The Correlation between Diction and Scheme Mastery with Students' Reading Comprehension at The Fifth Grade Students

M. Rodi[1*], Dian Permanasari[2], Febriyanti[3]
STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung[123]
*rodi.lanado@gmail.com

Abstract: This study aimed to identify and describe the relationship level of diction and schemata mastery with reading ability at the fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro, Semaka District, in the 2018/2019. This study is a quantitative descriptive method of because the score. The variables in this study are in the form of numbers and are presented in the form of tabulation and using statistical analysis. The population of this research is students of the fifth grade of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro Semaka District Tanggamus District. Semaka 2018/2019 Academic Year consists of 2 classes. Research result shows that the correlation coefficient between diction mastery and reading comprehension ability of 0.776. The correlation coefficient between schemata on the ability to read comprehension of 0.820, while the double coefficient correlation between diction and schemata mastery on the ability to read comprehension of 0.836. The conclusion can be drawn is that there is a very close and significant relationship between vocabulary mastery and schemata with reading comprehension ability in the fifth grade of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro, Semaka Tanggamus District, 2018/2019 academic year. This indicates that the better the mastery of diction and schemata owned, the better the reading comprehension ability.
Keywords: diction, schematic, reading comprehension

INTRODUCTION

Students' reading comprehension ability is closely related to the mastery of the student's diction. Diction is a significant factor in reading. The more comprehensive the students' knowledge of diction, the better their reading skills will impact understanding the discourse, or the student's assignments will also increase. Learning to read comprehension is also related to teachers' views of the nature of learning to read. Selection of the form of learning strategy can affect the results that students will obtain. One of the efforts to overcome the success of learning reading comprehension in the fifth grade of elementary school is to design an effective and efficient reading

comprehension learning model. The meaning of effective and efficient in a relatively short time for students can improve students' understanding of reading. The creativity of educators must provide a teaching process by using a model that can improve the ability to understand the material content (Hastomo, 2016). Learning model alternatives include learning models for applying schemata theory.

Through the schemata, one would quickly obtain or represent knowledge of what one read or heard so that new information will be easily obtained. The schematic theory states that how the reader understands the context of the reading depends not only on the information read but also on readers' relevant mental structures. So in learning to read, the teacher needs to generate student schemata. This is comparable to the cognitive view, which states that mental aspects and background knowledge are fundamental in learning (Lestari et al., 2018). Due to the critical role of schemata in understanding the reading, it is necessary to research to find out how significant the schematic relationships are, such as the absorption of information, focus attention, and remembering to improve skills in reading comprehension for elementary school students.

Moreover, Schallert (2017). stated that reading comprehension is a process of acquiring meaning that actively involves knowledge and experience that readers already have and are associated with reading content. Meanwhile, according to Hodgson (Tarigan, 2008: 7), reading is a process carried out and used by readers to get the message the author wants to convey through the medium of words or written language. A process that demands that the group of united words is seen at a glance, and the meaning of words individually will be known.

Furthermore, Pourhosein & Sabouri (2016) explain that reading is a process of obtaining meaning from written words. They also explain that reading is a process of forming meaning from written texts. Furthermore, Wigfield, Gladstone & Turci (2016) state reading is a psychological process of determining the meaning of written words. Reading involves vision, eye movement, mental speech, memory, word knowledge understandable, and the reader's experience. It is different from Lado (Tarigan, 2008: 9), reading is the understanding of language patterns from written images. Meanwhile, according to Anderson (Tarigan, 2008: 7), reading is an encoding process that returns and decodes (a recording and decoding process). An Aspect of decoding is connecting written words with spoken language (oral language meaning), which includes changing writing/printing into a meaningful sound.

Diction is a choice of words that includes the meaning of which words are used to convey ideas, how to form groups of the right words, and which style is best used in the situation in the right choice of words and made

possible only by the mastery of a large number vocabulary of that language (Keraf, 1994:24). Diction is a choice of words that are right and in harmony with their use in conveying an idea or story which includes language style, expression, choice of words, and so on, so that obtained the desired effect. Limitations in vocabulary can be complex for someone to convey his meaning to others. And if the person uses excessive vocabulary, it will also make it difficult for others to understand the message. Diction is a choice of words that includes the meaning of the words which are used to convey ideas, how to form the correct grouping of words, and the style in which one is best used in situations of proper word choice and only made possible by the mastery of a large number of vocabulary words. (Keraf, 1994:24).

From various opinions regarding diction, among them, (Keraf 1994:24) said that there are three main things about diction, namely: First, the choice of words or diction includes the meaning of which words are used to convey ideas, how to form a grouping of words the right one or use the correct expressions and which style is best used in situations. Second, the choice of words or diction is the ability to correctly distinguish the nuances of meaning from the idea you want to convey and find the appropriate form (fit) with the situation and sense of values owned by the listener community. Third, The right and proper choice of words are only possible by the mastery of a certain number of words large vocabulary, or vocabulary of the language.

The definition of diction is the choice of words. The speaker chooses a word that is right to say something. Word choice is an essential element in the world of composing and everyday speech. We cannot run from the dictionary when choosing the right word to express a point. The dictionary gives us an accuracy of the àuse of words. In this case, the exact meaning of the word is needed. The right one will help someone express precisely what they want to be delivered, both orally and in writing. Besides, the choice of words must also be according to the situation and the place where the words are used. The main thing regarding diction are 1) The choice of words or diction includes the meaning of words which one is used to convey an idea, how to form grouping the right words or to use appropriate expressions, and which style is best used in a given situation. 2) Word choice or diction is the ability to accurately distinguish the nuances of meaning from an idea to be conveyed and to find form appropriate (suitable) to the situation and the sense of belonging to the group listening community. 3) The right and appropriate choice of words is only possible by mastering a large vocabulary of that language. Meanwhile, what is meant by the vocabulary of a language is the total choice of words that a language has (Wahyuningsih et al., 2019).

Kieras & Just (2018) say, "Choosing the right words for conveying ideas, especially through writing, is quite difficult". In line with this opinion, the

American novelist named Hemingway's works include The Snow of Kilimanjaro, quoted by Clark & Gardner (2017) says that "The accuracy in the choice of words considers it as the most difficult part of the writing process." Hastomo (2016) argues that in choosing words there are several the main requirements that must be considered, namely communicating ideas based on the choice of the right words and according to the rules of Indonesian.; (2) produce peak (most effective) communication without misinterpretation; (3) generate a response from readers or listeners following the expectations of the author or reader, and (4) produce a target in expected communication.

Kaushik & Lipton (2018) argue that denotative meaning is the meaning in the natural realm explicitly. This natural meaning is the appropriate meaning. Denotative is a meaning contained in a word objectively. Often the denotative meaning is also called conceptual meaning. For example, the word eats means putting something in the mouth, chewing, and swallowing. The meaning of the word eats like this is a denotative meaning. The connotative meaning is associative meaning that arises from social attitudes, personal attitudes, and additional criteria imposed on conceptual meaning. The word eats in a connotative sense can mean profit or hit.

According to Chen (2018), the meaning of connotation is attitude additions, social and personal attitudes, attitudes of the era, and additional criteria assigned to a conceptual meaning. So what connotation means is a word that has a different meaning to an abstract, a special meaning, a new meaning, an emotional value, a specific feeling, and the meaning of another. Connotative meaning is also called dynamic meaning or evaluative meaning, which means that connotation is a type of meaning from the stimulus and response that contains emotional values. Partial connotative meaning also occurs because the speaker wants to generate feelings of agreement, pleasure, displeasure, and so on the listener. On the other hand, the words he chose showed that the conversation had the same feeling.

Words that have additional meanings or taste values are called connotations (Keraf, 1994:29). If we want certain emotions, we must choose words connotations adjusted to the purpose to be achieved. Connotation is a meaning or additional meaning to the essential importance in the form of a particular taste or image value. According to Hasan et al. (1998:458), schemata represent the addressee's knowledge to understand what is read or heard. The concept is an essential element in processing all new information. Before we understand schemata, we should first know the origin of the word schemata. It turns out that schemata come from the word schema, meaning its meaning can be explained as a process by which one compares knowledge he has with new information coming into himself.

According to Putra (2008:109), the schema is a mental framework, a

form of systematic arrangement of thoughts on various aspects. Schemata is a form of representation of ideas, perceptions, and actions that are associated and is an essential ability in the use of thought. This schematic will constantly develop along with the many experiences. Schemata also represent the form of a set of perceptions and ideas and are also needed in essential thought development. Schemata also develop in line with capacity experience, so it can be said that schemata are directly proportional to knowledge.

Furthermore, Xie (2017) says that the scheme is generalized knowledge about a particular situation and event. In its development, the previous schemata are an integral part of the new schemata. Assimilation and accommodation are the processes that cause a person's schemata to develop continually. Assimilation is the absorption of new concepts into cognitive structures that have been built or already exist. At the same time, the definition of accommodation is the process of forming new schemata or modifying existing cognitive systems there so that new concepts that enter can be well absorbed. Based on the description above, the researchers were interested in conducting a study entitled, "The Correlation between Diction Mastery and Schematics with the Reading Comprehension of the Fifth Grade Students".

METHOD

The method used in this research is the descriptive quantitative method because the variable scores in this study are in the form of numbers and are presented in shape tabulation and using statistical analysis. This method can describe accurately and provide information about the symptoms found in the research. In addition, the descriptive way, according to this study, describes the symptom variable and the correlation of the variables in this study—the method used to observe the object to be directly studied.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Description of Research Result Data

Data on three research variables were obtained from research respondents as described in the attachment. For more details, the research data will be presented in three data groups, namely; (a) mastery of diction, (b) mastery of schemata, (c) reading comprehension ability.

Diction Mastery Data (x1)

After scoring, the highest score was 90, and the lowest was 45. The average is 70.10, with a standard deviation of 10.95. If it is interpreted as mastery of diction in the category: very poor, less, enough, good enough, good, very good. Then it is known that there are two students or 6.7% in the inferior category, four students or 13.3% less, six students or 20% is sufficient, ten

students or 33.3% is quite good, five students or 16.7% is good, and three students or 10% is outstanding. It can be explained that the overall mastery of diction is suitable for students because only 33.3% are under the good enough category.

Schematic Mastery Data (x2)

After scoring, the highest score was 80, and the lowest was 40. The average is 61.20, with a standard deviation of 8.54. If it is interpreted as mastery of schemata in the category: very poor, less, enough, good enough, good, very good. Then it is known that there are two students or 6.7% in the very poor category, three students or 10.0% less, eight students or 26.7% is sufficient, ten students or 33.3% is quite good, six students or 20.0% is good, and one student or 3.3% very good. It can be explained that the overall mastery students' schemata are good because only 33.3% are under the good enough category.

Reading Comprehension Data (y)

After scoring, the highest score was 93, and the lowest was 47. The average is 71.57, with a standard deviation of 11.97. If it is interpreted as the ability to read comprehension in the categories: very less, less, adequate, quite good, good, very good. Then it is known that there are four students or 13.3% in the very poor category, one student or 3% less, nine students or 30% sufficient, eight students or 27% quite good, four students or 13.3% good, and four students or 13.3% very well. It can be explained that overall, students' reading comprehension skills are good because only 27% are under the category of pretty good. After testing the analysis requirements, namely the normality and linearity test and regression significance meets the requirements as required, hypothesis testing can be done using statistical formulas according to the form of the data.

The Correlation of Diction Mastery with Reading Comprehension Ability

Analysis of simple correlation between mastery of diction (x1) and comprehension ability (y) resulted in half-test reliability of rx1y = 0.635 while the overall reliability of the test is r11 = 0.776. Testing the significance of the correlation coefficient using the t-test resulting in t count = 6.507. From the distribution list t for dk = 28 and level significant = 0.05 and 0.01 obtained t table = 1.701 and 2.048. The value obtained from the calculation appears greater than the value of t in the table (t count > t table). This shows that the correlation coefficient of 0.776 is significant. Thus the null hypothesis (H0) is declared accepted or rejected. Otherwise alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Thus, there is a positive and significant relationship between diction

mastery (x1) and reading comprehension ability (y). The higher the students' mastery of diction, the higher their reading comprehension ability will be.

The Correlation between Mastery of Schematics and Reading Comprehension

Simple correlation analysis between schemata mastery (x2) and reading comprehension ability (y) resulted in half-test reliability of rx2y = 0.694 while the overall reliability of the test was r11 = 0.820. Testing the significance (significance) of the correlation coefficient using the t-test produces a t count = 7.572. From the distribution list t for dk = 28 and level significant = 0.05 and 0.01 obtained t table = 1.701 and 2.048. The value of t obtained from the calculation appears greater than the value of t in the table (t count > t table). This shows that the correlation coefficient of 0.820 is significant. Thus the null hypothesis (H0) is declared accepted or rejected. Otherwise alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Thus, there is a positive and significant relationship between schemata mastery (x2) and reading comprehension ability (y). The higher the mastery of students' schemata, the higher the reading comprehension ability. Whereas the correlation coefficient of 0.820 is in the very high category, the close correlation between schemata mastery and reading comprehension ability is very high.

Coefficient of determination correlation schemata mastery and ability reading comprehension (r2) of 0.672, which means that 67.2% of reading comprehension ability can be explained by the schematic or the contribution of schemata mastery with reading comprehension ability is 67.2%.

The Correlation between Diction Mastery and Schematic Mastery with Reading Comprehension

From the results of multiple regression analysis or multiple diction mastery (x1) and schemata (x2) with the ability to read comprehension (y), obtained the equation regression: = -18.15 + 0.593 X1 + 0.787 X2 Multiple correlation analysis between diction mastery (x1) and schemata (x2) with reading comprehension ability (y) produces a correlation coefficient doubled by 0.836. Testing the significance (meaning) of the correlation coefficient using the F test resulted in an F count = 31.405.

From the distribution list for dk in the numerator of 2 and dk in the denominator 27 at the level real or significant = 0.05 and 0.01 obtained F table = 3.35 and 5.49. Look that the F value obtained from the calculation is greater than the F value in the table (F count > F table). This shows that the regression equation and the multiple coefficient correlation of 0.836 are significant. Thus the null hypothesis (H0) declared failed to be accepted or rejected, while on the contrary, the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted. Therefore, there is a

solid relationship and significant difference between diction mastery and schemata mastery with reading comprehension. The correlation coefficient is 0.836 in the very high category, then the degree of closeness of the correlation between mastery of diction and schemata with reading comprehension is very high.

The determination coefficient of the correlation between diction mastery and schemata mastery with reading comprehension (R2) is 0.699, which means that 69.9% of reading comprehension ability can be explained by diction mastery with its schemata or contribution to diction mastery and schemata mastery with reading comprehension is 69.9%.

Discussion

The results of hypothesis testing show that the three hypotheses submitted in this study were all accepted. This finding is generally meant for the fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro. So there is a close and significant correlation between the mastery of diction and schemata with the ability to read comprehension. As for the discussion, the results of the analysis and testing of the hypothesis are described as follows:

The results of the analysis regarding the correlation between diction mastery and reading comprehension show a significant correlation between the two variables which means that the better ability of students' diction, the better the students' reading comprehension. The correlation coefficient is 0.776 in the high category, then the level of closeness. The correlation between diction mastery and reading comprehension is tall with the degree or degree of strength of the correlation (coefficient of determination correlation) of 0.602 and the effective contribution of 60.2%. So can, it is said that about 60.2% variance of reading comprehension scores of the fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro, Semaka, and Tanggamus can be explained by the mastery of diction that students have. In other words, mastery of diction contributes about 60.2% to reading comprehension.

Regarding the results of the analysis related to the correlation between schemata mastery and reading comprehension. The correlation coefficient is 0.820 in the very high category, then the level of closeness of correlation between schemata mastery and reading comprehension is very high. With the strength of the significant correlation listed through the coefficient correlation, it can be interpreted that the two variables have a significant correlation. So it can be said that the better the mastery of schemata, the better the students' reading comprehension. Coefficient correlation determination is 0.672, and the practical contribution is 67.2%. So that it can be said that about a 67.2% variance in reading ability scores understanding of fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro, Semaka, Tanggamus can be explained by

the mastery of the schemata that students have, in other words, mastery of schemata contributes about 67.2% to the reading comprehension.

Concerning the correlation of the two independent variables to the dependent variable, the acceptance of the research hypothesis, which states that there is a significant correlation between mastery of diction and schemata with reading comprehension, meaning that the position of the two independent variables as a determinant variable (predictor) of variance in reading comprehension scores unquestionable understanding. By obtaining the correlation coefficient double of 0.836 in the very high category, and the correlation coefficient of determination double of 0.699 with the effective contribution given by diction mastery and schemata with reading comprehension is 69.9% of this means that there are still 30.1% determined by variables other than those two variables.

Mastery of diction and schemata has an effective contribution to reading comprehension. This means that mastery of diction and schemata are critical in reading comprehension. This is because reading comprehension is essentially an understanding of reading information that requires cognitive processes and aims to gain understanding from the reading text. Because In reading activities, a reader's understanding requires mastery of what will be understood from the text. One of The tricks is to have a diction treasury. The better the mastery of one's diction, the better one's level of understanding of the reading text. Likewise, with the mastery of the schemata that students have, in this case, the background of the reader's knowledge related to the reading material. The better mastery of schemata that the students have, the better their reading comprehension will be.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the result and discussion, the researchers conclude that there is a close and significant correlation between diction mastery and reading comprehension in the fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro Semaka Tanggamus for the 2018/2019 Academic Year. The higher students' mastery of diction, the higher their reading comprehension will be. The contribution of diction mastery with reading ability understanding is 60.2%. Furthermore, there is a close and significant correlation between schemata and reading comprehension in the fifth-grade students of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro Semaka Tanggamus in the 2018/2019 Academic Year. The higher the mastery of the schemata that students have, the higher their reading comprehension will be. The contribution of schemata mastery and reading comprehension is 67.2%. Moreover, there is a very close and significant correlation between diction mastery and schemata with reading comprehension in the fifth-grade students

of SD Negeri 2 Srikuncoro, Semaka, Tanggamus in 2018/2019. The contribution of diction mastery and schemata with reading comprehension is 69.9%.

REFERENCES

Chen, D. (2018). Neural reading comprehension and beyond. Stanford University.

Clark, C., & Gardner, M. (2017). Simple and effective multi-paragraph reading comprehension. arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10723.

Hasan, Alwi et.al. 1998. Tata Bahasa Baku Bahasa Indonesia. Jakarta:Balai Pustaka.

Hastomo, T. (2016, January). The Effectiveness of Edmodo in teaching writing viewed from students' motivation. In Proceeding of International Conference on Teacher Training and Education (Vol. 1, No. 1).

Kaushik, D., & Lipton, Z. C. (2018). How much reading does reading comprehension require? a critical investigation of popular benchmarks. arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.04926.

Keraf, Gorys. 1994. Diksi dan Gaya Bahasa. Jakarta:PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Kieras, D. E., & Just, M. A. (Eds.). (2018). New methods in reading comprehension research. Routledge.

Lestari, S. ., Surastina, S., Rachmasisca, F. M. ., & Hastomo, T. . (2018). The Correlation of Effective Sentence Mastery and Language Attitude with Students' Writing Summary Ability. IJLHE: International Journal of Language, Humanities, and Education, 1(2), 1–10.

Pourhosein Gilakjani, A., & Sabouri, N. B. (2016). How can students improve their reading comprehension skill. Journal of Studies in Education, 6(2), 229.

Putra, Yovan P. 2008. Memori dan Pembelajaran Efektif. Bandung:CV. Yrama Widya.

Schallert, D. L. (2017). The role of illustrations in reading comprehension. Theoretical issues in reading comprehension, 503-524.

Tarigan, Henry Guntur. 2008. Membaca Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa. Bandung:Angkasa Bandung.

Wahyuningsih, L. S. ., Sutiyono, A. ., & Hastomo, T. . (2019). The Use of A Scientific Approach to Improve Argumentation Writing Ability for Middle School Students. IJLHE: International Journal of Language, Humanities, and Education, 2(1), 63–71.

Wigfield, A., Gladstone, J. R., & Turci, L. (2016). Beyond cognition: Reading motivation and reading comprehension. Child development perspectives, 10(3), 190-195.

Xie, X. (2017). The influence of schema theory on foreign language reading comprehension. The English Teacher, 9.