Toward a Better Preparation of Student Teachers' Reading Skill: The SQ3R Strategy with Authentic and Simplified Texts on Reading Literacy and Vocabulary Mastery

Robi Soma[*]
Jambi University

Amirul Mukminin[**]
Jambi University

Noprival[***]
Jambi University

Abstract

The purpose of the quantitative study with a factorial experimental approach was to examine the significant increase and difference of students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery after being taught through the SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi, Indonesia. The sample of this study was 56 six semester student teachers at one public university in Jambi. To collecting the data, pre-test and post-test techniques were used. The result of paired sample t-test showed that there was a significant progress in students' achievement of reading literacy and vocabulary mastery of both experimental groups. Moreover, the result of independent sample t-test analysis showed that there was no significant difference in students' achievement of reading literacy and vocabulary mastery between both experimental groups as well as level of achievement. The factorial analysis showed that there was an interaction between the kind of texts and students' level of achievement both high and low achievers. Implications of findings and suggestions are discussed.

Keywords: *authentic texts, simplified texts, high and low achievers*

[*] Robi Soma, M.Pd. is a faculty member, Faculty of Education, Jambi University, Indonesia.
E-mail: *robi_soma@yahoo.com*

[**] Amirul Mukminin, PhD. is a faculty member, Faculty of Education, Jambi University, Indonesia.
E-mail: *amirmuk@yahoo.com*

[***] Noprival, MA. Graduated from an MA program from the EFL University in Hyderabad, India.
Email: *noprival@yahoo.com*

Introduction

Reading is a way of getting knowledge and is one of the literacy skills which a person needs to understand. Reading literacy is the capability to grasp the gist of a text. It has a very close relationship with writing literacy, that is, the ability of how to express our thoughts as well as ideas on paper. Even though we read every day, we view reading differently depending on our objective. Some people may read for pleasure, whereas some others probably read for information. In terms of academic fields, reading is important to help students get a better understanding about their subjects. Kabilan, Seng, and Kee (2010) stated, "reading is a dynamic, cognitive and interactive process and not merely a process of decoding of codes in printed form but also a process of creating meaning as a result of the transaction between the reader and the text" (p. 128). Nowadays, due to the advanced technology, students can get suitable reading materials they need to support their comprehension of the course taken. At the same time, reading literacy is developed through good reading materials. Meanwhile, Hill (2006; 2008, p. 3) stated, "Literacy comprises the four basic English skills namely; reading, listening, speaking and writing". Those four literacy skills play an important role to make the students better at communicating effectively. The concept of literacy is broad covering media literacy, visual literacy, and functional literacy.

The plural form of literacies is now commonly used (Hill, 2006; 2008). Therefore, reading literacy is defined as "understanding, using and reflecting on writing texts, in order to achieve one's goals, to develop one's knowledge, potential, and to participate in society" (OECD, 2009, p. 20). Furthermore, Elley (1992 as cited in Diem, 2011) mentioned that the score of our country in the South-East Asia region in that the Indonesian students reading literacy was very low with the score of 51.7 compared to the Philippines with the score of 52.6, Thailand with the score of 65.1, Singapore with the score of 7.4, and Hongkong with the score of 75.5. Meanwhile, according to the report from the Progress International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS, 2012), Indonesia mean score is still low, namely 428. It means that it is still lower than the PIRLS scale average of 500.

In relation to reading, however, most students have low motivation. They only read and study for examinations and are reluctant to find out the information through printed, electronic media and online resources from the internet. They belong to both reluctant and passive readers. Some others often get difficulty to catch the idea of the paragraph as the result of not having good vocabulary mastery. Additionally, vocabulary is an important language element to achieve in comprehension. It means that a communication will never occur in the absence of vocabulary. Thornbury (2009, p. 14) stated, "Most learners still get problems in memorizing words because they forget the words soon after they have looked up in a dictionary. The students sometimes get difficulties in expressing their opinions due to the lack of relevant vocabulary to use". In addition, the use of similar idiomatic expressions to express a different sort of thing has become one of the main obstructions for them to master vocabulary.

More importantly, vocabulary mastery is the skill of the language speaker in choosing the appropriate lexical items or words in oral communication and it is important to support the four English basic skills (Wulandari, 2012). Based on the research conducted for more than a half century, some researchers point out that vocabulary is one of the properties that are specific to language that has to be learned. It is not only a list of words but it is a system which is embedded in a language. For example, Cahyono & Widiyati (2008) argued that good vocabulary mastery supported mastery of each language skill, both receptive and productive skills. In relation to the university students' vocabulary mastery, Sutarsyah (2001) stated that the university students had low achievement in reading skills and vocabulary gain. Furthermore, it was also found out that most of the university students had low achievement in vocabulary mastery which might hamper their academic study (Nurweni & Read, 1998).

Coping with the poor reading literacy, the present study proposed the authentic reading texts as one of the alternative solutions to increase students' literacy especially in reading. Sanderson (1999 as cited in Tamo 2009, p. 74) stated, "Authentic materials are materials that we can use in the classroom and have not been changed in any way for ESL students." Furthermore, authentic materials are generally defined as "those written and oral communications produced by members of a language and culture group for members of the same language and culture group" (Galloway, 1998, p. 133 as cited in Moeller, Ketsman and Masmaliyeva, 2009, p. 20). They provide an appropriate sociocultural context for language learning and allow students to read, see, and feel real language purposefully. The reason why authentic materials are good for teaching and learning activities refers to the fact that those kinds of texts are possible to be created "as close an approximation as possible to the world outside the classroom" (McDonough & Shaw, 1993, p. 43 as cited in Moeller, Ketsman & Masmaliyeva, 2009, p. 21). Cho, Ahn and Krashen (2005) stated that authentic texts are beneficial due to the repeated exposure to the same vocabulary. They tended to memorize various words easily since they appear for more than three times in the book. Hence, the students' vocabulary acquisition was better. The researchers took 37 fourth grade students as the samples of the English as a foreign language in Korea without comparison

group. They read a series of Clifford books. The result showed that their reading comprehension ability increased after reading the books.

However, due to certain objectives, a text cannot be presented as it is because of particular grammatical items, foreign culture content and inappropriate level of vocabulary. In other words, a text needs to be simplified to fulfil the school or university curriculum. A simplified text is a text which has been adapted from the original one in terms of vocabulary, grammatical structure. It can be longer or shorter. Generally, simplified L2 reading texts are either adapted from authentic texts or written explicitly for the L2 reader. At the linguistic level, simplified texts are largely modified to control the complexity of the lexicon and the syntax (Crossley, Allen & McNamara, 2011).

Based on the preliminary study with an informal interview with the sixth semester students and the lecturers who taught them vocabulary and reading subjects, we found that the problems of reading and vocabulary were also faced by the research site student teachers. Approximately forty percent of the students got an average score of 70-74, the rest of them (60%) obtained a below average score. Additionally, the results of informal interviews with the lecturers, we found that only 40% of the students had an intermediate level reading ability, while others were below.

Looking at the data, we thought that it was necessary to improve the students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery and we offered to apply the SQ3R strategy in teaching authentic and simplified texts. SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review) (Robinson, 1970) was a reading strategy which was designed to help students improve their comprehension (understanding), memory, and efficiency in reading. This strategy was chosen as studies on the use of the SQ3R strategy in teaching authentic and simplified texts to improve the students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery in English as a foreign language has not much been done in Indonesian contexts. The purpose of the quantitative study with a factorial experimental approach was to examine the significant increase and difference of students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery after being taught through the SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts.

Methods and Procedures

Methods

The present study used the quantitative study with a factorial experimental approach. In a factorial design, two or more independent variables were involved (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010). This kind of design is used for two primary purposes: (1) to see if the effects of an intervention are consistent across characteristics of the subjects and (2) to examine the unique effect of the independent variables together (this is called an interaction). There were two groups in this study: two experimental groups without control group. In both groups, the students were given the treatment in the form of intervention using the SQ3R with authentic texts for one group whereas the other group was taught using the SQ3R with simplified texts. SQ3R, (Survey, Question, Read, Recite and Review) is a method of teaching English especially reading to the students. This study involved two parallel groups which became both experimental groups, (SQ3R with authentic and simplified texts) with two subjects areas (vocabulary and reading), and two levels of achievements (high and low). To put them into matrix, it would be as follows: 2 x 2 x 2. Both groups were given a pre-test and post-test with the same treatment but with different kinds of texts. In conducting this study, we made two experimental groups in order to find out the effect of using one teaching method with two different texts in students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery of the sixth semester student teachers at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi. The diagram of factorial design can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Factorial experimental design

R (Random assignment) High Achievers	Pre-test	Experimental Group 1	authentic texts	(Y1) Reading literacy (Y2) Vocabulary mastery	Post-test
		Experimental Group 2	simplified texts	(Y1) Reading literacy (Y2) Vocabulary mastery	
R (Random assignment) Low Achievers	Pre-test	Experimental Group 1	authentic texts	(Y1) Reading literacy (Y2) Vocabulary mastery	Post-test
		Experimental Group 2	simplified texts	(Y1) Reading literacy (Y2) Vocabulary mastery	

In taking the sample, we administered the International TOEFL Prediction (TOEFL ITP) to the population in order to know the students' English proficiency. The test lasted 3 hours which consisted of: Section1− Listening comprehension 50 items, Section 2− Structure and written expression 40 items

and Section 3− Reading comprehension 50 items. The total number of items was 140 items. We used the purposive random sampling technique and chose the participants on the basis of the score gained by the students. The students who got the TOEFL score >450 were categorized as high achievers and those who got <450 were categorized as low achievers. The population of this study was 98 sixth semester students from the regular classes in the academic year of 2012/2013. 56 out of 98 students were taken randomly as the sample of the study in which 16 students were included in the high category and 40 students were included in the low category. They were divided equally into two groups; experimental group 1 (that was taught by using SQ3R with the authentic texts) and experimental group 2 (that was taught by using SQ3R with the simplified texts). In teaching the materials, we used the authentic texts materials from the Jakarta Post daily newspaper and the same texts were simplified by a native speaker and a Ph.D. student from Florida State University, USA.

The data of this study were vocabulary and reading literacy achievement. The technique used to obtain the data was TOEFL ITP: reading and vocabulary sections. The tests were used to measure the reading literacy and vocabulary mastery achievement of the sixth semester student teachers at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi in the academic year of 2012/2013. The try-out was administered at the research site in May 2013. The analysis of Alpha Cronbach showed that reliability coefficient of test items was .897 for vocabulary and .810 for reading. Test items were considered reliable since the coefficient exceeded .70. In addition, since this coefficient was higher than .70, the test items of reading comprehension were considered valid. Only two items of the vocabulary test were discarded since they were too difficult and were considered invalid. The reading and vocabulary tests were constructed by selecting texts with the readability for the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th reading level. Flesch-Kincaid technique through Microsoft Word was used to measure readability. 28 items of vocabulary test and 30 items of reading test.

The Procedures

The procedure of conducting SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, Recite, and Review) strategy was adapted from the procedure designed by Robinson (1970). This five-phase procedure was explained as follows. *Survey,* the teacher asked the students to skim the title of the newspaper article, including the introduction, the table of contents and any illustrations, charts or graphs and the summary paragraph. The students were supposed to write unfamiliar words and find the definitions. Most importantly, skim the section headings and the first sentences of each paragraph to find the main points to be developed. The time was only a few minutes.

Question, the teacher had the students turn the first heading or the first sentence of the first paragraph into a question and asked them to increase the students' and the teacher's involvement and comprehension. *Read,* the teacher asked the students to read for the purpose of answering that question, i.e., to the end of the first headed section. This was not a passive plodding along each line, but an active search for the answer. They just underlined only key words, not the whole paragraphs. Use a dictionary when necessary to look up unfamiliar words. *Recite,* when the students have finished reading the first section, have them look away from the book and try briefly to recite in their own words the answer to their question (aloud if possible). *Review,* the teacher asked the students to look over their notes again to get a bird's-eye view of the points and their relationship to one another. Check their memory by reciting the major points under each heading and sub-points under each major point. The teacher did this by covering up the notes and tried to recall the information.

Results and Discussions

The purpose of the quantitative study with a factorial experimental approach was to examine the significant increase and difference of students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery after being taught through the SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi, Indonesia. The findings of this study indicated that the Shapiro-Wilk test of reading literacy, p-value of reading literacy pre-test in experimental group 1 was .365 and p-value of post-test was .539 whereas p-value of reading literacy pre-test in experimental group 2 was .613 and p-value of post-test was .707. In terms of vocabulary mastery, p-value of vocabulary pre-test in experimental group 1 was .387 and p-value of posttest was .797 whereas p-value of vocabulary pre-test in experimental group 2 was .893 and p-value of post-test was .880. Since p-values exceeded .05 it meant that the pretest and posttest data could be assumed normally distributed. Levene's test of homogeneity showed that the p-value of the posttest of reading literacy was .420 and vocabulary was .176. This value exceeded .05, meaning that posttest scores of reading literacy and vocabulary mastery of both experimental groups were homogen. Therefore, it could be assumed that the data of this study were statistically found reliable and valid.

Additionally, the mean score of reading literacy in the poor category was 48.95, in the average category was 63.49, and in the good category was 77.33. On the other hand, for vocabulary mastery achievement, the mean score in the poor category was 49.50, in the average category was 63.20, and in the good category was 75.44, and in the excellent category was 86.20. Moreover, the mean scores of students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery achievements in both experimental groups were 64 and 68. In can be concluded that the mean score of the students' reading literacy achievement was in the average level category and students' vocabulary achievement was in the average level category.

Also, the findings of this study indicated that the frequency and percentage of students' reading literacy achievement showed that there were 6 students (10.7%) who were in the poor category, 41 students (73.2%) who were in the average category, and 9 students (16.2%) who were in the good category. The result showed that most of the students' reading literacy achievement was in the average category (73.2%). On the other hand, the results of students' vocabulary achievement in both experimental groups, there were 4 students (7.1%) who were in the poor category, 27 students (48.2%) who were in the average category, 23 students (41.1%) who were in the good category, and 2 students (3.6%) were in the excellent category. The result showed that most students' vocabulary achievement was in the average category (48.2%) as can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. Frequency and mean of students' vocabulary mastery and reading literacy based on students' achievement level (N=56)

Variables	Levels of Achievement	Mean	Freq & Prcntg	Std.
1. VOCAB	Very Poor			
	Poor	49.50	4 (7.1 %)	3.45
	Average	63.20	27 (48.2 %)	4.04
	Good	75.44	23 (41.1 %)	3.83
	Excellent	86.20	2 (3.6 %)	0.28
TOTAL		274.34	56 (100 %)	11.60
MEAN		68.07		2.32
2. READING	Very Poor	-	-	-
LITERACY	Poor	48.95	6 (10.7 %)	3.86
	Average	63.49	41 (73.2 %)	3.89
	Good	77.33	9 (16.2%)	3.86
	Excellent	-	-	-
TOTAL		189.77	56 (100 %)	12.38
MEAN		64.15	-	2.48

Table 3. Mean difference between pre- and post-tests of vocabulary mastery and reading literacy achievement of experimental group 1 and 2based on SQ3R method and levels of achievement

	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST		Mean difference Pre and Post-test Exp 1 Within
Variables	Mean Exp 1 AT	Mean Exp 2 ST		Mean Exp 1 AT	Mean Exp 2 ST
1. Vocabulary	51.8	48.3	16.48	68.3	67.9
a. High	64.4	64.3	12.55	76.9	69.8
b. Low	46.8	42	20.91	67.7	64.4
2. Reading					
Literacy	33.7	45.4	28.85	62.6	65.8
a. High	34.2	55.3	32.15	66.4	78.1
b. Low	33.5	41.4	27.5	61	60.9

Mean difference Pre and Post-test Exp 2 Within	T-Value Post-Test Between Exp 1 & Exp 2	T-Value of Gain Between Exp 1 & Exp 2 p<	The Value of Sig.2-tailed Exp1 Within	The Value of Sig.2-tailed Exp2 Within	The Value of Sig.2-tailed Between Exp1 and Exp2
19.53	0.4	0.16	0.000	0.000	0.873
5.45	7.15	2	0.005	0.003	0.065
22.4	3.42	1.2	0.000	0.000	0.235
20.38	3.196	1.44	0.000	0.000	0.153
22.86	11.51	5.29	0.000	0.000	0.060
19.49	0.13	0.06	0.000	0.000	0.950

As shown in table 3, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 was 33.7 with the standard deviation was 9.04. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' reading literacy achievement in post-test in experimental group 1 was 62.55 with the standard deviation was 6.38. The output data showed that the mean difference of reading literacy achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 was 28.85 with the standard deviation was 9.06, and t-obtained was 16.83 (p<0.000). Since t-obtained of vocabulary, and reading literacy (7.38 and 16.83) were higher than t-table both 1.674 and 2.005. On the other hand, the result of paired sample t-test in experimental group 1, which was taught by using SQ3R with authentic texts, the mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 was 51.79 with the standard deviation was 15.35. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of experimental group 1 was 68.27 with the standard deviation was 7.36. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 was 16.48 with the standard deviation was 11. 80, and t-obtained was 7.38 (p<0.000). Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o1 and H_o2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a1 and H_a2) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by the experimental group 1.

Concerning the result of paired sample T-test in experimental group 2 which was taught by using SQ3R with simplified texts, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 was 20.38 with the standard deviation was 7.56 and t-obtained was 14.25 (p<0.000). Since t-obtained of vocabulary, and reading literacy (10.71 and 14.25) were higher than t-table both 1.674 and 2.005. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o1 and H_o2) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a1 and H_a2) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by the experimental group 2. On the other hand, the mean difference of vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 2 was 48.34 with the standard deviation was 16.19. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of experimental group 2 was 67.87 with the standard deviation was 10.96. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 was 19.53 with the standard deviation was 9.64, and t-obtained was 10.71 (p<0.000).

In terms of levels of achievement, the result of paired sample t-test in experimental group 1 which was taught by using SQ3R with authentic texts, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 for high achievers was 34.23 with the standard deviation was 10.27. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' reading literacy achievement in post-test of high achievers experimental group 1 was 66.41 with the standard deviation was 1.45. The output data showed that the mean difference of reading literacy achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 of high achievers was 32.17 with the standard deviation was 7.00 and t-obtained was 13.00 (p<0.000). On the other hand, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 for low achievers was 33.5 with the standard deviation was 8.78. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' reading literacy achievement in post-test of low achievers was 61.01 with the standard deviation was 6.54. The output data showed that the mean difference of reading literacy achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 of low achievers was 27.52 with the standard deviation 9.60 and t-obtained was 12.81 (p<0.000). Since t-obtained in vocabulary of high achievers were higher than t-table both 1.895 and 2.365 and low achievers were higher than t-table both 1.729 and 2.093. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o3 and H_o4) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a3 and H_a4) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by both high and low achievers in experimental group 1.

In addition, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement in pre-test of experimental group 2 which was taught by using simplified texts for high achievers was 55.27 with the standard deviation was 7.43. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' reading literacy achievement in post-test of high achievers experimental group 2 was 77.92 with the standard deviation was 4.57. The output data showed that the mean difference of reading literacy achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 of high achievers was 22.65 with the standard deviation was 7.57 and t-obtained was 8.46 (p<0.000). On the other hand, the mean score of students' reading literacy achievement in pre-test of experimental group 2 for low achievers was 41.41 with the standard deviation was 6.72. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of low achievers was 60.88 with the standard deviation was 6.37. The output data showed that the mean difference of reading achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 of low achievers was 19.47 with the standard deviation was 7.56 and t-obtained was 11.51 (p<0.000). Since t-obtained in reading literacy of high achievers were higher than t-table both 1.895 and 2.365 and low achievers were higher than t-table both 1.729 and 2.093. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o3 and H_o4) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a3 and H_a4) were accepted

which means that there was a significant difference made by both high and low achievers in experimental group 2.

On the other hand, in terms of levels of achievement, the mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 for low achievers were 46.79 with the standard deviation was 15.08. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of low achievers was 67.68 with the standard deviation was 7.62. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 of low achievers was 20.89 with the standard deviation 11.04 and t-obtained was 8.45 ($p < 0.000$). Since t-obtained in vocabulary of high achievers were higher than t-table both 1.895 and 2.365 and low achievers were higher than t-table both 1.729 and 2.093. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o3 and H_o4) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a3 and H_a4) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by both high and low achievers in experimental group 1. The mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1 for high achievers was 64.35 with the standard deviation was 9.51. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of high achievers experimental group 1 was 76.90 with the standard deviation was 7.36. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 1 of high achievers was 12.55 with the standard deviation 8.90 and t-obtained was 3.98 ($p < 0.000$).

In addition, the mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 2 which was taught by using simplified texts for high achievers was 64.30 with the standard deviation was 6.42. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of high achievers experimental group 2 was 69.75 with the standard deviation was 6.92. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 of high achievers was 5.45 with the standard deviation 3.42 and t-obtained was 4.50 ($p < 0.000$). On the other hand, the mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 2 for low achievers was 22.32 with the standard deviation was 8.61. Meanwhile, the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement in post-test of low achievers was 41.94 with the standard deviation was 13.72. The output data showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement between pre-test and post-test in experimental group 2 of low achievers was 19.62 with the standard deviation 20.56 and t-obtained was 4.26 ($p < 0.000$). Since t-obtained in vocabulary of high achievers were higher than t-table both 1.895 and 2.365 and low achievers were higher than t-table both 1.729 and 2.093. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H_o3 and H_o4) were rejected and the research hypotheses (H_a3 and H_a4) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by both high and low achievers in experimental group 2.

From the result of the independent samples T-test, the mean difference of reading literacy post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 3.19 and t-obtained was 2.00 ($p < 0.000$). In addition, vocabulary post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 0.4 and t-obtained was 0.16 ($p < 0.000$). Since the p value or output of reading literacy and vocabulary were more than the value of probability 0.05 or 0.025 and t-obtained was higher than t-table (1.674 and 2.005). Therefore, the null hypotheses (H_o3) was accepted and the research hypotheses (H_a3) was rejected. It means that there was no difference in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery achievement between the students who were taught by using authentic texts (Experimental group 1) and those who were taught by using simplified texts (Experimental group 2). In other words, authentic texts and simplified texts are both effective to teach the students both reading literacy and vocabulary mastery.

In terms of levels of achievement, for reading of high achievers, the mean difference of reading literacy post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 11.51 and t-obtained was 5.29 ($p < 0.000$). In addition, for reading literacy of low achievers, the mean difference of reading literacy post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 0.13 and t-obtained was 0.06 ($p < 0.000$). Meanwhile, for vocabulary of high achievers, the mean difference of vocabulary post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 7.15 and t-obtained was 2.00 ($p < 0.000$). In addition, for vocabulary of low achievers, the mean difference of vocabulary post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 3.42 and t-obtained was 1.20 ($p < 0.000$)

Since the p value or output of reading literacy and vocabulary mastery in both high and low achievers in experimental group 1 and 2 were more than the value of probability 0.05 or 0.025 and t-obtained was higher than t-table for low achievers was 1.674 & 2.005 (df=14) and high achievers was 1.685 & 2.024 (df=38). Therefore, the null hypotheses (H_o3) was accepted and the research hypotheses (H_a3) was rejected. It means that there was no difference in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery achievement between the students who were taught by using authentic texts (Experimental group 1) and those who were taught by using simplified texts (Experimental group 2). In other words, authentic and

simplified texts were effective to teach the students vocabulary and reading literacy either high or low achievers.

Table 4. Tests Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Post-test

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5461.857[a]	3	1820.619	11.915	.000
Intercept	84810.728	1	848105.728	5550.296	.000
Group	652.536	1	652.536	4.270	.044
Level	3942.676	1	3942.676	25.802	.000
Group * Level	1409.700	1	1409.700	9.226	.004
Error	7945.793	52	152.804		
Total	992507.330	56			
Corrected Total	13407.650	55			

a. R Squared = .407 (Adjusted R Squared = .373)

In relation to the interactions between group and students' level of achievement based on the formulation 2 x 2 x 2 factorial design, it could be said that authentic texts were suitable for both high and low achievers in both experimental groups. Therefore, the null hypotheses (Ho4 and Ho5) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha4 and Ha5) were accepted. It means that there was an interaction between the kind of texts and students' level of achievement in this case high and low achievers as moderator variables. In other words, group and level of achievement altogether affected reading literacy and vocabulary mastery achievement.

Referring to the results of the study, it showed that authentic and simplified texts were capable of attracting the sixth semester student teachers at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi to study English particularly reading literacy and vocabulary mastery. It was also proved that those two kinds of texts could make significant increase in students' achievement of reading literacy and vocabulary mastery both in experimental group 1 using authentic texts and experimental group 2 using simplified texts and also for the two levels of achievement; high and low achievers. Based on the descriptive and statistical analysis, the students who were taught by using authentic texts and simplified texts got good progress both in vocabulary mastery and reading literacy. The reason why the writer chose authentic texts was that this kind of texts gave more exposure to the target language, provided students with the real information about foreign cultures (Berardo, 2006).

In relation to the result of paired sample t-test, the statistical analysis showed that in reading literacy, there was a significant difference both in high and low achievers and also for the combination of those two. In addition, the statistical analysis also showed that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement both in high and low achievers, except for the combination of those two. From the independent samples t-test between experimental group 1 which was taught by using authentic texts and experimental group 2 which was taught by using simplified texts, it was found that there was no significant difference both in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery. In other words, authentic and simplified texts had the same effectiveness. The same thing also happened with the students' level of achievement in which there was no difference between the two groups.

Basically, authentic texts could be used by any level of students from the beginning to intermediate level of L2 learners (Crossley, Louwerse, McCarthy, & McNamara, 2007). However, the 'original' texts were seldom used for EFL students due to the inappropriate level of students besides some difficulties faced by the students themselves such as unfamiliar foreign culture, grammatical complexity and a large number of unfamiliar words. Besides, low-frequency words were often encountered by the students so that it made them got less understanding about the texts being read. In line with that, one of the disadvantages of using authentic texts was the irrelevant vocabulary items to the students' immediate needs (Berardo, 2006). It meant that the students almost always got along with words they never used in their daily life. For those reasons, it could be accepted if the students of this study could not perform well since they themselves belonged to the average level students based on the result of vocabulary and reading literacy post-tests. In relation to factorial analysis, there was an interaction between group and students' level of achievement which meant that both authentic texts and simplified texts could increase students' vocabulary and reading literacy not only for high but also low achievers.

Conclusions and Suggestions

The purpose of the quantitative study with a factorial experimental approach was to examine the significant increase and difference of students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery after being taught through the SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts at one English Study Program Public University in Jambi, Indonesia. The findings of this study shed light on our understanding of the effects of the use of SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts on students' achievement in reading literacy and vocabulary mastery. From the results of the data analyses and interpretations, it could be concluded that authentic texts could increase students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery in all levels of students. The statistical analysis showed that there was no significant difference between the students who were taught by using authentic and simplified texts which meant that those two kinds of texts are both effective. It was also found that authentic material such as reading, was suitable for both high and low achievers. Moreover, by giving the authentic texts, they would become well-informed about what was happening in the world. Furthermore, in giving authentic materials to the students, it was important to consider the grade level of the materials so that teachers could get suitable learning materials, especially for authentic texts reading materials that were good for EFL students in order to familiarize them with the real English language by considering the level of students. Furthermore, a large amount of exposure was necessary to make them interested in learning English especially vocabulary and reading.

Implications for the improvement teaching and learning vocabulary and reading literacy can be drawn from the findings of this study. First, to study English well and thoroughly, students should be engaged more with authentic texts since those learning materials provide them with a large variety of language styles and rich of new vocabulary. They need to learn something different out of the textbooks. English curriculum has to provide students with a lot of materials in all fields of study such as: politics, economy, environment, culture and so on. By having a lot of exposure on authentic texts, it is hoped that students will be encouraged to read more books, newspapers, magazines and other reading materials. Second, since teaching reading and vocabulary using authentic texts are quite difficult to do and time consuming, teachers are required to be more creative in selecting the materials which are suitable to the student's need and based on the curriculum. In addition, teachers need good preparation to teach reading and vocabulary using authentic texts and also to master the material very well. The readability of the texts is another important thing to consider by teachers so that students are able to understand the materials. Last, as a formal institution, a school or college has to facilitate students with access to get various kinds of reading literacy and vocabulary materials which are suitable with the curriculum to reach the objectives of the study and make use of the school library as a source to obtain knowledge and information.

References

Berardo, S. A. (2006). The use of authentic materials in the teaching of reading. *The Reading Matrix, 6* (2), 347-353.

Cahyono, B. Y., Widiyati. U. (2008). The teaching of EFL vocabulary in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal, 19*(1), 1-17.

Chou, K. S., Ahn, K. O., & Krashen, S. (2005). The effects of narrow reading of authentic texts on interest and reading ability in English as a foreign language. *Reading Improvement, 42* (1), 58-65.

Crossley, S. A., Louwerse, M. M., Mc Carthy, P. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2007). A Linguistic analysis of simplified and authentic texts. *The Modern Language Journal, 91*(7), 15-30.

Crossley, S. A., Allen, D. B., & Mc Namara, D. S. (2011). The readability and intuitive simplification: A comparison of readability formulas. *Reading in a Foreign Language Journal 23*(1), 84-101.

Diem, C. D. (2011). *Perpustakaan, kepustakaan, dan keaksaraan: Model pembelajaran EYL.* Palembang: Penerbit Universitas Sriwijaya.

Flesch Kincaid. (2011). *Reading case*. Available: http://www.St&ards-schm&ards.com/ exhibits/rixindex.php.

Hill, S. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Assessment and teaching.* Praharan: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Kabilan, M. K., Seng, M. K., & Kee, O. A. (2010). Reader- text transaction in text comprehension. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies, 10*(3), 1-16.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry* (7th ed). New York, NY: Pearson.

Moeller, A. J., Ketsman, O., & Masmaliyeva, L. (2009). The essential of vocabulary teaching: From theory to practice. *Diverse by Design: Central State Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Language Report, 1*(1), 16-31.

Nurweni, A., & Read, J. (1998). The English vocabulary knowledge of Indonesian university students. *English for Specific Purposes, 18*(2), 161-175.

OECD. (2010). PISA 2009 *Results: What students know and can do: Student performance in reading, mathematics and science.* Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264091450.

Priyatno. D. (2009). *Mandiri belajar SPSS bagi mahasiswa dan umum*. Yogyakarta: Mediakom.

Robinson, S. (1970). *Effective Study* (4th ed). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Sutarsyah, C. (2001). Vocabulary analysis on reading texts EFL students. *TEFLIN Journal, 12*(2), 118-125.

Tamo, D. (2009). The use of authentic materials in classrooms. *LCP Journal 2*(1), 74-78.

Thornbury, S. (2009). *How to teach vocabulary.* Essex: Longman.

Wulandari, T. R. (2012). Increasing English vocabulary of the fifth grade through videotaped children songs. A Paper presented in the 59th TEFLIN International Conference in Surabaya, Indonesia.