JoTELL *Journal of Teaching English, Linguistics, and Literature* published by English Education Study Program, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Universitas Negeri Manado, Vol. 3 No. 5, pp. 617-625

IMPROVING READING ENGLISH BY USING RCRR (READ, COVER, REMEMBER, RETELL) STRATEGY (CLASSROOM ACTION RESEARCH ON 8TH-GRADE STUDENTS AT SMP NEGERI 4 TONDANO)

WARINI LA ALI, NOLDY PELENKAHU, RINNY RORIMPANDEY

Universitas Negeri Manado
Correspondence author: noldypelenkahu@unima.ac,id

Received: 28 March 2024
Accepted: 20 May 2024
Published: 28 May 2024

Abstract: The purpose of this study is to find the effect of using the RCRR strategy to improve students reading comprehension at SMP Negeri 4 Tondano. This study used quantitative research with a classroom action research design. The subjects of this study were 30 students of class 8B at SMP Negeri 4 Tondano. Data were collected through pre-tests and post-tests with different questions. The data analysis results showed a difference between the pre-test total score of 1.500 and the post-test total score of 2.010. This study calculated the effect of using the RCRR strategy in class 8B using a t-test on SPSS software version 25. The results showed an effect of using the RCRR strategy with Sig. (2-tailed) of .000 < 0.05. The alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, while the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. Therefore, using the RCRR strategy effectively improves students reading comprehension.

Keywords: ***RCRR, Reading, Comprehension, Improving***

INTRODUCTION

Language is a means to communicate with others. The language used by the speaker makes the listener or interlocutor understand the message to be conveyed. According to Hammp, language is used for communication, expression, and social control (Paula L., 2019). In other words, people can use language to convey their opinions, thoughts, and feelings.

English has become commonly used in various fields worldwide, including politics, economics, health, technology, science, and education (Liando, Tatipang & Lengkoan, 2022). Teaching English aims to enable students to compete internationally and access knowledge from around the world (Tumbal, Liando & Olii, 2021). According to Palenkahu (2014), in learning English, students must master four language skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Alyousef (2005:143) defines reading as an interaction between the reader and the text to improve reading comprehension. Readers who understand the material will easily understand the message conveyed. In their journal (2016:125), Papatga and Ersoy underline the importance of understanding the author's point of view or message. This suggests that students with high awareness will become excellent readers. The efficiency of reading skills training relies heavily on comprehensive comprehension; therefore, students should actively participate in varied reading tasks.

According to Hyot (2002:147), Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) is an excellent strategy for assisting readers of all grade levels. In other words, this strategy can help kids of all grade levels enhance their reading comprehension and remember what they have read. RCRR is a teaching strategy teachers can employ to pique students' interest in reading specific resources, such as descriptive text.

The researcher found that the students needed help understanding the content of the reading; they needed to understand the meaning of the text. To overcome this difficulty, students reading comprehension should be improved by using effective and interesting strategies. Therefore, the researcher used the RCRR (Read, Cover, Remember, Retell) strategy.

Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) Strategy

Experts have described the Read, Cover, Remember, and Retell (RCRR) strategy. According to Brummer & Macceca (2008), this strategy helps readers of different grade levels who struggle with speed reading, thus improving text comprehension. Anita (2013) highlights its effectiveness in improving reading comprehension and knowledge, especially in group settings where students can discuss. Thrisha and Macceca (2018) emphasized the role of this strategy in improving comprehension and retention by encouraging readers to read carefully, remember, and retell the content of the text. Dahler (2019) emphasizes the purpose of RCRR to encourage slow and meaningful reading, as described by Brummer and Macceca (2008), in the context of cooperative learning strategies that encourage students to summarize the text of each passage.

Reading Comprehension

The purpose of any interaction with text is to understand it. If readers do not understand the text they are reading or viewing, they cannot be said to be reading. This is stated by Shea and Roberts (2016:19). In his book, Willis quotes Cunningham and Stanovich, who states that in order to comprehend text, readers must be able to decode

or recognize words, access the process of combining text to construct meaning, and retain reading content to stimulate the storage of information related to long-term memory. Reading is mostly for comprehension, and students will benefit more from homework assignments if they grasp the texts they read. According to this theory, reading comprehension is described as an attempt to acquire and construct meaning through interaction with the written word.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used quantitative research with a one-group pre-test and post-test classroom action research (CAR) design. A pre-test was given before treatment and a post-test after treatment to evaluate the impact of the RCRR (Read, Cover, Remember, Retell) strategy on the reading comprehension of eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 4 Tondano. The sample was 30 students from class 8B. A twenty-question test was used as an instrument to assess students' comprehension before and after the treatment.

Data Analysis

Researcher analyzed the data using SPSS version 25. To calculate the score of students' test answers, researchers used the following formula:

$$\text{Students score} = \frac{The\ number\ of\ students\ correct\ answer}{Maximum\ Score} \text{ x } 100$$

(Gay, 2012)

This study used descriptive statistical analysis, normality tests, and t-tests. The analysis was conducted in stages, starting with descriptive statistics, then normality test, and finally, t-test to compare pre-test and post-test scores. The t-test was conducted using SPSS 25.

1) Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics assess data by explaining it and not drawing general conclusions. Select analyze – Descriptive Statistic – Descriptive – Input pre-test and post-test data in the variable column - Options - choose what to present (mean, sum, standar deviation, maximum. minimum) - Variable test - Continue – Ok.

2) Normality Test

The normality test finds whether the data is normally distributed (Enterprise, 2018). This analysis uses the Kolmogrov-Sminorv table. Researchers perform the analysis by clicking the Analyze menu - regression - linear - Fill the dependent column with the pre-test value and the independent column with the post-test value. - save - unstandardized - continue - ok, then click analyze - nonparametric test - legacy dialog - 1 sample k-5 - enter unstandardized data into the test variable list column - check normal - click ok. The conclusions of the normality test results are as follows:

a. if the Significance value is > 0.05, the data is normally distributed.
b. if the significance value is < 0.05, the data is not normally distributed.

3) T-test

The t-test is a statistical analysis that finds whether there is a significant difference between the average test results of two groups (Hayes, 2021). The t-test is classified into three types depending on the sample: independent sample t-test, paired sample t-test, and one-sample t-test. This study used the paired t-test to calculate the pre-test and post-test mean differences. The researcher analyzed in SPSS by selecting analyze - compare means - paired samples t-test - ok. The criteria for accepting or rejecting this hypothesis test, according to Pestman and Alberink (2012), are as follows:

a. If the significance value > 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected.
b. If the significant value < 0.05, the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

This study collected data from one class consisting of 30 students in class 8B SMP Negeri 4 Tondano. The research method was quantitative, with a Classroom Action Research (CAR) design that included pre-test and post-test. Data was collected by giving a test of 20 questions. The results of the research are presented in table form as follows:

Table 4.1: The Result of pre-test and post-test

No	Sample	Pre-test	Post-test
1.	AG	50	65

2.	AH	40	60
3.	AP	90	95
4.	AR	30	50
5.	CT	85	85
6.	CM	35	60
7.	CP	55	80
8.	EM	55	70
9.	FN	65	70
10.	GK	40	60
11.	HT	50	60
12.	IM	65	80
13.	JR	25	55
14.	JK	60	60
15.	KH	40	60
16.	KD	60	75
17.	MR	20	50
18.	MU	25	60
19.	MA	45	60
20.	MM	65	80
21.	MW	50	65
22.	NT	50	65
23.	RK	60	75
24.	RR	35	50
25.	RJ	50	60
26.	RY	30	75
27.	SY	60	90
28.	TS	60	65
29.	WM	60	70
30.	YM	45	60
	Total	1.500	2.010

Table 4.1 shows the pre-test and post-test results for class 8B. The table shows that the highest pre-test score was 90, and the lowest was 20. Meanwhile, the highest post-test score was 95, and the lowest score was 50.

Data Analysis

This study was analyzed using the t-test on SPSS software version 25. However, previously, the data had to go to descriptive statistics and normality as a condition before implementing the t-test. Both pre-test and post-test tests will find if the data collected has a normal distribution. The results of the data analysis can be seen as follows:

1) Descriptive Statictics

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	30	20	90	1500	50.00	16.505
Posttest	30	50	95	2010	67.00	11.567
Valid N (listwise)	30					

Based on Table 4.2, the pre-test and post-test students totaled 30. In the pre-test, the minimum score was 20, the maximum score was 90, the total students score was 1.500, and the average score was 50.00. As for the post-test, the number of students is 30. The minimum score is 50, the maximum score is 95, the overall score is 2.010, and the average score is 67.00.

2) Normality Test

Table 4.3

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		30
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	10.01775885
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.185
	Positive	.085
	Negative	-.185
Test Statistic		.185
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.010[c]

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Based on Table 4.3, the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the significance value (2-tailed) is 0.10 > 0.05, it can be said that the pre-test and post-test data are

normally distributed.

3)T-test

Table 4.4

The Result of T-test

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Pretest - Posttest	-17.000	10.137	1.851	-20.785	-13.215	-9.185	29	.000

Based on Table 4.4, the t-test significance value (2-tailed) is .000 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the use of RCRR has a significant effect on students reading comprehension. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted, while the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected.

Discussion

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, the hypothesis in this study is that there is an increase in students reading comprehension by using the RCRR strategy. The results of this study support the findings of Nihayati Putri Suseno (2023) regarding the effect of the RCRR strategy on reading comprehension. Brummer & Macceca (2008) also stated that the RCRR strategy is efficient in helping readers of different grade levels to understand the text read. Dahler (2018) conducted a study to assess the impact of the RCRR strategy on students reading comprehension. His findings showed a substantial improvement in reading comprehension. Thus, the RCRR strategy is effective in improving students reading comprehension.

Students have difficulty understanding reading texts; the researcher used the RCRR strategy to improve students reading comprehension. Before applying the RCRR strategy, the researcher administered a pre-test to assess the extent of students' reading comprehension. The pre-test results showed that the lowest score was 20 and the highest was 90, with an average of 50.00. After obtaining these results, the researcher implemented the treatment for four meetings. Following the treatment, a post-test was administered to evaluate the effect of the RCRR strategy on students' reading comprehension. The post-test results showed that students' scores increased,

with the highest score of 95, the lowest score of 50, and an average score of 67.00.

To analyze the pre-test and post-test data, the researcher used a t-test. Table 4.4 shows that the Sig. (2-tailed) is .000 < 0.05. This indicates that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. Therefore, using RCRR improves students reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

Alyousef, H.S. (2005). Teaching Reading Comprehension to Esl/Efl Learners. The Reading Matrix, 5(2), 143-154.

Anita. (2013) The Effect of Using Read, Cover, Remember, Retell Strategy Toward Reading Comprehension of Second Year Students at Senior High School Sukaramai Tampung Hulu Kampar Regency. (Bachelor"s Thesis, UIN Sultan Syarif Kasim, Riau, Indonesia)

Brummer, T., & Macceca, S. (2008). Reading Strategies for Mathematics. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education

Dahler, D., Joni Putra, R., Zaim, M., & Fauzan, A. (2019). *Using Read Cover Remember Retell (RCRR)in Teaching Reading Comprehension*. *178*(ICoIE 2018), 211–216. https://doi.org/10.2991/icoie-18.2019.48

Djuma, R. I., Palengkahu, N., & Sanger, M. B. . (2022). Improving Student'S Reading Comprehension Through Scanning Technique At the Second Grade of the Junior High School. *SoCul: International Journal of Research in Social Cultural Issues*, *1*(01), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.53682/soculijrccsscli.v1i01.1697

Enterprise, J. (2018). *Lancar Menggunakan SPSS untuk Pemula*. Jakarta: Pt Elex Media Komputindo.

Gay, 2012. Technique of data analysis. Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.

Hampp, P. L. (2019). Use of Songs in Teaching Simple Tobe and Past Tense Teaching. *Journal of English Language and Literature Teaching*, *4*(1), 15–24. https://doi.org/10.36412/jellt.v4i1.939

Hoyt, Linda. 2009. Revisit, Reflect, Retell, Updated Edition: Time-Tested Strategies for Teaching Reading Comprehension. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Kumayas, T., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). The Challenges of Teaching Grammar at the University Level: Learning From the Experience of English Lecturer. *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature and Education*, *11*(1), 98-105.

Lengkoan, F., & Rombepajung, P. A. (2022). Teachers' Perception of Online Learning in The Pandemic Era. *Jurnal Lingua Idea*, *13*(1), 1-11.

Liando, N. (2009). Success in learning English as a foreign language. *LITERA*, 8(2).

Liando, N., Pelenkahu, N., & Mongkaren, S. (2021). Students and Parents ' Perceptions toward English Online Learning during Corona Virus Pandemic. *Jundiksha*, 9(1), 91–97.

Liando, N. V. F., Dallyono, R., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2023b). Among English, Indonesian and local language: Translanguaging practices in an Indonesian EFL classroom. *Indonesian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 13(1), 204–216. https://doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v13i1.58270

Liando, N. V. F., & Tatipang, D. P. (2023, January). On Looking Scrambled Game in English Spelling Teaching. In *Unima International Conference on Social Sciences and Humanities (UNICSSH 2022)* (pp. 630-637). Atlantis Press.

Liando, N. V. F., Tatipang, D. P., & Wuntu, C. N. (2023a). First Language Interfere in EFL Classes: Revealing Students' Perspectives and Teachers' Reasons in ELL. *REiLA: Journal of Research and Innovation in Language*, *5*(1), 77-88.

Liando, N. V., Tatipang, D. P., & Lengkoan, F. (2022). A study of translanguaging practices in an EFL classroom in Indonesian context: A multilingual concept. *Research and Innovation in Language Learning*, *5*(2), 167-185.

Liando, N. V. F., & Tatipang, D. P. (2022). English or Indonesian Language? Parents' Perception Toward Children's Second Language Learning Context. *Jurnal Lingua Idea*, *13*(1), 61-75.

Nur, S., Lakoro, Q., & Lengkoan, F. (2023). The Effectiveness of Digital Learning Curriculum 2013 in Pandemic. *Journal of English Culture, Language, Literature and Education*, *11*(2), 264-276.

Mokosolang, S. J., Liando, N., & Rorimpandey, R. (2022). the Use of Mind Mapping Technique To Improve Students' Reading Comprehension: a Study Conducted At Smp Negeri 4 Touluaan. *Kompetensi*, *2*(01), 1074–1083. https://doi.org/10.53682/kompetensi.v2i01.4736

Mose, R., Liando, N. V. F., & Wungow, T. (2022). *the Implementation of Collaborative Strategy in Teaching Students ' Reading Comprehension At Smp Negeri 2 Eris*. *1*(10), 1215–1226.

Pestman, W. R., & Alberink, I. B. (2012). Chapter 3. Hypothesis testing. *Mathematical*

Statistics, 110–143. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110809343.110

Shea, M., & Nancy Roberts. 2016. The Fives: Strategy for Reading Comprehension. West Palm Beach, Fl: Learning Sciences International.

Suseno, N. P. (2023). *Applying Read , Cover , Remember , and Retell (RCRR) Strategy to Increase Students ' Reading Comprehension of Recount Text*. *4*(2), 380–392. https://doi.org/10.35961/salee.v4i2.794

Trisha, B., & Maccecca, S. (2018). Reading Strategies for Mathematics. Oceanus Dr.Huntington Beach: Shell education.

Willis, Judy. 2008. Teaching the Brain to Read: Strategies for Improving Fluency, Vocabulary, and Comprehension. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.