



The Effect of Teaching by using Interactive Approach on the students Reading ability (Experimental Research to Tenth Grade Students of Madrasah Aliyah Swasta Gp. Teungoh Langsa Municipality, Aceh Province, Indonesia)

Baihaqi and Kamalul Ikhsan

Department English Language , University of Samudra, Aceh Province , Indonesia.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 3 October 2016;

Received in revised form:

14 November 2016;

Accepted: 28 November 2016;

Keywords

Teaching,
Interactive Approach,
Reading Ability.

ABSTRACT

This research deals with the effect of teaching by using Interactive Approach on the students' reading ability. The objective of the research is to investigate the effect of applying Interactive Approach on the students' reading ability. The sample of this study was 32 students. This study was conducted with an experimental research. The researcher took 1 class of Grade X Students of Madrasah Aliyah Swasta Gp. Teungoh Langsa Municipality as the sample and the class was divided into two treatments. The first treatment was the control group and the second treatment was the experimental group. The experimental group was taught by applying Interactive Approach, and the control group was taught by applying Conventional Approach. The instrument for collecting the data was objective test and essay test. To obtain the reliability of the test, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment formula. The result of the study showed that the reliability of the test was 0.57. The data were analyzed by using t-test formula. The analysis showed that the scores of the students of the experimental group were significantly higher than the scores of the students in the control group at the level significance 0.05 with the degree of freedom (*df*) 60 at the level of significance 0.05, it was found out that t_{observed} value 4.725 > t_{table} value 3.460. Therefore, the hypothesis that Interactive Approach significantly affects the students' reading ability is accepted.

© 2016 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

A. Background of Research

Language has a very important function in the process of communication. It is used as a system to express meanings, ideas, thoughts, and etc. language is also a complex cognitive skill, developing through a series of stages, which requires extensive practice and feedback in order to operate at an autonomous level. Language proficiency can be describe as a procedural knowledge and the use of learning strategies is also a part of procedural knowledge, learning is an active and in fact an interactive process. Second language acquisition can be understood adequately only with reference to the interaction between language and cognition. Language is important and useful for people around the world. English as an international language has played a very important role in the era of globalization. It is an international language used in a global setting.

Based on Yoosabai, (2009:65) explains "In Indonesia, English is taught as a foreign language and the purpose of learning English is for communication". There are four language skills that should be well- mastered by students in order that they are able to communicate well in English, namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. It is obvious that the four language skills are of equal importance. Reading is to widen one's horizon because through it much information and knowledge can be absorbed and in turn will increase one's knowledge.

According to (Grabe and Stoller, 2002:89) defines "Reading is regarded as the most vital and necessary for students in both classroom context and an extracurricular environment." Reading is necessary because it seems to be common source to achieve and develop learners' knowledge and skills. Meanwhile Ozckus, (2003:103) states "They may complete a reading assignment and not even realize that they had problems understanding the text." In fact, many Indonesian students are still having difficulties to find the main ideas and supporting ideas in a text or paragraph. Likewise, they are unfamiliar with synonym in text.

Clark (2003:22) say "the fundamental function of language is for communication. It means that language is used by the speaker/writer to express ideas, feelings, and desires, and to get information from other people." According to Brown (2001:102) states "There are many definitions of reading ability." He states that reading ability is primarily a matter of developing appropriate efficient ability strategies for the majority of second language learners who are already literate in their native language. Grabe and Stoller (2002: 17) also states "reading ability is a crucial skill for all of students to master, especially in today's world of heavy standardized testing". They define reading ability as the ability of understanding and interpreting information a text correctly. The purpose is to get meaning from the written text.

In addition, Alexander (1988 in Nasution, 2009:20) state "successful ability involves the reader's discovering meaning need to achieve the particular purposes set for by him.

It may finding a particular piece of information, solving a problem through reading, working to understand an idea, or following a set of directions.”

Reading ability requires effective and efficient reading ability. Grabe and Stoller (2002: 17) state “there are several processes which are involved in effective reading ability.” First is interactive process. In the interactive process, linguistic information from the text will be related to the information activated by reader’s long term memory as prior knowledge. Second is strategic process. In the strategic process, the reader hopefully will be able to read flexibility in line with changing purposes and at the same times ongoing monitoring development in their ability in comprehending the text. And the last is evaluation process. The reader will also deal with the evaluation process means that they should decide which of the information on the text is important or not.

Not just effective reading, reader also need efficient reading to obtain satisfactory results in reading. Based on Nuttall, (2000:50) says “The first requirement for efficient reading is to know what you want from reading: then you judge your success according to how well and how fast you achieve it.” Nasution, (2009:26) explains “reading ability, readers understand as much as possible the message that the writer puts into a text, a reader is not just saying the words, but moreover they is able to identify the main idea. Therefore, when they reads, he/she recognize the words and attaches meaning to them.”

According to Berry (2005:66) explains “there are three levels of ability which can allow reader access to information when they are trying to build their understanding.” The first level of ability can be called the literal level. In this level, readers are able to remember and answer questions based on what is actually stated in text and just could memorize the information like dates or specific facts what is actually stated. The second level of ability is called the interpretive level. At interpretive level, reader are attempting to understand what the author meant by what they said in the story, paragraph or textbook. The reader must be able to draw inferences, tap into background knowledge or experience. The third level of ability is called the applied level. Applied level is taking what was said (literal) and then what was meant by what was said (interpretative) and then extend (apply) the concepts or ideas beyond the situation. It means that reader have already reached the previous two levels. In this level, reader is analyzing or synthesizing information and applying it to other information.

Based on the explanation above, reading ability level should be viewed as guide for teacher in specifying activities which are aimed at certain ability outcomes, identifying ability task that increase students’ chance of success, and structuring questions and activities to identify the appropriate level of structure and the degree of direct instruction.

The following presents some definitions about reading:

1)Reading is defined as a complex system of deriving meaning from print that requires all of the following:

- The skills and knowledge to understand how phonemes, or speech sounds, are connected to print
- The ability to decode unfamiliar words
- The ability to read fluently
- Sufficient background information and vocabulary to foster reading
- The development of appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print
- The development and maintenance of a motivation to read.

2)Reading is the process of constructing meaning from written text. It is complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information (Anderson et. Al. 2000).

3)Reading is the process of constructing meaning through the dynamic interaction among: (1) the reader’s existing knowledge; (2) the information suggested by the text being read; and (3) the context of the reading situation (Wixson, Peters, 2000: 33, citing the new definition of reading for Michigan).

4)Reading is a process, reading is strategic, reading is interactive, and reading instruction requires orchestration (Klein, Peterson, Simington, 2001: 34).

According to Olson & Burns (2005:5) ability is the ability to understand and apply reading material. When the students can get ability from the text, they understand the message of the text. According to Peterson (2001: 56) ability is “the capacity for understanding fully; the act or action of grasping with the intellect”. Webster also tells us that reading is to receive or take in the sense of (as letters or symbols) by scanning; to understand the meaning of written or printed matter; to learn from what one has seen or found in writing or printing.

Kustaryo (2000:32) states “reading is one of the most important skills besides listening, speaking and writing.” Further in K13 (Kurikulum 2013) of senior high School Level states that there are four language skills that should be achieved in learning process namely listening, speaking, reading and writing. Reading is one of the four skills that must be mastered. It states that the students are intended to comprehend the text. Reading ability problem, lack of prior knowledge in word recognition, new word recognition, the language system, students’ and teachers’ factor.” Reading ability can be defined as the level of understanding of passage or text. For normal reading rates (around 200-220 words per minute) an acceptable level of ability is above 75%. The goal of reading is constructing meaning in response to text. It requires interactive use of graph phonic, syntactic, and semantic cues to construct meaning. Zuwoski (2002:1) says “reading is a personal interaction, like conversation, between a reader and words on a page.”

According to Carrell (2004:14) explains “‘reading’ must employ memory; it must hold an image, briefly store information, and retain knowledge and understanding.” In other words it can be said that reading is an active cognitive process or interacting with print and monitoring ability to establish meaning. The readers use their brain to process information. It decides what task it must handle, what information is available, what strategies it must employ, which input channels to use, where to seek information. The brain seeks to maximize information it acquires and minimize effort and energy used to acquire. Reading can be seen as an “interactive” process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or (reading fluency). In this process, the reader interacts dynamically with the text as he/she tries to elicit the meaning and where various kinds of knowledge are being used: linguistic or systemic knowledge (through bottom-up processing) as well as schematic knowledge (through top-down processing). Since reading is a complex process, Grabe (2002:379) argues “many researchers attempt to understand and explain the fluent reading process by analyzing the process into a set of component skills” in reading; consequently researchers proposed at least six general component skills and knowledge areas:

1. Automatic recognition skills
2. Vocabulary and structural knowledge
3. Formal discourse structure knowledge
4. Content/world background knowledge
5. Synthesis and evaluation skills/strategies
6. Metacognitive knowledge and skills monitoring

According to Nits (2001:26) there are three steps to be followed to focus readers' attention to the reading, such as: (1) predicting the contents through analyzing the topic, (2) focus on the reading to find the answers to their prediction, and (3) reread the text to get deeper ability. Therefore, it is clear that one can comprehend reading text well if one can interact with

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-Test
Experimental	√	Interactive Approach	√
Control	√	Conventional Approach	√

te writer of the text. The information above inspired the researcher to study the effect of interactive Approach on the students' reading ability achievement. There are many factors which make reading ability cannot be achieved. Some of them are motivation, concentration, lack of vocabulary, the difficulty of structure, and the teaching method. Conventional Approach will not enable the students to achieve reading ability to the utmost because the students do not interact actively with the text. Interactive Approach will lead the students to interact with the text, and therefore they will understand what they read. For this instances, the researcher intends to conduct research with entitle "The Effect of Teaching by Using Interactive on the Students Reading Comprehension (An experimental Research to Tenth Grade Students Madrasah Aliyah Swasta Gp Teungoh, Academic Year 2015-2016, Langsa Municipality, Aceh Province, Indonesia)"

B. Problem of Research

The problem of the study is formulated as follows: "How does Interactive Approach significantly affect the students' reading

ability to tenth grade students of Madrasah Aliyah Swasta Gp. Teungoh Academic Year 2015/2016?"

C. Purpose of the Research

In relation to the research problem, the purpose of the research is to find out the significant effect of Interactive Approach in teaching reading toward the students' reading ability to the tenth grade students of Madrasah Aliyah Swasta Gp. Teungoh Academic Year 2015-2016?"

D. Method of the Research

In order to know the effect of Interactive Approach, the sample is treated into two times: the first times, the control group is thought by using conventional method and the second times the same class is conducted by using interactive approach that is called the experimental group. The design can be figured out as per as mentioned by Suharsimi (2001: 43)

The population is divided into two groups: Experimental and Control groups.

1. Experimental group is taught by using Interactive Approach, whereas the control group is taught by using conventional strategy.

2. Both groups are given pre-test and post-test.

The data is collected by using objectives test and essay test. The reason for choosing the objective test because:

1. It is effective for measuring.
2. Objective scoring which is quick, easy, and consistent.
3. It usually encourage students to develop a comprehensive knowledge of specific facts and the ability to make a fine discrimination among them. In this case, 20 objectives tests are given to the students.

E. Result

1) The total pre-test scores of experimental group ($\sum X$) = 1764 and the total post-test scores ($\sum X_1$) = 2349. The increase of the scores is 585 point or 32.14%. Here is the table:

Table 1. Experimental Group.

No.	Initial Names	Pre-test			Post-test		
		Objective	Essay	Scores	Objective	Essay	Scores
1	SRD	50	44	47	70	64	67
2	ALS	50	44	47	60	58	59
3	FMS	60	58	59	80	76	78
4	MJ	50	44	47	70	68	69
5	MI	80	74	77	100	94	97
6	ZA	70	62	66	90	92	91
7	FI	60	54	57	80	74	77
8	IS	60	52	56	90	78	84
9	AM	50	44	47	70	64	67
10	RS	60	58	59	80	78	79
11	AF	40	38	39	70	50	60
12	IR	40	34	37	70	50	60
13	WA	60	54	57	70	74	72
14	MU	60	54	57	80	80	80
15	RW	60	52	56	70	68	69
16	FQ	60	54	57	80	70	75
17	WS	50	38	44	70	62	66
18	NH	70	58	64	80	74	77
19	PR	60	54	57	70	78	74
20	FF	70	62	66	90	82	86
21	MFR	60	54	57	80	78	79
22	AS	60	58	59	70	82	76
23	TMC	60	58	59	70	82	76
24	BK	50	44	47	70	64	67
25	FR	50	44	47	60	58	59
26	MZ	50	44	47	70	58	64
27	MI	60	48	54	80	60	70
28	TFR	60	50	55	80	66	73
29	NM	50	48	49	60	62	61
30	MK	70	54	62	90	64	77
31	AV	70	62	66	90	68	79
32	AL	70	62	66	90	72	81
Total		1870	1658	$\sum X=1764$	2450	2248	$\sum X_1=2349$

2)The total pre-test scores of control group ($\sum Y$) = 1823 and the total post-test scores is 2239. The increase of the scores is 416 points or 21.52%. Here is the table:

Table 2. Control Group.

No.	Initial Names	Pre-test			Post-test		
		Objective	Essay	Scores	Objective	Essay	Scores
1	SRD	60	54	57	70	68	69
2	ALS	60	58	59	80	62	71
3	FMS	50	44	47	70	54	62
4	MJ	50	44	47	60	58	59
5	MI	60	54	57	70	64	67
6	ZA	80	74	77	90	84	87
7	FI	80	52	66	90	84	87
8	IS	60	64	62	70	62	66
9	AM	70	42	56	80	44	62
10	RS	50	44	47	60	58	59
11	AF	50	48	49	70	62	66
12	IR	60	52	56	60	60	60
13	WA	50	44	47	50	44	47
14	MU	60	54	57	80	74	77
15	RW	60	42	51	70	74	72
16	FQ	40	38	39	60	52	56
17	WS	60	48	54	70	74	72
18	NH	50	44	47	60	64	62
19	PR	60	54	57	70	74	72
20	FF	70	64	67	80	72	76
21	MFR	60	54	57	70	68	69
22	AS	60	58	59	70	78	74
23	TMC	50	44	47	60	64	62
24	BK	50	44	47	60	58	59
25	FR	60	54	57	70	64	67
26	MZ	80	74	77	80	74	77
27	MI	80	52	66	90	84	87
28	TFR	60	64	62	70	62	66
29	NM	70	42	56	80	74	77
30	MK	50	44	47	60	58	59
31	AV	50	54	52	60	64	62
32	AL	60	42	51	70	68	69
Total		1960	1686	$\sum Y=1823$	2310	2168	$\sum Y_1=2239$

3)According to Purwanto's criteria, the condition of the experimental group: 11 students (34.37%) fail in pre-test and no student (0%) fail in post-test; 12 students (33.37%) were poor in pre-test and no student (0%) were poor; 8 students (25%) were fair in pre-test and 12 students (33.37%) were fair in post-test; 1 student (3.12%) was good in pre-test and 15 students (46.87%) were good in post-test; no student (0%) was excellent in pre-test and 5 students (15.62%) were excellent in post-test.

Table 3. Tabulation of the Experimental Group

No.	Names	Pre-test	%	Status of Achievement	Post-test	%	Status of Achievement
1	SRD	47	47%	Fail	67	67	Fair
2	ALS	47	47%	Fail	59	59	Fair
3	FMS	59	59%	Poor	78	78	Good
4	MJ	47	47%	Fail	69	69	Fair
5	MI	77	77%	Good	97	97	Excellent
6	ZA	66	66%	Fair	91	91	Excellent
7	FI	57	57%	Poor	77	77	Good
8	IS	56	56%	Poor	84	84	Good
9	AM	47	47%	Poor	67	67	Fair
10	RS	59	59%	Fail	79	79	Good
11	AF	39	39%	Fair	60	60	Fair
12	IR	37	37%	Fail	60	60	Fair
13	WA	57	57%	Poor	72	72	Good
14	MU	57	57%	Poor	80	80	Good
15	RW	56	56%	Poor	69	69	Fair
16	FQ	57	57%	Poor	75	75	Good
17	WS	44	44%	Fail	66	66	Fair
18	NH	64	64%	Fair	77	77	Good
19	PR	57	57%	Poor	74	74	Good
20	FF	66	66%	Fair	86	86	Excellent
21	MFR	57	57%	Poor	79	79	Excellent
22	AS	59	59%	Poor	76	76	Good
23	TMC	59	59%	Poor	76	76	Good
24	BK	47	47%	Fail	67	67	Fair

25	FR	47	47%	Fail	59	59	Fair
26	MZ	47	47%	Fail	64	64	Fair
27	MI	54	54%	Fair	70	70	Good
28	TFR	55	55%	Poor	73	73	Good
29	NM	49	49%	Fail	61	61	Fair
30	MK	62	62%	Fair	77	77	Good
31	AV	66	66%	Fair	79	79	Good
32	AL	66	66%	Fair	81	81%	Excellent

1. Experimental Group's Pre-test
 - 11 students (34.37%) fail.
 - 12 students (37.50%) were Poor.
 - 8 students (25%) were fair.
 - 1 student (3.12%) was good.
 - 0% student was excellent.
2. Experimental Group's Post-test
 - 0% student fail.
 - 12 students (33.37%) were fair.
 - 15 students (46.87%) were good.
 - 5 students (15.62%) students were excellent

4) According to Purwanto's criteria, the condition of control group: 11 students (33.33%) fail in pre-test and 1 student (3.03%) fail in post-test; 15 students (45%) were poor in pre-test and 5 students (15.15%) were poor in post-test; 3 students (9.09%) were fair in pre-test and 14 students (42.42%) were fair in post-test; 4 students (12.12%) were good in pre-test and 8 students (24.24%) were good in post-test; no student (0%) was excellent in pre-test and 5 students (15.15%) were excellent in post-test.

Table 4. Tabulation of the Control Group.

No.	Names	Pre-test	%	Status of Achievement	Post-test	%	Status of Achievement
1	SRD	57	57%	Poor	69	69%	Fair
2	ALS	59	59%	Poor	71	71%	Good
3	FMS	47	47%	Fail	62	62%	Fair
4	MJ	47	47%	Fail	59	59%	Poor
5	MI	57	57%	Poor	67	67%	Fair
6	ZA	77	77%	Good	87	87%	Excellent
7	FI	66	66%	Good	87	87%	Excellent
8	IS	62	62%	Poor	66	66%	Fair
9	AM	56	56%	Fair	62	62%	Good
10	RS	47	47%	Fail	59	59%	Poor
11	AF	49	49%	Fail	66	66%	Fair
12	IR	56	56%	Poor	60	60%	Fair
13	WA	47	47%	Fail	47	47%	Fail
14	MU	57	57%	Poor	77	77%	Good
15	RW	51	51%	Poor	72	72%	Good
16	FQ	39	39%	Fail	56	56%	Poor
17	WS	54	54%	Poor	72	72%	Good
18	NH	47	47%	Fail	62	62%	Fair
19	PR	57	57%	Poor	72	72%	Good
20	FF	67	67%	Fair	76	76%	Excellent
21	MFR	57	57%	Poor	69	69%	Fair
22	AS	59	59%	Poor	74	74%	Good
23	TMC	47	47%	Fail	62	62%	Fair
24	BK	47	47%	Fail	59	59%	Poor
25	FR	57	57%	Poor	67	67%	Fair
26	MZ	77	77%	Good	77	77%	Excellent
27	MI	66	66%	Good	87	87%	Excellent
28	TFR	62	62%	Poor	66	66%	Fair
29	NM	56	56%	Fair	77	77%	Good
30	MK	47	47%	Fail	59	59%	Poor
31	AV	52	52%	Fail	62	62%	Fair
32	AL	51	51%	Poor	69	69%	Fair

1. Control Group's Pre-test
 - 11 students (33.33%) fail
 - 15 students (45.45%) were poor.
 - 3 students (9.09%) were fair.
 - 4 students (12.12%) were good.
 - 0% student was excellent.
2. Control Group's Post-test
 - 1 student (3.03%) fail.
 - 5 students (15.15%) were poor
 - 14 students (42.42%) were fair.
 - 8 students (24.24%) were good.
 - 5 students (15.15%) student were excellent

5) According to Harris' criteria, the condition of experimental group: 24 students (75%) were unable in pre-test and 4 students (12.50%) were unable in post-test; 8 students (25%) were able in pre-test and 28 students (87.50%) were able in post-test.

Table 5. Tabulation of the Experimental Group.

No.	Names	Pre-test	%	Status of Achievement	Post-test	%	Status of Achievement
1	SRD	47	47%	Unable	67	67	Able
2	ALS	47	47%	Unable	59	59	Able
3	FMS	59	59%	Unable	78	78	Able
4	MJ	47	47%	Unable	69	69	Able
5	MI	77	77%	Able	97	97	Able

6	ZA	66	66%	Able	91	91	Able
7	FI	57	57%	Unable	77	77	Able
8	IS	56	56%	Unable	84	84	Able
9	AM	47	47%	Unable	67	67	Able
10	RS	59	59%	Able	79	79	Able
11	AF	39	39%	Unable	60	60	Unable
12	IR	37	37%	Unable	60	60	Unable
13	WA	57	57%	Unable	72	72	Able
14	MU	57	57%	Unable	80	80	Able
15	RW	56	56%	Unable	69	69	Able
16	FQ	57	57%	Unable	75	75	Able
17	WS	44	44%	Unable	66	66	Able
18	NH	64	64%	Able	77	77	Able
19	PR	57	57%	Unable	74	74	Able
20	FF	66	66%	Able	86	86	Able
21	MFR	57	57%	Unable	79	79	Able
22	AS	59	59%	Unable	76	76	Able
23	TMC	59	59%	Unable	76	76	Able
24	BK	47	47%	Unable	67	67	Able
25	FR	47	47%	Unable	59	59	Able
26	MZ	47	47%	Unable	64	64	Unable
27	MI	54	54%	Unable	70	70	Able
28	TFR	55	55%	Unable	73	73	Able
29	NM	49	49%	Unable	61	61	Unable
30	MK	62	62%	Able	77	77	Able
31	AV	66	66%	Able	79	79	Able
32	AL	66	66%	Able	81	81%	Able

1. The Result of Pre-test

- 24 students (75%) were unable.
- 8 students (25%) were able.

2. The Result of Post-test

- 4 students (12.50%) were unable.
- 28 students (87.50%) were able.

6) According to Harris' criteria, the condition of control group: 29 students (87.87%) were unable in pre-test and 11 students (33.33%) were unable in post-test; 4 students (12.13%) were able in pre-test and 22 students (66.64%) were able in post test.

Table 6. Tabulation of the Control Group.

No.	Names	Pre-test	%	Status of Achievement	Post-test	%	Status of Achievement
1	SRD	57	57%	Unable	69	69%	Able
2	ALS	59	59%	Unable	71	71%	Able
3	FMS	47	47%	Unable	62	62%	Unable
4	MJ	47	47%	Unable	59	59%	Unable
5	MI	57	57%	Unable	67	67%	Able
6	ZA	77	77%	Able	87	87%	Able
7	FI	66	66%	Able	87	87%	Able
8	IS	62	62%	Unable	66	66%	Able
9	AM	56	56%	Able	62	62%	Able
10	RS	47	47%	Unable	59	59%	Able
11	AF	49	49%	Unable	66	66%	Able
12	IR	56	56%	Unable	60	60%	Unable
13	WA	47	47%	Unable	47	47%	Unable
14	MU	57	57%	Unable	77	77%	Able
15	RW	51	51%	Unable	72	72%	Able
16	FQ	39	39%	Unable	56	56%	Unable
17	WS	54	54%	Unable	72	72%	Able
18	NH	47	47%	Unable	62	62%	Able
19	PR	57	57%	Unable	72	72%	Able
20	FF	67	67%	Able	76	76%	Able
21	MFR	57	57%	Unable	69	69%	Able
22	AS	59	59%	Unable	74	74%	Able
23	TMC	47	47%	Unable	62	62%	Unable
24	BK	47	47%	Unable	59	59%	Unable
25	FR	57	57%	Unable	67	67%	Able
26	MZ	77	77%	Unable	77	77%	Able
27	MI	66	66%	Unable	87	87%	Able
28	TFR	62	62%	Unable	66	66%	Able
29	NM	56	56%	Unable	77	77%	Able
30	MK	47	47%	Unable	59	59%	Unable
31	AV	52	52%	Unable	62	62%	Unable
32	AL	51	51%	Unable	69	69%	Able

1. The Result of Pre-test

2. The Result of Post-test

- 29 students (87.87%) were unable.
- 4 students (12.13%) were able.
- 11 students (33.33%) were unable.
- 22 students (66.64%) were able.

7) Mean of experimental group (M_{ex}) = 74.12 and the standard deviation (SD_{ex}) = 56.01.

Table 7. Calculation of Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) of Experimental Group.

No.	Names	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (X ₁)	Deviation (dx)	Squared of Deviation (dx ₁)
1	SRD	47	67	20	400
2	ALS	47	59	12	144
3	FMS	59	78	19	361
4	MJ	47	69	22	484
5	MI	77	97	20	400
6	ZA	66	91	25	625
7	FI	57	77	20	400
8	IS	56	84	28	784
9	AM	47	67	20	400
10	RS	59	79	20	400
11	AF	39	60	21	441
12	IR	37	60	23	529
13	WA	57	72	15	225
14	MU	57	80	23	529
15	RW	56	69	13	169
16	FQ	57	75	18	324
17	WS	44	66	22	484
18	NH	64	77	13	169
19	PR	57	74	17	289
20	FF	66	86	20	400
21	MFR	57	79	22	484
22	AS	59	76	17	289
23	TMC	59	76	17	289
24	BK	47	67	20	400
25	FR	47	59	12	144
26	MZ	47	64	17	289
27	MI	54	70	16	256
28	TFR	55	73	18	324
29	NM	49	61	12	144
30	MK	62	77	15	225
31	AV	66	79	13	169
32	AL	66	81	15	225
Total		ΣX=1764	ΣX ₁ =2349	Σdx=585	Σdx ₁ =342225

1. Calculation of Mean (M) of Experimental Group

$$M_{ex} = \frac{\sum X_1}{N}$$

$$M_{ex} = \frac{2349}{32}$$

$$M_{ex} = 73.41$$

2. Calculation of Standard Deviation (SD) of Experimental Group

$$SD_{ex} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum dx_1}{N}}$$

$$SD_{ex} = \sqrt{\frac{342225}{32}}$$

$$SD_{ex} = \sqrt{10694.53}$$

$$SD_{ex} = 3 \times 103.4$$

$$SD_{ex} = 310.2$$

8) Mean of control group (M_{con}) = 66.54 and the standard deviation (SD_{con}) = 38.53.

Table 8. Calculation of Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) of Control Group

No.	Names	Pre-test (Y)	Post-test (Y ₁)	Deviation (dy)	Squared of Deviation (dy ₁)
1	SRD	57	69	12	144
2	ALS	59	71	12	144
3	FMS	47	62	15	225
4	MJ	47	59	12	144
5	MI	57	67	10	100
6	ZA	77	87	10	100
7	FI	66	87	21	441

8	IS	62	66	4	16
9	AM	56	62	6	36
10	RS	47	59	12	144
11	AF	49	66	17	289
12	IR	56	60	4	16
13	WA	47	47	0	0
14	MU	57	77	20	400
15	RW	51	72	21	441
16	FQ	39	56	17	289
17	WS	54	72	18	324
18	NH	47	62	15	225
19	PR	57	72	15	225
20	FF	67	76	9	81
21	MFR	57	69	12	144
22	AS	59	74	15	225
23	TMC	47	62	15	225
24	BK	47	59	12	144
25	FR	57	67	10	100
26	MZ	77	77	0	0
27	MI	66	87	21	441
28	TFR	62	66	4	16
29	NM	56	77	21	441
30	MK	47	59	12	144
31	AV	52	62	10	100
32	AL	51	69	18	324
Total		$\Sigma Y_1=1823$	$\Sigma Y_2=2239$	$\Sigma dy=416$	$\Sigma dy^2=6344$

1. Calculation of Mean (M) of Control Group

$$M_{ex} = \frac{\Sigma Y_1}{N}$$

$$M_{ex} = \frac{2239}{33}$$

$$M_{ex} = 67.85$$

2. Calculation of Standard Deviation (SD) of Control Group

$$SD_c = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma dy_1^2}{N}}$$

$$SD_c = \sqrt{\frac{6344}{33}}$$

$$SD_c = \sqrt{192.24}$$

$$SD_c = 13.86$$

$$SD_c = 41.58$$

In order to find out the reliability of the test, the writer used Pearson Product Formula. The calculation of reliability can be shown as in the following:

$$R = \frac{N(\Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{[N(\Sigma X^2) - (\Sigma X)^2][N(\Sigma Y^2) - (\Sigma Y)^2]}}$$

$$R = \frac{30(154525) - (2140)(2150)}{\sqrt{[30(154750) - (4579600)][30(156050) - (46225000)]}}$$

$$R = \frac{4635750 - 460100}{\sqrt{[4642500 - 4579600][4681500 - 46225000]}}$$

$$R = \frac{34750}{\sqrt{[30(154750) - (4579600)][30(156050) - (46225000)]}}$$

$$R = \frac{34750}{\sqrt{(62900)(59000)}}$$

$$R = \frac{34750}{\sqrt{(3711100000)}}$$

$$R = \frac{34750}{60918.7}$$

$$R = 0.57$$

The value of coefficient correlation was categorized in the following criteria (Purwanto's, 2001:144):

0.00 – 0.20	= no correlation
0.21 – 0.40	= low
0.41 – 0.70	= sufficient
0.71 – 0.90	= high
0.91 – 1.00	= very high.

The result of testing the reliability is 0.57. It means that the reliability of the test is sufficient. To know the difference effect between experimental and control groups, the researcher used the t-test formula (Dirgayasa, 2005:57) as follow as:

$$t = \frac{M_{Ex} - M_{Con}}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma d_{x1} - \Sigma d_{y1}}{N_{Ex} + N_{Con} - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{N_{Ex}} + \frac{1}{N_{Con}}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{74.12 - 66.54}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{11157 - 5523}{32 + 33 - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{32} + \frac{1}{33}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{7.58}{\sqrt{(89.43)(0.031)}}$$

$$t = \frac{7.58}{\sqrt{(2.77)}}$$

$$t = \frac{7.58}{1.60}$$

$$t = 4.725$$

From the degree of freedom of 60 at the level of significance 0.05, it was found out that $t_{observed}$ value 4.725 > t_{table} value 3.460.

F. Conclusion

The result showed that the mean of experimental group is higher than that of control group. As shown by the calculation t-test presented, the result of t_{obs} (4.725) is higher than t_{table} (3.460). This means that the hypothesis stating that Interactive Approach significantly affects the students' reading ability is accepted. The finding showed that teaching by applying Interactive Approach is significantly effect students' ability

References

Anderson. 2000. *Approach, Method, and Technique in Teaching as a Second Language*. New York: Mc Grow-Hill.

Arikunto, S. 1998. *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Berry. 2005. *Research in Education*. 7th New Delhi: Prentice Hall.

Brown, D .2001. *Teaching by Principles (second edition)*. San Francisco State University: Longman Publihers, Inc.

Burns and Olson. 2005. *Teaching Reading in Today's Elementary School*. Knoxville: University of Tenesse.

Carrel. 2004. *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. New York: Prentice-Hall.

Clark . 2003. *Educational Research: An Introduction*. Boston: Longman.

Grabe, William and Stoller, Fredricka. 2002 *.Teaching and Researching Reading*. England. Longman.

Hornby, A.S. 2001. *Oxford Advance Learners Dictionary of Current English*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Klein, Peterson, Simington. 2001. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kustaryo. 2000. *English in Context. Developing Competencies in English*. Jakarta: Grafindo Media Pratama.

Nasution, Fatimah. 2009. *The Implementation of Reciprocal Strategy in Teaching Reading Narrative Texts: (An Experimental Study at An Islamic Senior High School (MAN) in Medan)*. UPI: Unpublished Thesis.

Nits, L.S. and William Diehl. 2001. *Developing Text Book Thinking: Strategies for Success in College*. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company.

Nuttal, Christine. 2000. *Teaching Reading Skill in a Foreign Language*. Heinemann: The Bath Press.

Ozckus. 2003. *Interactive Approach to Second Language Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wixson, Peter. 2001. *Developing Reading Skills for EFL Students*. Michigan: Merril.

Yoosabai. 2009. *Levels of Reading Ability*. Available at <http://www.sc4.edu/documents/studyskills/h7levelsreadingcomp.doc>. Last Accessed March, 25th 2016

Zukowski, J.,Faust Susan, S. Johnson, and Elizabeth E. Templin 2002. In *Contect: Developing Academic Reading Skills*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle, Thomson Learning Inc.