THE EFFECT OF PORPE AND QTA TECHNIQUES TOWARD STUDENTS' READING PERSUASIVE SKILL

By:
Rachmanita
English Language Education Study Program at FKIP Islamic University of Ogan Komering Ilir Kayuagung, South Sumatera
ayuksulung2407@gmail.com

Eva Saptarina
English Language Education Study Program at FKIP Islamic University of Ogan Komering Ilir Kayuagung, South Sumatera
eevaa1481@gmail.com

Abstract: The objective of this study was to see whether the use of techniques as PORPE (Predict, Organize, Rehearse, Practice, and Evaluate) and QtA (Question the Author) were effective in improving students' reading achievement or not. This study was experimental research with non- randomized control group pretest posttest design. The sample of this research was seventy five students of eleventh graders of social class at SMA Negeri 2 Kayuagung which consisted of three groups, two experimental groups and one control group. The first experimental group was given treatment by using PORPE technique, the second group was given treatment by using QtA technique, and the control group was not given treatment. The data were gathered by using reading test and were analyzed by using One-way ANOVA. The findings showed that PORPE and QtA techniques were effective in improving the students' reading achievement.

Keywords: PORPE technique, QtA technique, students' reading achievement

INTRODUCTION

One of the important skills to be taught is reading. Farrel (2009) explains that reading is not a passive activity since it involves the readers to interact actively with the text. In the other words, reading is the activity of seeing at and comprehending to the written text and as one of effective learning activities in order to get knowledge. By reading, the students will acquire the knowledge in easy and fast way because all they have to do is choosing the books and reading it. Therefore, reading should be a core activity for students to get the knowledge. It also will become a

source of inspiration, basis of knowledge, and as a media to sharpen the students' critical thinking.

In fact, reading habit is still low in Indonesia. It can be seen from the lack of students who come to the library to read, fear of expressing their idea, and the lack of comprehending the text. These things are as barriers of their success in reading. Republika (2014) confirms that based on research done by PISA in 2012, the literacy condition in Indonesia was in the rank of 64 out of 65 countries and Indonesians reading level was in the rank of 57 out of 65 countries. Republika (2014) also states that the index of reading interest was 0.001 (in 1.000 citizens there were only one who like reading)which was based on the statistics data from UNESCO in 2012.

Based on the illustration above, the teachers can increase the reading skill by using PORPE and QtA techniques. PORPE is stand for Predict, Organize, Rehearse, Practice, and Evaluation. It is one of reading techniques developed by Simpson cited by Zuhdi (2008, p.158). It is designed to help students in 1) actively designing, monitoring, and evaluating the reading material; 2) learn the process involved in preparing essay; 3) using the process of writing as a means to obtain the material field of study.

Moreover, Abidin (2012, p.117) explains that PORPE (predict, Organize, Rehearse, Practice, and Evaluate) technique is used to improve the readers' metacognitive skill through the activities such as, define the goals of reading, analyze the important parts in the text, focus

to the main ideas of the text, get use to make questions, the last is evaluate the learning activities that have been done. PORPE also encourages the students to be more active cognitively and meta-cognitively since they are demanded to think critically toward the text to be read. it also to train the students to have self esteem and to be brave to give comments and suggestions, and they are to be brave perform in front of their classmates. Zuchdi (2008, p.157) also claims that PORPE technique has some benefits that are; it encourages students to think, analyze, and synthesize the main concept of the reading, it can help the students to remember the content of the text longer, it can be one of useful strategies for students, it can help students in doing their assignments and test, and the last this

technique directly can help the students in doing essay test.

The steps of teaching reading by using PORPE technique are stated by Simpson (2007) as follows (1) Predict; Students predict the questions in the text. The teacher introduces the language that is used in writing an essay. They can explain about the words that are usually used in writing an essay. For examples; discuss, explain, criticize, and compare, (2) Organize; Students are trained to organize the information that will be used to answer the essays' questions to be predicted before, (3) Rehearse; The students keep the information in their mind. The information is including the main ideas of the text, examples, and the conclusion of the text, (4) Practice; Students write in details the information that they get from the text, (5) Evaluate; Students

evaluate the quality of their answer from the previous step.

In addition, the teachers can also use the QtA to improve students' reading skill. Rockets (2017) states that QtA (Question the Author) is a strategy that involves the students actively with the text. Rather than read and retrieve knowledge from the text, QtA technique encourages students to ask question to the author and the text. By forming the questions, students learn more about text. Students learn to ask question such as: What is the message of the text? Does the author explain briefly in the text? How it connect with the author's previous explanation? Moreover, QtA has some benefits that are; involving students in reading and helping students to strengthen their comprehension toward the text, teaching students to ask questions to

the author while reading, and coaching students to criticize the author while reading.

Parris et.al (2009, p.232) also state that QtA (Questioning the Author) is a technique which is based on the teachers modeling the questions to the author. The teachers train the students to ask the question to the author while they are reading. This technique develops the dialogue between the reader and the author. They also claimed that this technique can be used in teaching reading comprehension for junior and senior high students. In other words, this technique can be used for junior and senior high school students except elementary students. This technique focuses on the interaction among the reader, the content of the reading, and the author.

Antonacci and O'Callaghan (2011, p.121) describe that there are two important elements of QtA technique for reading, they are; teacher's planning and discussion based on guidance. The details are as follows;

1. Teachers' Planning

   a. Analyze the text

   The teacher read the text from the perspective of students to anticipate the problems that will occur to the reader. The teacher gives the following questions; 1) what information that students need to know to comprehend this part? 2) what message that the author state in the text? 3) what are the unfamiliar terms of the text that is hard to understand? 4) what aspect of the text that is need to be clarified?

   b. Develop the questions

   Questions are the important parts of this technique. The questions are tending to help the students to develop the meaning from the text. The questions also ask the author to clarify the text which is ambiguous. Some questions for example; 1) what are the author trying to say in the text? 2) what is the author purpose in this part? 3) what is the message of the text? 4) is the author explain briefly in the text? 5) is this in line with the author stated before in the text? 6) how it connect with the author opinion previously? 7) according to you why the author tell it now?

2. Discussion based on guidance

a. Students are directed to read the segment of the text and drove them to discussion where questions are argued to make them comprehend the text.

b. Students are directed to do questions and answers.

c. Students are directed to give comment on the questions.

d. When the students show their respond through answering the questions then the teacher continue to the next segment of the text.

e. When the students say that the author does not give the information in the text, the teachers help the students by giving them other questions or information.

f. The teachers close the discussion by summarizing the text.

The benefits of QtA according to Adonan (2009, p. 139) ; a) the students are fully engaged in question, b) the students will not frustrated anymore when they facing long and hard passage, c) the students are more understand about the text, d) this strategy is very useful for the one who want to improving the reading skill, e) it can be developed in all content area and can be adjusted for young learner.

Based on the explanation above, it is interested to conduct the study entitled The Effect of PORPE and QtA Techniques toward Students' Reading Persuasive Skill.

METHODOLOGY

This study used a quasi-experimental design with nonequivalent control group design. The students in the experimental group were taught reading persuasive text by using PORPE and QtA techniques while the control group did not give treatment. There were three parallel classes used in this study consisting of seventy five students. One class consisted of twenty five students. Two classes were chosen as experimental groups and one class as a control group. In choosing the sample the purposive sampling method was used. The samples of this study were the class which had the same criteria in terms of a total number of the students, the same English average score and to be taught by the same English teacher. To determine the experimental and

control groups, flipping coin was used. The class which got the number was the experimental group and the class which got the bird symbol was the control group. Consequently, class XI social 3 and 1 were the experimental group and XI social 2 was the control group.

This study applied the test in the form of reading comprehension. After doing the try out to non sample class, there were twenty five desirable questions in the form of reading comprehension. These desirable questions next to be tested for pre and post test. Before doing a further analysis towards the data, normality of the data should be tested first. In this study, to test the normality of the data, the writer used SPSS 16.00 with *Saphiro-Wilk* method and *Levene statistics* was used to test the homogeneity of the data. Finally, the

reading test was measured by using one- way ANOVA in order to find out the differences between the means and decide whether those differences were likely to happen by chance or by treatment effect. The one- way ANOVA was calculated using SPSS version 16.0.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Result of the Reading Pretest Scores

In the first experimental group which is used PORPE technique, the highest score was 76 and the lowest score for pretest was 48 and the average score was 59.84 with standard deviation of 7.701. In the second experimental group which is used QtA technique, the highest score was for pretest 76 and the lowest score was 48 and the average score was 62.28 with standard deviation 7.368. In the control group, the highest score of the pretest obtained by the students was 68 and the lowest score was 36 and the average score was 52.64 with standard deviation 8.920. The result of pretest of each group is presented in Table 1.

Table 1
The Results of Pretest Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics
First Experimental Group	25	48	76	59.8400	7.70108
Second Experimental Group	25	48	76	61.2800	7.36840
Control Group	25	36	68	52.6400	8.92039

Based on the results obtained from pretest in the first experimental group which was used PORPE technique there were forty percent of students (ten students) in the category of good, sixty percent of students (fifteen students) in the category of fair, and none of the students were in very good, poor, and very poor category. From the second experimental group which was used QtA technique there were sixty four percent of students (sixteen students) in the category of fair, thirty four percent of students (nine students) in the category of good, and none of the students were in the category of very good, poor, and very poor. Meanwhile in the control group, there were seventy two percent of students (eighteen students) in the category of fair, sixteen percent of students (four students) in the category of good, and twelve percent of students (three students) in the category of poor, and none of students were in the category of very good and very poor. The distribution of pretest scores for the first, the second experimental group and the control group is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
The Distribution of Pretest Scores for the First, the Second Experimental Group,
and the Control Group

Score Interval	Criteria	Pretest		
		1st experimental group	2nd experimental group	Control group
81-100	Very Good	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
61-80	Good	10 (40%)	9 (36%)	4 (16%)
41-60	Fair	15 (60%)	16 (64%)	18 (72%)
21-40	Poor	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)
0-20	Very Poor	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

The Result of the Reading Posttest Scores

In the first experimental group which was used PORPE technique, the highest score for posttest was 80 and the lowest score was 56 and the average score was 72.36 with standard deviation of 9.621. In the second experimental group which is used QtA technique, the highest score for posttest was 92 and the lowest score was 52 and the average score was 72.00 with standard deviation 10.327. In the control group, the highest score of the posttest obtained by the students was 72 and the lowest score was 36 and the average score was 55.20 with standard deviation 9.237. The result of posttest of each group is presented in Table 3.

Table 3
The Results of Posttest Scores

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics
First Experimental Group	25	56	80	72.3600	9.62150
Second Experimental Group	25	52	92	72.0000	10.32796
Control Group	25	36	72	55.2000	9.23760

Based on the results obtained from posttest in the first experimental group which was used PORPE technique there were sixteen percent of students (four students) in the category of very good, sixty eight percent of students (seventeen students) in the category of good, sixteen percent of students (four students) in the category of fair, and none of them were in the category of poor and very poor. From the second experimental group which was used QtA technique there were sixteen percent of students (four students) in the category of very good, eighty four percent of students (twenty one students) in the category of good,

sixteen percent of students (four students) in the category of fair, and none of the students were in the category of poor and very poor. Meanwhile, in the control group there were twenty eight percent of students (seven students) in the category of good, sixty eight percent of students (seventeen students) in the category of fair, four percent of student (one student) in the category of very poor, and none of students were in the category of poor. The distribution of posttest scores for the first, the second experimental group and the control group is presented in Table 4.

Table 4
The Distribution of Posttest Scores for the First, the Second Experimental Group,
and the Control Group

Score Interval	Criteria	Posttest		
		1st experimental group	2nd experimental group	Control group
81-100	Very Good	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	0 (0%)
61-80	Good	17 (68%)	21 (84%)	7 (28%)
41-60	Fair	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	17 (68%)
21-40	Poor	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (12%)
0-20	Very Poor	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (4%)

The Analysis Using One-way ANOVA

Before analyzing the result of pretest and posttest scores, the normality, the homogeneity, and the man differences of all groups should be found by using one-way ANOVA method. The Table 5 below is presented the test normality of the data of pretest and posttest scores.

Table 5
The Test Normality of the Data of Pretest and Posttest Scores

	Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.
1st exp pretest	.945	25	.195
1st exp posttest	.956	25	.334
2nd exp pretest	.933	25	.101
2nd exp posttest	.963	25	.485
Control pretest	.965	25	.517
Control posttest	.947	25	.213

The Saphiro-Wilk test of the pretest of the first experimental group using PORPE technique showed that significance was 0.195 since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal. Then, The Saphiro-Wilk test of the posttest of the first experimental group using PORPE technique showed that significance was 0.334 since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal.

The Saphiro-Wilk test of the pretest of the first experimental group using QtA technique showed that significance was 0.101since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal. Then, The Saphiro-Wilk test of the posttest of the first experimental group using

QtA technique showed that significance was 0.485 since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal.

The Saphiro-Wilk test of the pretest of the control group using conventional way showed that significance was 0.517 since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal. Then, The Saphiro-Wilk test of the posttest of the first experimental group using conventional way showed that significance was 0.213 since it was higher than 0.05, so it could be concluded that the data obtained were considered normal.

The test of homogeneity of variances showed that the significant was 0.842. Since it was higher than the alpha level of 0.05 it meant that

the variance of every treatment was homogenous.

The Results of Students' Reading Achievements among Group

Based on the obtained data listed in Table 6, the result of one-way ANOVA analysis showed that F_{value} was 25.338 with significant 0.000. Since F_{value} (25.338) was higher than F_{value} (2.07), so it meant that mean of each group was significantly different. There was significant difference among the means of six sets of scores, i.e, pretest in the first experimental group, pretest in the second experimental group, pretest in the control group, posttest in the first experimental group, posttest in the second experimental group, posttest in the control group. It was proved by one-way ANOVA calculation that p_{value} (0.00) less than $α_{value}$ (0.05). The significant level between groups was 0.00 and the significant level was lower than 0.05. It meant that there was a significant difference in reading achievement among the students thought through the techniques of PORPE and QtA and that of those who were not.

Table 6
The Results of One-Way ANOVA

Score	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	4806.960	2	2403.480	25.338	.000
Within Groups	6829.760	72	94.858		
Total	11636.720	74			

The Results of Students' Reading Achievements Difference of each Group

The comparison between pretest scores and posttest scores in the first experimental group showed that both sets of scores were significantly different. It referred that the samples made progress after they were given some treatments in the form of teaching reading through PORPE technique. It can be seen that p_{value} (0.00) was lower than α_{value} (0.05).

It was also identified that there was significant difference between pretest and posttest scores in the second experimental group. Since p_{value} (0.00) was lower than α_{value} (0.05), so it confirmed that teaching reading through peer QtA technique also effectively increased the student's reading achievement. Since

the significant level of all groups were lower than α_{value} (0.05). it meant that the techniques of PORPE and QtA were effective in improving students reading achievement. H_a was accepted.

Finally, there was difference in control group. However, it was not significantly. Since p_{value} (0.91) was higher than α_{value} (0.05), so it was inferred that the students, in control group did not increase the reading achievement significantly as shown in Table 7. Moreover, to observe which more effective-PORPE technique, QtA technique, there was no statistical evidence showed the difference. There was no significant difference between first (PORPE) and second (QtA) groups achievement. So, the treatments given to the three groups were similarly effective. They could increase the

students' reading achievement.

Table 7
The Summary of Multiple Comparisons of Pretest Scores as the Result of ANOVA Calculation

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Pretest in the first experimental Group (PORPE)	Posttest in the first experimental Group (PORPE)	-12.520*	2.524	.000	-19.81	-5.23
Pretest in the second experimental group (QtA)	Posttest in the second experimental group (QtA)	-10.720*	2.524	.001	-18.01	-3.43
Pretest in the control group	Pretest in the control group	-2.560	2.524	.913	-9.85	4.73

The writer also compared the mean difference of the result of the posttest of each group. Based on the findings, it was found that the mean differences between posttest in the first and in the second experimental groups were 0.36 at significant level 1.00. The mean difference between posttest in the first and the control group were 17.16 at significant level 0.00. Based on the data, it showed that there were differences among the result of the posttest of the groups but they were not significantly difference.

The mean difference between posttest in the second and in the first experimental groups were 0.36 at significant level 1.00. The mean difference between posttest in the second and the control group were 16.80 at significant level 0.00. Based on the data, it showed that there were differences among the result of the posttest of the groups but they were not significantly difference.

The mean difference between posttest in the control and in the first experimental groups were 17.16 at

significant level 0.00. The mean difference between posttest in the control and in the second experimental groups were 16.80 at significant level 0.00. Based on the data above, it showed that there was significantly difference among the result of the posttest of the groups.

Table 8
The Summary of Multiple Comparison of Posttest Scores
as the Result of ANOVA Calculation Multiple Comparisons

(I) Group	(J) Group	Mean differencce (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Posttest in the first experimental Group (PORPE)	Posttest in the second experimental Group (QtA)	.360	2.524	1.000	-6.93	7.65
	Posttest in the control group	17.160[*]	2.524	.000	9.87	24.45
Posttest in the second experimental group (QtA)	Posttest in the first experimental Group (PORPE)	-.360	2.524	1.000	-7.65	6.93
	Posttest in the control group	16.800[*]	2.524	.000	9.51	24.09
Posttest in the control group	Posttest in the first experimental group (PORPE)	-17.160[*]	2.524	.000	-24.45	-9.87
	Posttest in the first experimental group (QtA)	-16.800[*]	2.524	.000	-24.09	-9.51

Based on the result of the study, the following interpretations are presented to strengthen the value of the study.

The finding showed evidences that there were significantly difference from the total scores of pretests to posttests in the first and the second groups. This happened because the students did not have the prior knowledge of reading persuasive text although they were a student of senior high school. This was also because they did not have a

motivation in reading. They just read the text and answer some questions without knowing the content of the persuasive text comprehensively. The students were exposed to read persuasive text through the techniques of PORPE and QtA, their reading achievements were improved significantly.

In contrast, the finding showed evidences that there were no significantly difference from the total scores of pretests and posttests in control group. This might be the students did not have good prior knowledge of reading persuasive text and they did not expose to read through some techniques.

The finding showed evidences that there were no significantly difference from the total of posttests in the first and second experimental groups. It inferred that the techniques

of PORPE (Predict, Organize, Rehearse, Practice, Evaluate) and QtA (Questioning the Author) were effective in improving the students' reading achievement. The writer assumed that this improvement because these two techniques were very appropriate to be used in reading especially reading persuasive text. These techniques were engage students to think critically toward the text and they tried to find the author's message from the text then they performed it with their way. These techniques also engage the students to dig much actual information from the text since persuasive included the actual facts. In other words, these two techniques were very suitable for senior high school and college students who wanted to sharpen their critical thinking.

In contrast, the finding showed evidences that there were differences among those groups. This might be because the students in control group did not expose to read persuasive text through PORPE and QtA techniques. Moreover, the students were accustomed to doing the work sheet given by their English teacher for English lesson. The teacher only asked the students to read it then answered some questions related to the text without exposing them to some techniques. This situation made the students did not feel excited in reading and directly got bored since they would only read and answer the questions.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the data, it could be concluded that the exposing of writing by using the techniques of PORPE and QtA were effective in improving the students' reading achievement especially in reading persuasive text. Most of the students in the two experimental groups had better improvement and were active in reading persuasive text using the techniques: PORPE and QtA. These two techniques were very suitable to be used in reading especially reading persuasive text. These techniques were also engage students to think critically toward the text and they tried to find the author's message from the text then they performed it with their way. In addition, these techniques also encourage the students to explore actual facts information from the persuasive text so that their critical thinking can be increased.

REFERENCES

Abidin, Y. (2012.) *Pembelajaran membaca berbasis*

pendidikan karakter. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Antonacci, P. A & O'Callaghan, C. M. (2011). Developing Content Area Literacy. London: SAGE Publication, Inc.

Arikunto. (2010). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu pendekatan praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Baleghizadeh. (2011). Training in Questioning the Author Technique on EFL Reading Comprehension. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences 29,1668-1676.*

Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., Hamilton, R.L., & Kucan, L. (1997). *Questioning the author: An approach for enhancing student engagement with text.* Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Doug, B. (2009). *Classroom strategies for interactive learning.* Chicago:International Reading Association, Inc.

Farell, T.S.C. (2009). *Teaching reading to English language learners: A natural approach.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Ghazali. (2013). *Pembelajaran keterampilan berbahasa dengan pendekatan komunikatif-interaktif.* Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Iskandarwassid & Sunendar, D. (2009). *Strategi pembelajaran bahasa*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Nurhadi. (2008). *Membaca cepat dan efektif :* Teori dan Latihan. Malang: Sinar Baru.

Parris, S. et, al. (2009). Adolescent Literary. Chicago: International Reading Association, Inc.

Rahim, F. (2008). *Pengajaran Membaca di Sekolah Dasa*r. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Reading Rockets. (2017). *Question the author.* Retrieved July 3rd, 2017 from http://www.readingrockets.org /strategies/question_the_autho r .

Regina. (2008). *Paragraf persuasi*. Retrieved July 3rd, 2017 from http://wbsiteasyik.blogspot.co m/2008/11/paragraf persuasi.htm.

Republika (2014). *Literasi Indonesia sangat rendah.* Retrieved July 3, 2017 from m.repulika.co.id.

Sawali. (2007). *Paragraf persuasi*. Retrieved July 4th, 2017 from http://sawali.info/diskusi- kelompokterbimbing-model- tutor-sebaya/paragraf - persuasi.

Sinaga, D.S. & C Sibarani, B. (2013). *The Effect of Applying Predict, Organize,Rehearse, Practice, Evaluate (PORPE)*

Strategy on Students' Reading Comprehension. Retrieved June 28th, 2017 from jurnal.unimed.ac.id>jelt>article>view.

Simpson, Michele L. (2007). "PORPE: A Study Strategy for Learning on the Content Areas". University of Georgia. Retrieved February 4th, 2017 from http://www.kendallhunt.com/countentrealiteracy/Articles/Simpson.pdf.

Sugiyono. (2010). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif,kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Suyono, M. Muslich. (2010). *Aneka model pembelajaran membaca dan menulis*. Malang: A3 (Asih Asah Asuh).

Zuchdi, Darmiyati. (2008). *Strategi meningkatkan kemampuan membaca peningkatan komprehensi*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press