CORRELATION BETWEEN THE USE OF FACEBOOK GROUP AND THE 5TH SEMESTER ENGLISH STUDENTS' ACADEMIC WRITING IN WRITING III COURSE OF FKIP SRIWIJAYA UNIVERSITY

Gustiningdiah Purwandini
dessynuke_wulandari@yahoo.com

RitaInderawati
ritarudisaid@yahoo.com

Zainal A. Naning
@yahoo.com

Abstract: This study was conducted in order to find out the correlation between the use of Facebook group and the academic writing of 5th semester student of the English Education Study Program, FKIP Unsri, taking Writing III course. It also investigated the aspect of writing the students mostly developed, and the students' perception toward the use of Facebook group in Writing III course. The population was the 5th semester English students of FKIP Sriwijaya University academic year 2013/2014. They were 27 students from class 5B participating as the sample of this study. To collect the data, documentation and questionnaire were used. The students' academic writing was analyzed based on the rubric, and the questionnaire was analyzed manually by using percentage analysis. To find out the correlation between the use of Facebook group and the students' academic writing, correlation analysis was utilized. The results of the study showed that there was no significant correlation between the use of Facebook group and the students' academic writing since r-obtained was lower than r-table (0.154<0.444). The result of students' writing scoring indicated that the students develop the aspect of punctuation, spelling, and mechanics the most (mean score=16.89). The result of the questionnaire showed that the students had positive perception toward the use of Facebook group in Writing III course.

Key words: *correlation, the use of Facebook group, students' academic writing, students' perception*

People write something for a reason or a purpose. In other words, writing helps people to communicate and makes the communication itself significant (NSW Department of Education and Training Curriculum Support Directorate, 1999). Fromkin and Rodman (1993) mention, "Writing permits a society to permanently record its literature, its history and science, and its technology. The creation of development of writing systems is therefore one of the greatest of human achievements" (p. 363). This is in line with Lincoln's statement (as cited in The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, 2003, p. 36):

Writing – the art of communicating thoughts to the mind – is the great invention of the world…. Great, very great, in enabling us to converse with the dead, the absent, and the unborn, at all distances of time and space, and great not only in its benefits, but its great help to all other inventions.

Writing enriches the America's political life as well. Leaders like Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt "have used the power of words, language, and writing to remind the citizens of what high standards they have set for themselves" (The

National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, 2003, p. 10).

Writing is necessary for university students. After graduating from university, they will face the 'real world' that they have to find job. Business and organizations today depend on efficient and effective written communication. Business transactions, records, legal documents, political and military agreements in the previous days were all rendered by translators into written word. The ability to write has been indispensable to the global community. Brown (2004) states, "Writing skill, at least at rudimentary levels, is a necessary condition for achieving employment in many walks of life and simply taken for granted in literate cultures" (p. 218). Many employers want graduates who are able to write for a variety of audiences. Those who have poor skills of writing will not get on well when looking for jobs.

It is true that writing is not as simple as speaking. Both of them are much different. Speaking uses many communication tools whereas writing does not. Polk (2009) indicates that writing does not have body language, tone of voice, and facial expressions. Instead, it has only words. That is why writing does not always communicate the writer's meaning. Rather, the readers create it. According to Taylor (1990), "Writing is not merely visible speech; it is more than visible speech in some ways and less in others" (p. 6). This statement is supported by Weber (as cited in Taylor, 1990), "When language is fixed in writing it takes on separate identity, serving different functions and following different principles of organization from its spoken counterpart" (pp. 6-7). Writing is the product of critical thinking and is considered challenging because it takes more time, requires a very deep thinking, and has more work to do than speaking in order to transfer the meaning to the readers who are not present. It also involves the process of thinking, drafting, and revising which demands specialized skills. Thus,

writing is also called as a '*thinking process*' (Brown, 2007).

Students who are good at grammar are not always good at writing since writing needs "mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements" (Heaton, 1990, p. 135). Grammar is not the only aspect in writing. The students have to have ideas and have to think carefully to develop the ideas. Besides, the students also have to know and understand the subject matter being written. The students, at least, have a prior knowledge about the subject. As The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges states, "…writing is best understood as a complex intellectual activity that requires students to stretch their minds, sharpen their analytical capabilities, and make valid and accurate distinctions" (2003, p. 13). To produce an effective writing, the students must have the six 'c's that they must write: (1) clearly; (2) coherently; (3) concisely; (4) correctly; with (5) courtesy; and (6) confidence (Dwyer as cited in Griffith University, 2004). The students also have to go through the process of prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Another statement by Brown (2007) is that writing needs more components such as content, organizations, discourse, syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics.

In university, the most common type of writing that students have to write is academic writing. Academic writing has its own characteristics that make it different from personal writing (Bowker, 2007). Academic writing has its typical format: beginning, middle, and end. It is also written by citing published authors' opinion to support the writing. Rules of punctuation and grammar must be followed in writing academically as well. To have a good academic writing, some stages have to be passed through. They are prewriting, planning, writing, revising, and editing (Oshima & Hogue, 1999). Prewriting helps the students choose a topic and gather information about it. Planning is the process of making outline.

It is necessary because an essay is long. It keeps the students on the track, too. Then, the students write the rough draft based on the outline. The last two stages are revising and editing. Revising allows the students to improve their writing by changing, rearranging, adding, or deleting any ideas in the writing in order to communicate the thoughts. On the other hand, in editing the students check any errors or mistakes in grammar, structure, spelling, or punctuation. To end the stages, the students are supposed to write the final copy neatly.

As people live in advanced technological era, they cannot ignore technology. Facebook is an example. Facebook has become very well-known since its first launch in 2004. A survey showed that the social media had more than 500 million active users as of March 2011, and it increased and reached 1.11 billion users in the world as of May 2013. Surprisingly, among more than 200 countries in the world, Indonesia ranked the 2nd position as of January 2012 numbering 41.8 million users and as of May-June 2013 were in the 4th position of Facebook users numbering 92.9% or 64 million active users (Grazella, 2013). One of the features Facebook has is group. People can create a group to share common interest, common ground, or particular themes (Mack, Behler, Roberts, & Rimland as cited in Gafni & Deri, 2012). This feature provides unlimited number of members to join. It also allows the members to share ideas, interact, question, comment, and critique on topics they like to discuss (Limbu, 2011). By being the group member, someone does not have to be friend of other members or expose his personal information. Once Facebook group is created, it can be opened for public or secretly, or limited only for the members, in which only the members can see the activities inside the group.

Pedagogically, Facebook is potential for language classes. In the group, the members can share anything which can be responded by others – peer comments. Rudy (2011) mentions the importance of peer comment. Peers are good source of giving feedback and help the student make improvements. Unfortunately, Facebook cannot automatically detect errors or mistakes in grammar, structure, and punctuation. It can only detect errors or mistakes in spelling. The students have to check again and again to make sure that they do not make any mistakes in their writing. In this case, Rudy (2012) has suggested that because writing needs a process from drafting, revising, and editing, students have to directly type in their laptop by applying grammar and spelling check in review menu after they are sure that they have followed the rules of writing academically.

Some researchers have utilized Facebook in their studies, for example the study done by Blattner and Fiori (2009) entitled "Facebook in the Language Classroom: Promises and Possibilities", White (2009) entitled "The Use of Facebook to Improve Motivation and Academic Writing", Shih (2011) entitled "Can Web 2.0 Technology Assist College Students in Learning English Writing? Integrating Facebook and Peer Assessment with Blended Learning", Limbu (2011) entitled "Processing First-Year College Writing via Facebook Pedagogy in Linguistically and Culturally Diverse First-Year Composition Classes", Rudy (2012) entitled "The Application of Peer Comment in Facebook in Writing Academic Paragraphs by the 4th Semester Students of English Education Study Program of FKIP University of Sriwijaya", AlAamri (2012) entitled "Using Web 2.0 Technologies to Enhance Academic Writing Proficiency among EES Students in Sultan Qaboos University: An Example of Facebook and Blogs", Yunus, Salehi, and Chenzi (2012) entitled "Integrating Social Networking Tools into ESL Classroom: Strengths and Weaknesses", Mahmud and Ching (2012) entitled "Facebook Does It Really Work for L2 Learners", Perez-Sabater (2012) entitled "The Linguistics of Social

Networking: A Study of Writing Conventions on Facebook", Gafni and Deri (2012) entitled "Costs and Benefits of Facebook for Undergraduate Students", and Budiardi and Anggraeni (2013) entitled "Facebook Base Writing Learning for TEFL: A Case Study of ELT in Malang, Indonesia".

What is seen is different from what is expected. Some studies dealing with students' academic writing in Indonesia show that the students had some problems in their academic writing. A study conducted by Jubhari (2009) suggests that English lecturers in Indonesia should change their focus in teaching languages from language structure to paragraph development and critical reasoning. The learners should be familiar with the genre of academic writing. Another study done by Budiharso (2006) reveals that students produced awkward sentences in their essays. They also made grammatical errors in terms of word structure. The study administered by Maharsi (n.d.) shows that some students made limited use of resources and had difficulties in outlining. They were also confused in applying the concepts of unity and coherence when writing. As a result of this, they used transitional signals inappropriately and in limited number. They also tended to copy the whole sentences when citing others' opinion. Other students did not know which organization was appropriate for their topics. Damayanti's study (2012) on "An Analysis of Academic Paragraph Writing in Facebook of the 4th Semester English Education Study Program Students of FKIP Sriwijaya University" points out that the students still had weaknesses in structure, grammar, and mechanics. There were only 11 students (58%) whose sentences were clear and only 11 students (56.5%) with no errors in grammar and mechanics.

Based on an observation and two informal interviews, students of English Education Study Program of FKIP Sriwijaya University learned how to write academic English writing in the forms of essays in Writing III course. They were taught the structure or the organization of an essay. They also used Facebook group in the course. The activities were mostly done in the online group on Facebook. When one of the students posted an essay, others commented whether there should be revision or not. When the essay needed revision, other students commented what should be revised and how to revise it. The role of the lecturer was to watch the students' activities. She also motivated the students to actively participate in the online discussion. By having online learning, the students were able to write academically. They could write essays in order, which means that they wrote according to its structure or organization. However, the students still had difficulties in diction and mechanics. They were unable to use appropriate words and punctuation. They sometimes forgot to give capital letter in their essay. One of the students said that she was confused what to write in the body paragraphs though she had thesis statement in her introduction of the essay. She was also confused how to conclude the essay.

Based on an observation, it showed that most students of English Education Study Program of FKIP Sriwijaya University got good mark in Writing II course, in which they started to learn how to write academic English writing. They knew the organization of good paragraph and were able to write paragraph with good organization. Unfortunately, they still had difficulties in grammar, structure, and punctuation.

English has four skills which are speaking, listening, reading, and writing. Writing is also known as written communication. Griffith University (2004, p. 1) defines written communication as the following,

> Written communication is the ability to use the conventions of disciplinary discourse to communicate effectively

in writing with a range of audiences, in a variety of modes (e.g. persuasion, argument, exposition), as context requires, using a number of different means (e.g. graphical, statistical, audio-visual and technological).

People write something for a reason or a purpose. In other words, writing helps people to communicate and makes the communication itself significant (NSW Department of Education and Training Curriculum Support Directorate, 1999). Fromkin and Rodman (1993) mention, "Writing permits a society to permanently record its literature, its history and science, and its technology. The creation of development of writing systems is therefore one of the greatest of human achievements" (p. 363). This is in line with Lincoln's statement (as cited in The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, 2003, p. 36):

> Writing – the art of communicating thoughts to the mind – is the great invention of the world…. Great, very great, in enabling us to converse with the dead, the absent, and the unborn, at all distances of time and space, and great not only in its benefits, but its great help to all other inventions.

Writing enriches the America's political life as well. Leaders like Abraham Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt "have used the power of words, language, and writing to remind the citizens of what high standards they have set for themselves" (The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges, 2003, p. 10).

Writing is necessary for university students. After graduating from university, they will face the 'real world' that they have to find job. Business and organizations today depend on efficient and effective written communication. Business transactions, records, legal documents, political and military agreements in the previous days were all rendered by translators into written word. The ability to write has been indispensable to the global community. Brown (2004) states, "Writing skill, at least at rudimentary levels, is a necessary condition for achieving employment in many walks of life and simply taken for granted in literate cultures" (p. 218). Many employers want graduates who are able to write for a variety of audiences. Those who have poor skills of writing will not get on well when looking for jobs.

It is true that writing is not as simple as speaking. Both of them are much different. Speaking uses many communication tools whereas writing does not. Polk (2009) indicates that writing does not have body language, tone of voice, and facial expressions. Instead, it has only words. That is why writing does not always communicate the writer's meaning. Rather, the readers create it. According to Taylor (1990), "Writing is not merely visible speech; it is more than visible speech in some ways and less in others" (p. 6). This statement is supported by Weber (as cited in Taylor, 1990), "When language is fixed in writing it takes on separate identity, serving different functions and following different principles of organization from its spoken counterpart" (pp. 6-7). Writing is the product of critical thinking and is considered challenging because it takes more time, requires a very deep thinking, and has more work to do than speaking in order to transfer the meaning to the readers who are not present. It also involves the process of thinking, drafting, and revising which demands specialized skills. Thus, writing is also called as a '*thinking process*' (Brown, 2007).

Students who are good at grammar are not always good at writing since writing needs "mastery not only of grammatical and rhetorical devices but also of conceptual and judgmental elements" (Heaton, 1990, p. 135). Grammar is not the only aspect in writing. The students have to have ideas and have to think carefully to develop the ideas. Besides, the students also have to know and understand the subject matter being written. The students, at least, have a prior knowledge about the subject. As The National Commission on Writing in America's Schools and Colleges states, "…writing is best understood as a complex intellectual activity that requires students to stretch their minds, sharpen their analytical capabilities, and make valid and accurate distinctions" (2003, p. 13). To produce an effective writing, the students must have the six 'c's that they must write: (1) clearly; (2) coherently; (3) concisely; (4) correctly; with (5) courtesy; and (6) confidence (Dwyer as cited in Griffith University, 2004). The students also have to go through the process of prewriting, drafting, revising, and editing. Another statement by Brown (2007) is that writing needs more components such as content, organizations, discourse, syntax, vocabulary, and mechanics.

In university, the most common type of writing that students have to write is academic writing. Academic writing has its own characteristics that make it different from personal writing (Bowker, 2007). Academic writing has its typical format: beginning, middle, and end. It is also written by citing published authors' opinion to support the writing. Rules of punctuation and grammar must be followed in writing academically as well. To have a good academic writing, some stages have to be passed through. They are prewriting, planning, writing, revising, and editing (Oshima & Hogue, 1999). Prewriting helps the students choose a topic and gather information about it. Planning is the process of making outline. It is necessary because an essay is long. It keeps the students on the track, too. Then, the students write the rough draft based on the outline. The last two stages are revising and editing. Revising allows the students to improve their writing by changing, rearranging, adding, or deleting any ideas in the writing in order to communicate the thoughts. On the other hand, in editing the students check any errors or mistakes in grammar, structure, spelling, or punctuation. To end the stages, the students are supposed to write the final copy neatly.

As people live in advanced technological era, they cannot ignore technology. Facebook is an example. Facebook has become very well-known since its first launch in 2004. A survey showed that the social media had more than 500 million active users as of March 2011, and it increased and reached 1.11 billion users in the world as of May 2013. Surprisingly, among more than 200 countries in the world, Indonesia ranked the 2nd position as of January 2012 numbering 41.8 million users and as of May-June 2013 were in the 4th position of Facebook users numbering 92.9% or 64 million active users (Grazella, 2013). One of the features Facebook has is group. People can create a group to share common interest, common ground, or particular themes (Mack, Behler, Roberts, & Rimland as cited in Gafni & Deri, 2012). This feature provides unlimited number of members to join. It also allows the members to share ideas, interact, question, comment, and critique on topics they like to discuss (Limbu, 2011). By being the group member, someone does not have to be friend of other members or expose his personal information. Once Facebook group is created, it can be opened for public or secretly, or limited only for the members, in which only the members can see the activities inside the group.

Pedagogically, Facebook is potential for language classes. In the group, the members can share anything which can be responded by others – peer comments. Rudy (2011) mentions the importance of peer comment. Peers are

good source of giving feedback and help the student make improvements. Unfortunately, Facebook cannot automatically detect errors or mistakes in grammar, structure, and punctuation. It can only detect errors or mistakes in spelling. The students have to check again and again to make sure that they do not make any mistakes in their writing. In this case, Rudy (2012) has suggested that because writing needs a process from drafting, revising, and editing, students have to directly type in their laptop by applying grammar and spelling check in review menu after they are sure that they have followed the rules of writing academically.

Some researchers have utilized Facebook in their studies, for example the study done by Blattner and Fiori (2009) entitled "Facebook in the Language Classroom: Promises and Possibilities", White (2009) entitled "The Use of Facebook to Improve Motivation and Academic Writing", Shih (2011) entitled "Can Web 2.0 Technology Assist College Students in Learning English Writing? Integrating Facebook and Peer Assessment with Blended Learning", Limbu (2011) entitled "Processing First-Year College Writing via Facebook Pedagogy in Linguistically and Culturally Diverse First-Year Composition Classes", Rudy (2012) entitled "The Application of Peer Comment in Facebook in Writing Academic Paragraphs by the 4th Semester Students of English Education Study Program of FKIP University of Sriwijaya", AlAamri (2012) entitled "Using Web 2.0 Technologies to Enhance Academic Writing Proficiency among EES Students in Sultan Qaboos University: An Example of Facebook and Blogs", Yunus, Salehi, and Chenzi (2012) entitled "Integrating Social Networking Tools into ESL Classroom: Strengths and Weaknesses", Mahmud and Ching (2012) entitled "Facebook Does It Really Work for L2 Learners", Perez-Sabater (2012) entitled "The Linguistics of Social Networking: A Study of Writing Conventions on Facebook", Gafni and

Deri (2012) entitled "Costs and Benefits of Facebook for Undergraduate Students", and Budiardi and Anggraeni (2013) entitled "Facebook Base Writing Learning for TEFL: A Case Study of ELT in Malang, Indonesia".

What is seen is different from what is expected. Some studies dealing with students' academic writing in Indonesia show that the students had some problems in their academic writing. A study conducted by Jubhari (2009) suggests that English lecturers in Indonesia should change their focus in teaching languages from language structure to paragraph development and critical reasoning. The learners should be familiar with the genre of academic writing. Another study done by Budiharso (2006) reveals that students produced awkward sentences in their essays. They also made grammatical errors in terms of word structure. The study administered by Maharsi (n.d.) shows that some students made limited use of resources and had difficulties in outlining. They were also confused in applying the concepts of unity and coherence when writing. As a result of this, they used transitional signals inappropriately and in limited number. They also tended to copy the whole sentences when citing others' opinion. Other students did not know which organization was appropriate for their topics. Damayanti's study (2012) on "An Analysis of Academic Paragraph Writing in Facebook of the 4th Semester English Education Study Program Students of FKIP Sriwijaya University" points out that the students still had weaknesses in structure, grammar, and mechanics. There were only 11 students (58%) whose sentences were clear and only 11 students (56.5%) with no errors in grammar and mechanics.

Based on an observation and two informal interviews, students of English Education Study Program of FKIP Sriwijaya University learned how to write academic English writing in the forms of essays in Writing III course. They were taught the structure or the organization of

an essay. They also used Facebook group in the course. The activities were mostly done in the online group on Facebook. When one of the students posted an essay, others commented whether there should be revision or not. When the essay needed revision, other students commented what should be revised and how to revise it. The role of the lecturer was to watch the students' activities. She also motivated the students to actively participate in the online discussion. By having online learning, the students were able to write academically. They could write essays in order, which means that they wrote according to its structure or organization. However, the students still had difficulties in diction and mechanics. They were unable to use appropriate words and punctuation. They sometimes forgot to give capital letter in their essay. One of the students said that she was confused what to write in the body paragraphs though she had thesis statement in her introduction of the essay. She was also confused how to conclude the essay.

Based on an observation, it showed that most students of English Education Study Program of FKIP Sriwijaya University got good mark in Writing II course, in which they started to learn how to write academic English writing. They knew the organization of good paragraph and were able to write paragraph with good organization. Unfortunately, they still had difficulties in grammar, structure, and punctuation.

METHODOLOGY
Research Method
, this study was a correlation study. Creswell (2012) states, "Investigators use the correlation statistical test to describe and measure the degree of association (or relationship) between two or more variables or sets of scores" (p. 338). This study is aimed to find out the correlation between the use of Facebook group and the 5th semester English students' academic writing in

Writing III course of FKIP Sriwijaya University.

Population and Sample
The population of this study was all of the students of eighth graders of SMP Negeri 53 Palembang in the academic year 2013/2014. The total number of population on this research was 228.

A purposive sampling was applied to select the sample. The writer chose two classes VIII. 2 and VIII. 3 for the sample. There were three of reasons. Firstly, they were taught by the same teacher. Secondly, they had similarity in terms of number of students. Thirdly, they had similarity in terms of English score test between 60 until 70. In deciding which one the experimental and control group, the writer randomized those two classes by flipping coin. The head side is for control group and the tail side is for the experimental group.

Data Collection and Analysis
To collect the data, a reading comprehension test (N of test item = 25) in the form of multiple choice was given to the sample. The test was tried out before given to the sample students. The reliability score was 0.811.

Paired sample t-tests was applied to compute to see the differences between the pre-test and post-test of the experimental group. In addition, the independent sample t-testwas used to find out whether or not there was significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 53 Palembang who were taught through REAP strategy and those who were not.

FINDINGS

The Result of the Pre-test and Post-test in the Experimental Group

Table 1
Score Distribution of Experimental Group(N=26)

Score Interval	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		N	%	N	%
86-100	Excellent	1	2.63	8	21
71-85	Good	8	21	29	76.3

56-70	Average	14	36.84	1	2.63
41-55	Poor	11	28.94	-	-
0-40	Failed	4	10.52	-	-
Total		38	99.9	38	99.9

The table 1 above shows that in the pre test there are 4 students (10.52%) got the score 40 or below that were classified into failed category, 11 students (28.94%) got score between 41-55 that were classified into poor category, 14 students (36.84%) got scores between 56-70 that were classified into average category, 8 students (21%) got scores between 71-85 that were classified into good category and 1 student (2.63%) got scores between 86-100 that was classified into excellent category.

In the post test, none of students got the scores between 41-45 or 40 or below. From the result none of the students was in failed or poor category. 1 student (2.63%) got score between 56 -70 that was classified into average category, 29 students (76.3%) got score between 71 -85 that were classified into good category. And the last, 8 students (21%) got score between 86-100 that were classified into excellent category.

The Result of the Pre-test and Post-test in the Control Group

Table 2 shows that in the pre test there is 1 student (2.63%) got the score 40 or below that were classified into failed category, 4 students (10.52%) got scores between 41-55 that were classified into poor category, 18 students (47.36%) got scores between 56-70 that were classified into average category, 15 students (39.47%) got scores between 71-85 that were classified into good category and none students got scores between 86-100 that were classified into excellent category.

In the post test, none of students got the scores between 41-45 or 40 or below. From the result none of the students was in failed or poor category. 9 students (23.68%) got scores between 56 -70 that were classified into average category, 26 students (68.42%) got scores between 71 -85 that were classified into good category.

And the last, 3 students (7.89%) got scores between 86-100 that were classified into excellent category.

Table 2
Score Distribution of Control Group(N=26)

Score Interval	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		N	%	N	%
86-100	Excellent	-	-	3	7.89
71-85	Good	15	39.47	26	68.42
56-70	Average	18	47.36	9	23.68
41-55	Poor	4	10.52	-	-
0-40	Failed	1	2.63	-	-
Total		38	99.98	38	99.98

Paired Sample T-Test

Table 3 shows the mean of pre-test 57.36 and the mean of the post-test was 81.15. The standard deviation of the pre-test was 13.833 and the standard deviation of the post-test was 5.948.

The result of paired sample t-test shows that the t-obtained was 14.398. P value was .000. It was less than the value of probability (0.05). For t-obtained 14.398was higher than the critical value of t-table (2.026). Since the p value < 0.05 (.000 < 0.05) and t-obtained > t-table (14.398 > 2.026), it could be stated that the null hypothesis (H0) was rejected and the research hypothesis (H1) was accepted. It means that there was significant difference between pre-test and post-test of reading comprehension achievement in the experimental group.

Table 3
Paired Sample t-Test of Experimental Group

Group	Test	Mean	Std. Dev	T	Sig. (2-Tailed
Exp	Pre-Test	57.36	13.833		
	Post-Test	81.15	5.948	14.398	.000

Independent Sample T-Test

Table4 above shows the difference in mean, standard deviation, and also standard error of the pre-test and post-test

of experimental and control groups. The independent sample t-test shows that the mean of pre-test in the experimental group was 57.36; standard deviation was 13.833; and the standard error mean was 2.244. In the control group, the mean of pre-test was 65.68; standard deviation was 11.526; and the standard error mean was 1.869.

Furthermore, the independent sample t-test of post-test shows that the mean of post-test in experimental group was 81.15; standard deviation was 5.948; and the standard error mean was .96491. In the control group, the mean of post-test was 75.05; standard deviation was 8.236; and the standard error mean was 1.336.

Table 4
Independent Sample t-Test of the Post Test for Both Groups

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-Tailed)	Mean Diff
Pre test	2.194	.143	-2.847	74	.006	-8.315
Post test	2.859	.095	3.704	74	.000	6.105

INTERPRETATION

Based on the result of this study, the writer found that using REAP strategy can be used as an alternative method in teaching reading comprehension. It is very useful for the students in learning reading process. Allen as cited in Watson (2011)," REAP is designed to improve thinking; a strategy for helping readers read and understand the text. This strategy, with modeling and guided practice will help students in increasing reading comprehension, (p.1)". REAP is used in a large group setting to offer students the chance to contribute to discussion and then by doing so build a larger knowledge base. However, the students has the different of ability on reading level, so it can be proved through their groups' discussion to find the meaning of the information on the text. REAP strategy is important to note that for use in the classroom and visualizing while reading can increase

reading comprehension. In this study, REAP strategy is helpful for the writer in teaching reading comprehension because it can help the students to understand and comprehend more about the text what they have read.

It means that the students were able to analyze, use critical thinking, interpret and explain about the information of the text. After that, the students began to read the text, and the writer asked them to write about what the information that is got from the text. It is relevant to Holandyah (2012) states that The REAP Strategy is an Annotation Strategy for improving reading and writing skills. Annotating has some of benefits. Besides making texts more meaningful, annotating improves students' attention while reading and makes reading a more active process. Annotation writing enhances information processing and, in turn, improves registration of information in memory. There is less information to remember when it has been summarized in an annotation, and annotations are written in a student's own words. It means that they succeed to comprehend the text. In other words, the students who were taught through REAP strategy can comprehend the text and make the conclusion of the text.

Finally, the writer concluded that REAP strategy improved the students' reading comprehension achievement, and it could be used as one of new method in teaching reading.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the result finding, there was significant different in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught through REAP strategy and those who were not. It could be proven by analyzing the students' pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group and control group using independent sample t-test. The result showed that teaching reading comprehension after gave treatment through REAP Strategy had a significant different on the students' reading

comprehension achievement. The independent sample t-test analysis found t-obtained was 3.704 at the significance level of $p < 0.05$ and df =74, the critical value of t-table was 1.993. Since the t-obtained was higher than t-table that is 3.704>1.993, the null hypotheses (H_o) was rejected and the research hypotheses (H_1) was accepted. The writer concluded that REAP strategy helped the students to improve their reading comprehension.

Based on the results of this study, some suggestions are offered:

1. For English Teachers

The English teacher of SMP Negeri 53 Palembang can use the REAP strategyas one of new method in teaching and learning reading process.Nonetheless, the success of teaching and learning activities is not only influenced by the teacher but also through REAP strategy.

2. For the Students

The students should prepare themselves earlier before they learn the new materials of reading text through REAP strategy.

REFERENCES

Bacha, N. N. (2002). Testing writing in the EFL classroom: Student expectation. *English Teaching Forum. 40*(2), 14-16

Bernhardt, E. B. (1991). *Reading development in a second language: Theoretical, empirical, and classroom perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Best, J.W., & Kahn, J.V. (2006).*Research in education.*Boston, MA: Pearson Education.Inc. Retrieved from http://www33.homepage.villanova.edu/edward.fierros/pdf/BestKahn1a.pdf

Bureau of Secondary Curriculum Development New York State Education Department.(1957). *Syllabus in English for secondary schools.*Albany, NY: Bureau of Secondary Curriculum Development New York State Education Department.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative research (2nd.ed.*). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Dubay, W. H. (2004). *The principles of readability*. Retrieved from http://www.nald.ca/library/research/readab/readab.pdf

Eanet, M. G., &Manzo, A. V. (1976). REAP - A strategy for improving reading/writing/study skills. *Journal of Reading, 19,* 647

Ediger, A. (2001). Teaching children literacy skills in a second language. In Murcia, M. C. (3rd.ed), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, (pp. 153-169). Canada: Thomson Learning

Englishindo.(2011). *Types of Reading.*Retrieved from http://www.englishindo.com/2011/06/types-of-reading.html .

Farini.(2010). *Improving reading comprehension achievement and vocabulary by using collaborative strategic reading (csr) to the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 18 Palembang* (Unpublished Thesis).Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Gunning, T. G. (1992).*Creating reading instruction for all children*. Boston, MA: Allyn& Bacon, Inc.

Grabe, W., &Stoller, F. L. (2001). Reading for academic purposes: Guidelines for the ESL/EFL teacher. In Murcia, M. C. (3rd.ed), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language,* (pp. 187-203).Edinburgh: Pearson Education Limited

Hill, S. (2006). *Developing early literacy: Assessment and teaching.* Melbourne: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Hill, S. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Assessment and teaching.* Melbourne: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Holandyah, M. (2012).*Quantum ilmu: REAP strategy in reading comprehension.* Retrieved from http://holandyah.blogspot.com/2012/01/reap-strategy-in-reading-comprehension.html

Kane, S. T. (2000). *The oxford essential guide to writing.*New York, NY: Barkley Books.

Khand, Z. (2004). Teaching reading skills: problems & suggestions. *Journal of Research (Faculty of Language & Islamic Studies), 45*(5), 43-56

Kubiszyn, T., &Borich, G. (1993).*Educational testing and measurement classroom application and practice(4th.ed).* New York : HarperCollins College Publisher.

Mc. Millan, J. H. (1992). *Educational research: Fundamental for consumer.* New York, NY: Harper Collins Publisher.

Morris, W. (1975).*The American heritage dictionary of English Language.* Polo Alto, CA: American Heritage Pub Co.

National Reading panel. (2000). Teaching children to read: An evidence based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction. *NationalInstitute of Child Health and Human Development.* Retrieved from http://www.nifl.gov/partnershipforreading/adult_reading/references/source/nrpB.html

Novianty, M. (2011).*Using hidden message word searches method in teaching English vocabulary to the eighth grade students' of SMP Negeri 33 Palembang* (Unpublished Thesis). Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Nuraisyah.(2010). Teaching reading comprehension to the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 54 Palembang through short stories.(Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis).Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Postlethwaite, T. N. (2005). *Educational research: Some basic concepts and terminology.* Hamburg: UNESCO.

Pretorius, E. J. (2000). *What they can't read will hurt them: Reading and academic achievement.* Retrieved from http://www.innovation.ukzn.ac.za/InnovationPdfs/No21pp33-41Pretorius.pdf.

Rasyid, N. (2010).*Perbedaan narrative text dan recount text.* Retrieved from

Rugayamanan.(2012). *Definition of recount, report, narrative, descriptive and procedure text.* Retrieved from http://rugayamanan.wordpress.com/2012/12/08/definition-of-recount-report-narrative-descriptive-and-procedure-text-2/

Setiawan B. (2012). *Teaching reading comprehension to the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 8 Palembang through retelling activities* (Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis).Sriwijaya University, Palembang, Indonesia.

Tuckman, B. W. (1978). *Conducting educational research (2nd.ed).* New York, NY: Hartcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Wallen, N.E., & Jack R, F. (1991).*Educational research: A guide to the process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Watson, M. (2011).*Tools for teaching content literacy*. Retrieved from http://readingstrategiesp514.wikispaces.com/REAP

Yossuke, Y. (2011). *Kinds of reading comprehension*. Retrieved fromhttp://yoyoii.blogspot.com/2011/06/kinds-of-reading-comprehension.html

About the authors:

Dessy Nuke Wulandari is the graduate of the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Sriwijaya University.
Prof. Diemroh Ihsan, Ph.D and **Dra. Rita Hayati, M.A** are the lecturers at the English Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher training and Education, Sriwijaya University. She is also the Head of the Sriwijaya University Language Institute.