

# THE EFFECT OF L1 MULTIPLE-CHOICE GLOSSES ON READING COMPREHENSION OF NARRATIVE TEXTS (An Ex-post Facto Study in 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Students at a Junior High School in Kabupaten Bandung)

Try Ayu Nuralam Setiawan  
tryayu.ns@gmail.com

Department of English Education, Indonesia University of Education

**Abstract:** The lack of vocabulary is one of the problems that is mostly encountered by students while reading. L1 MCG is one of the solutions to facilitate students in understanding some vocabulary while reading. The purpose of the research is to find out the use of L1 MCG on reading comprehension and to investigate students' opinion on L1 MCG in the text. Employing ex-post facto design, this study involved 92 ninth graders in a junior high school at Kabupaten Bandung to accomplish two tests namely grouping test and performance test. A grouping test is to classify students into two groups that are L1 MCG group and no gloss group based on students' ranking score. A performance test is to emphasize the difference in students' reading comprehension of L1 MCG group and no gloss group. The questionnaires were distributed to collect students' opinion in L1 MCG group. The result of the research showed that the scores of L1 MCG group was higher than no gloss group and the students suggested that L1 MCG has facilitated their reading comprehension, has motivated them to read. They agreed with using L1 MCG as media on learning activity. Finally, L1 MCG is suggested to facilitate students in understanding the text while reading.

**Keywords:** *L1 MCG, Reading Comprehension*

## Introduction

Reading is one of the skills that is essential for students. Students' reading skill will be improved by a strong vocabulary regular reading and it leads students to be successful in the school (Langan,2012). It is obvious if there is a relationship between vocabulary and reading.

Susanti (2002) enlightened the relationship between vocabulary and

reading. She found if a student highly mastered vocabulary, she/he would have a good skill in reading. In contrast, if a student mastered less vocabulary, he/she would find the complexity while reading.

One of suggested helps to assist students in improving their reading comprehension is vocabulary glosses. Vocabulary glosses simply define as providing the definition of unknown words that are put on the side or bottom

margins in the text (Lomicka, 1998; Nation, 1983). In other words while reading, students would find the definition of words nearby from the text. It seems that vocabulary glosses could help students in developing their reading comprehension. Forough (2012) has proved in his research that glosses group was better than no gloss group in reading comprehension.

There are many kinds of vocabulary glosses in L1 or in L2. One of them is multiple-choice glosses (MCG). According to Hulstjin (1992), MCG is more effective than single gloss to decrease the wrong inferring when reading a text. MCG and reading comprehension are considered to have a relationship because if MCG is provided in the text, students should select the appropriate translation of the word based on the context when constructing the text. It is predicted by providing MCG in the text; it will affect to improve their reading comprehension.

Furthermore, vocabulary glosses could be defined in native language (*Bahasa Indonesia*) (L1) or in English (L2). According to Miyasako (2002), L1 was more appropriate for lower achieving students and L2 was good for higher achieving students based on her research in one of senior high schools in Japan. In

this research, multiple-choice glosses in *Bahasa Indonesia* (L1 MCG) were selected because the contributing students in this research were ninth graders at a junior high school by means their English skill was still developing.

MCG is often predicted that it will help students in reading comprehension. Lin and Huang (2008) compared between meaning-inferred gloss and meaning-given gloss. Lin and Huang (2008) confirmed if meaning-inferred gloss (MCG) was better to facilitate learner's reading comprehension than meaning-given gloss (SG). In other word, Lin & Huang (2008) found MCG was more helpful to improve learner's reading comprehension than SG. In contrast, Miyasako (2002) compared between three conditions that were SG, MCG and no gloss. Miyasako (2002) affirmed if there was no significance difference between SG and MCG (vocabulary glosses) and no gloss. As a result, MCG did not extremely facilitate learners in reading comprehension.

In conclusion, vocabulary is an important need for students to improve their reading comprehension. MCG is one of solutions to help students in terms of vocabulary while reading. However, the effect of MCG on reading comprehension is still not constant. Therefore, there

should be another research to explore the effect of MCG on reading comprehension. Furthermore, this research was guided by two research questions, they are as follows:

1. What differences in students' reading comprehension are caused by L1 MCG?
2. What is the students' opinion on the L1 MCG in the text?

The significance of this research is divided in two perspectives; theoretical significance and practical significance. From a theoretical significance, it would be analysed from two previous studies; Lin & Huang (2008) and Miyasako (2002) who focused on MCG on reading comprehension. There are two aspects which are emphasized: that are participants and the kind of the text. First, Lin and Huang investigated in a senior high school in Taiwan. The texts that were selected as their research instrument were *Traditional Education* and *Single Mother*. From the titles, they could be categorized as report texts or description texts. Second, Miyasako (2002) did her research in a senior high school in Japan. She selected a short story in her research.

In this research, the contributing participants were ninth grade students in a junior high school in *Kabupaten Bandung*, Indonesia. The text that was

selected to be one of research instruments was narrative text. Therefore, this research can contribute the development research of MCG on reading comprehension.

From a practical significance, as mentioned before students' vocabulary should be improved to help students in reading comprehension. MCG can be one of solutions to help students in comprehending text. Through providing MCG to emphasize the words which have more than one definition on the text, it will help students to understand the text.

There are four aspects that should be explained namely the theory of MCG, theory of reading comprehension, theory of narrative text and MCG in narrative text.

First, the theory of MCG is from Laufer and Hulstijn (2001). The theory is called Involvement Load Hypothesis. The theory covers three components, which are 'need', 'search' and 'evaluation'. 'Need' directs to introducing the word or idiom or even sentence from others. This situation will improve the sense of curiosity and need. 'Need' could be categorized as motivational component. 'Search' is finding the translation of unknown word. 'Evaluation' is judged as comparing a target word to other words to decide whether a target word is

appropriate with the context or not. 'Search' and 'evaluation' could be categorized as cognitive component. In addition, this theory asserts if the learners could learn words if they are related to the process of lexical information.

The theory of Involvement Load Hypothesis from Laufer and Hulstijn (2001) can be analyzed through providing multiple-choice glosses in the text. Text can be the exposure to the motivational component, which is need. Besides, MCG can relate to two cognitive components, 'search' and 'evaluation'. In further, 'evaluation' could be reinforced by answering the questions based on the text to measure reading comprehension. In summary, providing L1 MCG in the text could cover all of components in Involvement Load Hypothesis theory.

Second, according to RAND Reading Study Group (2002) reading comprehension is "the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language". It is considered that reading comprehension could be successful if reader connected the meaning of text with the readers' prior knowledge. Therefore, it would depend on the skill level and age of the reader.

At school, the readers are students. Consequently, teachers should assist students to comprehend the text. It is supported by Pardo (2004) who suggested that there are steps which help students in improving students' reading comprehension. Those are:

1. Teach decoding skill;
2. Help students build fluency;
3. Build and activate prior knowledge;
4. Teach vocabulary words;
5. Motivate students'
6. Engaged students in personal responses to the text.

Third, the texts that were used as the instruments in this research to find out the effect of L1 MCG on reading comprehension were narrative texts. Wajnryb (2002) pointed out "narrative text is a text, a piece of connected discourse, larger than the single sentence by varying in length from short text of a few sentences to a complex form containing many sections and sub-sections.." On the other hand, Knap and Watkins (2005) tells if narrative is considered as students' 'pick up'. However, it is believed if the purpose of narrative text is to entertain the readers. In addition, Knap and Watkins (2005) considers if narrative has enormous

influence to change social opinion and attitudes.

Fourth, it was MCG in narrative text. It is found that some words in verb past are also known as another word class, for instance noun. In other words, it is considered that students would find the complexity while reading a narrative text. However, the narrative text is constructed by verb past. Therefore, it is suggested that MCG can be beneficial for students while they were reading L1 MCG narrative text. Furthermore, students should have a good prior knowledge of narrative text in order; students can compare narrative text that has been known by students before and L1 MCG narrative text. In addition, students also can give an opinion on advantages and disadvantages of L1 MCG.

## **Methodology**

In this part, it will explain the method, the variable, the hypothesis, the population, the instruments, the data analysis and the research procedure of this research.

The method that was used in this research was ex-post facto. It is based on two reasons, they are because the participants in this research were not randomly assigned to group and because

there was no treatment (Lammars and Baidia, 2004)

The independent variable in this research was the effect of L1 MCG, while dependent variable was students' reading comprehension.

The hypotheses is divided in two, null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis. In this research, null hypotheses is "L1 MCG group have not a greater amount of reading comprehension than no gloss group". Besides, the alternative hypotheses is "L1 MCG group have a greater amount of reading comprehension than no gloss group". Through rejecting null hypotheses, the research would promote the alternative hypotheses, as a result the L1 MCG facilitates students' reading comprehension.

Population in this research was nine graders of junior high school students in Kabupaten Bandung. To create the population involve in to the research is not a simple thing because it is too large, diverse, scattered over a large geographic area, also it will spend much time and money (Fraenkel, 2012). Therefore, the population was restricted in to a sample. The sample in this research was 92 ninth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Banjaran.

The instruments that were utilized in this research were impromptu reading plus comprehension and questionnaire. According to Brown (2004), due to the tests in this research were considered to have a combination of form focused and meaning-focused objectives, more emphasis on meaning, one of the tests that is appropriate is impromptu reading plus comprehension. In this research, there were two tests—grouping test and performance test. The grouping test and performance test included 30 items from 4 narrative texts also completed by multiple-choices from which were four options in each number.

The questionnaire that used in this research was likert style scale. The scales were four and the statements were fourteen. The focus of the questionnaire was to acquire students' opinion againts the effect of L1 multiple choice gloss in the text to students' reading comprehension.

There are fourteen statements in the questionnaire. The statements in the questionnaire were divided into four aspects:

1. Students' response to their learning on reading comprehension of narrative text;

2. Students' understanding of narrative text completed by L1 MCG;
3. Students' opinion on the use of L1 MCG in the narrative text;
4. Students' opinion on the use of L1 MCG as media in the narrative text.

The research procedure in this research consisted of conducting grouping test, directing performance test and accomplishing questionnaire.

First, it was conducting grouping test that was to minimize the possible threat (Fraenkel, 2012). Grouping test is closely related to proficiency test. Hughes (1989) asserts proficiency test is to determine the capability in a language without the training or learning activity. Grouping test in this research meant to represent the proficiency of students' reading comprehension. It was used to classify the students into two groups which each group was heterogeneous.

Grouping test was 30 items from 4 narrative texts and completed by multiple-choice. This test classified the samples into two groups, even group and odd group. 92 students as the samples were given the test. The result of this test was sorted from highest score to lowest

score as the students' ranking of reading comprehension skill.

This ranking was used to classify the students into the groups, by means the students whose even number ranking were in L1 MCG group where the students would get L1 MCG text, besides the students whose ranking odd number were in no gloss group where the students would get no gloss text. Grouping test was conducted in 13<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> of October 2014.

Second, it was directing performance test. Fitzpatrick and Morrison (1971) confirms performance test is the situational test which evaluates performance and product, thus Brown (1971) describes the performance or product as what students make, do or demonstrate (cited in Priestley, 1982). In this research, performance test was to evaluate students' performance in reading. In further, the performance test was to compare students' performance between L1 MCG group and no gloss group on reading comprehension. In other words, the result of performance test contrasted students' reading comprehension between L1 MCG text and no gloss text. The performance test was directed in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of October 2014.

Third, it was accomplishing questionnaire. To acquire students' opinion on the L1 MCG in text, spreading the questionnaires were accomplished to L1 MCG group after directing performance test. The questionnaire were accomplished in 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> of October 2014.

The analysis of grouping test and performance test were based on the scoring technique that was without punishment formula (Arikunto, 2006). In other words, the obtained score was as same as right answer.

However, the output data on grouping test were computed based on how many the correct answers that were obtained by the students. After that, the output data were sorted from the highest into lowest score. The ranking used to classify the students into L1 MCG group and no gloss group.

The analysis of performance test used independent t-test. The independent t-test was to determine whether there was a significant difference between the score of students who answer the questions from L1 MCG text and no gloss text or not.

In this study the independent t-test was computed using SPSS 21 for Windows Program.  $T_{obtained}$  was acquired then it was compared with  $t_{critical}$ . If

$t_{obtained} \geq t_{critical}$  at the level of significance  $(p) = 0,05$ , the null hypotheses ( $H_0$ ) is rejected and the alternative hypotheses is accepted. In contrast,  $t_{obtained} \leq t_{critical}$ , the null hypotheses is accepted.

The questionnaire that used in this research was likert style scale. The scales were four and the statements were fourteen. In likert scale, there are five alternative answers with the scale 1-5. This questionnaire used positive statements, therefore the range score can be viewed in the table, as follows:

**Table 1 The Range Score of Questionnaire**

| Answers                | Score |
|------------------------|-------|
| Strongly Agree (SA)    | 5     |
| Agree (A)              | 4     |
| Uncertain (U)          | 3     |
| Disagree (D)           | 2     |
| Strongly Disagree (SD) | 1     |

To obtain the strong answer from students, the alternative answer *uncertain (U)* is omitted. As a result, there were four alternative answers with the range score 4-1 while 4 for strongly agree (SA), 3 for agree (A), 2 for disagree (D) and 1 for strongly disagree (SD).

## Data Presentation and Discussion

The first research question finds out whether there are differences in reading comprehension caused by L1 MCG or not. In acquiring the answer of first research question, it was supported by grouping test and performance test.

The highest score is 9,3 out of 10 and the lowest score was 1,3 out of 10 on grouping test. From 92 students, based on the result of grouping test 46 students were in even group and 46 students were in odd group. In other words, 46 students would get an L1 MCG text and 46 students would get no gloss text in performance test.

When conducting performance test, there were 7 students who could not follow the test. Therefore, there were 85 students on performance test. As a result, 42 students were in L1 MCG group and 43 students were no gloss group.

To contrast the result of performance text, independent t-test by using SPSS 21 for Windows Program was calculated. The result is displayed in the table below

**Table 2 Group Statistics**  
**Group Statistics**

|       | kind_of_text  | N  | Mean  | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|-------|---------------|----|-------|----------------|-----------------|
| Score | L1 MCG text   | 42 | 5.905 | 1.6683         | .2574           |
|       | No gloss text | 43 | 5.221 | 1.4028         | .2139           |

**Table 3 Independent Samples Test**  
**Independent Samples Test**

|       |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-test for Equality of Means |        |                 |                 |                       |   |        |
|-------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|--------|
|       |                             | F                                       | Sig. | T                            | Df     | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |        |
|       |                             |   |      |                              |        |                 |                 | Lower                 |   | Upper  |
| Score | Equal variances assumed     | 3.022                                   | .086 | 2.047                        | 83     | .044            | .6838           | .3340                 | .0195                                     | 1.3482 |
|       | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 2.047                        | 79.957 | .044            | .6838           | .3347                 | .0177                                     | 1.3499 |

From the table above, it can be seen the difference between the mean. The mean from L1 MCG text was 5,9 and the mean from no gloss text was 5,2. In short, the mean of the L1 MCG group was higher than no gloss text. From the calculation of independent t-test,  $t_{obt}$  was 2,047. If  $df=83$ ,  $t_{crit}$  is 1,988. If  $t_{obt}$  was compared with  $t_{crit}$ ,  $2,047 \geq 1,988$  by means  $t_{obt} \geq t_{crit}$  at the level of significance ( $p$ ) = 0, 05. In conclusion, the result previewed the null hypothesis was rejected and alternative hypothesis was accepted that was “there is a significant difference between L1 MCG text and no gloss text in reading comprehension”.

In this research, three components that are in Involvement Load Hypothesis that is the theory of MCG were covered; as follows narrative text could be ‘need’ as the exposure to motivational component. Facilitating L1 MCG in the text and answering the question based on the text loaded ‘search’ and ‘evaluation’. 92 ninth grade students of junior high school engaged in this research. They were sorted into two groups--L1 MCG text group and no gloss text by doing grouping test before doing a performance test to contrast the effect of L1 MCG. It was found the mean score of L1 MCG group was higher than

the mean score of no gloss text. Based on the calculation independent t-test by using SPSS 21 for Windows Program, it highlighted if there was significantly different between L1 MCG text and no gloss text on reading comprehension.

This finding in this research informs that the theory of involvement load hypothesis is not only to help learners on vocabulary learning, but also it can facilitate learners on reading comprehension. Involvement load hypothesis encourage learners to involve on lexical information process which is not only beneficial for vocabulary learning but also to facilitate on reading comprehension.

By providing L1 MCG in the text, for instance in narrative text ‘search’ and ‘need’ components were completed. L1 MCG made readers easily finding the meaning of words to comprehend the text. Since the word has multiple definitions, readers should evaluate to select the appropriate meaning based on the context. However, ‘evaluation’ component was reinforced by answering the questions based on the texts. Furthermore, the fulfillment of the components of involvement load hypothesis facilitate students on comprehending the text. L1

MCG in the text have helped students to improve their reading comprehension.

It presented that the necessary of understanding vocabulary while reading is important. It is in line with Pardo's statement (2004) that teacher should facilitate students to train their automatic decoding, by means teacher should help students to realize the meaning of vocabulary. Therefore, L1 MCG can help students to train their automatic reading to improve the students' reading comprehension while reading a text. Finally, the research has proved if the facilitation of L1 MCG helps students as the readers to improve their reading comprehension while reading a text.

In further, L1 MCG in this research is assumed as textual glosses by means the gloss is provided textually and it is not using technology like multimedia glosses. Therefore, this finding is in accordance with Foroogh (2012), Ko (2005) and Jacob (1994) who concluded that by providing vocabulary glosses in the text have helped readers to comprehend the texts. In conclusion, there is a difference in students' reading comprehension caused by L1 MCG. In other words, students who get L1 MCG text have higher scores than students who get no gloss text on reading

comprehension. It also directs to L1 MCG facilitates students on reading comprehension.

The questionnaire in this research was to find out what students' opinion on the advantages or disadvantages and also the effect of L1 MCG text in reading comprehension. The questionnaire was distributed to the L1 MCG group after conducting performance tests. The questionnaire was likert style scale with fourteen statements which were stated in *Bahasa Indonesia* to make students comfortable in responding the statements and four alternative answers.

Aspect one was students' response to their learning in reading comprehension of narrative text. This aspect was formulated into five statements.

**Table 4 The Result of Aspect One in Questionnaire**

| No | Statements  | SA        | A         | D     | SD       |
|----|---|-----------|-----------|-------|----------|
| 1  | In learning English, reading skill is part that I like.                           | 4,7<br>%  | 62<br>%   | 33,3% | 0        |
| 2  | Reading narrative text is more enjoyable than other texts.                        | 7,2<br>%  | 59,<br>5% | 33,3% | 0        |
| 3  | Reading narrative text is easier than reading other texts.                        | 9,6<br>%  | 69<br>%   | 19%   | 2,4<br>% |
| 4  | Narrative is easily understood by me.   | 7,2<br>%  | 64,<br>2% | 28,6% | 0        |
| 5  | My teacher always explains the other meaning of words that are in narrative text. | 28,<br>6% | 54,<br>8% | 11,9% | 4,7<br>% |

First statement asked whether reading was student's favourite skill or not. Almost all of the students agreed with reading were their favourite skill. Second

statement focused on narrative text was enjoyable or not. 67% students told if the narrative was more enjoyable than other texts. The third statement, aimed to narrative was easy to read or not. 81% students confirmed if narrative text was easier than other texts.

Fourth statement directed to narrative was easily understood or not. 71% students affirmed if they could simply understand narrative text. A fifth statement was purposed if the students knew other meanings of words in narrative text or not. 84% students confirmed if their teacher used to explain the other meaning of words in narrative text.

In conclusion, mostly students' responded the narrative text in learning narrative text on reading comprehension was enjoyable, more comfortable and simpler comprehended. Students also used to be introduced the other meaning of words in a narrative text.

These findings confirm Knap and Watkins (2005) who states if the narrative is considered as the students' "pick up". It is highlighted from second statements that 66,7% approves if narrative text was more interesting than the other texts.

The second aspect that focused on students' understanding of narrative text completed by L1 MCG was presented by four statements, they were:

**Table 5 The Result of Aspect Two in Questionnaire**

| No | Statements   | SA        | A         | D         | SD       |
|----|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| 1  | The facilitation of L1 MCG in the text makes me easy to understand narrative text.                       | 19<br>%   | 66,<br>7% | 14,<br>3% | 0        |
| 2  | L1 MCG helps me to understand the main idea every paragraph in narrative text.                           | 19<br>%   | 59,<br>6% | 21,<br>4% | 0        |
| 3  | I understand detail information easily in every paragraph in narrative text that is completed by L1 MCG. | 21,<br>4% | 59,<br>6% | 16,<br>6% | 2,4<br>% |
| 4  | The facilitation L1 MCG on narrative text helps me to  | 2,4<br>%  | 76,<br>2% | 19<br>%   | 2,4<br>% |

|  |                                  |  |  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
|  | conclude coda in narrative text. |  |  |  |  |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|

First statement pointed out, if L1 MCG facilitates students to comprehend narrative text or not. 86% students affirmed if L1 MCG made them easier to comprehend narrative text. Second statement intended if L1 MCG facilitates students to understand the main idea in every paragraph of narrative text or not. 79% students confirmed if L1 MCG helped them to understand each main idea in narrative text.

The third statement directed if L1 MCG makes students easier to obtain the detailed information in narrative text or not. 79% students confirmed if L1 MCG assisted them to obtain the detailed information in narrative text. Last statement's target was if L1 MCG improves students to conclude coda of narrative text or not. 78% students considered if L1 MCG helped them to conclude coda of narrative text.

From the elaboration above, most students assumed if the facilitation of L1 MCG influenced them to improve their understanding of narrative text. This finding is in line with Hsu (2011) who confirms the contact between gloss, reader and text would enhance reading

comprehension. In this research gloss that is selected is L1 MCG.

Aspect three that was students' opinion on the use of L1 MCG in the narrative text was represented in three statements. They were as follows:

**Table 6 The Result of Aspect Three in Questionnaire**

| No | Statements  | SA        | A             | D        | SD       |
|----|---|-----------|---------------|----------|----------|
| 1  | The facilitation of L1 MCG in narrative text motivates me to read narrative text.                     | 4,7<br>%  | 73<br>,9<br>% | 19<br>%  | 2,4<br>% |
| 2  | L1 MCG helps me to comprehend the meaning of words based on the context in narrative text.            | 16,<br>6% | 76<br>,2<br>% | 7.2<br>% | 0        |
| 3  | I am sure if facilitation of L1 MCG in narrative text could help me to improve reading narrative text | 21,<br>4% | 69<br>%       | 9,6<br>% | 0        |

|  |        |  |  |  |  |
|--|--------|--|--|--|--|
|  | skill. |  |  |  |  |
|--|--------|--|--|--|--|

First statement aimed if L1 MCG motivates students to read narrative text or not. 79% students believed if L1 MCG made them desire to read narrative text. Second statement focused on if students' realize that L1 MCG helps them to construct the meaning of words in narrative text based on the context or not. 83% students considered that L1 MCG helped them to construct the meaning of words in narrative text. Last statement point was that students believe if L1 MCG can help them to improve their skill in reading narrative text or not. 90% students claimed if L1 MCG could help them to improve their skill in reading narrative text.

Briefly, students' opinion on L1 MCG text was that L1 MCG motivated them to read, mostly students have realized if L1 MCG helped them to construct the meaning of words. In general, students believed if L1 MCG could help them to enhance their reading skill. These findings are in line with two benefits out of five benefits that are asserted by Ko (2005). Those are if L1 MCG reduces the interruption to look up the meaning of new words in the dictionary and L1 MCG informs new words consciously. In

conclusion, L1 MCG narrative text was more interesting than no gloss narrative text.

Aspect four that was the students' opinion against the use of L1 MCG as media in learning narrative text was formulated into two statements, they were:

**Table 7 The Result of Aspect Four in Questionnaire**

| N<br>o | Statements   | SA        | A         | D         | SD       |
|--------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| 1      | I think L1 MCG is good to place on narrative text when learning English. | 33,<br>3% | 54,<br>8% | 11,<br>9% | 0        |
| 2      | I prefer to read L1 MCG narrative text than no gloss text.               | 21,<br>4% | 57,<br>3% | 16,<br>6% | 4,7<br>% |

First statement aimed students' opinion on the facilitation of L1 MCG in narrative text when learning English subject in the classroom. 88% students suggested facilitating L1 MCG in narrative text in the learning activity. Last statement focused on students' selection between L1 MCG text or no gloss text. 78% students

selected L1 MCG text than no gloss text. In summary, most students agreed with using L1 MCG as media in narrative text.

This finding was from the students' perspective which proposed to make L1 MCG as media on learning activity. This finding confirms Kumar (1998) who presents eight benefits of media in instruction. Two benefits are as follows:

- a. Media could provide flexibility when learning by means media helps teacher to omit one step of activities. When L1 MCG is on the text, the teacher may not discuss difficult words in the text. However, L1 MCG presents the multiple translations of difficult words for students on the text directly.
- b. Media could afford supplementary activity that could be accomplished by students. While L1 MCG provides multiple translations of words, the teacher can encourage students to select the appropriate meaning for some words in the text. This activity is one of supplementary activities that can be accomplished by teacher if the text is L1 MCG text.

While reading the text, students were automatically curious to understand what the text meant. If

the text was completed by L1 MCG, it would students to decide what some words mean based on the context. After students understood the text, they could answer some questions based on the text. In summary, L1 MCG could help students to improve their reading comprehension since there was significantly different between text completed by L1 MCG text and no gloss text on reading comprehension.

Facilitating L1 MCG was considered to make text friendlier for students since there were some words which were translated in their native language. Therefore, L1 MCG could motivate students to read the text. Because there were questions based on the text, L1 MCG could help students to construct the meaning of words in the text. In short, students would suggest the use of L1 MCG in a learning activity.

Ko (2005) states the advantages of gloss are to avoid readers guessing about the meaning incorrectly, to reduce the interruption of looking up the meaning of words through the dictionary and to

promote students' dependent and their autonomy. Hsu (2011) adds the interaction between gloss, reader and text will enhance readers' reading comprehension.

The research used a questionnaire to find out the students' opinion against the advantages and disadvantages of using L1 MCG in the text. Fourteen statements represented four aspects which focus on students': learning in reading comprehension of narrative text, understanding of narrative text completed by L1 MCG, opinion on the use of L1 MCG in narrative text and opinion on the use of L1 MCG as media in narrative text.

The result of questionnaire presents:

1. Mostly the students' response to learning narrative text on reading comprehension was enjoyable, comfortable and simple to be comprehended;
2. Most students assumed if the facilitation of L1 MCG influenced them to improve their understanding of narrative text;

3. About 80% students believed if L1 MCG motivated them to read, helped them to construct meaning and to enhance their reading skill.
4. Briefly, students agreed with using L1 MCG as media in narrative text.

Students' response toward the facilitation of L1 MCG in the text tended to be positive. Students realized that the use of L1 MCG was beneficial for them. Students also easily constructed the meaning without time consuming and they were avoided from improperly predicting the definition of words.

In addition, the facilitation of L1 MCG in the text could improve readers more effort to understand the text. It was predicted that this effort made readers enhance their reading comprehension on the text. It is supported by Hsu (2011) that the contact between text, glossing and readers improve readers' reading comprehension. In conclusion, students' opinion on L1 MCG was positive on L1 MCG as method to improve reading comprehension.

### **Conclusions**

There are two conclusions that are drawn from this research. First, it is the fact if L1 MCG can help students to improve

their reading comprehension. Second, it is about students' opinion while reading the text that is completed by L1 MCG.

L1 MCG is exceedingly beneficial for readers who have the less vocabulary. When, L1 MCG is in the text, the readers are prevented from guessing the meaning improperly or looking up the meaning in the dictionary which is time consuming. Therefore, it is better to emphasize the effectiveness of L1 MCG in the text. L1 MCG provided positive effect for students on reading comprehension. By providing L1 MCG in the text, it has avoided students to guess the meaning of words improperly. In addition, students can be prevented the time-consuming by finding out the meaning of words in the dictionary. In conclusion, L1 MCG helped students to improve their reading comprehension.

When the students found the text that was written in English (L2), they looked mystified. While there was L1 MCG in the text, the text would be more attractive for them. Students' opinion on the use of L1 MCG was positive. Students confirmed if L1 MCG helped them to construct the meaning of words in the text. They also considered that L1 MCG motivated them to read the text and believed if L1 MCG helped them to

understand the text. Therefore, they suggested creating L1 MCG as media in a learning activity.

The implication of these findings from this research will suggest providing L1 MCG in the text to improve reading comprehension. However, it is necessary to select the beneficial words to be glossed in the text.

There are three suggestions for future research. First, the future research can compare SG and MCG on reading comprehension or on vocabulary retention. Second, it is the selection of language in the gloss words. However, the decision of selecting the language is adjusted by the students' English proficiency.

Third, it is the selected text. In fact, all of the texts can be facilitated by L1 MCG. Therefore, it is suggested to find out the effect of L1 MCG in other texts like expository text, recount text, report text or another. The present research used impromptu reading plus comprehension to measure reading comprehension. Furthermore, it is suggested to use other methods to emphasize reading comprehension.

## References

- Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur penelitian: suatu pendekatan praktik. (Revised edition)*. Jakarta, Indonesia: Rineka Cipta)
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. London, England: Longman Publication Group
- Foroogh, A. (2012). Gloss or no gloss? EFL learner's preference. *American International Journal of Social Science*, 2(1). 75-85.
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to Design and Evaluate Research in Education*. New York, US: McGraw-Hill
- Hsu, M. H. (2011). *The effect of first language gloss on reading comprehension, lexical acquisition and retention: Single gloss and multiple-choice gloss*. *黃埔學報*, 61 期, 33-52.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (1992). Retention of inferred an given word meanings: experiments in incidental vocabulary learning. In. P. J. L. Arnaud & H. Bejoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and applied*

- linguistics* (pp. 113-125). London: McMillan.
- Hulstijn, J. H., & Laufer, B. (2001). Some empirical evidence for the involvement load hypothesis in vocabulary acquisition. *Language Learning, 51*, 539-558.
- Jacobs, G. M. (1994). What lurks in the margin: use of vocabulary glosses as a strategy in second language reading. *Issues in Applied Linguistics, 5*(1).
- Jacobs, G. M., Dufon, P., & Hong, F. C. (1994). L1 and L2 vocabulary glosses in L2 reading passages: their effectiveness for increasing comprehension and vocabulary knowledge. *Journal of Research in Reading, 17*(1), 19-28.
- Knap & Watkins (2005). *Genre, text, grammar*. NSW, Australia: University of New South Wales Press Ltd.
- Ko, M. H. (2005). Glosses, comprehension, and strategy use. *Reading in a foreign language, 17*(2), 125-143.
- Kumar, Veena. 1998. *Media options for teachers*. Atlantic Publishers and Distributors: Vishal Enclave
- Lammers, W. J., & Badia, P. (2004). Fundamentals of behavioral research. *Recording for the Blind & Dyslexic*.
- Langan, John (2012). *English skills with reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Lin, C. C., & Huang, H. M. (2008). Meaning-inferred gloss and meaning-given gloss on incidental vocabulary learning. *師大學報：人文與社會類, 53*(2), 87-116.
- Lomicka, L. (1998). "To gloss or not to gloss": an investigation of reading comprehension online. *Language learning & technology, 1*(2), 41.
- Miyasako, N. (2002). *Does text-glossing have any effects on incidental vocabulary learning through reading for Japanese senior high school students?*. *Language Education & Technology, 39*, 1-20.
- Nation, I. S. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Stuttgart, Germany: Ernst Klett Sprachen.
- Pardo, L. S. (2004). What every teacher needs to know about comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 58*(3), 272-280.
- Priestley, M. (1982). *Performance assessment in education and training: alternative techniques*.

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:  
Educational Technology  
Publications

RAND Reading Study Group. (2002).  
*Reading for understanding*. Santa  
Monica: RAND Education

Susanti, R. (2002). Penguasaan kosa kata  
dan kemampuan membaca bahasa  
inggris. *Jurnal Pendidikan*  
*Penabur-No.01/Th.1/March 2002*,  
page 87-93.

Wajnryb, R. (2003). *Stories: Narrative*  
*activities for the language*  
*classroom*. Stuttgart, Germany:  
Ernst Klett Sprachen.