Using Authentic and Simplified Texts with SQ3R in Teaching Vocabulary and Reading

Robi Soma[1]

robi_soma@yahoo.com

Abstract: The objectives of the study were to find out whether or not (1) there was a significant increase of students' achievement in vocabulary and reading literacy after they were taught using SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts (2) there was any significant difference in the students' achievement in vocabulary and reading literacy between the students who were taught using SQ3R with authentic texts and simplified texts, and (3) there was a significant interaction of authentic texts and simplified texts toward reading literacy and vocabulary mastery of the students who were high and low achievers. Factorial experimental design was used in this study because this study involved two parallel groups which became experimental group 1 and 2. The population of this study was 56 six semester students of Jambi University in the academic year 2012/2013. In selecting the sample, TOEFL ITP was administered to the population. The students were categorized into high and low achievers based on the score. 56 students from the two classes were selected as the sample; 16 students were high achievers and 40 students were low achievers which were distributed equally to the two experimental groups. In collecting the data, tests (pre and post-test) were used to both groups. The data of the test results were analyzed using t-test in SPSS 15. The result of independent sample t-test analysis showed that there was no significant difference in students' achievement of vocabulary and reading literacy between both experimental groups as well as level of achievement for both high and low achievers.

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

Abstrak: Tujuan dari studi ini adalah untuk mencari tahu adakah (1) peningkatan prestasi siswa dalam kosa kata dan literasi bacaan yang signifikan setelah mereka diajar menggunakan SQ3R dengan teks asli dan teks sederhana (2) perbedaan signifikan pada prestasi siswa di dalam kosa kata dan literasi bacaan antar siswa yang diajar menggunakan SQ3R dengan teks asli dan teks sederhana, dan (3) interaksi yang signifikan dari teks asli dan teks sederhana ke arah literasi bacaan dan penguasaan kosa kata pada siswa dengan tingkat pencapaian tinggi dan pencapaian rendah. Disain eksperimen faktorial digunakan dalam studi ini dengan melibatkan dua kelompok paralel yaitu kelompok eksperimen 1 dan 2. Populasi dalam studi ini adalah 56 mahasiswa semester 6 Universitas Jambi tahun akademik 2012/2013. Dalam memilih sampel, TOEFL ITP diuji pada semua populasi. Sampel digolongkan ke dalam kemampuan pencapaian tinggi dan rendah berdasarkan nilai TOEFL ITP. 56 mahasiswa dari dua kelas tersebut, terpilih menjadi sampel; 16 orang dengan kategori kemampuan pencapaian tinggi dan 40 orang dengan tingkat kemampuan pencapaian rendah dimana mereka dibagi rata menjadi dua grup eksperimen. Dalam mengumpulkan data, tes (pre dan post-test) digunakan pada kedua kelompok. Data dari hasil tes dianalisis melalui t-test menggunakan SPSS 15. Hasil analisis independen t-test menunjukkan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan signifikan dalam prestasi kosa kata dan literasi bacaan siswa antara kedua kelompok eksperimen seperti halnya tingkat pencapaian untuk kedua kelompok siswa dengan tingkat kemampuan tinggi dan rendah.

Kata kunci: Teks asli, teks sederhana, kemampuan pencapaian tinggi dan rendah.

---

[1]*A Lecturer of English Education of Jambi University, South Sumatra.*

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, p. 128) stated that "reading is a dynamic, cognitive and interactive process and not merely a process of decoding of codes in printed form but a process of creating meaning as a result of the transaction between the reader and the text"

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) states "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, p. 3). 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, p. 30-31) mentions the score of our country in the South-East Asia region in that the Indonesian students reading literacy was very low with the score 51,7 compared to the Philippines with the score 52,6, Thailand 65,1, Singapore 7,4 and Hongkong 75,5. Meanwhile, according to the report from *Progress International Reading Literacy Study 2012* (PIRLS), Indonesia score is still low namely 428. It means that it is still lower than PIRLS scale average, 500.

Based on the definitions mentioned above, it can be said that reading literacy is the capability of implementing as well as reflecting what has been read for the purpose of upgrading one's qualifications and helping other people. The data describing the poor literacy condition of Indonesian students show that it needs continuous improvements by applying effective teaching methods and providing good reading materials to produce better qualifications of human resources.

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.

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), based on his teaching experiences states, "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 useful vocabulary to express". 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.

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, p. 444). 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. According to Cahyono and Widiyati (2008, p. 1), good vocabulary mastery supports mastery of each language skills, both receptive and productive. In relation to the university students' vocabulary mastery, Sutarsyah (2001) stated that the university students have low achievement in

eading skills and vocabulary gain. Furthermore, it is also found out that most of university students had low achievement on vocabulary mastery which might hamper their academic study (Nurweni & Read, 1998).

Coping with poor reading literacy, the writer proposed authentic reading texts as one of the 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 & 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). The source of authentic texts can be from newspapers, magazines, movies, TV news or programs, songs and literature (Berardo, 2006, p. 62). Other forms of authentic texts are letters, advertisements, everyday notices, maps, charts and non-prose texts. In this case, the writer chose English newspaper The Jakarta Post as the authentic reading materials taught to the students. In brief, authentic texts expose the students with the real language use not just like the language they use every day because there could be some words or terms they never encounter in conventional teaching materials they often read.

Cho, Ahn and Krashen (2005, p. 61-62) 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.

Due to certain objectives, a text cannot be presented as is because of particular grammatical items, foreign culture content and inappropriate level of vocabulary. In other words, a text needs to be simplified to fulfill 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, p. 2).

Based on the informal interview with the sixth semester students and the lecturers who taught them vocabulary and reading subjects last semester, the writer knew that the problem of reading and vocabulary was also faced by Jambi university students. Approximately forty percent of the students got average score, which means B namely 70-74.99 the rest of them, sixty percent of them obtained below average score or C+ that means 65-69.99 and C means 60-64.99. From the writer's informal interview with the lecturer, only 40% of the students had intermediate level reading ability. Looking at the data above, the writer thought that it was necessary to improve the students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery and he would like to apply SQ3R strategy in teaching authentic and simplified texts. SQ3R (Survey, Question, Read, and Recite) was a reading strategy which was designed to help students improve their comprehension (understanding), memory, and efficiency in reading. The strategy consists of five steps that deepen students' thinking as they read. Students are various in capability; high and low ability. The first one is those who have excellent ability in terms of four English skills; reading, writing, speaking and listening and the second one is those whose capability is still low and needs to learn English a lot. Because of the students' difference in English capability, the writer was eager to adapt SQ3R strategy in giving

them the authentic reading texts or materials and he found out it necessary to include simplified texts to reach their comprehension level.

To carry out this study, the writer chose the sixth semester students of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Jambi University in the academic year of 2012/2013. The writer intended to see the effect of the authentic texts in increasing the students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery since he assumed that they had already completed all reading subjects namely; reading I, II, III and IV. He really hoped that they were ready to accept authentic materials whose contents they did not find in their daily environment like the language structure used, the content and of course the authenticity of the materials themselves.

For those reasons the writer was interested in conducting research entitled "Effectiveness of Authentic and Simplified Texts using SQ3R Strategy in Developing Vocabulary and Reading Literacy of High and Low Achievers".

METHOD

The writer used experimental method and chose factorial experimental design. Most designs involved only one single independent variable. In factorial design, two or more independent variables were involved (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 283). 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 SQ3R with authentic texts for one group whereas the other group was taught using SQ3R with simplified texts. SQ3R, (Survey, Question, Read, Recite and Review) is a method of teaching English especially reading to the students. This study was factorial experimental design. The writer used this design because 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. Both groups were given a pre-test and post-test with the same treatment but different kinds of texts. In conducting this study, the writer made two experimental groups in order to find out the effect of using the two methods in students' reading literacy and vocabulary mastery of the sixth semester students of Jambi University. The diagram of factorial design can be seen in table 1.

Table 1: Factorial Experimental Design

R High Achievers	O1	Exp1	X1 Y1 X2 Y2	O2
		Exp2	X1 Y1 X2 Y2	
R Low Achievers	O1	Exp1	X1 Y1 X2 Y2	O2
		Exp2	X1 Y1 X2 Y2	

Source: Mc Millan, J., H. & Schumacher, S. 2010

Where:
- O1 : Pretest
- O2 : Posttest
- Exp1 : Experimental Group 1
- Exp2 : Experimental Group 2
- X1 : authentic texts
- X2 : simplified texts
- Y1 : Reading literacy
- Y2 : Vocabulary
- R : Random assignment

In taking the sample, the writer administered 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. The writer used purposive sampling technique and chose them 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 high achievers. The population of this study was 98 sixth semester students from 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 with high category and 40 students with low category and divided equally into two groups; experimental group 1 (which was taught using SQ3R with authentic texts) and experimental group 2 (which was taught using SQ3R with simplified texts). In teaching the materials, the writer used the authentic texts materials from The Jakarta Post daily newspaper and the same texts were simplified by a native speaker named Rusty Ennemoser, a Ph.D. candidate from Florida State University (FSU).

The data of this study were vocabulary and reading literacy achievement. The technique used to obtain the data was TOEFL ITP test vocabulary and reading sections test. The tests were used to measure the vocabulary and reading literacy achievement of the sixth semester English major students of Jambi University in the academic year of 2012/2013. The try-out was administered in Jambi University on 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 vocabulary and reading tests were constructed by selecting texts with 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 with the specification table described in Table-2.

Table 2: Test Specifications

Kind of test	Number of Questions	Test type
Vocabulary	28	Multiple Choice
Reading Literacy	30	Multiple Choice

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

The Shapiro-Wilk test showed that 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. In terms 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. 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 vocabulary was .176 and reading literacy was .420. This value exceeded .05, meaning that posttest scores of reading comprehension of both experimental groups were homogen. Therefore, it could be assumed that the data of this study were statistically found reliable and valid.

Based on table 3, the mean score of vocabulary achievement in poor category was 49.50, average category was 63.20, good category 75.44, and excellent category was 86.20. On the other hand, for reading literacy achievement, the mean score in poor category was 48.95, average category was 63.49, and good category was 77.33. Moreover, the mean scores

of students' vocabulary and reading literacy achievements in both experimental groups were 68 and 64. In can be concluded that the mean score of the students' vocabulary achievement was in *average level category* and students' reading literacy achievement was in *average level category*.

In relation to the frequency and percentage of students' vocabulary achievement in both experimental groups, there were 4 students (7.1%) who were in poor category, 27 students (48.2%) who were in average category, 23 students (41.1%) who were in good category, and 2 students (3.6%) were in excellent category. The result showed that most students' vocabulary achievement was in *average category* (48.2%). On the other hand, the results of reading literacy achievement showed that there were 6 students (10.7%) who were in poor category, 41 students (73.2%) who were in average category, and 9 students (16.2%) who were in good category. The result showed that most of the students' reading literacy achievement was in *average category* (73.2%).

As shown in table 4 above, the result of paired sample t-test in experimental group 1, which was taught by using SQ3R with authentic texts, the

Table 3: Frequency and Mean of Students' Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Literacy Based on Students' Achievement Level (N=56)

Variables	Levels of Achievement	Mean	Frequency and Percentage	Std. Deviation
1.VOCABULARY	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**
1. READING LITERACY	Very Poor	-	-	-
	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 4. Mean difference between pre- and Post-tests of Vocabulary Mastery
and Reading Literacy achievement of Experimental Group 1 and 2 based on
SQ3R and Levels of Achievement**

Variables	PRE-TEST Mean Exp 1 AT	PRE-TEST Mean Exp 2 ST	POST-TEST Mean Exp 1 AT	POST-TEST Mean Exp 2 ST	Mean difference Pre and Post-test Exp 1 Within	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
1. Vocabulary	51.8	48.3	68.3	67.9	16.48	19.53	0.4	0.16	0.000	0.000	0.873
a. High	64.4	64.3	76.9	69.8	12.55	5.45	7.15	2	0.005	0.003	0.065
b. Low	46.8	42	67.7	64.4	20.91	22.4	3.42	1.2	0.000	0.000	0.235
2. Reading Literacy	33.7	45.4	62.6	65.8	28.85	20.38	3.196	1.44	0.000	0.000	0.153
a. High	34.2	55.3	66.4	78.1	32.15	22.86	11.51	5.29	0.000	0.000	0.060
b. Low	33.5	41.4	61	60.9	27.5	19.49	0.13	0.06	0.000	0.000	0.950

Notes: AT = Authentic Texts

ST = Simplified Texts

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).

On the other hand, 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. Therefore, it could be concluded that null hypotheses (H01 and H02) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) 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' 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). On the other hand, the mean difference of 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 (H01 and H02) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha1 and Ha2) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by the experimental group 2.

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' 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). On the other hand, the mean score of students' vocabulary achievement in pre-test of experimental group 1for low achievers was 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 (H03 and H04) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha3 and Ha4) 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' 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 (H03 and H04) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha3 and Ha4) were accepted which means that there was a significant difference made by both high and low achievers in experimental group 2.

Based on 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 (H03 and H04) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha3 and Ha4) 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 (H03 and H04) were rejected and the research hypotheses (Ha3 and Ha4) 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 vocabulary post-test between experimental group 1 and 2 was 0.4 and t-obtained was 0.16 (p<0.000). In addition, 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). Since the p value or output of vocabulary and reading literacy 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 (H03) was accepted and the research hypotheses (Ha3) was rejected. It means that there was no difference in vocabulary and reading literacy 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 vocabulary and reading literacy.

In terms of levels of achievement, 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). Meanwhile, 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). Since the p value or output of vocabulary and reading literacy 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 (H03) was accepted and the research hypotheses (Ha3) was rejected. It means that there was no difference in vocabulary and reading literacy 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.

In relation to the interactions between group and students' level of achievement based on the

Table 5: Tests Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Posttest

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)

formulation 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 (H04 and H05) 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 vocabulary and reading literacy achievement.

INTERPRETATIONS

Referring to the results of the study, it showed that authentic and simplified texts were capable of attracting the sixth semester students of Jambi University to study English particularly vocabulary and reading literacy. It was also proved that those two kinds of texts could make significant increase in students' achievement of vocabulary and reading literacy 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, p.65).

In relation to the result of paired samples t-test, the statistical analysis showed that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement both in high and low achievers, except for the combination of those two. Whereas in reading literacy, there was a significant difference both in high and low achievers and also 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 vocabulary and reading literacy. 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, p.15). 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, p. 65). 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.

In conclusion, authentic texts, especially reading materials, 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.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS
Conclusions
From the result of the data analyses and interpretations, it could be concluded that authentic texts could increase students' vocabulary and reading literacy 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.

Suggestions
Based on the conclusion above, the writer would like to give some suggestions in relation to the improvement teaching and learning vocabulary and reading literacy.

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.

Third, 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 ReadingMatrix, 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., McCarthy, 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., & McNamara, 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: Universitas Sriwijaya.

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

Hill, S. (2008). *Developing early literacy: Assessment and teaching.* Prahan: 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.* Retrieved from 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. *Proceedings of The 59th TEFLIN International Conference.* Widya Mandala Catholic University, Surabaya, Indonesia.