edu. *Definition of enjoyment*.  
[www.wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn](http://www.wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn)
- Rayner, Keith and Alexander Pollastek. 1989. *The psychology of Reading*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Robinson, H Alan. 1975. *Teaching Reading and Study Strategies: The Content Areas*. Boston. Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Rumelhart. *Analysis of schema theory and its influence on reading*.  
<http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/uc200711/uc20071104.pdf>
- Santrock, John W. 2008. *Educational Psychology: Third Edition*. New York. McGrawHill
- Smith, Frank. 1971. *Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston
- Sujanto, Agus. 1986. *Psikologi Perkembangan: cet. ke-*. Jakarta: Aksara Baru
- The WAC Journal-vol 16: September 2005. Note Taking and Learning: *A Summary of Research*. Françoise Boch, Stenhal University and Annie Piolat, University of Pravelence
- Tuckman, Bruce W. 1978. *Conducting Educational Research: Second Edition*. New York. Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc.
- Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Valiathan, Martin A and LaNunziata, Louis. 2009. *Direct Instruction Works! (Benefit of Expository E-Learning)*. Singapore: Knowledge Platform
- Vockell, Edward L. 1983. *Educational Research*. New York: Macmillan Publishing, Co.Inc.
- Weir, Cyril. 1990. *Communicative Language Testing*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall
- William, Eddie. 1996. *Reading in the Language Classroom*. Malaysia: International Book Distributors Ltd.