

# The Process and CLIL Approaches to Reading Comprehension Competence: is there a difference and does it matter?

*by* Subyantoro Bahasa Indonesia

---

**Submission date:** 09-May-2023 09:22AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 2088148422

**File name:** ehension\_Competence\_is\_there\_a\_difference\_and\_does\_it\_matter.pdf (437.42K)

**Word count:** 3847

**Character count:** 21389

# The Process and CLIL Approaches to Reading Comprehension Competence: is there a difference and does it matter?

<sup>1</sup>St.Nurbaya, <sup>2</sup>Fathur Rahman, <sup>3</sup>Rustono, <sup>4</sup>Subyantoro

## **ABSTRACT**

*Excellent learning begins with a good planning. One of the components of a learning plan that must be considered is choosing a learning approach. The various approaches offered by learning experts are not necessarily in line with the desired learning objectives, so is the approach to reading comprehension learning. Therefore, to find out the effectiveness of a learning approach, it needs to be tested. The aim of this research is to find out whether there is a difference between the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach to reading learning and its effect on reading comprehension competencies. From the results of the influence test it is found that the Process Approach significantly influences reading comprehension competence based on Ruddell's taxonomy, while the CLIL Approach provides insignificant effects on reading competence. It can be seen from the difference in the contribution of the mean value between the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach. The mean increase in the Process Approach was  $2.780 < 0.05$ , while the CLIL Approach was only  $0.049 < 0.05$ .*

**Keywords:** Reading, Process Approach, CLIL Approach

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Learning approach is one of the elements that must be considered in learning. There are various approaches to learning to write, read, listen and speak introduced by experts, such as the approach to the writing process introduced by (Nordin & Mohammad, 2006, p. 77), as well as the reading process approach introduced by Tomkins & Hoskisson, (1995; Tomkins, 2010), and Kastam Syamsi in his 2016 research. Other approaches employed in learning are the CLIL Approach (Coyle, D. 2005), Coyle, D., Philip, H., & David, M. 2010, and Subyantoro (2014, 2015). This study will explain the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach. Both approaches are the chosen approach to be implemented in Indonesian language learning based on the 2013 Curriculum. The Process Approach is a learning approach that directs students to interact with the text so as to foster competence in understanding the contents. Indonesian students reading competence is still low. A number of impediments were found during the learning process, ranging from extraneous factors such as the lack of facilities, family

environment differences, to intra-student factors in the form of motivation, interest, schemata and metacognition.

The low reading competence must be improved. One of the ways is through testing a particular learning approach. The learning approaches tested in this study are the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach.

The utilization of the Process Approach will stimulate the students' cognitive process to decipher the contents of the text by maximizing the use of metacognition. The stages in learning with the approach require students to employ the appropriate and effective ways of thinking to understand texts quickly as well, while the use of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) approaches to reading comprehension courses opens opportunities for the development of multi-language and language competencies and social competence of the students. However, the assumptions in the integrated learning content and language approach in Coyle (2010) \_\_\_\_\_. The CLIL Approach requires students to re-communicate the contents of the text utilizing the metacognition to more quickly gain an understanding of the contents. The students will be more engaged in the learning process because they will utilize all of their own potential in the form of metacognition to understand the text being read. The use of external factors in the form of metacognition becomes the prime factor in mastering the contents of the text being read. Furthermore, the demand to re-communicate the contents of the text in the approach requires the students to employ certain metacognition to achieve maximum results.

The problem explored in this study is the influence of the Process Approach and the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Approach on reading competence. The implementation of both approaches was conducted by taking into account the following factors 1) reading competence must be developed hand in hand with linguistic competence, because reading competence and linguistic competence are the main competencies for understanding text, 2) there is no specific study of students' reading comprehension competence that leads to efforts to construct logical thinking skills in understanding various structures of a text, 3) there is no previous study of reading comprehension competencies of students whose learning uses the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) which integrates linguistic elements as part of the implementation of the Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) Approach and the Process Approach.

## II. RESEARCH METHODS

The approach adopted in this research was a quantitative approach to which problem solving is carried out with a quasi-experimental research type with three variables. The three variables were two independent variables and one dependent variable, in the form of the Process Approach as the experimental class and the CLIL Approach as the control class in reading comprehension learning.

### Population and Research Samples

The population of this research were all of the sixth semester students of the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Department, Faculty of Languages and Arts, Yogyakarta State

University, totaling 180 people enrolled in the Reading Comprehension course. In the academic year 2017/2018 there were six classes with an average number of students 35, thus the number of population classes in this study was six classes, which are A, B, E, F, K, O. Of the six classes, the sample class were determined as described below.

The number of population classes as described in the population sub-section above was six classes which are A, B, E, F, K, O. The selection of the sample was done by cluster random sampling technique by lottery (Sarwono 2013, p. 103). Based on the lottery results, the experimental class was class K and O. Class K became the control class that implements the CLIL Approach, while class O became the experimental class that implemented the Process Approach.

### Research Variables

There were three research variables. The independent variables were the implementation of the Process Approach as the experimental class and the CLIL Approach as the control class and the dependent variable was reading competence.

### Data Collection Techniques and Instruments

The development of instruments employed in this study was derived from the concept of Ruddell's taxonomy (2005). The concept of reading competence and Ruddell's taxonomy derived operational definitions. Operational definitions were then arranged into indicators. The indicators derived instrument lines which were used as a guide for compiling questions or research instruments. The instrument employed in the study was the instrument in the form of \_\_\_\_.

### Instrument Testing

The instrument trial analysis was performed on the instruments employed to ensure their validity and reliability. Testing and analysis of reading comprehension instruments was done empirically and analyzed by statistics as well as a non-statistical empirical test. The instruments were tested and analyzed empirically based on Item Response Theory (IRT) as stated by Subali (2011) in the form of a Quest program conducted on reading competence instruments.

The test findings of the reading comprehension competence instruments based on the Quest program are as follows. There were 35 tests with 40 items with 0.5 chance that were consistent with the principle of Maximum Likelihood. All cases of the tests and anchors were analyzed, and none of the tests were deleted or not analyzed. The reliability value was based on the estimated items of Wright and Master (1982). Based on the values of MEAN INFIT MNSQ 1.00 and SD 0.16 means that overall the items are in accordance with the Rasch model. The reliability test value refers to the number 0.86, while the reading comprehension criteria used in this study are as in the following table.

Table 1.1 Competence Criteria for Reading Comprehension

No.	Category	Score Ranges	Value Ranges
-----	----------	--------------	--------------

1.	Very Good	40-40	80-80
2.	Good	30-39	60-78
3.	Satisfactory	20-29	40-28
4.	Less Than Satisfactory	10-19	20-28

In addition to the normality test for the data to be analyzed, then as a statistical test requirement further homogeneity test need to be done. Homogeneity test conducted on reading competence data was tested with statistical tests.

#### Levene's Test of Equality

The assessment to categorize data homogeneity was performed on the basis of: 1) if the value is significant or the probability value is  $>0.05$ , then the data comes from populations that have the same variant (homogeneous) and if the data is  $<0.05$ , the data comes from populations that have unequal variants or data (not homogeneous). From the summary table of Levene analysis, it is known that the value of reading ability is at the value of F: 0.808 at df1: 1 and df2: 68 sig: 0.372. Because the sig value (p value) is  $0.372 > 0.05$ , then the reading competence data is homogeneous.

#### Data Analysis

Data analysis in this study was conducted according to the type of research that is experimental research. Data analysis was also adjusted to the research variables which have one dependent variable, namely reading competence whose data were on a quantitative scale, with two independent variables, namely the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach based on the type of research data, the data analysis in this study was conducted with a difference test.

### III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

#### Hypothesis Testing of the Effect of the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach on Reading Comprehension Competence

Based on the findings of the analysis of the effect of the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach on reading comprehension competence, the mean increase in reading comprehension competence in the Process Approach group is 2.780, while the CLIL Approach is 0.049. This shows that the Process Approach provides a more substantial contribution than the CLIL Approach. In other words, the CLIL Approach has no effect on reading competence because the influence value is only  $0.049 < 0.05$  which means  $H_0$  is accepted,  $H_a$  is rejected, while the mean increase in the Process Approach is  $2.780 < 0.05$ , it means that  $H_0$  is accepted  $H_a$  is rejected. Put differently, the Process

Approach significantly influences the reading comprehension competence based on Ruddell's taxonomy.

### **The Difference Between the Effect of the Process Approach and the CLIL Approach on Reading Comprehension Competence Based on Ruddell's Taxonomy**

Based on the test findings of the difference between the implementation of the CLIL Approach and the Process Approach using the LSD test, the magnitude of the difference in the increase in reading skills between the CLIL class and the Process Approach class is 2.731 where the increase in reading skills is greater by 2.731. The difference in logical reading competence figures occurs because in theory the Process Approach is designed to direct students to be actively involved in the reading process.

The difference in the value of increased reading in experimental classes is very likely to occur compared to the CLIL Approach as a control class because in theory the CLIL Approach is aimed at understanding the four elements of C in language learning. The four elements of C in the CLIL Approach are content, communication, cognition, and culture (community/citizenship). In other words, the design of teaching materials and/or learning conducted with Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) are four foci learning. The meaning of four foci in this study is first, learning is aimed at understanding the content or the content of the text in the form of the structure and characteristics of the text and not on understanding the information contained in the text, so based on the focus of learning in the form of text content, what is understood by students is the structure and characteristics of the text, not the information presented in the text.

The second focus of learning is aimed at the mastery of language factors, and the use of language, aimed at understanding the linguistic elements used by the writer in the text, while the third focus is communication competence. The focus of communication is oriented towards developing students' communication competence in conveying ideas or expressing opinions. The fourth focus in the CLIL Approach is the understanding of culture or local wisdom delivered by the author in the text so that the utilization of the CLIL concept in reading comprehension results in students' ability to master the content of a particular subject being taught while mastering linguistic factors, and being able to utilize language as a communication tool, both speaking and writing, and reading simultaneously.

Based on the philosophy of the CLIL Approach, ideally the CLIL Approach is useful to improve the four foci of learning which in theory is not designed to improve reading competence, but only to understand the four foci of learning that has been previously described. In addition, in theory, reading competence based on Ruddell's taxonomy is hard to understand because in Ruddell's taxonomy there are reading competencies and sub-competencies that require thought processes that not only require literal cognitive competence, but also interpretative, applicative thought processes.

Reading competence based on Ruddell's taxonomy, which includes eight stages also cannot be developed in a relatively short period of time such as during experiments, because it requires a continuous habituation that has its original purpose set. This is in line with the theory of learning which says that the learning process will produce behavioral changes, which means that whatever is learned

(read) must be understood literally, interpreted, and applied clearly. Reading in the context of Ruddell's taxonomy is a reader competence profile which is drawn in eight steps with three sub-competencies, so continuous practice is needed to master it.

It takes competence to adjust quickly and precisely when interpreting the text that is being read. Appropriate self-adjustment when reading text, related to learning goals or reading goals, as stated by Bloom (1956) and Krathwohl (1964) who arrange learning goals in the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective domains. These cognitive domains consist of several levels of learning, namely knowledge (remembering), understanding (interpretation), application, analysis (trying to think of related concepts), synthesis (merging parts of concepts into whole concepts), and evaluation (comparing values, ideas, and methods).

These domains cannot be achieved when learning is only based on learning theory that utilizes intelligence only as stated by Piaget (2002, p. 311). Piaget's statement (2002, p. 311) is reinforced by the findings of a research conducted by Yustina, et al. (2015) that the critical thinking skills of students must be assisted with the implementation of certain learning, in this case the problem solving learning method is better than students who use conventional learning.

The reading function proposed by Morris (1990, p. 14) leads to meaningful activities for conveying required information. The statement can also be interpreted as in reading activities there is an active reaction function to seek further information to satisfy curiosity (Suryaman, 2001, p. 35). Reading comprehension ability increased by 40% to 80%, according to Sari, et al (2014) and Haerudin (2013), strengthened research findings in children's reading comprehension ranging from 40% to 80% after intervention with the arrangement of the primary ideas, also stated that reading comprehension of experimental class students with the DKB learning model.

A similar finding was also stated by Hassan Soleimani, Sajadeh Hajghani (2013) that students who experiment with reading comprehension strategies in learning English text have increased comprehension compared to those without comprehension strategies, in other words, traditional learning. His research findings also show that strategy training could increase students' awareness of reading strategies, and could encourage the use of reading strategies to master the reading contents, increasing the scores.

Therefore, Piaget (2002, p. 311) and Woolfolk (2008), emphasize that in the process of interpreting knowledge or the meaning of the contents of the text being read must be continually balanced with intelligence development (genetic epistemology), clarified by Woolfolk (2008), that students who possess high-level thinking skills are able to distinguish between facts and opinions, identify relevant information, solve problems, and be able to infer the information that has been analyzed and do not place intelligence competencies as a legacy that will affect certain competencies, including reading competencies.

Learning approach that emphasizes activities in the form of learning processes that require direct reading activities when learning in general delivers a substantial contribution to the aspects to be assessed. Research that indicates the same findings about the use of learning models in reading learning

is a research conducted by Juel (in Kucan et al, 2010) on the use of tutorial instruction model and Hassan Soleimani, Sajadeh Hajghani (2013) about reading comprehension strategies showing results, meaning there are significant changes in reading comprehension in students who take part in learning with the tutorial instruction model.

Likewise, the use of reading and reader-based learning models is also carried out by Suryaman (2001, p. 17). Suryaman finds an increase in students' reading competence of 24.21% from the initial competence of only 60.76%, up to 85.86% after students followed the learning model they developed (2001, p. 372). The findings of Juel and Suryaman's research indicate that reading learning that is designed in the form of instructions (models) clearly influences the research variables (one of the research variables is the ability to understand the contents of the text).

Other research that strengthens the findings of research that implements learning methods that have clear learning activity steps was carried out by Hsiona (2014) who employed the Design-Based-Approach method as a reading project in several model schools. Hsiona found that there was a significant increase in the reading comprehension competence in students after the intervention of learning with Design-Based-Approach.

It can be concluded that the implementation of the learning approach that includes a step of learning activities that involves reading activities and the ability to interpret the reading content shows better results compared to the learning approach whose design does not contain a systematic step like the CLIL Approach. This is in line with the findings of Suyitno (2011) which states that the sequence of presentation of learning material must be presented procedurally in describing the steps in sequence in accordance with the steps of carrying out a task.

Setiawan's research (2011) which also implements Catalisting Strategy in writing learning shows the similarity with this research, in that having clear steps in learning even with different strategies and learning materials promotes excellent learning outcomes and processes.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

The Process Approach significantly influences reading competence based on Ruddell's taxonomy, while the CLIL Approach does not affect it. This can be seen from the difference in the mean value contribution. The mean increase in the Process Approach was  $2.780 < 0.05$ , while the CLIL Approach was only  $0.049 < 0.05$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. Bloom, B. S. (Ed.). 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: The Classification of Educational Goals, Handbook 1: Cognitive Domain*. New York: McKay.
2. Coyle, D. 2005. "Developing CLIL: *Towards a Theory of Practice*" dalam *Monograph 6*. Barcelona: APAC.Hlm. 5-29.



3. Coyle, D., Philip, H., & David, M. 2010. *CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
4. Haerudin, D. 2013. "Model Pembelajaran Diskusi Kelompok Bernomor Dalam Pembelajaran Membaca Pemahaman". *Artikel Jurnal Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia Bandung*. Diperoleh dari [http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/BS\\_JPBSP/article/view/759](http://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/BS_JPBSP/article/view/759) (diunduh 15 Juli 2019).
5. Hsiona, S., Stuart, M., Aaron W., dan Mei, L.K. 2014. "Improving Achievemen in Secondary Scholl: Impach of a Literacy Project on Reading Comprehension and Secondary School Qualification". *JurnalReading Research Quarterly*, 49(13), hlm. 305-325.
6. Juel, C. 2010. "Taking a Long Viuw of Reading Development" dalamKucan et al. (Ed.), *Bringing Reading Research To Life*. New York :The Guilford Press.
7. Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., & Masia, B. B. 1964. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook II, Affective Domain*. New York: David McKay.
8. Nordin, S. Md. & Mohammad, N. 2006. The Beset of Two Approach: Process/Genre-Based Approach to Teaching Writing, *The English Teacher*, (Online), 2006, Vol. XXXV, pp. 75-85, (<http://www.melta.org.my/ET/2006/2006-6.pdf>), diakses 12 Januari 2009.
9. Piaget, J. 1966. *Psychology of Intelligency*. New York: Columbia University Press.
10. Ruddell, M. R. 2005. *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*. Four Edition. USA: Hermitage Publishing Sevices.
11. Ruddell, R. B. 1978. "Developing Comprehensive Abilities: Implications from Research for an Instructional Framework" in S.J Samuels (Ed.), *What Research has to Say about ReadingInstruction*. Newark, Del: International Reading Association.
12. Sari, I., dkk.2014. "Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Melalui Teknik Penataan Gagasan Bagi Anak Kesulitan Belajar". *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Khusus*, 3 (1), hlm. 390-399. Diperoleh dari <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jupekhu> (diunduh 13 Agustus 2018).
13. Setiawan,P. Penggunaan Metode Calistung dalam Pembelajaran Menulis. 2016 Thesis. UMM.Malang
14. Subali, B. 2011. "Pengukuran Kreativitas Keterampilan Proses Sains dalam Konteks Assessment for Learning". *Cakrawala Pendidikan*, 130144.
15. Suratno, &Kurniati, D. 2017. "Implementasi Model Pembelajaran Math-Science Berbasis Performance Assessment Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Mahasiswa di Daerah Perkebunan Kopi Jember". *Jurnal Penelitian danEvaluasiPendidikan*, 21 (1), hlm. 1-10. Diperoleh dari <http://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/jpep>. Hlm. 1-10
16. Suryaman, M. 2001. "Model Pembelajaran Membaca Berbasis Bacaan dan Pembaca. (Studi tentang Bacaan Fiksi dan Non Fiksi dan tentang Pembaca Mahasiswa SLTP)".*Disertasi*. Bandung: Program Pasca Sarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.
17. Suyitno, I. 2011. *Memahami Tindakan Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
18. Tomkins, G.E. & Hoskisson, K. 1995. *Langu- age Arts: Content and Teaching Strate- gies*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Merrill.

19. Tomkins, G.E. 2010. *Literacy for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, A Balanced Approach*. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
20. Yustina, S., dkk. 2015. Penerapan Metode Pembelajaran Problem Solving Terhadap Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Mahasiswa Pada Materi Koloid Kelas XI IPA SMA Negeri 4 Banjarmasin. *Quantum, Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Sains*, Vol.6, No.2, Oktober 2015, hlm. 108-11.
21. Woolfolk, A. 2008. *Educational Psychology Active Learning Edition 10th ed*. Pearson Education, Inc.

# The Process and CLIL Approaches to Reading Comprehension Competence: is there a difference and does it matter?

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

9%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

7%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

- 1** Submitted to Trisakti University  
Student Paper 4%
- 2** Rosita Sihotang, Nelson Balisar Panjaitan. "The Effectiveness of Vocabulary Self-Collection Strategy (VSS) Towards Studentsâ€™ Vocabulary Enhancement", Acuity : Journal of English Language Pedagogy, Literature and Culture, 1970  
Publication 1%
- 3** Harry Affandy, Dewanta Arya Nugraha, Scundy Nourma Pratiwi, C. Cari. "Calibration for Instrument Argumentation Skills on the Subject of Fluid Statics Using Item Response Theory", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021  
Publication 1%
- 4** [eprints.unm.ac.id](http://eprints.unm.ac.id)  
Internet Source 1%
- 5** Putu Ayu Anastasya Putri, I Gusti Ngurah Parthama, Putu Lirishati Soetama. "The <1%

translation evaluation of google translation",  
Journal of Language and Applied Linguistics,  
2021

Publication

---

6	Submitted to School of Business and Management ITB Student Paper	<1 %
7	hdl.handle.net Internet Source	<1 %
8	adoc.pub Internet Source	<1 %
9	diglosiaunmul.com Internet Source	<1 %
10	journal.ia-education.com Internet Source	<1 %
11	journal.stkipsingkawang.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
12	text-id.123dok.com Internet Source	<1 %
13	www.researchgate.net Internet Source	<1 %

---

Exclude quotes  On

Exclude bibliography  On

Exclude matches  < 10 words

# The Process and CLIL Approaches to Reading Comprehension Competence: is there a difference and does it matter?

---

GRADEMARK REPORT

---

FINAL GRADE

**/0**

GENERAL COMMENTS

**Instructor**

---

PAGE 1

---

PAGE 2

---

PAGE 3

---

PAGE 4

---

PAGE 5

---

PAGE 6

---

PAGE 7

---

PAGE 8

---

PAGE 9

---