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#### Abstract

Abstrak: penelitian in bertujuan untuk mengaji efek Think-Pare-Share strategi pada mahasiswa bahasa Inggeris di FKIP Universitas HKBP Nommensen Pematangsiantar. Subjek penelitian terdiridari 30 orang mahsiswa pada kelas experiment dan begitu juga pada kelas kontrol. Penelitian ini mengalisis data dengan mengaplikasikan metode quantitative karena data analisis berhubungan dengan angka yang dalam hal ini disebut dengan skormahasiswa.Penelitian ini dilakukan pada mahasiswa semester tiga tahun akademik 2014-2015 sebagai populasi dan sebagai sample adalah kelas A and B. Berdasarkan hasil analisis data, peneliti menguraikan temuan bahwa TPS memiliki efek terhadap pemahaman bacaan oleh mahasiswa. Temuan penelitian menunjukkan bahwa rata-rata skor dikelas experiment lebih tinggi dibanding rata-rata skor di kelas kontrol Skor rata-rata di kleas eksperimen adalah 41,73 sementara di kelas control adalah 11, 34 . terdapat 28 mahasiswa yang memeroleh rata-rata skortertinggi di kelas eksperimen yaitu55. 65 or $93 \%$ sementara rata-rata sko rtertinggi di kelas control adalah diperoleh 25 mahasiswa yaitu 41,34 atau $83 \%$.


Kata kunci: efek, Think-Pare-Share, strategi, pemahaman bacaan.


#### Abstract

Think-Pare-Share (TPS) strategy in reading comprehension by the third semester of English Department Students at FKIP Universitas HKBP NommensenPematangsiantar. The subjects of the research are 30 students as experiment and control group. This research applies quantitative research method in analyzing the data which refers to the number in the form of students' value as the measurement of students'reading comprehension. This research conducted into the third semester at academic year 2014-2015 as the population and the sample is class A and B. based on the data analysis, the researcher finds out the effect of TPS strategy in students' reading comprehension by these research findings show that the mean of students' score in experiment class is 41,73 than in control class is 11,34 . There are 28 students who get the highest score in experiment class. They get the mean score more than 55.65 or $93 \%$ students get high score while in control class there are 25 students who get the 41,34 mean score or $83 \%$ as the highest score.
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## INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the human being activities that easy to do. It is meant that reading can be done any time in everywhere. The easy to be
done is not meant as easy to be understood. Some time catching the meaning of the text is not easy. When somebody read the text, it is
not only to pronounce the words involved in the text itself. Meanwhile reading is thinking and understanding and getting at the meaning behind a text (Seravallo 2010:43). Based onKamil (2003:6) reading understands written texts. Additionally, McNamara (2006:4) inserts that reading is an extraordinary achievement when one considers the number of levels and components that must be mastered.Reading is a complex behavior which involves conscious and unconscious use of the meaning, which the writer is assumed to have intended.

Understanding the text is achieved by the purpose of obtaining information of some topics, obtaining instructions on how to perform some task for our work or daily life, acting in a play, keeping in touch with friends by correspondence, knowing where and when something will take place or what is available, knowing what is happening or has happened (Nunan, 2003:251). Doing these purposes in reading the text it means by comprehending of the text. In another terms it is called as reading comprehension. Reading comprehension is the ability to take information from written text and do something with in a way that demonstrates knowledge or understanding of that information. Comprehension occurs when a reader is able to act on, respond to, or transform the information that is presented in written text in ways that demonstrate understanding. It illustrates how readers can show they understand what they read.According to Kamil (2003:6) Comprehension is the process of making sense of words, sentences and connected text.

In comprehending the English text as the second language (ESL) there are always possibilities for the learners get difficulties since it would be a long and complex undertaking. To solve the problem, Think-Pair-Share is a part of Co-operative Learning Teaching strategy which is one of possible that can be applied by the learners. Cooperative learning was designed and implemented to develop social strategies and acceptable social attitudes in students, and to improve social relations within and between groups. Cooperative learning refers to a
variety of teaching methods in which students work in small groups to help each other in learning the subject matter. cooperative in class, students are expected to help each other, discuss and give argument with each other, to hone the skills that they possess at the time and close the gaps in their understanding (Brown 2003:50).

Think-Pair-Share is a cooperative learning technique that encourages individual participation and is applicable across all grade levels and class sizes. When teachers deliver lessons to the classroom, the students sit in pairs with each team. The teacher asks the class and students are asked to think of an answer of their own, then pair up with a partner to reach an agreement on an answer. Finally, the teacher asks the students to share their answers that they agree with the whole class (Slavin, 2005).

Think-Pair-Share is technique with great and its result in increased students participation and improved retention of information. Istarani(2011:67) says that Think-Pair-Share is a three-step structure in which students"think" individually about the question posed by the teacher (step1), "pair" up with a neighboring student and discuss their ideas together (step2), and "share" the ideas discussed in pairs with the entire class (step3). The ideas are to get you all to think the concepts that think the speakers' think. Think-Pair-Share could be prepared to recent topic.

Furthermore, Slavin(2005:56) explain that this activity preferably one demanding analysis evaluation or synthesis and gives students thirty seconds or more to think through appropriate response (think). This time can also be spent writing the responses. After this "wait team", students then return to partners and share their immediate feedback on their ideas (pair). During the third and last stage, students responses can be shared within learning teams, with larger groups or with the entire class during a follow-up discussion (share). The job of the group should be clearly expressed (Slavin: 1995).

The excess of the learning model and Think Pair Share are (1) Can increase the reasoning power of students, the students'
critical, students' imagination and the analysis of student's to a problem (2) Promote cooperation among the students as they work in groups (3) Improve the ability of students to understand and appreciate other people's options (4) Improve students' ability to express opinion as implementation science (5) The teachers more likely to add knowledge of the students' when they are completed discussion. With all these potential advantages, Lie (2002:56) says that learner confidence improves and all students are given a way to participate in class. In another words,Aqib (2013:24) said Think-Pair and Share designed to build students' interaction in reading comprehension.

## RESEARCH METHOD

To increase the learners' comprehension in reading English text, the researcher applied Think-Pare-Share strategy for a certain class which is known as experimental class. The learners' achievement of the reading comprehension test is compared with the conventional strategy in another class. It purposed to find out the effect of Think-PareShare strategy. To process the data, the researcher decides to apply quantitative research method. The learners' achievement is performed in the form of number which is known as learners' value (Arikunto, 2010).

The population of the research is the English Department of FKIP Universitas HKBP NommensenPematangsiantar. They are registered at the third semester students in academic year of 2014-2015. They are tested on reading comprehension of English text. The students consist of ten parallel classes as the member of population, class A and B as the sample group simply to respond the given description by the lecturer of reading III subject. Class A takes place as control class and Class B as experimental class.Every class seems to have similar characteristic in passing kinds of lectures. On the day of the test every class consist of 30 students who complete the test.

Table 1:
Method of Research

| Group | Test I | Treatment | Test II |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | Pre-test | Think-Pair-Share <br> Technique | Post- <br> test |
| B | Pre-Test | Conventional <br> Technique | Post- <br> Test |

Note;
A= Experimental Group
B= Control Group

| Name | Number of item |  |  |  |  |  | Total |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | $\ldots$ | true | false |
| $X y$ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 5 | 3 |
| $X p$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  | 4 | 4 |

To find out whether there is significant effect of Think-Pare-Share (TPS) Strategy in reading comprehension by the learners, the researcher comparing the correct answer of the items with the learners' work. All the students correct answer then counted to know how significant the TPS strategy is. They are identified on each items test as follows:

## Table 2

Learners' score test
To find out the significant effect of TPS in reading comprehension produced by learners, the researcher counted the students' achievement by t -test formula based on Arikunto (2010:354) to analyzing the data. The formula of the $t$-test will be described as follow:
$t=\frac{M x-M y}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{d x^{2}+y^{2}}{(N x+N y)-2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{N x}+\frac{1}{N y}\right)}}$
Note:
Mx = Mean of experimental group
My = Mean of control group
$\mathrm{Dx}^{2}=$ Standard deviation of experimental group
$D y^{2}=$ Standard deviation of control group
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{x}}=$ Total sample of
experimental group
$\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{y}} \quad=$ Total number of control group

## DISCUSSION

Data analysis aimed at finding the effect of TPS is conducted quantitatively. The researcher conducts some activities as follows:

Table 3
The score of Pre-test and Post-test of Experimental class
Pr
$\mathrm{e}-$
T
st
C

| 1 | Adrian | 48 | 72 | 2304 | 5184 | 3456 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Aldi | 32 | 68 | 1024 | 4624 | 2176 |
| 3 | Atika | 32 | 56 | 1024 | 3136 | 1792 |
| 4 | Citra | 64 | 96 | 4096 | 9216 | 6144 |
| 5 | Dhea | 48 | 84 | 2304 | 7056 | 4032 |
| 6 | Dicky | 40 | 76 | 1600 | 5776 | 3040 |
| 7 | Doni | 40 | 88 | 1600 | 7744 | 3520 |
| 8 | Engjeli | 32 | 72 | 1024 | 5184 | 2304 |
| 9 | Febi | 44 | 76 | 1936 | 5776 | 3344 |
| 10 | Febri | 36 | 84 | 1296 | 7056 | 3024 |
| 11 | Hanna | 52 | 100 | 2704 | 10000 | 5200 |
| 12 | Hendra | 68 | 92 | 4624 | 8464 | 6256 |
| 13 | Henny | 28 | 56 | 784 | 3136 | 1568 |
| 14 | Jaya | 40 | 76 | 1600 | 5776 | 3040 |
|  | Sitorus |  |  |  |  |  |
| 15 | Jelita | 20 | 56 | 400 | 3136 | 1120 |
| 16 | Jonny Sirait | 68 | 92 | 4624 | 8464 | 6256 |
| 17 | Muhamm ad | 24 | 68 | 576 | 4624 | 1632 |
| 18 | Nursakin ah | 56 | 76 | 3136 | 5776 | 4256 |
| 19 | Paisal | 48 | 80 | 2304 | 6400 | 3840 |
| 20 | Preddy | 48 | 92 | 2304 | 8464 | 4416 |
| 21 | Rahmah | 60 | 80 | 3600 | 6400 | 4800 |
| 22 | Rinaldy | 52 | 72 | 2704 | 5184 | 3744 |
| 23 | Ririn | 20 | 80 | 400 | 6400 | 1600 |
| 24 | Riska | 28 | 72 | 784 | 5184 | 2016 |
| 25 | Ruth | 56 | 76 | 3136 | 5776 | 4256 |
| 26 | Tiwi | 40 | 76 | 1600 | 5776 | 3040 |
| 27 | Umar | 44 | 84 | 1936 | 7056 | 3696 |


| 28 | Very | 32 | 88 | 1024 | 7744 | 2816 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 | Yudika | 20 | 48 | 400 | 2304 | 960 |
| 30 | Yusnita | 32 | 48 | 1024 | 1024 | 2304 |
| N | Total | $\sum$ | $\sum \mathbf{Y}$ | $\sum \mathbf{X}^{\mathbf{2}}=$ | $\sum \mathbf{Y}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\sum \mathbf{X Y}$ |
| $=3$ |  | $\mathbf{X}$ | $=$ |  | $=$ | $=$ |
| 0 |  | $=$ |  | 57872 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 228 |  | 1791 | 9888 |
|  |  | 12 | 4 |  | 20 | 0 |

The list of value of pre-test and post test of experimental class in the table above showed that the lowest score of the pre-test is 20 and the highest is 68 , while the lowest score in post-test is 48 and the highest is 100 . After listing the name and the score, the researcher calculated the sum of all pre-test and post-test scores'. The result showed that the sum of the pre-test $\left(\sum \mathrm{X}\right)$ is 1252 while the sum of post-test $\left(\sum \mathrm{Y}\right)$ is 2284 . Then the result showed that the sum of $X^{2}\left(\sum X^{2}\right)$ is 57872 and sum of $\mathrm{Y}^{2}\left(\sum \mathrm{Y}^{2}\right)$ is 179120 . While, the sum of multiplication of $X$ and $Y\left(\sum X Y\right)$ is 98880 . The data showed that ability of the students in post-test is more increase than in pre-test.

Table 4
The students' score in Pre-test and Post-test in Control class

| No | Name | Pre- <br> Test <br> X | Post- <br> Test <br> Y | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ | $\mathrm{Y}^{2}$ | XY |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | Agus | 20 | 44 | 400 | 1936 | 880 |
| 2 | Andri | 28 | 48 | 784 | 2304 | 1344 |
| 3 | Anggreini | 28 | 48 | 784 | 2304 | 1344 |
| 4 | Artika | 44 | 44 | 1936 | 1936 | 1936 |
| 5 | Bagus | 16 | 40 | 256 | 1600 | 640 |
| 6 | Baito | 32 | 64 | 1024 | 4094 | 2048 |
| 7 | Benget | 44 | 60 | 1936 | 3600 | 2640 |
| 8 | Benny | 36 | 56 | 1296 | 3136 | 2016 |
| 9 | Bintang | 20 | 44 | 400 | 1936 | 880 |
| 10 | DaudMalau | 20 | 68 | 400 | 4624 | 1360 |
| 11 | David | 28 | 84 | 784 | 7056 | 2352 |
| 12 | EnjiSihite | 16 | 40 | 256 | 1600 | 640 |
| 13 | Eswindo | 32 | 52 | 1024 | 2704 | 1664 |
| 14 | Ester | 48 | 52 | 2304 | 2704 | 2496 |
| 15 | Hasren | 52 | 60 | 2704 | 3600 | 3120 |
| 16 | Indah | 20 | 36 | 400 | 1296 | 720 |
| 17 | Jelita | 36 | 68 | 1296 | 4624 | 2448 |
| 18 | Jesika | 20 | 40 | 400 | 1600 | 800 |
| 19 | John | 20 | 28 | 400 | 784 | 560 |
| 20 | Jonfri | 32 | 48 | 1024 | 2304 | 1536 |
| 21 | Kelvin | 36 | 44 | 1296 | 1936 | 1584 |
| 22 | Lidia | 16 | 40 | 256 | 1600 | 640 |
| 23 | Michael | 40 | 52 | 1600 | 2704 | 2080 |
| 24 | Mutiara | 20 | 52 | 400 | 2704 | 1040 |
| 25 | Putra | 48 | 48 | 2304 | 2304 | 2304 |
| 26 | Putra S. | 52 | 60 | 2704 | 3600 | 3120 |
| 27 | Rifka | 28 | 52 | 784 | 2704 | 1456 |
| 28 | Setia | 20 | 40 | 400 | 1600 | 800 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| 29 | Wantri | 20 | 24 | 400 | 576 | 480 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Yohannes | 28 | 44 | 784 | 1936 | 1232 |
| $\mathrm{~N}=$ | Score | $\sum \mathbf{X}^{=}$ | $\sum \mathbf{Y}=$ | $\sum \mathbf{X}^{2}$ | $\sum \mathbf{Y}^{2}$ | $\sum \mathbf{X Y Y}=$ |
| 30 |  | 900 | 1480 | $=$ <br> 3073 | 476160 |  |
|  |  |  |  | 6 | 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The list of the value of pre-test and post test of experimental class in the table above shows that the lowest score of the pretest is 16 and the highest is 52 , while the lowest score in post-test is 24 and the highest is 68. After listing the name and the score, the researcher calculated the sum of all pre-test and post-test scores'. The result showed that the sum of the pre-test $\left(\sum X\right)$ is 900 while the sum of post-test. Then the result showed that the sum of $\mathrm{X}^{2}\left(\sum \mathrm{X}^{2}\right)$ is 30736 and sum of $\mathrm{Y}^{2}$ $\left(\sum \mathrm{Y}^{2}\right)$ is 77408. While, the sum of multiplication of X and $\mathrm{Y}\left(\sum \mathrm{XY}\right)$ is 46160 . The data showed that ability of the students in post-test in more increase than in pre-test.

## The Level of the Student's Ability

In order to find out the level of ability of the students, the writer should find out the mean and standard deviation firstly. Mean is computed by adding a list scores and dividing by the number of the scores. Standard deviation is a measure of the spread of the score.
Mean and Standard Deviation Experimental and Control Class.

$$
\operatorname{Mean}(\bar{x})=\frac{\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}}{\mathrm{n}}
$$

Note:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\bar{x} & =\text { the means } \\
\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}} & =\text { the sum of pre- }
\end{array}
$$

scores of both groups

$$
\mathrm{n} \quad=\text { number of sample }
$$

The formula to get the Standard Deviation is:

$$
S=\sqrt{\frac{n \sum x i^{2}-\left(\sum x i\right)^{2}}{n(n-1)}}
$$

## Note:

$\mathrm{S}=$ standard deviation
$\mathrm{n}=$ number of sample in $\mathrm{X}_{1}$ of $\mathrm{X}_{2}$
$\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}=$ the sun of the score X

From the table 1 it can be calculated that Mean and Standard Deviation of experimental class as follows:
$\mathrm{n}=30$
$\mathrm{x}=1252$
a. Mean
$(\bar{x})=\frac{\sum \mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{i}}}{n}$
$=\frac{1252}{30}$

$$
=41,73
$$

Based on the calculating above, the writer got the mean of experimental group was 41,73 . Then the writer calculated the mean of control group with the same formula.
b. Standard Deviation

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S=\sqrt{\frac{n \sum \mathrm{xi}^{2}-\left(\sum \mathrm{xi}\right)^{2}}{\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{n}-1)}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{30.57872-(1252)^{2}}{30(30-1)}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1736160-1567504}{(30)(29)}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{168656}{870}} \\
& =\sqrt{193,85} \\
& =13,92
\end{aligned}
$$

Based on the calculating above, the writer got the standard deviation of experimental group was 13,92 . Then the writer calculated the standard deviation of control group with the same formula.

Table 5
The criteria level of student's ability in experimental class

|  | The Criteria |
| :--- | :--- |
| High | $(\bar{x})+\mathrm{S}$ |
|  | $41,73+13,92=$ |
|  | 55,65 |
| Medium | $(\bar{x})-S$ |
|  | $\leftrightarrow(\bar{x})+S$ |
|  | $41,73-13,92 \leftrightarrow$ |
|  | 41,73 |
|  | 13,92 |
|  | $27,81 \leftrightarrow 55,65$ |
| Low | $\bar{x}-\mathrm{S}$ |
|  | $41,73-13,92$ |
|  | 27,81 |

Mean $\quad: \bar{x}=41,73$
Standard Deviation $(S)=13,92$
To find out the percentage of criteria
level ability of the students, the formula is:
$\mathrm{P}=\frac{f}{N} \times 100 \%$
Note: $\quad \mathrm{P}=$ percentage
$\mathrm{f}=$ frequency number of the students
$\mathrm{N}=$ total number of sample

Table 6
The level of students' ability in experiment class.

| Level <br> Ability | The Criteria | Frequency <br> number of <br> the <br> students | Perc |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Highest | More than 55,65 | 28 | $93 \%$ |
| Medium | Between 27.81-55,65 | 2 | $06 \%$ |
| Lowest | Lest than 27,81 | - | - |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

From the data above it can be seen that the ability of the students is in highest level in the which the students who get more than 55,65 are 28 students. The students who are at medium level with score between 27,8155,65 are 2 students and none of them in lowest level.

## Mean and Standard Deviation of

 Control ClassFrom the table 2 it can be seen that Mean and Standard Deviation of control class by the number of subject is $30(\mathrm{n}=30)$ and total value of pre-test is $900(\mathrm{X}=900)$ as follows; (a) mean is 30 and standard deviation is 11,34

Table 7
The criteria level of student's ability in control class

| Level Ability | The Criteria |
| :--- | :--- |
| High | $(\bar{x})+\mathrm{S}$ |
|  | $30+11,34=41,34$ |
| Medium | $(\bar{x})-S$ |
|  | $\leftrightarrow(\bar{x})+S$ |
|  | $30-11,34 \leftrightarrow 30+$ |
|  | 11,34 |
|  | $18,66 \leftrightarrow 41,34$ |


| Low | $(\bar{x})-\mathrm{S}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $30-11,34$ |  |
|  | 18,66 |
|  |  |

$\operatorname{Mean}(\bar{x})=30$
Standard Deviation (S) = 11,34
Table 8
The level of students' ability in control group

| Level | The Criteria | Frequency <br> number of the <br> students | Percentage |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| Highest | More than 41,34 | 25 | $83 \%$ |
| Medium | Between $18,66-$ <br> 41,34 | - | $16 \%$ |
| Lowest | Lest than 18,66 |  | - |
| Total | $\mathbf{3 0}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |  |

From the data above it can be seen that the highest students' abilitywho get more than 41,34 are 25 students. The students who are at medium level with score between $18,66-41,34$ are 5 students and none of them in lowest level.

## CONCLUSSION

After analyzing the data to find out the effect of TPS in reading comprehension, the researcher get conclusion as follows:

1. The learners felt more enjoyable and interested in learning reading comprehension by using Think-PairShare strategy. It is showed by their enthusiasm while the researcher applies this technique for them.
2. Think-Pare-Share strategy is suitable to apply in teaching reading because it can improve the students' achievement in reading comprehension.
3. Teaching reading comprehension by using Think-Pair-Share strategy is significantly effects than by using Conventional Method. It is proven based on the mean of experiment group is higher than the mean of control group. The mean of students' score in
experiment class is 41,73 than in control class is 11,34 . There are 28 students who get the highest score in experiment class. They get the mean score more than 55.65 or $93 \%$ students get high score while in control class there are 25 students who get the 41,34 mean score or $83 \%$ as the highest score.

## REFERENCES

Aqib,Zainal.2013,Model-model media danstrategipembelajarankontekstua. Bandung:YramaWidia.
Arikunto,Suharsimi.2010:ProsedurPenelitian SuatuPendekatanPraktik EdisiRevisi 2010, Jakarta:RinekaCipta.
Brown,H.2003.Principles of language learning and teaching.Urbana:University of Illinois.
Istarani. 2011, 58 model pembelajaraninovativ.Medan:Mediap ersada

Kamil at all.2003,Teaching Reading.Chicago:Shell Education LieAnita.2002. Cooperative Learning Memperaktekkan Cooperative Learning.Jakarta: Grasindo
McNamara,
Danielle.2006.Reading
Comprehension Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, New York.
Nunan, D. 2003. Practical English Language Teaching. New York: McGraw Hill.
Serravallo,Jennifer. 2010, Teaching Reading in small group.United States of America:Heinemann
Slavin, R. (1988). Cooperative learning.New York: Longman.

