

**PEEL: Journal English Education and Linguistic**

Vol. 4, No. 2, 2025

DOI 10.56489/fik.v4i2

**P-ISSN: 2962-7265; E-ISSN: 2962-7273**

## **THE INFERENTIAL READING COMPREHENSION OF READING TEXT**

**Taher<sup>1</sup>**

[Kamilataher837@gmail.com](mailto:Kamilataher837@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

This study aims to describe the inferential reading comprehension ability of senior high school students in understanding English reading texts. Inferential reading comprehension refers to the ability to understand implied meanings in a text, including inferring unstated main ideas, identifying the author's purpose, and drawing conclusions. This research employed a descriptive qualitative design. The participants of the study were 46 third-year students of SMAN 4 Berau in the 2007/2008 academic year. The primary instrument used for data collection was a multiple-choice reading test consisting of 20 items, designed to measure students' abilities in inferring unstated main ideas, detecting the author's purpose, drawing conclusions, and general reading comprehension. The results of the study showed that the overall mean score of students' inferential reading comprehension was 68.26%, which falls into the "good" category. Specifically, the students' ability in inferring unstated main ideas reached 74.27% (good), detecting the author's purpose reached 69.56% (good), drawing conclusions reached 61.23% (fair), and general reading comprehension reached 67.39% (good). The distribution of students' achievement levels indicated that 15.2% of the students were classified as excellent, 43.5% as good, 30.4% as fair, and 10.9% as poor. These findings suggest that although the students generally demonstrate a good level of inferential reading comprehension, they still face difficulties particularly in drawing conclusions from reading texts. Therefore, continuous practice and appropriate instructional strategies are necessary to further improve students' inferential reading comprehension skills.

**Keywords:** inferential reading, comprehension, reading text

### **A. INTRODUCTION**

Research on reading comprehension has been conducted in connection with the role that reading plays in guiding the acquisition of other language abilities. However, junior and senior high school pupils in Indonesia, where English is regarded as a foreign language, still struggle with their reading abilities. This study

---

<sup>1</sup> Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Tarbiyah Muhammadiyah Tanjung Redeb

attempts to find a solution to this problem, specifically regarding the students' capacity to understand implicit concepts.

Communication between the reader and the writer occurs during the reading process. Reading provides enjoyment in addition to knowledge and information. Readers can obtain a variety of information and broaden their perspective through reading. In summary, reading helps readers become knowledgeable individuals. Reading is one of the English language skills that pupils should study mandatory in senior high school, along with speaking, writing, and listening.

The author attempted to convey that the reading section's goal is to understand the contents of the brief functional texts and essays, which must take the form of recount, narrative, procedure, descriptive, news item, spoof, report, analytical exposition, hortatory exposition, explanation, discussion, and review in the contextual daily and to access the science or knowledge. The author inferred from the aforementioned remark that reading is crucial for mastering other language abilities including speaking, writing, and listening.

Despite having been taught English since junior high school, the children continued to struggle with comprehensive reading. According to Otto and Spiegel, many children are proficient readers of the passage's words, but they struggle to respond to questions that require them to draw conclusions or identify the major theme. Many junior and senior high school pupils still struggle to understand what they read.

These issues arise because reading students should make use of hints and past knowledge they have already learned. They should also be motivated to overcome unfamiliar words and information, which were areas in which they lacked proficiency. When attempting to understand the reading passage's substance, students continue to encounter the same issue.

From these opinions, it can be said that reading to understand still becomes problems for most students of senior / junior high school in Indonesia. Concerning with the reading comprehension skill, Kustaryo divides it into three levels of comprehension.

1. The first comprehension skill is literal reading comprehension. It is the comprehension of a text in which the ideas and fact are clearly stated in the text, so the readers can go back to the text to find the information desired.
2. The second comprehension skill is inferential reading comprehension. It is the comprehension of the text in which the readers must read between lines to get the implied meaning. In other words, the readers must draw conclusion of unstated meaning by putting fact and ideas together through more thinking and predicting what is not stated by the authors. At last,
3. The third comprehension skill is critical reading comprehension. It is the comprehension of the text in which the reader must read critically, so they might question, compare or evaluate the text.

It can be said that in *Standars Kompetensi Lulusan (SKL)* is explained that in reading material the students have to find the conclusion in generally, the main ideas, the implied informations, detail of informations, the certain informations and also the meaning of words/frase/sentences from the texts that have to form of the short functional text and essay that divides into narrative, descriptive and argumentative.

To put it another way, the researcher attempts to assume that senior high school students should be proficient readers, particularly in literal and inferential reading comprehension. Regarding the first objective, there aren't many challenges for the students to handle the material.

However, when they are asked to recognize the implicit meaning, sometimes it is not always easy for them to do. The students are required to have the ability not only to understand the sentences, but also they are asked to guess what are actually meant by the implicit sentences. The writer in PPPGT.VEDC Malang formulated that the students reading skill can be develop by learning of reading comprehension techniques such as skimming, scanning, reading in detail, less the meaning of words, reading for the main idea and make some predicting about the content of reading passage According to the writer in PPPGT.VEDC Malang,

According to Lin Lougheed made a strategy to developing reading comprehension skill as PSRA strategy or prediction, scan, read, and answer. And also as Asniar Azis Hamrat formulates SQ3R or survei, question, read, recite and review. To build the reading comprehension skill of the students.

## **B. METHODOLOGY**

This research was intended to describe the second year student' abilities to comprehend the inferential reading comprehension of English reading text. In line with this purpose, that was to describe about the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension, the appropriate research design chosen was a descriptive qualitative design. According to Strauss and Corbin if a research wanted to describe certain variable, the research was a descriptive qualitative research.

Through qualitative research method, it enabled the researcher to intricate details of the phenomena. However, these methods were in effect quantifying qualitative data, which was done by coding a data in a manner that allow them to be statistically analyzed

### **1. The Research Instruments**

In relation with this research, the researcher applied some data collection methods to get the required data, consisting of primary and supporting data. The instruments of this study would be a written test in inferring unstated main idea, detecting the author's purpose and general reading. The test is multiple choice with five options which consist of 20 items. Arikunto explained that test was a set of questions, exercise or other means which were used to measure skill, knowledge, intelligence, ability or talent of individuals or groups. In this research, test could apply to measure the students' abilities to identify the inferential reading comprehension in English reading texts.

The test was objective test in the form of multiple choice. This kind of test could be used by considering that it could test many materials in short time. In addition, it was easier to score and create likely higher test reliability. Hughes stated that the most obvious advantage of multiple choices was that scoring could be perfectly reliable. The test consisted of 20 items. The allocation time was 60

minutes. These items could spread out equally to the three indicators of this research.

For inferring unstated main idea, detecting the author's purpose and drawing conclusion each consists of six items and for general reading consists of two items. Each correct answer could get 5 points.

For each wrong answer, got 0 point. If the respondents were able to answer all items correctly, they could get 100 point.

Table 1. Distributions of item for each indicator

No	Item No	Indicator
1. Reading Text 1	1	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	2	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	3	Drawing A Conclusion
	4	General Reading (genre of text)
2. Reading Text 2	5	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	6	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	7	Drawing A Conclusion
3. Reading Text 3	8	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	9	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	10	Drawing A Conclusion
	11	General Reading (genre of text)
4. Reading Text 4	12	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	13	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	14	Drawing A Conclusion
5. Reading Text 5	15	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	16	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	17	Drawing A Conclusion
6. Reading Text 6	18	Inferring Unstated Main Idea
	19	Detecting The Authors' Purpose
	20	Drawing A Conclusion

Regarding the test validity and reliability, this research used content validity because it was intended to use representative material of the language skills, which were measured. Moreover, the test items were constructed by considering the material stated in the *KTSP* 2006 and the research indicators to meet the content

validity of the test. Concerning with the reliability, Hughes stated that a valid test must be reliable; a reliable test may not be valid at all. The test, which was considered valid, was commonly reliable although it was conducted in a different place at different time. In line, with this idea, Joni stated that if the test is valid it must be reliable. On the other hand, when the test is a reliable, it is not always valid. It could be concluded that the test, which is valid, must be reliable. Based on the statements above, since the test had content validity, it was valid and reliable. Therefore, the reliability of the test was established.

This research used objective test by using multiple-choice test. Teacher made test was used in this research. Teacher made test was a test, which was constructed by the teacher himself.

However, this test was consulted to the material in the KTSP 2006 of the second students of SMA, and to the English teacher of SMAN 4 Berau.

When there were the test items which were unsuitable with the aim of the teaching, they would be revised. In fact, the test material was suitable with the aim of the teaching. So, the test items were not revised.

In this study, the writer himself compiled the test materials from the handbook of SMAN 4 Berau, they are:

1. Linked To The World 1,2, and 3, English for Senior High School. Written by F.A. Soeprapto and Mariana Darwis. Published by Yudistira
2. Look Ahead 1,2, and 3 An English Course, For Senior High School Students Year XII. Written by Th. M. Sudarwati and Eudia Grace. Published by Penerbit Erlangga.
3. Mastering English 1, 2, and 3, For SMU. Written by The English Team for SMU. Published by PT. GALAXY PUSPA MEGA.
4. English in Action, For Senior High School Grade X, XI XII. Written by Peter James. Published by Gelora Aksara Pratama.
5. Intensive – Learning English, For Grade XII of Natural and Social Science Programmes Senior High School (SMA/MA). Written by Dinna Ferdianti. Published by PT. Setia Purna Inves

6. Intensive – Learning English, For Grade XII of Language Programme Senior High School (SMA/MA). Written by Dinna Ferdianti. Published by PT. Setia Purna Inves.

### 3.4.1 Instrument Analysis

a) Validity

Before the real test given, the test would be tried out in order to see whether the test is valid. Anderson as quoted by Arikunto said that a test is valid if it measures what it purpose to measure.

For this study, the level of validity is finding out by correlation between the students' scores of try out test and the students' test score similar topic examination (daily examination). To measure the validity of the test, the writer used product moment correlation formula from Persian quoted by Arikunto:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N(\sum xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{\{N(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2\}\{N(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

Where:

- $r_{xy}$  = Coefficient correlation of x and y
- $N$  = Total number of test
- $x$  = The score of try out test
- $y$  = The score of teacher made test
- $x^y$  = Squared of X
- $y^2$  = Squared of Y
- $xy$  = Multiplication of variable of x and y.

from the calculation see appendix 8, the writer got the validity score is 0,930. It is higher than 0.291 (r value for 46 students in the table of r value product moment). Because of  $0,930 > 0.444$ , it can be said that the validity of the test is valid.

b) Reliability

In obtaining a good test, it is also necessary to finds its reliability. Reliability means the test can be reliable to be use as the data collection tool. As Anderson quoted by Arikunto stated that a

reliable measure in one that provides consistent and stable indication of the characteristic being investigated. In addition, Dallen stated that a test is reliable if it consistently yields the same result when repeated measurement is taken of the subject. In this study, the writer used *single test double trial method*. The first step to find the reliability is dividing into two groups: they were the first test is X and the second test became the variable Y. the variable here were correlating to find out the  $r$  value by using product moment as follows :

$$r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(x^2)(y^2)}}$$

From the calculation see appendix 9 , the writer got the reliability score is 0,997. It is higher than 0,291 (r value for (46 students) in the table of f value product moment). Because of  $0,997 > 0,291$ . it can be said that the reliability of the test is reliable.

c) Difficulty Index

Furthermore, the writer measures the item analysis which is useful for selecting the item test. The item number indicating the easy and difficult index was taking from Arikunto as follows:

$$P = \frac{B}{JS}$$

Where:

$P$  : Degree of difficulty (proportion)

$B$  : The number students who answer text correctly

$JS$  : Total of the test members

Classifications of the Degree of Difficulty are:

1.40 - 0.30 = Difficult

0.30 - 0.70 = Fair

0.70 - 1.00 = Easy

For the calculation see appendix 5

d) Discriminating Power

To find out the Discriminating Power, the writer used the formula as follow :

$$D = \frac{BA}{JA} - \frac{BB}{JB}$$

Where:

- $D$  = Discriminating Power
- $JA$  = Number of test in high group
- $JB$  = Number of test in low group
- $BA$  = Number of the students in high group with correct answer.
- $BB$  = Number of the students in low with correct answer.

The classification of Discriminating Power:

- $D$  = 0.00 - 0.20 is poor
- $D$  = 0.20 - 0.40 is satisfactory
- $D$  = 0,40 - 0.70 is good
- $D$  = 0.70 - 1.00 is excellent
- $D$  = all negative, it's better not use them.

Aikunto said that good items are the one which have discrimination index from 0.40 – 0.70.

For the calculation see appendix 6

### 3.4.2 Scoring Test

To score the test, the writer used scoring standard technique

from Arikunto

$$S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

- $S$  = The score

R = The number of correct answer

N = Total number of the test item.

So, the total score (maximum score) for the test instrument is:

$$S = \frac{20}{20} \times 100$$

### Data Collection Technique

To collect the data, writer followed some procedure below:

1. Preparing the test in inferential reading comprehension.
2. Organizing fixed items of instrument as a set of test.
3. Giving the test in inferential reading comprehension to the third year students, SMAN 4 Berau. Scoring and classifying the scores into score criteria and calculated percentage of each score criteria.

### Data Analysis Technique

The step to analyze the data are as follows:

1. Scoring the students' answer sheet

The writer used formula stated by Arikunto to scoring the test.

$$S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100 \%$$

Where:

S = The score

R = The number of correct answer

N = Total number of the test item.

2. Arranging the students' scores from the highest to the lowest.
3. Counting the mean of students' score, the writer used Rammers' formula as follows:

$$M = \frac{X}{N}$$

Where:

M = Mean of average

X = The sum total of the score in distribution

N = Total number of students.

4. Finding the percentage score frequency using formula stated by Arikunto :

$$P = \frac{f}{n}$$

Where:

$f$  = Frequency

$n$  = Number of cases

The result of percentage calculation is tabulated in the following table of degree mastery that what suggested by Arikunto.

Table 2. The Degree of Mastery

No	Degree of Mastery	Letter	Qualification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	80 – 100	A	Excellent		
2	66 – 79	B	Good		
3	56 – 65	C	Fair		
4	40 – 55	D	Poor		
5	0 – 39	E	Failed		
	Total				

### Interview

Bogdan and Biklen stated that interview was a dialogue conducted by the interviewer to obtain the data from the interviewees .

The guided interview was used in this research to obtain the supporting data about the the English teaching in general, the text books used in English teaching, the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension so far, students' problems in gaining the inferential reading comprehension skill, and how to overcome their problems.

The inreview questions were used as a guide to interview the English teacher of the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau which was prepared in appendix.

### C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

In the following sections, the research results, the analysis of the data, the interpretation of the data, the result of interview, and the result of documents are presented in turn.

### 1. The Result of the Test

The purpose of reading test was to get the main data about the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension. The test was administered on August 11, 2008 and August 21, 2008. The test was objective test in the form of multiple choices. The time of the test was 60 minutes.

The students were required to choose the correct answer among the available options. The test items covered four indicators, namely inferring the unstated idea, detecting the author's purpose, drawing a conclusion and general reading. The students' score of the reading test were analyzed based on the number of correct answers of the test items. It means that the more correct answers they had, the better score they got. The test consisted of 20 items and each item was scored 5 point. So, the total score was 100 point. For more specific of the result of this research, it is presented in data analysis below.

### 2. Data Analysis

It had been stated that this study used 46 students as respondents and used 20 items in inferential reading comprehension of reading text to collect the data. The data presentation was in the form of students scores classification. The result of analysis was intended to answer the research problem that stated " How is the students' ability on the inferential reading comprehension of reading texts of the third year students at SMAN 4 Berau?"

The students' reading test scores were analysed to know their ability in inferential reading comprehension. To score the test, the writer used scoring standard technique from Arikunto as follow:

$$S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

S = The score

R = The number of correct answer

N = Total test items

The following table showed the scores of the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension test. It included the scores of ability in inferring unstated

main ideas, detecting the author's purpose, drawing a conclusion and general reading.

Table 4 : The Data of the Students Reading Test Scores of the Ability in Inferential Reading Comprehension of Reading Texts.

Student NO	Inferred Unstated Main Idea (Total:30)	Detecting the Author's Purpose (Total:30)	Drawing a Conclusion (Total: 30)	General Reading (Total:10)	Total (100)	Percentage (%)
1.	30	20	10	10	70	70
2.	20	30	20	10	80	80
3.	20	25	15	5	65	65
4.	20	25	15	10	70	70
5.	20	25	10	5	60	60
6.	25	15	20	10	70	70
7.	25	15	20	10	70	70
8.	30	20	15	10	75	75
9.	20	10	25	5	60	60
10.	20	20	10	5	55	55
11.	10	20	15	5	50	50
12.	20	20	10	5	55	55
13.	20	25	15	5	65	65
14.	25	25	15	10	75	75
15.	20	25	10	10	65	65
16.	25	25	15	5	70	70
17.	10	25	15	5	55	55
18.	20	20	10	5	55	55
19.	25	25	20	5	75	75
20.	25	20	20	5	70	70
21.	25	20	20	5	70	70
22.	25	20	25	5	75	75
23.	25	10	20	5	60	60
24.	25	10	20	5	60	60
25.	25	25	20	10	80	80
26.	25	15	15	5	60	60
27.	20	25	25	10	80	80
28.	20	15	20	5	60	60
29.	25	25	15	5	70	70
30.	10	25	25	5	65	65
31.	25	15	25	5	70	70
32.	25	20	25	10	80	80
33.	20	20	15	5	60	60
34.	15	20	20	5	60	60

35.	30	20	20	10	80	80
36.	30	20	20	10	80	80
37.	20	25	20	5	70	70
38.	25	20	20	5	70	70
39.	20	20	20	10	70	70
40.	20	25	25	5	75	75
41.	25	20	15	10	70	70
42.	25	15	20	5	65	65
43.	20	25	25	5	75	75
44.	15	25	20	5	65	65
45.	30	25	20	10	85	85
46.	25	20	25	5	75	75
Total	1025	960	845	310	3145	3145

The following table below showed the students' score on twice test in inferential reading comprehension. It is showed that the rank of students could be changed from the first to the second test.

Table 5. The Data of the Students' Reading Test Scores to *single test double trial method*.

Students Number	First Test		Second Test	
	Score	Rank	Score	Rank
1	80	2	85	1
2	90	1	80	2
3	70	9	80	3
4	75	4	80	4
5	80	3	80	5
6	70	10	80	6
7	75	5	80	7
8	75	6	75	8
9	70	11	75	9
10	75	7	75	10
11	70	12	75	11
12	65	18	75	12
13	70	13	75	13
14	75	8	75	14
15	65	19	70	15
16	70	14	70	16
17	70	15	70	17
18	65	20	70	18
19	65	21	70	19
20	65	22	70	20
21	70	16	70	21

22	60	28	70	22
23	60	29	70	23
24	60	30	70	24
25	70	17	70	25
26	65	23	70	26
27	65	24	70	27
28	60	31	65	28
29	60	32	65	29
30	60	33	65	30
31	65	25	65	31
32	65	26	65	32
33	65	24	65	33
34	60	34	60	34
35	55	35	60	35
36	55	36	60	36
37	50	38	60	37
38	50	39	60	38
39	50	40	60	39
40	55	37	60	40
41	50	4	60	41
42	50	42	55	42
43	50	43	55	43
44	45	44	55	44
45	45	45	55	45
46	40	46	50	46
Total	2.920		3.140	

Table 5 : The Percentage of the Students' Reading Scores of Each Indicator

No	Indicators	The Obtained Score	The Total Scores	percentage
1	2	3	4	5
1.	The Students' Ability in Inferring Unstated Main Idea	1025	1380	74,27
2.	The Students' Ability in Detecting the Author's Purpose	960	1380	69,56
3.	The Students' Ability in Drawing A Conclusion	845	1380	61,23
4.	The Students' Ability in General Reading	310	460	67,39
5.	The Students' Ability in Inferential Reading	3140	4600	68,26

	Comprehension of Reading Texts			
--	--------------------------------	--	--	--

Table 6: The Classification of the Students' Reading Scores of Each Indicators.

No	Indicators	Mean Score (%)	Interval Score (%)	Classification
1	2	3	4	5
1.	The Students' Ability in Inferring Unstated Main Idea	74,27	66 – 79	Good
2.	The Students' Ability in Detecting the Author's Purpose	69,56	66 – 79	Good
3.	The Students' Ability in Drawing a Conclusion	61,23	56 – 65	Fair
4.	The Students' Ability in General Reading	67,39	66 – 79	Good
5.	The Students' Ability in Inferential Reading Comprehension of Reading Texts	68,26	66 – 79	Good

The students' ability in inferential reading comprehension was categorized based on Arikunto's classification of the score levels. The table above showed of the students' category and students' frequency on the ability in inferential reading comprehension. The table 6 above showed the classification of the students' score level, the classification included the mean the interval scores.

$$M = \frac{3145}{46} = 68,26$$

46

The table below showed the categories of students' ability in inferential reading comprehension. It was included the students scores in letter, qualification, frequency, and percentage.

Table 7: The Categories of Students' Ability in Inferential Reading Comprehension of Reading Texts.

No	Degree of Mastery	Letter	Qualification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1	80 – 100	A	Excellent	7	15,2
2	66 – 79	B	Good	20	43,5
3	56 – 65	C	Fair	14	30,4
4	40 – 55	D	Poor	5	10,9

5	0 – 39	E	Failed	-	-
Total				46	100

The total score are 100. The scores are classified into five levels; namely 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. Students whose score are 80 to 100 get 9 and it considered excellent. Students whose score are 66 to 79 get 8 and it considered good. Whereas students whose scores are 55 to 65 get 7, it considered fair. Students whose score are 40 to 55 get 6 and it considered poor. Students whose scores are 0 to 39 get 5 and it considered bad (failed).

Look at the table and the data follows:

Table 8. The Students' scores in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts.

Students	Raw Score	Standard Score	Classification				
			Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	failed
1	70	8					
2	80	9					
3	65	7					
4	70	8					
5	60	7					
6	70	8					
7	70	8					
8	75	8					
9	60	7					
10	55	6					
11	50	6					
12	55	6					
13	65	7					
14	75	8					
15	65	7					
16	70	8					
17	55	6					
18	55	6					
19	75	8					
20	70	8					
21	70	8					
22	75	8					
23	60	7					
24	60	7					
25	80	9					

26	60	7					
27	80	9					
28	60	7					
29	70	8					
30	65	7					
31	70	8					
32	80	9					
33	60	7					
34	60	7					
35	80	9					
36	80	9					
37	70	8					
38	70	8					
39	70	8					
40	75	8					
41	70	8					
42	65	7					
43	75	8					
44	65	7					
45	85	9					
46	75	8					
Total			7	20	14	5	
Total Percentage			15,2 %	43,5 %	30,4 %	10,9 %	

- 1) Qualification A  
 $\% = 7 / 46 \times 100 = 15,2 \%$
- 2) Qualification B  
 $\% = 20 / 46 \times 100 = 43,5 \%$
- 3) Qualification C  
 $\% = 14 / 46 \times 100 = 30,4 \%$
- 4) Qualification D  
 $\% = 5 / 46 \times 100 = 10,9 \%$

Based on the table above, the writer could say in series that the highest students score classification was on good category with 43,5 % of students score frequencies, the second was on fair category with 30,4 % of students score frequencies, the third was on excellent category with 15,2 % of students score frequencies, and the lowest one was poor category with 10,9 % of students score frequencies.

### 3. Interpretation of the Data

Based on the evidence of the data analysis showed that the students ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts made by the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau was good.

The data interpretation is presented as follow:

1. Based on the table 6. students' score and computation. It showed that the mean score of the students is 68,26 which is considered good category.
2. There were 27 of students got higher score than the mean score and 19 students got lower score than the mean score.
3. There were 15,2 % or 7 of the students got A (excellent), 43,5 % or 20 of the students got B (good), 30,4 % or 14 of the students got C (fair), and 10,9 % or 5 of the students got D (poor).

The interpretation of the data above it could be seen that the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts made by the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau in academic year 2007 / 2008 was good.

For more specific interpretation of the research result, the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension could be seen in detail for each indicators as follows:

The easiest indicator of inferential reading comprehension was in inferring unstated main ideas. The students' ability in inferring reading comprehension was 74,27 % or good level and the most difficult indicator was in drawing conclusion. The students' ability in drawing conclusion was 61,23 % or fair level. Then, the students' ability in detecting the authors' purpose was 69,56 % this was categorized as good level. The last, the students' ability in general reading was 67,39 % or good level. On the mean score, the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension was 68,26 %. It means that the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension was good level.

Based on the result presented in table 7. It was known that 7 students or 15,2 % who got excellent scores in the test, 20 students or 43,5 % who got good scores, 14 students or 30,4 % who got fair scores, and 5 students or 10,9 % who got poor scores.

To be more specific, the discussion of students' result were represented by the following students. The respondent number 45 got 85 for all indicators. He got the highest score among the students, which was excellent level. From 20 test items, she got 30 scores on inferring unstated main ideas, 25 scores on detecting the authors' purpose, 20 scores on drawing a conclusion, and 10 scores on general reading .

For her, inferring unstated main idea, detecting the authors' purpose, and drawing a conclusion and general reading was easy because she had enough prior knowledge and experiences as well as the meaning of the sentences.

On the contrary, the respondent number 11 got 50 for all indicators. She got the lowest (poor) score among the students. Her score for unstated main idea was 10, detecting the authors' purpose was 20, drawing a conclusion was 15, and general reading was 5. Her highest score from 20 items test was on detecting the authors' purpose, that was 20. The indicators on detecting the authors' purpose was easier than the other indicators. It was because she predicted the content of the passage by herself. While she got difficulties on inferring unstated main idea, drawing a conclusion, and general reading because she did not have enough experience about it. In addition, she did not enough vocabulary so she did not understand the content of the passage.

The respondent number 5 got 60 for all indicators. She got 20 for inferring unstated main ideas, got 25 for detecting the authors' purpose, and got 5 for general reading. She got difficulties on drawing a conclusion because she was lack of prior of knowledge and experience about the types of this passage. Her score on drawing a conclusion was 10. It meant that he had enough ability on inferential reading comprehension especially on drawing a conclusion.

The respondent number 15 got 65 for all indicators. He got 20 scores on inferring unstated main ideas, got 25 scores on detecting the authors' purpose and got 5 scores on general reading. For inferring unstated main ideas and detecting the authors' purpose were easy for him because he had enough prior knowledge and experience about the types of this passage. However, he got bad scores on drawing conclusion because he was lack of prior knowledge and experience about the types

of this passage. His score on drawing a conclusion was 10. In general, he had enough ability on inferential reading comprehension.

The respondent number 14 got 75 point for all indicators. He got 25 on inferring unstated main ideas and detecting the authors' purpose. On inferring unstated main idea and detecting the authors' purpose were easy because he had enough prior knowledge and vocabulary. However, he got 15 scores on drawing a conclusion because he was confused with the types of this passage. In general, he had more than enough ability on inferential reading comprehension.

Based on the results, it could be said that the students still had problem with inferential reading comprehension especially in drawing a conclusion.

It was assumed that the students still found difficulty in drawing a conclusion because the students lacked of prior knowledge and experience as well as about the types of this passage. They did not understand the type of paragraph as well. They did not understand a certain word that could influence their ability to infer the details of the text. They found that comprehending word without enough prior knowledge was very difficult to be performed.

As said by Burns et al that understanding printed materials depends upon knowledge of word meanings. As students got some troubles in comprehending words and types of passage they also faced the same problem with their comprehension. This condition could be solved if the teachers gave the meanings of the difficult words in other forms of the text and gave the types of the passage. As Young and Savage said that a teacher should socialize the words and their meanings before they were given to the students in the form of the text.

Based on the explanation above, it be concluded that in general, the quality of the third year students' abilities of SMAN 4 Berau in inferential reading comprehension was good level.

It is suggested that students' ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts should be drilled and they need to practice as frequently as possible in inferential reading comprehension to improve and maintain their achievement in this inferential reading skill.

#### **4. Result of Interview**

The interview was conducted to get supporting data about the English teaching and learning process. The interview was conducted on July 21, 2008. Two English teachers were invited and ready for the interview.

Both of the teachers said the English teacher at SMAN 4 Berau used some textbooks. The following are the textbooks:

1. Linked To The World 1,2, and 3, English for Senior High School. Written by F.A. Soeprapto and Mariana Darwis. Published by Yudistira
2. Look Ahead 1,2, and 3 An English Course, For Senior High School Students Year XII. Written by Th. M. Sudarwati and Eudia Grace. Published by Penerbit Erlangga.
3. Mastering English 1, 2, and 3, For SMU. Written by The English Team for SMU. Published by PT. GALAXY PUSPA MEGA.
4. English in Action, For Senior High School Grade X, XI XII. Written by Peter James. Published by Gelora Aksara Pratama.
5. Intensive – Learning English, For Grade XII of Natural and Social Science Programmes Senior High School (SMA/MA). Written by Dinna Ferdianti. Published by PT. Setia Purna Inves
6. Intensive – Learning English, For Grade XII of Language Programme Senior High School (SMA/MA). Written by Dinna Ferdianti. Published by PT. Setia Purna Inves.

The teachers said that the English teaching and learning process was based on Curriculum Based Competency and KTSP 2006 on Communicative Approach and Contextual Strategy. They said that the teacher asked their students to express their ideas in English.

The teaching applied various methods such as discussion, explanation, and question answer, depending on the classroom situation. On this point, they informed that in Communicative Approach, the teaching of reading was divided into three parts.

Those were pre – reading, whilst – reading, and post reading. The teachers added that they used reading techniques such as skimming, scanning, reading aloud, silent reading and careful reading. Moreover, the reading materials were given to

the students based on the English teaching syllabus. In presenting reading material, the teacher always led the students to understand the passage by explaining what actually the main points of each paragraph were. On Contextual Strategy, they informed that the teaching of reading was used constructivism, learning community, authentic assessment, reflection, modelling, questioning, and inquiry approach.

The problem that some of the students still had difficulty to drawing a conclusion and detecting the authors' purpose . The teacher had given explanation about the inferential reading, but not all students could understand about the subject easily. Some of the students still felt difficult about the subject because of the lack of prior knowledge and vocabulary, lack of an experience about the types if the passage or lack of motivation to do the reading and not knowing how to solve the problem. They sometimes did not have an ability to use the clue/s used by the author in writing passage.

## **5. Result of Documents**

As stated in the previous chapter that document was used to get the data about the supporting data of this study. They are the students' score of semester 1 in 2007 - 2008 academic year, the names of respondent, the school facilities and the personnel of the school. The research respondents were the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau in 2007 – 2008 academic year. The names of respondents could be seen on appendix .

Based on the evidence and the experience of the writer for two months in SMAN 4 Berau, the writer concluded that the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts is influenced of the internal and external factors. In internal factor of teaching and learning process, the English teachers always used English as the first language in teaching of English materials and Indonesian as the second language. So, because the students always accepted that English as habitual interaction (in speaking, reading, writing and listening in learned integrated) in the classroom, it can be concluded that the students' ability can be true perfectly. In external factors of teaching and learning process, this SMAN 4 Berau that build on July 19<sup>th</sup>, 2004 and is legitimated by Gubernur Provinsi Kalimantan Timur , Bapak Suwarna AF. And is lead by Drs. Eddy Darmawan that popular called as SMA

PLUS Kabupaten Berau – have many facilities (English laboratory, Multimedia room, library , SPEC,etc) that support the teaching and learning process, especially in English. In the same year of the research of the writer, one of the students ; Hairil Anwar followed Science Olympic. It is prove that SMAN 4 Berau that has purpose as “ *terwujudnya sumberdaya manusia muda unggul dalam bidang IPTEK dan IMTAQ, kreatif, inovatif, produktif, kompetitif serta berwawasan global*” has many potential students to progress Berau Regency in international community.

#### **D. CONCLUSIONS**

Based on the results of data analysis it is known that on the mean score of the third year students of SMAN4 Berau in the 2007 – 2008 academic year had 68,26 % or good ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts and got 67,39 % or good ability in general reading. Specifically, the results showed different categories as follows:

1. The mean score of the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau in the 2007-2008 academic year had 74,27 % or good ability in inferring unstated main ideas in reading comprehension of reading texts.
2. The mean score of the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau in the 2007-2008 academic year had 69,56 % or good ability in detecting the authors' purpose in reading comprehension of reading texts.
3. The mean score of the third year students of SMAN 4 Berau in the 2007-2008 academic year had 61,23 % or fair ability in drawing a conclusion in reading comprehension of reading texts.
4. The result showed that 15,2 % or 7 of the students got A (excellent), 43,5 % or 20 of the students got B (good), 30,4 % or 14 of the students got C (fair), and 10,9 % or 5 of the students got D (poor).

The results showed that the students' ability in inferential reading comprehension of reading texts need to be improved and maintenance since their ability in it was still good.

## REFERENCES

- Alexander, J. 1988. *Teaching Reading. (Third Edition)*. Boston: Scott Foresman and Company.
- Ali, M. 1987. *Penelitian Pendidikan. Prosedur dan Strategi*. Bandung: Angkasa
- Anthony, R. and Richard, B. 1977. *Efficient Reading A Practical Guide*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill Company
- Arnold Griese. *Do You Read Me?*. Good Year Publishing Company, California. 1977
- Arikunto, S. 1989. *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. 1998 *Manajemen Penelitian*. Jakarta: Proyek LPTK.
- Arikunto, S. 2005. *Dasar – dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan (Edisi Revisi)*. Jakarta: Bumi Akasara
- Asniar Azis Hamrat. *Build Up Your Reading and Writing Note. Handout*. Universitas Hasanuddin. Sulawesi Selatan. 2002
- Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. (Second Edition)*. Sydney: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- BSNP. DEPDIKNAS. 2006. *Petunjuk Teknis Pengembangan Silabus dan Contoh / Model Silabus. Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris. SMA/MA*. Jakarta.
- Burn, P.C. And Roe, B.D., 1984. *Teaching Reading In the Secondary School*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Collins. *Collins Cobuild Learner's Dictionary*. Collins Hauler Publisher, London. 2000.
- Dallen, V and Deobold, B. *Understanding Educational Research*. New York: McGraw Book Company. P.
- Gary Robert Muschla, *Ready to Use Reading Proficiency Lessons and Activities. 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Level*. San Fransisco. Jossey – Bass Published.
- Grellet, F. 1996. *Development Reading Skill: A Practical Guide to Reading Comprehension Exercise*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grolier Incorporated. 1998. *The Encyclopedia Americana: International Edition*.

- Harmer, J. 2003. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. Longman Publishing.
- Hornby, A.S. 1995. *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, A. 1984. *Testing for Language Teachers*. London: Longman Ltd
- Juwariyah. *A Descriptive Study of the Students' Ability to Identify the main Idea of Reading Text of MAN I Jember in the Academic Year 1999-2000* (SI Thesis). Jember. Jember University 1995.
- Kustaryo, S. 1988. *Reading Techiques for College Students*. Jakarta: Depdikbud. Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Layton, James. *The Psychology of Learning Toe Read*. New York: Academic Press. 1979.
- Leonard, E. 1981. *Teaching In Middle and Secondary School*. New york: Macmillan Publishing co., Inc.
- Lin Lougheed, Ed.G. *Baron's TOEIC TEST. Students' #1 Choice*. Binarupa Aksara. Ciputat. Indonesia. 2007
- Margaret E Baudion. *Reder's Choise*. The University of Michigan, 1977.
- McNeil, J.D. 1992. *Reading Comprehension. New Direction for Classroom Practice*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher, Inc.
- McWhorter, K. 1989. *College Reading and Study Skill*. London: Scott Foresman and Co.
- Merriam – Webster's. Merriam-Webster's Collegiate® Dictionary. Eleventh Edition on Cd-Room. win 98/NT/2000/XP/MAC 05 9/X. ©2004 Merriam-Webster, Incorporated. USA.*
- Moore, B.J. *The Teaching of Reading*. Long Man Lc. Singapore. 1984
- Muschla, G.R. 2003. *Ready To Use Reading Proficiency Lessons and Activitie: 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Level*. San Fransisco. Jossey - Bass Published
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olson, J. And Dilner, B. 1982. *Learning to Teach Reading in the Secondary School*. London: Collier Macmillan Publishing.

- Otto, J. and Spiegel, M. 1979. *How To Teach Reading*. Sydney: Addison Wesley Publishing Company.
- PPPGT. VEDC Malang. Materi Pelatihan : *Reading Skills Development for TOEIC Preparation*. VEDC Malang. Malang. 2004
- Rammers, G and Rummel, . *A Practical Introduction to Measurement and Evaluation*. New York: Haerder and Row Publishing.
- Richards, J.C. and Renandya, W.A. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- R. Joni. *Pengukuran dan Penelitian*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pengkajian Latihan Pengembangan Masyarakat 1986
- Smith and Harris. *Reading instruction: Diagnostic Teaching in the Classroom*. Richard, C, Owen Publisher., Inc. New York. 1980
- Spears, D.M. 2000. *Improving Reading Skill*. New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Steinberg, Dany, D.. *Psycholinguistic, Language Mind and World*. New York: Longman Publisher. 1982.
- Strauss, A. and Yuliet, C. 1990. *Basic Of Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park: Sage Publication.
- Sumarsono, S. 1997. *Reading 1*. Jakarta. DEPDIKBUD.
- Tampubolon, BP,. *Kemampuan Membaca, Teknik Membaca Efektif dan Efisien*. Angkasa Bandung. 1987.
- Team Of Five. 2005. *Improving Reading Skill. In English: For University Students, Book One, Two, and Three Plus Workbook*. Jakarta: Kencana, Prana Media.
- Wallace, M.J. 1999. *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiener, P. and Charles, B. 1966. *Reading Skill Handbook*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Wood, N.V. 1991. *Strategy for College Reading and Teaching*. New York.: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Young, M. Savage, H.H. 1982. *Better Learning*. New Jersey: Practice Hall
- Yuliani, M., Aryanto, S. Dkk., 2007. *Detik – detik Ujian Nasional Bahasa Inggris, untuk SMA/MA*. Intan Pariwara. Klaten.