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#### Abstract

This study was aimed at investigating whether or not there was a significant difference in the students' reading achievement after they were taught by using the Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy. A quasiexperimental design (non equivalent pre-test and post-test control design) was used in this study. Fifty six out of 145 seventh grade students of MTsN Lumpatan were purposively taken as the sample. There were 28 students in the experimental group and 28 students in the control group ( $\mathrm{N}=56$ ). The data was collected through reading test and analyzed by using t -test, multiple regression, and pearson product moment. The results showed the students who treated by using the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy achieved a higher mean score of reading achievement (79.71) than the students who did not use the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy.
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#### Abstract

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan mengetahui ada atau tidaknya perbedaan yang signifikan pada nilai membaca siswa menggunakan strategi pembelajaran Berpikir, Berpasangan, dan Berbagi. Desain penelitian kuasi ekperimental digunakan didalam penelitian ini. Lima puluh enam dari 145 siswa kelas 7 MTsN Lumpatan dipilih secara purposive dan digunakan sebagai sampel didalam penelitian ini. Sebanyak 28 siswa dikelompokkan kedalam kelas ekperimental dan 28 siswa dikelompokkan kedalam kelas kontrol. Data penelitian diambil menggunakan kuesioner dan tes membaca dan kemudian dianalisis menggunakan t -test, multiple regression dan pearson product moment. Hasil analisa menunjukkan bahwa siswa yang diajarkan menggunakan strategi pembelajaran Berpikir, Berpasangan, dan Berbagi menunjukkan pada nilai membaca yang bagus (79.71) dibandingkan siswa yang berada didalam kelas kontrol.


Kata Kunci: Strategi Berpikir, Nilai Membaca, MTsN Lumpatan

## Introduction

Reading text in a foreign or second language is much more difficult than that in first language. ${ }^{1}$ It was found in PISA result in 2009 that the Indonesian's rank of reading was 402 , mathematics 371 , and science $383 .{ }^{2}$ The results showed that Indonesia was in the $57^{\text {th }}$ rank out of 65 countries in the survey (OECD, 2010). In addition, PIRLS 2011 showed that Indonesian students' average score in reading literacy was $428 .{ }^{3}$ It is far below the standard mean score of international reading literacy (500). It is a poor condition of our education quality, especially in reading skill.

In line with it, South Sumatera students also have problem in reading skill. Diem who conducted a study of 3-Ls (Libraries, Literature, and Literacy) in Palembang found that the total mean of students reading achievement was 54.77. ${ }^{4}$ Sudarmi who conducted a study of junior high school students in Palembang supported that the students in South Sumatera had low reading achievement. She found that $6.11 \%$ had excellent scores, $14.06 \%$ had good scores, $19.87 \%$ had average scores, and $59.93 \%$ had poor scores. ${ }^{5}$ It showed that the English reading achievement of Junior High School students in South Sumatera is still low.

Those problems are also found in MTsN Lumpatan which is one of National Standard Schools (NSS) in South Sumatera It can be seen from the reading achievement of the students. From 145 students in seventh grade, the mean score of reading is only 55 (poor category). The mean score of students did not reach the standard of the school that is 70. In addition, the English

[^0]teacher of MTsN Lumpatan agrees that students have difficulties in reading especially on reading descriptive text. Nevertheless, students are be able to response accurately, fluently, and appropriately messages in descriptive text. Therefore, in order to get the messages they have to understand the text literally and inferentially.

All the parties have to find the solution of this problem. According to Hewit, there are four important aspects can make the teaching and learning process successful: strategy, style, motivation, and attitude. ${ }^{6}$ Westwood believes strategy as a most powerful way to solve students' difficulties to read, write, and spell. ${ }^{7}$ It means that a good strategy can increase the students' achievement in reading, writing, and speaking. In addition, a good teaching strategy can motivate students to learn and make them focus in ELT process. ${ }^{8}$

There are many types of learning strategies in teaching reading. One of the strategies is Think-pair-Share (TPS) strategy. The Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy is one of the cooperative learning strategies which designed to provide students with a clear focus and time to formulate individual ideas and share them to other students. Robertson states that the Think-Pair-Share strategy is a strategy which makes students interact with the material and their friends. This strategy not only teaches the content of material but also increases the interaction among students. ${ }^{9}$

This strategy gives positive effect to students' reading motivation and achievement. Johnson, Johnson, and Stanne argue that cooperative learning has a significant positive impact on students' achievement than competitive and

[^1]individualistic efforts (effect size $=0.80$ and 1.03 respectively). ${ }^{10}$ Furthermore, this strategy also gives the students opportunities to interact with each other and it enhances their motivation in learning. ${ }^{11}$

Based on the explanation above, It is important to find out the effect and contribution of the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy to enhance the students' achievement.

## Reading Skill

Reading is a complex cognitive and linguistic process. Nuttal states that there are three levels of reading skill. First, the process of decoding, deciphering, and identifying the printed words. Second, the process of articulating, speaking, and pronouncing the words in print. Third, the process of understanding and interpreting the meaning of text. ${ }^{12}$ It means that the students are able to comprehend, understand, and interpret the content of the text after they read it.

In addition, Grabe and Stoller explain reading is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret the information appropriately. ${ }^{13}$ Alyousef states that reading can be see as an interactive process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or reading fluency ${ }^{14}$. It involves decoding alphabetic symbols, drawing upon experiences and language, and using strategies effectively to make meaning.

## Reading Achievement (RA)

Reading achievement is the result of students' understanding of a text that can be affected by some factors, such as their reading strategies. Reading

[^2]achievement test is a way to know students' result in reading comprehension. The Department of Education of New Brunswick classifies three components of reading achievement standard at Seven Grade students namely: text complexity, reading strategies and behaviors, and comprehension responses. ${ }^{15}$ Text complexity is a characteristic of literacy and information texts. Reading strategies and behaviors refers to learning behaviors students should exhibit when reading texts independently. Comprehension responses are literal, inferential or interpretative, and personal or critical or evaluative responses to texts. Among those components, comprehension is an important part of reading achievement to know students' ability in reading.

Reading comprehension is an interactive mental process between the reader's linguistic knowledge, knowledge of the world, and knowledge of the topic. ${ }^{16}$ Royer states that the reading comprehension is the process of understanding and constructing the meaning of the text. ${ }^{17}$ Reading comprehension is affected by difficulty of the text, the vocabulary uses in the text, the reader familiarity with the subject matter, and other factors.

This study focused on literal and interpretive or inferential levels. Literal level refers to reading the line on the text. In this level, the students recall explicitly stated facts and ideas. However, inferential or interpretative level includes reading between the lines. Here, the students connect ideas within the text, demonstrating an ability to identify and understand messages that are implied, but not explicitly stated. The writer used those two levels above because in Junior High School, especially for seventh grade students, the curriculum suggests the teacher to give a simple descriptive text to the students. The writer analyzed the contribution of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy to two scales of students' reading achievement.

[^3]
## Think Pair-Share (TPS)

Think Pair Share is a structure first developed by Frank Lyman at the University of Maryland in 1981. It introduces the peer interaction element of cooperative learning in the idea of 'wait to think' time, which has been demonstrated to be a powerful factor in improving student responses to questions. Think-Pair-Share strategy can be defined as a multi-mode discussion cycle in which students listen to a question or presentation, have to think individually, talk with each other in pairs, and finally share responses with the larger group. ${ }^{18}$ This strategy provides students with a clear focus and time to formulate individual ideas and finally share them to other students. The stages above can be illustrated by Figure 1.

(Adapted from sparklebox Teacher Resources Limited, 2005)
Figure 1. The stages of Think-Pair-Share Strategy

Think-Pair-Share strategy has some benefits for the students. According to Edith Cowan University, the benefits of Think-Pair-Share strategy are ${ }^{19}$ : (1) promote students participation, (2) help students to feel comfortable and get know their peers, (3) be useful for all year levels and all class sizes, (4) it is easy

[^4]to teach in the classroom and only take short time to prepare and start and do; (5) engage the whole class and allow quiet students to answer questions; make class discussion more fruitful because everyone has ideas to discuss; (6) provide equity for all students rather than the same or loud students answering; and (7) stretch students thinking and enhances students learning. This strategy is good for teacher and students in the process of teaching and learning reading.

## TPS strategy and Reading Achievement

Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy is one of the cooperative learning strategies which have a positive impact on students' reading motivation and achievement. Abass states that cooperative learning strategy gives students opportunities to interact with each other and it enhances their motivation in learning. ${ }^{20}$ This strategy can motivate the students during teaching and learning process because this strategy gives opportunities of the students to interact and share their opinions.

Johson, Johson, and Stanne found that cooperative learning strategy has a significant positive impact on students achievement. ${ }^{21}$ In addition, Millis states that cooperative learning results in many well studied outcomes including higher academic achievement because students benefit from peer coaching and from the divergent viewpoints that promote critical thinking. ${ }^{22}$ Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy can improve students' reading achievement because this strategy can make it easier for the students to comprehend the text.

Therefore, the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy improves not only students' reading motivation but also students' reading achievement. Liang found that cooperative learning gave significant effects to students learning motivation ( $\mathrm{t}=0.000$ ) and English achievement $(\mathrm{t}=0.000) .{ }^{23}$ It can be said that

[^5]this strategy can help the teacher in teaching English to the students who have lower motivation and achievement.

## Method of The Research

A quasi experimental design (Non-equivalent groups Pretest-Posttest Control Design) was used in this study. The writer used purposive sampling technique in this study. The sample was selected based on some criteria: (1) the students are taught by the same teacher (VII.1-VII.4), (2) the students do not take extra courses, and (3) the students have the same number of teaching sessions. The sample size calculated by Raosoft Inc was used to find out the sample size of this study. ${ }^{24}$ From the Raosoft analysis ( $91 \%$ of confidence level and $9 \%$ of error level), the writer found that the minimum recommended sample size of 145 students was 56 . The writer took fifty six (56) out of 145 students in this study. The sample was assigned into two groups: 28 students (experimental group) and 28 students (control group). Each group consists of 14 boys and 14 girls.

The writer collected the data by using the reading test. The writer used reading test specification by Department of Education of New Brunswick for the seventh grade students. The reading test consists of fifty questions. There are four analyses was used in this research. Paired Sample t-test and Independent Sample t-test were used to find out the significant difference in students' reading achievemnet between students who were taught by using TPS strategy and those who are not. Multiple Regression was used to find out the contribution of TPS strategy to each subscale of reading achievement. Pearson Product Moment was used to find out the contribution of TPS strategy to each scores category of reading achievement.

## Findings

There are three important findings of this study. First, the Think-PairShare (TPS) strategy significantly improves the students' reading achievement. It was shown from the students' scores after the implementation of Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy in teaching and learning process, the results of the posttest was better than that of the results in the pretest $(79.71>38)$. In the control

[^6]group, it was found that there was low significant mean difference than that of the mean difference in the experimental group $(25.214<41.357)$. The students' mean scores of reading achievement (79) in the experimental group had already fulfilled the standard score of school but it did not happen by control group (65). (see table 1)

Second, The results also showed that there was a significance difference between students' reading achievement in the experimental and control group (15 points). The students who were in experimental group got higher achievement than the students who were in the control group. It can be said that The use of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy as a strategy to teach reading in the experimental group was effective. (see table 1)

Table 1. The Results of Paired Sample and Independent Sample t-test

| Strategy | Variables | Pretest |  | Posttest |  | Mean difference pre and posttest Exp within | Mean difference pre and posttest Cont within | T-value posttest between Exp and Control | T value of Gain between Exp \& Control | The <br> value <br> of <br> Sig.2- <br> tailed <br> Exp <br> within | The value of Sig.2tailed | The <br> value of <br> Sig.2- <br> tailed <br> between |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | Mean Cont | Mean <br> Exp | Mean Cont |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cont within | Exp and Control |
| TPS | RAT | 38 | 39.57 | 79.71 | 64.97 | 41.357 | 25.214 | 8.595 | 14.929 | . 000 | . 000 | . 000 |

Note:
TPS : Think-Pair-Share
RAT : Reading Achievement Test
Third, the writer found Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy gave the significant contribution to students' reading achievement. The results showed that Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy gave high contribution to the students' reading achievement namely $99.9 \%$. In terms of sub-scales category, the contributions of TPS were in the inferential comprehension (55.4\%) categories. (see table 2)

Table 2. The Contribution of TPS Strategy to Each Sub-Scale

| Strategy | Variables | Sub-Scales | R | R | R Square Change | F | Percent of |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change | Contribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TPS | RAT | - | $1.000^{\mathrm{b}}$ | .999 | .115 | 2947.436 | $11.5 \%$ |
|  | RAT | Inferential | .744 | .554 | .554 | 32.285 | $55.4 \%$ |
|  |  | Literal | .1000 | 1000 | .446 | 3.348 | $44.6 \%$ |

## Discussion

The TPS strategy could improve the students' reading achievement. The students' reading achievement in the experimental group increased because they were taught by using the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy. There was an improvement of students' mean scores between pretest and posttest ( 42 points). It is in line with a study done by Johson, Johnson, and Stanne. ${ }^{25}$ They found that the cooperative learning strategy has a significant positive impact on students' achievement. In addition, Millis states cooperative learning results in many well studied outcomes including higher academic achievement because students benefit from peer coaching and from the divergent viewpoints that promote critical thinking. ${ }^{26}$ The significant difference between students' reading achievement in both groups might be caused by the teaching strategy, materials, and media used during the teaching and learning process. The writer used laptop, colorful image, loud speaker, and LCD. Those media makes the students more active, happier, interest, and enjoy in the classroom. This study confirms what was founds by Tinio who states that the use of ICT by the teacher in the classroom can impact the students' learning achievement. ${ }^{27}$ Furthermore, Fredriksson, Gajek, and Jedeskog also argued that ICT gave positive impact in teaching and learning process. ${ }^{28}$ Hence, the curricula suggested the teacher to use ICT or media in teaching.

[^7]In terms of reading achievement in the experimental and control groups, the students' mean scores were in good and adequate categories. The students who were in experimental group got higher achievement than the students who were in the control group. It can be caused by the use of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy in the experimental group. This strategy gave high improvement in the students' reading motivation and achievement. This study supports by Liang who found that the cooperative learning strategy gave significant effects to students learning motivation $(\mathrm{t}=0.000)$ and English achievement $(\mathrm{t}=0.000) .{ }^{29}$

The mean scores of students' reading achievement in the experimental group was in good category (79.71). This score fulfilled the minimum standard of the national school $(\geq 70)$ but it did not fulfill the minimum standard of the international school in Indonesia ( $\geq 80$ ). It can be caused by the limited time of this study. This study also supported by Richards and Rodgers who state that time plays an important role for the teacher while they are teaching the students in class. ${ }^{30}$ The writer only had 34 meetings to teach reading for the students by using the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy. The timing was used by the writer to give the treatment or reading test can also influence the students' reading achievement. The treatment and the reading test were given to the students in the afternoon class (14.00-16.00) because the writer did not want to disturb students' learning time at school. Therefore, the results got are not as high as expected by the writer. The writer believes that if the treatment and reading test done in the morning class, there will be a higher improvement in students' reading motivation and achievement.

In the control group, the results showed that there was an improvement of the students' mean scores. In terms of reading motivation, the improvement of the students' mean scores was 13 points (113-126). While in terms of reading achievement, the improvement of students' mean scores was 26 points (39-65). So, although the mean scores improved, but it was not fulfill the standard at MTsN Lumpatan. The small improvement may be caused by teaching strategy used by the teacher in the teaching and learning process. The teacher of English gives the reading texts and asks students to answer the questions without giving them the pre-activity or warming up activity to build their prior knowledge. As

[^8]we know that, the curriculum suggests that the teacher should follows three the step of teaching and learning process, namely: pre-activity, whilst-activity, and post-activity to make sure that the teaching and learning process well done. ${ }^{31}$

Moreover, the writer also found that the strategy gave the contribution to each sub-scale and score categories of students' reading achievement. In the reading achievement, Think-Pair-Share (TPS) gave the contribution for inferential comprehension and poor score categories. It can be caused by the characteristics of this strategy. This strategy engaged the whole students to participate and share their ideas or opinion based on their understanding or their own sentences and it made them had more critical thinking in learning process. ${ }^{32}$ They were tried answer the questions inferentially or logically. This strategy also asked the students to write down their friend's answers when they discussed in pairs and groups. According to Barwood, taking a note is a good way for the students to get and remember the information or the content of the topics easily. ${ }^{33}$ It can be said that by taking a note, the students who had poor scores can absorb and remember the topics, questions, and answers of the text. It made the students who had poor scores become more confident in answering the questions.

In terms of reading achievement, Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy gave the contribution to very poor scores category. This strategy were did not gave contribution to good, adequate, and very poor scores categories. This strategy did not give the contribution to good and adequate categories, it can be caused by the levels of the reading test. Reading test used descriptive text in levels 4,5 , 6,7 , and 8 . Based on the test for choosing the sample, the students who were in good and adequate categories were mastering those levels. It can be seen from the results in the reading achievement test, the results showed that the students in good and adequate categories is achieved the score standard minimum of reading achievement. While, this strategy did not give contribution to very poor category, it can be caused by guiding and monitoring that was given by the writer. The students who were in very poor category accepted the same guiding and monitoring about the material, it makes them not really understand the

[^9]material. The writer should give them more attention to make them more easy to comprehend the text during teaching and learning process. Chambers and Gregory (2006) states that the teacher plays crucial role as the facilitator and guidance for the students in teaching and learning process. ${ }^{34}$ They should give more attention and motivation for students. the writer believes that if she gives more attention to the students who had very poor achievement, the students will be achieved the higher achievement.

It is clear that the Think-Pair-Share (TPS) strategy could improve the students' reading achievement. It is supported by the research done by Pan \& Wu which found that the cooperative learning has effects on English reading comprehension. ${ }^{35}$ Similarly, Liang also found that the cooperative learning gave significant effects to students learning achievement. ${ }^{36}$ The results of her study showed that there was a significant improvement of the students' reading achievement in the experimental group. This strategy improves not only students' achievement but also develop students' characters.

## Conclusion

From the results and interpretation above, it can be concluded that TPS strategy is a good reading strategy for the students in ELT process because the students' mean scores and the students' scores percentage in the experimental group better than the control groups. This strategy give contribution to the students' reading achievement.

## Suggestions

The writer would like to suggest that the teachers of English can use Think Pair Share (TPS) strategy as one of the teaching reading strategies in Junior High School. This strategy can use for teaching English in the large classes ( $\mathrm{N} \geq 25$ students). This strategy improves the students' reading achievement.

[^10]
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