# THE EFFECT OF USING FRAYER MODEL IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION AT THE FIRST GRADE OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 BENAI DISTRICT KUANTAN SINGINGI REGENCY

By

**RAJA KIKI TRI GUSTI**

**NIM. 10714000112**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING**

**STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU**

**PEKANBARU**

**1433 H/2012 M**

# THE EFFECT OF USING FRAYER MODEL IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION AT THE FIRST GRADE OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 BENAI DISTRICT KUANTAN SINGINGI REGENCY

A thesis

Submitted in Partial Satisfaction of Requirement

For the Bachelor Degree in Education

(S.Pd.)



**By**

**RAJA KIKI TRI GUSTI**

**NIM. 10714000112**

**DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH EDUCATION**

**FACULTY OF EDUCATION AND TEACHER TRAINING**

**STATE ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF SULTAN SYARIF KASIM RIAU**

**PEKANBARU**

**1433 H/2012 M**

# ABSTRAK

**Raja Kiki Tri Gusti (2011) :**"Dampak Penggunaan Frayer Model dalam Meningkatkan Motivasi Membaca Siswa pada Kelas Satu SMPN 1 Benai Kabupaten Kuantan".

Penelitian ini mempunyai tiga rumusan masalah yaitu; peningkatan motivasi membaca siswa dengan menggunakan frayer model, peningkatan motivasi membaca siswa tanpa menggunakan frayer model dan apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan antara motivasi membaca siswa yang di ajar dengan menggunakan frayer model dan siswa tanpa menggunakan frayer model.

Penelitian dilaksanakan di SMPN 1 Benai. Ini dilaksanakan pada tanggal 20 Juli s/d 11 Agustus 2011. Jumlah populasi dari penelitian ini adalah 74 siswa dari 3 kelas dan sampelnya berjumlah 48 siswa dari 2 kelas karena jenis penelitian yang digunakan adalah penelitian quasi-eksperimental *(random sampling)*.

Dalam pengumpulan data, penulis menggunakan observasi dan angket, observasi digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data dari penggunaan frayer model dan angket digunakan untuk mengumpulkan data tentang motivasi membaca siswa. Ada dua macam angket: *Pretest* digunakan untuk menentukan motivasi membaca siswa sebelum mendapatkan perlakuan dan *posttest* digunakan untuk menentukan motivasi membaca siswa setelah mendapatkan perlakuan. Untuk mengetahui perbedaan yang signifikan antara motivasi membaca siswa dalam yang di ajar dengan menggunakan frayer model dan siswa yang di ajar tanpa menggunakan frayer model, maka nilai yang diperoleh dianalisis menggunakan rumus T-test kemudian dibandingkan dengan T-table dengan mempertimbangkan *degree of freedom (df)*.

Berdasarkan hasil temuan penelitian, nilai dari $t_0= 3.34$ dan penulis membandingkan dengan $t_{tabel}$ pada taraf signifikan 5% dan 1%, (df = 46); 2.02 < (3.34) > 2.69. Sehingga bisa disimpulkan bahwa Ho ditolak dan Ha diterima. Bisa diartikan ada perbedaan yang signifikan pada motivasi membaca siswa antara siswa yang di ajar dengan menggunakan frayer model dan siswa yang di ajar tanpa menggunakan frayer model pada siswa kelas satu SMPN 1 Benai Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi. Dengan kata lain, terdapat dampak yang signifikan dari penggunaan frayer model terhadap motivasi membaca siswa pada siswa kelas satu SMPN 1 Benai Kabupaten Kuantan Singingi.

# ABSTRACT

**Raja Kiki Tri Gusti (2011) :** "The Effect of Using Frayer Model in Improving Students' Reading Motivation at the First Grade of SMPN 1 Benai District Kuantan Singingi Regency".

The research has three formulations of the problems that the improvement of students' reading motivation by using Frayer Model, the improvement of students' reading motivation without the use Frayer Model, and whether or not there is a significant difference of students' reading motivation between students who are taught by using frayer model and those who are without taught by use frayer model.

The research was carried out at SMPN 1 Benai. It was conducted from July 20, to August 11, 2011. The subject of the research was the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai. The population of this research was 74 students from three classes and the sample was only two classes of the total classes that consisted of 48 students, because this research was assigned by using random sampling in Quasi-Experimental research.

In collecting data, the writer used observation and questionnaire, observation was used in order to collect the data of using frayer model and questionnaire was used in order to collect the data of students' reading motivation at the first grade of SMPN 1 Benai.. The questionnaire consisted of two tests: Pretest was used to determine student's reading motivation before getting the treatment and Posttest was used to determine student's reading motivation after getting the treatment. In order to know the significant difference on students who are taught by using frayer model and those who are without taught by use frayer model, the scores were analyzed by using test "T" formula. The students' score was compared with T-table which considered with degree of freedom (df).

From the research findings, the score of $t_o = 3.34$ and the writer compared $t_{table}$ at 5% and 1%, $(df = 46)$; $2.02 < 3.34 > 2.69$. It can be concluded that $H_o$ is rejected and $H_a$ is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference of students' reading motivation between students who are taught by using frayer model and those who are without taught by use frayer model at the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai. In other words, there is a significant effect of using frayer model in improving students' reading motivation at the first grade of SMPN1 Benai District Kuantan Singingi Regency.

# LIST OF CONTENT

# LIST OF TABLE

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### A. The Background of the Problem

Reading is one of the language skills that contributes to the success of language learning. The ability to read has become an indispensable skill in students' life. In reading, we need full concentration to understand the materials.

In junior high school, reading is one of the four language skills that has a priority to be learned by the students ; they should have strong foundation for their reading skill. So, it is crucial got them the master this skill to become a skillful reader take the same kind of effort and practice[1]. They should learn how to understanding the text and practice read an English text because English is not easy as our own language.

Motivation is very important in language learning to gain the objectives of learning. The above statement indicates that motivation in learning English becomes a key factor to successful conversational ability among the students and which much influences them in learning English.

In learning reading, especially for English students, this course is intended to improve their reading skills. They have to train much on reading[2]. Therefore, students

---

[1]Rose Wassman. Lee ann Rinsky, *Effective Reading in a Changing World*. (Deanza College: Prentice Hall, 2000). pp 3

[2] Sriwulandari, Endang. *A Reading Program*. (Yogyakarta: Karnisius, 1993), pp. 3

have to motivate their reading skill if they want to improve their achievement in reading.

According Burners and Page, one of the significant sources of motivation to become a proficient talker is that he/she needs to communicate. As students become increasingly aware of communication through print, first by being read to, they increase the amount of time spent actually, and has become more proficient readers[3]. According to Penny Ur, the reader is motivated to read by interesting content or a challenging task, the order way the reader has no particular interest in reading[4].

In other words, to enable reading, the students must be involved in learning process to find effectively the information they need. Consequently, the students' motivation is quite important to make them achieve well in learning English.

Moreover, these are also suitable with the stated syllabus in School-Based Curriculum (KTSP) target as well as the target expected by the school. According to the syllabus for first grade students' of junior high school, the standard competence of learning English refers to the capability of using and comprehending sentence as well as understanding various texts (genre) with identifying the language characteristics of each genre[5].

SMPN 1 Benai is one schools using school based curriculum (KTSP) as the guide English as process of learning. It is located in Benai, Kuantan Singingi. Many

---

[3] Burners, Don, & Page, Glenda. *Insights and Strategies for Teaching Reading.* (USA Virginia: Brisbane College of Advanced Education,1985), pp. 28

[4] Penny Ur. *A Course in Language Teaching.* (New York: Cambridge University, 2003), pp. 148

[5]*Syllabus for the First Grade Students of Junior High School (KTSP)*

subjects are taught in this school. English is also taught as a main subject. English has been taught twice with duration 45 minutes for one-hour-learning process. In teaching learning process, the students have been taught many vocabularies, grammar, and genre of English text in order to make them master reading skill as one of the important skills in English. Reading in English also supplemented in this school. The students are demanded to fill the minimum score of KKM. The score of KKM is 60.

According the syllabus 2009-2010 at the first grade, the students are required to understand narrative text. Based on the standard competition, the students can understand the meaning in simple short transactional and simple short essay with narrative text for interaction in daily life. The teacher have taught English well using many strategies. But, the student still found difficulties to understand about reading motivation. The students are not only having understanding the structure of the texts but also comprehending the meaning of text implicitly. Since English is not our first language, many students still face difficulties in gathering and comprehending the ideas of reading passage. In addition, they also cannot find the topic in a paragraph and difficult to get information.

The problems of the students can be seen in the following phenomena (2010)[6]:

1. Some of the students do not know the real meaning based on the context of the English text.

2. Some of the students still have difficulties in understanding the reading text.

---

[6] Interview Data from English Teaching of SMPN 1 Benai

3.  Some of the students still use strategy of reading by reading the entire reading textbook.

4.  Some of the students need long time to understand the reading text

Basically, the problems above could result from many factors. They could derive from the teaching strategy, the students' intellectual competence themselves, or the students' socio and economic condition which force them to be lack of school facilities and eventually causes low interest of studying and low scores of English. To provide solution to these problems, the writer proposes what is called Frayer Model strategy. The teacher must train our students on the use of strategies to enhance understanding of word meaning.

To improve the students' reading motivation needs an appropriate strategy, technique, and method helping them as solution for their problems. In this case, the writer chooses Frayer Model to improve students' reading motivation because Frayer Model is excellent graphic organizers that can be used to encourage students' to learn more learn subtleties and nuances of particular words, which are reinforced by the visual organization of the information in graphic of Frayer Model. Frayer Model helps students' create a broader concept of a definition, one that encourages them to

integrate their own knowledge[7]. It also helps students develop elaborated definitions, rather than simple, one or two word descriptions.

Based on the explanation and the problem experienced by the students above, the writer is interested in conducting a research entitled: THE EFFECT OF USING FRAYER MODEL IN IMPROVING STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION AT THE FIRST GRADE OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 BENAI DISTRICT KUANTAN SINGINGI REGENCY.

## B. The Problem

### 1. The Identification of the Problem

Based on the background of the problem, it is very clear that most of the students at the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai still get some problems in their reading motivation. To make it clearer, the researcher identifies the problems as follows:

a. Why do not some of the students know the real meaning based on the context of the English text?

b. Why do some of the students still have difficulties in understanding the reading text?

c. Why do some of the students still use strategy of reading by reading the entire reading text book?

---

[7] M. C. Gore. *Successful Inclusion Strategies for Secondary and Middles School teachers; Keys of Help Struggling Learners Access the Curriculum*. (New York: Corwin Press).

d. Why some of the students need long time to understand the reading text?

## 2. The Limitation of the Problem

Because of limited time, energy, and fund, it is necessary for the writer to limit the problem. The researcher focuses this research on the effect of using frayer model in improving students reading motivation at the first grade of SMPN 1 Benai . In order to avoid misunderstanding in this research, the text used by the researcher is descriptive text.

## 3. The Formulation of the Problem

Based on the limitation of the problem above, the writer formulates the problem as follows:

1. How is the improvement of students' reading motivation taught by using Frayer Model?

2. How is the improvement of students' reading motivation without taught by use Frayer Model?

3. Is there any significant difference of students' reading motivation between students' who are taught using Frayer Model and those are without taught use Frayer Model at the first grade of SMPN 1 Benai?

**C. The Reason of Choosing the Title**

The reason why the writer is interested in carrying out a research on the topic above is based on several considerations:

1. The writer is interested in finding out ability of the students at the SMPN 1 Benai the on effect of using frayer model strategy in improving reading motivation.

2. This research is very relevant to the writer as an English student of English Department of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

3. The problems of the research are very interesting and challenging to be investigated.

**D. The Objective and Significance of the Research**

**1. The Objectives of the Research**

a. To find out the improvement of students' reading motivation by using frayer model strategy.

b. To find out the improvement students' reading motivation without the use of frayer model strategy.

c. To find out whether there is any significant difference of students' reading motivation between who are taught using frayer model and those without taught use Frayer Model at the first grade of SMPN 1 Benai.

**2. The Significance of the Research**

Related to the objectives of the research above, the significance of the research are as follows:

a. To fulfill one of requirements for the writer to complete her undergraduate degree program at English Education Department of Education and Teacher Training Faculty of State Islamic University of Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau.

b. The research findings are to give the valuable input to the teachers of English at SMPN 1 Benai especially and all English teachers generally as an attempt in improving the students' ability in reading motivation.

c. To enhance the writer's knowledge about improving students' reading motivation by using frayer model.

## E. The Need for the Study

The needs of research are as follows:

1. To give contribution to English teacher at SMPN 1 Benai about frayer model as a good strategy in teaching reading. It is an effective words instruction. Teacher can use it to assess students' understanding of the concept. Teachers can determine if students are able to correctly apply the meaning of words.

2. To help students at the second grade of SMPN 1 Benai improve their reading through frayer model. It provides students with deep understanding of words.

3. To help the writer accomplish the purpose of getting under graduate degree at English language education. In short, to help the writer complete the requirements for a graduate degree.

## F. The Definition of Terms

1. Effect

Effect is a change produced by an action or causes a result[8]. In this research, effect is defined as the result of teaching reading treated frayer model strategy.

2. Frayer Model

Frayer Model is an instructional strategy teachers would use for helping students learn new concepts through the use of attributes and nonattributes. The Frayer Model has several steps where the teacher is helping students learn a concept by giving examples and nonexamples of the concept.

3. Reading

Reading is an interactive process in which the reader engages in an exchange of ideas with an author via text[9].

4. Motivation

Motivation is the factors that determine a person's desire to do something[10]. In second language and foreign language learning consists of two type :

---

[8] Hornby,A.S. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* . (New York: Oxford University. 1995), pp. 369

[9] Burners. Don. & Page. Glenda. Op.Cit. pp. 26

a. Instrumental motivation: wanting to learn a language because it will be useful for certain "instrumental" goals.

b. Integrative motivation: wanting to learn a language in order to communicate with people of another culture who speak it.

According to Brown, motivation was examined as factor of a number as the emotions and need that constitute the source of the drive to expand effort required learning a foreign language[11].

Based on Brown statement above, motivation is an importanthing to master in foreign language. Motivation is very important for every student because it is one of the psychological factors that influences them in learning process.

---

[10] Jack c. Richard. John Platt. Heidi Platt. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*.(New York: Pearson Education, 1999), pp. 238

[11] Brown, H. Douglas. *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. (San Fransisco: Prentice Hall Regents, 1994), pp. 162

# CHAPTER II

# REVIEW OF LITERATURE

## A. The Theoretical Framework

### 1. The Nature of Motivation

Motivation is an extremely important factor in successful language acquisition[1].

Motivation can be particularly helpful to teachers who work with struggling readers[2]. Motivation is recognized as a crucial element in all learning, children need to be motivated to read and use literacy to develop into fluent readers[3]. Motivation to read is a complex construct that influences readers' choices of reading material, their willingness to engage in reading, and thus their ultimate competence in reading, especially related to academic reading task[4].

Based on the explanation above reading motivation has the potential to impact literacy achievement learning about and measuring. Reading motivation is crucial to designing interventions and measuring students' response to the interventions. To make up reading motivation such as self-efficacy, challenge,

---

[1] Chitravelu Nesamelar. Et al, *ELT Methodology Principles and Practice*.( Syah Alam: Fajar Bakti Sdn Bhd, 1995), pp. 10

[2] Dorothy s. Srtickland. Kathy Ganske & Joanne k.Monroe. *Supporting Struggling Readers and Writers: Strategies for Classrrom Intervention 3-6.* ( Portland: Stenhouse Publisher, 2006), pp. 15

[3] Ibid. pp. 16

[4] Susan Lenski & Jill Lewis. Op. Cit. pp. 43

work avoidance, intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation, social and compliance.

There are two types of motivation:

1. Extrinsic motivation

Extrinsic motivation is caused by external factors such as a desire to be assimilated into the culture of the speakers of English, the prospect of gaining entry into a college or university or getting a better paid job, a desire for praise and recognition from fellow students and teachers.

2. Intrinsic motivation

Intrinsic motivation is the keenness or desire to learn English for its own sake. For example, a student who comes into a family that has a very positive attitude towards English will also have a love for the language and will want to master it to the best of his ability.

Intrinsic motivation that is certain types of motivation occur primarily with intuitive reading processes. In contrast to intuitive reading performed under conditions of intrinsic motivation, reasoning in reading is likely to be accompanied by motivational process of self-discipline. Intuitive reading is dominated by fluent flow of basic processes.

Intrinsic motivation enables the students to learn without the need for external reinforcement[5]. Accomplished readers have already developed the

---

[5] Susan Lenski & Jill Lewis. *Reading Success for Struggling Adolescent Learners.* (New York: The Gulford Press, 2008), pp. 16

intrinsic motivation they need to read, which is reinforced by the satisfaction that reading provides. To make a reader out of struggling reader one must appreciate what good reading requires of the reader. Reading is a multifaceted skill involving highly accurate decoding, language comprehension, fluency, and interest and motivation[6].

## 2. The Nature of Reading Motivation

Reading motivation is motivational drive to read, an area of interest in the field of education. Studying and implementing the conditions under which students are motivated to read is important in the process of teaching and fostering learning.

Three broad categories in reading motivation:

1. Includes competence and efficacy beliefs:

    a. Self efficacy, the belief that one can be successful at reading

    b. Challenge, the willingness to take on difficult reading material

    c. Work avoidance, the desire to avoid reading activities

2. Concerns the purposes and goals children have for reading, whether intrinsic or extrinsic.

The intrinsic (learning) goals are:

    a. Curiosity, the desire to read about a particular topic of interest.

---

[6] Lou Denti & Gilbert Guerin. *Effective Practice for Adolescents with Reading and Literacy Challenge*. (New York: Routledge, 2008), pp. 200

b. Involvement, the enjoyment experienced from reading certain kinds of literary or informational texts.

c. Importance, the belief that reading is valuable.

The extrinsic (performance) goals are:

a. Grades, the desire to be favorably evaluated by the teacher.

b. Compettition, the desire to out perform others in reading.

3. Addresses social aspects of reading.

a. Social, the sharing of the meanings gained from reading with others.

b. Compliance, reading to meet the expectations of others.

Motivation also becomes a key to getting struggling readers to spend time actively reading[7]. We must assist students in finding materials that are of special interest to them, as the right level of difficulty and that they want to read.

## 3. Teaching Reading through Frayer Model

Frayer Model is a strategy that uses a graphic organizer for vocabulary building developed to improve students' reading through building connections of key words, students' prior knowledge and new concept from the context. Two versions of the Frayer Model can be used. The first, students' provide a definition, list characteristic, and provide examples and non-examples of the concept. The second, students' analyze a words essential and non-essential

---

[7] Karen, Tankersley. *The Threads of Reading: Strategies for Literacy Development.* (Virginia Usa:Alexandria, 2003), pp. 137

characteristic and refine their understanding by choosing examples and non-examples of the concept[8].

A persistent challenge for teachers is to encourage students to be active thinkers while the read. Active the readers make prediction about what they will be reading. Before they start, active readers have an idea of what to look for, and when they are done, they evaluate what they have learned or experienced.

Teaching by using frayer model is one of the strategies of teaching that can invite the students' interest in class; even they will feel not bored. Teaching using frayer model has several steps in which the teacher is helping students learn a concept by giving examples and non examples of the concept[9].

The steps are as follows:

1. Define the concept giving attributes of the concept.

2. Show students how this concept differs from other similar concepts (by highlighting noncritical attributes).

3. Provide examples and explain what makes these examples.

4. Provide non examples and explain what makes these non examples.

5. Provide students with examples and non examples and ask them to determine whether they are examples or non examples.

---

[8] http://www.Justreadnow.com/Bulding Vocabulary/htm
[9] Janet, Allen. *Inside Words: Tools for Teaching Academic Vocabulary, Grades 4-12.* (Portland: Stenhouse Publishers, 2007), pp. 43

Systematic reading instruction is one of the most important instructional interventions that teachers can use, particularly with low achieving students. The most effective reading instruction is the kind that also improves motivation. Word meaning instruction that helps learners fit new words into and already existing conceptual network is substantially more effective than having students look up words in a dictionary or read words in interesting and relevant context. The frayer model is one of those systematic reading instructions. It was developed to analyze and assess attainment of concepts.

The frayer models are intended to help students organize their understanding of specific words through the identification of example and non examples[10]. It is important to include both examples and non-examples so that students are able to clarify what the concept word is and what it is not.

The frayer model is especially useful in social studies for teaching reading that describes complex concepts that describes concepts students may already know but cannot yet clearly define. Using the frayer model takes a substantial amount of the teachers and students' time and effort, but it provides students with a rich understanding of important concepts.[11]

This model orders these variations in terms of difficulty. Suggestions are also provided to help match methods of reading instructions to individual

---

[10] Kathy Ganske & Douglas Fisher. Op. Cit. pp. 186
[11] Stephanie, Macecca. *Reading Strategies for Social Studies*. (New York: Shell Education, 2007)

students needs.[12] Frayer model is instructions in teaching for concept understanding. This model can be used to manipulate, expand and improve the key concept.

From the explanation above, it can be seen that Frayer Model strategy is one of the good strategy that should be considered by the teacher to be applied in the process of teaching and learning English, especially in reading subject to increase students' reading motivation.

**4. The Advantages of using Frayer Model in Teaching Reading**

There are some advantages that will be got by students through this strategy, they are:

   a. It will help students understand of new concept or word in relational approach.

   b. Students will be easy to analyze and think about attributes and non attributes of example and non-example of concept or words.

   c. It provides graphic organizer for students regarding the concept or words they are learning.

   d. It supports student learning words of a foreign language.

   e. Frayer model develops understanding of key concept.

   f. It will make visual connections and personal associations.

---

[12] Michael, Graves. *The Vocabulary Book: Learning and Instruction.* ( New York : Teachers College Press, International Reading Association, and National Council of Teachers of English, 2006) pp. 208

**5.  Teaching Procedure in Improving Students' Reading Motivation**

According to Allen, Frayer model is a word categorization activity that helps learner develop their understanding of concepts. Using the Frayer Model will help students' provide a defenition, list characteristics, and provide example and nonexample of the concept and students could analyze a words essential characteristics and noncharacteristics and refine their understanding by choosing example and nonexample of the concept[13].

The Frayer model is usually done with a critical concept that is part of a unit or theme, it is time consuming and so would usually be revisited over several days of study, when using the Frayer model the teacher is directly teaching students about the concept by providing specific attributes / nonattributes and example / nonexample to refine students' defenition of the concept.

To make it clearer, the writer would like to describe the teaching procedure of using Frayer Model as follows:

a. Teacher explains the purpose of each component of the Frayer's square to the students and Model for the class using a familiar term.

b. Teacher asks the students to assign the concept or word to be studied.

c. Teacher asks the students to may work individually or in pairs to complete the diagram with the assigned.

---

[13] Janet Allen, Op. Cit., pp. 43

d. Teacher asks the students to represen a basic level of concept development where students define the term in their own words, provide facts / characteristics about the concept, and list examples and nonexamples of it.

e. Teacher asks the students to increase the level of critical analysis by encouraging the students to delve deeper into the meaning of the concept by creating a list of essential characteristics or characteristics the concept must possess, versus a list of nonessential characteristics or characteristics the concept may possess, but does not include or exclude it from the concept.

From the explanation above, it can be seen that Frayer Model is one of the good strategies that should be considered by the teacher to be applied in the process of teaching and learning English, especially in reading subject to increase students' reading motivation.

## B. The Relevant Research

1. A research from Suyanto

According to Suyanto, there are some conclusions in his research about Effect of Frayer Model Technique to Extend Students' Vocabulary at the First Grade of SMK Perbankan Pekanbaru. He concluded that, there is no significant effect of frayer model to extend students' vocabulary at the first grade of SMK Perbankan Pekanbaru. It happened because the students used the same strategies

in learning English; furthermore the teacher seldom used the strategies to teach their students.

2. A research from Sandra Enge

According to Sandra Enge, she conduced a research entitled " The Impact of Frayer Model on Vocabulary Acquisition of Second Grade Students". He concluded that, frayer model proved to be an especially effective tool for vocabulary attainment for second graders. Then, the use of the frayer model had a positive effect on the vocabulary scores in this second grade class, frayer model has improved the scores on weekly vocabulary tests. The use of the frayer model has enhanced vocabulary, not only in reading but also across the curriculum.

The researches above give big contribution to the writers research and the writer gets much information to conduct the research. The writer takes information about the effect of using frayer model in reading. Therefore, the writer focuses on effect of using frayer model in improving students' reading motivation.

## C.  The Operational Concept

The operational concept is the concept to give explanation about theoretical framework in order to avoid misunderstanding and misinterpretation toward the research. There are two variables used in the research, they are variable X and

variable Y. Frayer Model strategy is as variable X that gives the effect on students' reading motivation as variable Y. The indicators that will be compared are about the students' reading motivation before and after being taught by Frayer Model strategy. The indicators are as follows:

**1. Variable X: The Frayer Model**

a. The teacher directly teaches students about the concept by providing specific attributes/ non attributes and examples/ non examples.

a. The teacher asks the students about the concept

b. The teacher asks the students to define concept giving attributes of the concept.

c. The teacher asks students to draw examples and non examples.

d. The teacher asks students to express the examples and non examples about the concept.

**2. Variable Y: Reading Motivation**

To know the students' reading motivation of the first grade students at SMPN 1 Benai, the writer determines some indicators for reading motivation as the following:

a. The students are able to read well have larges vocabularies.

b. The students are able to persist in reading difficult text.

c. The students are able to identify a knowledge goal and announce it.

d. The students are able to struggle with the words and decide that reading is hard work.

e. The students are able to desire to complete a task rather than to understand or enjoy text.

### D. The Assumption and Hypothesis

#### 1. The Assumption

Before starting the hypothesis as a temporary answer to the problem, the writer would like to present some assumptions as follows:

a. .If the students have good motivation in learning reading, their reading achievement will be high.

b. The students will be motivated if the teacher teaches the students by using frayer model.

#### 2. Hypothesis

$H_o$: There is no significant difference of reading motivation between students taught by using frayer model strategy and those taught by using conventional strategy.

$H_a$: There is a significant difference of reading motivation between students taught by using frayer model strategy and those taught by using conventional strategy.

# CHAPTER III

# RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## A. The Research Design

The type of the research is quasi-experimental research. According to Sugiono, quasi-experimental design is a research design having some but not the entire characteristic of the true experiment.[1] The type of quasi-experimental design of this research is control group design. In this design, the researcher uses two classes as the sample; control group and experimental group. Those classes are not chosen randomly. Both groups take a pretest and posttest. Only the experiment group receives the treatment.

## B. The Location and Time of the Research

The research was carried out at SMPN 1 Benai. And conducted at the first grade students SMPN 1 Benai on July 2011.

## C. The Subject and Object of the Research

The subject of this research was the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai in the 2011/2012 academic year.

The object of this research was effect of using frayer model strategy in improving students in reading motivation.

---

[1] Sugiono. *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. (Bandung: CV. Alfabeta, 2002). pp. 54

**D. The Population and Sample of Research**

1. **Population**

   The population of this research was the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai in 2011-2012 academic years. It has 3 classes: VII A, VII B, VII C. The number of the first grade students of SMPN 1 Benai was 74 students.

**TABLE III.1**

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH POPULATION**

| No | Class | Number of Students |
|----|-------|--------------------|
| 1 | VII A | 24 |
| 2 | VII B | 24 |
| 3 | VII C | 26 |
| Total | | 74  students |

2. **Sample**

   From the table above, it can be seen that the sample of the research was 48 students. The sample of the research was divided into two groups. The first group was experimental class, consisting of 24 students and the other one was control class

that consisted of 24 students. The class of  SMPN 1 Benai consisted of VII A, VII B, VII C. Technique in taking sample was random sampling techniques. The writer named card based on every first grade class. After the mixing these cards, the writer took two cards randomly as a sample of research. As a result class VII A was for experimental class, and VII B was for class control.

### E.  The Technique of  Collecting Data

To obtain the data needed in this research, the investigator  used technique as follows:

1.  Questionnaires

The data were gotten from the writer question. The questionnaires were a number of questions for the respondents dealing with students' motivation in reading.

2.  Observation

Observation was an activity concerned toward some objects by using eyes and can be called direct observation. Observation was used to get data about the implementation of frayer model in teaching reading.

### F.  The Technique of Data Analysis

In order to find out whether there is a significant effect of using Frayer Model strategy in improving students' reading motivation, the researcher explained it in descriptive form.  The technique applied to analyze every item observed in the observation was as follows:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \text{ X } 100\%$$

Where:

P= percentage

F= frequency of score

N= total score

Futher, the score obtained were classified into the following classification:

1. 76% - 100%: Very good

2. 56% - 76% : Enough

3. 40% - 55% : Less

4.  Less than 40% : Bad

The questionnaire refers to students' reading motivation. There were twenty items as representative statement of students' reading motivation. This item consisted of positive and negative questions. It dealt with the respondents opinion in answering to the options: always (5), sometime (4), often (3), seldom (2), and never (1). The negative questions: always (1), sometime (2), often (3), seldom (4), and never (5).

The formula used was T- test, as follows:

$$t_0 = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

Where:

to: the value of t

Mx: mean score of experimental

My: mean score of control group

SDx: the standard deviation of experimental group

Sdy: the standard deviation of control group

N: number of students

Futher more, mean score and standard deviation were taken by the following formula:

$$Mx = \frac{\Sigma X}{N}$$

$M x = $ Mean score of experimental class

$X = $ Total score of experimental class

$N = $ Number of students

$$My = \frac{\Sigma Y}{N}$$

$M y = $ Mean score of control class

$Y = $ Total score of control class

$N = $ Number of students

$$SDx = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma x^2}{N}}$$

$SDx = $ Standard deviation of experimental class

$X^2 = $ Total square (score minus mean score)

$N = $ Number of students of experimental class

$$SDy = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma y^2}{N}}$$

SDy = Standard deviation of control class

$Y^2$ = Total square (score minus mean score)

N = Number of students of control class

After analyzing the data using t-test, it was also necessary to obtain the degree of freedom to determine whether the t-score is significant or not. The t-obtained value of t-table was gotten by using degree of freedom. The formula of degree of freedom used is as follows:

df: (N1+N2) – 2

Where:

df: the degree of freedom

N1: the number of students in experiment class

N2: the number of students in control class

After getting the degree of freedom, the writer can conclude that if t  t-table, Ha is accepted which means that there is significant effect of using frayer model in improving students'reading motivation. If t t-table, Ho is accepted then  it can be said that there is significant effect of using frayer model in improving students' reading motivation.

# CHAPTER IV

# DATA PRESENTATION AND DATA ANALYSIS

## A. Data Presentation

In data presentation, there are two instrument used by the writer to collect the data in this research. They are questionnaire and observation. Previously, it has been noticed that aims of this research are to find out whether or not there is significant the effect of using frayer model in improving students' reading motivation of the first grade at SMPN 1 Benai, especially in understanding the meaning of the words ( definition, characteristics, and examples or non- examples ).

Firstly, the writer will present the result of observation the activity done as long as frayer model. The writer used observational sheet that included the procedure of teaching frayer model in the classroom. Then, at the last meeting, the writer utilized questionnaire or written questions given to the respondents to be answered. The questionnaire were given to the students who had been determined to be the respondents. After the questionnaire had been distributed to every respondent and they have completed all the answers of every question, the writer collected the data coming together in the tables. In this case, it was put in plain words based on the comparing of frequency and percentage the alternative answer shown in the tables that indicated the score of the answers.

1. **Data presentation of Observation on the using frayer model**

The data below is the result of the obsevation of the using frayer model. The obsevation was done eight meetings when the activity of the teaching reading of using frayer model. The data are as follows:

**TABLE IV. 1**

**THE OBSERVATION THE EFFECT OF USING FRAYER MODEL**

| No | Items | Yes | | No | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | P | F | P |
| 1. | The teacher uses the frayer model in teaching learning reading English | 8 | 10% | 0 | 0% |
| 2. | The teacher explains the concept by providing specific attributes/ non attributes and example/ non example | 4 | 5% | 4 | 5% |
| 3. | The teacher asks to students to create a definition of the concept in their own words | 4 | 5% | 4 | 5% |
| 4. | The teacher asks to students brainstorm a list of words and ideas related to the concept and then work together to complete frayer model, students may need to use a dictionary for clues | 6 | 7.5% | 2 | 2.5% |
| 5. | The teacher makes draw example and non example | 6 | 7.5% | 2 | 2.5% |
| 6. | The teacher asks to students express the example and non example about the concept | 8 | 10% | 0 | 0% |
| 7. | The teacher asks to students should be encouraged to use visual representations in addition to words as they establish understandings | 4 | 5% | 4 | 5% |
| 8. | The teacher gives contribution or share ideas about the concept | 6 | 7.5% | 2 | 2.5% |

| 9. | The teacher asks to students look up the words meaning in dictionary | 8 | 10% | 0 | 0% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10. | The teacher explains which one the students do not understand | 8 | 10% | 0 | 0% |
| **Total** | | 62 | 77.5 % | 18 | 22.5 % |

From the table above shown that there were 62 activities well done during the classes and 18 activities were not well done.

The percentage result of information is futher computed as follows:

$$P = \frac{F}{N} \text{ X } 100\% \qquad\qquad P = \frac{F}{N} \text{ X } 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{62}{80} \text{ X } 100\% \qquad\qquad P = \frac{18}{80} \text{ X } 100\%$$

$$P = 77.5\% \qquad\qquad P = 22.5\%$$

The table above also shows that there were some categories that were implemented, they were as follows:

1. The teacher uses the frayer model in teaching learning reading English

2. The teacher explains brainstorm a list of words and ideas related to the concept and then work together to complete frayer model, students may need to use a dictionary for clues

3. The teacher makes draw example and non example

4. The teacher asks to students express the example and non example about the concept

5. The teacher gives contribution or share ideas about the concept

6. The teacher asks to students look up the words meaning in dictionary

7. The teacher explains which one the students do not understand

While, the table above also shows that there are some categories which not well implemented, they are as follows:

1. The teacher explains the concept by providing specific attributes/ non attributes and example/ non example

2. The teacher asks to students to create a definition of the concept in their own words

3. The teacher asks to students should be encouraged to use visual representations in addition to words as they establish understandings

## 2. The Students' Reading Motivation

### TABLE IV. 2

### THE STUDENTS DISCUSS WITH FRIENDS IF THERE IS PROBLEM IN READING

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 2 | 8.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 |
| B | Sometimes | 9 | 37.5 | 9 | 37.5 | 12 | 50 | 10 | 41.7 |
| C | Often | 4 | 16.7 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 12.5 | 8 | 33.3 |
| D | Seldom | 9 | 37.5 | 4 | 16.7 | 6 | 25 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 8.3% of the respondents of experimental class always discuss with friends if there is problem in reading before the treatment and this increases to 20.8% at the end of treatment. 37.5% of the respondents did sometimes the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7%, and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 12.5% of the respondents always discuss with friends if there is problem in reading at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 50% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 41.7% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 25% of the respondents did seldom at the beginning and this decreased to 20.8%, and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.3**

**THE STUDENTS HAVE TO COPY DOWN THE READING TEXT**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 7 | 29.2 | 6 | 25 | 5 | 20.8 | 5 | 20.8 |
| B | Sometimes | 8 | 33.3 | 8 | 33.3 | 7 | 29.2 | 8 | 33.3 |
| C | Often | 6 | 25 | 9 | 37.5 | 9 | 37.5 | 10 | 41.7 |
| D | Seldom | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |
|-------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental class and control class. It can be seen that 29.5% of the respondents of experimental class always have to copy down the reading text before the treatment and this decreases to 25% at the end of treatment. 33.3% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remains were the same at the end. 25% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 37.5% at the end of treatment. 12.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreases to 4.2%, and no respondent never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 20.8% of the respondents always have to copy down the reading text remain was the same at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did often at the beginning and increased to 41.7% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% at the end and no respondents did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.4**

**THE STUDENTS ACTIVE TO  PARTICIPATE  IN TEACHING READING**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 | 4 | 16.7 |

| B | Sometimes | 7 | 29.2 | 9 | 37.5 | 13 | 54.2 | 13 | 54.2 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | Often | 12 | 50 | 10 | 41.7 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 |
| D | Seldom | 4 | 16.7 | 3 | 12.5 | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 4.2% of the respondents of experimental class were always active to participate in teaching reading at the beginning and this increased to 8.3% at the end. 29.5% of the respondents were sometimes in the beginning and this increases to 37.5% at the end. 50% of the respondents were often in the beginning and this decreases to 41.7%. 16.7% of the respondents seldom in the begining and this decreases to 12.5% and no respondent were never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 12.5% of the respondents were always active to participate in teaching reading at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 54.2% of the respondents were sometimes at the beginning and remain the same at the end. 13.5% of the respondents often at the beginning and this increases to 16.7% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents are seldom at the beginning and this decreases to 16.7%, and no respondent is never at the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.5**

**THE STUDENTS MAKE SUMMARY FROM THE READING TEXT**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 12 | 50 | 14 | 58.3 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 |
| B | Sometimes | 8 | 33.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 11 | 45.8 | 9 | 37.5 |
| C | Often | 3 | 12.5 | 5 | 20.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 10 | 41.7 |
| D | Seldom | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 50% of the respondents of experimental class were always make summary from the reading text before the treatment and this increased to 58.3% at the end of treatment. 33.3% of the respondents were sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents were often in the beginning and this increased to 20.8% at the end. 4.2% of the respondents were seldom in the beginning and remain was the same at the end, and no respondent was never in the begining at the end. While in control class, 4.2% of the respondents always make summary from the reading text at the beginning and remain the same at the end. 45.8% of the respondents are sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 37.5% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents are often in the beginning and this increases to 41.7% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents are seldom in the beginning and this decreases to 16.7% at the end and, no respondent is never in the beginning at the end.

**TABLE IV.6**

**THE STUDENTS HAVE GOOD IMPRESSION IN TEACHING READING PROCESS**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 12 | 50 | 15 | 62.5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B | Sometimes | 7 | 29.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 10 | 37.5 | 13 | 54.2 |
| C | Often | 1 | 4.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 |
| D | Seldom | 4 | 16.7 | 1 | 4.2 | 9 | 37.5 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 50% of the respondents of experimental class always have good impression in teaching reading process before the treatment and this increase to 62.5% at the end of treatment. 29.5% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 20.8% at the end. 4.2% of the respondents often in the beginning and this increased to 12.5% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents seldom in the beginning and this decrease to 4.2% at the end and, no respondents did never in the beginning at the end. While in control class, 0% respondents always had good impession in teaching reading process at the beginning and this increase to at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did sometimes at the beginning and this increased to 54.2% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did

often in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7% at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this increased to 20.8% at the end.

**TABLE IV.7**

**THE STUDENTS LIKE TO MAKE SCHEDULE IN READING**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 12 | 50 | 13 | 54.2 | 4 | 16.7 | 4 | 16.7 |
| B | Sometimes | 3 | 12.5 | 6 | 25 | 12 | 50 | 10 | 41.7 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 3 | 12.5 | 4 | 16.7 | 7 | 29.2 |
| D | Seldom | 4 | 16.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 3 | 12.5 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 50% of the respondents of experimental class always like to make schedule in reading before the treatment and this increases to 54.2% at the of treatment. 12.5% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3%, and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 16.7% of the respondents always do like to make schedule in reading  and remain was the same at the end. 50% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 41.7% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often at the beginning and

increased to 29.2% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end and no respondent never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.8**

**THE STUDENTS REVIEW THE MATERIAL AT HOME IN READING**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 9 | 37.5 | 11 | 45.8 | 15 | 62.5 | 15 | 62.5 |
| C | Often | 7 | 29.2 | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 4 | 16.7 |
| D | Seldom | 6 | 25 | 6 | 25 | 5 | 20.8 | 3 | 12.5 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 8.3% of the respondents of experimental class always reviewed the material at home in reading before the treatment and this increase to 12.5% at the of treatment. 37.5% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 45.8% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents often in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% at the end. 25% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and remain was the same, and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of the respondents always reviewed the material at home at the beginning and remain was

the same at the end. 62.5% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain the same at the end. 8.3% of the respondents did often at the beginning and increased to 16.7% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end and, no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

## TABLE IV.9

## THE STUDENTS HAVE GOOD ATTITUDE IN TEACHING READING PROCESS

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 11 | 45.8 | 13 | 54.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 4 | 16.7 |
| B | Sometimes | 7 | 29.2 | 8 | 33.3 | 13 | 54.2 | 13 | 54.2 |
| C | Often | 4 | 16.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 |
| D | Seldom | 2 | 8.3 | 1 | 4.2 | 6 | 25 | 4 | 16.7 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 45.8% of the respondents of experimental class always good attitude in teacing reading process before the treatment and this increase to 54.2% at the of treatment. 29.2% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% at the end. 8.3% of

the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of the respondents did always have good attitude in teaching reading process at the beginning and this increased to 16.7% at the end. 54.2% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 4.2% of the respondents did often at the beginning and increased to 8.3% at the end. 25% of the respondentsdid seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7% at the end, and no respondent never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.10**

**THE STUDENTS FEEL HAPPY IN DOING READING TASK**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 7 | 29.2 | 10 | 41.7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| B | Sometimes | 11 | 45.8 | 9 | 37.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 5 | 20.8 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 |
| D | Seldom | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 18 | 75 | 16 | 66.6 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 29.2% of the respondents of experimental class always feel happy in doing reading task before the treatment and this increase to 41.7% at the of treatment. 45.8% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 37.5% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often

in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end. 4.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this increased to 8.3% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 0% of the respondents did always feel happy in in reading task at the beginning at the end. 8.3% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 20.8% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 75% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 66.6% at the end and, no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

### TABLE IV.11

### THE STUDENTS NOT DISTURBED OR FRUSTRATED IN TEACHING READING ACTIVITY

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 11 | 45.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 5 | 20.8 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 | 8 | 33.3 | 9 | 37.5 |
| C | Often | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 6 | 25 |
| D | Seldom | 6 | 25 | 10 | 41.7 | 8 | 33.3 | 7 | 29.2 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 45.8% of the respondents of experimental class always not disturbed or frustrated in teaching reading activity before the treatment and this decrease to 29.2% at the of treatment. 20.8% of

respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7% at the end. 8.3% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 12.5% at the end. 25% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this increased to 41.7% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 20.8% of the respondents did always not disturbed or frustrated in teaching reading activity at the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 37.5% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 29.2% at the end and, no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.12**

**THE STUDENTS MAKE PREPARATION IN READING**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 1 | 4.2 | 4 | 16.7 | 3 | 12.5 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 2 | 8.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 11 | 45.8 | 14 | 58.3 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 |
| D | Seldom | 16 | 66.6 | 14 | 58.3 | 9 | 37.5 | 6 | 25 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 4.2% of the respondents of

experimental class always make preparation in reading before the treatment and this increase to 16.7% at the of treatment. 8.3% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 20.8% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% at the end. 66.6% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 58.3% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 12.5% of the respondents did always make preparation in reading at the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% at the end. 45.8% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increase to 58.3% at the end. 4.2% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 8.3% at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 25% at the end and no respondent never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.13**

**THE STUDENTS NOT BORED IN TEACHING READING PROCESS**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 7 | 29.2 | 11 | 45.8 | 1 | 4.2 | 1 | 4.2 |
| B | Sometimes | 5 | 20.8 | 8 | 33.3 | 11 | 45.8 | 12 | 50 |
| C | Often | 4 | 16.7 | 1 | 4.2 | 4 | 16.7 | 6 | 25 |
| D | Seldom | 8 | 33.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 7 | 29.2 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 29.2% of the respondents of experimental class always not bored in teaching reading process before the treatment and this increase to 45.8% at the of treatment. 20.8% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 16.7% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 4.2% of the respondents did always not bored in teaching reading process at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 45.8% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 50% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 20.8% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

## TABLE IV.14

## THE STUDENTS ATTEND THE READING CLASS

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 2 | 8.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 4 | 16.7 | 1 | 4.2 |
| B | Sometimes | 12 | 50 | 10 | 41.7 | 7 | 29.2 | 14 | 58.3 |
| C | Often | 3 | 12.5 | 7 | 29.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 |
| D | Seldom | 7 | 29.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 11 | 45.8 | 6 | 25 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 8.3% of the respondents of experimental class always attend the reading class the treatment and this increase to 16.7% at the of treatment. 50% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 41.7% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 29.2% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 16.7% of the respondents did always attend the reading class  at the beginning and this decreased to4.2% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 58.3% at the end. 8.3% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 12.5% at the end. 45.8% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 25%, at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.15**

**THE STUDENTS DO NOT MAKE NOISY IN TEACHING READING PROCESS**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |

| A | Always | 3 | 12.5 | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 | 4 | 16.7 |
|---|--------|---|------|---|------|---|------|---|------|
| B | Sometimes | 5 | 20.8 | 7 | 29.2 | 8 | 33.3 | 9 | 37.5 |
| C | Often | 3 | 12.5 | 10 | 41.7 | 6 | 25 | 8 | 33.3 |
| D | Seldom | 13 | 54.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 12.5 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 12.5% of the respondents of experimental class always do not make noisy in teaching reading process before the treatment and this increase to 20.8% at the of treatment. 20.8% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 29.2% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this increased to 41.7% at the end. 54.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 16.7% of the respondents did always do not make noisy in teaching reading process at the beginning and and remain was the same at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 37.5% at the end. 25% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 25% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.16**

**THE STUDENTS FOLLOW THE MATERIAL IN TEACHING READING**

**PROCESS SERIOUSLY**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 5 | 20.8 | 15 | 62.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 8 | 33.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 15 | 62.5 | 15 | 62.5 |
| C | Often | 7 | 29.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 | 4 | 16.7 |
| D | Seldom | 4 | 16.7 | 1 | 4.2 | 6 | 25 | 3 | 12.5 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 20.8% of the respondents of experimental class always follow the material in teaching reading process seriously before the treatment and this increase to 62.5% at the of treatment. 33.3% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 20.8% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of the respondents did always follow the material in teaching reading process seriously at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 62.5% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 4.2% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 16.7% at the

end. 25% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.17**

**THE STUDENTS ASK TO THE TEACHER IF DID NOT UNDERSTOOD ABOUT THE TOPIC IN READING**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 15 | 62.5 | 19 | 79.1 | 3 | 12.5 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 3 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 45.8 | 11 | 45.8 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 3 | 12.5 | 3 | 12.5 | 6 | 25 |
| D | Seldom | 1 | 4.2 | 2 | 8.3 | 7 | 29.2 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 62.5% of the respondents of experimental class always asked to the teacher if did not understood about the topic in reading before the treatment and this increase to 79.1% at the of treatment. 12.5% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this decreased to 0% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% at the end. 4.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this increase to 8.3% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 12.5% of the respondents did always asked to the teacher if did not understood about the topic in reading at the beginning and this decreased 8.3% at the end. 45.8%

of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 20.8% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.18**

**THE STUDENTS NEVER ABSENT IN ATTENDING THE READING CLASS**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 4 | 16.7 | 9 | 37.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 6 | 25 | 7 | 29.2 | 11 | 45.8 | 11 | 45.8 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 2 | 8.3 | 4 | 16.7 | 6 | 25 |
| D | Seldom | 9 | 37.5 | 6 | 25 | 7 | 29.2 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 16.7% of the respondents of experimental class always never absent in attending the reading class before the treatment and this increase to 37.5% at the of treatment. 25% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 29.2% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% at the end. 37.5% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 25% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of

the respondents did always never absent in attending the reading class at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 45.8% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased 20.8% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.19**

**THE STUDENTS CAME TO READING CLASS ON TIME**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 12 | 50 | 16 | 66.6 | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 |
| B | Sometimes | 5 | 20.8 | 6 | 25 | 12 | 50 | 12 | 50 |
| C | Often | 3 | 12.5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20.8 | 5 | 20.8 |
| D | Seldom | 4 | 16.7 | 2 | 8.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 4 | 16.7 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 50% of the respondents of experimental class always came to reading class on time before the treatment and this increase to 66.6% at the of treatment. 20.8% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increase to 25% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 0% at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did

seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of the respondents always came to reading class on time the beginning and this increased 12.5% at the end. 50% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often at the beginning and remain was the same at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased 16.7% at the end and no respondent did  never in the beginning and at the end.

**TABLE IV.20**

**THE STUDENTS NEVER FEEL BORED TO ENTER THE READING CLASS**

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
|----|-------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 5 | 20.8 | 9 | 37.5 | 2 | 8.3 | 2 | 8.3 |
| B | Sometimes | 9 | 37.5 | 11 | 45.8 | 11 | 45.8 | 11 | 45.8 |
| C | Often | 3 | 12.5 | 1 | 4.2 | 4 | 16.7 | 7 | 29.2 |
| D | Seldom | 7 | 29.2 | 3 | 12.5 | 7 | 29.2 | 4 | 16.7 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in experimental and control class. It can be seen that 20.8% of the respondents of experimental class always never feel bored to enter the reading class before the treatment and this increase to 37.5% at the of treatment. 37.5% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 45.8% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 4.2% at the end. 29.2%

of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 12.5% and no

respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 8.3% of

the respondents always never feel bored to enter the reading class at the beginning

and remain was the same at the end. 45.8% of the respondents did sometimes in the

beginning and remain was the same at the end. 16.7% of the respondents did often at

the beginning and this increased to 29.2% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did

seldom in the beginning and this decreased 16.7% at the end and no respondent did

never in the beginning and at the end.

## TABLE IV.21

## THE STUDENTS LIKE PROTEST FRIENDS OPINION ABOUT THE TOPIC
## BECAUSE THAT OPINION WAS WRONG

| No | Alternative | Experimental Class | | | | Control Class | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Pre | | Post | | Pre | | Post | |
| | | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| A | Always | 4 | 16.7 | 8 | 33.3 | 6 | 25 | 5 | 20.8 |
| B | Sometimes | 7 | 29.2 | 9 | 37.5 | 7 | 29.2 | 8 | 33.3 |
| C | Often | 5 | 20.8 | 2 | 8.3 | 3 | 12.5 | 6 | 25 |
| D | Seldom | 8 | 33.3 | 5 | 20.8 | 8 | 33.3 | 5 | 20.8 |
| E | Never | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Total | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 | 24 | 100 |

The table above shows various responses among the respondents in

experimental and control class. It can be seen that 16.7% of the respondents of

experimental class always like protest friends opinion about the topic because that

opinion was wrong before the treatment and this increase to 33.3% at the of

treatment. 29.2% of respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 37.5% at the end. 20.8% of the respondents did often in the beginning and this decreased to 8.3% at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased to 20.8% and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end. While in control class, 25% of the respondents always like protest friends opinion about the topic because that opinion was wrong at the beginning and this decreased 20.8% at the end. 29.2% of the respondents did sometimes in the beginning and this increased to 33.3% at the end. 12.5% of the respondents did often at the beginning and this increased to 25% at the end. 33.3% of the respondents did seldom in the beginning and this decreased 20.8% at the end and no respondent did never in the beginning and at the end.

## B. Data Analysis

### 1. The Use of Frayer Model

From the table IV.1, the percentage of using of frayer model for each category can be seen as follows:

1. The teacher uses the frayer model in teaching learning reading English (10%).

2. The teacher explains the concept by providing specific attributes/ non attributes and example/ non example (5%).

3. The teacher asks to students create a definition of the concept in their own words (5%).

4. The teacher asks to students brainstorm a list of words and ideas related to the concept and then work together to complete frayer model, students may need to use a dictionary for clues (7.5%).

5. The teacher make an example and non example (7.5%).

6. The teacher asks to students express the example and non example about the concept (10%).

7. The teacher encourages students to use visual representations in addition to words as they establish understandings (5%).

8. The teacher gives contribution or share ideas about the concept (7.5%).

9. The teacher asks to students look up the words meaning in dictionary (10%).

10. The teacher which one the students do not understand (10%).

Futher, the result of observation percentage above is inserted to the table of observation percentage to know the difference between the activities that were well done and the activities that were not well implemented. The following table is the recapitulation of the use of frayer model.

**TABLE IV.22**

**RECAPITULATION OF THE PERCENTAGE OF THE USE OF FRAYER MODEL**

| No | Result of Observation | F | P |
|----|----------------------|---|---|
|    |                      |   |   |

| 1 | Yes | 62 | 77.5% |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | No | 18 | 22.5% |
| **Total** | | 80 | 100% |

Based on the observation percentage above, the use of frayer model in teaching reading falls into good, for the obtained percentage is 77.5%. Therefore, it can be said that the frayer model was applied by the teacher.

### 2. Students' Reading Motivation

From the formulation of the problem, there are three answers about formulation of the problem those must be found by the writer. The first formulation of the problems, the writer asked "is there any significant effect of using frayer model in improving students reading motivation"? To find out and investigate its finding, it is necessary to analyze and measure the data gained from the pre and post questionnaire of experimental class, where pre questionnaire was given before treatment, and post questionnaire was given after the treatment. Below is the table of the students' reading motivation before use frayer model.

**TABLE IV.23**

**THE RECAPITULATION OF SCORE THE STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION BEFORE THE USE OF FRAYER MODEL ON EXPERIMENTAL CLASS**

| Item | Always | Sometime | Often | Seldom | Never |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| s | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 8.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 4 | 16.7% | 9 | 37.5% | | |
| 2 | 7 | 29.2% | 8 | 33.3% | 6 | 25% | 3 | 12.55 | | |
| 3 | 1 | 4.2% | 7 | 29.2% | 12 | 50% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 4 | 12 | 50% | 8 | 33.3% | 3 | 12.5% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 5 | 12 | 50% | 7 | 29.2% | 1 | 4.2% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 6 | 12 | 50% | 3 | 12.5% | 5 | 20.8% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 7 | 2 | 8.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 7 | 29.2% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 8 | 11 | 45.8% | 7 | 29.2% | 4 | 16.7% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 9 | 7 | 29.2% | 11 | 45.8% | 5 | 20.8% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 10 | 10 | 41.7% | 5 | 20.8% | 2 | 8.3% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 11 | 1 | 4.2% | 2 | 8.3% | 5 | 20.8% | 16 | 66.6% | | |
| 12 | 7 | 29.2% | 5 | 20.8% | 4 | 16.7% | 8 | 33.3% | | |
| 13 | 2 | 8.3% | 12 | 50% | 3 | 12.5% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 14 | 3 | 12.5% | 5 | 20.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 13 | 54.2% | | |
| 15 | 5 | 20.8% | 8 | 33.3% | 7 | 29.2% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 16 | 15 | 62.5% | 3 | 12.5% | 5 | 20.8% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 17 | 4 | 16.7% | 6 | 25% | 5 | 20.8% | 9 | 37.5% | | |
| 18 | 12 | 50% | 5 | 20.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 19 | 5 | 20.8% | 9 | 37.5% | 3 | 12.5% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 20 | 4 | 16.7% | 7 | 29.2% | 5 | 20.8% | 8 | 33.3% | | |
| Total | 134 | 27.9% | 136 | 28.3% | 92 | 19.2% | 117 | 24.3% | | |

From the table above, the obtained data then were computed by the following calculation to obtain the score as well as is percentage:

$134 + 136 + 92 + 117 = 480$

$134 \times 5 = 670$

$136 \times 4 = 544$

$92 \times 3 = 276$

$117 \times 2 = \dfrac{234}{1724}$

$$P = \frac{1724}{480 \, x \, 5} \text{ X } 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{1724}{2400} \text{ X } 100\%$$

$$P = 71.8\%$$

From the calculation above, it can be said that the students' reading motivation in experimental class decreases because the obtained percentage is 71.8%.

**TABLE IV.24**

**THE RECAPITULATION OF SCORE  OF POST-QUESTIONNAIRE OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS**

| Items | Always | | Sometime | | Often | | Seldom | | Never | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| 1 | 5 | 20.8% | 9 | 37.5% | 6 | 25% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 2 | 6 | 25% | 8 | 33.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 1 | 4.2% | | |

| 3 | 2 | 8.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 10 | 41.7% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | 14 | 58.3% | 4 | 16.7% | 5 | 20.8% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 5 | 15 | 62.5% | 5 | 20.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 6 | 13 | 54.2% | 6 | 25% | 3 | 12.5% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 7 | 3 | 12.5% | 11 | 45.8% | 1 | 4.2% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 8 | 13 | 54.2% | 8 | 33.3% | 2 | 8.3% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 9 | 10 | 41.7% | 9 | 37.5% | 3 | 12.5% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 10 | 7 | 29.2% | 4 | 16.7% | 3 | 12.5% | 10 | 41.7% | | |
| 11 | 4 | 16.7% | 5 | 20.8% | 1 | 4.2% | 14 | 58.3% | | |
| 12 | 11 | 45.8% | 8 | 33.3% | 1 | 4.2% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 13 | 4 | 16.7% | 10 | 41.7% | 7 | 29.2% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| 14 | 5 | 20.8% | 7 | 29.2% | 10 | 41.7% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 15 | 15 | 62.5% | 5 | 20.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 16 | 19 | 79.1% | 0 | 0% | 3 | 12.5% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 17 | 9 | 37.5% | 7 | 29.2% | 2 | 8.3% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 18 | 16 | 66.6% | 6 | 25% | 0 | 0% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 19 | 9 | 37.5% | 11 | 45.8% | 1 | 4.2% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 20 | 8 | 33.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 1 | 4.2% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| Total | 188 | 39.2% | 141 | 29.3% | 74 | 15.4% | 70 | 14.5% | | |

$$188 + 141 + 74 + 70 = 480$$

$$188 \times 5 = 940$$

$$141 \times 4 = 564$$

$$74 \times 3 = 222$$

$$70 \times 2 = \frac{140}{1866}$$

$$P = \frac{1866}{480 \; x \; 5} \; X \; 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{1866}{2400} \; X \; 100\%$$

P = 77.7%

From the above computation, it is clear that the students' reading motivation in experimental class after the treatment is 77.7%.

The data obtained through pre and post questionnaire for both classes were analyzed with the following calculation:

**TABLE IV.25**

**THE RECAPITULATION OF SCORE OF PRE QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONTROLL CLASS**

| Items | Always | | Sometime | | Often | | Seldom | | Never | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| 1 | 2 | 8.3% | 12 | 50% | 3 | 12.5% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 2 | 5 | 20.8% | 7 | 29.2% | 9 | 37.5% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| 3 | 3 | 12.5% | 13 | 54.2% | 3 | 12.5% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 4 | 1 | 4.2% | 11 | 45.8% | 7 | 29.2% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 5 | 0 | 0% | 10 | 41.7% | 5 | 20.8% | 9 | 37.5% | | |
| 6 | 4 | 16.7% | 12 | 50% | 4 | 16.7% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 7 | 2 | 8.3% | 15 | 62.5% | 2 | 8.3% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 8 | 2 | 8.3% | 13 | 54.2% | 1 | 4.2% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 9 | 0 | 0% | 2 | 8.3% | 3 | 12.5% | 18 | 75% | | |
| 10 | 5 | 20.8% | 8 | 33.3% | 3 | 12.5% | 8 | 33.3% | | |
| 11 | 3 | 12.5% | 11 | 45.8% | 1 | 4.2% | 9 | 37.5% | | |
| 12 | 1 | 4.2% | 11 | 45.8% | 4 | 16.7% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 13 | 4 | 16.7% | 7 | 29.2% | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | | |
| 14 | 4 | 16.7% | 8 | 33.3% | 6 | 25% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 15 | 2 | 8.3% | 15 | 62.5% | 1 | 4.2% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 16 | 3 | 12.5% | 11 | 45.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 17 | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | 4 | 16.7% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 18 | 2 | 8.3% | 12 | 50% | 5 | 20.8% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 19 | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | 4 | 16.7% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 20 | 6 | 25% | 7 | 29.2% | 3 | 12.5% | 8 | 33.3% | | |

| Total | 53 | 11.1% | 207 | 43.2% | 73 | 15.2% | 142 | 29.6% | | |
|-------|----|-------|-----|-------|----|-------|-----|-------|--|--|

To interpret the above table, it is necessary to find the total percentage by the following calculation:

$$53 + 207 + 73 + 142 = 480$$

$$53 \times 5 = 265$$

$$207 \times 4 = 828$$

$$73 \times 3 = 219$$

$$142 \times 2 = \frac{284}{1596}$$

$$P = \frac{1596}{480 \times 5} \times 100\%$$

$$P = \frac{1596}{2400} \times 100\%$$

$$P = 66.5\%$$

From the calculation above, it can be concluded that the students' reading motivation before the treatment in control class decrease as shown by the obtained percentage 66.5%.

**TABLE IV.26**

**THE RECAPITULATION OF SCORE OF POST QUESTIONNAIRE OF CONTROL CLASS**

| Items | Always | | Sometime | | Often | | Seldom | | Never | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P | F | P |
| 1 | 3 | 12.5% | 10 | 41.7% | 8 | 33.3% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 2 | 5 | 20.8% | 8 | 33.3% | 10 | 41.7% | 1 | 4.2% | | |
| 3 | 4 | 16.7% | 13 | 54.2% | 3 | 12.5% | 0 | 0% | | |
| 4 | 1 | 4.2% | 9 | 37.5% | 10 | 41.7% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 5 | 0 | 0% | 13 | 54.2% | 4 | 16.7% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 6 | 4 | 16.7% | 10 | 41.7% | 7 | 29.2% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| 7 | 2 | 8.3% | 15 | 62.5% | 4 | 16.7% | 2 | 8.3% | | |
| 8 | 4 | 16.7% | 13 | 54.2% | 2 | 8.3% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 9 | 0 | 0% | 5 | 20.8% | 3 | 12.5% | 16 | 66.6% | | |
| 10 | 2 | 8.3% | 9 | 37.5% | 6 | 25% | 7 | 29.2% | | |
| 11 | 2 | 8.3% | 14 | 58.3% | 2 | 8.3% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 12 | 1 | 4.2% | 12 | 50% | 6 | 25% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 13 | 1 | 4.2% | 14 | 58.3% | 3 | 12.5% | 6 | 25% | | |
| 14 | 4 | 16.7% | 9 | 37.5% | 8 | 33.3% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| 15 | 2 | 8.3% | 15 | 62.5% | 4 | 16.7% | 3 | 12.5% | | |
| 16 | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | 6 | 25% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 17 | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | 6 | 25% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| 18 | 3 | 12.5% | 12 | 50% | 5 | 20.8% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 19 | 2 | 8.3% | 11 | 45.8% | 7 | 29.2% | 4 | 16.7% | | |
| 20 | 5 | 20.8% | 8 | 33.3% | 6 | 25% | 5 | 20.8% | | |
| Total | 49 | 10.2 | 222 | 46.3 | 110 | 22.9 | 93 | 19.3 | | |

To interpret the above it is necessary to find the total percentage by the following calculation:

$49 + 222 + 110 + 93 = 480$

$49 \times 5 = 245$

$222 \times 4 = 888$

$110 \times 3 = 330$

$93 \times 2 = \dfrac{186}{1649}$

$P = \dfrac{1649}{480 \times 5} \times 100\%$

$P = \dfrac{1649}{2400} \times 100\%$

$P = 68.70\%$

From that calculation and analyses above, it can be said that the students' reading motivation in control class of the post questionnaire falls into 68.7%. Futher, it also shows that students' reading motivation of control class did not increase significantly. In other words, the students reading motivation of control class increase from (66.5) to (68.7%).

To find out the two formulations of the problem of significant of the use of frayer model in improving students' reading motivation, it is necessary to refer to the table below.

**TABLE IV.27**

**THE RECAPITULATION STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION IN EXPERIMENT AND CONTROL CLASS**

| STUDENTS | EXPERIMENTAL | | STUDENTS | CONTROL | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PRE | POST | | PRE | POST |
| 1 | 71 | 78 | 1 | 66 | 68 |
| 2 | 73 | 76 | 2 | 70 | 71 |
| 3 | 72 | 79 | 3 | 69 | 73 |
| 4 | 73 | 79 | 4 | 64 | 66 |
| 5 | 74 | 84 | 5 | 68 | 66 |
| 6 | 70 | 78 | 6 | 67 | 68 |
| 7 | 72 | 75 | 7 | 63 | 66 |
| 8 | 71 | 74 | 8 | 68 | 70 |
| 9 | 72 | 83 | 9 | 69 | 69 |
| 10 | 73 | 85 | 10 | 64 | 63 |
| 11 | 71 | 74 | 11 | 69 | 71 |
| 12 | 72 | 80 | 12 | 65 | 70 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | 73 | 75 | 13 | 69 | 70 |
| 14 | 73 | 80 | 14 | 60 | 65 |
| 15 | 71 | 75 | 15 | 70 | 71 |
| 16 | 75 | 79 | 16 | 73 | 74 |
| 17 | 73 | 73 | 17 | 56 | 66 |
| 18 | 69 | 78 | 18 | 60 | 65 |
| 19 | 70 | 73 | 19 | 63 | 68 |
| 20 | 75 | 85 | 20 | 68 | 70 |
| 21 | 70 | 75 | 21 | 66 | 69 |
| 22 | 69 | 69 | 22 | 68 | 70 |
| 23 | 73 | 88 | 23 | 73 | 73 |
| 24 | 69 | 71 | 24 | 68 | 69 |
| TOTAL | 1724 | 1866 | TOTAL | 1596 | 1649 |
| MEAN | 71.8 | 77.7 | MEAN | 66.5 | 68.7 |

To clarify the increment of motivation in both classes at the end of treatment in experimental group, it is necessary to refer the following table.

**TABLE IV.28**

**THE RECAPITULATION OF PERCENTAGE FROM OF STUDENTS' READING MOTIVATION PRE-MOTIVATION TO POST-MOTIVATION FOR BOTH CLASSES**

| STUDENTS | EXPERIMENTAL CLASS | | | | STUDENTS | CONTROL CLASS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | PRE | POST | RANGE | P (%) | | PRE | POST | RANGE | P (%) |
| 1 | 71 | 78 | 7 | 9.86 | 1 | 66 | 68 | 2 | 3.1 |

| 2 | 73 | 76 | 3 | 4.10 | 2 | 70 | 71 | 1 | 1.4 |
|---|----|----|---|------|---|----|----|---|-----|
| 3 | 72 | 79 | 7 | 9.73 | 3 | 69 | 73 | 4 | 5.8 |
| 4 | 73 | 79 | 6 | 8.22 | 4 | 64 | 66 | 2 | 3.1 |
| 5 | 74 | 84 | 10 | 13.6 | 5 | 68 | 66 | -2 | 2.9 |
| 6 | 70 | 78 | 8 | 11.5 | 6 | 67 | 68 | 1 | 1.5 |
| 7 | 72 | 75 | 3 | 4.16 | 7 | 63 | 66 | 3 | 4.8 |
| 8 | 71 | 74 | 3 | 4.22 | 8 | 68 | 70 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 9 | 72 | 83 | 11 | 15.3 | 9 | 69 | 69 | 0 | 0 |
| 10 | 73 | 85 | 12 | 16.5 | 10 | 64 | 63 | -1 | 1.5 |
| 11 | 71 | 74 | 3 | 4.3 | 11 | 69 | 71 | 2 | 2.8 |
| 12 | 72 | 80 | 8 | 11.2 | 12 | 65 | 70 | 5 | 7.6 |
| 13 | 73 | 75 | 2 | 2.8 | 13 | 69 | 70 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 14 | 73 | 80 | 7 | 9.6 | 14 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 8.3 |
| 15 | 71 | 75 | 4 | 5.7 | 15 | 70 | 71 | 1 | 1.4 |
| 16 | 75 | 77 | 2 | 2.7 | 16 | 73 | 74 | 1 | 1.3 |
| 17 | 73 | 75 | 2 | 2.8 | 17 | 56 | 66 | 10 | 17.8 |
| 18 | 69 | 78 | 9 | 13.1 | 18 | 60 | 65 | 5 | 8.3 |
| 19 | 70 | 73 | 3 | 4.2 | 19 | 63 | 68 | 5 | 7.9 |
| 20 | 75 | 85 | 10 | 13.3 | 20 | 68 | 70 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 21 | 70 | 74 | 4 | 5.7 | 21 | 66 | 69 | 3 | 4.5 |
| 22 | 69 | 70 | 1 | 1.4 | 22 | 68 | 70 | 2 | 2.9 |
| 23 | 73 | 88 | 15 | 20.5 | 23 | 73 | 73 | 0 | 0 |
| 24 | 69 | 71 | 2 | 2.9 | 24 | 68 | 69 | 1 | 1.4 |
| TOTAL | 1724 | 1866 | 142 | 197.4 | TOTAL | 1596 | 1649 | 61 | 95.5 |
| MEAN | 71.8 | 77.7 | 5.9 | 82.25 | MEAN | 66.5 | 68.7 | 2.6 | 3.9 |

From the calculation above, it is clear that the students' reading motivation in experimental class is higher than the reading motivation in control class. It is   shown that the calculation 5.9> is bigger than 2.6, and the mean percentage 82.25> is bigger than 3.9

To answer the effect of the use of frayer model in improving students' reading motivation,we need to compare the obtained mean of each group as follows:

$$t_0 = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{SD_x}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{SD_y}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right)^2}}$$

The following table is the table of mean and standard deviation of range score of experiment class and control class.

**TABLE IV.29**

**MEAN AND STANDARD DEVIATION OF RANGE SCORE FOR
EXPERIMENT AND CONTROL CLASS**

| No | Score | | X (X-MX) | Y (Y-MY) | $s_{\overline{X}^2}^2$ | $\overline{Y}^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | X | Y | | | | |
| 1 | 7 | 2 | 1.1 | -1.9 | 1.21 | 3.61 |
| 2 | 3 | 1 | -2.9 | -2.9 | 8.41 | 8.41 |
| 3 | 7 | 4 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 1.21 | 0.01 |
| 4 | 6 | 2 | 0.1 | -1.9 | 0.01 | 3.61 |
| 5 | 10 | -2 | 4.1 | -5.9 | 16.9 | 34.8 |
| 6 | 8 | 1 | 2.1 | -2.9 | 4.41 | 8.41 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | -2.9 | -0.9 | 8.41 | 0.81 |
| 8 | 3 | 2 | -2.9 | -1.9 | 8.41 | 3.61 |
| 9 | 11 | 0 | 5.1 | -3.9 | 26.1 | 15.2 |
| 10 | 12 | -1 | 6.1 | -4.9 | 37.3 | 24 |
| 11 | 3 | 2 | -2.9 | -1.9 | 8.41 | 3.61 |
| 12 | 8 | 5 | 2.1 | 1.1 | 4.41 | 1.21 |
| 13 | 2 | 1 | -3.9 | -2.9 | 15.21 | 8.41 |
| 14 | 7 | 5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.21 | 1.21 |
| 15 | 4 | 1 | -1.9 | -2.9 | 3.61 | 8.41 |
| 16 | 2 | 1 | -3.9 | -2.9 | 15.21 | 8.41 |
| 17 | 2 | 10 | -3.9 | 6.1 | 15.21 | 37.2 |
| 18 | 9 | 5 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 9.7 | 1.21 |
| 19 | 3 | 5 | -2.9 | 1.1 | 8.41 | 1.21 |
| 20 | 10 | 2 | 4.1 | -1.9 | 16.9 | 3.61 |
| 21 | 4 | 3 | -1.9 | -0.9 | 3.7 | 0.81 |
| 22 | 1 | 2 | -4.9 | -1.9 | 24.1 | 3.61 |
| 23 | 15 | 0 | 9.1 | -3.9 | 82.9 | 15.2 |
| 24 | 2 | 1 | -3.9 | -2.9 | 15.21 | 8.41 |
| TOTAL | 142 | 61 | | | 336.56 | 204.99 |
| Mean | 5.9 | 2.6 | | | 14.023 | 8.54 |

While, the result of the standard deviation of post reading motivation for each class is as follows:

a. Standard deviation for range score of experimental class

$$SDx = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma X^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{336.56}{24}} = \sqrt{14.023} = 3.8$$

b. Standar deviation for control class

$$SDy = \sqrt{\frac{\Sigma Y^2}{N}} = \sqrt{\frac{204.99}{24}} = \sqrt{8.54} = 2.9$$

From the calculation above, it can be stated that:

$SDx = 3.8$

$SDy = 2.9$

$Mx = 5.9$

$My = 2.6$

$$t_o = \frac{M_x - M_y}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{SDx}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{SDy}{\sqrt{N-1}}\right]^2}} = \frac{5.9 - 2.6}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{3.8}{\sqrt{24-1}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{2.9}{\sqrt{24-1}}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{3.3}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{3.8}{\sqrt{23}}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{2.9}{\sqrt{23}}\right]^2}} = \frac{3.3}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{3.8}{4.79}\right]^2 + \left[\frac{2.9}{4.79}\right]^2}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{3.3}{\sqrt{(0.79)^2 + (0.60)^2}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{3.3}{\sqrt{0.63 + 0.36}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{3.3}{\sqrt{(0.99)}}$$

$$t_o = \frac{3.3}{0.99}$$

$$t_o = 3.34$$

Based on the calculation above, it is clear that the obtained $t_o$ is 3.34. To know whether there is significant effect or not between the use of frayer model in improving students reading motivation, we need to obtain the degree of freedom by following way:

$$df = (N1 + N2) - 2$$

$$= (24 + 24) - 2$$

$$= 48 - 2$$

$$= 46$$

After getting the degree of freedom above, it can be said that the degree of freedom is 46. Because the degree of 46 is not available, the writer took 45 as the nearest score to 46. The t-table at 5% level of significance is 2.02, and at 1% level of significance is 2.69. So, the writer can conclude that $t_0$ is lower than t-table both in

5% and 1% level of significance. So it can be concluded 2.69 <3.34 > 2.02. Therefore, the first hypothesis (Ha) that postulates significant effect of using frayer model in improving students' reading motivation is accepted automacically, and the second hypothesis (Ho) is rejected.

# CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

### A. Conclusion

There are three formulatios of the problems formulated previously; the first formulation is to find out how the improvement of students' reading motivation by using frayer model is very good, where the average score is 77,7. Based on the classification of students' score the rank 61-80% categorized very good.

The second formulation of the problem needs an answer in this research is to find out how the improvement of students' reading motivation taught without the use frayer model is enough, where the average score is 68,7. Based on the classification of students' score the rank 56-76% categorized enough.

Based on the analysis of T-test formula. It can be seen $t_o$ is 3.34, It is higher than t-table either at level 5% = 2.02 or 1% = 2.69. It can be concluded that $H_o$ is rejected and $H_a$ is accepted. It means that there is a significant difference between students' reading motivation taught by using frayer model and students' reading motivation without taught by use frayer model. From the significant different mean between using outlining (77.7) with using conventional (68.7) and it is also supported by the result of t-test that $t_o$ is higher than t table either at level 5% or 1% (2,02 < 3.34 > 2,69), it shows that using frayer model has positive effect toward students' reading motivation.

**B. Suggestion**

**1. Suggestion for Teachers**

a. The teachers should be able to choose teaching media suitable with lesson taught, and they use the variation media so that the students are not bored.

b. It is recommended to the teachers to use Frayer Model strategy in teaching and learning process.

c. The teacher must be able to know what the students' need; the teacher can teach based on students' learning style and strategies so that the learning objective can be reached.

d. The teacher should build a favorable atmosphere at times of teaching learning process conducted because the conductive condition in teaching would become one asset to carry the success of material to be taught.

**2. Suggestion for Students**

a. The students should try to understand using Frayer Model in reading text.

b. The students should give more attention to teachers explanation as long as learning and teaching process.

c. The students should realize that the English is very important and follow what the teachers command in the class activities.

# REFERENCES

Allen, Janet. (2007). *Inside Words: Tools for Teaching Academic Vocabulary*, *Grades 4-12*. Portland: Stenhouse Publisher.

Brown, H. Douglas. (1994). *Teaching by Principles an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Cresswell, Jhon W, (2008). *Educational Reseach; Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Reseach.* New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2006. *MODEL Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) SMP dan MTs.* Solo: PT. Tiga Serangkai.

Djamarah, Syaiful Bahri. (2008). *Psikologi Belajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Ganske, Kathy and Doughlas Fisher. (2010). *Compehension Across the Curriculum: Perspective and Practice K-12*. New York: The Gulford Press.

Gore, M.C. (2004). *Succesfull Inclusion Strategies for Secondary and Middles School Teachers: Keys to Help Struggling Learners Access the Curriculum*. New York: Corwin Press.

Graves, F m. (2006). *The Vocabulary Book: Learning and Instuctions*. New York: Teachers College Press, International Reading Association and National Council of Teachers of English.

Hirai, Debra L Cook, et al. (2010). *Academic Language/ Literacy Strategy for Adolescents*. New York: Routledge.

Hornby, AS. (1987). *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Irwin, Judith W. (1986). *Teaching Reading Comperehension Process.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Lems, Kristin. (2010). *Teaching Reading to English Language Learner*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Loudenti and Gilbert Guerin. (2008). *Effective Practice for Adolescent with Reading and Literacy.* New York: Routledge.

Macecca, Stephanie. (2007). *Reading Strategies for Social Studies*. New York: Shell Education.

Nation, I.S.P. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Reading and Writing*. New York: Routledge.

Nuttall, Christine. (1982). *9 Teaching Reading Skill in a Foreign Language.* New York: Mc Grow Hill Book Company.

Raffini, James P. (1996). *150 Ways to Increase Instrinsic Motivation in the Classroom*. New York: Allyn and Bacon.

Richards C, Jack and Richard Schmidt, 2002. *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics. Third Edition*. New York: Pearson Education

Sardiman. (2011). *Interaksi dan Motivasi Belajar Mengajar.* Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Slameto. (2010). *Belajar dan Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhnya*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Snow, Catherine and Chair. (2002). *Reading for Understanding toward an Research and Development Program in Reading Comprehension*. Santa Monica CA: RAND Reading Study Group.

Sticicklend, Dorothy.S, Kathy, Ganske, et al. (2006). *Supporting Struggeling Readers and Writers*. Monroe Portland, Maine: StenhousePublisher.

Sugiono. (2008). *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.

Tankersley, Karen. (2003). *The Treads of Reading: Strategies for Literacy Development*. New York: Alexandria.