

CORRELATION BETWEEN READING STRATEGIES AND READING MOTIVATION TO READING COMPREHENSION OF THE THIRD SEMESTER STUDENTS AT THE ENGLISH EDUCATION STUDY PROGRAM OF STAIN PALANGKA RAYA

Santi Erliana, M. Pd

ABSTRACT

Experts believe it takes more than just reading aloud or read word by word to achieve the *comprehension* level since reading takes the occurrence of interaction between knowledge existing in a learner's mind (prior knowledge) and the new knowledge from the information being read in the text, takes the use of strategies in reading, and the readers' awareness in monitoring their comprehension and in using appropriate strategies to deal with their problems in comprehending texts. Their studies recommend readers to utilize strategies in reading and to have motivation in learning reading to achieve better comprehension. The present study aims at examining the correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension, correlation between reading motivation and reading comprehension, correlation between combinations of reading strategies and reading motivation toward reading comprehension. The study used quantitative design, particularly correlational. 46 third semester students at the academic year 2014/2015 were taken as the sample of the study. The data were taken from reading strategies and reading motivation questionnaires and reading achievement test. The finding indicates the significant simultaneous correlation between reading strategies and reading motivation toward reading comprehension of the third semester students. The finding recommends the utilization of strategies in reading and to build reading culture for the students, the teaching of reading using strategy instruction which provide opportunities for the students to utilize reading strategies and to have more positive response toward reading for the lecturers, and Classroom Action Research using strategy instruction for better reading comprehension for the future researcher.

Key Words: Reading Strategy, Reading Motivation, Reading Comprehension.

The students in English education study program in STAIN *Palangkaraya* are obliged to take Reading I, Reading II and Reading III course which are designed to provide the students with the opportunity to improve their English reading proficiency based on the six levels of thinking: remembering, understanding, applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating (Kurikulum dan Silabus Tarbiyah STAIN Palangkaraya, 2006). At the Reading Courses, the students need to comprehend the literal, inferential, and applied comprehension of narrative, descriptive, expository and argumentative type of texts from intermediate level up to post advanced level (approximately from 5000 to 10000 words).

In spite of the demand of the syllabus, the result of preliminary test revealed that the students still encounter problems to identify main ideas (particularly the implied ones), to differentiate major supporting details from the minor ones, to understand writer's ideas

organization, to cope with difficult vocabularies, to get the gist of the text, to recall what they read, and to state their comprehension of the text using their own words. Moreover, the result of informal interview also revealed that the students have a very limited knowledge of reading strategies and automatically lack of reading strategies use during the process of teaching.

Apparently there is a discrepancy between the demand of syllabus and the students' ability. Experts in reading agree that it is not easy to comprehend a text since reading is a complex process. According to Birch (2002:2), the process of reading seems simple—just like other mental activities—but in fact it is complex and complicated because it involves a great deal of precise knowledge which must be acquired or learned and many processing strategies which must be practiced until they are automatic. Similarly, Grabe & Stoller (2002:19) describe the way how reading comprehension processes to work for skilled readers text by dividing the processes into lower-level processes—represent the more automatic linguistic processes and are typically as more skills orientated, and high-level processes—represent comprehension processes that make much more use of the reader's background knowledge and inference skills.

Experts (Nunan, 1991; Anderson, 1994; Richard, et al., 2002; Stahl, 2004; Carrell, 1998; Carrell et al., 1998; Cohen, 2007; Hudson, 2007; Wenden, 1998; White, 1999; and Zhang, 2009) believe it takes more than just reading aloud or read word by word to achieve the *comprehension* level since reading takes the occurrence of interaction between knowledge existing in a learner's mind (prior knowledge) and the new knowledge from the information being read in the text, takes the use of strategies in reading, and the readers' awareness in monitoring their comprehension and in using appropriate strategies to deal with their problems in comprehending texts. Their studies recommend readers to utilize strategies in reading and to have motivation in learning reading to achieve better comprehension. In line with the nature of quantitative research, the writer is interested in verifying this theory using correlational design which aims at examining the correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension, between reading motivation and reading comprehension, between reading strategies and reading motivation and between reading strategies and reading motivation to reading comprehension.

The study is expected to be significant theoretically to provide more evidence of the correlation between reading strategy and, reading motivation to reading achievement for better teaching and learning process of reading. Practically, the study is expected to be significant for the students, the reading lecturers, and future researcher. First of all, it provides sight of the

importance of utilize strategies in reading and to have motivation in reading for the students in order to overcome their reading problems and to achieve better achievement. Then, it provides sight of the importance in providing models of effective reading strategies and encouraging reading motivation within the teaching and learning process of reading. Finally, it provides knowledge on method in investigating reading strategy instruction, reading strategy, reading motivation and reading comprehension with different approach for deeper analysis.

THEORY

Reading is a process which starts with a linguistic surface representation encoded by a writer and ends with meaning which a reader construct. The meaning is constructed continuously, and to carry out this process the reader relies, particularly, on his brain (Goodman, 1988:12). This means that a reader follows some steps in processing information to figure out the established meaning in the text. Experts divide the steps in the establishment of meaning in reading into *decoding* and *comprehension*. Carnine et al. (1990:34), for example, define decoding as the translation of printed words into a representation similar to oral language, and comprehension as the attempt in understanding the representation. Similarly, Alderson (2000) believes that decoding activities refer to word recognition activities, whereas comprehension activities consist of activities to parse sentences, to understand sentences in discourse, to build a discourse structure, and to integrate what is understood from the discourse with what a reader already knows. From this, we can infer that a reader starts his/her reading by comparing what is written in the text with when it is used in conversation (decode), then to find the logical meaning of the written words in where the sentence exist (comprehension). So, the main objective of reading activity is the understanding of the message trying to be delivered by the writer and to transfer what is written into our mind and resulting in the form of idea.

Then, it can be concluded that reading comprehension is an action in where we compare the interpretation of the written material with its representation in spoken, and then we try to comprehend the representation by connecting what we have known with the topic discussed, to comprehend the text structure, and to be actively involved in reading through the utilization of reading strategies.

Despite the goal, According to Birch (2002:2), the process of reading seems simple—just like other mental activities—but in fact it is complex and complicated because it involves a great deal of precise knowledge which must be acquired or learned and many processing strategies which must be practiced until they are automatic. Carnine, et al. (1990:3) states that “reading is a complex process—complex to learn and complex to teach.”

Similarly, in order to describe the complexity of reading process, Burns et al (1996:9) list nine aspects of reading covered by children when they read: sensory, perceptual, sequential, experiential, thinking, learning, associational, affective, and constructive. They believe that “reading is not a single skill but a combination of many skills and processes in which a reader interacts with print to derive both meaning and pleasure from the written word”. Grabe & Stoller (2002:19) support this and describe the way how reading comprehension processes to work for skilled readers text by dividing the processes into lower-level processes—represent the more automatic linguistic processes and are typically as more skills orientated, and high-level processes—represent comprehension processes that make much more use of the reader’s background knowledge and inference skills.

To sum up, during the process of reading, a reader does not only extract information from the text by simply decode the text, but also to activate a range of knowledge in his mind, which in turn, will be refined and extended by the new information supplied in the text. So to what extent does a reader comprehension assume to have lower level or higher level of comprehension? Readers employ different types of comprehension in order to understand fully what they read. The types of comprehension depend on the level in which the comprehension process takes place. Regarding the process of reading comprehension, Burns et al. (1996:255) classify four types of comprehension: literal, interpretive, critical, and creative comprehension.

In the attempt of transferring the printed material into a reader’s mind, to process the result of the ‘imported’ information, and finally to produce his understanding toward the selection, there are some factors those may interfere and prevent him in getting the gist of the selection. The writer summarizes the factors those affect on the basis of complexity of the reading process as the reader, the text, and the instruction.

First of all, each reader has different ways in approaching a text. According to Gebhard (2000: 29) there are some problems dealing with the reader such as lack of reading speed, lack of vocabulary, lack of background knowledge, and reading habit. ‘Good readers’ are those who are able to tackle text effective end efficiently, and ‘poor readers’ are those who encounter problems while reading. Blachowicz & Ogle (2008:33-34) contrast the good reader with the poor reader in terms of their preference in the use of strategies in reading. They state that effective and efficient readers utilize and are aware of different strategies in three stages of reading: pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading. In addition to the use of strategies in reading, Nuttall (1996: 11) emphasizes the importance of reader’s active involvement during reading. She compares the comprehension to be achieved as the top of a hill. The good reader walks along a street and finds little difficulty in interpreting the text because the meaning is fairly clear to him to get along, because he has much in common with the writer and finds few problems with the language. Meanwhile, for the poor reader the same text appears very difficult. To get the meaning involves

an uphill struggle and he is not at all sure of the route. His way forward is continually blocked by problems of unfamiliar vocabulary, ignorant of facts, and so on. However, the poor reader is not sitting down in despair. He tries hard by first realizes that he has problems in reading, then he sets a clear purpose in reading and knows what he expects to get from the text, and finally equipping himself for the journey and is tackling his problems with vigour and with all the tools at his disposal. From this, we can conclude that problems encounter by the poor reader lie within the reader himself. Without the awareness of the presence of problems and the existence of will of the readers to keep trying in tackling the reading difficulty, the problems will keep exist.

Then, reading problems arise from the text. There are many reasons that may cause a text difficult for a reader to understand. As Nuttall's belief (1996:18) that unfamiliarity with the code in which the text is written may cause difficulty. In addition to the factors Carnine et al. (1990:295) describe level of text difficulty of two most general level of comprehension: literal and inferential. They stand the limit or range of difficulty for measuring literal comprehension, and/or how implicit is the information to be encountered within the text. In the first place, literal comprehension is the simplest written comprehension exercise, in which the answer is directly stated in passage. Several variables affect the difficulty of passage-related items: (1) the degree to which the items are literal, (2) the length of the passage, (3) the order in which questions are asked, (4) the complexity of the instruction, and (5) the use of pronoun.

Different from literal comprehension, the level of difficulty of inferential comprehension involves three intermediate-level comprehension skills: making inferences based on relationship (neither stated nor not stated), comprehending sentences with complicated syntactic structures, and critically reading passages (i.e., identifying an author's conclusion and evaluating the adequacy of the evidence and the legitimacy of the arguments). Inferential questions require knowledge of relationships between two objects or events. Sometimes the relationship is directly stated in a passage. More often, the relationship is not specified; students are expected to know a particular relationship or are expected to infer the relationship using the information stated in a passage.

As clearly stated in the background of the study from the three text types learned in the first semester, students encounter difficulties in reading expository text. The term *expository* is often used to describe text written for the purpose of conveying factual information, explaining ideas, or presenting an argument (Mason & Au, 1990:125). Its materials are designed to convey factual information or to explain what is difficult to understand. This type of text is significantly different from the narrative one. It uses new organizational structures, more difficult to decode and understand vocabulary, introduction of unique typographic features, and higher dense of concept (Carnine et al., 1990: 339).

Expository text is considered most difficult by third semester students of English education

in STAIN Palangkaraya (85%) due to limited vocabulary, background knowledge, and text structure. Authors use different structure in organizing expository texts. Therefore, according to Mason and Au (1990:140) it is necessary for the teacher to help the students to learn about and apply knowledge of the different structures often found in expository texts. Different from narrative, expository texts do not follow any one structure. Within expository materials, students may encounter several different structures those are likely to appear in the same selection.

The third factor contributes to reading problems is the instruction. Gelewa (2005) states the failure of learning and teaching English as a foreign language is also probably determined by the teacher. Pressley (1998) believes that “good reading instruction is reliant on teacher’s knowledge of and ability to appropriately model the strategies necessary for reading comprehension”. Meaning that the teachers have significant role to build and activate the schemata, to facilitate and provide opportunities of the use of the strategies, and to build students’ awareness in using strategies in reading, as well as monitoring their comprehension for better reading comprehension achievement. This is in line with Blachowicz & Ogle’s (2008:42) opinion on the essential role of teacher in reading classes. “Good teachers know their students and provide the needed guidance and support as they consciously move from direct instruction to a release of responsibility to their students.”

The release of responsibility to the students must be along with the teaching of strategies in reading. Researchers have found that teaching reading strategies is important to developing increased student comprehension. At the same time, they have found many teachers lack a solid foundation for teaching these reading comprehension strategies (National Reading Panel, 2005). Therefore, teachers need to be prepared, through professional development, on how to design effective comprehension strategies and how to teach these strategies to their students. Improving reading skills is a top priority for all educators (McKown & Barnett, 2007:4). Unfortunately, most reading instruction still rely on testing students’ reading comprehension rather than providing ways in comprehending various texts. This kind of instruction is that what so called by Nuttal (1996:34) as giving the ‘wrong help’. Two Chinese linguists, Zhang & Wu (2009:38) investigated the effect of reading-strategy instruction on Chinese reading improvement and found out, that:

a typical English reading lesson in high schools usually goes through pre-, while-, and post-reading procedures; in which students are required to do various kinds of comprehension-testing exercises that implicitly require a limited number of EFL reading strategies. It is assumed that students will naturally acquire the target strategies through implicit learning. However, problems arise. Students complain that they do not see improvement in their reading ability. Neither do they know what strategies to use. Lecturers complain that students just cannot use their learned strategies to cope with new reading tasks.

Regarding the factors contribute to problems in reading, the readers' awareness of reading problems and readers' attempts in order to cope the problems are very important. Studies recommend the utilization of strategies in reading and positive response toward reading. First of all, Strategies are defined as learning techniques, behaviors, and problem solving or study skills, which make learning more effective and efficient (Oxford, 1990). Meanwhile, Stahl (2004:598) states that strategies in reading can be tools in the assimilation, refinement, and use of content, and it is believed as the reader is actively engage in particular cognitive strategies (activating prior knowledge, predicting, organizing, questioning, summarizing, and creating a mental image), he/she will be likely to understand and recall more of what they read. Kamil (2003:5) defines strategies in reading as those directed and intended by the students in order to build independence in reading.

From the definitions of strategies, the writer concludes that reading strategies are one of the attempts conduct by reader in dealing with comprehension problems. Why utilizing strategies then? Alderson (1984) believes that "the use of reading strategies is regarded as being conducive to successful reading comprehension despite the complex nature of the reading process, which invokes both the L2 reader's language ability and reading ability". Similarly, Blachowicz & Ogle (2008:12) state that using strategies for constructing meaning before, during and after reading will help students connect what they read now with what they have learned in the past. They range from simple fix-up strategies such as simply rereading difficult segments and guessing the meaning of an unknown word from context, to more comprehensive strategies such as summarizing and relating what is being read to the reader's background knowledge (Janzen, 2002:287). Hence, using reading strategies indicates how readers conceive a task, what they do to make meaning from texts, and what they do when comprehension breaks down (Zhang, 2001).

According to Cohen (1990), reading strategies are "those mental processes that readers consciously choose to use in accomplishing reading tasks" (p. 83). Garner (1987) saw it as an action, or a series of actions that a reader employs in order to construct meaning in the reading process. Hence, using reading strategies indicates how readers conceive a task, what they do to make meaning from texts, and what they do when comprehension breaks down (Block, 1986, 1992; Macaro, 2001; Macaro & Erler, 2008; Zhang, 2001).

So far, L1 and L2 reading researchers have profiled a wide array of reading strategies used by readers. These range from the more traditionally well-known ones like skimming, scanning,

and inferring to the more recently recognized ones such as activating schemata, recognizing text structure, using mental imagery, visualizing, generating questions, monitoring comprehension, evaluating strategy use, etc. (Pressley, 2002; and Zhang et al., 2008). However, researchers such as Cohen (2003, 2007), Grabe (2004), Paris (2002), and Zhang (2003) pointed out that strategies themselves are not inherently good or bad, but they have the potential to be used effectively or ineffectively in different contexts. Readers' use of reading strategies is informed by their metacognitive awareness of the strategies and how these strategies can be maximized for optimal effects in solving comprehension problems (Carrell, 1998; Carrell et al., 1998; Cohen, 2007; Hudson, 2007; Wenden, 1998; White, 1999; Zhang, 2008).

From this we can conclude that the use of reading strategies will not be effective for reading comprehension when there is no awareness of the readers of their reading process. Moreover, the readers must also have positive response toward the reading activity itself. In other words, readers must have motivation in reading. Motivation is defined as the act or process of motivating; the condition of being motivating; a motivating force, stimulus, or influence; incentive; drive; something (such as a need or desire) that causes a person or student to act (Meriam-Webster, 1997); and the expenditure of effort to accomplish results (DuBrin, 2008). Research confirms that motivation is a key factor in successful reading, and that it is linked to four important elements in a child's life: access to books, choice of books, familiarity with words, books, and reading, and exposure to others who exhibit a love of reading. When children are motivated, they will read frequently, which in turn helps them become skillful readers. And children who are skillful readers learn well and deeply and successfully.

The results of studies indicate the need to increase reading teacher's understanding of how children acquire the motivation to develop into active, engaged readers. Highly motivated readers are self-determining and generate their own reading opportunities. They want to read and choose to read for a wide range of personal reasons such as curiosity, involvement, social interchange, and emotional satisfaction. According to Guthrie (1996), highly motivated readers generate their own literacy learning opportunities, and, in doing so, they begin to determine their own destiny as literacy learners.

One of the common motivational theories is Eccles' expectancy-value theory suggests two factors determine motivation: the learning outcome individual expects (either success or failure) and the worthiness of the task for the learner. This theory is supported by a number of research studies that suggest that students who *believe* they are capable and competent readers are more likely to outperform those who do not hold such beliefs (Paris & Oka, 1986; Schunk, 1985). In

addition, students who perceive reading as valuable and important and who have personally relevant reasons for reading will engage in reading in a more planned and effortful manner (Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck & Elliott, 1983; Paris & Oka, 1986). Other theories have been grounded in the expectancy-value theory, such as Ford's motivational systems theory which maintains that people will attempt to attain goals they value and perceive as achievable; and Winne (1985) who views the "idealized reader" as one who feels competent and perceives reading as being of personal value and practical importance. Within this theoretical framework, reading motivation is defined by an individual self-concept and the value the individual places on reading. Evidence from theory and research supports the notion that high motivation to read is associated with positive self-concept as a reader and low value assignment (Ford, 1992; Henk & Melnick, 1995; Wigfield, 1994).

Given the emphasis on self-concept and task value in motivational theory, it seems important that teachers have resources for assessing both of these factors. When an individual has these two qualities, he is qualified as *engaged readers*—those ideal readers who are intrinsically motivated, and who read regularly and enthusiastically for a variety of their own purposes (Guthrie & Anderson, 1999). Furthermore, engaged and motivated readers read more than less enthusiastic ones (Guthrie, Wigfield, Metsala, & Cox, 1999; Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), attain higher level of achievement in reading (Cunningham & Stanovich, 1997; Guthrie, Schafer, & Huang, 2001), perform better on standardized tests of reading (Gottfried, 1990), and receive higher grades in school (Sweet, Guthrie, & Ng, 1998).

To identify a measure of reading motivation and a perfect fit, Gambrell et al.'s Motivation to Read Profile is appropriate (Gambrell, Palmer, Codling, & Mazzoni, 1996) because it is modeled on the basis of expectancy-value theory, yields measures of both reading self-efficacy and value ascribed in reading, and has adequate reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.75$ for self-efficacy and 0.82 for value (Applegate & Applegate, 2010).

Regarding the theories the present study aims at examining the correlation of reading strategies, reading motivation and reading achievement of the third semester students. The study is done under the assumption that the higher frequency of students' strategy use will contribute to the higher achievement of reading comprehension. It also assumes that the more positive response toward reading activity will contribute to the higher achievement. Then, the third assumption is that the combination of reading strategies and reading motivation will contribute to the higher achievement in reading comprehension.

METHOD

The subjects were 46 students of the third semester students in academic year 2014/2015. They were exposed to Mokhtary and Sheorey's (2002) Metacognitive Awareness Questionnaire, Gambrell's Motivation to Read Profile, and reading test. The first is used while the latter is used. First of all, reading strategy survey with 28 items from three aspects of students' reading strategies use (global strategies, problem solving strategies, and support strategies) with five scales (never/almost never, occasionally, sometimes, usually, always/almost) was used to identify the reading strategy. Then, survey involving two dimensions on students reading motivation (self-concept as a reader and value of reading) to assess motivation to read was used. Finally, 30 Multiple choice items test constructed from expository texts is chosen to get the data.

The test is based on the material that contains expository text. It is made based on the syllabus of Reading II in STAIN Palangka Raya. The content specification can be seen in the following table:

Table 1
Test Items Specification

Skill to test	Level	Items Number	Percentage
Reading Comprehension	Literal	15 questions	50%
	Inferential	12 questions	40%
	Critical	3 questions	10%

Meanwhile, for the questionnaire on reading strategies can be seen in following table:

Table 2
Categorization and description of EFL reading strategies
(Adapted from Mohktary and Sheorey, 2002)

Category	Description	Example	Item
Global reading strategies (GLOB)	The intentional, carefully planned techniques by which learners monitor or manage their reading	Having the purpose in mind; previewing the text	1-12
Problem-solving strategies (PROB)	The localized, focused techniques used when problems develop in understanding textual information	Adjusting reading speed; rereading the text	13-19
Support strategies	The basic support mechanism	Using dictionaries,	20-28

(SUP)	intended to aid the reader in comprehending the text	taking notes	
-------	--	--------------	--

For the students' reading motivation, the following table shows the item specification, as follows.

Table 3
Categorization and description of Reading Motivation

Category	Description	Example	Item
Self-concept as a reader	To elicit information about students' self-perceived competence in reading and self-perceived performance relative to peers	Having the purpose in mind; previewing the text	1-10
The value of reading items	To elicit information about the value students place on reading tasks and activities, particularly in terms of frequency of engagement and reading-related activities.	Adjusting reading speed; rereading the text	11-20

FINDINGS

The presentation of result of the study is based on the order of research problems. First, the data of students' reading comprehension, students' reading strategies and students' reading motivation. Next, the correlation between the students' reading strategies and reading comprehension, the correlation between the students' reading motivation and reading motivation, the correlation between the students' reading strategies and motivation, and finally, the correlation between the students' reading strategies and motivation to reading comprehension.

A. Students' Reading Strategies

The result of the questionnaire indicated the third semester students of English departement in academic year 2014/2015 usually use reading strategies in reading any reading material. It can be seen that the highest frequency use of students' reading strategies is 4 and the lowest frequency use of students' reading strategies is 3.1. Meanwhile, the mean score is 3.54. Then, the third semester students' reading strategies are categorized as FAIRLY HIGH. based on SILL (Oxford, 1990) where its interpretation are shown in Table 4 below:

Table 4
Frequency scales of strategy use (Oxford, 1990) Mean Score

Scale	Grade	Frequency	Evaluation
4.5–5.0	4	High	Always or almost always used
3.5–4.49	3	Fairly High/Usually used	
2.5–3.49	2	Medium	Sometimes used
1.5–2.49	1	Low	Generally not used
1.0–1.49	0	Never or almost never used	

B. Students' Reading Motivation

The survey assesses two specific dimensions of reading motivation: self-concept as a reader and value of reading. The items that focus on self-concept as a reader are designed to elicit information about students' self-perceived competence in reading and self-perceived performance relative to peers. The value of reading items are designed to elicit information about the value students place on reading tasks and activities, particularly in terms of frequency of engagement and reading related activities. The survey has 20 items based on a 4-point scale. The highest score possible is 80 points. On some items the response options are ordered least positive to most positive. When scoring the survey, the most positive response is assigned the highest number (4) while the least positive response is assigned the lowest number (1).

The result of the questionnaire indicated the third semester students of English department in academic year 2014/2015 have positive response toward both self-perceived competence in reading and self-perceived performance relative to peer. It can be seen that the highest response toward students' self-concept is 31 and the lowest response toward students' self-concept is 21 with the mean score 26.28. Then the students have *positive* response toward their own concept of reading motivation. Meanwhile, the highest response toward students' value of reading is 37 and the lowest response toward value of reading is 23 with the mean score 30.43. Then the students have *positive* response toward their self-perceived performance relative to peers. In general, the students response toward self-concept is at level 3 indicating positive response and the students' response toward the value of reading is at the same level with 3. The following table presents the students' response toward reading motivation adapted from Gambrell et al. (1996) and its interpretation are shown in Table 5 below:

Table 5
Reading Motivation Scale and Response Interpretation

SCALE	LEVEL	RESPONSE TOWARD SELF-CONCEPT AND READING VALUE
1-10	1	VERY NEGATIVE
11-20	2	NEGATIVE
21-30	3	POSITIVE
31-40	4	VERY POSITIVE

C. Students' Reading Comprehension

The result of the test indicated the third semester students of English department in academic year 2014/2015 are generally capable in reading, particularly in determining topic, main idea and details. It can be seen that the highest score of students' reading ability is 86.6 and the lowest score is 60. Meanwhile, the mean score is 73,95 and the standard deviation score is 9,67. Then, the third semester students' reading abilities are categorized as GOOD which is at the scale 3. The following table presents the students' reading skill scores category:

Table 6
Students' Reading Scores Category

No	Score	SCALE	Category	Frequency	Percentage
1	88-100	4	VERY GOOD	6	13,0
2	70-84	3	GOOD	23	50,00
3	60-69	2	FAIR	17	36,9
04	50-59	1	POOR	0	0
5	<50	0	VERY POOR	0	0
TOTAL				46	100

D. CORRELATION BETWEEN READING STRATEGIES AND READING COMPREHENSION

The first problem of the study is: is there any correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension. The following table summarizes the result of the study

Table 4.7

Correlation Between Reading Strategies and Reading Comprehension

NO	X	Y	XY	X2	Y2
TOTAL	126	142	393	360	468
MEAN	2.73913	3.08695652	8.543478	7.82608696	10.173913

From the table of correlation calculation above, then the writer calculate the correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension using the following formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

Specifically, the calculation of the correlation is as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{46 \cdot 393 - (126)(142)}{\sqrt{\{46 \cdot 360 - (126)^2\} \cdot \{46 \cdot 468 - (142)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{18078 - 17892}{\sqrt{\{16560 - 15876\} \cdot \{21528 - 20164\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{186}{\sqrt{684 \cdot 1364}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{186}{965}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0.19$$

Then, after the result is consulted with correlation table, it is shown that 0.19 is at the very low correlation which leads to no correlation between reading the students' reading strategies and reading comprehension.

E. CORRELATION BETWEEN READING MOTIVATION AND READING COMPREHENSION

The second problem of the study is: is there any correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension. The following table summarizes the result of the study

Table 8

Correlation Between Reading Motivation and Reading Comprehension

NO	X1	X2	X	Y	XY	X2	Y2
TOTAL	141	160	150.5	142	393	360	468
MEAN	2.73913	3.4782609	3.086957	3.08695652	8.543478	7.82608696	10.173913

From the table of correlation calculation above, then the writer calculate the correlation between reading motivation and reading comprehension using the following formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

Specifically, the calculation of the correlation is as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{46 \cdot 463.5 - (141)(142)}{\sqrt{\{46 \cdot 496.75 - (141)^2\} \cdot \{46 \cdot 468 - (142)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{21321 - 20022}{\sqrt{\{22850.5 - 19881\} \cdot \{21528 - 20164\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1299}{\sqrt{2969.5 \cdot 1364}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1299}{2012.56}$$

$$r_{xy} = 0.64$$

Then, after the result is consulted with correlation table, it is shown that 0.64 is at the average correlation which leads to the existence of correlation between the students' reading motivation and reading comprehension.

F. CORRELATION BETWEEN READING STRATEGIES AND READING MOTIVATION

The third problem of the study is: is there any correlation between reading strategies and reading motivation. The following table summarizes the result of the study

Table 9

Correlation Between Reading Motivation and Reading Strategies

NO	X	Y	XY	X2	Y2
TOTAL	126	150.5	393	360	468
MEAN	2.73913	3.086957	8.543478	7.82608696	10.173913

From the table of correlation calculation above, then the writer calculate the correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension using the following formula:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N\sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

Specifically, the calculation of the correlation is as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{46 \cdot 411.5 - (150.5)(126)}{\sqrt{\{46 \cdot 22650.25 - (150.5)^2\} \cdot \{46 \cdot 360 - (126)^2\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{18929 - 18963}{\sqrt{\{1041900 - 22650.25\} \cdot \{16560 - 15876\}}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{1299}{\sqrt{2969.5 \cdot 1364}}$$

$$r_{xy} = \frac{-34}{26403.92}$$

$$r_{xy} = -0.001288$$

Then, after the result is consulted with correlation table, it is shown that -0.001 is at the negative correlation which leads to no correlation between the students' reading strategies and reading motivation.

G. CORRELATION BETWEEN READING MOTIVATION AND READING STRATEGIES TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION

The fourth problem of the study is: is there any correlation between reading strategies and reading motivation toward reading comprehension. In order to calculate the correlation, the

presentation of X1 (reading strategies), X2 (reading motivation) and Y (reading comprehension) is necessary. The following table summarizes the data needed

Table 10
Data of Correlation Coefficient among Variables

Correlation Coefficient of Reading Strategies (X1) and Reading Comprehension (Y)	Correlation Coefficient of Reading Motivation (X2) and Reading Comprehension (Y)	Correlation Coefficient of Reading Strategies (X1) and Reading Motivation (X2)
0.19	0.64	-0.001288

From the table of data above, then the writer calculate the r value using the following formula:

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{\frac{r_{yx_1}^2 + r_{yx_2}^2 - 2r_{yx_1}r_{yx_2}r_{x_1x_2}}{1 - r_{x_1x_2}^2}}$$

Where $R_{yx_1x_2}$ = double correlation coefficient between variable x_1 and x_2
 r_{yx_1} = correlation coefficient variable x_1 toward Y
 r_{yx_2} = correlation coefficient variable x_2 toward Y
 $r_{x_1x_2}$ = correlation coefficient variable x_1 toward x_2

Then, the complete calculation is as follows:

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{\frac{0.19+0.64-2 \times 0.19 \times 0.62 \times -0.0001288}{1 - -0.001288}}$$

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{\frac{0.83-2 \times 0.117788712}{1.001288}}$$

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{\frac{0.83-0.23}{1.001288}}$$

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{\frac{0.6}{1.001288}}$$

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = \sqrt{0.5990}$$

$$R_{yx_1x_2} = 0.77$$

From the result, it is concluded that reading strategies and reading motivation simultaneously contribute to reading comprehension of the third semester students. Specifically, simultaneous contribution is by: $R^2 \times 100\% = 0.77^2 \times 100\% = 59.29\%$ and the rest was the result of other variables.

Then, the acceptance of H_a is examined by calculating the F-value, with the following criteria:

When the F-Count \geq than F-table, then the H_0 is rejected which means the correlation is significant.

When the F-Count \leq than F-table, then the H_0 is accepted which means the correlation is not significant.

With significance level (α) = 0.05, the value of F-Count is:

$$F\text{-count} = \frac{\frac{R^2}{k}}{\frac{(1-R^2)}{n-k-1}} = \frac{\frac{0.77^2}{2}}{\frac{(1-0.77^2)}{46-2-1}} = \frac{\frac{0.5929}{2}}{\frac{(1-0.5929)}{43}} = \frac{0.29645}{\frac{0.4071}{43}} = \frac{0.29645}{0.00946} = 31.33$$

Meanwhile, the value of F-table is calculated as follows:

$$F\text{-table} = \{(1 - \alpha) (dk = k), (dk = n - k - 1)\}$$

$$F\text{-table} = \{(1 - 0.05) (dk = 2), (dk = 46 - 2 - 1)\}$$

$$F\text{-table} = \{(1-0.05) (2, 43)\}$$

In the F-table 2 is as denominator and 43 as the numerator.

Next, is to calculate interpolation of F-table using following formula:

$$C = C_0 + \frac{(C_1 - C_0)}{(B_1 - B_0)} \cdot (B - B_0)$$

Where:

C is the F-value to find

C₀ is the F table before (1 score) the existing value = 3.25

C₁ is the F table after (1 score) the existing value = 3.26

B is the value of dk (degree of freedom) to find (dk=n-k -1 = 46 - 2 - 1 = 43)

B₀ is the value of previous dk (degree of freedom) = 42

B₁ is the value of dk of the existing value = 44

The complete calculation is as follows:

$$C = C_0 + \frac{(C_1 - C_0)}{(B_1 - B_0)} \cdot (B - B_0)$$

$$C = 3.25 + \frac{(3.26 - 3.25)}{(44 - 42)} \cdot (43 - 42)$$

$$C = 3.25 + \frac{0.01}{2} \cdot 1$$

$$C = 3.25 + 0.005 \cdot 1$$

$$C = 3.255$$

Finally, since F-count \geq F-table with $31.33 \geq 3.255$, then it is concluded that H_0 stated there is no significant correlation between reading strategies, reading motivation and reading

comprehension of the third semester students is rejected. It means that there is significant correlation between reading strategies and reading motivation simultaneously toward reading comprehension of the third semester students of English department of STAIN Palangkaraya.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The conclusion arrives at the description of the correlation of reading strategies, reading motivation and reading comprehension of the third semester English study program students of Islamic State College of Palangka Raya. The research findings are:

1. There is a very low correlation between reading strategies and reading comprehension of the third semester English department students with 0.19 . It means that the higher the students utilization of reading strategies does not automatically contribute to the higher comprehension they made. The possible cause is the lack of knowledge of reading strategies owned by the students.
2. There is an average correlation between the reading motivation and reading comprehension of the third semester English department students with 0.64. It means the higher the students' motivation in reading, the better their comprehension.
3. There is no correlation between the reading strategies and reading motivation of the third semester English department students with -0.001288 . It means the more variation of reading strategies utilized by the students does not automatically contribute to the increase of motivation or response toward reading.
4. Finally, there is significant simultaneous correlation between reading strategies and reading motivation to reading comprehension of the third semester English department students where the $F\text{-count} \geq F\text{-table}$ with $31.33 \geq 3.255$. It means the more utilization of reading strategies and the more positive response toward reading contribute to the better comprehension of the students.

To follow up the conclusion, some suggestions are proposed to the English students, teachers/lecturers and other researchers. First of all, the positive response toward reading contribute to better reading comprehension. Moreover, when the positive response is followed with the utilization of reading strategies, comprehension in reading as the highest goal reading can be achieved. Therefore, it suggested for the students to build the reading culture and to utilize strategies in reading. Then, regarding the finding, it is suggested for the researcher as the students lecturer to consider the strategy instruction in teaching reading for more positive response toward reading, more utilization of reading strategies to achieve the higher reading comprehension. Finally, future researchers are suggested to conduct classroom action research with strategy instruction for better reading comprehension.

REFERENCE

- Alderson, J.C. 2000. *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267.
- Birch, B. M. 2002. *English L2 Reading: Getting to the Bottom*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Blachowicz, C. & Ogle, D. 2008. *Reading Comprehension: Strategies for Independent Learners (2nd ed.)*. London: The Guilford
- Carnine, D., Silbert, J., & Kameenui, E. J. 1990. *Direct Instruction Reading (2nd Ed.)*. Columbus: Merrill.
- Dweck, C., & Elliot, E. (1983). Achievement Motivation. In E. M. Heatherington (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 643 – 691). New York: Wiley.
- Eccles, J. (1983). Expectancies, values and academic behaviors. In J.T. Spence (Ed.), *Achievement and achievement Motives* (pp.75-146). San Fransisco: Freeman
- Ford, M. E. (1992). *Motivating Humans*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Gambrell, L.B., Palmer, B.M., Codling, R.M., & Mazzoni, S.A. (1996). Assessing motivation to read. *The Reading Teacher*, 49, 518–533.
- Gebhard, J. G. 2000. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Gelewa, B. 2005. *Implementing Directed Reading-Thinking Activity (DR-TA) in Teaching Reading Comprehension to the 3rd year students of SMPN 13 Samarinda*. Unpublished thesis. State University of Malang.
- Goodman, K. 1988. The Reading Process. In Carrell, P.L., Devine, J., & Eskey, D. E. *Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Grabe, W. & Stoller, F. L. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Guthrie, J. T. (1996). Educational vontexts for engagement in literacy. *The Reading Teacher*, 49, 432-445
- Guthries, J.T., Schrafer, W., Wang, Y., & Afflerbach, P. (1993). *Influences of Instruction on reading engagement: An empirical exploration of a social cognitive framework of reading activity* (research Report No. 3). Athens, GA: National Reading Research Center.
- Janzen, J. 2002. Teaching Strategic Reading. In Richard, J. C., & Renandya, W. A. (Eds.). *Methodology in Language Teaching: An anthology of current practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Kamil, M. L. 2003. *Adolescents and Literacy: Reading for the 21st Century*. Alliance for Excellent Education. (online), (<http://www.all4ed.org> accessed on April 18th 2009).
- Mason, J. M. & Au, K. H. 1990. *Reading Instruction for Today (2nd Edition)*. HarperCollins.
- McKown, B. A. & Barnett, C. L. 2007. *Improving Reading Comprehension through Higher-Order Thinking Skills*. (online) (<http://www.eric.ed.gov/> [ED496222], accessed on June, 8th 2009)
- McNeil, J. D. 1992. *Reading Comprehension: New Direction for Classroom Practice (3rd Edition)*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Nuttall, C. 1996. *Teaching Reading in a Foreign Language*. (Second Edition). London: Heinemann.
- Oxford, R.L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies*. New York: Newbury House.
- Paris, S.G., & Oka, E.R. (1986). Self-Regulated Learning among Exceptional Children. *Exceptional Children*, 53, 103-108.
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Misretta-Hampston, J., & Echevaria, M.1998. *Literacy Instruction in 10 fourth and fifth-grade classroom in upstate New York. Scientific Studies of Reading*, 2, 159-194.
- Schunk, D. (1985). Self-efficacy and school learning. *Psychology in the Schools*, 22, 208-223.
- Stahl, K. A. D. 2004. Proof, Practice and Promise: Comprehension Strategy Instruction in Primary Grades. *The Reading Teacher*, 57 (7): 598-609.
- Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 6 (1), 48-78
- Winne, P. (1985). Steps toward promoting cognitive achievements. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 673 – 693.
- Zhang, L. J., & Wu, A. 2009. Chinese senior high school EFL students' metacognitive awareness and reading-strategy use. *Reading in a Foreign Language*, 21 (1), 37-59.
- Zhang, L.J. 2001. Awareness in Reading: EFL Students' Metacognitive Knowledge of Reading Strategies Acquisition-Poor Environment. *Language Awareness*, 10, 268-288.

