



THE EFL AUTONOMOUS LEARNING ON READING COMPREHENSION

Hamid Ismail¹, Saiful² and Rina Asrini Bakri³

¹English Education Department, STKIP KIE RAHA Ternate, Indonesia

²English Education Department, Universitas Muhammadiyah Makassar, Indonesia

³English Education Department College: STKIP YPUP Makassar, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received 4th January, 2019

Received in revised form 25th

February, 2019

Accepted 18th March, 2019

Published online 28th April, 2019

Key words:

EFL Aotonomous Learning, Reading Comprehension, Interest

ABSTRACT

The core point of this research was to find out the students reading comprehension achievement after applying aotonomous learning at SMA NEG 1 Bontonompo Selatan Gowa. The research was an experimental method with pre test - post test design and questionnaire. The sample was 26 students by using purposive technique sampling. The result of the research indicated that there was significant difference between pre test and post test of the students reading comprehension achievement. The value of the t test was higher than t-table. The data of the questionnaire showed the means score of the students indicated the students agree that aotonomous learning was interested for them in teaching and learning program. It can be concluded that aotonomous learning effective to be applied in teaching reading.

Copyright©2019 **Hamid Ismail and Saiful**. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

INTRODUCTION

In learning language, one of the aspects that should be improved is reading. In daily life, it is very important to get information from every reading passage, especially in learning English. Reading is one of the basic skills in English which is not simply translated word by word but need to be acquired during language course. Therefore, when the students learn to read, they should be able to comprehend the reading text during the process of reading. They are not only expected to read the text in good pronunciation or to find the meaning of each word within the text.

Clark and Starr (1986: 270-271) states that reading is a difficult skill that takes you to master. For most of us it is skill we must continue to learn well into our lives. Undoubtedly most of students will not have mastered all the skill they need to because efficient, effective readers and some of the students will be truly disabled readers.

In fact, many students get difficulties in comprehending the English reading text; getting the general information, specific information, vocabulary, grammatical, and main idea of paragraph of a text (Lusiana, 2007:2). Block (2003:11) states that there are number of causes of poor comprehension, such as; lack of vocabulary knowledge, inappropriate reading strategies and reading speeds, some factors associated with students boring activities in reading text of low interest materials, situation (uncomfortable situation towards learning), and insufficient time spent in reading.

**Corresponding author: Hamid Ismail*

English Education Department, STKIP KIE RAHA Ternate, Indonesia

It means that the factors that cause students difficulties in comprehending the reading text, not only from the teacher strategies, text and also the students. The interaction between the teacher and also the students has influenced to the students in comprehending the text, some of the reason; it may methodology that the teacher uses in teaching.

Although reading is very important but students still have any difficulties in mastering reading, in the third semester students English department Unismuh Makassar the researcher find that students are lacking in reading English passage.

First, students have difficulty in understanding English word, phrase and sentence in English. Second, the students have difficulty in finding the main idea of the text they read. Third, students are not accustomed to practice reading in the classroom and every day life.

Last lecturers could not find the right method or technique to provide materials for students to learn and quick understanding the material presented. Based on factors that are mentioned above the biggest problem is how to choose appropriate technique or method because student can easily get bored if teacher presents material with traditional technique.

Based on the problem above it is necessary to apply a method or strategies to solve students from reading problem in English in order students can read and understand meaning of every reading passage. Aotonomous learning is chosen to solve this problem, the students develop independent skills in comprehending, composing and learning the text.

Aotonomous learning helps students engage with texts in deliberate and purposeful (strategic) ways. It makes the

students more clear about the information and elaborate with their own knowledge.

Traditional method also make the students have a less motivation to be active questioners, read for specific purpose and reflect following reading about whether the purpose was met. But Autonomous learning can help the students to increase their motivation, access what they know, decide what they want to learn and whether it is likely to be in the passage, and decide what they need to be done after reading.

Therefore, it is necessary to do research on the application of autonomous learning on English subjects in order to help improve Reading Comprehension at third semester students of English department Unismuh Makassar.

The findings will inform institutions and teachers of what to watch out for when considering integrating reading into the curriculum so as to make language learning both inside and outside the classroom more effective.

Research Question

According to the title of the study, the researcher presents the problems statements as follows:

1. To what extent can Autonomous Learning improve students reading comprehension?
2. Are the students interested in learning reading through Autonomous Learning?

METHOD

Population and sample

The population of this research is the thirdsemester students of Unismuh Makassar English department academic year 2017/2018. It consisted of 234 students. The research applied purposive sampling. The researcher has chosen one class as sample, namely class D. The researcher chooses D class because their English prior knowledge especially their ability to read is lower than the other class.

Instruments of the Research

In order to collect the intended data, this study make the following instrumentation;

Reading test

There were two kinds of test to measure students' reading comprehension namely pre-test and post-test. Pre-test or initial reflection was intended to assess the pre-existing reading comprehension of the subjects which was administered in the first meeting before the researcher conducted the research by applying Autonomous learning in the classroom. The post-tests were administered in the end of each session. The function of administering post test was to evaluate the effectiveness of Autonomous learning in teaching reading comprehension.

Pre-test and Post-test were in the form of multiple choice items which is consisted of 20 question of Pre-test and 10 question of Post-test. The expected answer were A, B, C, and D. Each correct answer had 1 point and incorrect answer got 0 point. The purpose of pre-test conducted was to find out initial condition of subject in reading comprehension. Mean while the post-test would reflect the effectiveness of Autonomous learning when it was applied.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was prepared to find out the changing behavior when the students were taught reading comprehension through Autonomous learning. The questionnaire was given after the researcher finished cycle I. The questionnaire which was constructed in the format of multiple choice consisted of 10 items with options; A, B, C, and D. In order to avoid confusing and misunderstanding to the students, the questionnaire was written in Bahasa Indonesia. The answer of the questionnaire scored using the rating scale 3-0. The scale 3 was considered for the answer A, the scale 2 was considered for the answer B, the scale 1 was considered for the answer C, and the scale 0 was considered for the answer D.

Procedures of Collecting Data

In collecting data, the researcher were used three steps; they are pre-test, treatment, and post-test.

Pre-test

Before giving treatment, the researcher administered the pre-test that is used to see the students' prior ability or knowledge in reading autonomous learning.

Treatment

After giving pre-test, the researcher gave treatment for the students in three meetings. There were the activities that had been done in each meeting as follows:

- a. The first meeting The researcher explained about the content of reading to the students that had been done as the main teaching and learning instruction program during the treatment activities in the class.
- b. The second meeting the researcher gave reading test in autonomus learning.
- c. The third meeting researcher reviewed how to apply the autonomus learning in reading.

Post-test

After giving the treatment, the researcher gave post-test to the students. The post-test had been given to find out the result after giving treatment.

Technique of Data Analysis

The data analysis which was done through the test analyzed as in the following systematic procedure:

Scoring the students correct answer of pre-test and post-test

$$\text{Score} = \frac{\text{Total number of correct Answer}}{\text{Total number of Items}} \times 10$$

(Gay, 1981:298)

Classifying the score of the students' Pre Test and Post Test

9.6- 10	Classified as excellent
8.6-9.5	Classified as very good
7.6- 8.5	Classified as good
6.6-7.5	Classified as fairly good
5.6-6.5	Classified as fair
4.6-5.5	Classified as poor
0.0-4.5	Classified very poor

(Adopted from Depdikbud in Adi: 2008)

Computing the frequency on the rate percentage of the students' score

$$\text{O}/\text{O} = \frac{n}{N} \times 10$$

Where :

n = Frequency
N = The total number of the students
(Gay, 2006)

Calculating the mean score of the students' Pre Test and Post Test

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

Where :

\bar{X} = mean
 $\sum X$ = the sum of the scores
N = the number of subjects

Findings

Based on explanation previously in collecting data, the researcher administered a test that was used as a pretest and post-test. The pretest was administered before giving the treatment and posttest was administered after giving treatment. The content of them was the same.

The rate percentage of students' score obtained through the test. After calculating the result of students' pretest and posttest score into percentage, they were then classified into four levels, as follow:

Pre-test

The first time, the researcher came to their class to do the pre-test, the students expressed as if they rejected the attendance of the researcher. It was described by their mimic, facial, gesture and responses. Their English lecturer let the researcher introduced himself and the aim of his attendance to their class then their English lecturer left the researcher in the class. The researcher checked the students' attendance lists. The class was very chaos.

To solve this situation, the researcher gave short motivation about how important English mastery in this global era competition. In addition, he continued that by mastery English language, the people will get the good job easily. He also explained about the next activity. When the researcher was speaking, they spoke one to other. The researcher heard their whispering. It looked like they did not know what the researcher said. Recognizing their ability in understanding English speaking, the researcher translated His speaking into Indonesian language. The students were silent. When they were silent, the researcher divided the pre-test question. He gave a clear explanation about instruction in the pre-test questions. Most of them were seriously in doing the pre-test but others were not.

The researcher had planned before that the pre-test was in 90 minutes but could not be, He needed 135 minutes or three lessons. The researcher lost more time in cheking the students attendance list and giving the motivation to them. It was the real situation in pre-test. The students' score in pre-test were showed in the table 1. It was been explained in collecting data,

the researcher used reading test, in pretest and posttest to know the students reading achievements. The researcher gave the questions that should be answered by students. The result can be seen in table 1.

According to the criterion by Depdikbud in Andriana (2013) learning process can be said to be successful if students achievement is 65% above, seeing from the result of the pretest that is only 46%, the researcher concluded that the students reading comprehension still low than Depdikbud Criterion.

Treatment

In doing the treatments, there were some indicators should be reached by students. They were:

1. The students were able to find the unfamiliar words from the text.
2. The students were able to understand the content of the text.

For the first time the researcher coming on the class gave of treatment after pretest. The researcher told to the students that they could enjoy during the time of study on the class. The Researcher implemented to students about Autonomous learning.

The second and the third activities on the treatments, the students gave positive responded and good answered whenever the researcher asked to the students to mention the descriptive text and dominant generic structure from the reading selection. However, the researcher gives much attention to answer the students question in Explain the material.

The problem faced by the students in doing the treatment.

The fundamental issue faced by the researcher, in the class there are many kinds of students' background. It affected students' characteristics in the class. There were hyperactive students, interactive, extrovert, and others characteristics. In doing the treatment, we could say that, they did not have basic vocabulary mastery. It could be looked from their unfamiliar words. Almost all words in the text were written by researcher. Some students are bored in doing the treatment. It is caused by same activities in this part. Moreover to find the difficulties word in the dictionary activities. To help them in understanding the difficulties word and avoid their boring, the researcher make some illustration and joke related to the difficult word list.

Post-test

The Last activities were posttest and questionnaire. It was conducted of written test. The test items were similar to the test in the pre-test. The score is higher than pretest was only 46%. From fact the researcher concluded that the students' achievement is improved. The findings were presented according to the data obtained through the reading test with the teacher, the reading test was used to measure the students' reading comprehension. Then in order to complete the data, the researcher gave test to the students. To prove this statement, the result of the test in this researcher was compared on the following table.

The students' score

As has been clarified formerly in the procedure of collection data, the researcher conducted a test that was pre test and post

test. The pre test was applied before giving the treatment while post test was administrated after giving the treatment.

Table 3.1 Students' score of pre-test (x_1), post test (x_2), Gain/difference between the matched pair (D), and the square of gain (D^2)

No	Respondents	Pre test (x_1)	Post test (x_2)	Difference	(D^2)
1	ST	6,0	8,0	2,0	4,0
2	IPS	6,5	7,0	0,5	0,25
3	DM	6,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
4	SAS	7,0	8,0	1,0	2,0
5	MJ	6,0	8,0	2,0	4,0
6	RT	7,5	9,0	1,5	2,25
7	AK	5,5	7,0	1,5	2,25
8	MVM	7,5	9,0	1,5	2,25
9	FNR	6,0	8,0	2,0	4,0
10	MA	5,0	7,0	2,0	4,0
11	NE	5,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
12	MJ	6,0	8,0	2,0	4,0
13	AN	6,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
14	MS	5,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
15	TA	5,0	7,0	2,0	4,0
16	SW	5,5	7,0	1,5	2,25
17	AT	5,0	8,0	3,0	9,0
18	KK	5,5	8,0	2,5	6,25
19	FS	5,5	7,0	1,5	2,25
20	EG	5,0	8,0	3,0	9,0
21	MTA	5,5	8,0	2,5	6,25
22	AJ	6,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
23	AR	6,0	8,0	2,0	4,0
24	RL	5,5	7,0	1,5	2,25
25	SA	5,5	7,0	1,5	2,25
26	JIE	5,5	8,0	1,5	2,25
	N=26	$\sum x_1=153$	$\sum x_2=202$	$\sum D=46$	$\sum D^2=401$

The table above shows that the total score of the students' pretest result and the students' posttest result was quite different, where the total score of the pre-test result ($\sum x_1$) was 153 while the total score of posttest ($\sum x_2$) was 202. From the total score of the pretest and posttest above can be reached the gain or the different between matched pairs ($\sum D$) was 46 after getting the gain or the different between matched pairs can be seen the total square gain ($\sum D^2$) was 401. From the data elaborated above, can be taken the conclusion that the Autonomous Learning can improv the students' reading comprehension at the third semester students of English department Unismuh Makassar.

The students' maximum score in pretest was 7,5 and the students' minimum score was 5,0 where the students maximum score in posttest was 9,0 and the students' minimum score was 7,0. After calculating the data taken from the pretest and post test score, the table shows that maximum gain (D) of the students' score is 3,0 and the minimum gain is 0,5 (Where : N=26, $\sum X_1 = 153$, $\sum X_2 = 202$, $\sum D = 46$, and $\sum D^2 = 401$).

Scoring classification

The raw score of the students' reading comprehension were classified into seven levels based on Gay,1981 classification into some criteria. The criteria and the percentage of the students' score of pretest and posttest were presented as follow:

The students' Pretest

After calculating the data and analyze the students' score, the writer classified the students' score into seven categories which were excellent, very good, good, fairly good, fair, poor and very poor categories in pre-test and post-test students' reading comprehension.

These classifications were used to find out the significant of the Autonomous Learning as a teaching method in teaching reading at the third grade students of English Department Unismuh Makassar. The rate percentage and frequency were separated into two columns' and the tables were divided into two tables namely the first is the rate percentage of the students' achievement in pre-test and the second table is the rate of the students' scores post-test. Before giving the treatment the writer did the pre-test to know the students knowledge about reading. The data showed from the table 3.2 below. It was of the rate percentage of students' pre-test.

Table 3.2 Students' Score Classification in Pre-test(X_1)

No	Respondents	Score	Classification
1	ST	6,0	Fair
2	IPS	6,5	Fair
3	DM	6,5	Fair
4	SAS	7,0	Fairly good
5	MJ	6,0	Fair
6	RT	7,5	Fairly good
7	AK	5,5	Poor
8	MVM	7,5	Fairly goog
9	FNR	6,0	Fair
10	MA	5,0	Poor
11	NE	5,5	Poor
12	MF	6,0	Fair
13	AN	6,5	Fair
14	MS	5,5	Poor
15	TA	5,0	Poor
16	SW	5,5	Poor
17	AT	5,0	Poor
18	KK	5,5	Poor
19	FS	5,5	Poor
20	EG	5,0	Poor
21	MTA	5,5	Poor
22	AJ	6,5	Fair
23	AR	6,0	Fair
24	RL	5,5	Poor
25	SA	5,5	Poor
26	JIE	5,5	Poor
	N=26	$\sum x_1=153$	

Based on the classification score of the students' pre-test, it can be assumed that the students' reading comprehension is almost dominated by the poor classification. By looking the students' score the researcher was eager to apply the treatment by using Autonomous Learning because the result of the students' pre-test reading indicated the students reading skill should be improved by involving some interesting strategies based on their level.

Table 3.3 Frequency and rate percentage of the students' English Reading Achievement in Pretest

No	Classification	Range	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	9,6 – 10	0	0%
2	Very good	8,6 – 9,5	0	0%
3	Good	7,6 – 8,5	0	0%
4	Fairly good	6,6 – 7,5	3	10%
5	Fair	5,6 – 6,5	9	35%
6	Poor	4,6 – 5,5	14	55%
7	Very poor	0 – 4,5	0	0%
	Total		26	100%

The data in table 3.3 above shows that frequency and the rate percentage of the students' achievement in pretest (before teaching use Autonomous Learning). It can be obviously seen that none of them was classified into very good, into good, and into very poor. 3 students (10%) was classified into fairly good, 9 students (35%) was classified into fair, 14 students (55%) was classified into poor.

Table 3.4 The students score of classification in Post-test (X₂)

No	Respondents	Score	Classification
1	ST	8,0	Good
2	IPS	7,0	Fairly good
3	DM	8,0	Good
4	SAS	8,0	Good
5	MJ	8,0	Good
6	RT	9,0	Very good
7	AK	7,0	Fairly good
8	MVM	9,0	Very good
9	FNR	8,0	Good
10	MA	7,0	Fairly good
11	NE	8,0	Good
12	MF	8,0	Good
13	AN	8,0	Good
14	MS	8,0	Good
15	TA	7,0	Fairly good
16	SW	7,0	Fairly good
17	AT	8,0	Good
18	KK	8,0	Good
19	FS	7,0	Fairly good
20	EG	8,0	Good
21	MTA	8,0	Good
22	AJ	8,0	Good
23	AR	8,0	Good
24	RL	7,0	Fairly good
25	SA	7,0	Fairly good
26	JIE	8,0	Good
N=26		Σx ₂ =202	

From the table above, the writer gets conclusion that there are 2 students classified into very good, 16 students classified into good, 8 students classified into fairly good and no one student are classified into Excellent, fair, poor and very poor.

Table 3.5 Frequency and rate percentage of students' English Reading Achievement in Posttest

No	Classification	Range	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	9,6 – 10	0	0%
2	Very good	8,6 – 9,5	2	6%
3	Good	7,6 – 8,5	16	64%
4	Fairly good	6,6 – 7,5	8	30%
5	Fair	5,6 – 6,5	0	0%
6	Poor	4,6 – 5,5	0	0%
7	Very poor	0 – 4,5	0	0%
TOTAL			26	100%

The data in the table 3.5 above shows that the frequency and the rate percentage of the students' achievement in post-test (after teaching through Autonomous Learning). It can be clearly seen that 2 students (6%) was classified into Very good, 16 students (64%) was classified into Good, 8 students (30%) was classified into fairly good and none of them was classified into Excellent, fair, poor and very poor.

Mean Score

The mean score of the students' pretest

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{153}{26}$$

$$\bar{X} = 5,88$$

The mean score of the students' posttest

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

$$\bar{X} = \frac{202}{26}$$

$$\bar{X} = 7,76$$

Table 3.6 The mean score of the students' pretest and post-test

Test	Mean score	Total score
Pretest (x ₁)	5,88	153
Posttest(x ₂)	7,76	202

The data in the table above shows that the mean score of students' pretest was 5,88 which classified as poor, while the mean score of students' posttest score was 7,76 which classified good. The mean score of the students' posttest was higher than the mean score of the students pretest.

It means that using Autonomous Learning can improving students English Reading comprehension of English department.

T – test value

$$t = \frac{\bar{D}}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum D^2 - \frac{(\sum D)^2}{N}}{N(N-1)}}$$

Where:

$$D = \frac{\sum D}{N}$$

$$D = \frac{46}{26}$$

$$D = 1,76$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum 401 - \frac{(\sum 46)^2}{26}}{26(26-1)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum 401 - \frac{(46)^2}{26}}{26(25)}}$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{\sqrt{\frac{401 - (2116)}{26}}$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{0,70}$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{\sqrt{\frac{401 - 81,38}{650}}$$

$$t = \frac{1,76}{\sqrt{0,491}}$$

$$t = 2,51$$

The students t-test was 2,51

Table 3.7 Test of significant

Df	Level of Significance	T-Test Value	T-Table
30	0,05	2,51	2,060

The data of the table 5 shows that t-table value was smaller than t-table test value of the students' achievement in learning English reading. It could be concluded that there was a significant difference between the result of the students' pre-test and pos-test. From the analysis above, the researcher concluded that there was significant difference between pretest

and posttest by using Autonomous Learning in improving the English reading. It means that Autonomous Learning was effective to be used to improving the students' English reading comprehension.

Hypothesis testing

To find out degree of freedom (df) the researcher used the following formula:

Df = N-1
 Df = 26 - 1
 Df = 25

For the level significance (p) = 0,05 and the degree of freedom (df) = 25, then the value of t-table = 2,060 and the value of t-test = 2,51. Comparing with the test value, it can be concluded, t-test value (2,51 was higher than the t-table (2,060). In other hand we can said that 2,51 > 2,060. This means that null hypothesis (H₀) of this research is rejected and the alternative hypothesis (H₁) acceptable because there is significance different between the pre-test and post-test by using Autonomous Learning in improving students' reading. From the analysis above, the researcher concludes that, there was a significance different between the result of pre-test and the post-test of students' score after by using Autonomous Learning in improving students' reading. In other words, it can be said the use of Autonomous Learning can improve students' reading comprehension.

3.2 The analysis of the students' questionnaire towards the the autonomous learning on reading comprehension.

Based on the scoring system above, the students mentioned above gets score four (3) for items number one (1). The way of reading the students' answer is as same as explanations above. Besides that, we see that the total sum of students score from The data obtained from questionnaire is 75,5 and the average of students' score was 2, 90 Or 3. It means that the students agree that Autonomous Learning was interested for them in teaching learning process.

CONCLUSION

Reading is one of the important factors in learning all language teaching. The students must learn new words continually as they learn structure and as they practice sound system, but most of the students were not interested and motivated at all. Without reading mastery, they can not improve the other skills in learning a language. The researcher used Autonomous Learning as one way in teaching reading that benefits the students' in many ways. After the researcher done the research and analyzed the data that have been presented in the previous chapter, the researcher makes conclusion as follows:

The Use of Autonomous Learning can improve students' reading comprehension of the third semester students of Muhammadiyah university of Makassar English Department Class D. The result of data analysis showed that the mean score of students' reading after giving the treatment by using Autonomous Learning was greater than the mean score before giving the treatment.

Table 3.3 The data obtained from questionnaire

No	StudentsName	Questions										score
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
1	ST	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
2	IPS	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
3	DM	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
4	SAS	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	28
5	MJ	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
6	RT	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	29
7	AK	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	28
8	MVM	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
9	FNR	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
10	MA	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	2	27
11	NE	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	29
12	MF	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	28
13	AN	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	28
14	MS	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	29
15	TA	3	3	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	27
16	SW	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
17	AT	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
18	KK	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	29
19	FS	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
20	AG	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
21	MTA	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
22	AJ	3	3	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	28
23	AR	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	3	27
24	RL	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
25	SA	3	3	3	3	2	3	3	2	3	3	28
26	JIE	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	30
Total		78	78	76	75	74	76	76	74	72	73	7.55 2.90

The table 3 above shows that students' number one (1) in students attendance list answers B for item number 1. The students' answers were scored as follows:

- ✓ Option A is scored 3
- ✓ Option B is scored 2
- ✓ Option C is scored 1
- ✓ Option D is scored 0

The implementation of Autonomous Learning could also make the students interested in learning reading.

References

1. Abudulaziz, and Stover. *Academic Challenges In Reading*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc, 1989)
2. Burgmeir, Arline. *Academic Vocabulary Study*. (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc. 1991)
3. Benson, P. *Teaching and researching autonomy in language learning*. (London: Longma, 2000)
4. Cutler, Wade E. *Triple Your Reading Speed*. New York: (Prentice Hall, 1993)
5. Crome, K., Farrar, R., and O'Connor, P. *What is Autonomous Learning? Discourse, 9(1), 111-126*, Retrieved from <http://prs.heacademy.ac.uk/view.html/PrsDiscourseArticles/113> 2008.
6. Clark, and Starr. *Secondary and Middle School Teaching Methods*. (America: Macmillan, Inc. 1986)
7. Cochran. *Reading In the Content Areas for Junior High School and High School*. (America: Allyn and Bacon. 1997)
8. Depdikbud. *Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Proses Belajar Mengajar Dan Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Penilaian*. (Jakarta: Depdikbud. 2008)
9. Elizabeth, Susan. *Developing Literacy: Assessment and Teaching*. (China: Sue Hill, 1998).
10. Fatmawati. *Developing students reading comprehension by using reading text used at junior high school. A thesis of FKIP UNM, 2014*.
11. Fazey, D., and Fazey, J. *The potential for Autonomy in learning: Perception of competence, motivation and locus of control in 1st year undergraduate students*. *Studies in Hinger Education*, 26(3), 345, 2001.
12. Gay, L.R. *Educational Research Competencies for Analysis and Application*. (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill publishing company, 1981)
13. Harmer. *Teaching English for ESL students*. Available on line at <http://www.academicwritingsuite101.com/> Accses on 09/07/2018
14. Husnaini. *"The First Year Students' Difficulties in Answering Reading Comprehension Question in Accordance with Reading Skill at SMU negeri 3 Palembang"*. Thesis. Palembang: University of PGRI Palembang 2003.
15. Lusiana, M. *"Some Problems in Teaching Reading Comprehension titled "Helicopter" to the Eight Year Students of SMP Negeri 35 Palembang"*. Thesis. Palembang: Universitas of PGRI Palembang, 2007.
16. Markstein. *Developing Reading Skill*. America: (New Bury House Publisher, 1991).
17. Nunan. *Language Teaching Methodology: A Textbook for Teachers*. (Great Britain: Redwood Books 1995).
18. Rahmawati and Wulyani. *Using Autonomous Learning Strategy to improve students reading ability at the eight grade students of SMPN 1 Singosari Malang*. Unpublished Thesis. Malang. Universitas of Malang, 2011.
 - a. Wagman, 1984. *The Assessment In Reading*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc..

How to cite this article:

Hamid Ismail, Saiful and Rina Asrini Bakri (2019) 'The Efl Autonomous Learning on Reading Comprehension', *International Journal of Current Advanced Research*, 08(04), pp. 18430-18436. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijcar.2019.18436.3523>
