Chapter Four

Results and Discussion

This chapter describes the results of the research. As this study used descriptive quantitative, the researcher described the results of the research completely by using tables. The results essentially answered the research question. This chapter also shows the researcher's discussion on the results.

Results

The table below shows the categories of difficulties in reading comprehension and describes the result of data analysis from categories of difficulties in reading comprehension. The table also describes the result of data analysis from fifteen items. The interpretation written on this table was based on scale referenced grading presented in chapter three.

No	Categories	Item	Statement	Mean	Average	Interpretation
			Table 4.1 Difficulties in reading comprehension			
1	Phonological processing	QD 13	I get difficulty to read the word that I dont know the pronunciation	2.80	2.80	Sometimes
2	Complex sentences	QD 3	I have difficulty in understanding complex sentences	2.75	2.75	Sometimes
3	Meaning of word /vocabulary	QD 1	I have difficulty in understanding word that is almost same as other word.	2.47	2.61	Sometimes
		QD 2	I have difficulty in understanding difficult words that I read.	2.75		
		QD 4	I always forget vocabulary the words I learn.	2.63		
4	Lack of concentration	QD 5	I forget what I just read	2.30	2.51	Sometimes
		QD 9	Ihave difficulty in reading directly from computer screen	2.33		
		QD 10	I lack of concentration when I read	2.41		
		QD 11	I ussualy get borred when I read	2.88		
		QD 12	I ussualy get tired when I read	2.69		
5	Language Processing	QD 14	I read slowly	2.41	2.41	Rarely
6	Inability to connect ideas in the passage	QD 6	I have difficulty in understanding main idea in the text.	2.39	2.36	Rarely
		QD 7	I have difficulty in understanding the details when I read.	2.42		
		QD 8	I have difficultiy to connect one idea to another idea.	2.28		
7	Meaning of sentences	QD 15	I don't understand what I read.	2.11	2.11	Rarely

The table 4.2 below shows the result of data analysis of metacognitive strategies used by the students in reading comprehension.

No	Categories	Item	Statement	Mean	Average	Interpretation
			Table 4.2 Strategies in reading			
1	Predicting	QS 13	I use previous knowledge when I read.	3.06	3.06	Sometimes
2	Monitoring, Clarifying, and Fixing - UP	QS 2	I underline or highlight main idea what I read.	3.25	3.04	Sometimes
		QS 5	Before I read, I decide the purpose for read.	2.64		
		QS 6	I read slowly and carefully to understand what I rea	3.08		
		QS 7	I re-read when I lack of concentration.	3.30		
		QS 9	When I read, sometimes I stop and think what I read.	3.13		
		QS 10	When the reading is difficult, I pay more attention.	2.83		
		QS 12	I re- read again, if I don't understand.	3.13		
3	Visualizing	QS1	I believe that it is easier to understand a reading passage if we memorize some of the information in it.	2.75	2.91	Sometimes
		QS 8	To remember what I read, I try to imagine or visualize the information what I read.	3.08		
4	Summarizing	QS 4	I summarize main idea when I read.	2.78	2.88	Sometimes
		QS 11	I conclude what I read orally.	2.89		
		QS 15	I use key word to summarize what I read.	2.98		
5	Drawing Inferences	QS 3	I complete my reading with other references, when I read a main idea.	2.67	2.67	Sometimes
6	Questioning	QS 14	I use question words (what, who, when, where, why and how) for understanding what I read.	2.47	2.47	Rarely

This table shows the categories of metacognitive strategies in reading used the EED students of UMY batch on 2014 and describe the result of data analysis of the mean point from categories of metacognitive strategies. Also, this table describe the result analysis of fifteen question. Also, the interpretation was written on this table. The result of this table is suitable with scale on chapter three.

Difficulties in reading comprehension

There are seven categories of difficulties in reading comprehension. The result of seven categories of difficulties in reading comprehension based on the range from

the highest to the lowest score shown in table 4.1 are phonological processing followed by complex sentences, meaning of word / vocabulary, lack of concentration during reading, language processing, Inability to connect ideas in a passage, and meaning of sentences. The result of each category of difficulties in reading comprehension is described below.

Phonological processing

The students have difficulties in phonological processing in reading comprehension. The data description of phonological processing category is shown in table 4.3.

Table 4.3 phnological processing			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.80	1	4	1

The item of difficulties related to phonological processing was shown by the mean score of 2.80. This score is in the category of "sometimes" as presented in table 4, page 18. This means the students 'sometimes' face difficulties related to phonological processing when they read.

Complex Sentences.

The result shows that the students have difficulties related to complex sentences in reading comprehension. Table 4.4 shows the statistic description of Complex sentence difficulties.

Table 4.4 complex sentences			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.75	2	4	1

The mean of complex sentence difficulties in reading comprehension was 2.75 that was in category of "sometimes". Therefore, the EED of UMY students batch 2014 sometimes face the complex sentences as difficulties in reading comprehension.

Meaning of word / vocabulary.

The result shows that the students have difficulties related to meaning of word or vocabulary in reading comprehension. Table 4.5 shows the statistic description of Meaning of word / vocabulary difficulties.

Table 4.5 Meaning of word / vocabulary			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Number of Items
2.615	2.469	2.750	3

The mean average of the difficulties related to meaning of word or vocabulary was 2. 61 that was in the category of 'sometimes'. This means that the EED of UMY students batch 2014 'sometimes' face the difficulties related to meaning of word / vocabulary in reading comprehension.

Lack of concentration during reading

The result shows that students have difficulties in reading comprehension because they lack of concentration during reading. The result can be seen in the table below.

Table 4.6 Lack of concentration			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.519	2.297	2.875	5

The mean average of lack of concentration was 2.51 that was in the category of 'sometimes'. This means that the students 'sometimes' lack of concentration when they read.

Language processing

The result in table 4.7 shows the score of language processing as difficulties in reading comprehension.

Table 4.7 Language Processing			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.41	1	4	1

The mean average of language processing was 2.41 that was in category of "rarely". This shows that the EED of UMY students rarely face language processing as difficulties in reading comprehension.

Inability to connect ideas in a passage

The result shows the score of inability to connect ideas in a passage as difficulties in reading comprehension. The result as seen in table below.

Table 4.8 Inability to connect ideas in passage			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.365	2.281	2.422	3

The mean average of inability to connect ideas in passage was 2.36 that was in category of "rarely". Therefore, the students` of EED of UMY 'rarely' face inability to connect ideas in passage as difficulties in reading comprehension.

Meaning of sentences.

The result shows the score of meaning of sentences as difficulties in reading comprehension. The result can be seen in the table below.

Table 4.9 Meanng of sentences			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.11	1	4	1

The mean average of meaning of sentences was 2.11 that was in the category of "rarely". This shows the students of EED of UMY rarely face the difficulties related to meaning of sentences in reading comprehension.

Metacognitive strategies in reading comprehension

The metacognitive strategies present some reading strategies that were used by students. There were six categories of metacognitive strategies in reading. The result of data analysis of the categories was ordered from the highest to the lowest as presented in table 4.2 page 18. They are predicting followed by monitoring, clarifying, and fixing up, visualizing, summarizing, drawing inferences, and questioning. The result of each category of metacognitive strategies is described below.

Predicting. The Result of description of predicting as a reading strategy used by the students is shown in table 4.10.

Table 4.10 Predicting			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
3.06	2	4	1

The mean average of predicting was 3.06 that was in category of 'sometimes', so the EED of UMY students batch 2014 'sometimes' use predicting as one of the strategies in reading.

Monitoring, clarifying, and fixing up. The result of the data analysis on metacognitive strategies such as monitoring, clarifying, and fixing up can be seen in the table below.

Table 4.11 Monitoring, clarifying and fixing -up			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
3.049	2.641	3.297	7

The mean average of monitoring, clarifying, and fixing-up was 3.04 that was in category of 'sometimes', so the EED of UMY students batch 2014 'sometimes' use monitoring, clarifying, and fixing-up as strategies in reading.

Visualizing. The result of data analysis on the visualizing strategy is shown in the table below.

Table 4.11 Visualizing			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.914	2.750	3.078	2

The mean average of visualizing was 2.91 that was in the category of 'sometimes', so the EED of UMY student 'sometimes' use visualizing as strategies in reading.

Summarizing / retelling. The result of summarizing / retelling can be seen in table below

Table 4.12 Summarizing			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.885	2.781	2.984	3

The mean average of summarizing / retelling was 2.88 that was in the category of 'sometimes'. Therefore, the EED of UMY students 'sometimes' use summarizing / retelling as their strategies in reading.

Drawing Inference. The result of data analysis on drawing inference is shown in table 4.13.

Table 4.13 Drawing inferences			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.67	1	4	1

The mean average of drawing inference was 2.67 that was in the category of 'sometimes'. Therefore, the EED of UMY students 'sometimes' use drawing inference as their strategies in reading.

Questioning. The result of the data analysis on using questioning as reading strategy can be seen in table 4.14.

Table 4.14 Questioning			
Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N of Items
2.47	1	4	1

The mean average of questioning was 2.47 that was in the category of 'rarely'. It means that EED of UMY students batch 2014 'rarely' use questioning as their reading strategies.

Discussion

The result shows the description of the students` difficulties in reading comprehension. The difficulties in reading comprehension were sometimes faced by the students when they read. They were phonological processing, complex sentences, meaning of word / vocabulary, lack of concentration during reading, language processing, inability to connect ideas in a passage, and meaning of sentences. In addition, the students used six metacognitive strategies when they read. They were predicting, monitoring, clarifying, and fix up, visualizing, summarizing, drawing inferences, and questioning.

Difficulties of reading comprehension. The data analysis shows that out of seven difficulties in reading comprehension, the highest difficulty was related to the category of phonology processing. The mean of phonological processing was 2.80. This means the students sometimes face phonological processing. This result is appropriate with Sanahan et al. (2015) who mentioned that readers have a specific weakness in phonological processing. They might fail understanding phonetic coding. In this research, the statement on number thirteen "*I get difficulty reading the words that I didn't know the pronunciation*" represented the students' difficulties in reading related to the phonological processing especially the phonetic coding.

The second highest difficulty faced by the students was related to complex sentences. The result is appropriate with Boroughs (2012) who said that the readers face difficulty because they are unfamiliar with complex sentence structures that

occur in written language that usually do not occur in oral language. This difficulty was shown in the statement *'I have difficulty understanding complex sentences'*.

On the contrary, the students 'rarely' face difficulties related to the meaning of sentences as shown by the lowest score of mean 2.11. This means that that students rarely misunderstand the meaning of sentences when they read. The category of this difficulty is shown in item '*I do not understand what I read*'. Therefore, Boroughs' (2012) statement which stated that many students have comprehension problems because they have difficulty interpreting the meaning in sentences is not highly reflected in EED of UMY students.

Metacognitive strategies in reading comprehension. In reading, the students apply some metacognitive strategies. The data analysis shows that from seven difficulties in reading comprehension, the highest strategy was related to the category of predicting. The mean of predicting was 3.06. It means the students sometimes use predicting when they do not understand to read text. The category of predicting is shown in item '*I use previous knowledge when I read*'. This is appropriate with statement by Sanahan (2010). He said that the students think about what they already know and use that knowledge in conjunction with other clues to construct meaning from what they read or to hypothesize what will happen next n the text.

The second highest strategy used by the students was visualizing. The result is similar with by Sanahan (2010) who said that the students visualize what is described in the text and remember what they read. Two items show this strategy. The first

statement is *'I believe that it is easier to understand a reading passage if we memorize some of the information in it'*. The second is *'To remember what I read, I try to imagine or visualize the information what I read'*. The mean average of two statements was 2.91. It means the students of EED of UMY sometimes use visualizing as their strategy when they read.

The result of data analysis showed that questioning was the lowest strategy in reading used by the EED students of UMY batch 2014. The mean was 2.47. It means the students rarely use questioning when they read. This strategy is represented in the item *'I use question words (what, who, when, where, why, and how) for understanding what I read'*. Sahanan (2010) stated that students develop and attempt to answer questions about the important ideas in the text while reading, using words such as *"where"* or *"why"*. However, this strategy is rarely used by the EED of UMY students when they read.