

U. SUPARMAN, MA., Ph.D.

HP. : 0812 7236 836
Flexi. : 0721- 7386876

Vol. 2 No. 1, Juni 2009

ISSN 1979-5718

EDU-LINGUA

JURNAL PENDIDIKAN BAHASA

INCREASING STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT USING COLLABORATIVE READING STRATEGY (CRS) AT SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF ONE OF STATE SMPS IN LAMPUNG PROVINCE

Ujang Suparman

THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPERATIVES OF ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE: FORMS AND MEANINGS

Santi Chairani Djonhar

LISTENING ABILITIES AND COMPETENCIES OF PEMKOT STUDENTS TO *I JUST CALLED TO SAY I LOVE YOU* BY STEVIE WONDER

Sri Mahawan

PROVERBS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION: A COMPARISON BETWEEN AMERICAN AND INDONESIAN PROVERBS

Trikartikaningsih Byas

PEMANFAATAN TEKNOLOGI INFORMASI DAN KOMUNIKASI DALAM PEMBELAJARAN BAHASA DAN SASTRA INDONESIA

Hartoyo

EDU-LINGUA

Vol. 2 No. 1

Hlm 1-108

Jakarta, Juni 2009

ISSN 1979-5718

EDU-LINGUA
JURNAL PENDIDIKAN BAHASA

- 1 — 32 INCREASING STUDENTS' READING
ACHIEVEMENT USING COLLABORATIVE
READING STRATEGY (CRS) AT SECOND
YEAR STUDENTS OF ONE OF STATE SMPs IN
LAMPUNG PROVINCE
Ujang Suparman
- 33 — 56 THE DEVELOPMENT OF IMPERATIVES OF
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE:
FORMS AND MEANINGS
Santi Chairani Djonhar
- 57 — 70 LISTENING ABILITIES AND COMPETENCIES
OF PEMKOT STUDENTS TO *I JUST CALLED
TO SAY I LOVE YOU* BY STEVIE WONDER
Sri Mahawan
- 71 — 90 PROVERBS IN INTERCULTURAL
COMMUNICATION: A COMPARISON
BETWEEN AMERICAN AND INDONESIAN
PROVERBS
Trikartikaningsih Byas
- 91 — 108 PEMANFAATAN TEKNOLOGI INFORMASI
DAN KOMUNIKASI DALAM PEMBELAJARAN
BAHASA DAN SASTRA INDONESIA
Hartoyo

EDU-LINGUA
JURNAL PENDIDIKAN BAHASA
ISSN 1979-5718

Terbit dua kali dalam satu tahun setiap bulan Juni dan Oktober

PENASIHAT

Suyatno
R. Santosa Murwani

KETUA PENYUNTING

Sabarti Akhadiah

WAKIL KETUA PENYUNTING

Gunawan Suryoputro

PENYUNTING/MITRA BESTARI

Nurachman Hanafi (Universitas Mataram)
Hartoyo (Universitas Negeri Semarang)
U. Suparman (Universitas Lampung)
Hadjid Harnawidagda (UHAMKA)
Jenny N. T. Hardjatno (Universitas Indonesia)

PENYUNTING PELAKSANA

Sumardi
Ade Hikmat
Tri Wintolo Apoko

ADMINISTRASI/TATA USAHA

Suradji
Yuniar M.
Sri Mulyani
Imam Mudjiantoro

ALAMAT EDITOR

d.a. PPs. UHAMKA
Program Studi Bahasa
Jalan Limau II, Kebayoran Baru, Jakarta Selatan
Telp. 021-7256159, 7206984, Fax. 021-7206984
e-mail: pps.uhamka@yahoo.co.id

PERCETAKAN
UHAMKA PRESS

INCREASING STUDENTS' READING ACHIEVEMENT USING COLLABORATIVE READING STRATEGY (CRS) AT SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF ONE OF STATE SMPs IN LAMPUNG PROVINCE

Ujang Suparman
Lampung University

Abstract

The study investigates the use of collaborative reading strategy (CRS) in increasing students' reading comprehension achievement. This technique combines two instructional approaches: *reading comprehension strategy instruction* and *cooperative learning*. The aim of the study was to find out the students' reading comprehension achievement after learning reading using CRS. The hypothesis of the study is that there was a significant increase in students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the three treatments using collaborative reading strategy. The study applied true experimental designs, control group pretest-posttest design. The population of the study was the second year students of one of the state SMP in Lampung Province consisting of 228 students. Two classes were selected for the experiment. One class was as the control group and the other was assigned as the experimental group. Pretest-posttest items were employed to obtain the data. Based on the calculation of t-test, the results show that there is a significant increase on students' reading comprehension achievement after learning reading using CRS ($p < .05$, $p = .000$). The main increase of the experimental group (12.30) was higher than the control group (3.68). The experimental group represents a better improvement after they received the treatment.

Key words: reading comprehension, collaborative reading strategy, and small group instruction

Alamat email penulis: suparman@unila.ac.id

Vol. 2, No. 1, Juni 2009

Edu-Lingua

1

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

In the recent curriculum, School Based Curriculum (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan/ KTSP*), reading is seen as an essentially active activity. Here, the readers' responsibility was not merely to transfer what the author had written into the reader's head but also asked the readers to interact with the text to create meaning and understanding. It is because in the guideline of KTSP¹ is stated that English has different characteristics with exact or social subjects. As a language, English has a function as a means of communication. Besides learning about grammar and vocabulary, the students should be able to use or implement the language to communicate with surrounding (Depdiknas, 2006a: 1)

The objectives of reading skill teaching-learning process in KTSP for the eight grades is to ask the students to be able to construct meaning from text. Basically it is the same as comprehension of reading text. All the students are expected to be able to comprehend a reading text. They are asked to be good at reading.

In addition, on the Passing Grades Standard (*Standard Kompetensi Kelulusan/ SKL*) of Junior High School for reading skill² is stated that the students should be able to identify the main idea, explicit and implicit specific information, reference, the word meaning, phrase, and sentence of short simple essay. It can be said that to graduate from Junior High School besides being good at reading, the students are also asked to be good in comprehending.

However, based on the researcher's pre observation on eighth graders of state junior high schools (SMP) in Lampung Province, it was found that not all Junior High School students were good at reading. In general, they had difficulty in comprehending a reading text. The students had difficulty in finding the main idea, main topic and specific information of a reading text. It shows that reading is not simple for most Junior High School students.

There are many problems that might influence the students' quality of reading, such as students' lack of vocabulary, lack of reading engagement, reading strategy, and the passage itself. However, the researcher assumes that one of the most important factors is the reading comprehension strategy used in the reading class. The students are lack of effective reading strategy. They need more creative reading strategies. They need to be familiar with many kinds of strategies in reading that can help them in comprehending the text much better.

To overcome the problem of students' low reading comprehension achievement, according to the researcher, one of the strategies which can be used is *Collaborative Reading Strategy* (CRS) in reading classes. CRS is an excellent strategy to use in content area instruction and has shown improved achievement on content testing (Klingner, Vaughn & Schumn, 1998). CRS combines the essential reading comprehension strategies that have been demonstrated to be effective in improving students reading understanding of text with cooperative learning groups or paired learning. Students ^{who} work in collaborative groups with defined roles to engage in a meaningful context can easily make sense of conceptual ideas of the text.

As a matter of fact, there is only little research about CRS in teaching reading comprehension. Some of them are: the initial research on CRS is conducted to 26 Latino middle school students with learning disabilities who were also English language learners (Klingner & Vaughn, 1996). This research showed even students who were relatively poor decoders made improvements in reading comprehension. Klingner, Vaughn & Schumn (1998), MacGinitie & McGinitie (1989) Palinscar & Brown (1984) found that students using CRS strategy scored higher in test of reading comprehension. The test included standardized reading comprehension tests, such as MacGinitie Reading Comprehension Test and passage comprehension as well as textbook unit texts. CRS is also implemented with fifth-grade students who were English language

learners. Result indicated that students demonstrated high level of academic engagement and assisted each other with word meanings, main idea, and understanding text (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000).

Realizing the importance of using CRS in reading, the researcher tried to conduct this research. The researcher assumes that reading comprehension is a critical skill for junior high school students in Lampung Province as it facilitates participation in mainstream content area classes, and CRS is an interesting tool that can be used as alternative way in teaching students' reading comprehension. Therefore, the researcher tried to find out whether there was any significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement using Collaborative reading strategy or not.

Research Problem

Based on the background of the research above, the researcher addressed the following research question: "Is there any significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement after being taught using *collaborative reading strategy*?"

Objective of the Research

The objective of this research was to investigate whether there was any significant increase in students' reading comprehension achievement after being taught using *collaborative reading strategy*.

Uses of the Research

The uses of the research are as follow:

1. Theoretically, the results of this research are expected to confirm and clarify the previous theories about teaching reading using CRS.
2. Practically, the results of this research hopefully can be used as information for English teachers about the effectiveness of

CRS in increasing students' reading comprehension achievement.

Scope of the Research

This research was focused on CRS that was used as a strategy to help students increase their reading comprehension achievement. The researcher conducted this research in second-grade of state SMPs in Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province. The VIII₅ and VIII₆ each of which consists of 37 and 38 students were taken as the sample. The texts used in this research were recount texts that were suitable for Junior High School language level based on KTSP. Besides, the texts that were used must be interesting for the students and can be read in a short time.

FRAME OF THEORIES

In this section, the researcher reviews the concepts that were considered to be well constructed toward the findings of the research. From those supporting concepts, he developed the assumption.

Concept of Reading Comprehension

Before going to the concept of reading comprehension, it is better to know what reading is. Many experts have defined "reading" in rather different words but basically intended the same meaning, such as Smith (1982:6) defines that reading is something that makes sense to the reader and always should. Nuttal (1982:42) states that reading as the meaningful interpretation of printed or written symbol; and Mackey (1997: 15) suggests that reading is an active process because it involves an interaction between thought and language. It means that the readers always activate their minds to get meaning and information while interacting with the written text.

Furthermore, Smith (1982: 166) states that reading is a matter of identifying letters in order to recognize words in order to get the meaning from what is read, involving making connection among words and ideas presented in the text and the readers' own background knowledge. Another linguist, Dallman (1982) in Marantina (2006:6) states that reading is more than knowing what each a letter of alphabet stands for, reading involves more than recognition, that is, without comprehension, no reading takes place. Therefore, if the readers can read the words but can not understand what they read, they are not really reading. In reading, the readers are active and intentional constructing meaning using the message in the print and their own background knowledge. Based on the concepts of reading above, reading comprehension can be defined as the interaction process between the reader and the prints in creating meaning and constructing knowledge in various ways.

Moreover, The U. S. National Reading Panel (Armbruster, Bonnie B. and Jean Osborn, 2001) defines reading comprehension as a complex system of deriving meaning from prints that requires all of the following:

- the skill and knowledge to understand how phonemes, or speech sounds, are connected to prints;
- the ability to decode unfamiliar words;
- the ability to read fluently;
- sufficient background information and vocabulary to foster reading comprehension;
- the development of appropriate active strategies to construct meaning from print;
- the development and maintenance of a motivation to read.

From the definition above, it is understood that the interaction between the reader and the prints is not simple. It requires considerable work from the reader during the reading process.

Referring to the definition above, it can be inferred that one of the essential aspects in making sense of ideas of a text is the

reading strategy. There is a "link" between reading comprehension and the reading strategy that is used to build the reading comprehension. Therefore, students must be provided with the appropriate strategy to enable them to think, reason, and communicate through the written words. Thus, it is assumed that comprehension involves combining reading with thinking and reasoning in the prints with an appropriate strategy. It means any appropriate reading strategy may assist the comprehension to the reading text.

Reading Strategy Instruction

As stated previously that any strategy may contribute well toward reading. Therefore, the teacher should implement the "appropriate" strategy when teaching reading. Because teachers have a limited amount of time to teach reading, it is critical that they make use of the time they have to ensure knowledge and understanding of their text. This can be accomplished more effectively with the use of strategy instruction to monitor and act on improving reading comprehension (Vaughn, Chard, Bryant, Coleman, Tyler, Linan-Thompson & Kouzekanani, 2000 in Standish, 2005).

Cognitive strategies that assist students in processing text-based information can be taught to junior and senior high school students. Through strategy instruction, students can be empowered to take control of their own learning through a series of steps to organize, retain and express content knowledge. Effective use of strategies by junior and senior high school students involves knowing how to use the strategy as well as when to use the strategy (metacognition). When teachers consider introducing strategies to students in the content area classroom, it is vital that students not only understand the strategy being taught, but also know how the strategy can be used to approach, complete or modify a literacy task. Students have to observe a connection between the demands of the text and the need to use the strategy

that they have learned. The ultimate success of the implementation of a strategy is when students can modify the strategy to improve their learning (Day & Elksnin, 1994 in Standish, 2005).

Increasing emphasis is being placed on strategic learning in the content area. Researchers have found that when teachers present content area texts strategically and effectively, students find it easier to learn the material and are more likely to adopt the strategies modeled by the teacher to enhance their own learning. An integration of strategies into the content area learning will enable students to frame processes, apply processes and extend processes (Day & Elksnin, 1994; Vaughn et al., 2001 in Standish, 2005). The present study utilizes a cognitive strategy, *collaborative reading strategy* (CRS), created to enhance junior high school students' comprehension of the text. CRS was designed for students to be taught to activate and refine their reading comprehension skills as they work in collaborative groups with defined roles to engage in meaningful encounters with conceptual ideas from the text.

The Concept of the *Collaborative reading strategy* (CRS)

CRS is assumed to be an excellent technique for teaching students reading comprehension and building vocabulary and also working together cooperatively. Klingner and Vaughn (1996) originally design CRS by combining modified reciprocal teaching with cooperative learning. It is a reading comprehension practice that combines two instructional elements: (1) *modified reciprocal teaching* (Palinscar and Brown, 1984) and (2) *cooperative learning* (Johnson and Johnson, 1987) or *students pairing* (Klingner and Vaughn, 2005). In reciprocal teaching, teacher and students take turn leading a dialogue concerning key features of the text through summarizing, questioning, clarifying, and predicting. Reciprocal teaching was developed with the intention of helping students who have difficulties in reading comprehension through a number of activities (*preview, click and clunk, get the gist and wrap up*) that the

students apply before, during and after reading in small cooperative groups.

The four strategies used in CRS are research-based and designed to incorporate the four best practices in making sense of the meaning from the text. The first strategy, *preview*, is designed to activate the students' background knowledge and to make predictions about the text before they begin to read. The second strategy, *click and clunk*, is designed to assist the students in monitoring their reading and enhancing their vocabulary development during their reading. The third strategy, *get the gist*, teaches the students identify the main ideas in each section of text while they are reading. The fourth strategy, *wrap-up*, asks the students to summarize the key ideas from the text and to generate questions about the material after reading (Vaughn et al., 2001 in Standish, 2005).

CRS uses the preceding guidelines to provide meaningful roles for each student in the group. Before students assume their role for CRS, they should have time to practice the expectations associated with that role. CRS suggests six roles: *leader*, *clunk expert*, *gist expert*, *encourager*, *announcer* and *timekeeper*. Of those six, *leader*, *clunk expert* and *gist expert* are essential; the other three can be combined. Each of the roles has a *cue card* and specific responsibilities that are described in the following paragraph (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998).

The first role of the students in CRS is *the leader*. The leader guides the group in the four CRS strategies, prompts the group members when to do their jobs and helps the group stay on task. *The announcer* calls on group members to read or share an idea, ensures that all group members have an opportunity to share and reminds the group that one person at a time may speak. *The clunk expert* asks the group if they have any *clunks* helps the group figure out *the clunks* and summarizes the meaning of each *clunk* so they can write it in their *learning logs*. The *gist expert* works with the group to decide on the best gist and assists the group in writing it

in their *learning logs*. The *encourager* lets the group members know when they have worked together well or how they helped each other to learn. Finally, the *timekeeper* sets the timer for each portion of the collaborative reading strategy (CRS) and then lets the group know when to begin (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998; Klingner et al., 2001 in Standish 2005). Thus, it is systematically understandable that CRS is appropriate and effective to be used in increasing students' reading comprehension achievement. CRS is intended to make students actively involved with the process of learning.

In using CRS, there must be the strengths and the weaknesses that are elaborated in the following section.

1. *The Advantages of CRS*

There are some advantages of reading using CRS. The first advantage is that CRS provides meaningful roles for each student in the group. A second advantage is that students become more active and independent reader. In addition, it provides student-led instruction that is highly useful for students in comprehending content area text as well as deciphering vocabulary and multisyllabic words. CRS also provides peer interaction that occurs as students work in heterogeneous group that can promote interest and persistence in the reading task. Furthermore, it makes students actively construct knowledge about text in a social environment through interacting with the other members of their group. It also functions to improve students' accuracy and fluency of oral reading and to make gain in word identification and comprehension. Finally, it builds on students' knowledge and experience, makes students spend the majority of their time engaged in academic discussion and enhances students' inherent ability.

2. *The Disadvantages of CRS*

Like other strategies or methods in learning, CRS has at least two weaknesses, that is: First, group of students using CRS needs

longer time to implement the strategy, and; second, teachers vary in the students' levels of comfort with the application of cooperative group.

Teaching Reading Comprehension Using Collaborative Reading Strategy (CRS)

CRS can be implemented in two phases: (1) teaching the strategies, and (2) cooperative learning group activity or student pairing. The steps of implementation described below were developed through a series of research studies (Bryant et al., 2000; Klingner and Vaughn, 1998, 1999; Vaughn et al., 2000; Klingner and Bryant, 2001 in Bremer, 2002)

Phase 1. Teaching the Strategies

Students learn four strategies: *preview*, *click and clunk*, *get the gist* and *wrap up*. *Preview* is used before reading the entire text of the lesson, and *wrap up* is used after reading the entire text of the lesson. The other two strategies, *click and clunk* and *get the gist*, are used multiple times while reading the text, after each paragraph.

1. Previewing

The *preview* strategy activates background knowledge and establishes predictions about the text by scanning the pictures, captions, graphics, title, headings, subheadings and key words. The objective of the *preview* strategy is to stimulate the students' background knowledge about the topic, to encourage interest and motivation to read the text, to make informed predictions about the text, to set a purpose for reading and to share and learn from other members of their group (Vaughn & Klingner, 1999; Vaughn et al., 2001 in Standish, 2005).

2. Clicking and Clunking

After the students preview the text, they begin reading as they employ the *click and clunk* strategy. This second strategy is a self-

monitoring device to be used during the students' reading of text. When the students *click*, they are recognizing words and their meanings in the context of the text. When they come to a *clunk* in their reading, they have found a word or section that they do not understand which is inhibiting their comprehension of the text. Students write down their clunks in their *learning logs*. After the students finish a section of the text, they discuss and solve their *clunks*. Solving *clunks* is termed *de-clunking* in CRS and involves the use of four "*fix-up*" strategies. The students work in their groups to solve the clunks with the "*fix-up*" strategies, including rereading, context clues, prefixes or suffixes and morphemic analysis (Klingner et al., 2001; Vaughn et al., 2001 in Standish 2005).

3. *Getting the Gist*

Getting the gist, also known as finding the main idea, is practiced while reading the text. The students are required to get the gist after reading each section of the text. This strategy is specifically taught to the students in the teacher modeling and assisting phase and may need to be re-taught as the students acquire mastery of this difficult strategy. Students are taught to first identify the most important person, thing or place in a section of text. The students should then brainstorm to establish the most important idea of the passage and then rephrase that idea in ten words or less. They learn to elicit the main idea while filtering out unnecessary details (Vaughn et al., 2001 in Standish 2005).

4. *Wrapping up*

After the students have read the text, they engage in *wrap up*. This fourth strategy teaches students to identify the most significant ideas in the entire passage they have read and then to assist them with understanding and remembering what they have learned. In this process, students are taught to generate questions and to review important ideas in the text they have read. Students

generate questions concerning what they have read by thinking about the important ideas in the passage and then forming the questions that a good teacher might ask students to see if they really understand the material. Then to implement the second step of *wrapping up, reviewing*, students write down the most important ideas they have learned from the passage. The review strategy requires students to mentally organize textual information and focus on comprehension of the text as a whole. This increases understanding and memory of text.

Phase 2. Cooperative-Learning Group or Student Pairing

Once students have learned the four strategies (*previewing, clicking and clunking, getting the gist, and wrapping up*) and have developed proficiency for applying them in teacher-led activities, they are ready to apply CRS in their peer-led cooperative-learning groups. Some teachers find it easier to have students work in pairs, and that has also proved to be successful practice. Procedures for using these strategies with group are outlined below.

1. *Setting the stage*

First, the teacher assigns students to groups. Each group should include about four students of varying ability. Then, the teacher assigns roles to the students. Roles should rotate on a regular basis so that the students can experience a variety of roles. Possible roles include the following:

- a. *Leader*: Tells the group what they read next and what strategy used next.
- b. *Clunk Expert*: Uses clunk cards to remind the group of the steps to follow when trying to figure out the meaning of the clunk(s).
- c. *Gist expert*: Guides the group toward getting the gist and determines that the gist contains the most important ideas but unnecessary details.

- d. *Announcer*: calls on group members to read a passage or share an idea.
- e. *Encourager*: lets the group members know when they have worked together well or how they helped each other to learn.
- f. *Timekeeper*: sets the timer for each portion of the CRS and then lets the group know when to begin.

2. *Selecting the materials*

The following materials will be helpful for the teacher to assist students to use CRS and cooperative learning techniques (Klingner, Vaughn, Dimino, Schumn, and Bryant, 2001 in Bremer, 2002).

- a. *Reading materials*. When selecting reading materials for CRS, the teacher will consider: (a) reading materials at students' instructional level, which generally refer to students being able to decode about 80% of the words correctly, (b) reading materials having themes and supporting details, (c) reading materials consisting of several paragraphs, and (d) reading materials containing clues/ pictures for predicting
- b. *Clunk cards*. Each of the four *clunk cards* contains one *fix-up* strategy. Fix-up strategies included in the *clunk cards* are: (a) reread the sentences with *the clunk* and look for key ideas to help you figure out the word- think about what makes sense, (b) reread the sentence before and after the clunk looking for clues, (c) look for a prefix or suffix in the word that might help, and (d) break the word apart and look for smaller words that you know.
- c. *Cue card*. *Cue cards* outline the procedures to be followed in cooperative learning group. They remind students of each step to be followed to fulfill that role.
- d. *Learning Log*. CRS *learning log* serves two roles: (a) written documentation of learning, assuring the individual accountability that facilitates cooperative learning, and (b) study guides for students.
- e. *Timer (optional)*. Timers that students set themselves can help groups to remain on tasks.

- f. *Score card* (optional). The scorekeeper in a group follows a *cue card* to find out when to award points, and records these points on a score card.

3. Process

The basic steps to apply CRS in cooperative learning group are as follows:

- Step 1: Whole class introduction. The teacher introduces the topic, teaches key vocabulary, and provides instructions.
- Step 2: Cooperative group activity during *preview*, *click and clunk*, *get the gist*, and *wrap up*. Each group member plays an assigned role and fills out a CRS learning logs during the activity.
- Step 3: Whole class wrap up strategy. The teacher discusses the day's reading passage, reviews clunks, answers questions, or shares some review ideas.

4. Role of the teacher

During the cooperative group activity, the teacher's role is circulating among the groups, clarifying *clunks*, modeling strategy usage, modeling cooperative learning techniques, redirecting students to remain on-task, and providing assistance.

Based on the stages mentioned above, the researcher took the general procedure of teaching reading comprehension using CRS during her research. The researcher runs each treatment through the following steps:

1. Assign students to their groups.
2. Assign roles the students: Leader, Clunk Expert, Gist Expert, and Announcer. Review role assignments.
3. Read passage using the step-by-step strategy:

Before reading

a. *Previewing*

- (1) Brainstorm – what we know already about the topic.

- (2) Predict - what we think we will learn about the topic when we read the passage.

During Reading

b. Clicking and Clunking

- (1) Are there any parts that are hard to understand (*clunks*)?
- (2) How can the clunk be fixed? Use *fix-up strategies*.
 - (a) Reread the sentence and look for the key ideas to help you understand the words.
 - (b) Reread the sentence with the clunk and the sentence before and after the clunks looking for the clues.
 - (c) Look for prefix or suffix in the word.
 - (d) Break the sentence apart and look for smaller words.

c. Getting the gist

- (1) What is the most important person, place, or thing?
- (2) What is the most important idea about person, place, or thing?

After Reading

d. Wrapping up

- (1) Ask questions: What question would show we understand the most important information? What are the answers to these questions?
- (2) Review: What did we learn?

Theoretical Assumption

Based on the literature review above, the researcher came to the assumption that CRS was very likely to have an impact to increase students' reading comprehension achievement. CRS could encourage students actively to be engaged in constructing meaning from text in their collaborative group. Moreover, it seems to be able to make meaningful encounters with text resulting from the interaction between a reader's prior knowledge and experience, information found in the text and the broader social context of learning (Katims and Harmon, 2000 in Standish, 2005).

By using CRS in teaching reading comprehension, it is assumed that the problems which usually occur in reading can be reduced or avoided, if not overcome completely. As the result, logically, the students' reading comprehension achievement can be increased.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were then proposed:

H₀ : There is no significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the three treatments using collaborative reading strategy.

H₁ : There is significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the three treatments using *Collaborative reading strategy*.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The design of this research was *control group pretest- posttest design* (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:22). The design was used to investigate whether there is significant increase in students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the three treatments using collaborative-reading strategy (CRS). In this design, there were two groups - an experimental group which received the special treatment using CRS and a control group which did not.

The design had high internal and external validity because the control group was present, the sample were randomly selected and assigned to the groups, and the pretest was capturing the initial differences between the groups. The design of the research was as follows:

G1 (random) = T1 X T2

G2 (random) = T1 0 T2

Where:

G1 = experimental group

G2 = control group

T1 = pre-test

T2 = post-test

X = treatment (using CRS)

0 = no treatment

(Hatch and Farhady, 1982:22)

One group pretest-posttest design could also be used to find out the answer to the present research problem. Since, the researcher assumed every kind of the treatment given to the students would increase their achievement; moreover; the researcher wanted to find how high the increase of the students' reading comprehension achievement and to make justified claims about the effect of CRS, therefore, the control class was needed.

Population and Sample

The population of this research was the second year students at one of state- junior-high schools in Lampung Province. There were six classes of the second year students in 2008/2009 academic year. Each class consisted of about 37-40 students. There was one class, VIII₁, as the superior class. Therefore, the researcher did not include it as the population in this research because it had different quality achievement. This research used two classes -experimental and control group- which were selected randomly using Simple Random Sampling - lottery. The sample of the research was VIII₅ as the experimental group and VIII₆ as the control group. The pretest and posttest was administered in those classes.

Data Collecting Technique

The data collecting technique consisted of pretest and posttest. The pretest was administered to the experimental and control groups in 40 minutes. It was to find out the students' entry

point of both groups before giving the treatments. The posttest was administered in order to find out the students' reading comprehension achievement after they received the treatments. Like the pretest, the posttest was administered in 40 minutes.

Then, the means (\bar{x}) of pretest and posttest of the groups were compared to find out the progress before and after the treatments. If the mean score of pretest was the same or higher than the mean score of posttest in the experimental group, it indicated that CRS does not influence on increasing the students' reading comprehension achievement. On the other hand, if the mean score of the posttest was higher than the mean score of pretest in the experimental group, it showed that CRS has influence on increasing the students' reading comprehension achievement. The researcher was spent one month in collecting the data.

Try Out

Before the required data were collected using the instrument that had been prepared, the researcher conducted a try out to make sure the quality of the instrument, i. e. validity, reliability, level difficulty, and discrimination power.

Validity

Validity refers to the extent to which the test measures what is intended to be measure. This means that it relates directly to the purpose of the test (Shohamy, 1985: 74). There are four types of validity: face validity, content validity, construct validity and empirical or criterion-related validity. To measure whether the test has good validity, the researcher used content and construct validity.

a. Content Validity

Content validity is the extent to which the test measures a representative sample of the subject matter, content. The focus

of the content validity is the adequacy of the sample and not simply on the appearance of the test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 251).

b. Construct Validity

Construct validity is concerned with whether the test is actually in line with the theory of what it is intended to understand the language (Shohamy, 1985: 74)

The validity of the instrument was referred to the content and constructs validity in which the question represents five of sort reading skills, i. e. *determining main idea; finding the detail information; reference; inference and vocabulary* (Nuttal, 1985).

The result of the tryout test showed that the test is valid since it can measures what should be measured (Shohamy, 1985:74), that is, the students' skills in reading comprehension.

1. Reliability

Reliability refers to whether the test is consistent in its score and gives us an indication of how accurate the test score are (Shohamy, 1985: 70). Split half method was used by the researcher to estimate the reliability of the test. This formula was simple to use since: (1) it avoids troublesome correlations and (2) in addition to the number of items in the test, it involves only the test, mean and standard deviation. Both of which are normally calculated as a matter of routine, (Heaton, 1991: 164). To measure coefficient of the reliability of the first and second half groups, the researcher used the following formula:

$$r_1 = \frac{\sum XY}{\sqrt{\sum X^2 \sum Y^2}}$$

Where:

- r_1 : The coefficient of reliability between first half and second half group
 X : The total numbers of first half group
 Y : The total numbers of second half group
 X^2 : The square of X
 Y^2 : The square of Y

(Lado, 1961, in Hughes, 1991: 3)

The researcher used "Spearman Brown's Prophecy formula" (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 268) to know the coefficient correlation of the whole items. The formula was as follow:

$$rk = \frac{2 r_1}{1 + r_1}$$

Where:

- rk : The reliability of the test
 r : The reliability of the half test

The criteria of reliability are:

- 0.90 - 1.00 : high
0.50 - 0.89 : moderate
0.0 - 0.49 : low

The result of the tryout test was reliable. The reliability coefficient for the tryout test was .98. It can be stated that the results of the tests were reliable since they could reflect the accuracy and consistency of the reading comprehension skill of the sample.

2. Level of Difficulty

To see the level of difficulty, the researcher used the following formula:

$$LD = \frac{R}{N}$$

Where:

LD : Level of difficulty

R : The number of the students who answer correctly

N : The total number of the student following the test

The criteria were:

< 0.30 : difficult

0.30 – 0.70 : average

> 0.70 : easy

(Shohamy, 1985: 79)

3. Discrimination Power

The discrimination power was used to see the students who can answer the questions correctly. The participants of the tryout were divided into two groups, upper and lower students. The *upper students* refer to those students whose answers were above the means, whereas the *lower students* refer to those who were the opposite.

To see the discrimination power, the researcher used the following formula:

$$DP = \frac{U - L}{\frac{1}{2}N}$$

Where:

DP : Discrimination power

U : The proportion of the upper group students

L : The proportion of the lower group students

N : The total number of the students

The criteria were:

- a. If the value is positive, it means that more high level students answerer to the test correctly than low level students do. If the

value is zero, no discrimination.

- b. If the score is negative, it means that more low level students answerer to the tests correctly than the high level students do.
- c. In general, the higher the discrimination index, the better it will be. In classroom situation most items should be higher than 0.20 indexes (Shohamy, 1985: 81).

Data Analysis

In order to identify whether the students' reading comprehension achievement increased or not, the researcher examined the students' scores using the following steps:

1. Scoring the pre test and post test
2. Tabulating the results of the test and calculating the score of the pretest and post test.
3. Drawing conclusion from the tabulated results of the pre- and post-tests that were statistically analyzed using *independent group t-test* computed by means of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 12.0

Data Treatment

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982), using t-test for hypothesis testing has three basic assumptions, that is:

- The data is interval
- The data is drawn from random sample in a population
- The data is normally distributed.

Therefore, the researcher used these following procedures in the data treatment:

1. Random test

Random test was used to make sure whether the data is random or not. The researcher used SPSS version 12.0 to help her. The hypothesis for the random test was formulated as follow:

H_0 : the data is random

H_1 : the data is not random

In this research report, the criteria for the hypothesis are:

H_0 is accepted if $\text{sig} > \alpha$. In this case, the researcher used the level of significant 0.05.

Based on the result, it can be determined that $\text{sig} > \alpha$ in pretest and posttest of both experimental and control class. It proves that H_0 was accepted. In other words, all the data were random

2. Normality test

The researcher used normality test to know whether or not the data in the experimental and control groups were normally distributed. The hypothesis for the normality tests was as follow:

H_0 : the data is distributed normally

H_1 : the data is not distributed normally

In this proposal, the criteria for the hypothesis are:

H_0 is accepted if $\text{sig} > \alpha$. In this case the researcher uses level of significant 0.05.

The results of data analysis proved that H_0 was accepted. In other words, all the data were normally distributed.

Hypotheses Testing

The hypotheses were stated as follows:

H_0 : There is no significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement after giving the three treatments using collaborative reading strategy.

H_1 : There is significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement after giving the three treatments using collaborative reading strategy.

Independent group T-Test was statistically tested the hypothesis. The hypothesis was analyzed at the significant level of 0.05 in which the hypothesis was approved if $\text{sign} < \alpha$. It means that the probability of the error in the hypothesis was only about 5%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of the Research

1. *Pretest Results*

The pretest was conducted to find out the students' entry point of both control and experimental classes. It was administered on September 22, 2008 in 40 minutes. There were 20 items of objective reading test with four options for each item. In the control class, the mean score was 60; the highest 80; the lowest 40; the median score 60 and the mode 65.

Independent Sample T-test was then applied to examine the difference of reading comprehension achievement between the two groups on the reading test before the treatments. The results show that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the sample classes.

Two tailed significance shows $\text{Sig} > \alpha$, with the level of significant 0.05. Based on the analysis, it can be identified that the significance was .640. It means that the H_0 stating that "there is no significant difference in the level of ability" was accepted. In other words, the reading comprehension achievement of the two groups was homogenous ($\text{Sig} > .05 = \text{homogenous}$, $\text{Sig} < .05 = \text{heterogeneous}$). Therefore, it was an ideal condition to use the two groups as the sample of the research (Hatch and Farhady, 1982: 22).

2. *Posttest Results*

The posttest was conducted after treatment was completed to find out whether there was an increase in students' reading comprehension achievement or not. It was found that in the control class, the mean score was 63.68; the highest 95; the lowest 45; the median 60 and the mode 60. In the experimental class, the mean score was 73.38; the highest 90 and the lowest 60; the median 75 and the mode 75.

comprehension tests after using the CRS strategy than those who did not use it.

Before conducting the treatments, the pretest was administered. The result of which showed that the students of the experimental group could answer about 62% of the whole pretest items, while the control group was about 60%. It indicates that both groups have the same level of achievement since the range of the pretest results is close.

The posttest was administered after treatment was completed. The results of the posttest showed that, in general, the participants in the experimental class could answer correctly for about 73% of the whole items, while those in the control class 63%. In other words, the posttest results of the experimental class showed that there was a significant increase in the mean score of the tests.

Students' responses in the lesson indicated that the students were more confident in doing tasks when the teacher gave them explicit instruction. Moreover, the students' attitude toward reading would become more positive if they perceived their important task. Some students enjoyed doing the task by themselves rather than in group. There was more comfortable feeling among those who did the task by themselves. One student commented "I prefer writing by myself. If I work in group there is more chance of other kids stealing my ideas. And then teacher thinks I copied them." The student had a tendency to work alone. This is in line with the findings stating that student has different comfort level in cooperative group (Vaughn and Klingner, 1999). Klingner and Vaughn (1996) originally designed CRS by combining modified reciprocal teaching with cooperative learning. Reciprocal teaching was developed with the intention of aiding students having difficulty with reading comprehension. Thus, every student had to work in group even though they preferred working by themselves.

This present research is consistent with the research found by Standish (2004), Klingner and Vaughn (2000), Klingner, Vaughn,

and Schumn (1998) stating that the use of CRS in reading class made students spend the majority of their time on task dialogue. It is because CRS was designed to teach students to be active and to refine their reading comprehension skills as they worked in collaborative groups with defined roles to engage in meaningful encounters with conceptual idea from the text. Although the participants did not use English all the time, the students' activity in collaborative work showed that they spent more time on task during the reading lesson. It was also found that the peer interaction when working in collaborative activities could promote interest and persistence in the reading task. This present research also supports the theory stating that small group of student-led instruction are highly useful for comprehending content area text (Bryant et al., 1999 in Standish, 2005). In their collaborative group, the students became more active and independent readers.

However, there are some limitations in this research. One of the limitations is that it was held in short term; where the research was carried out for two months and the treatments were not fully applied with the CRS strategies. Another limitation was that the teacher did not give example of the whole process of the implementation of CRS in reading at the first meeting. The researcher only gave the general implementation of CRS.

After all, CRS was appropriate and possible to be used to increase students' reading comprehension achievement significantly.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Conclusions

Based on the results of the data analysis, the researcher draws a major conclusion as follow:

Using CRS in reading classes can increase students' reading comprehension achievement significantly. The result of hypothesis

testing also proved the increase of students' reading comprehension achievement. There was a significant increase of students' mean score from the pretest to posttest, and the hypothesis (H_1) of this research was accepted ($\text{Sig} > , p=0.000$). It also suggests that CRS can be used as an alternative tool for the teacher in teaching reading comprehension.

The researcher also draws the following supporting conclusions:

1. CRS is appropriate and effective to be used to increase students' reading comprehension achievement. It is intended to make them actively involved in the process of learning.
2. CRS provides meaningful roles for the students within the groups. It makes each of them to be more active and independent reader.

Suggestions

Based on the conclusions above, some suggestions are put forward:

1. English teachers at Junior High Schools are suggested to use CRS as an alternative strategy for teaching reading comprehension to the students, since, based on the results of the research, it is found that CRS can be used to increase students' reading comprehension achievement significantly.
2. In the future, further research should be conducted in relatively longer period and involving comprehensive CRS strategies to make the findings of the research more convincing.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, B. B. and Osborn, J. *Put reading first*. Center of the Improvement of Early Reading Achievement (CIREA). C. Ralph Adler, RMC Research Corporation. September 2001.

National Institute for Literacy (NIFL). 4 February 2008.
http://www.nifl.gov/partnershipforreading/publications/reading_first1text.html

Bremer, C. D., Vaughn, S., Clapper, A. T. and Kim, A. *Collaborative reading strategy (CRS): improving secondary students' reading comprehension skill*. July 2002. University of Minnesota. Improving Secondary Education and Transition Services through Research. Research to Practice Brief. 4 February 2008.
<http://www.ncset.org/publication/>

Depdiknas. 2006a. *Kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan-sekolahmenengah pertama/ madrasah tsanawiyah*. Jakarta: Depdiknas

_____. 2006b. *Silabus kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan 2006*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Hatch, E. and Farhady, H. 1982. *Research design and statistic for applied linguistic*. London: New Burry House, Inc.

Heaton, J.B. 1991. *Writing English language test*. New York: Longman, Inc.

Hughes, A. 1991. *Testing for language teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klingner, J. K. and Vaughn, S. 2005. *The helping behaviors of the fifth graders while using collaborative reading strategy ESL content classes*. Teacher of English to Speakers of Other Language, Inc (TESOL). A Cambium Learning Company. 4 February 2008.
<http://store.cambiumlearning.com/esources/ProgramOverview/pdf>.

_____. 2008. *Using collaborative reading strategy*. Reading Rockets. Office of Special Education Programs. U. S. Department of Education. 4 February 2008. <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/103>

Mackey, R. 1997. *Teaching the information-gathering skill in reading a second language*. Rowley, mass: Newbury House Publisher.

Marantina, N. 2006. *A comparative study of teaching reading comprehension through retelling story and translation of fairy tale*

- Unpublished Spd Thesis. Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung
- Nuttal, C. 1985. *Teaching reading skill in a foreign language (new edition)*. Heinemann Educational Book: Oxford University Press.
- McWhorter, K. T. 1989. *College reading and study skills*. London: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Setiyadi, Ag. B. 2006. *Metode penelitian untuk pengajaran bahasa asing*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Shohamy, E. 1985. *A practical handbook in language testing for the second language teachers*. Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.
- Smith, F. 1982. *Understanding reading 2nd edition*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Simanjutak, E. G. 1998. *Developing reading skill for ESL students*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Standish, L. G. 2005. *The effect of the collaborative reading strategy and direct instruction in persuasion on sixth-grade students' persuasive writing and attitudes*. University of Maryland. <http://drum.umd.edu/dspace/bitstream/1903/2700/1/umi-umd-2628.pdf>. 3 March 2008.