

# THE EFFECT OF “SCHEMA DEVELOPMENT TECHNIQUE” ON STUDENTS’ READING ABILITY AT SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT

Deni Widiarti, Bambang Suwarno, Dedi Sofyan

**Postgraduate Program of English Education  
Department of Teaching and Art  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education  
Bengkulu University  
Bengkulu City, Indonesia  
[deni\\_widiarti@yahoo.com](mailto:deni_widiarti@yahoo.com)**

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to find the effect of “schema development technique” on students’ reading ability at senior high school students. It is also aimed to find whether schema development technique could improve students’ reading ability on the aspect of literal comprehension, inference and vocabulary building. The population was the tenth graders of SMA Negeri Rejang Lebong, from which two classes were selected as the research sample. The instrument was a reading test. The instrument draft had been tried out. The try out was done to find the validity and item characteristics of the original draft. From 90 try out item questions, 42 of them were found to be valid and 48 were invalid. The reliability index was 0,898 (high). The findings of the research revealed that schema development technique was effective for improving students overall comprehension. It was also effective for improving two aspects (literal aspect and vocabulary building). However, it was not effective for improving students’ reading ability on inference aspect. It’s caused by the nature of inference which requires for background knowledge towards the reading text.

**Key words:** Schema Development Technique, Reading Ability, TEFL

## ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk melihat dampak teknik schema development pada kemampuan membaca siswa di Sekolah Menengah Atas. Selain itu juga bertujuan untuk menemukan apakah *Schema Development Technique* mampu meningkatkan kemampuan membaca siswa pada aspek literal, aspek inference dan aspek vocabulary. Populasi penelitian ini adalah siswa kelas X SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong, terdiri dari dua kelas yang dipilih sebagai sampel penelitian. Instrument adalah test kemampuan membaca. Draft instrument telah di uji coba dengan nilai  $r = 0.898$  (tinggi). Uji coba telah dilaksanakan untuk menemukan validitas dan karakteristik soal dari draft asli. Dari 90 soal uji coba, 42 soal valid dan 48 soal tidak valid. Indeks reliability adalah 0.898 (tinggi). Hasil dari penelitian ini membuktikan bahwa teknik Schema Development efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan membaca siswa secara keseluruhan. Selain itu juga efektif untuk meningkatkan kemampuan siswa pada dua aspek (aspect literal dan aspect

vocabulary). Akan tetapi, Teknik Schema Development tidak efektif dalam meningkatkan aspek inference. Hal tersebut disebabkan oleh kemampuan inference membutuhkan kemampuan awal tentang teks yang dibaca.

Kata Kunci :Teknik Schema Development, Kemampuan Membaca, TEFL

## INTRODUCTION

The act of reading cannot be separated from comprehension. The students cannot achieve their academic success without comprehending what they read. In comprehending the text, the students should be monitored by their teachers, hence the way to teach comprehension should be well understood by the teachers. Teaching comprehension is an activity through some steps: selecting a text, explaining the strategy, modelling the strategy, guided support, practicing independently, and reflecting( McNamara: 2006). Therefore, it can be concluded that reading comprehension is a long process.

In addition, having a good comprehension in reading can be facilitated by many strategies. McNamara(2006) whose thinking is adopted by the College Board underlines growing recognition that the use of reading strategies is essential; high ability students who use reading strategies are getting successful not only in comprehending reading, but also in overcoming reading problems and becoming a better reader and comprehender. In summary, the students should have better strategies for their good comprehension.

Nowadays, the need of reading comprehension requires teachers to facilitate students through interesting

strategies in learning process. Reading is a complex process, complex to learn and complex to teach (Carnine, Silbert, and Kameenui: 1990:3), so there must be a technique which can help them to read effectively and interestingly.

Explicit teaching comprehension strategies is seen as a possible approach to tackle the problems faced by the students. In this case, the researcher will try to find interesting and effective way for the students and the teachers so that they can do their reading activity well.

The students have to improve their prior knowledge about reading skill, because the student's ability in answering questions between the lines is still poor. It can be proven by their mark in Reading subject, showed that many of students got mark C. It can be proven by their score of reading test in Daily Examination. 50% students got score under the Minimal Mastery Criteria (KKM = 75), 40% students got score 75 and just 10% students get score 80. They must have background knowledge in order to understand content of text. And after that they will be able to answer the questions that the answer are not stated in the text.

One of techniques which are available is the Schema Development Technique. By using this technique, the students were

able to communicate information because it can clarify complex concepts into simple, meaningful displays so that the students can develop a holistic understanding of the content to be learned (Siriphanich and Laohawiriyano).

From this case the researcher tries to apply Schema Development Technique in teaching reading. Schema theory is a theory about knowledge, about how knowledge is represented, and about how that representation facilitates the use of knowledge in various ways. According to schema theorists, all knowledge is packaged into units called schemata, and embedded into these units of knowledge is information on how this knowledge is to be used (Porter: 2007).

Schema Development Technique is an active organization of past reaction, on past experience. Through Schema Development Technique, the students will be able to recall their memories or their past experience. Because the use of this technique is to build background knowledge and to recall the

memories. The use of Schema Development Technique is to make students improve their ability in comprehending the reading text, which the answers that are not directly stated in the text. Through this technique, the student will be taught the way how to understand the text with knowledge from outside before they read the text and answer the questions. The students have to be motivated to read more seriously and efficiently in order to make reading itself as their reading ability.

## METHOD

The research employs Quasi Experimental Design, especially in the form of One-Group Pretest-Posttest Design. This design is used for seeing the effect of “Schema Development Technique” in improving students’ reading ability. In the beginning, the researcher has been given the pre-test to the sample and after the treatment, the sample has been given a post-test. The result has been seen by comparing pre-test score and post-test score (Ruseffendi: 1994).

The design can be seen as follow:

Group	Pre-test	Independent Variable	Post-test
Experiment	X <sub>1</sub>	T	X <sub>2</sub>
Control	Y <sub>1</sub>	-	Y <sub>2</sub>

Where:

X<sub>1</sub> = Pre-test for subjects in reading ability without using schema development technique.

T = The treatment by using schema development technique

X<sub>2</sub> = Post-test for subjects in reading ability by using schema development technique.

The study use cluster sampling. According to Gay (1990), cluster

sampling is a technique in which group was not individual, randomly

selected. All members of the selected groups have similar characteristics.

The instrument that has been used in this research is a reading comprehension test and has been prepared by the researcher that is adopted from the student's book and other relevant books. The original draft are 90 items.

The 90 questions have been tried out to the students of class X IPS 2 of the same school, but not belong to the samples of this research. The try out has been conducted to find its validity and items characteristics, items that pass should be met the criteria of Felicity Value(FV) and Discrimination Index(DI).The test will be constructed based on the following framework.

## **RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION**

### **A. Result of Total Pre-Test and Post-Test**

#### **1. Try Out Result**

Before doing the pre-test, the test itself was tried out in class X IPS2 of the same school. The try out was used to find the validity and item characteristics of the original draft. From 90 try out item questions, 42 of them were found to be valid and 48 were invalid. The realibility index was 0,898 (high). According to Heaton (1988), the test is valid if the Felicity Value (FV) is between 0,3 and 0,7 and Discrimination Index(DI) score is to be equal or more than 0,3.

#### **2. Result of Normality Test**

##### **2.1 Pre-Test**

The result of pre-test for experiment group was calculated by

using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table ( $0.120 < 47.4$ ). And control class,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table ( $0.118 < 47.4$ ). (See appendix 9)

##### **2.2 Post-Test**

The result of post-test for control class was calculated by using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table ( $0.210 < 47,4$ ). And control group,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table ( $0.2 < 47.4$ ). ( See appendix 10 )

### **3. Result of Homogeneity Test**

#### **3.1 Pre-Test**

Then the result of pre-test was calculated by using the formula of F value. From the F value calculation, the F obtained was smaller than F table ( $0.278 < 3.991$ ), in other words, both sample have equal variances. Thus, analysis was continued by using the t-test for equal variances. (See appendix 11 )

#### **3.2 Post-Test**

The result of post-test was calculated by using the formula of F value. From the F-value calculation, the F-count was 0.465 whereas the F-table was 3.991. it means that F-count was smaller than F-table ( $0.465 < 3.991$ ). In other words, both samples have equal variances. Thus, the analysis was continued by using t-test formula for equal variances (See appendix 12).

In order to to analyze the pre-test and post-test result the score of experimental group and control group were compared by using t-test

was used to see whether the treatment could improve students reading ability or not.

#### 4. Hypothesis testing

##### 4.1 Pre-test

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was 0.355 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was smaller than t-table (t-count < t-table;  $0.355 < 1.669$ ). Based on the explanation above, the differences between the two groups were small. Briefly, these two groups have similar ability and therefore those groups can be accepted as the sample of the research.

From the result of pre-test calculation, it means there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. In addition, the result of hypothesis testing indicated the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) "There is no significant difference in students reading ability between the experimental group and control group".  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_1$  was rejected.

The pre-test was given on January 15<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>, 2018 before the treatment to know whether the two groups had similar ability. The treatment was held since January 22<sup>nd</sup> – February 15<sup>th</sup>. The result of pre-test was compared in the following table :

**Table 2. Pre-test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	76.1	35.7	63.21	0.355	1.669	No Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	76.1	38	63.95				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The table 2 shown that the highest score of the experiment class (76.1) was gained by one student and the lowest score (35.7) was gained by one student. Meanwhile, in the control class the highest score (76.1) gained by one student and the lowest score (38) was gained by one student. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of experiment class was 63.21 and control class was 63.95.

##### 4.2 Post-test

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was 1.807 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was bigger than t-table (t-count > t-table;  $1.807 > 1.669$ ). It can be concluded that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_1$  was accepted. In other words, there was a significant difference in post-test score average between the experimental group and control group. Shortly, this research was successful and showed that

implementing schema development technique could improve students' reading ability at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong.

The post test was given on February 21<sup>st</sup> and 22<sup>nd</sup> after the last treatment. It was given to both groups, the experimental class and control class. The post-test was

administered to see whether or not Schema Development Technique could make an improvement by the experiment group. The result of the post-test was used to find out the maximum score, the minimum score, and the mean score from both groups that can be seen in the following table.

**Table 3. Post-test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	88.1	78.5	81.71	1.807	1.669	Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	85.2	76.1	80.28				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The table 3 shown that in the experimental class, the maximum score was (88,1) which gained by three students, while the minimum score was (78.5) which gained by eleven students. Meanwhile, in the control class, the maximum score was (85.2) which gained by seven students, while the minimum score was (76.1) which gained by seven students. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of experiment group was 81.71 and control group was 80.28.

From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0.121 < 47.4). And control class,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0.121 < 47.4). (See appendix 13).

#### **b. Post-test**

The result of post-test for control class was calculated by using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0.205 < 47,4). And control group,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0.205 < 47.4). (See appendix 16).

## **5. Difference on Performance Aspects**

### **5.1 Result of Normality Test on Literal Aspect**

#### **a. Pre-Test**

The result of pre-test for experiment group was calculated by using the formula of normality test.

### **5.2 Result of Homogeneity Test on Literal Aspect**

#### **a. Pre-Test**

Then the result of pre-test was calculated by using the formula of F value. From the F value calculation, the F obtained was smaller than F table (0.317 < 3.991 ), in other words, both sample have equal

variances. Thus, analysis was continued by using the t-test for equal variances (See appendix 19).

**b. Post-Test**

The result of post-test was calculated by using the formula of F-value. From the F-value calculation, the F-count was 0.575, whereas the F-table was 3.991. It means that F-count was smaller than F-table ( $0.575 < 3.991$ ). In other words, both samples have equal variances. Thus, the analysis was continued by using t-test formula for equal variances (See appendix 22).

**5.3 Hypothesis testing on literal aspect**

**a. Pre-Test**

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was -0,334 and t-

table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was smaller than t-table (t-count < t-table;  $-0.334 < 1.669$ ). Based on the explanation above, the differences between the two groups were small. Briefly, these two groups have similar ability and therefore those groups can be accepted as the sample of the research.

The result of hypothesis testing indicated the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) "There is no significant difference in students reading ability between the experimental group and control group".  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_1$  was rejected.

In order to answer the second problem, the researcher also analyze the result of literal aspect score analysis of pre-test. The result was compared in the following table.

**Table 4. Literal Pre-Test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	84.5	39	70.22	-0.334	1.669	No Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	82.2	41	68,84				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The table 4 shown that the maximal score of the experimental group (84.5) was gained by two students and the minimum score (39) was gained by one student. Meanwhile, in the control group the maximum score (82.2) also was gained by one student and the minimum score 41 was gained by

one student. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of experimental group was 70.22 and control group was 68.84. Experimental mean score is bigger than control group.

### b. Post-test

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was 1,722 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was bigger than t-table (t-count > t-table; 1,722 > 1.669). It can be concluded that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_1$  was accepted. In other words, there was a significant difference in post-test score average between the experimental group and control group in literal aspect. Shortly, this

research was successful and showed that implementing schema development technique could improve students' reading ability at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong.

The result of literal post-test score was used to find out maximum score, minimum score and the mean score from both groups that can be seen in the following table.

**Table 5. Literal Post-test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	88.1	78.5	82.44	1.722	1.669	Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	85.2	76,1	81.31				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The table 5 shown that in the experimental group, maximum score was 88.1 which gained by two students, while minimum score was 78.5 which gained by eleven students. Meanwhile, in the control group, maximum score was 85.2 which gained by four students, while minimum score was 76.1 which gained by four students. From the calculation, it was found that mean score of experimental group was 82.44 and the mean score of control class was 81.31.

### 5.4 Result of Normality Test on Inference Aspect

#### a. Pre-Test

The result of pre-test for experiment group was calculated by using the formula of normality test.

From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,116 < 47.4). While for the control class,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,115 < 47.4). (See appendix 14).

#### b. Post-Test

The result of post-test for control class was calculated by using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,196 < 47,4). While for the control group,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,207 < 47.4). (See appendix 17).

### 5.5 Result of Homogeneity Test on Inference Aspect

**a. Pre-Test**

Then the result of pre-test was calculated by using the formula of F value. From the F value calculation, the F obtained was smaller than F table ( $0,331 < 3.991$ ), in other words, both sample have equal variances. Thus, analysis was continued by using the t-test for equal variances (See appendix 20).

**b. Post-test**

The result of post-test was calculated by using the formula of F-value. From the F-value calculation, the F-count was 1.472, whereas the F-table was 3.991. It means that F-count was smaller than F-table ( $1,472 < 3.991$ ). In other words, both samples have equal variances. Thus, the analysis was continued by using t-test formula for equal variances (See appendix 23).

**a. Pre-Test**

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was -0,341 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was smaller than t-table (t-count < t-table;  $-0.341 < 1.669$ ). Based on the explanation above, the differences between the two groups were small or not significant, these two groups have similar ability.

The result of hypothesis testing indicated the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) "There is no significant difference in students reading ability between the experimental group and control group" on inference aspect.  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_1$  was rejected.

In order to answer the second problem, the researcher analyze the result of Inference Aspect score analysis of pre-test. The result was compared in the following table.

**5.6 Hypothesis testing on Inference aspect**

**Table 6. Inference Pre-Test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	65	29	52.7	-0,341	1,669	No Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	59.5	27.5	52.3				

Note :

- E : Experiment Class
- C : Control Class

The table 6 shown that the maximum score of the experimental group (65) was gained by one student and the minimum score (29) was gained by one student. Meanwhile, in the control group the maximum score (59.5) was gained by one student and the minimum score (27.5) was gained by one

student. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of experimental group was 52.7 and control group was 52.3. Experimental mean score is bigger than the control group.

**b. Post-test**

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was 1.270 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was smaller than t-table (t-count < t-table; 1.270 > 1.669). It can be concluded that H<sub>0</sub> was accepted and H<sub>1</sub> was rejected. In other words, there was no significant difference in post-test score average between the experimental group and control group in inference. Shortly, this

research was not successful and showed that implementing schema development technique could not improve students' reading ability at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong.

The result inference post-test score was used to find out maximum score, minimum score, and mean score of both groups that can be seen in the following table.

**Table 7. Inference Post-Test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	83.4	65	68.2	1,270	1,669	No Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	74	57.5	66.1				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

Table 7 shown that in the experimental group, the maximum score was 83.4 which gained by one student, while the minimum score was 74 which gained by eleven students. Meanwhile, in the control group, maximum score was 85.2 which gained by one students, while minimum score was 76.1 which gained by one student. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of the experimental group was 68.2 and the mean score of control class was 66.1.

obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,125 < 47.4). And control class,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,126 < 47.4). (See appendix 15).

**b. Post-Test**

The result of post-test for control class was calculated by using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,200 < 47,4). While for the control group,  $\chi^2$  obtained was smaller than  $\chi^2$  table (0,201 < 47.4).

**5.7 Result of Normality Test on Vocabulary Aspect**

**a. Pre-Test**

The result of pre-test for experiment group was calculated by using the formula of normality test. From the Chi Square Value,  $\chi^2$

**5.8 Result of Homogeneity Test on Vocabulary Aspect**

**a. Pre-Test**

Then the result of pre-test was calculated by using the formula of F value. From the F value calculation, the F obtained was smaller than F

table ( $0,299 < 3.991$  ). In other words, both sample have equal variances. Thus, analysis was continued by using the t-test for equal variances (See appendix 24).

**b. Post-Test**

The result of post-test was calculated by using the formula of F-value. From the F-value calculation, the F-count was 0,085, whereas the F-table was 3.991. It means that F-count was smaller than F-table ( $0,085 < 3.991$ ). In other words, both samples have equal variances. Thus, the analysis was continued by using t-test formula for equal variances.

**5.9 Hypothesis testing on Vocabulary aspect**

**a. Pre-Test**

**Table 8. Vocabulary Pre-Test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	82	40	69.9	-0,327	1,669	No Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	79.33	38.3	69.8				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The 8 shown the maximum score of the experimental group (82) was gained by one student and the minimum score (40) was gained by one student. Meanwhile, in the control group the maximum score (79.33) was gained by one student and the minimum score (38.3) was gained by one student. From the calculation, it was found that the mean score of experimental group was 69.9 and control group was 69.8. Experimental mean score is bigger than control group.

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was -0,341 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that the t obtained was smaller than t-table (t-count < t-table;  $-0,327 < 1.669$ ). Based on the explanation above, the differences between the two groups were small or not significant briefly, these two groups have similar ability.

The result of hypothesis testing indicated the alternative hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) “There is no significant difference in students reading ability between the experimental group and control group” on vocabulary aspect.  $H_0$  was accepted and  $H_1$  was rejected

In order to answer the second problem, the researcher analyzed the result of Vocabulary score analysis of pre-test. The overall results were shown in the following table.

**b. Post-Test**

From t-test calculation, the value of t-count was 1.741 and t-table was 1.669. It showed that t obtained was bigger than t-table (t-count > t-table;  $1.741 > 1.669$ ). It can be concluded that  $H_0$  was rejected and  $H_1$  was accepted. In other words, there was a significant difference in post-test score average between the experimental group and control group in vocabulary aspect. Shortly, this research was successful and showed that implementing schema development technique could

improve students' reading ability at the tenth grade of SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong.

The result vocabulary post-test score was used to find out maximum

score, minimum score, and mean score from both groups that can be seen in the following table.

**Table 9. Vocabulary Post-Test Result**

Class	Max score	Min score	Mean score	t-count	t-table	Difference	Remark
E	84.36	73.8	77.92	1.741	1,669	Significant difference	Two tailed $\alpha = 0.05$
C	77.5	68	73				

Note :

E : Experiment Class

C : Control Class

The table 9 shown that in the experimental group, maximum score was 84.36 which gained by one student, while minimum score was 73.8 which gained by one student. Meanwhile, in the control group, maximum score was 77.5 which gained by one student, while minimum score was 68 which gained by one student. From the calculation, it was found that mean score of experimental group was 77.92 and the mean score of control class was 73.

## CONCLUSSION AND SUGGESTION

### A. CONCLUSION

Having completed the research of implementing Schema Development Technique in teaching reading ability at the tenth grade students of SMA Negeri 4 Rejang Lebong, it could be concluded that the implementation of Schema Development Technique could improve students reading ability as proven by the score differences

between the two groups. As could be read in following discussion:

1. Schema development technique is effective to increase students' reading ability. This is proven by the fact that the means of both classes was not differ significantly at the pre-test. The means differ significantly at the post-test.
2. Schema development technique is effective for the two aspects of reading, namely literal aspect and vocabulary aspect, But, it's less significant to improve the inference aspect. This may be due to the nature of inference that requires students to draw conclusion from the reading texts. It was that the information is not explicitly stated in the text. Inference in reading is the ability to understand the meaning of a passage of text without all the information being spelled out. From context clues within a passage, the author

gives information about plot, characters, setting, time period and other elements of story by the things he or she infers. Word choice and word order give clues about the story as it unfolds to the reader. Readers take the clues they are given and draw conclusions based on their own worldview and personal experiences.(Richards, 2017)

## B. SUGGESTION

Based on the conclusion above, the researcher would like to give suggestions related to this research, which hopefully will be helpful for English teacher, students, institution, and further researcher.

1. For English teacher, stimulate the students to be active in the teaching learning process is very important. Teacher should motivate and challenge them to read more effectively in teaching and learning process of reading. Based on that reason, the language teacher should choose a certain teaching technique that can build a good atmosphere of teaching learning process such as reading use Schema Development Technique.

Teacher should use the Schema Development Technique to improve students' reading ability on literal aspect, vocabulary aspect, especially for inference aspect.

2. For the students, a great motivation is something that students should have. With a great motivation, they will practice more in order to explore their English. They also should practice the reading ability more, because it can give more knowledge for them. Reading also can enrich their vocabulary. Schema development technique is an effective technique for improving students' reading ability.
3. Based on some limitation in this study, it's better for further researcher to conduct a study with this technique and should pay attention to vocabulary teaching and learning process. It is suggested should be given separated treatment and assessment for vocabulary building.

## REFERENCES

Ahmad, F. (2016). *Contoh-soal-narrative-text-sma-pilihanda*. Retrived on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from <https://umuminfo.blogspot.co.id/2016/10/.html>.

Alemi, M. (2010). *The effects of pre-reading activities on esp reading comprehension*. Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, Iran : Published Thesis.

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading*. Cambridge, UK University Press.

- Anderson and Pearson. (1987). "A schema theoretic view of basic processes in reading comprehension", *TESOL Quarterly*, vol 21 no 3.
- Ary, D. (2002). *Introduction in research in education*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Thomson learning.
- Arikunto, S. (1998). *Prosedur penelitian suatu peningkatan*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta.
- Ben, T.(2003).*Pre reading strategies*. Retrived on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from [www.lawnerds.com/guide/reading.html](http://www.lawnerds.com/guide/reading.html).
- Bycina and Dubbin. F. (1991). *Teaching English as a second language*. New York, NY: Newbury House.
- Cain, K., Lemmon, K., & Oakhill, J. (2004). Individual differences in the inference of word meanings from context: The influence of reading comprehension, vocabulary knowledge, and memory capacity. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(4), 671-681.
- Cain, K., Oakhill, J. (2006). *Profiles of children with specific reading comprehension difficulties*. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 76, 683-393. DOI: 10.1348/000709905X67610.
- Ciardiello. (1998). *Handbook of research on reading comprehension*. United Stated of America, USA : University of North Carolina and Greenshoro.
- Carrel, P. L, et al. (1986). *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University.
- Carrel, P and Eisterhold. (1987). "Schema theory and esl reading pedagogy".*TESOL Quarterly*, vol 21 no 3.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second-language skills, theory and practice, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed*. Boston,MA: Harcourt brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Chia, H.I. (2001). *Reading activities for effective top down processing*. Delhi, India : Asoke K. Ghosh.
- Devine, T.G. (1986). *Teaching reading comprehension from theory to practice*. London, UK: Allin and Bacon.
- Dewi, C. K. (2014). *Improving the Reading Comprehension of Grade VIII Students at SMP N 1 Mlati Using Schema Activation Strategy in the Academic Year of 2013/2014*. Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta,Indonesia : Unpublished Thesis.

- Gay, L.R. (1990). *Educational research*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Heaton, J.B. (1988). *Writing English language test*. New York, NY: Longman
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of english language teaching*. New York, NY: Longman
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1996). *Reciprocal teaching of reading comprehension strategies for students with learning disabilities who use English as a second language*. *Elementary School Journal*, 96, 275-293.
- Manola, Frank. (1998). *Flexible common schema study*. [Inc.fmanola@objs.com](mailto:Inc.fmanola@objs.com)
- McNamara, D.S., & Magliano, J. P. (2006). Towards a comprehensive model of comprehension. In B. Rose (Ed.), *The psychology of learning and motivation* (pp.297-384). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Mohamed, Abd Al Kareem. (2014). *The impact of using schema theory on reading comprehension among eighth grade students in karak governorate in of pre-prepared knowledge activities*. Al-Hussein Bin Talal University : Unpublished Thesis.
- Morgan, Nicola. (2000). *Pre reading skills*. Retrived on April 29<sup>th</sup> 2018, from [nmorgan@childliteracy.com](mailto:nmorgan@childliteracy.com)
- Nunan, David.(1991). *Language teaching methodology*. Sydney, Australia: Macquarie University.
- Nuttall, Christine. (1996). *Teaching reading skill in a foreign language*. London, UK: Heineman.
- Porter, Louise. (2007). *Theory and practice for teachers*. Australia, Camberas : National Library of Australia.
- Ruseffendi, E.T. (1994). *Dasar-dasar penelitian penelitian dan bidang non-eksata lainnya*. Semarang, Indonesia: IKIP Semarang Press
- Richard.2017. Hearst Seattle Media, LLC
- Sasson, D. (2007). *Improving ESL Reading Skills*. [www.google.com](http://www.google.com)
- Seymour, K. (2017). *Schema theory and reading comprehension*. Retrived on April 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from <https://wehavekids.com/education/Reading-Comprehension-Theory>
- Sirkin, R. Mark. (1994). *Statistics for social sciences second edition*. London, UK: Sage Publication.

Varaprasad, C. (1997). *Some  
classroom strategies*, vol 35  
no 3  
[www.bahasainggrisoke.com](http://www.bahasainggrisoke.com)

Zakharenko. (2007). *How can pre-  
reading strategies benefit  
students with disabilities*.  
Newyorks, NY : St. John  
Fisher College.