

The Influence of Interactive Learning Model vs Direct Learning Model and Achievement Motivation on Learning Outcomes English Discourse Reading Comprehension Grade VIII Kupang

Hendrina Pada, Punadji Setyosari¹, I Nyoman Sudana Degeng², Utami Widiati³.
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
henipada66@gmail.com

Abstrak: The study had three issues, namely: (1) whether there are differences in learning outcomes reading comprehension of discourse between students taught by using the model of interactive learning and hands-on learning; (2) whether there are differences in learning outcomes reading comprehension of discourse between students who have high achievement motivation and low achievement motivation; and (3) whether there is an interaction between the learning model interactive and hands-on learning and achievement motivation on learning outcomes.

The purpose of research is (1) To test whether there is any difference in learning outcomes reading comprehension of discourse between students taught by using the model of interactive learning and learning directly, (2) To test whether there is any difference in learning outcomes reading comprehension of discourse between students who have high achievement motivation and low achievement motivation, and (3) To test whether there is interaction between the learning model and achievement motivation on learning outcomes reading comprehension of discourse.

The subjects were students of class VIII (C and D) SMP II Kupang. Which was randomized number C grade students 36 people and the number of class D 34 people. This research was analyzed descriptively by using SPSS window version 16.00. The procedure research begins by preparing the syllabus; lesson plans, teaching materials, test instrument, achievement motivation instruments. The results showed that (1) Interactive Learning Model is superior compared with a mean of 61 848 Direct Learning Model with a mean of 55 368. (2) There are significant differences in learning outcomes between students who are highly motivated high achievers with a mean of 64 779, while the mean motivated underachieving students at 52 436 and (3) There is an interaction between the learning model and achievement motivation on learning outcomes. English reading comprehension of discourse is evident with a mean value of student learning outcomes that are subjected to interactive learning model with high achievement motivation amounting to 69 023, while the mean value of student learning outcomes that are subjected to interactive learning model with low achievement motivation as much as 54 673. Students who receive treatment direct instructional model with high achievement motivation earn a mean learning outcomes by 60 536 while students who get treatment direct instructional model with low achievement motivation gets a mean value of 50 199.

Keywords: Interactive Learning Model, Direct Learning Model, Achievement Motivation, Learning Outcomes.

Reading is one of language skills besides the other language skills such as listening skills, speaking skills and writing skills. Each language skills are closely related to the thought processes that underlie language. Listening and reading skills are closely related because both are means to receive communication while speaking and writing skills are closely related because both are a way to express the meaning (Anderson and Krathwoll, 2001). The reading

process has three basic components that are important, namely recording, decoding, and meaning. Recording refers to the words and sentences, and then associate it with sounds that match the writing system used. The process of decoding (encoding) refers to the process of translating a series of graphics into words. Thus concluded that reading is not a simple activity within the meaning attempts to obtain what is written in the text but reading is an activity grafonic interaction, syntactic, semantic and schematic (Wassid and Sunendar, 2011).

Strategic reading strategies required in reading. Effective readers are readers who use a variety of reading strategies in accordance with the text and content in order to construct meaning when reading. Reading is an interactive process. Reader involvement with the text depends on the context. People who love to read a text will meet the objectives to be achieved. Is that reads text aimed at obtaining pleasure (reading for pleasure) or a text with the aim of obtaining information (reading for information). Whatever the objectives to be achieved by the reader, it is certain that the text is read must be understandable (readable) so that the interaction between the reader with text (Abidin, 2012)

Broadly speaking there is two essential skills in reading is a skill that is both mechanical (mechanical skills) and skills that understand (comprehension skills). In developing and improving the skills of learners in reading need to consider several things related to the learners as shown below.

- a. Reading aims to broaden the experience of learners in the understanding of science, technology, and culture.
- b. Reading means teaching language sounds, symbol and meaning of new words to the learners.
- c. By reading the learner can help learners understand the structures that are difficult in sentence.
- d. Through reading the learner can teach the skills of understanding (comprehension skills) and can improve the speed and accuracy (fluency and accuracy) in reading
- e. Reading activities have different purposes depending on the circumstances or learning level. (Rahim, 2009).

Learners who are at the beginner level, the reading process is a process for recognizing symbols, recognizing words and sentences, finding main ideas and key words, and can be told of the contents of short readings. The purpose of reading for learners who are at intermediate and advanced positions is to find the main idea and supporting ideas, interpret and digest readings, as well as communicating the contents reading

Tarigan (2008) cites the opinion of Broughton who said that in reading activities, especially in the foreign language text, pronunciation becomes more important than comprehension and reading materials chosen should contain content and language relatively easily understood by learners.

Hadley (2001) says in learning to read, pre reading activity is very important. This is because the activities in pre reading apperception learners can perform activities related to the discourse that will be read by students. In pre reading activities learners can do the work of predicting the content of reading or trying to make hypotheses on the content of the discourse.

Reading activity predicts the content will be able to motivate learners to compare what has been predicted by the contents of discourse actually. Rahim in Abidin (2012) to support what was said by Hadley that pre reading activity can activate the schemata of students at once arouse curiosity and interest in reading the discourse learners will read.

Brown (2001) said that in addition to the activities pre reading, read core activity is also very important in learning to read. In addition to the core activities of pre reading and read, pre reading activity is also important. Was said to be important because at this stage the learners can test their understanding by comparing the hypothesis or prediction drawn up in stages with

the content of reading pre reading to build a new understanding of the content of the discourse. Resmini (2006) have the same opinion to the above opinion is that the activity is post reading learning activities to develop reading, asking questions, relating back and visual presentation.

The other model reading is reading linear models which are also called bottom-up models. This model considers that the text determines the language that embodies an understanding. Bottom-up models also called skill models pioneered by the research figures read like Cough, Alford, and Holley Wilcox (Abidin, 2012) The model begins with the basic steps that the process of recognition of the texts and sounds, recognize morpheme, word, grammatical structure identification, the process of recognition of letters, words, phrases, sentences, text and finally towards the meaning for the achievement of an understanding.

Furthermore, there is a psycholinguistic model of reading is often known as top-down models. This model is also called holistic models. Figure studies to introduce this model is Kenneth Goodman Smith (Anderson, 2001) The model begins with the step reading predictions, hypotheses, which may be in the reading to capitalize the knowledge of the content and its own language. The core notion of this model is that the knowledge, experience. Furthermore, there are interactive learning model, known as a model of balance. Prominent research interactive learning model is Rummelhart (Rummelhart, 1977) .Then followed by other research leaders such as Anderson, (2001) and Brown (2001).

Thus, based on the understanding stated above, the actually what is problematic in teaching reading at the moment? Empirically which become problems in learning to read in school today, especially learning to read in class VIII are:

1. Learning to read in school are learning to read that only refers to the practical interests of the learner is able to answer questions in the reading.
2. The unclear role of the learner in learning to read. Learners simply assign learners to read and become a model for learners read.
3. To test reading comprehension by having the learner do learners answered questions readings.
4. Translating word by word more frequently performed than on guiding learners contextually translated text.
5. Selection of the reading text for learners not measures the readability level learners.
6. Learners do not feel it is important to select and apply relevant learning model in order to enhance the learners understanding of the content of the discourse or text in particular discourse or English text to be read.
7. In the learning process in the classroom learners more plays as a center (teacher-centered) of the learners as the center (student centered).
8. Conditions of learner's class that is not conducive because the number of learners is at the amount of at least between 36 to 38 students in one class.
9. Schools do not prepare a resource book that can be used by learners in classical learning.
10. Learners and learners themselves have attempted to hold a book or learning resources as needed.

In this study the researchers chose to conduct research, especially in the areas of reading comprehension in English discourse formulated through a titled: Influence of Interactive Learning Model vs. Model Direct Learning and Achievement Motivation on Learning Outcomes Discourse Reading Comprehension English learners Junior Class VIII in Kupang Nusa Tenggara Timur

RESEARCH METHODS

Implementation of research and data collection is done in SMP Negeri 2 Kupang on odd

semester 2015/2016 academic year from early November 2015 until the end of December this 2015. The research uses quasi experimental study design type or quasi-experimental research. In the experimental study, researchers did not have the flexibility to do random class because the class that there is already structured by school administrative (Setyosari, 2013: 45).

This research designed by ANOVA (Analysis of Variance) two lanes. This is in line with what is proposed by Kerlinger (2003: 351) and Tuckman (1999: 386) that the study design anava two pathways is a design study that describes about the existence of two independent variables or more mutually confronted to assess the consequences independently of the a bound variable.

Study groups were used as research subjects, drawn from Junior High School 2 class VIII kupang State which accounted for 36 Orang class C and class D amounted to 34 people. Both of these classes either an experimental class or control class in the learning process guided by the learning device such as syllabus, lesson plan (RPP), teaching materials, student activity sheets and sheets of student assessment. Based on the curriculum and syllabus subjects of English junior class VIII first half, the kind of discourse that is taught is the kind of discourse descriptive and recount. Thus both these types of discourse used in the study.

The number of meetings allocated to each group / class, 6 times plus 1 times for the pre-test and 1 times for post-test. Each meeting lasted for 2x 40 minutes. All learners are the subject of research, before the treatment is done first given pre-test learning outcomes discourse English reading comprehension and achievement motivation filling instrument. The research instrument includes two things: the development and testing of instruments and research instruments. The development of research instruments associated with the preparation of the instrument while the instrument trial related to whether the instruments are arranged to qualify the reliability of follow-Richarson Kuder way test that resulted in a score with a dichotomy on the test item (1 and 0) with the formula Kuder- Richarson KR formula 21 and validity of the items on achievement motivation instrument used product moment correlation analysis. An item is said to be valid if $r_{counting} > r_{table} (5\%)$ (Sugiyono, 2013).

Normality test is done by testing Liliefors Significance of Kolmogorov- Smirnov correction by SPSS for Windows version 16.0. Homogeneity test conducted by test Levene's test. Decision dissemination or distribution normality and homogeneity of variance based on the provisions of significance of 5%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study research designed Anova (Analysis of Variance) two lanes. The table below illustrates the results of the analysis and discussion of two paths.

Table Analysis Results Anova Two Lines

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: learning outcomes

Anova Analysis Results Table Two Lines

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects					
Dependent Variable: HasilBelajar					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	59416.496 ^a	4	14854.124	586.253	.000
Intercept	394719.878	1	394719.878	15578.555	.000
model	1206.450	1	1206.450	47.615	.000

motivation	1627.174	1	1627.174	64.220	.000
model * motivation	115.678	1	115.678	4.565	.034
Error	3420.547	135	25.337		
Total	574304.500	140			
Corrected Total	62837.043	139			
a. R Squared = .946 (Adjusted R Squared = .944)					

The results of the analysis of the learning model Anava known that the calculated F value of 47 615 with significant value 0.000 probability that is below the significance level of 0.05 or ($p < 0.05$). Thus concluded there were differences in learning outcomes of English reading comprehension of discourse between groups of learners who received treatment with an interactive learning model and the group of learners that are subjected to direct instructional model. Based on the formula proposed hypothesis, we conclude that H_0 is rejected and H_1 accepted.

The results of the analysis of achievement motivation Anava to note that the value of F arithmetic amounted to 64 220 by the significance probability value of 0.000 is below the significance probability 0:05 ($P < 0.05$). Thus concluded there are differences in learning outcomes of English reading comprehension of discourse between groups of learners who have high achievement motivation with a group of learners who have low achievement motivation.

Anava analysis results related to the interaction between the learning model and achievement motivation explained that the value of F count equal to 4,565 and the significance probability value of 0.034 less than the significance probability 0:05. Thus concluded there is interaction between the learning model and achievement motivation on learning outcomes discourse English reading comprehension.

CONCLUSIONS

1. In Learning English reading comprehension of discourse, there are significant differences in learning outcomes between the groups of learners who receive treatment model of interactive learning and group of learners that are subjected to direct learning model.
2. The difference in learning outcomes discourse English reading comprehension significantly between groups of learners who have high achievement motivation and groups of learners who have low achievement motivation.
3. There is an interaction between the learning model applied and achievement motivation possessed the learning outcomes discourse English reading comprehension. Thus it can be said that in the learning of English reading comprehension of discourse, interactive learning model is superior to direct instructional model if high achievement motivation learners.

Suggestions

the suggestions in this paper are:

1. We recommend that in the process of learning English reading comprehension discourse, subjects of English learners can consider Interactive learning model as an alternative model of learning in order to improve learning outcomes discourse reading comprehension of English learners.
2. Learners need to pay attention to the issue of motivation of achievement of each learner in the classroom so that treatment guidance in the learning process more focused.
3. Keep the communication space cooperation between the learners and parents of learners in providing motivation, reward and facilities for effective learning process and increase learning outcomes learners are expected.

REFERENCES

- Abidin, Y. 2010. *Ability and Speaking Academic*. Bandung: Rizqi Press.
- Abidin, Y. 2012. *Learning Reading Education Based Karakter*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Anderson. 2001. *Teaching Elementary Language Arts*. New York: Allyn & Bacon.
- Anderson & Krathwohl. 2001. *Taxonomic for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives Bridge Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman Inc.
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principle. An Interactive Approach to Language Peadagogy*. San Francisco: Longman.
- Cohen, L. 1976. *Educational Research in the Classroom and School A Manual of Materials and Methods*. San Francisco: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Degeng, I.S.N. 2013. *Learning Sciences. Classification Variables for Development Theory and Penelitan*. Bandung: Kalam Life
- Hadley, A.O. 1993. *Teaching Language in Context. (University of Illinois: Hainle & hainle Publishers. Inc. Bostan, Massachusetts*
- Kerlinger, F.N 2003. *Principles of Behavioral Research (3th edition) .Penerjemah: Landung R.Simatupang*. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University.
- Rahim, F. 2009. *The teaching of reading in schools Dasar*. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- Resmini. 2006. *Reading and Writing in SD: Theory and Learning was*. Bandung: Upi Press.
- Rubin, D. 1993. *A Practical Approach to Teaching Reading*. Boston. Allyn and Bacon.
- Rumelhart, D.E & Norman D.A. 1977. *The Knowledge representation in Memory. Dalam R.C.Anderson, R.J Spiro and Montague. (Eds) Schooling and Acquisition of Knowledge. Hillsdale, N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.*
- Rumelhart, D.E & Norman D.A. 1981. *Analogical process in Learning*. Hillsdale, N.J. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Setyosari, P & Sihkabuden. 2005. *Media Pembelajaran*. Penerbit Eagle: Malang
- Sugiyono. 2013. *Metode Pendidikan. Pendekatan Research Quantitative, Qualitative and R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tarigan, H.G. 2008. *Speak reading as a skill*. Bandung. Penerbit Space
- Tuckman, B.W. 1999. *Conducting Educational Research. Fifth Edition*. Orlando: Earl Mcpeek Publisher
- Wassid I. & Sunendar. 2011. *Strategi Language Learning*. Bandung. PT Youth Rosdakarya.