

# **The Effect Of Listening While Reading (LWR) on Students Reading Fluency at Second Grade Students of State Senior High School 1 Janapria**

Lia Opiani

University of Islam Malang, Indonesia

E-mail Address:Liaovi94@gmailcom

## **Abstract**

The research was conducted to measure the effect of listening while reading to promote students reading fluency. Quasi-experimental applied in this study and the sample was all second grade students of senior high school 1 JANAPRIA in academic years 2018/2019. The sample of this present study was two classes of second grade students of senior high school JANAPRIA. Class XI IPS II was the experimental group and class XI IPS I was the control group. the result of Independent T-test computation of post-test showed that  $T_{obt}$  for reading comprehension was ( $t=8.958$ ) was the same with  $T_{crit}$  was ( $t=8.958$ ) and for reading rate  $T_{obt}$  was ( $t=13.739$ ) and was the same with  $T_{crit}$  was ( $t=13.739$ ) and the value significance for reading comprehension and rate were .000 hence, due to the sig (2-tailed)  $.000 < .05$  means that there were significantly different between the post-test scores of experimental group and control group after treatment. Hence, it can be concluded that the level of significant of LWR and conventional method are significantly different. Overall, the students who are taught using listening while reading had better on reading fluency than those who are not.

**Key words:** Reading Fluency, Listening while Reading (LWR), Narrative text.

## **INTRODUCTION**

### **Background**

Based on Government Regulations of the Republic Indonesia, No. 19 Year 2005 (2005:26), National standards of Education (*Standar Nasional Pendidikan*) highlight reading as one of critical skills need to be emphasize in the teaching of language. Besides, Curriculum 2013 also demand the students to be able comprehend, analyze, and respond critically, toward information's given in several kinds of text (Kemendikbud, 2013:66-71). Moreover, the growing abundance of available texts and the rapid information-processing era also value readings to become more and more important skill to be mastered by students to success in their life. Such as conditions, then drive many Indonesian English teachers and researcher to pay a greater attention on this skill and train their students with several strategies when teaching skill of reading.

As have been summarized by Cahyono and Widiati (2011:26), teaching reading as a foreign language in Indonesia is commonly emphasized on the teaching of reading comprehension. Many researcher solely focus on their research within the topic. Most of them investigate the effect of certain strategies or technique on students' reading comprehension (e.g, M. Taufikur Rahman 2017 The Effectiveness of Cooperative Integrative Reading and Composition (CIRC) and Direct Instruction (DI) in Teaching Reading Comprehension to the Students of Junior High School, Mihdar Amar 2019 The Effect of Graphic Organizer Atrategies on Reading Comprehension of Students with Different Learning Styles, Nur Cholisyah 2017 The Effect of Directed Reading Thinking Activity (DRTA) on Students Reading Comprehension, Miyoko Kobayashi 2002 Method Effects On Reading Comprehension Test Performance: Text Organization and Response Format, and SaidatulKarimah 2018 The Effect of Speed Reading Technique on Students Reading Comprehension). This condition, then make others aspect of reading such as fluency has been neglected.

According to Pinnell's research (as cited in Rasinski, 2004:50), reading fluency training should be started of 4<sup>th</sup> grade students and need to focus on oral reading fluency. In addition, Rasinski's study (2004) concluded fluent and not fluent readers were also found in senior high school level. Based on this fact he suggest that reading fluency should be part of elementary and senior high school reading curriculum. Hence, it can be said that reading fluency is really important to children (young learners) and adolescent (adult learners)

Reading fluency commonly refers to the ability to read text quickly, accurately, and with proper expression (NICHD, 2000:2-3). Rasinski (2004) stated that reading fluency refers to three important dimension that bridge between word recognition to comprehension. First, accuracy or accurate decoding of word in text, then automaticity or decoding word with minimal use of attention resources; and prosody or the appropriate use of phrasing and

expression to convey meaning. This reading component are immensely important to be developed, especially for learning to build their positive attitude toward reading. Next, Samuel (2006:34) stand the definition of fluency in reading into “the ability to decode and comprehend the text at the same time” along the lines, based on those explanations it can be conclude that fluency in reading covers automatic and accurate decoding of the words accompanied by appropriate expression and comprehension of the text.

Reading fluency essentially plays important roles in L2 reading. Firstly, it promotes learners to become proficient readers. Hasbrouck and Tindal (2006:636) define proficient readers as readers who are able to process written text fluently with appropriate rate, accuracy, and expression. Fluency in reading also facilitates learners to enjoy reading. Non-fluent readers may be able to comprehend a text but reading, for them is a slow, laborious, inefficient, ineffective, and often punishing process (Pikulski and Chard, 2003:2). Thusly, by becoming fluent readers, learners can read smoothly and effortlessly. Additionally, a research carried out by Rasinski et al. (2005:25) shows that high school students’ reading fluency levels were related to their comprehension performance.

Nonetheless, the importance of reading fluency is supported by the theory automatically in reading proposed by LaBerge& Samuel (as cited in Griffith and Rasinski, 2004:126). According to the theory, reader a limited amount of attention they can devote the cognitive task they must decoded the word and comprehend the text. Therefore, if readers devote their attention more on decoding the words our understanding the vocabulary, the will lose the meaning of the text. Hence, based on the report of national reading panel (NICHHD, 2000) reading fluency is one of critical component is successful reading instruction since the fluency effects learner’s reading efficiency and comprehension.

Based on the consideration above, this study attempt to investigate the effects of listening while reading and conventional reading (intensive and extensive reading) on reading

fluency. It is stand to explores possible effects of simultaneous listening and reading on SMAN 1 JANAPRIA learners. Despite at SMAN 1 JANAPRIA has correspondence between spelling and pronunciation, its word stress, intonation, phrasing, and other important reading aspects are still problematic and they have posed many problem in developing their reading, their comprehension and their reading fluency of the written text. (see Chang, 2009; Chang, 2011; Land, 1991; Rasinski, 1990; Rubin, Hafer, & Arata, 2000; Sticht, & James, 1984; Woodall, 2010). These studies have provided considerable evidence to support that reading and listening processes are closely related to each other.

## **METHOD**

### ***Design***

The design was quasi-experimental applied in this study. The subject of the present study are not assign to control and experiment group randomly because the classes cannot be recognized pre-test and post-test are administer before and after treatment. Ary et al (2008:355) stand quasi-experiment “is similar to randomize design in that stuentis involve manipulation of an independent variable but differ in that subject are not randomly assigned” instead the experiment must use already assemble group such as classes.

### ***Subject of this Study***

The subject of the present study was the second grade senior high school students in the academic years 2018/2019. Senior High School students was chosen as subjects since the focus of the real research was silent reading fluency. It takes dominant form of learning on adult and adolescent. Then, second grades are considered appropriate since the researcher want to see the effect of listening while reading on learners’ reading fluency within 2013 curriculum. This research take place in senior high school students There was five class for eleventh grades with three programs (science, social, and language) Science and social program consisted of two classes (XI-1 and XI-2) and language class had only one class.

Both class of social program have 68 students. XI-1 have 34 and XI-2 34 students. Thus, among those classes, Social program was chosen by the researcher for this study. The subjects was XI-1 and XI-2, which consist of 68 students. There was 34 students in XI-1 and 34 students in XI-2. Since both group was assume had equal ability so that there was no particular reason to decide which one as the experimental group and which one as the control group. Eventually, based on the result of lottery, class XI-2 was the experimental group and class XI-1 was the control group.

### ***Instrument***

In this study was applied two instruments; reading fluency test and questionnaire. The goal of instrument to accumulate the primary and secondary data. The first instrument was reading fluency test doing as the primary instrument was constructed to measure students reading fluency after the process of treatment. Afterward, questionnaire of participants attitude toward the strategy of was used at finding out the participant attitude toward the Listening while Reading (LWR) during the process of treatment based on the lesson plane that were made. It was used in the experimental group only. It was used as the guide to record the quality of teaching and students activities during the process of treatment. The quality of teaching was considered importance to be observed since it assuring that procedure of listening while reading (LWR) was correctly implemented by the teachers.

### ***General Procedures of Data Collecting***

The techniques of data collection that the researcher used was the test. In collecting the data by using test, the researcher used three kinds of test; pre-test, treatment and post-test where pre-test which gave before doing treatment and post-test which gave after doing treatment.

### *Pre-test*

In this step of test, the research do the pre-test was to make sure the similarities and differences from both of groups. To make sure the differences and similarities the researcher compare the main score of both groups then look at the level of significance. Thus, after the level of significance has gained the researcher look at the Z score then multiplied with the score of SED

Furthermore, the pre-test was designed to determine the post-test designed. Therefore, if the comparison of two main score are significant. If the main score less than 5% using T-test meanwhile if mean score more than 5% using ANCOVA.

### *Treatment*

The stage of teaching and learning are also same that are using scientific approach (observing, questioning, collecting, and information, analyzing information and communicating) as it suggest in the curriculum 2013. The two classes also have the same opportunity to learn outside the classroom through extensive reading activity.

The difference was lay on the certain activities which were design to build students awareness toward reading chunks in language. In the experimental, the teacher reading text then the students listening, at the same time reading in silent and the students are teach to recognize lexico-grammtical units in the text through the focus practice activities such as translation to make sure that they comprehend the text better, analyzing lexico-grammatical unit are find in the text. Meanwhile, in the control group they just learn reading as the way their teacher usually teachers reading them. Such as silent reading, discussion, and answering comprehension questions. In addition for outside classroom activity, the experiment group have extensive reading task, which required them that find and to read text as well as to record new vocabulary or lexico-grammatical unit they found in the text. Next to, for the

control group the teacher also ask them to read extensively outside the classroom yet their task just to summarize the reading passage without recording the lexico-grammatical.

### ***Post-test***

The last step of collecting data is the granting of the post-test when the both had given the process of treatment. In this condition, the participant were asked to doing the test in the form of multiple choice and the time provided was 90 minutes then after finish their test the participant are asked to submit their work to scoring and analyzing.

### ***Data analysis***

Dealing with data analysis, there were two different kinds of data, primary and secondary that analyzed. Hence, in this section the students were treated and analyzed in different ways. In the primary data are obtained from the result of post-test. It was analyzed quantitatively to see the effect of treatment. The scores of students in experimental and control group are recorded and separately tabulated.

To answer questions whether the students who were treated using Listening While Reading (LWR) were more fluent in reading than those who were not, the researcher analyzed the data as called descriptive statistic first. In the present research, it was conducted to know minimum and maximum score, mean and standard deviation. After doing data analysis, the result was presented in graphic forms. The score was statically analyzed with using SPSS 20.0 for windows.

## **RESULT**

### ***Finding***

#### ***Major Findings***

The posttest scores serve the major data in this study. Pretest functioned as a homogeneity test to measure whether or not the two groups were starting equal. It was

considered important to count equally of the group before the experimentations since it ensured that those two groups were comparable (Creswell, 2012:298). The decision whether the strategy implemented effective or not would be drawn based on the final statistical computations SPSS program version 20. Later, these findings should be confirmed by the minor data

### Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig(2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Comprehension	Equal variances assumed	.498	.483	8.958	66	.000	17.206	1.921	13.371	21.041
	Equal variances not assumed			8.958	65.285	.000	17.206	1.962	13.370	21.041
Rate	Equal variances assumed	3.560	.064	13.739	66	.000	22.853	1.663	19.532	26.174
	Equal variances not assumed			13.739	65.285	.000	22.853	1.663	19.525	26.180

Table was presented the analysis of posttest score in the experiment and control groups. Refers to the result of analysis above, it can be seen that score F for equal variances assumed for reading comprehension was .498 and for reading rate 3.560 then, the sig. score for reading comprehension was .048 and for reading rate was .064, t score for reading comprehension was 8.958 and for reading rate was 13.739 and the degree of freedom (df) score for equally mean of reading comprehension and rate was 66. Additionally, the score sig (2-tailed) was .000. Therefore, due to the sig (2-tailed) was  $.000 < 0.05$  hence, the result of comparison average control and experimental group revealed that there was significantly different.



### **Minor Finding**

The minor data were used to strengthen the findings in major data. When the statistical computation did not show the significance difference, the minor data should be able to explain why it happened. The minor finding are bellow

	Disagree Completely	Disagree	Agree Completely	Agree	Total
1. LWR help me understand text better	0%	11.76%	29.46%	58.86%	100%
2. Help me increasing my reading skills	0%	5.8%	26.48%	67.65%	100%
3.help me answer questions easier	2.9%	2.9%	29.42%	64.70%	100%
4. Help me read faster	2.9%	14.7%	52.10%	29.42%	100%
5. Help me pass the passage 2 minutes	0%	2.9%	32.36%	64.70%	100%
6. Hearing the pronunciation help me understand the text better	0%	2.9%	64.70%	32.36%	100%

Based on the respond about that students beliefs that listening while reading (LWR) can improve their reading skill comprehension and rate. Additionally, the students were give opportunity to write their comment during treatment regarding their experience of it. In fact of interest students focus on this study was 28 students from the experimental groups wrote the positive comment about this strategy at the end of questionnaire

### **DISCUSSION**

The result of data analysis showed the implementation of LWR had promote students becomes more fluent in reading. It showed of their reading comprehension and rate scores which were higher than those who were treated without using that strategy. According to some previous studies had suggested that LWR enhances fluency via a neurological impress or modeling process. (Cunningham, 1979; Heckelman, 1969). Stated that Neurological impress theories suggest that reading along with a more rapid reader establishes a neurological pattern

of more rapid neurological responding within the listener. Modeling theories suggest that listeners model the reading speed of the fluent reader. Nevertheless, researchers who have manipulated aloud reading speed during LWR have found little support for either of these theories. Instead, the procedure appears to be effective due to the opportunities to read (i.e., repeated reading) embedded within LWR interventions (Skinner et al., 1993; Skinner, Cooper, & Cole, 1997; Skinner, Logan, Robinson, & Robinson, 1997; Skinner & Shapiro, 1989; Sterling, Robinson, & Skinner, 1997). In fact, the result of this strategy had showed that the students who treated with listening while reading had better on reading fluency than those who are not.

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

Based on the research findings, the conclusion can be drawn to answer research question in present study. Relate to the result of statistical computations the implementation of listening while reading (LWR) showed significantly difference on students reading comprehensions, it was enough evidence to accept the hypothesis that students who were treated using listening while reading (LWR) had better on reading fluency than those who were not. Next the statistical computation of reading rate, parallel with the reading comprehension in reading rate was also found the significantly difference on students scores. Therefore, it could be revealed that LWR significantly increase reading fluency at second grade students of senior high school 1 JANAPRIA by learning disabilities.

In minor finding based on the respond of questionnaire was also showed that LWR help promote the reading fluency. LWR help students comprehending the text better, faster in reading, and also know to pronounce the word correctly of the text. Hence, this strategy are proper to apply by the teachers when teaching reading in the fields.

Based on the previous data analysis, discussion and above conclusions, these suggestion are addressed for future researcher especially the English teachers to use this

strategy for teaching reading due to this present study had showed that the LWR approach help students at senior high school1 JANAPRIA develop their reading skills, particularly in reading fluency, increasing their vocabulary and comprehend the text better.

The aims of the this study was based on statistical computation the researcher hope this study will give contribution to the English teachers who want to teach reading skills and to the future researcher who want to conduct a research about reading in general. As it had been discussed, teaching reading skill trough listening while reading (LWR) beside learning window moving underlined, and eye tracking the LWR also increasing student vocabulary, comprehend text better. Therefore, by utilizing various kind of reading fluency assessment, it could be observed which one could provide more accurate measurement of reading fluency component. Overall, highlighting for future researcher to conduct a research using this approach in another level of students.

## REFERENCES

- Ary, Donald et. al. 1985. *Introduction to Research in Education*: Third Edition. New York: CBS College Publishing
- Breznitz, Z. (1987). Increasing first graders' reading accuracy and comprehension by Accelerating their reading rates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 79, 236–242.
- Billington, E.J., Skinner, C.H., & Cruchon, N.M. (2004). Improving sixth-grade students' Perceptions of high effort assignments by assigning more work: Interaction of additive interspersal and assignment effort on assignment Choice. *Journal of School Psychology*, 42, 477–490.
- Chomsky, C. (1978). When you still can't read in third grade: After decoding, what? In S.J.
- Samuels (Ed.), *What Research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 13–30).
- Carrels. P. L., 1998. *Interactive Approaches to second language readings*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Daneman, M., & Carpenter, P.A. (1980). Individual differences in working memory and reading. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Behavior*, 19, 450–466.
- Dowhower, S.L. (1987). Effects of repeated reading on second-grade transitional readers' Fluency and comprehension. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 389–406.
- Daly, E.J., Chafouleas, S., & Skinner, C.H. (2004). *Interventions for reading problems: Designing and evaluating Effective strategies*. New York: Guilford.
- Daly, E.J, III, & Martens, B.K. (1994). A comparison of three intervention for increasing oral reading performance application of the interactional hierarchy. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, 27, 459-469
- Grabe, W. 2010. *Reading in Second Language; Moving from the theory to practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hapstak, J. and Tracey, D.H. 2007. Effects of Assisted-Repeated reading students of Varying Reading ability: A single subject experimental research study. *Reading horizon journal*, volume 47 (4)
- Kruidenier, J.R. (2002). *Research-based principles for adult basic education reading Instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute for Literacy, Partnership for Reading.

- LaBerge, D., & Samuels, S.J. (1974). Toward a theory of automatic processing in reading. *Cognitive Psychology*, 6, 293–323.
- Latief, M.A. 2012. *Research method in language learning an introduction*. Malang. UM. Press
- McMillan, J. H. 1992. *Educational Research: Fundamental for the consumer*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher
- Nunan, D 1999. *second language teaching and learning*. Boston Heinle
- Perfetti, C. (1977). Language comprehension and fast decoding: Some Psycholinguistic Perquisites for skilled Reading comprehension. In J. Guthrie (Ed.), *Cognition, curriculum, and comprehension* (pp. 20–41). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Rasinski, T. (1990). Effect of repeated reading and listening while reading on reading fluency. *Journal of Educational Research*, 83, 147-150
- Rose, T.L (1984a). The effects of two pre-Practice procedures on oral reading. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 17, 544-548
- Rose, T.L (1984b). The effects of previewing on retarded learner oral reading. *Education and Training of the Mentally Retarded*, 17, 49-53
- Rose, T.L (1984c). Effects of previewing on oral reading of mainstreamed behaviorally Disordered students. *Behavioral Disordered*, 10, 33-39
- R Hill, Water, 1979, *secondary school reading process, program, procedure*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stanovich, K.E. (1986). Matthew effects in reading: Some consequences of individual Differences in the acquisition of literacy. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 21, 360–406.
- Smith. F. 1973. *Psycholinguistics and reading* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Segalowitz, S. J., Segalowitz, N. S., & Wood, A G. (1998). Assessing the Development of Automaticity in second language word recognition. *Applied linguistics*, 19 (01), 53-67
- Stich, T. & James, J. (1984). Listening and reading. In P. D. Pearson (Ed), *Handbook of reading Research* (pp.293-317) New York, NY: Longman

- Skinner, C.H. (1998). Preventing academic skill deficits. In T.S. Watson & F.M. Gresham (Eds.) *Handbook of child behavior therapy* (pp. 61–82). New York: Plenum Press.
- Skinner, C.H., Adamson, K.L., Woodward, J.R., Jackson, R.R., Atchison, L.A., & Mims, J.W. (1993). A comparison of fast rate, slow rate, and silent previewing interventions on Reading performance. *Learning Disabilities Quarterly*, 26, 674–681.
- Skinner, C.H., Cooper, L., & Cole, C.L. (1997). The effects of oral presentation Previewing rates on reading performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 30, 331–333.
- Skinner, C.H., Logan, P., Robinson, S.L., & Robinson, D.H. (1997). Myths and Realities of Modeling as a reading intervention: Beyond acquisition. *School Psychology Review*, 26, 437–447.
- Skinner, C.H., Robinson, S.L., Morse, D.T., O’Neal, M.R., & Jackson, R.R. (1998). Effects of models’ reading rate on Generalized reading performance in students with learning Disabilities. *International Journal of Special Education*, 13(2), 54–64.
- Skinner, C.H., Satcher, J.F., Bamberg, H.W., Waters-Kemp, P.A., Brandt, R., & Robinson, D.H. (1995). Effects of listening previewing across passages written at instructional and frustration reading levels. *Journal of Balanced Reading Instruction*, 2(1), 16–26.
- Skinner, C.H., & Shapiro, E.S. (1989). A comparison of a taped-words and drill Interventions on Reading fluency in adolescents with behavior disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 12, 123–133.
- Strong, A.C., Wehby, J.H., Falk, K.B., & Lane, K.L. (2004). The impact of a Structured reading Curriculum and repeated Reading on the performance of junior high students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 561–581.
- Tractenberg, R.E. (2002). Exploring hypotheses about phonological awareness, Memory, and reading achievement. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 35, 407–424.
- Woodall, B. (2010) simultaneous listening and reading in ESL: Helping second language Learners read (and enjoy reading) more efficiently. *TESOL Journal*, 1 (2), 186-205

