

Using RCRR (Read, Cover, Remember, and Retell) in Enhancing the First Grade Students' Reading Comprehension Ability

Yayu Sri Rahayu¹, Rizki Widiastuti², Agus Kusnandar³

Universitas Bale Bandung

yayusrirahayu@unibba.ac.id¹, rizkiwidiastuti@unibba.ac.id², aguskusnandar@unniba.ac.id³

Abstract: Students in second grade at SMP Karya Pembangunan Baros Bandung, a private school in Bandung, should be able to comprehend descriptive text based on the 2013 English syllabus curriculum. The researchers used Read Cover, Remember Retell (RCRR) to teach descriptive text reading comprehension to first-grade students at SMP KP Baros Bandung Junior High School. This study aimed to compare the impact of the Read Cover, Remember Retell (RCRR) approach on reading comprehension and recall of text among students taught without it. This research used a quasi-experimental method. The population consisted of 60 first-grade pupils from SMP KP Baros Bandung. The research sample comprised 30 students from VIIA (experimental) and 30 from VIIB (control). Data was collected through reading tests, pre-tests, and post-tests. Data analysis techniques include T-tests, U-Mann Whitney, and N-gain. The study indicated that the experimental class had a higher n-gain average score (0.425) than the control class's 0.315. The experimental class showed greater improvement than the control class. In conclusion, the Read Cover, Remember Retell (RCRR) technique improves students' reading comprehension of second-grade descriptive material at SMP KP Baros Bandung.

Key words: RCRR, enhancing, first grade, reading comprehension ability

INTRODUCTION

One of the abilities students need to acquire in the English curriculum is reading comprehension. Reading books can help students with vocabulary expansion in addition to skill development. Reading can be challenging for English learners. The reading text includes letters, words, and sentences that provide meaning. Reading helps students enhance their knowledge. Reading provides opportunities for information, leisure, professional advancement, and academic pursuits. Students need knowledge, abilities, and techniques to comprehend. Comprehension involves inferring the author's intended meaning based on prior experiences and indications from the text. Students with strong comprehension skills may succeed as readers. Students can express themselves using a wide range of new words. According to the superior reading competency standards of the 2013 junior high school curriculum, students should be able to comprehend brief functional texts in various everyday contexts, such as recount, narrative, and descriptive texts. This means that even though pre-research revealed that many students still have limited comprehension of texts, especially descriptive texts, it is still necessary for them to understand the type of text that contains definitions, frequent systems, and language features.

Reading involves more than just word identification, according to Das (2009, p. 8); it also entails comprehension or knowing the words about one another. This indicates that reading the

text aloud is crucial to understanding it. Reading still plays a major part and is crucial as a medium to convey meaning and information through the text. Students should not only learn but also comprehend identifying words in context and students' problems in the real world.

Based on preliminary research at one private junior high school in Bandung Regency, the writer found several problems the students face in reading comprehension, particularly in reading descriptive text. The phenomena that occurred in the reading comprehension of descriptive texts were: first, some students could not identify the descriptive text's main idea. Second, some students needed help identifying specific information in the descriptive text. Third, some students needed help identifying inferences from the descriptive text. Fourth, some students needed help with references to the descriptive text. Lastly, some students needed help identifying the meaning of the vocabulary in the descriptive text. This causes students to need help understanding the main idea of the text. Then, the students tend to be lazy in finding the word's meaning because reading takes longer, making it difficult to understand English texts. As a result, they need help understanding the contents of the texts they read. The needs of students make them less enthusiastic and less motivated to read a text; students also become passive because reading activities still depend on the teacher's explanation.

Different reading strategies can assist students in overcoming the reading difficulties mentioned earlier. Students can be engaged in reading comprehension activities through the implementation of a variety of reading instruction strategies. Instructors must identify the most effective strategy for each pupil to assist them in overcoming obstacles. Read, Cover, Remember, and Retell (RCRR) are among them. The Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) method is effective across all reading levels and can assist individuals who believe that excellent reading requires speed but requires assistance comprehending the material (Trisha & Macceca, 2018). Certain authorities have defined the Read Cover, Remember Retell (RCRR) strategy. The Read Cover, Remember Retell (RCRR) strategy is an efficacious approach to supporting readers of all grade levels who mistakenly believe that proficient reading entails rapid comprehension of the material (Gusdinarti, 2013). The instructional activity is initially demonstrated to the entire class and subsequently carried out with pairs of students who read the identical text (Macceca, 2007).

Read, cover, and remember. Retell is intended to encourage readers of informational texts to slow down and read for meaning. They start by reading a short amount of text and then covering the print with their hand. While their hands are over the page, readers question, "What did I learn?" "What is important?" "What keywords and ideas should I remember?" Students rapidly learn that if they are unsure and need to recheck the content, they should adopt the same method as good readers and reread the section to give themselves another chance to assimilate the information. This pause in reading, followed by self-questioning, results in a mid-stream retelling and strengthens content comprehension. The intentional steps establish a habit in which pausing, pondering, self-questioning, and summarizing seamlessly blend into informational reading. (Hoyt, 2009, p. 174).

This research question is based on the description provided above. Is there a difference between students taught using the RCRR technique and those taught without it, In a private junior high school in Bandung Regency, SMP Karya Pembangunan at first-grade students in learning reading comprehension of descriptive text.

RESEARCH METHOD

The study was conducted as an experiment. According to Creswell (2005:282), experimental research is a traditional strategy for conducting quantitative research. Experiment

research involves testing a concept to see if it affects a specific outcome or characteristic. An experiment was carried out to determine the potential cause and effect between independent and dependent variables. The researcher will seek to control all variables affecting the outcome except the independent variable. When the independent variable impacts the dependent variable, it is referred to as "caused" or "probably caused" by the latter. This study included 60 students in the first grade of a private school in Bandung Regency who served as both the control and experimental groups. The study was conducted in July and August 2023. This research spanned three weeks and six meetings with an experimental class strategy. The instrument used to collect data from students was a test. The tests were divided into two types: pre-test and post-test. The final treatment is a post-test, and a pre-test is given before treatment. The test format was multiple-choice. The text presented four options: A, B, C, D, and E. The text type was descriptive text. Both pre-tests and post-tests included 30 items. Using the RCRR technique, the data were statically analysed to determine whether or not there was a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control classes. In cases where the data were normal and homogenous, the T-test was used for analysis; in other cases, the U-Mann Whitney test was used. After calculating the average score, the resultant data was examined using N-gain. Gain determines the percentage of actual (pre-test and post-test) that would result in the greatest possible gain. Subsequently, the N-Gain would be interpreted using the N-Gain score attainment criterion. This study uses the RCRR Strategy and the N-Gain formula to determine the student's reading comprehension effect size. The researchers analysed pre-and post-test data using SPSS for Windows 21.0. Before hypothesis testing, the researchers analysed both groups' normality test distribution and homogeneity variance data. This study tested data for normalcy distribution using the Kolmogorov Smirnov (KS-21) test in SPSS version 21.0. The Levene Test was also performed to ensure sample homogeneity. After testing for normality and homogeneity, the average score was determined. The researcher utilised N-Gain between the pre-test and post-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

After giving descriptive text data in the experimental and control classes, students' reading comprehension is evaluated using a test. The study used pre-test and post-test scores from the first grade students. The following describes the research outcomes based on pre- and post-test scores provided to participants.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic of Pre-Test and Post-Test Score

Value	Class	N	Test of Descriptive Test			Average
			Ideal Score	Min Score	Max Score	
Pre test	Experimental	30	100	40	80	58.3
	Control	30	100	35	80	52.9
Post test	Experimental	30	100	52	85	75.1
	Control	30	100	40	78	59.5

Table 1 data showed the distinctions between the pre-test score and the post-test score. The pre-test's highest score is 80, with the lowest score being 40. Meanwhile, the highest post-test score is 85, with the lowest score being 52. The pre-test's mean score is 58.3, whereas the

post-test score is 75.1 The data stated that the post-test mean score was improved compared to the pre-test mean score. It stated that after implementing Read, Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) strategy, students accomplished a better output in reading understanding of descriptive text.

The data in Table. 1 showed the variety of the outcome of the pre-test and post-test scores of the control class that not taught by the RCRR strategy. The highest score in the pre-test is 80, with the lowest score is 40. The mean score of the pre-test is 52.9, while the post-test mean score is 59.5. In conclusion, there is no significant improvement in the pre-test and post-test scores of the controlled class. The researcher conducted normality, homogeneity, and continuity tests on pre-test data using T-tests or U-Mann-Whitney tests after comparing scores between experimental and control classes. If the data is normal and homogeneous, the T-test can be employed. Otherwise, nonparametric methods such as U-Mann-Whitney can be utilised.

Table 2. Normality test of pre test and post test

Value	Class	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	α (significant level)	Hypothesis	Distribution
Pre-test	Experimental	0.224	0.05	Accept H0	Normal
	Control	0.406	0.05	Accept H0	Normal
Post-test	Experimental	0.169	0.05	Accept H0	Normal
	Control	0.035	0.05	Reject H0	Not Normal

From the table 2 above, it showed of pre- test of experimental class and control class that distribution of data were normal. Based on the value of significant level was 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). In the asymp.Sig (2-tailed) value of experimental class was 0.224, if the data value of asymp.Sig (2-tailed) $0.224 > 0.05$, it meant that the distribution of data was normal and the control class value of asymp.Sig (2-tailed) $0.406 > 0.05$, It meant that the distribution also was normal. Thus, data in both classes were normal. Meanwhile, the normality test of post-test on experimental class and control class were not normal distribution. Here experimental class had the column Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) value was 0.169, it compared with significant lever 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) $0.169 > 0.05$, it meant that the data were normal. While the control class got Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) value was 0.034, it compared with significant lever 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). Asymp.Sig (2-tailed) $0.035 < 0.05$ it meant that the data were not normal.

The researchers conducted normality and homogeneity tests on pre-test. The homogeneity test evaluates sample homogeneity. The value was obtained by comparing it to the trimmed mean at a significance level of 0.05. When analysing the data, the homogeneity test was calculated using the Levene test formula. The results of the homogeneity test of the pre-test for the experimental and control classes are as follows:

Table 3. homogeneity test of pre-test

Data	Trimmed Mean	α (significant level)	Hypothesis	Distribution
Pre-test	0.937	0.05	Accept H_0	Homogeneous

Following the homogeneous test, the researcher calculated the T-test. The T-test was the final pre-test for the experimental and control classes. The parametric statistic (T-test) was chosen due to the normal and homogeneous distribution of pre-test data in the experimental and control groups. This test was conducted to determine if the results differed significantly. The T-test compares Assimp.Sig (2-tailed) to a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$. If Assimp.Sig (2-tailed) < 0.05 , the data was significantly different, while Assimp.Sig (2-tailed) > 0.05 indicated no significant difference. The table below shows the results of the T-test for both classes' pre-tests.

Table 4. T-test result of pre-test

Data	Asymp Sig.tailed)	α (significant level)	Hypothesis	Distribution
Pre-test	0.901	0.05	Accept H_a	Not differ significant

Table 4. shows no significant difference in pre-test results between experimental and control classes due to the asymptotic value of the data. The Sig (2-tailed) value was greater than the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$). The asymp. The sig (2-tailed) value was 0.901, which is more than 0.05. Students' abilities in the experimental and control classes did not differ much.

Meanwhile, nonparametric methods were used to calculate post-test data due to its normality and homogeneity. The researcher calculated the data using the U-Mann Whitney test. The U-test compared Asym.Sig (2-tailed) to a significant level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). When Asym.Sig(2-tailed) < 0.05 , the data differed considerably, whereas when it > 0.05 , there was no significant difference. The table below shows the results of the U-test on post-test.

Table 5. U-tests result of post-test

Data	Asymp Sig.tailed)	α (significant level)	Hypothesis	Distribution
Post test	0.0000	0.05	Accept H_a	Have differ significant

Table 5. indicates a significant difference in U-test results between the experimental and control classes, with an Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) value less than 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). The 2-tailed Asymp.Sig. value was 0.000, which is less than 0.05. Both classes demonstrated considerable differences. Next, the researcher used the N-Gain algorithm to calculate data and compare it to achievement criteria. The average N-Gain score of the experimental class correlated with the criteria for achieving the N-Gain value. The results of N-Gain are as follows:

Table 6. N-Gain Score of Experimental Class

Test	N	N-Gain			Average
		Ideal Score	Minimum Score	Maximum Score	
Pre-test	30	100	40	80	0.425
Post-test	30	100	52	85	

Table 4.8 indicates an average N-Gain of 0.526. The read-cover-remember-to-retell method in the experimental class was considered average if the accomplishment N-Gain score was $0.3 < g < 0.7$. The average N-Gain was $0.3 < 0.526 < 0.7$. Adopting the read, cover, recall, and retell technique improved reading comprehension of recount texts in first-grade children at SMP KP Baros Bandung.

DISCUSSION

The Read Cover Remember Retell (RCRR) strategy had a positive impact on the reading comprehension of first-grade students in junior high school. This cooperative learning method aligns with lesson plans and syllabus in the eighth grade. The difference is that this technique involves forming groups of two or more pupils, which is more successful and efficient. This method helped pupils learn reading comprehension. Using this method in class can increase student engagement and comprehension. Second, the students read the material that contains instructions for this method. As a result, the students could not feel bored or sluggish. Third, this technique helps students add vocabulary to the text by giving them opportunities to read and recall the main points of the text. Finally, pupils not only mastered their own grasp of the reading, but they were also able to share it with her or their partner.

The RCRR strategy improved reading comprehension by increasing student enthusiasm and confidence in sharing points with partners. Furthermore, their reading comprehension skills improved, as evidenced by the fact that the post-test score was greater than the pre-test score. Remember the Retell (RCRR) Strategy. It is an excellent strategy for readers of all grade levels who believe that good reading entails reading rapidly and, as a result, not comprehending what they have read. To conclude, read the cover. The Retell technique is an appropriate method for researchers to teach reading comprehension.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion obtained from the results of this study shows that teaching reading comprehension of descriptive text by using the Read, Cover, Remember and Retell (RCRR) technique provides better results. The data shows the Alternative Hypothesis (H_a) is accepted and the Null Hypothesis (H_0) is rejected. This means that the Read, Cover, Remember and Retell (RCRR) technique is able to improve students' reading comprehension of descriptive text. The study aims to compare the impact of the Read Cover Remember Retell (RCRR) strategy on reading comprehension in first-grade students at SMP KP Baros Bandung. The question has been answered positively. RCRR method enhances reading comprehension. Several results support this, including the following: The Read Cover, Remember, Retell (RCRR) strategy significantly improved students' reading comprehension of descriptive text in

the experimental class compared to the control class. Additionally, there was a significant difference between pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental class. The Read Cover Remember Retell (RCRR) technique significantly improved the reading comprehension of descriptive material among first-grade pupils at SMP KP Baros Bandung. The RCRR technique enhances pupils' reading comprehension of descriptive texts.

REFERENCES

- Butt, David, et al. (2000). *Using Functional Grammar: an Explore's Guide (2nd Ed.)*. Sydney: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research Macquarie University.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research, 4th Edition*. Boston: Pearson Education
- Das, J. P. (2009). *Reading difficulties and dyslexia: An interpretation for teachers* (p. 8). New Delhi: Sage Publication India Pvt Ltd
- Dahler, et al. (2018). Using read cover remember retell (RCRR) in teaching reading comprehension. In International Conference on Innovation in Education (ICoIE 2018) (Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research). Retrieved from <https://www.atlantispres.com/proceedings/icoie-18/55912903> on 14/02/2023
- Dahler, Putra, R. J., Zaim, M., & Fauzan, A. (2019). Using Read Cover Remember Retell (RCRR) in Teaching Reading Comprehension. Atlantis Press: In International Conference on Islamic Education (ICoIE), 211-216
- Derewianka, Beverly, *Exploring How Texts Work*, Australia: Primary English Teaching Association, pp. 16, 2004.
- Grabe & Stoller. 2011. *teaching and researching reading*. Great Britain. Pearson Education Limited.
- Hoyt, Linda. 2009. *Revisit, Reflect, Retell Updated Edition Time-Tested Strategies For Teaching Reading Comprehension*. United States of America. Heinemann.
- Harison, C. (2004). *Understanding Reading Development*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Macceca, S. (2013). *Reading Strategies For Social Studies*. Huntington Beach: Teacher Created Materials.
- Nurrizal & Juriah. 2020. Enhancing students' reading comprehension achievement on report text through students team achievement divisions (stad) method. *Elang An English Language Education Journal*, Edition 5 (1), 12-18
- Trisha, B., & Macceca, S. (2018). *Reading strategies for Mathematics*. Oceanus Dr Huntington Beach: SHELL Education.