IMPROVING READING COMPREHENSION OF ELEVENTH-GRADE STUDENTS THROUGH TPS TECHNIQUE

*Fadjar[1], Abdul Kamaruddin[2], Afrillia Anggeri[3]

[1,2,3]English Education Study Program, Teacher Training and Education Faculty
Tadulako University, Palu

*anakkedua623@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims at finding out whether or not the implementation of Think- Pair-Share (TPS) Technique can improve the reading comprehension of the eleventh-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Banawa. This research employed a quasi-experimental research design which involved two groups of students as experimental and control groups. The samples were selected by using a purposive sampling technique. The samples were the students of XI IPS 2 as the experimental group and XI IPS1 as the control group. The instrument of this research was a test that was given to the sample as a pretest and posttest in the form of a reading test. The result of data analysis shows that the mean score of the posttest in the experimental group is 76.82 which is considered higher than the mean score of posttest in control group (65.06). By applying 42 degrees of freedom (df) and 0.05 level of significance, it indicates that the t_{conted} (3.84) is higher than the t_{table} (2.01). As a result, it clarifies that the hypothesis of this research is accepted. In conclusion, the findings of this research reveal that students' reading comprehension can be effectively improved by using Think-Pair-Share (TPS)

Keywords: Reading, improving; Think-Pair-Share; Students

INTRODUCTION

Reading is considered difficult to learn by students because they are required to understand what they read exactly. They also have to comprehend the content of the text itself. The students are categorized as good readers if they can comprehend the information of the text. As Rillyanto (2014) states reading is a complex process, it involves not only idea but also recognizing the relationship and structures among ideas. To catch the points of the writer in the text, the readers need to read efficiently in order to grasp the meaning. Faradiaswita (2012) states that reading is difficult to analyze because it involves the most intricate workings of the human mind, it is a genuine cognitive process. Therefore the students can be good readers if they are able to understand the meaning of the text.

In teaching English in senior high school, reading is one of the important skills that need to be mastered by the students, and this is explained in K13. However, based on preliminary observation and interview that has been done with the teacher of SMA N 1 Banawa, some of the students did not understand the English text. The researchers found some problems related to their learning process. The first problem was the lack of proper and suitable reading materials provided by the teacher. Second, the students did not have motivation and interest in learning a new vocabulary in the text. Third, the students commonly found difficulties in getting information in the text (literal meaning) and they found it difficult to find out the moral value of the text (inferential meaning).

By seeing the problems above, the researchers tried to experiment to improve the students' reading comprehension using Cooperative learning. Cooperative learning is an educational approach that aims to organize classroom activities into academic and social learning experiences. One of Cooperative learning that seems suitable for improving reading comprehension Think-Pair-Share technique. Think-Pair-Share technique is a good way to attract the students' attention in learning English, especially reading comprehension.

According to Lyman (1981), Think-Pair-Share technique as one of the cooperative language learning models has some advantages. They are as follows :
1) The Think-Pair-Share technique is quick and does not take much preparation time. 2) The Think-Pair-Share technique makes classroom discussions more productive, as students have already had an opportunity to think about their ideas before sharing with the whole class. 3) Students have opportunity to learn higher level thinking skills from their peers and gain self-confidence when reporting ideas to the whole class. 4) The pair step ensures that no student is left out of the discussion. 5) Students are able to rehearse responses mentally and verbally, and all students have an opportunity to talk. 6) Both students and teachers have increased opportunities to think and become involved in group discussions. 7) The Think-Pair-Share technique is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes.

METHOD

This research used a quasi-experimental research design. The researchers applied pre-test and pos²t-test to the experimental group and control group. The experimental group received special treatment whereas the control group did not.

The sample of this research was 21 students of class XI IPS 1 and 23 students of XI IPS 2. Those classes were chosen because most of them was lack in English subjects, especially reading comprehension and they had the same characteristics in English lessons. The experimental group was XI IPS 2 which had the lowest score in English subjects and class XI IPS 1 became the control group.

The research instrument of data collection was a written test. The test was used to measure the student's reading comprehension. There were two kinds of tests; pretest and posttest. Those were used to measure the students' reading comprehension and to see the significant difference between before and after the application of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) Technique.

The pretest was a written test. The tests consisted of four parts; the first part consisted of 5 items of multiple choice, the second part consisted of 5 items of Essay, and the third part consisted of 5 items of True or False. The source was obtained from the syllabus for eleventh-grade students.

To obtain data on the teaching and learning process, the research distributed the worksheets to the students. By distributing the worksheet, the researchers were able to know the abilities of students. Student scores were determined by the following criteria.

Table 1 - The Scoring System of the Test

No	Kinds of test	Number of item	Correct	Incorrect	Max Score
1	Multiple choices	5	1	0	5
2	True or false	5	1	0	5
3	Essay	5	4-2	1	20
	Total	15			30

After distributing the test, the researchers collected and analyzed the data. It means that the collected data of the research was in the form of numeric data. There were two kinds of tests in this research. They were pretest and post-test and to get the data the researchers analyzed the data obtained from post-test that the researchers offered to the experimental and control groups.

The pretest was conducted for both experimental and control groups. The pretest was taken before implementing TPS Technique in the experimental group. The researchers found the

score of each student by applying the formula designed by Arikunto (2016). The score of each student is presented as follows:

$$\Sigma = \frac{X}{n} \; X \; 100$$

Afterward, the researchers calculated the mean deviation of the class on pre-test and post-test the researchers used the following formula by Arikunto (2016) as follows:

The formula used for the experimental group:

$$Mx = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

The formula used for control group:

$$Mx = \frac{\Sigma x}{N}$$

The next thing that needed to be analyzed was computing the mean score and squared deviation. The researchers wanted to know the significant difference between the experimental and control classes. The researchers used the following square deviation formula proposed by Arikunto (2006):

$$\Sigma_X 2 = \Sigma_X 2 - \frac{(\Sigma_X 2)}{N}$$

$$\Sigma_y 2 = \Sigma_y 2 - \frac{(\Sigma_X 2)}{N}$$

Later, to find out the result of the test given by the researchers, he applied t- test formula to show whether or not there was an effect of the treatment that was using accent reduction software for the experimental group in enhancing the students' ability in pronouncing English coronal sounds. The formula was proposed by Arikunto (2013) as follows:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\Sigma x2 + \Sigma y2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

There were two criteria that the researchers used in making the hypothesis of this research to prove the effectiveness of the TPS technique in improving the reading comprehension of the eleventh-grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Banawa.

Table 2 - The Criteria for Evaluation and Interpretation of Correlation

Score Range	Category	Qualification
90-100	Very Good	Successful
80-89	Good	Successful
60-79	Fair	Successful

30-59	Poor	Failed
0-29	Very Poor	Failed

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

After distributing the test, the researchers collected and analyzed the data. It means that the collected data of the research was in the form of numeric data. There were two kinds of tests in this research. They were pretest and post-test and to get the data the researchers analyzed the data obtained from post-test that the researchers offered to the experimental and control groups. The researchers used three types of tests they are multiple-choice (5), essay test (5), and true-false (5). Total of the score is 30.

Table 3 - Experimental Group's Score on Pre-test

No	Students' Initial	Individual Score Distribution			Raw Score	Max Score	Standart Score	Category	Qualification
		MC	E	TF					
1	RND	3	10	2	15	30	50.00	Poor	Failed
2	ADT	3	9	3	15	30	50.00	Poor	Failed
3	NLS	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
4	MYF	3	10	4	17	30	56.66	Poor	Failed
5	MRF	2	9	2	13	30	43.33	Poor	Failed
6	MRP	2	10	4	16	30	53.33	Poor	Failed
7	DRI	4	15	5	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
8	ILH	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
9	RSN	3	7	3	13	30	43.33	Poor	Failed
10	RO	2	9	4	15	30	50.00	Poor	Failed
11	FJR	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
12	SUA	4	13	3	20	30	66.66	Fair	Successful
13	MRI	2	8	3	13	30	43.33	Poor	Failed
14	CRA	1	7	3	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
15	MHS	1	8	3	12	30	40.00	Poor	Failed
16	RAN	2	7	2	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
17	FHR	3	9	2	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
18	ICL	3	6	2	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
19	SAH	2	0	1	3	30	10.00	Very Poor	Failed
20	ABD	3	11	2	16	30	53.33	Poor	Failed
21	ARH	4	16	4	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
	Total Score						1016.59		

After calculating the data, the students' mean score of the pretest in the experimental

class was 48.40. It was obtained by computing all scores of the students which is 1016.59 and divided by 21 as the total number of students.

Table 4 - Control Group's Score on Pre-test

No.	Students' Initial	Individual Score Distribution			Raw Score	Max Score	Standart Score	Category	Qualification
		MC	E	TF					
1	NLM	4	10	4	18	30	60.00	Fair	Successful
2	ZHR	3	9	4	16	30	53.33	Poor	Failed
3	EGI	3	6	2	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
4	AND	2	7	3	12	30	40.00	Poor	Failed
5	RHT	3	9	4	16	30	53.33	Poor	Failed
6	DDI	2	9	4	15	30	50.00	Poor	Failed
7	TLB	2	8	2	12	30	40.00	Poor	Failed
8	RIO	3	7	2	12	30	40.00	Poor	Failed
9	FZN	3	6	3	12	30	40.00	Poor	Failed
10	AGN	4	15	4	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
11	RZP	3	6	2	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
12	HRD	4	10	3	17	30	56.66	Poor	Failed
13	ADT	2	6	3	11	30	36.66	Poor	Failed
14	MRF	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
15	PTR	2	8	3	13	30	43.33	Poor	Failed
16	RZF	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
17	YSF	3	9	2	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
18	TGH	3	11	3	17	30	56.66	Poor	Failed
19	NLI	2	9	2	13	30	43.33	Poor	Failed
20	AIP	2	9	3	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
21	NGZ	3	8	4	14	30	46.66	Poor	Failed
22	RSM	5	16	5	26	30	86.66	Good	Successful
23	FDL	5	8	3	16	30	53.33	Poor	Failed
	Total Score						1136.59		

After computing the data, the students' mean score of the pretest in the control class was 49.41. It is obtained by calculating the students' total score which was 1136.59 and dividing 23 as the total number of the students.

The posttest was conducted after treating to the experimental group by applying TPS. The posttest was administered to measure the effectiveness of TPS technique in improving the students' reading comprehension. The research used similar type of test given to students in the pretest in order to investigate whether there is an impact of TPS on the students' reading comprehension after the treatment. The result of the mean score of the post-test was provided by the following table:

Table 5 - Experimental Group's Score on Post-test

No	Students' Initial	Individual Score Distribution			Raw Score	Max Score	Standart Score	Category	Qualification
		MC	E	TF					
1	RND	4	16	4	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
2	ADT	5	16	4	25	30	83.33	Good	Successful
3	NLS	4	14	5	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
4	MYF	4	15	4	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
5	MRF	4	16	3	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
6	MRP	3	16	4	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
7	DRI	4	18	5	27	30	90.00	Very Good	Successful
8	ILH	4	16	4	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
9	RSN	4	14	3	21	30	70.00	Fair	Successful
10	RO	4	18	4	26	30	86.66	Good	Successful
11	FJR	4	14	4	22	30	73.33	Fair	Successful
12	SUA	5	15	3	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
13	MRI	4	12	5	21	30	70.00	Fair	Successful
14	CRA	4	16	3	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
15	MHS	3	13	3	19	30	63.33	Fair	Successful
16	RAN	4	15	5	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
17	FHR	3	14	4	21	30	70.00	Fair	Successful
18	ICL	4	15	4	23	30	76.66	Fair	Successful
19	SAH	4	12	3	19	30	63.33	Fair	Successful
20	ABD	4	15	5	24	30	80.00	Good	Successful
21	ARH	4	18	4	26	30	86.66	Good	Successful
	Total Score						1613.26		

The result of post-test in the experimental class is 76.82. It means that the mean score of post-test in the experimental class has increased compared to the mean score of pretest.

The data above showed that the students' mean score of post-test in the control class was 65.06. Therefore, the improvement of the experimental class is more significant than the control group. The computation above showed the scores of both classes are different. The mean score of post-test of experimental class was76.82 while the mean score of post-test of the control group was 65.06.

After getting the students' mean score of pretest and post-test in experimental and control groups, the researchers continued to analyze the deviation (D) and the square deviation (D2) of both the experimental class and control class.

By seeing the table above, it can be stated that the highest deviation score in the

experimental group is 53.33, while the highest squared deviation is 2844.08. In order to get the deviation between pretest and post-test, the score of the post-test was deducted by the score of the pretest. So the total deviation is 596.67 and the total of squared deviation is 19521.60.

By looking at the table above, it can be seen that the highest deviation score in the control group is 43.34, while the highest squared deviation is1878.35. In order to get the deviation between pretest and post-test, the score of the post-test was deducted by the score of the pretest. So the total of deviation is 360.01 and the total squared deviation is 9932.94.

After analyzing the data of the test by using t-test formula, the data indicated that t-counted was 5.00. In order to get the significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test means score, the researchers compared the value of t-counted with the value of the t-table.

From the calculation above, the value of t-counted was 3.84 and the value of t-table was 2.01. The result presented that the value of t-counted (3.84) was higher than the value of t-table (2.01), which means that the hypothesis of this research is accepted. To conclude, by using Share-Pair-Share strategy can improving the reading comprehension of tenth-grade students at SMAN 1 Banawa.

The researchers conducted the treatment to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 1 Banawa by using TPS technique. The treatment did to the experimental group in six meetings. Both groups were taught with different techniques. The experimental group was taught reading analytical exposition text through Think Pair Share (TPS) technique. Meanwhile, the control group was taught through traditional techniques as their teacher used in that school. A pretest was given to the students in the first meeting while a post-test was given in the last meeting to both classes (experimental and control class) in order to know the students' prior knowledge.

The data of the experimental class were collected from the result of the students' scores of pretest and post-test. Based on the result of pretest in experimental class, it can be seen that the highest and the lowest scores obtained by one student is 80, while the lowest score is 10. The mean score of pretest in experimental class was 48.40. After pretest was conducted, treatment was given to the experimental class, in here the researchers found some progress of the students every meeting. First, the students vocabulary has increased, because the students are getting used to reading textbooks and found new vocabulary words in the textbook. Second they have a good confidence, Third, they have high interest and motivation in learning English. Last, they also enjoy speak English. After giving the treatment six times, post-test was given to the students. In post-test, the highest score that obtained by one students was 90 and the lowest score that obtained by two students was 63.33 it can be seen that the mean score of post-test was improve and it was 76.82.

Furthermore, based on the result of pretest in control class, it can be seen the highest score that obtained by one student was 86.66 and the lowest score that obtained by three students was 36.66. The mean score of pretest was 49.41. it was higher than the experimental class. In post-test, the mean score of control class was improved and it was 65.06. Those are lower than mean score of post-test experimental class. Meanwhile, the higher score obtained by

one student in the control class was 83.33 and only one student obtained the lowest score which was 43.33.

Based on the analysis of the data, it shows that there is a significant difference between students' achievements in reading in experimental class which has given Think Pair Share technique and control class which has not. By using Think-Pair-Share technique, students learn from one another and get to try out their ideas. Students' confidence improves and all students are given a way to participate in class, rather than the few who usually volunteer. The benefits for the teacher include increasing time on task in the classroom and greater quality of students' contributions to class discussions. Students and teachers gain a much clearer understanding of the expectation for attention and participation in classroom discussions.

In line with the study by Dwigustini and Widiya (2020), think-pair-share integrated reading strategy instruction seems to be more useful in increasing motivation than using a traditional approach. However, when examined in terms of motivation type, both the traditional and intervention groups showed a statistically significant increase in intrinsic motivation.

Dealing with the explanation above, Think-Pair-Share technique also has been effectively implemented in teaching reading comprehension and allowed the students to interact with each other. To improve students' reading comprehension, they work together in pairs, are interested, and try to comprehend the text they have read. Thus, it is clear that the acceptance of the hypothesis proves that the treatment was working. This fact relates to the previous research by Alfi Nikmah (2020) that the Think Pair Share Technique is effective in teaching reading comprehension.

CONCLUSION

The effectiveness of the method was supported by the mean score of post-test in the experimental group (76.82) is bigger than the mean score of post-test in the control group is (65.06). It was also proven by the result of t-counted value (3.84) is greater than t-table value (2.01). Therefore, the research hypothesis is accepted. In addition, the development of the students' abilities can be directly seen in their reading text. This research proved that the use of TPS Technique is effective in the teaching and learning process, particularly in teaching analytical exposition text. Besides, the use of an effective technique, the success is also supported by the proper and comfortable atmosphere in which the students were given motivation and support so that they enjoyed the teaching and learning activities.

REFERENCES

Alyousef, H. S.(2006).*Teaching Reading Comprehension to ESL/EFL learners*. Saudi Arabia: Albaya Intermediate School.

Arends, (2007). *Learning to Teach (belajar untuk mengajar).* New York: Mc Graw Hill Company.

Arikunto, S. (2006). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Model Praktik.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Berry, J. (2005). *Levels of Reading Comprehension* Retrieved from http//www.sc4.edu/documents/studys kills/h7levelsreadingcomp.doc

Dahler, & Touran. (2017). The Effect of Using Content-Purpose-Audience (CPA) Strategy Toward Students' Writing of Analytical Exposition Text at the Eleventh Grade of SMA Nurul Falah Pekanbaru. Lectura: *Jurnal Pendidikan. Vol.8, No.1.*

Dwigustini, R., & Widiya, J. (2020). Think Pair Share Technique to Promote Students' Reading Comprehension. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan (JIP) STKIP Kusuma Negara*, 12(1), 25-34.

Faradiaswita, (2012). The Implementation of Think-Pair-Share Technique in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension at MTsN 1 Tanjung Karang. Bandar lampung: Lampung University.

Jollife, (2007). *Cooperative Learning*. London: Paul Chapman.

Kagan, S., & Kagan, M. (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Publishing.

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and Principle in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lyman, F. (1981). The Responsible Class Discussion. Maryland: University of Maryland.

Nikmah, A. (2020). Improving Student's Reading Comprehension on Narrative Text Through Directed Reading Think Pair Share (TPS) at Madrasa Aliyah. Journal of English Teaching and Learning Issues. Institute Agama Islam Negeri Kudus.

Shih, Y. C., & Reynolds, B. L. (2015). Teaching adolescents EFL by integrating Think-Pair-Share and reading strategi instruction: A Quasi-Experimental Study. RELC Journal, 46(3), 221-235.

Sugiarto & Sumarsono. (2014). The Implementation of Think-Pair-Share Model to Improve Students Ability in Reading Narrative Text. *Internasional Jurnal of English Edeuation*. Vol 3, Issue: 3 pp.206-215.