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**ABSTRACT**

The objectives of this research were : (i) to find out whether using students’ native language,Mandar,as instructional language in English class increases the students’ reading achievement (ii) to find out the students’ activities in studying English using their native language (iii) to uncover the students’ interest in studying English by using their native language . This research employed a quasi-experimental design. The population of this research was the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Tinambung in academic year 2015/2016. This research is used cluster random sampling technique. The research data were collected by using reading test and were subjected descriptive and inferential statistic using SPSS version 20.0 for windows program. The students’ score on posttest of experimental group (81.04) is more significantly improved than the students’ score on posttest of control group (65.06). The difference of both scores is statistically significant based on the t-test (p<0.05). The mean score of the interest is 87.85 and it is categorized as high interest. It can be concluded that the use of Native language, Mandar, as instructional language is effective to be implemented in increasing the students’ reading achievement, and the students have high interest in learning reading specially narrative text through the Students’ Native language as instructional language.
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**INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, the goverment has done many efforts to develope the quality of education in Indonesia. In learning process is not on the teacher becomes a resource of learning or teaching process but also the students must have an important action to get the succes in learning process in the class as student centre learning . Succes of the students will be reached when the teachers and students have readiness in learning process, because to get the effective outcome, interaction between teachers and students are very important.

English language teaching has been a subject to a great change in various adaptations in language classrooms even all around the world. So teacher must have a good media in teaching learning process that can make the students enjoy and easy to understand the material in the class. One of the ways to teach English in the English class is using Native Language. Eventhough using Native Languange in foreign language classroom still have controversies between the teachers in the history of language pedagogy, the effect of the first language in the second language teaching is still being debated, the part of language teachers disagree the use of Native Language in the foreign language classroom. In Jordan, many teachers are teaching English grammar by using the second language without any reference to Arabic language. However, when the Native Language of the speaker is used appropriately, there can be no doubt that it will be helpful to learn the foreign language cited from (Damra: 2012).

Spahiu (2013) stated that teachers are againts using Native Language have their main reason that risk of creating Native Language dependence and thus preventing students’ effort to find the meaning from explanations. But the other teachers have also strong arguments for using students’ Native Language, they believe that using Native Language is helpful in explaining complex idea and grammar rules and also helps students to learn new vocabularies more effectively, and prevent the waste of time in explanations and instructions So that eventhough the use of Native Language in English language classroom has been debated for a long time It is not problem, because it is very helpful and necessary for the students to understand the material.

As Cook (2001), stated "Using the First Language in the Classroom" "L1 provides scaffolding for the students to help each other. Based on the previous explanation, the researher is inspired to conduct a research about “*Using Students’ Native Language, Mandar, as instructional language in English class to increase reading achievement of the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Tinambung”*. This is because students’ Native Language is one of the ways that has many benefits to make the students easy to learn English because the students of SMAN 1 tinambung using Native Language in their school, in the house even in their surrounding, and then on academic year 2014/2015 in Reading achievement are still under minimal mastery criteria.

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Native Language According to Gass refers to the first language that a child learns. It is also known as the primary language, the mother tongue, or the first language (L1) cited (Syaripuddin : 2014). Native languange is the mother languange that we acquire since childhood. Bloomfield stated that the first language of human being learns to speak is his Native Language, he is a native speaker of this language, cited (Kirkpatrick, 2007: 8), So Native Language is very useful to use as a medium in teaching learning process because it can help the students to know the Material step by step through their short questions or answering them.

Mandar is a *language* that is used by the Mandar people*,* it is also one of the name of the ethnic group in Indonesia that place in West Sulawesi. Mandar language is used by the people of West Sulawesi, especially in Polewali, Majene and Mamuju Regency. According to Sinrang (2015:19) states that Mandar is *Mandara (river)* that means *Light*. It means light because Mandara (river) can bounce the light, we can know one other and get the knowledge because light. We can know Language because of light and we can know and interact the other because Language. Mandar language is used to communicate at home, in the office even in the classroom as instruction in teaching, like command word that is formed from a verb intransitive, such as *Piqoroq o diaya dikaqdera* (Sit on a chair), *Pindaiqmo o di papan tulis* (come forward on the board), *Muissanmi* (Do you understand)

Instructional Language is teaching instruction, Amidon stated in (Alejandro, 2011: 453) that teaching is an interactive process, primarily involving classroom talking between teacher and students and occurs during certain definable activity in the classroom, in this case how to explain the material through instructional language that can make the students understand easily. Because instructional language is detail direction about how to do something. giving an appropriate instruction to the students in teaching learning process will help the students make clarify what they don’t understand.

Reading is an active process in which readers shift between source of information ( what they know and the text says), elaborate meaning and strategies check their interpretation (revising when appropriate), the use context to focus their response. It means that reading activity needs a comprehension to interprete ( read between the lines) message from the written text. Reading is the construction of meaning. Without understanding, there is no reading. When we read, we pick up information and our minds work continuously to connect that information to what we already know

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Population and Sample**

The researcher took the tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Tinambung in academic year 2015/2016 that consisted of seven classes. The number of population was 252 students each class consists thirty six students. The sampling technique in this research is cluster random sampling technique. The classes of tenth grade students of SMAN 1 Tinambung who know and use native language, Mandar, X1 as experimental group (36 students) and X2 as control group (36 students) as the sample.

**Instrument**

**a). Students’ reading achievement**

The test consists of two kinds of test, pretest and posttest. The instrument is intended to measure the students’reading achievement in English class specially in reading aspect. The test in this research is reading text (narative text). The instrument that is used to find out the information of the study variables. An instrument must be tested validity and realibility in order to obtain valid and reliable data.

**b). Observation of students’ activities**

Observation is a way of collecting data directly, observation and recording systematically to the object that is being studied. This observation was done by observer in observing and recording the implementation of English learning in classroom and learning accomplisment. The observation in this researh is to measure the students’ activities by using students’ Native language, Mandar, as a instuctional language of the learning process in the classroom.

**c). Questionnare**

After the posttest, the questionnaire was distributed to the students to know the students’ interest in learning reading by using students’ Native language ,Mandar, as instuctional language. The result of the questionnaire was analyzed whether the students have positive or negative statements.

**RESULT**

1. **The Students’ Reading Achievement**

As being stated earlier that after tabulating and analyzing the students’ scores into percentage, they were classified into five level based on the Pusat Kurikulum (2006: 35). The following table is the students’ pretest score and percentage of experimental and control group.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental Group | | Control Group | |
|  |  | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very Good | 81 – 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Good | 61 – 80 | 1 | 2.78 | 2 | 5.56 |
| Fair | 41 – 60 | 10 | 27.78 | 12 | 33.33 |
| Poor | 21 – 40 | 15 | 41.67 | 13 | 36.11 |
| Very Poor | 0 – 20 | 10 | 27.78 | 9 | 25 |
| Total | | 36 | 100% | 36 | 100% |

The Students’ Reading Pretest Score

Based on the data in Table 4.1, the experimental group shows that of the 36 students, none of them gained very good classification, 1 (2.78%) students yielded good score, 10 (27.78%) students are classified fair, 15 (41.67%) students are categorized as poor and 10 ( 27.78) of the students are classified very poor category. The students’ scores range from very poor to good classification

In control group, the data indicated that of the 36 students, none of them gained very good, 2 (5.56%) as good classification, 12 (33.33%) students are classified as fair. 13 (36.11%) students classified as poor and 9 (25%) of the students were leveled in very poor classification. The students’ scores range from very poor to good classification.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
| Experimental | 33.89 | 14.98 |
| Control | 36.67 | 14.19 |

The mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students’ Pretest

Based on the classification of reading test, the mean score of experimental group 33.89 was considered poor with the standard deviation 14.98. In the control group, the category of poor was clearly identified since the mean score was 36.67 with the standard deviation 14.19

The scores of students’ posttest for experimental and control group. Those score then were analyzed and tabulated into percentage. The following table is statistical summary of the students’ posttest of both groups.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Classification | Score | Experimental Group | | Control Group | |
|  |  | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage |
| Very Good | 81 – 100 | 17 | 47.22 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Good | 61 – 80 | 18 | 50.00 | 24 | 66.67 |
| Fair | 41 – 60 | 1 | 2.78 | 12 | 33.33 |
| Poor | 21 – 40 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Very Poor | 0 – 20 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0.00 |
| Total | | 36 | 100% | 36 | 100% |

The Students’ Reading Posttest Score

From the classification, the score and the frequency of experimental group illustrated in the table above that the score of the 36 students, 17 (47.22 %) students have ability to gain the very good level, There were 18 (50.00 %) as good, one of them gained fair 1 (2.78) and none two of the categories, poor and very poor were not employed by anyone of them.

In control group out of 36 students, there were not students classified as very good. In the next level categorized as good which was dominated by 24 (66.67%) students and 12 (33.33%) students were indicated as fair. And none reached of them in poor and very poor category.

The result of the posttest employed to the control and experimental group was defined to be the way to know the mean score and the standard deviation. The following table presents the mean score and the standard deviation of both groups.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Group | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
| Experimental | 81.04 | 10.24 |
| Control | 65.07 | 5.09 |

The mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students’ Posttest

It can be seen in the table above that the experimental group was value 81.04 for its mean score with standard deviation obtained 5.09 For the control group, the mean score was 65.07 with the standard deviation value 10.24. It can be referred from the description about them the mean score and standard deviation for both experimental and control groups before and after the research (pretest and posttest) that although the control group has little improvement in language from the mean score 31.00 in pretest to 65.00 in posttest, but the level of five category is good level. Following the control group, the experimental group also shows an improvement in enriching reading. But, the experimental group produces a better improvement or a higher achievement that turns from 33.88 in pretest to 81.04 in posttest or poor classification to very good classification Test of significance (t-test).

T-test is a test to measure whether or not there is a significant difference between the result of the students’ mean score in the prestest and posttest yielded by control group and the experimental group. By using inferential of t-test or test of significant run by SPSS Version 20.0, the significant differences can be easier to analyze. The level of significance is (α) = 0.05 and the degree of freedom (df) = 35, N1+N2 – 2, the number of students of both groups (each 36) minus 1. The followimg table illustrates the t-test value result:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **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 | | Studentscore | Equal variances assumed | 10.340 | .002 | 8.384 | 70 | .000 | 15.972 | 1.905 | 12.173 | 19.772 | | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 8.384 | 51.300 | .000 | 15.972 | 1.905 | 12.148 | 19.796 | |

The Inferential Analysis between experimental Class and Control Class in Posttest

The table above shows that the t-value is 8.384 with degree of freedom 70 and P-value is 0.000. From the degree of freedom we can know the t-table is 1.667. Based on the data above H1 is accepted in posttest because t-value (8.384) > t-table (1.667) and P-value (0.00) < α (0.05). In other word, there is a significant difference between the students’ mean score between experimental and control group.

**The Students’ Activities.**

Observations analysis data of students’ activities in learning process by using students’ native language through observation sheet by observer

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No | Meeting | Questions Number | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Value | | Mean | |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 |  | |  | |
| 1 | First | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 75.5 | | 3.78 | |
| 2 | Second | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 76.5 | | 3.83 | |
| 3 | Third | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 77 | | 3.85 | |
| 4 | Fourth | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 3.5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 78 | | 3.90 | |
| RATA-RATA | | 4 | 3.9 | 4 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 4 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 4 | 4 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 4 | 3.9 | 4 | 4 | 76.75 | | 3.84 | |

Students’ activities analysis

From the data above, observations analysis data of students’ activities in learning process by using students’ native language in the class is of 3.84. The average value of the activities of students in the classroom at the high category. This indicates that the implementation of using students’ native language as instructional language in experimental class is well done.

**The Students’ Interest.**

The purpose of the questionnaires distribution was used to know the students’ interest during the research. The questionnaires was distributed to the students inexperimental group only after having treatments. All of the questions were answered individually based on their opinion after having treatments using students’ Native Language ,Mandar, as instructional language in the class Each questionnaire contained 15 statements. The options of the questionnaires were The options of the questionnaires were (1) very high interest, (2) high interest, (3) moderate, (4) low interest, and (5) very low interest. All five options of the responses were given values differently. As mentioned in the previous chapter, the scoring of the questionnaires was analyzed statistically based on the application of Likert Scale. The result shows the students interested in learning reading specially narative text by using Native language as instructional language in the class. This is indicated by the percentage of the students’ questionnaire shown in the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Classification | Range | Frequency | Percentage |
| 1 | Very High | 85 – 100 | 26 | 72.22% |
| 2 | High | 69 – 84 | 14 | 27.72% |
| 3 | Moderate | 51 – 68 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | Low | 36 – 50 | 0 | 0% |
| 5 | Very Low | 20 – 35 | 0 | 0% |
| Total | | | 36 | 100 % |

The Frequency and Percentage of Students’ Interest

Based on the classification above, it indicated that the overall response were only in very high interested and high interested classification. From 36 students, there were 26 (72.22%) reached the very high interest and 14 (27.72%) reached the high interest which was dominated. From all classification, none of the students were categorized moderate, low interest and very low interest. From the data, it was found that all of the students had high interest in learning English by Using Students’ Native Language, *Mandar,* as instructional language in the class.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Total Respondent | Total of Students’ Score | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| 36 | 3162.65 | 87.85 | 5.81 |

The Mean Score of Students’ Interest

In the relation to mean score above, the students reached 87.85 with the standard deviation 5.81, it can be concluded that the students of experimental group had high interest in increase their reading achievement by using students’ Native language as instructional language in the class.

**DISCUSSION**

Relating to collected data through the pretest and posttest, the comparison of the enrichment of students’ achievement of experimental and control class can be proved by analyzing the posttest result. It can be stated that after giving treatment by using Students’ Native language, *Mandar,* the mean score of the experimental group before the treatment was 33.89 and after the treatment the students gained score 81.04 with significantly mean difference 47.15. In the experimental group, 15 students dominated 41.67% in poor classification in pretest and 17 students in posttest with 47.22% domination in very good classification. Meanwhile, in control group showed the mean score was 36.67 before the treatment and 65.07 after the treatment with significantly mean difference 28.40. There were 13 students level in poor which dominated 36.11% in pretest and no one of the students dominated very good classification in posttest with 0%.

The result of students’ pretest, the researcher assumed that the prior knowledge of the students seem lack in reading achievement because the students did not have any knowledge about the reading test or they are not given the treatment yet by using Students’ Native languge, *Mandar*, There are some factors that can influence students’ achievement. Prasad (2008: 3) states that factors that influence teaching and learning process can be divided into two parts namely: internal factor and external factor. External factor is school environment (teaching procedure, school physical condition, curriculum, curriculum, school discipline, teaching media, time schedule). Whereas internal factor is internal factors are motivation, physical condition, student interest, student intelligence, attitude, language aptitude, and concentration. By using Native Language, *Mandar* the sudents of experimental group can increase their achievement, it is suitable for Prasad’s opinion above that one of the factor that can influence teaching and learning process is external factor in school environment (teaching media).

The experimental group was three level higher than the control group from very poor classification to very good classification. The statistical data based on the t-test through SPSS Version 20.0 to test the hypothesis indicated that the probability value of the experimental group is lower than alpha (α) in which (0.00 < 0.05). It meant that the H1 of the hypothesis was accepted.

The observation sheet that given to the observer to cover all of the activities of the students in the classroom during the teaching learning process in English class by using students’ native language ,mandar, as instructional language. from the first until the last meeting reached 3.84 classified as well done.

Based on the result of the questionnaire engaged to the experimental group, the interest of the students was dominantly classified as high interest. There was none of them classified as moderate, low interest and very low interest. From the result, 22 students dominated (61.11%) as very high interest, 14 (38.88 %) students as high interest, and there was not students as moderate, low and very low. From this fact, it pointed out that the way of English teacher in conducting materials by using students’ Native language as instructional language of teaching is closely related to the students’ interest or response toward increasing of reading achievement

**CONCLUSION**

The use of students’ native language as instructional language in teaching English increases the students’ reading achievement that is proved by the mean score of the students’ posttest in experimental group is higher than control group. The students’ native language, *Mandar,* as instructional language in the class runs well, it can be shown in students’ activity reached percentage 95,94% and the mean score reached the result of 3,84 it is well done or a high category. The students’ interest in English class by using Students’ native language, *Mandar*, as instructional language. It is indicated of the questionnaire that has highly interested category.
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