THE EFFECT OF RECIPROCAL TEACHING ON READING COMPREHENSION TO THE ELEVENTH YEAR STUDENTS OF SMA I PALLANGGA GOWA IN ACADEMIC YEAR 2013/2014

(Pengaruh Pengajaran Timbal Balik Terhadap Pemahaman Membaca Siswa Kelas Sebelas di SMA I Pallangga Gowa Tahun Ajaran 2013/2014)

Oleh :

SUMARNI B
Dosen Fakultas Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Dan Politik
Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Samarinda

Correspondence Address: Jl. AW.Syahranie IV Blok K No.18 Samarinda
HP. 0852 4987 6909 Email : *ninimarni@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

This research was conducted to know the effect of using Reciprocal Teaching Strategy to improve the students' reading comprehension and also to know what type of reading comprehension are dominantly affected by using Reciprocal Teaching. The research applied Quasi-Experimental design. This research was designed into two groups; Experimental group and Control group. Each group consisted of 36 students. The sample was chosen by using simple random technique which used lottery technique. The data were collected through multiple choice reading test both in experimental group and control group namely pretest and posttest. The data collected through reading test were analyzed by using SPSS 20.0 version.The research findings showed that the mean score and standard deviation for each group, getting fair classification on their posttest result, means that both experimental which uses Reciprocal Teaching Strategy and control group which uses Direct Teaching method in measuring students' reading ability have same improvement or there was no difference significantly between both of them(t $_{observe}$= 1.729< t $_{table}$ = 1.999 and p=0.08 > 0.05). Besides, all three levels of comprehension improved. It was proven by comparison of mean score of pretest and posttest on all level of both groups. The difference of pretest and posttest mean score both of groups was statistically significant to inferential and critical level (p=0.03). Although, this research have a little bit of improvement in experimental group but

the result still be believed that using reciprocal teaching affect dominantly in improving inferential and critical comprehension. It means that this strategy can support reader to get the comprehensible one of different genre of reading text.

Key words: reading comprehension, reciprocal teaching, cognitive strategies

I. INTRODUCTION

Reading is a receptive skill which takes a big role in mastering many things in learning. By having a good ability in reading, students will get more information easily. Reading supports students in every part of their learning process because one of the effective ways to get information or to master the learning material is by reading it. They may get information from reading textbook, newspaper, magazine, article and journal. Reading text also provides opportunities to study language: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and the way we construct sentences, paragraph and texts. Lastly, good reading text can introduce interesting topics, stimulate discussion, excite imaginative responses and be the springboard for well-rounded, fascinating lesson (Harmer J, 1998 : 79)

Some factors that influence to the reader was found by researchers Palincsar and Brown's (1984) said that young readers and poor readers do not use effective strategies for monitoring and constructing meaning from text so they did not know how to recognize written symbols correspond to one's spoken language. In the other hand, another factor, text factors influence readers' meaning. Text factors include the author's ideas, the words the author uses to express those ideas, and how the ideas are organized and presented.

Others circumstances whether lack of language itself, poor in their motivation, or read unauthentic text, were happen and influence to the reader on their reading comprehension. Both reader factors and text factors affect to the reading comprehension. Based on those factors above, the objectives of this research were to investigate them in a school.

In English curriculum for senior high school, reading skill means understanding the meaning in various types of written interactional and monolog text. In second grade of senior high school, there are narrative text, report text, analytical exposition, spoof text and hortatory exposition. Most of students in the second grade of SMA I Palangga Gowa in academic 2013/2014 do not have good ability in reading it. As it was shown in preliminary observation that in the first semester there were not more than 52% students in XI IPA got more than limit score. It shows that most of students still do not have good ability in reading it. The kind of less motivation, poor understanding of using their prior

knowledge and poor understanding of reading in a good way were as some cause why it did happen.

Beside the students' factors, the teachers undeniably also take a big role in the teaching reading process in this school which causes the students' reading ability become low. In teaching monolog texts, teacher has tried using teaching reading strategy like predicting in the pre-reading activity. However, it has not used as good as the theory. The teacher still asked the students to read the text individually or in groups and then they have to answer the questions.

In a school, teachers' responsibility is to overcome it to the students. In other hand reading skills is separate course in schools that must be mastered by the students and are taught by teachers in the various forms of approaches based on the teacher's ability.

Teaching reading in school can be done with a variety of approaches or techniques and the specific implementation is highly dependent on the ability of teachers to carry out the teaching technique or approach. By using a particular approach or technique is accurate and supported by adequate competence of teachers.

Whenever teachers were faced with the problem of students who have good decoding skills but they were inadequate comprehension skills. On the other hand is needed to train those students to use some strategies; otherwise, these students will continue to read texts emphasizing not only words but also for meaning (Dermody & Speaker, 1999). Because reading depends on efficient word recognition and comprehension, the instruction should develop reading skills and strategies, as well as build on learners' knowledge through the use of authentic text or some alternative strategies (Bernhardt, 1991; Bernhardt, 2000; Hulstijn, 1991; Kamil, Mosenthal & Pearson, 2000; Snow Burns & Griffin, 1998). Some researcher found that the innovation teaching technique in reading can improve students' achievement. Jodi Marsahall (2006) stated that Literarcy Circle prove to be an effective way to improve reading comprehension. Diehl (2005) stated in her dissertation that direct strategy instruction appeared to effect strategy acquisition which then led to improvement in the students' abilities to comprehend a specific text.

The previous finding describes us about the important innovation way in teaching reading and the phenomenon teaching reading comprehension. By conducting this research, the researcher investigated the comprehensive development of students' reading ability by using a strategy namely Reciprocal Teaching.

Reciprocal teaching strategy consists of four parts: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. Reciprocal Teaching Strategy is a set of four cognitive perspectives, used to improve students' reading comprehension. From the cognitive perspective, researcher believes that struggling readers can improve their performance through the use

of interactive (through dialogue) strategies and the reconstruction of ideas.

This technique will jointly build an understanding of a reading text. The students will be expected after undergoing treatments many times using this technique can improve they ability to read some texts comprehensively. It can be proved by seeing the other research's finding. Sarasti (2007) stated that the data suggested reciprocal teaching was an effective intervention in increasing reading comprehension abilities in students as measured by the CBM-maze probes.

Based on the views above, to solve the same problem, the aim of this research are to find out whether the applying of the reciprocal teaching and to find out what types of reading comprehension are dominantly affected by reciprocal teaching.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research employs quasi-experimental research. There are two forms of quasi experiment design, a time series design and nonequivalent control group design. This research will use a nonequivalent control group design.

There were students of SMA I Palangga Gowa as population of this study. There were 210 student of class X, 120 student of class XI, and 200 student of class XII . The sample were taken 72 students from different class of 210 students class X and was divided into two groups, 36 students as the control group and 36 students as the experiment group of this study. This sample of experiment group was being as a treatment group.

There was a kind of the instruments that used to collect the data, test. The test were pre-test and post-test, both of the tests were given for experimental and control group. The test consists of essay test namely short answer and objective test namely multiple choices. The test was conducted in order to check their reading achievement and comprehension.

The data was analyzed after observation and the test conducted. The data computed by using the procedure as follows, Scoring of the result of the students' pre-test and post-test, Calculating the mean score and t-test between reading comprehension of the experimental group and control group by using SPSS program version 18.0, Calculating student's score into percentage and Classifying the score of the student's interest.

III. RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

1. The Description of Students Score

Based on previous finding on all reading components, it showed that the reading skills of the eleventh grade students of SMA I Pallangga Gowa improved for control and experimental group. It was also supported by the students' frequency and rate percentage of the students' pre-test and post-test result.

Based on the students' work in the pretest of both experimental and control group, the researcher analyzed that on the all of components in reading, most students had low ability to read comprehensible. In control group, most of them 35 students (97%) of 36 students got very poor classification while in experimental group most of them 26 students (72%) of 36 students got very poor classification too. It shows that most of students still do not have good ability in reading.

The kind of less motivation, poor understanding of using their prior knowledge and poor understanding of reading in a good way were some cause why it did happen. As Palincsar and Brown's (1984) said that young readers and poor readers do not use effective strategies for monitoring and constructing meaning from text so they did not know how to recognize written symbols correspond to one's spoken language.

Related to the findings previously stated that, three level reading comprehensions were discussed one by one. For students' score in pretest, In literal comprehension, most of students in both control and experimental group could not get the primary literal meaning of a word, idea, or sentence explicit in context. It was proved that most of them just got very poor classification (67% students in control group and 22% students in experimental group). It means that they often unable to identify the meaning of unfamiliar terms from context so they read with some understanding of the main ideas.

For students' score in pretest, in inferential comprehension, the students were not simply read between the lines and could not make inferences about thing which are not directly stated in context. It was proved that most of them just got very poor classification (78% students in control group and 50% students in experimental group). It means that they may misinterpret information at times

In addition, in critical comprehension, most of students were not concerns with why the author says. It was proved that most of them just got very poor classification (97% students in control group and 81% students in experimental group). It was happen because they did not understand both main ideas and supporting details with ease.

On the contrary in pretest, based on the description of the data collected through posttest, showed that the students' ability in reading of control and experimental group were improved.

Based on the mean score, students' classification in control group were improved where only just 5 (14%) students got very poor and changed into variety good improvement. At least direct teaching method can improve students' competence in reading.

In the same improvement was happening too in experimental group. Students' classification in experimental group were improved where there was no students got very poor and changed into variety good improvement. At least Reciprocal Teaching Strategy can improve students' competence in reading.

Each level in reading comprehension was improved both control and experimental group into a variety good improvement as in analyzing score of the students' posttest. The improvement was increased into the level of critical comprehension where at least 3% students got excellent classification in experimental group while there were 6% students got good classification in control group. It means both group not only can read academic texts with ease but also can understand both main ideas and supporting details with ease.

2. Comparing Students' Score in pretest and posttest

Although the improvement was existed in both of groups but the results of data analysis by using independent sample showed that the average of the two groups increased on their reading comprehension abilities when they were compared to the pretest and posttest values . This data analysis presents comparisons of achievement of learning outcomes. The control group was given the achievement of learning outcomes when the mean score pretest showed 20.57 while in the experimental group showed 33.01. The data showed that at the beginning of the study both groups had differences. This indicates that the data were not homogeneous. Therefore for further testing and analyzing the data using each student's gain score .

The independent t-test of gain score results showed that the result in (t = 1.729, df = 69, and p = .088) showed that there was no difference in the mean for gain score the posttest scores between the Control Group and the Experimental Group.

Therefore, H01 (no significant difference in the reading comprehension performance between the participants in the Control Group and the participants in the Experimental Group) was accepted. It can be deduced that there was the same improvement both of group with the help of reciprocal teaching strategies of the Experimental Group and with the direct teaching method of the Control Group. Both forms of learning methods are equally improve student learning outcomes. Reciprocal teaching strategy was applied in this sample and the average posttest score improved significantly.

This is indicated by the analysis of the data using paired samples T - test but when compared with the results of the control group is smaller . Several possibilities can occurred, among others;

a. Emphasizing the Students' understanding of The Collaborative Learning

Reciprocal teaching is a cooperative learning instructional method in which natural dialogue models and reveals learners' thinking processes about a shared learning experience. Teachers foster reciprocal teaching through their belief that collaborative construction of meaning between themselves and students leads to a higher quality of learning (Allen, 2003). because this technique emphasizes the meaning of a learning program in collaboration resulted in higher learning that students need to be understanding about it as early as possible before applying RT. it is necessary for collaborating to gain a common understanding of a reading will be obtained in this technique when students are well aware of their roles and responsibilities. Roles and responsibilities of students that will be accepted are comfortable when they understand very well the meaning of collaborative learning.

The learning community is able to reinforce understanding and to see, hear, and correct misconceptions that otherwise might not have been apparent. All members of the community have shared responsibility for leading and taking part in dialogue during learning experiences (Hashey and Connors, 2003). Lack of students' understanding of this could be the cause of this RT does not run as expected to the sample of this research.

b. Emphasizing the Students' Understanding to Some Interactions

This Technique is emphasize not only to form a two -way interaction between teachers and students but also between students and students . The interaction between teachers and students has been going well but the research suspected to the interactions between students and students who have not been fully established. This may not be established because the students do not understand the definition of the tasks which is assigned to them . as we all know that the reciprocal teaching applying four types of task , summarizing , questioning , clarifying and predicting.

c. Emphasizing Students' Understanding to Some Instructions

Effective reciprocal teaching lessons include scaffolding, thinking aloud, using cooperative learning, and facilitating metacognition with each step. Each strategy is taught one by one by the teacher and is clearly understood by students before they

go on to the next strategy (Hashey et al, 2003). Overall student cannot receive directly the four components in a single learning session. Students will be more comfortable if the four components are presented one at a time per session learning. For instance summarizing activities was presented separately as well as the other three components one by one and in sequencing steps until at last the four components are presented to gather in then do the treatment. Because of the application of the four components are not presented separately, Simultaneously, learning instructions were received unclear by students.

d. Emphasizing to the Real Dialogue in RT

Palincsar, Brown, and Campione (1989) define reciprocal teaching is not only as a dialogue between teacher and student but also as a dialogue between student and student as a forming of modeling and guiding. The researcher modeling and guiding researchers estimate should be made to each group so that the teacher can assess directly the extent of students' progress in the discussion process before they'll do it independently in their group.

Teaching in the second group, the control group and the experimental group, carried out by researchers. Teaching is done by using different methods. Teaching in the control group using direct teaching method while in the experimental group using the Reciprocal Teaching. The results of the analysis of gain scores are mean control group score a few points higher than the experimental group. This shows that teaching successfully increased in both groups. A number of weaknesses that have been mentioned above could be the reason why the value of the experimental group not exceed the value of the control group. It is also proved that the teaching of reading by using direct teaching method is still enough to help improve students' grades.

To support this discussion, the research presented the brief reviewing of The analysis of 19 experimental studies by applying Reciprocal Teaching Strategy (Roseshine and Meister, 1993). The review found that (a) results were usually more significant when explicit instruction in the cognitive strategies was provided before the reciprocal teaching began than when reciprocal teaching only was used; (b) results were mostly non-significant when below-average students were taught, yet usually significant when all other students were taught; and (c) results were usually significant when experimenter-developed tests were used, yet usually non-significant when standardized tests were used. It means that everything that exists in this research have proved another finding as was explained above.

3. The Most Developed Component in the Students' Reading Skill

Teaching reading comprehension focuses on three forms of achievement levels: literal comprehension, inferential comprehension and critical comprehension. Based on the data that has been done, there is a significant increase differently in both groups.

Beside, to determine which one of level reading comprehension is dominantly affected by reciprocal teaching and direct teaching method, the researcher used ANOVA and based on the data in table 4.15 showed that the three levels of reading comprehension in experimental group have the different average score , where F_{value} (4.960) > F $_{table}$ (3.081) and the score of *P-value* was smaller than Alpha or 0.009 < 0.05. In control group, based on the data in table 4.17 and showed that the three levels of reading comprehension in experimental group have the different average score , where F_{value} (18.585) > F $_{table}$ (3.081) and the score of *P-value* was smaller than Alpha or 0.000 < 0.05. It proved that the score of three levels reading comprehension have almost the different significantly in average score. It means that from the three levels comprehension there is more than one of them dominantly significant affected by using reciprocal teaching strategy and by direct teaching method.

The dominant effect was existed between students' score in posttest of inferential to critical comprehension and vice versa. It was happen because the applying some strategy (predicting, questioning, clarifying and summarizing) in experimental group provided opportunities to students to share and discuses in real dialogue then it was become as a reason how well students were in their achievement in posttest. Pressley (1998) asserts that reciprocal teaching encourages students to take a more active role in leading a group dialogue, and helps to bring more meaning to the text at a personal and cognitive level. This strategy tell us that being active in learning can support activities itself and making improvement to many objectives of the learning outcomes.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings and discussions in the previous above, the researcher concludes that:
1. Students' score improved significantly in both experimental group which uses reciprocal teaching and control group which uses direct teaching after getting some treatments.
2. The experimental group has greater improvement than control group on their score reading comprehension in posttest.

3. Applying reciprocal teaching strategy in this research shown that students' ability from inferential to critical comprehension improved higher than their ability on literal comprehension.

REFERENCES

Alfassi, M. 2004. *Reading to Learn: Effects of Combined Strategy Instruction on High School Students. Journal of Educational Research. 97*(4), 171-184. Retrieved November 14, 2007, from EBSCO Host Research Databases.

Alverman, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (1998). *Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bernhardt, E.B. 1991. *Reading development in a second language: theoretical,empirical, and classroom perspectives*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cooper .Timothy T & Greive C. 2011. *The effectiveness of the methods of reciprocal teaching As applied within the NSW primary subject Human Society and its Environment: An exploratory study.* Macquarie College & Avondale College. Newcastel NSW

David, F. 2007. Teacher"s questioning behavior and ESL classroom interaction pattern. *Humanity and Social Sciences Journal*, 2, 127-31.

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional (Depdikbud). 2008. *Kriteria dan Indikator Keberhasilan Pbl.* Jakarta: Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan

Fawson, P. C., & Reutzel, D. R. 2000. *But I only have a basal: Implementing guided reading in the early grades*. The Reading Teacher, 54, 84-97.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. 1996. *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gall, M. D. 1986. Synthesis of research on teachers" questioning. *Educational Leadership*, 42, 40-47.

Garner, R. 1992. *Metacognition and self-monitoring strategies.* In S. J. Samuels & A. E. Farstrup (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (pp. 236-252). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Gass, S. M. (Ed.). 1997. *Input, Interaction, and the Second Language Learners* [M]. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlaum Associates, Publishers.

Gay, L.R. 2006. *Educational Research; Competencies for Analysis and Apllications*. Pearson Precentise Hall. New Jersey

Glaser, R, 1990. *The Reemergence of Learning Theory within Instruction at Research*. American Psychologist. 45, 29-39.

Ghorbani M. R., Ghangeraj A.A., Alavi S.Z. 2013. *Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Strategies Improves EFL Learners' Writing Ability.* Iran. University of Bojnord, Islamic Azad Universitya and Kosar University of Bojnord

Hart, E. R., & Speece, D. L. 1998. Reciprocal Teaching Goes to College: Effects for Postsecondary Students at Risk for Academic Failure. *Journal of Educational Psychology. 90*(4), 670- 681. Retrieved October 23, 2007, from Psych INFO database.

Harmer, J. 1998. *How to Teach English.* Pearson Education Ltd.

Hacker, D., & Tenent, A. (2002). *Implementing reciprocal teaching in the classroom:Overcoming obstacles and making modifications.* Journal of Educational Psychology, 94(4), 699 – 718.

Hulstijn, J. 1991. *How is reading in a second language related to reading in a first language? AILA review* (Milton Keynes, UK) vol. 8, p. 5–15.

Kamil, M.L.; Mosenthal, P.B.; Pearson, P.D., eds. 2000. *Handbook of reading research*, vol. 3. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Katleen B. Hester.*Classroom problems in the teaching of reading.* Michigan State normal College, Ypsilanti, Michigan

Kouri, T. A., Selle, C. A., & Riley, S. A. 2006. *Comparison of meaning and graphophonemic feedback strategies for guided reading instruction of children with language delays.* American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology, 15, 236-246.

Larson, B. & McKinley, N. 2003. C*ommunication solutions for Older Student: Assessment and Intervention Strategies.* Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.

Nunan, D. 1989. *Understanding language classrooms: A guide for teacher-initiated action.* Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. (1986). *Interactive teaching to promote independent learning from texts. The Reading Teacher, 39*, 771-777.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A, L. 1984. *Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Fostering and Comprehension- Monitoring Activities. Cognition and Instruction, 1*(2), 117-175.

Pressley, M., & Block, C. C. 2002. *Summing up: What comprehension instruction could be. Comprehension instruction: Research-based best practices.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Rosenshine, B., & Meister, C. 1994. *Reciprocal Teaching: A Review of 19 Experimental Studies* , 479-530. Retrieved November 1, 2007, from Eric Plus Text database.

Sarasti. I. A. *The Effects of Reciprocal Teaching Comprehension- Monitoring Strategy on the Third Grade Students' Reading Comprehension.* Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of Doctor of Education.

Soehartini, Waode Tress. 2010. *Improving reading Comprehension of The Second Grade Students of S*MA Negeri V Bau-bau Through DARTS S*trategies. Unpublished Thesis Graduated Program Makassar: State University of Makassar*

Snow, C.; Burns, M.; Griffin, P., eds. 1998. *Preventing reading difficulties in young children.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Sugiyono 2008. Penelitian Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan R&D. Bandung. Alpabeta

Terr, David (2010) "*Weighted Mean.*" From MathWorld. A Wolfram Web Resource: http://mathworld.wolfram.com/Weight

Ur, P. 1991. *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Lier, L. 1988. *The classroom and the Language Learner.* London: Longman.

Walsh, J. A. & Sattes, B. D. (2005). *Quality questioning: Research-based practice to engage every learner.* Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A Framework for Task-based Learning.* Harlow: Addison Wesley Longman.

http://www.hhpublishing.com/_onlinecourses/clast/clast_demo/readingsk ills/A3.html 31 Januari 2014

http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Mohamad-TestingReading.html

http://learningdisabilities.about.com

www.teachingenglish.org.uk

http://www.eric.ed.gov

Alverman, D. E., & Phelps, S. F. (1998). *Content reading and literacy: Succeeding in today's diverse classrooms*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Hacker, D., & Tenent, A. (2002). *Implementing reciprocal teaching in the classroom:Overcoming obstacles and making modifications*. Journal of Educational Psychology,94(4), 699 – 718.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. (1986). *Interactive teaching to promote ndependent learning from texts. The Reading Teacher, 39*, 771-777