

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

This study was carried out at the English Department and the Management of Finance Department, Airlangga University. It explores the influence of linguistic and content schemata on comprehending scientific text in EFL reading. Here, the respondents from the English Department are assumed to have good linguistic schemata but poor content schemata. Meanwhile, the respondents from the Management of Finance Department are assumed to have good content schemata but poor linguistic schemata.

According to the data analysis, the total scores gained by the respondents from the English Department are lower than the total scores gained by the respondents from the Management of Finance Department. There are 8 respondents from the English Department who got score above 60 and 7 respondents who got score below 60. Meanwhile, there are 14 respondents from the Management of Finance Department who got score above 60 and only 1 respondent who got score below 60.

According to the statistical test in which the writer choose $\alpha = 0.05$ as confidential value and t-critical value = 2.048, the computation of t-observed value comes to the number of $|t| = \pm 3.17$. Here, since $|t\text{-observed}| \geq t\text{-critical}$, the H_0

of this study is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Thus, content schemata have greater influences than linguistic schemata.

This study found out a reader who has good schemata and poor linguistic schemata, can comprehend a text better than a reader who has poor content schemata and good linguistic schemata. This finding might seem to deviate from Ullijn (1987 : 71) and Grellet's opinion (1991 : 12) about this case. They said that reading in second language depends mainly on the meaning of words and the knowledge of the subject. It means that both schemata are the same importance in comprehending a text.

This contradiction can be explained by using Coady's theory about fundamental psycholinguistic model of reading as cited in Hamied (1988 : 93). He said that reading is an interactive process at which background knowledge interacts with conceptual ability and process strategy of the reader. It means that a reader needs all of those variables on comprehending a text. Meanwhile, Coady also points out that background knowledge becomes an important variable since it may be able to compensate syntactic weakness.

Other factors that influence the process of reading comprehension can be explained by considering the importance of content schemata. The first is that the provided background knowledge will help the reader to gain access to the particular information learned when the text is read. The second is that a schema provides ideational scaffolding for assimilating text information. The next is that a schema



enables inferential elaboration. Then, the fourth is that content schemata plays a significant role in reading comprehension to facilitate selective allocation of attention. Another factor is that a schema facilitates editing and summarizing. And the last, a schema helps to generate about the missing information when there are gaps in memory.

Whatever the significant roles of background knowledge or content schemata on comprehending a text, we can not deny that formal schemata and especially linguistic schemata also contribute a lot to reading comprehension. One would not be able to work alone without the others. In this case, we should not forget that reading comprehension is an interactive process and the word “interactive” itself refers to both the interaction of the reader’s several kinds of knowledge and the interaction of the reader and the text.

To conclude, the awareness of having proper schemata in EFL reading will help the readers so much. The readers’ familiarity with the material will make the readers keep interacting with the text although they find syntactic difficulties.

BIBLIOGRAPY