EEdJ: English Education Journal
ISSN: 2807-2065
Vol.2, No. 1, 2022, Hal. 1-10
DOI 10.32923/eedj.v2i1.2521

Using RCRR Strategy to Improve Students' Reading Comprehension Skill

Utin Mutia[1], Ewa Desvy[2], Dina Novrieta[3], Priyanggo Karunia Rahman[4]
[1]IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Babel
[2]IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Babel
[3]IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Babel
[4]IAIN Syaikh Abdurrahman Siddik Babel

Keywords:
Reading Comprehension,
Narrative Text,
RCRRStrategy

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to find out the significant difference of the skill in reading comprehension of narrative text between the students that were treated by using RCRR Strategy and those who were not. The subject of this study were the students of eighth grade students of a state high school in Kelapa district, Bangka Belitung province. In this study, the researcher used quantitative approach with quasi-experimental design.The findings showed that the result of mean score of post-test in the experimental group was higher (71.11) than the mean score in control group (60.29). Meanwhile, the result of independentsamples test of students' post–test between experimental and control group, the t-otained in equal variances assumed was 3.40 and the significant (2- tailed) was.001. Since the t-obtained was higher than t-table ((3.40>2.05)) and the significant (2-tailed) was lower than computation with level significant (.001<0.05). It could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the samples significantly, and RCRR Strategy improved the students' skill in reading comprehension of narrative text. Therefore, the result of this study is expected to contribute to the development of the process of English teaching and learning, epecially for teaching and learning reading comprehension.

Correspondence:
Utin Mutia
Email: utinutina@gmail.com

Introduction

Comprehending a text is very crucial in reading. Reading comprehension is the process of forming a meaning by linking a number of processes which include reading words, world knowledge, and also fluency (Klingner et al., 2015). Comprehension in reading can improve reading skills as well as certain goals to be achieved (Sugiarto et al., 2021). When we want to read, we do not only read but also capture the meaning and understand the content contained in the reading (Fromkin et al., 2018). Without knowing the content of the reading, we will not understand what we have read (Muijselaar et al., 2017). This means that reading comprehension is a skill to understand the content of the reading, main ideas and summarize the content of what have been read (Richards et al., 2002). To improve the students' comprehension in reading, it needs an appropriate technique to help them to solve their problems (Indrawati & Widiana, 2019). Actually, there are many skills that can help students improve their reading comprehension. According to Mikulecky, there are many essential comprehension skills to be used in reading the texts, namely; previewing, scanning, skimming, using vocabulary, making inferences, finding topics, discovering topics, understanding main idea, identifying patterns of organization and summarizing (Mikulecky & Jeffries, 1996). The researcher chose making inferences, understanding main idea, and finding topic to test the students' reading comprehension in reading narrative text.

Based on the interview with the teacher of English and some students of eight grade of public high school in Kelapa, Bangka Belitung province, it was found that there were some problems in English teaching and learning process. First, the teacher said that the students were not interested in reading English text because many students did not understand how to read the text correctly and they got difficulties in reading comprehension. Second, the researcher found that the students got difficulties in reading comprehension because they lack of vocabulary. They did not know the meaning of the text, and they found it difficult to understand the text.

Furthermore, the researcher did the preliminary test in one of State Junior High Schools in Kelapa, West Bangka, especially at 8th grade students. There were 53 students from class A and B. The researcher did the test based on the syllabus that teacher used in the school.

Based on the result of the test, the students got difficulties on narrative text. So, the researcher chose narrative text as a type of text for this research. This study focused on three elements of reading skills, which are understanding main idea, making inferences, and finding topic. Many students got difficulties in three elements because students could not limit comprehension on the text. Students' ability in reading was low. The scores obtained from the state Junior High School started from the highest to the lowest scores. The eight-class had three classes with a total of 50 students. For the average score, the grade obtained by grade eight were 10-100.

In fact, there had been many students nevertheless had low potential in comprehending the narrative text. For example, when the researcher was doing observation at Junior High School in Kelapa, she found students' problems in reading comprehension in which the students thought that reading was a boring activity because the reading text was long. When the teacher asked the students orally to answer certain questions based on the text, most of them were unable to provide the right responses. Those conditions stated that the students had little comprehension of a text.

Based on the phenomena above, the researcher was interested in using Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy to improve reading comprehension. Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) is an effective method to help readers at all grade levels who think that good reading is reading quickly and as a result, they do not understand what they have read (Fromkin et al., 2018). It was modelled for students during a whole class instruction period, and then conducted with students who worked as partner to read the same text. This strategy helped the students to process on reading comprehension of a text and get the most important word from the text (Brummer & Macceca, 2013). It is obvious that Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy could increase student's comprehension in reading. The teacher should encourage and guide student to produce well. The sudents had a good potential by using the RCRR strategy, and students were also motivated to share what they already know from what they read with their partners. This means that students would be able to quickly grasp and understand this strategy followed by good results from the knowledge they have. Then, this strategy was believed to foster student understanding. Thus, it was believed that this strategy is more effective to make students understand and remember what they read in the text.

Furthermore, there were three previous studies related to this research. Firstly, was the one conducted by Brantas. He found that RCRR Strategy successfully improved the students' reading comprehension, RCRR Strategy also improved students' enthusiasm in English learning, especially in reading (Saputra, 2021). Secondly was the study done by Baiq Putri Liana. The result of this study showed that RCRR Strategy itself was one of the effective strategies that encourage the readers to slowdown for reading to enhance their reading comprehension (Liana, 2019). The third researcher was Srivinna Akhmaliah. She found that RCRR Strategy could influence the result of learning. The strategy was simple and easy to be applied. It could be used and understood quickly by the students (Akhmaliah, 2019). The fourth, Enggar Relawati, entitled *"Applying Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) Strategy Foster students' Reading comprehension of Descriptive Text at the Tenth Grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 8 Ciputat in Academic Year 2019/2020".* In teaching reading comprehension, she found significant improvements on experimental class much higher than control class. It can be seen from the mean of students' pre-test in experimental and control class. In the pre-test, both of two classes did the test well. It was found that the outcome of the standard deviation from the pre-test of both classes is lower than the post-test; there were 10.956 and 12.169 became 6.711 and 13.090. This means that RCRR strategy is implemented effectively in the classroom and all students demonstrated together their process. The similarity between this research and the previous researchers used experimental and control class research design, reading comprehension, and quantitative data. The difference were the previous research and the research by author is in the place to be researched. previous research examined the place Senior High School while this researcher examined the place of Junior High School (Relawati, 2019).

The difference between those studies and this research were in the aspects of kind of text, research methodology, type of data, research design and the population of the research. In Brantas's research, he used procedure text, and the researcher used narrative text. Brantas used the Class Action Research (cycle I and cycle II) and the researcher used experimental and control class. Baiq focused on senior high school and this research focused on junior high school. Srivinna used qualitative data for his research and this research used quantitative data. Enggar focused on reading and how to implement the strategy and this research focused on reading comprehension ability and how to apply the strategy.

Research problem of this study were described in the following questions:

1. How is the implementation of RCRR strategy in improving students' skill in reading narrrative text in State Junior High School in Kelapa?
2. Is there a significant difference in reading skill between the students who were taught by using RCRR strategy and those who were not taught by using RCRR strategy?

Method

In this research, the researcher used quantitative research to find out the answers of research questions (Goddard & Melville, 2004). Quantitative data uses statistical analysis to calculate the numeral data that are gathered. To analyse them, the researcher used correlation analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2019) .

The researcher used quasi-experimental research. Quasi-experimental is the research that does not permit the researcher to control the assignment. To describe experimental research, it can be done on two groups, where group one is called control without being given treat anything while the second group is given treatment. This research used all subject in the study group to be given treatment, instead of using randomly selected subjects (Maciejewski, 2020).

In this research, the researcher gave pre-test to know students' basic skills in reading comprehension of narrative text. After the writer gave pre-test, the researcher gave treatment to experimental class and control class. Treatment by using RCRR Strategy was used to experimental class, while the control class was not treated by using RCRR Strategy. At the end of the research, the research gave post-test in order to know students' skill after using RCRR Strategy. This research was conducted to the eighth-grade students of One of State Junior High Schools in Kelapa. The population of this research was taken from eight grade students of the school academic year of 2021/2022, which consisted of two classes, VIII A consisting of 26 students and VIII B consisting of27 students. So, the total of population of this research were 53 students. In this research, the researcher chose purposive sampling because as Fraenkel argued, purposive sampling based on the previous knowledge of a population and the specific purposed of the research, investigator used personal judgment to select a sample (Creswell, 2002). The researcher used two classes, a class as the experimental group and a class as control group. They were the students of 8th grade students for VIII A and VIII B.

Based on some considerations namely; (1) from the result of interview; the researcher chose class VIII A and VIII B as sample because the teacher stated in the interview that the students of VIII B got lowest average score, and the students of VIII B had low motivation in reading activity; (2) from the result of preliminary test, it showed that from 53 students that were given the preliminary test got difficulties in reading comprehension especially in narrative text (VIII A had average score of 78.54 and VIII B had average score of 64.78); (3) From the result of pre-test, it showed that the students of class VIII B had the lower score than the students VIII A in learning English. Thus, the researcher chose class VIII B as experimental group and class VIII A as control group. There were 27 students in experimental group and 26 students in control group. So, the total number of the students were 53 students.

After getting the data, the researcher moved to analyse the data. This part aimed to show some of the statistical techniques that the researcher needed to present. In this study, there were three techniques of collecting data. The researcher collected the data by tests. The test was used to measure the students' reading comprehension in narrative text. In this research, the test was given by the researcher to the students of experimental and control group consisting of pre-test and post-test. Pre-test was used to see the students' reading comprehension in narrative text before treatment, and the post-test was used to see students' reading comprehension in narrative text after the treatment. To analyse the data, the researcher used SPSS (*Statistical Package for Social* Science) 26 (Hatch & Farhady, 1982). The statistical method used by the researcher was matched *t-test*. This method used for comparing the result of pre-test and post-test. To analyse the data of observation, the researcher used non-statistical analysis in the form of narrative analysis (Johnson & Christensen, 2019). The researcher arranged the data by observing the class situation and condition in the teaching learning process. It was used to explain the students' activities individually

and group during the implementation of RCRR Method. In the observation sheet, there were some data related to product material and students' performance that consisted of cooperation, concept, and interaction/participation. The researcher used photos and hard Files from school which were got and used in the experimental and control group during given the treatment and given taught would be included in the appendices as the complements. In this research, the research used syllabus, lesson plan, and photos to carry out data that were analysed in implementation of RCRR Strategy.

In this study, researcher decided the content of test based on the syllabus and to see validity of test, the researcher counted the item test by using SPSS (Fraenkel et al., 2012).

Before the test was administered, the test tool had to be tried out to know level of its validity. The try-out of the test was conducted at the eighth-grade students of private Junior High School with the sample of 30 students. The researcher gave the test to the students in which the test had 40 multiple-choice items. In this study, the researcher used test-retest method to have the reliability of the test. Hatched and Farhady said that test was given twice to the same test takers at different times to see if the scores are the same. The researcher calculated the reliability by using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) 26 with Cronbach's Alpha Formula.

Results and Discussions

In this part, the researcher presented and analysed the observation in experimental group and control group. There were three indicators that had been observed by the researcher, they were students participation, students cooperation, and students concept (Ary, n.d.).

a. The Result of Observation in Experimental Group

The researcher got the score of observation based on three aspects: participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept. Then, the researcher accumulated the score of observation from the second until the twelfth meeting. The all aspects of observation namely participation, cooperation, and concept were increased in several meeting. In the second meeting, the percentage of participation, there were 10 students (37%) always participated, 10 students (37%) sometimes participated, and there were 7 students (26%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 15 students (56%) always cooperated, 9 students (33%) sometimes cooperated, and 3 students (11%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 7 students (26%) had very good understanding, 8 students (30%) had good understanding, 9 students (33%) had poor understanding, and 3 students (11%) had not understanding.

In the third meeting of the students' participation, there were 12 students (44%) that always participated, 9 students (33%) sometimes participated, and 6 students (22%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 13 students (48%) that always cooperated, 10 students (37%) sometimes cooperated, and 4 students (15%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 8 students (30%) that had very good understanding, 10 students (37%) had good understanding, 8 students (31%) had poor understanding, and 4 students (15%) had not understanding.

In the fourth meeting of the students' participation, there were 10 students (37%) that always participated, 8 students (30%) sometimes participated, and 9 students (33%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 16 students (59%) that always cooperated, 8 students (30%) sometimes cooperated, and 3 students (11%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 6 students (22%) that had very good understanding, 11 students (41%) had good understanding, 9 students (33%) had poor understanding, and 1 student (4%) had no understanding.

In the fifth meeting of the students' participation, there were 14 students (52%) that always participated, 10 students (37%) sometimes participated, and 3 students (11%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 18 students (67%) that always cooperated, 7 students (26%) sometimes cooperated, and 2 students (7%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 11 students (41%) had very good understanding, 10 students (37%) had good understanding, 3 students (11%) had poor understanding, and 3 students (11%) had not understanding.

In the sixth meeting of the students' participation, there were 15 students (56%) that always participated, 8 students (30%) sometimes participated, and 4 students (15%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 17 students (63%) that always cooperated, 9 students (33%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 student (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 12 students (42%) had very good understanding, 8 students (30%) had good understanding, 6 students (22%) had poor understanding, and 1 students (4%) had not understanding.

In the seventh meeting of the students' participation, there were 13 students (48%) that always participated, 18 students (67%) sometimes participated, and 4 students (15%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 15 students (56%) that always cooperated, 8 students (30%) sometimes cooperated, and 4 students (15%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 16 students (59%) that had very good understanding, 8 students (30%) had good understanding, 3 students (11%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the eighth meeting of the students' participation, there were 17 students (63%) that always participated, 9 students (33%) sometimes participated, and 1 students (4%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 20 students (74%) that always cooperated, 7 students (26%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 16 students (59%) that had very good understanding, 10 students (39%) had good understanding, 1 students (4%) had poor understanding, and 2 students (7%) had not understanding.

In the ninth meeting of the the students' participation, there were 19 students (70%) that always participated, 6 students (22%) sometimes participated, and 2 students (7%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 22 students (81%) that always cooperated, 4 students (15%) sometimes cooperated, and 3 students (11%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 18 students (67%) that had very good understanding, 7 students (26%) had good understanding, 1 students (4%) had poor understanding, and 1 students (4%) had not understanding.

In the tenth meeting of the students' participation, there were 22 students (78%) that always participated, 6 students (22%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 25 students (93%) that always cooperated, 1 students (4%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 students (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 22 students (81%) that had very good understanding, 4 students (15%) had good understanding, 1 students (4%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the eleventh meeting of the students' participation, there were 25 students (93%) that always participated, 2 students (7%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 26 students (96%) that always cooperated, 0 students (0%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 students (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 25 students (93%) had very good understanding, 1 students (4%) had good understanding, 1 students (4%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the twelfth meeting of the students' participation, there were 26 students (96%) that always participated, 1 students (4%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 27 students (100%) that always cooperated, 0 students (0%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 26 students (96%) that had very good understanding, 1 students (4%) had good understanding, 0 students (0%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the thirteenth meeting, the students' participation showed that there were 27 students (100%) that always participated, 0 students (0%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 27 students (100%) that always cooperated, 0 students (0%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 26 students (96%) that had very good understanding, 1 students (4%) had good understanding, 0 students (0%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

Based on the result above, the table showed that most of results of participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept were improved for several meetings. It could been seen from the percentage of participation indicator namely the students always participated in discussion in the sixth, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth. Meanwhile, the percentage of participation indicator namely the students always participated in discussion for the fourth, fifth, and seventh were decreased.

In the aspect of cooperation, it could be seen from the percentage of cooperation namely the students always cooperated with their friends in their group for the fourth, fifth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth. Meanwhile, the percentage of cooperation indicator namely the students that always cooperated in discussion for the third, sixth, and seventh were decreased.

And then the aspect of concept, it could be seen that the percentage of concept indicator namely the students had a good understanding in learning the concept for the seventh, ninth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth. Meanwhile, the percentage of cooperation indicator namely the students that always cooperated in discussion for the fourth, and fifth were decreased.

The result of Concept in Experimental Group

The researcher got the score of concept based on three aspects; participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept . Then, the researcher accumulated the score of observation from the second until the twelfth the meeting. From the calculation results of observation sheet, the researcher could describe that there were four students who always got perfect score (100 points) from the second meeting up to thirteenth meeting, they were students number 9, student number 13, student number 18, and student number 26. And then, there were 11 students who got high improvement from the second up to thirteenth meeting. They were student number 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11 ,12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27. And next, there was four students who got standard improvement from the second up to thirteenth meeting. They were student number 1, 4, 8, and 23.

b. The Result of Observation in Control Group

The researcher got the score of observation based on three aspects; participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept. Then, the researcher accumulated the score of observation from the second until the twelfth the meeting.

The all aspects of observation namely participation, cooperation, and concept increased for several meeting. In the second meeting, the percentage of participation showed that there were 14 students (54%) that always participated, 10 students (38%) sometimes participated, and there were 2 students (8%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 11 students (42%) that always cooperated, 11 students (42%) sometimes cooperated, and 4 students (15%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 3 students (12%) that had very good understanding, 5 students (19%) had good understanding, 8 students (31%) had poor understanding, and 10 students (38%) had not understanding.

In the third meeting, the students' participation showed that there were 15 students (58%) that always participated, 11 students (42%) sometimes participated, and 1 students (4%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 11 students (42%) that always cooperated, 10 students (38%) sometimes cooperated, and 5 students (19%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 3 students (12%) that had very good understanding, 9 students (35%) had good understanding, 8 students (31%) had poor understanding, and 6 students (23%) had not understanding.

In the fourth meeting of the students' participation, there were 14 students (54%) that always participated, 10 students (38%) sometimes participated, and 2 students (8%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 15 students (58%) that always cooperated, 11 students (42%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 students (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 6 students (23%) that had very good understanding, 14 students (54%) had good understanding, 8 students (31%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the fifth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 14 students (54%) always participated, 12 students (46%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 19 students (73%) always cooperated, 6 students (23%) sometimes cooperated, and 2 students (8%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 6 students (23%) had very good understanding, 5 students (19%) had good understanding, 6 students (23%) had poor understanding, and 9 students (35%) had not understanding.

In the sixth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 12 students (46%) always participated, 11 students (42%) sometimes participated, and 3 students (12%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 18 students (69%) always cooperated, 8 students (31%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 7 students (27%) had very good understanding, 4 students (15%) had good understanding, 9 students (35%) had poor understanding, and 6 students (23%) had not understanding.

In the seventh meeting, for the students of participation, there were 17 students (65%) always participated, 9 students (35%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 17 students (65%) always cooperated, 9 students (35%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 4 students (15%) had very good understanding, 4 students (15%) had good understanding, 15 students (58%) had poor understanding, and 3 students (12%) had not understanding.

In the eighth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 14 students (54%) always participated, 7 students (27%) sometimes participated, and 4 students (15%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 14 students (54%) always cooperated, 10 students (38%) sometimes cooperated, and 2 students (8%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 6 students (23%)

had very good understanding, 9 students (35%) had good understanding, 11 students (42%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the ninth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 18 students (69%) always participated, 8 students (31%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 15 students (58%) always cooperated, 10 students (38%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 students (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 9 students (35%) had very good understanding, 8 students (31%) had good understanding, 7 students (27%) had poor understanding, and 2 students (8%) had not understanding.

In the tenth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 17 students (65%) always participated, 9 students (35%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 14 students (54%) always cooperated, 9 students (35%) sometimes cooperated, and 3 students (12%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 17 students (65%) had very good understanding, 6 students (23%) had good understanding, 3 students (12%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the eleventh meeting, for the students of participation, there were 18 students (69%) always participated, 7 students (27%) sometimes participated, and 1 students (4%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 21 students (81%) always cooperated, 5 students (19%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 16 students (62%) had very good understanding, 12 students (46%) had good understanding, 3 students (12%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the twelfth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 19 students (73%) always participated, 5 students (19%) sometimes participated, and 2 students (8%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 22 students (85%) always cooperated, 3 students (12%) sometimes cooperated, and 1 students (4%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 23 students (88%) had very good understanding, 2 students (8%) had good understanding, 1 students (4%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

In the thirteenth meeting, for the students of participation, there were 25 students (93%) always participated, 1 students (4%) sometimes participated, and 0 students (0%) never participated. For the students' cooperation, there were 26 students (100%) always cooperated, 0 students (0%) sometimes cooperated, and 0 students (0%) never cooperated. For the students' concept, there were 23 students (88%) had very good understanding, 1 students (4%) had good understanding, 2 students (8%) had poor understanding, and 0 students (0%) had not understanding.

Most of results of participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept showed improvement for several meetings. The percentage of participation indicator namely the students always participated in discussion in the third, seventh, ninth, and twelfth. Meanwhile, the percentage of participation indicator namely the students always participated in discussion for the fourth, sixth, and eighth were decreased.

In the aspect of cooperation, the percentage of cooperation namely the students that always cooperated with their friends in their group for the fourth, fifth, eleventh, and twelfth. Meanwhile, the percentage of cooperation indicator namely the students always cooperated in discussion for the sixth, seventh, and eighth decreased.

And then the aspect of concept, the percentage of concept indicator namely the students had a good understanding in learning the concept for the fourth, sixth, ninth, eleventh and twelfth. Meanwhile, the percentage of cooperation indicator namely the students that always cooperated in discussion for the seventh, eighth and tenth decreased.

c. The result of Concept in Control Group

The researcher got the score of concepts based on three aspects; participation/interaction, cooperation, and concept. Then, the researcher accumulated the score of observation from the second until the twelfth the meeting

From the calculation results of observation sheet, the researcher could describe that there were three students who always got perfect score (100 points) from the second meeting up to thirteenth meeting, they were students number 11, student number 17, and student number 23. And then, there were 19 students who got high improvement from the second up to thirteenth meeting. They were student number 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26. And next, there was four students who got standard improvement from the second up to thirteenth meeting. They were student number 1, 2, 4, and 8.

The data were collected from the pre-test and post-test of the Experimental and Control Group. The data for experiment consisted of the score of pre-test and post-test of the students who earned reading through RCRR Strategy. Meanwhile, the control group consisted of the score pre-test and post-test of the students who were not given treatment by using RCRR Strategy in improving reading comprehension. After the data were collected, they were analysed by using independent sample test of Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 26.

After completing the implementation and the observation of this research, the researcher could interpret that the process of teaching and learning reading comprehension on narrative text by using RCRR Strategy was running well in which it could be seen from the result of observation that the researcher did when the researcher implemented the RCRR Strategy.

Firstly, the treatment was conducted effectively, and then it ran efficiently. The students were able to follow the strategy step by step. They were able to finish task in time even faster for several students or longer for some students. In some steps (Remember and Retell), they were able to comprehend the reading easily by using RCRR Strategy because they could already read the plot of the story. They also could find the topic in each paragraph of the story. Furthermore, most of students were interested in comprehending reading comprehension skill by using Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) Strategy.

From the result of observation to experimental group, in aspect participation, the average of students was low to concept for fifth meeting, it was caused by some factors such as, some of students were lazy to answer questions. However, some students were more enthusiastic.

In aspect of cooperation, most of students cooperated with their group. It was caused by some factors such as, the students were interested with the story of the material and the students enjoyed in learning process.

Then, in aspect of concepts, most of students had very good understanding. It was caused by some factors such as the topic of the text were not difficult for them to comprehend, and they were also easy to find conclusions from the contents of the story.

After conducting the experiment in teaching reading comprehension by using RCRR Strategy, the researcher concluded that RCRR Strategy was an effective technique in improving reading comprehension to the state junior high school students in Kelapa. The researcher interpreted that there was a significant difference in comprehension between students who were taught by using RCRR Strategy and the students who were not taught by using RCRR Strategy.

Based on the result of the test, it could be inferred that the students who were taught by using RCRR Strategy got better scores than those who were not taught by using RCRR Strategy. The highest score of pre-tests in experimental group was 44 and the highest score was 80. Then, the average of students score in pre-test was 60.29. While in post-test, the lowest score 52 and highest score was 92. And then, the average score was 71.11. Therefore, it could be concluded that the score of all students in the experimental group increased.

Then, from the result of paired sample t-test analysis, it could be proved that there was a significant difference between students' reading comprehension before and after treatment. The mean of pre-test in the experimental group was 61.53 and the mean of control group was 56.74. While the mean of post-test in the experimental was 74.30 and the mean of control group was 60.46. it means that, before getting treatment the mean of control group pre-test was higher than experimental group. However, in the post-test the mean of experimental group was higher than control group. It showed that the students had progress in reading comprehension skill. It was similar between pre-test and post-test and number of questions that consisted of 25 questions.

After that, based on the result of independent sample test of students post-test between experimental and control group, the obtain was 3.40 and the significant (2-tailed) was 0.01. Since *t-obtain* was than table ($3.40 > 2.05$) and the significant (2-tailed) was lower than computation with level ($0.01 < 0.05$), the alternative hypothesis (H_a) was accepted, and null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the students' reading comprehension skill between the students' who were taught by using RCRR Strategy and those were not taught by using RCRR Strategy.

Conclusions

Based on the process of the implementation of RCRR Strategy in experimental group, it can be concluded that the students who were taught by using RCRR Strategy were more comfortable in learning, and they also found the activity of reading texts more enjoyable. It could be seen from their participation in not only paying attention to the class of teaching learning process but also interacting to the learning activities. They became more active and excited to join the class. So, it could increase the students' motivation in learning activities such as to share the information or opinion about their story to each other.

There was a significant difference between the students' achievement in reading comprehension between experimental and control group. It could be seen from the result ofthe t-obtain that was 3.40 and the significant(2-tailed) was 0.01. Since-*obtain* was higher than table (3.40 > 2.05) and the significant (2-tailed) was lower than computation with level (0.01 <0.05), the alternative hypothesis (H_a)was accepted, and null hypothesis (H_0) was rejected. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference in the students' reading comprehension skill between the students' who were taught by using RCRR Strategy and those were not taught by using RCRR Strategy. So, in this research, the use of RCRR Strategy was proven to improve students' reading comprehension skill to the eighth-grade students at State Junior High School in Kelapa academic year of 2021/2022.

References

Akhmaliah, S. (2019). *The Implementation of RCRR (Read,Cover, Remember, Retell) Strategy to Improve the Eight Grade Students Ability at Reading Descriptive text at MTS Al Ittihadiyah Lau DendangMedan year 2019*.

Ary, D. (n.d.). Jacobs, Lucy Cheser. Razavieh, Asghar. Sorenses, Christine K.(2006). *Introduction to Research in Education 8th Edition*.

Brummer, T., & Macceca, S. (2013). *Reading strategies for mathematics*. Teacher Created Materials.

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative* (Vol. 7). Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Vol. 7). McGraw-hill New York.

Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., & Hyams, N. (2018). *An Introduction to Language (w/MLA9E Updates)*. Cengage Learning.

Goddard, W., & Melville, S. (2004). *Research methodology: An introduction*. Juta and Company Ltd.

Hatch, E., & Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics.*

Indrawati, I., & Widiana, A. (2019). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension in Narrative Text through Thieves Strategy to the 10th Grade Students of MAN 1 Pangkalpinang. *Scientia: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian*. https://doi.org/10.32923/sci.v4i2.1016

Johnson, R. B., & Christensen, L. (2019). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches*. Sage publications.

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2015). *Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties, 2/E*. Guilford Publications.

Liana, B. M. P. (2019). *The Effect of Read, Cover, remember, Retell (RCRR) Strategy Toward Students Reading Comprehension at MA Darul Muajirin Praya in Academic Year 2018/2019*.

Maciejewski, M. L. (2020). Quasi-experimental design. *Biostatistics & Epidemiology*, *4*(1), 38–47.

Mikulecky, B. S., & Jeffries, L. (1996). *More Reading Power: Reading Faster, Thinking Skills, Reading for Pleasure, Comprehension Skills.*

Muijselaar, M. M. L., Swart, N. M., Steenbeek-Planting, E. G., Droop, M., Verhoeven, L., & de Jong, P. F. (2017). Developmental relations between reading comprehension and reading strategies. *Scientific Studies of Reading*, *21*(3), 194–209.

Relawati, E. (2019). *Applying Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) Strategy Foster students' Reading comprehension of Descriptive Text at the Tenth-Grade of SMA Muhammadiyah 8 Ciputat in Academic Year 2019/2020*.

Richards, J. C., Richards, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge university press.

Saputra, B. W. (2021). *IMPROVING STUDENTS'READING COMPREHENSION BY USING RCRR (READ, COVER, REMEMBER, RETELL) STRATEGY (A CLASSROOM ACTION RESEARCH ON 8th GRADE STUDENTS OF MTs MIFTAHUL HUDA PABELAN IN THE*.

Sugiarto, D., Indrawati, I., & Meygita, R. (2021). Improving Students' Reading Comprehension Text through Concept-Oriented Reading Instruction (CORI). *EEdJ: English Education Journal*, *1*(1).