Cooperative Learning Strategy of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) Technique to Improve Reading Comprehension Ability of The Middle School Students

Doni Sudibyo
donisud06@gmail.com

Nurteteng
teteng.syaid72@gmail.com

Universitas Pendidikan Muhammadiyah Sorong

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research is to find out whether or not the use of cooperative learning Think-Pair-Share in teaching reading able to improve the students reading comprehension ability of the middle school students. The sample of this study is the students in SMP IT Nurul Yaqin Sorong, west Papua there are 60 students, it consisted of 2 parallel classes; each class consisted of 30 students. The method used in this research was quasi-experimental method, here the writer uses two classes as sample, namely experimental class and control class. Based on the findings, it concludes that need analysis is the means of total score for post-test of experimental class and control class one was different. Where the t-test value is greater (6.178) than the t-table value (2.00) for 0.05 level of significance, degree of freedom (N1+N2-2) 58. This means that the achievement of the students who were thought rerated through cooperative learning in reading comprehension is different. Thus, the alternative hypothesis saying that there is significant difference in reading achievement between students learning reading by using cooperative learning and without using cooperative learning.

Key Words: Cooperative Learning; Think-Pair-Share; Reading Comprehension

INTRODUCTION

The statuses of English in Indonesia as a foreign language, not as a second language will unlikely change. English plays the roles as the first foreign language of the government, a medium of learning particularly in relation to modern science and technology and various professional purposes through written materials ad through learning and training activities involving foreign instructors, a medium of international business transactions, a medium of mass media, both print and electronic, a language of the development of scientific ad technology.

Reading is one the very essential skill in our life, because through reading we canget a lot of information that enable us to enlarge our knowledge. Through reading people can improve their own knowledge and experience and increase new concept

or broaden our horizon of thinking needed to ensure the continuing personal growth and adopt the change in the world. In fact, reading is a source of getting information.

William (1984) finds that there are some common problems that teachers find in teaching reading. Learner's lack of motivation, teachers are uncertain as how they should carry out the language preparation, teachers are unsure about selecting and devising, reading related activities. This fact indicates that students 'motivation and teacher's preparation are very important to consider.

In addition, before a person or student can understand the text, he or she must have sufficient mastery of the language to meet ordinary conversational needs. If the material is of a technical or specialized character, a certain amount of a level of mental ability adequate to follow the reasoning presented is needed for both listening and reading comprehension.

For one thing, the word must recognize if their meaning is to be appreciated. A second differences that in reading one must organize the material into meaningful phrases and thought units, while in listen this is a large extent done for the listener by the phrasing and expression, the intonation and stress patterns of the speaker, while in reading one has to learn to govern one's rate of reading so as to go fast enough to catch the flow of ideas and supporting ideas but no so fast as to miss too many of the details. Reading is similar to listening in many ways, but involves the needs for additional skill and requires a higher level of synthetic sophistication. Unless the reader can identify the syntactic competence to understand it.

The students' experience in learning English through cooperative learning technique can contribute greatly to their ability to efficient reading. Based on the result of survey of the researcher a primary to the students of SMP IT Nurul Yaqin Sorong, it shows that the students are not interested to learn reading skill. It proved the result of the test 38,50 is fair categorized. Therefore, the researcher in her research use cooperative learning in teaching English reading to motivate students to read.

The proposed methods are through cooperative learning to motivate the students to read. So many people have success in mastering English through reading comprehension. This is because cooperative learning gives a teacher an enormous range of possible ways to exploit the material.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The previous research findings which are related to reading comprehension are described as follows. Herni (2005) conducted research on the use cooperative learning in teaching reading comprehension. She found that there is significant difference of the students' who are though cooperative learning and without cooperative learning. It proved by the result of the mean score for post-test of two

classes are different, which t-test value (3.69) is greater than the t-table value (2.000) for the level of significance 0.05

Hamzah (2004) conducted his research on use cooperative learning in improving reading and he found that the conventional learning group and cooperative learning have significant difference in improving the students' achievement in reading comprehension. The cooperative learning group can improve the student's achievement better than the conventional learning group. The result of data analysis shows that the calculated is greater than the t table (11.07>2.000) at the level of significance 0.005 and the degree of freedom (58).

The previous researches that are conducted found out that there is no fixed correlation between reading comprehension and teaching technique-cooperative learning. Therefore in this research, the writer wants to ensure that correlation under different setting and different population.

Some Pertinent Idea

Reading

Smith and Robinson (1980) argue that reading is an active attempt, on the part of reader, to understand writer's message. The reader interacts with, and tries to reconstruct what the writer wishes to communicate. Chambers and Lowry (in Megawati 1997) state that reading is more than morally recognizing the words for which certain combination of thinking responses. Those thinking responses are feeling and defining some need, identifying a selection for meeting the need, selecting from alternative means experimenting with choices, rejecting or reining the chosen route, and devising some means of evaluating the result. Kollers in Muslimi (1988) states that reading is information processing activity, one in which arbitrary, conventional set of symbols is used to transfer information from one unit to another.

Kinds of Reading Technique

There are three kinds of reading techniques that are commonly known. They are scanning, skimming and survey reading.

a. Scanning is closely related to skimming. But when a reader scans, he already has a purpose in mind. Scanning means searching for particular information (Postman:1985) Postman furthermore three steps when a reader scans :
    1. Read the questions
    2. Keep the key word of the question in mind
    3. Scan until a reader finds the answer to questions. Stop and write the answer.
b. Skimming: Smith (1980) says that the term skimming is used for the process of quickly passing over and entire selection or passage to get a general impression of it.

c. Survey reading, before reading we must analysis what we want to analyze. We need to survey the material that we will learn by looking into the scheme, the outline of the book and looking into the title of the chapter in the book fast and accurately.

Reading Comprehension

A simple definition of reading is that a process where one looks at and understands what has been written. When the two persons communicate through point materials Smith and Robinson (1980:205).

Reading with understanding requires thinking and of course, intelligent plays an influential role. As one might expect, a youngest or adults contraction, interest, motivation, and experimental background contribute to this understanding. Alexander (1967) divides reading process into two categories: (1) primary reading process are physical orientation, attention, and application. Both of them can influence attitude, motivation, affect, and physical feelings.

Stanford in Warda (1995:9) defines reading comprehension as a mental process requiring accurate word recognition, ability to call to mind particular, the ability to shift or reallocate meaning until the constructs or concepts presented are clearly grasped, critically evaluated, accepted and applied.

Cooperative Learning

Basically, the main idea of the cooperative learning is students working together to learn and be responsible for his learning progress. Johnson & Johnson in Trianto (2013: 57) states that the main goal of cooperative learning is to maximize the students' learning process in order to improve their academic achievement and understanding, both individually and collaboratively. Cooperative learning is a learning model that was made in order to improve the level of students' activeness and participation, give students the chance to interact with other students, learn along with students with different backgrounds, and provide experiences regarding the attitudes of leadership and decision-making.

Think-Pair-Share Technique

The think-pair-share technique can be defined as a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation and it is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes. Think-pair-share is a relatively low-risk and short cooperative learning technique, and is ideally suited for instructors and students who are new to cooperative learning. Defined by Ledlow (2001), ―Think-pair- share is a low-risk strategy to get many students actively involved in classes of any size‖. Ledlow (2001) also declared that think-pair-share (TPS) technique in education is also about:

1. Think: Students think independently about the question that has been posed, forming ideas of their own.
2. Pair: Students are grouped in pairs to discuss their thoughts. This step allows students to articulate their ideas and to consider those of others.
3. Share: Each student pair shares their ideas with a larger group, such as the whole class. Often, students are more comfortable presenting ideas to a group with the support of a partner. In addition, students' ideas have become more refined through this three-step process.

Therefore, based on the explanation above, it can be summarized that think- pair-share technique is a cooperative learning strategy involving three stages of learning which are think that requires the students to think, pair that requires the students to make a group of two or pair with their classmates and discuss with them, and share that requires the students to share their own and their pair ideas to the whole class.

The Importance of the Think-pair-share

Researchers have found that students' learning is enhanced when they have many opportunities to elaborate on ideas through talk (Pressley: 1992). The think-pair-share strategy increases the kinds of personal communications that are necessary for students to internally process, organize, and retain ideas.
In sharing their ideas, students take ownership of their learning and negotiate meanings rather than rely solely on the teacher's authority. Additional benefits of using the think-pair-share technique include the positive changes in students' self-esteem that occur when they listen to one another and respect others' ideas. Students have the opportunity to learn higher-level thinking skills from their peers, gain the extra time or prompting they may need, and gain confidence when reporting ideas to the whole class. In addition, the pair step of the technique ensures that no student is left out of the discussion. Even a student who is uncomfortable discussing his or her ideas with the whole class still has an audience in this step. Finally, while the strategy may appear to be time- consuming, it makes classroom discussions more productive, as students have already had an opportunity to think about their ideas before plunging into whole- class conversations.

Above of all, it can be concluded from Bell (1998) that the benefits gained from TPS technique are:

1. It is quick since it does not take much preparation time.
2. The personal interaction motivates many students with little intrinsic interest in the subject taken.
3. Multiple kinds and levels of questions can be asked.
4. It engages the entire class and allows quiet students to answer questions without having to stand out from their classmates.
5. Teachers can assess students' understanding by listening to several groups during the activity, and by collecting responses at the end.
6. Teachers can do think-pair-share activities once or several times during a given class period.

Seeing the idea above, this kind of technique is suitable to be implemented in the teaching and learning process since it has many benefits either for both teachers and students.

The Implementation of the Think-Pair-Share

The think-pair-share technique is ideal for teachers and students who are new to collaborative learning. It can be used in a variety of contexts. However, to be effective, students must consider a question or issue (Bell: 1998). As students consider the question or issue, they should derive some benefit from thinking about it further with pairs, such as when there are multiple correct answers to a question. On the other hand, providing students with questions that have only one correct response, such as, ―What is 1 + 1?‖ soon becomes tedious to students, as there is not much to share with partners or the whole class.

The think step may require students merely to be quiet for a few moments and ponder their thoughts about the question. They may write some thoughts in response to the question. Some teachers find it helpful to set a time limit for the think and pair steps of the technique. If teachers choose to do this, they have to be sure to give students an idea of how much time they will have. They also have to remember to allow sufficient time during the pair step to allow both students to talk about their thoughts.

In the share step of the technique, students can share their ideas in several ways. One way is to have all students stand, and after each student responds, he or she sits down, as does any student with a similar response. This continues until everyone is seated. Another way is to move quickly through the class, having students respond quickly, one after the other, or to have a class vote. Responses can be recorded on a LCD or on a graphic organizer for future discussions. Another variation is to stop after the pair step, and have students write their ideas. Collect students' responses and assess any problems in understanding.

Modifying what has been explained above, in the first stage, think, the researcher poses some questions related to the reading texts to be thought of the answers by the students individually. In the second stage, the researcher groups the students into several pairs. The researcher may choose the partners of the students or the students may choose their own partners. In this stage, the students discuss about their ideas related to the questions given with their pairs. In the last stage, share, the researcher asks the pairs of the students randomly to come in front of the class to share the result of their discussion with their pairs. After that, there will be a whole class discussion in which all the audiences may give their own ideas.

The Ways to Stretch Students' Thinking while Using TPS

Think-pair-share technique often stretches students' thinking merely by its implementation. Some students consider it a challenge to articulate their thoughts

to another person. However, once students become comfortable with this aspect, there are ways to expand the strategy's reach. One way to is to be sure that students have opportunities to pair with a variety of partners. Pairing students who sit closest to each other is convenient but doesn't provide the same intellectual or social challenge as accommodating the learning and discussion styles of a variety of classmates. Another method for varying the strategy is to allow two pair steps before proceeding to share. Students can either participate in two consecutive pairings or can pair with one student and then the first pair can be grouped with another pair to discuss their thoughts before joining a whole-class discussion. This double-pair method is particularly helpful if the teacher has a very large class or is dealing with an especially complex question.

METHOD

Design and Sample

The method used in this research was quasi-experimental method, here the writer uses two classes as sample, namely experimental class and control class. The sample of this research the seventh grade of SMP IT Nurul Yaqin Sorong. The VII A class as experimental group (I Automotive A) which is consisted of 30 students and the VII B class as control group which is also consisted of 30 students.

Instrument and Procedure

The instrument of this research is reading test which is consisted of 40 items, 10 number items of multiple choice, 10 number of items true or false, 10 number of items essay test and 10 number complete the sentence. The procedure of collecting data is presented in the chronological order as follows:

1. Pre-test. Before doing treatment, the research gave pre-test to identify the students' reading ability.
2. Treatment. In the treatment, the researcher began to stimulate student reading through cooperative learning for many four meetings. The first meeting, a visit to a glass factory, the second meeting about rain forest, the third meeting about explaining signs. The last meeting the researcher gave the students materials about expressing sympathy.
3. Post-test. After doing the treatment, the researcher gave the post-test to the students to know their developing after taught by cooperative learning. The result of the post-test is scored to prove the hypothesis.

Data Analysis

Since the present study is to measure the effect of Cooperative Learning Think Pair Share towards the students' reading comprehension achievement, it is classified into quantitative research. Here, the researcher was collected numerical data by comparing the results of pre-test and post-test between two groups of experimental study – control and experimental groups. The data is used to investigate whether

there is a significant increase in students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the Think Pair Share treatment in reading class.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Data collected through reading test for experimental class and control class. The result of the students' scores of experimental class is presented in the following table.

Table 1. The Students' Score in Pre-test and Post-test for Experimental Class

No	Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1.	86 – 100	Excellent	-	0 %	9	30 %
2.	71 – 85	Very good	1	3.33 %	13	43,33 %
3.	56 – 70	Good	6	20 %	8	26.67%
4.	41 – 55	Fairly good	18	60 %	-	0%
5.	< 40	Fair	5	16.67%		-
	Total		30	100 %	30	100 %

This table shows that before giving treatment most of the students' scores of experimental group were in fairly good classification. 1 (3.33 %) out of 30 students was in very good classification, 6 (20 %) out of 30 students were in good classification, 18 (60%) out of 30 students were in fairly good classification, 5 (16,67) out of 30 students were in fair and there is not students got excellent classification. After giving treatment, most of the students score were in very good classification, 9 (30%) out of 30 students were in excellent, 13 (43.33%) out of 30 students were in very good classification, 8 (26.67%) were in good classification, and no one students were in fairly good and fair classification.

It means that before giving treatment the reading achievement of the students was categorized fairly good classification and after giving treatment the students was categorized as very good. It means that the teaching reading comprehension through cooperative learning can improve the student achievement. The students' score for control class in pre-test and post-test can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. The Students' Score in Pre-test and Post-test for Control Class

No	Classification	Score	Pre-test		Post-test	
			F	%	F	%
1.	86 – 100	Excellent	-	0 %	0	
2.	71 – 85	Very good	-	0 %	8	26.67%
3.	56 – 70	Good	7	23.33 %	13	43.33%
4.	41 – 55	Fairly good	15	50 %	6	20%
5.	< 40	Fair	8	26.67 %	3	10%
	Total		30	100 %	30	100 %

This table shows that before giving treatment, most of the students' scores were in fairly good classification. Where 7 (23.33 %) out of 30 students were in good classification, 15 (50%) out of them were in fairly good classification, 8 (26.67%) out of them were in were in fair classification. After giving treatment most of the students score were in good classification. Where 8 (26.67%) out of 30 students were in very good classification, 13 (43.33 %) out of them were in good classification, 6 (20 %) out of 30 students were in fairly good classification, 3 (10 %) out of them were in fair classification. No one students in were excellent classification.

It means that before giving treatment the reading achievement of the students was categorized fairly good classification, while after giving treatment without using cooperative learning, the student's achievement was categorized good classification. It means that teaching reading through conventional learning can improved the students' achievement.

After calculating the result of the students' pre-test, the mean score and standard deviation of experimental class and control class presented in table 3. The table underneath shows that the mean score obtained by the students in experimental class (50.86) is greater than the control class on (48.44). It means that the mean scores of the pre-test obtained by the students in experimental class and control class are different.

Table 3. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of The Students Pre-test

Class	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental class Control class	50.86 48.44	9.093 7.943

In order to know whether or not the mean difference of experimental and control class are statically significant at the level of significant 0.05, degree of freedom (N1+N2-2) 58, the result of the calculation is shown as follow:

Table 4. The Result of Computation of t-test and t-table value

Level of Significant	T-test value	T- table value
0.05	1.137	2.00

The table above shows that the t-table (2.00) is greater than t-test value of the students pre-test (1.137). Based on this analysis it is concluded that there is not significant difference between two means scores. Having included the students pre-test, the next test to be analysis is post-test. The following is the table that describes

the mean scores and standard deviation of the students' post-test in experimental class and control class.

Table 5 .The Mean Score And Standard Deviation of The Students Post-test

Class	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
Experimental Class Control Class	80.175 62.24	9.90 13.18

The table above reveals that the mean scores obtained by the students in experimental class (80.175) is greater than control class (62.24). It shows that the mean scores of the post-test obtained by the students in experimental class and control class are different.

In order to know whether or not mean difference of experimental class and control class is statically significant, at the level of significance 0,05, degree of freedom (N1+N2-2) 58, the result of calculation is shown as follows:

Table 6. The result of computation of t-test and t-table value of the students' post-test

Level of Significant	T-test Value	T-table value
0.05	6.178	2.00

The table shows that the t-test value (6.178) is greater than t-table value (2.00) based on this result, it is concluded that there is significant difference of the students who are though reading comprehension through cooperative learning and without using cooperative learning.

Before giving treatment, the students achievement in reading was categorized fairly good classification, which was proved by the percentage of the total scores of pre-test for the two class (experimental and control class) and the students mean score from the pre-test obtained by the students in the experimental class (50.86) is greater than the control class on (48.44). In the other hand, the result of statistical t-test for pre-test show the mean scores for the class are not significantly different, where t-test value is smaller (1.137) than t-table (2.00) for 0.05 level of significance, degree of freedom (N1+ N2-2) 58. This means that the achievement of the students before giving treatment through cooperative learning in reading is not different.

After giving treatment for four times, the students achievement in reading for experimental class was categorized as was excellent. It is proved that there was 9 (30%) out of 30 students were in excellent. 13 (43,33%) out of 30 students in very good. 8 (26,67%) out of them were in good. While control class was categorize as

good classification it is proved that there 8 (26.67%) out of them were in very good, 13 (43,33%) out of 30 students. Were in good classification. 6 (20%) out of 30 students were in fairly good classification. 3 (10%) out of 30 students were in fair. No one students in were excellent classification.. The means of total score for post-test of experimental class and control class one was different. Where the t-test value is greater (6.178) than the t-table value (2.00) for 0.05 level of significance, degree of freedom (N1+N2-2) 58. This means that the achievement of the students who were thought rerated through cooperative learning in reading comprehension is different.

Thus the alternative hypothesis saying that there is significant difference in reading achievement between students learning reading by using cooperative learning and without using cooperative learning. It can be concluded that null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and therefore, alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted because t-test value (6.178) is greater than t-table value (2.00)

CONCLUSION

Based on the description of the previous chapter the writer would like to conclude that there is significant difference in reading achievement between the students who are taught through cooperative learning and those without cooperative learning were the means score of experimental class for post test is 80,175 and the means score of control class for post test is 62,24. The means that the achievement of the who thought through cooperative learning without cooperative learning. Using cooperative learning is effective in learning English reading to the students of SMP IT Nurul Yaqin Sorong. It proved by t-test value that is 6.178 which is greater than t-table value 2.00.

REFERENCES

Alexander LG. 1967. *Practice and Progress***.** London: Longman.

Alderson, C. J. (2000). *Assessing Reading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bell, J. (1998). *Improving Student Learning and College Teaching*. Ideas on Lecturing from a Variety of Places and People, Ideas on Cooperative Learning and the Use of Small Groups: Howard Community College.

Berardo, S.A. (2006). The Use of Authentic Materials in the Teaching of Reading. *The Reading Matrix*, 6 (2).

Bos, S.C. and Vaugh, S. (2009). *Strategies for Teaching Students with Learning and Behaviour Problems Seventh Edition*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.

Brown, D.H. (2001). *Teaching by Principles; An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy Second Edition*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

_____. (2000). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching Fourth Edition*. San Francisco: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

_____. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. San Francisco: Pearson education, Inc.

Burns, A. (2010). *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching*. Madison Ave, New York: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Caldwell, S.J (2008). Reading Assessment; A Primer for Teachers and Coaches Second Edition. New York: The Guilford Press.

Fajar, (1996). The Teaching Reading Comprehension Through Communicative Task of The Second Year Students of SMU Negeri 159 Sungguminas***a***. A Thesis. FPBS, IKIP Ujung Pandang.

Gay. L.R. (1981)**.** *Educational Research. Competencies for Analysis and Application. Second Edition.* Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merril Publishing Company.

Kustaryo, S. (1988). *Reading Technique for the College Students*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Muslimin, S. (1988). *A Pilot Study of Reading at the First Semester Students of English IKIP Ujung Pandang*. FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.

Postman, R. D. (1995). *Reading and Study Skills*. New York. Mac Milan Publishing Company. Inc.

Rachmajanti, S. (2003). *Cooperative Learning Practice*. Malang. Fakultas Sastra Universitas Malang.

Smith, N. B., & Robinson. (1980). *Reading Instruction for Today's Children*. Boston, Prencise Hall. Inc.

Yatim, N, (1990). *Scientific Reading Paper***.** Hasanuddin University (UNHAS) Makassar.

Warda, (1995). The Effectiveness of Picture in the teaching Reading Comprehension to the Sixth Grade of Elementary School of Athira Ujung Pandang. Thesis. FPBS IKIP Ujung Pandang.

Wakkang, H. (2004). Teaching Reading Comprehension Through Cooperative Learning to the Third Year Students of SLTP Negeri 1 Suppa Pinrang. Thesis. State Univercity Makassar.

William, E. (1984). *Reading in Language Classroom***.** London: Mac Millan Published Ltd.

Whorter, T. K. (1992). *Efficient and Flexible Reading*. New York: Harper