

# THE EFFECT OF USING COOPERATIVE INTEGRATED READING COMPOSITION (CIRC) TEACHING MODEL IN TEACHING READING NARRATIVE AND HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT AT GRADE XI SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL 1 AKABILURU

Sri Indah Pertiwi<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Desmawati Radjab<sup>2</sup>, M.Pd, Fitrawati, S.S., M.Pd<sup>3</sup>  
Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris  
FBS Universitas Negeri Padang  
Email: s\_indahpertiwi@yahoo.com

## Abstrak

Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah mengetahui pengaruh dari penggunaan model CIRC dalam pengajaran membaca teks *Narrative* dan *Hortatory Exposition* pada kelas XI. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian eksperimen yang membandingkan model CIRC dengan metode yang biasa digunakan oleh guru di sekolah tersebut. Penelitian ini melibatkan dua kelas, yaitu kelas eksperimen dan kelas kontrol. Kedua kelas mendapatkan pre-test pada pertemuan pertama, kemudian perlakuan dari pertemuan kedua sampai dengan pertemuan ketujuh, dan pada pertemuan terakhir mereka akan mendapatkan post-test. Dari penelitian ini disimpulkan bahwa penggunaan model ini dapat memberikan pengaruh yang baik terhadap pemahaman siswa. Hal ini telah dibuktikan dengan uji t, dimana  $t_{hitung} (4.48) > t_{tabel} (1.99)$ .

Key Words: CIRC Model, Narrative Text, Hortatory Exposition Text, Experimental Research.

## A. Introduction

Reading is one of important skills in English language besides writing, speaking, and listening. It is strengthened by Anderson (1999:1) reading is an important English skill to be mastered by ESL/EFL students. Many people believe that reading is an easy thing to do, because they just need to read a text. In fact, it is not as easy as they think. It is proved by the data taken in SMAN 1 Akabiluru.

Based on the preliminary study about Narrative text from two classes of Social Science Class at grade XI, there are only 13 students who passed the minimum mastery standard (SKBM) which is 70. It is the reason why the researcher chose to do a research about this text type. Besides, the researcher also took the mean score of student's National Examination enrolled 2011/2012 academic years is low. The researcher assumes that many students get trouble in

---

<sup>1</sup> The writer of paper from English Department for Graduation Period June 2013

<sup>2</sup> 1<sup>st</sup> advisor, lecturer of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

<sup>3</sup> 2<sup>nd</sup> advisor, lecturer of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang

reading because they are able to read it orally but they cannot understand the idea of the text.

Besides, there are several definitions of reading from experts. Grabe and Stoller (2002:9) also say that reading is the capability of the reader to find the purpose of the text and they can explain the information correctly. In addition, Anderson in Nunan (2003:68) states that reading is a way that is done by a reader to get meaning of the text by merging information and their background knowledge. Similarly, Pang et al (2003:6) also emphasize that reading is a complicated action that engage perception and thought to get the aim of a text. Based on some definitions above, it can be concluded that reading is an activity to get meaning and information from a written text.

Since reading is a purposeful activity, there are also some experts who state about the purposes of reading. Grabe and Stoller (2002:13) mention some purposes of reading, they are: (1) to search for simple information, (2) to skim quickly, (3) to learn from the text, (4) to integrate information, (5) to write and reading to critique texts, (6) for general comprehension. McDonough and Shaw (2003:90) also classify reading into: (1) getting general information, (2) getting specific information, (3) for pleasure or for interest. Moreover, Rivers and Temperley cite in McDonough and Shaw (2003) also brings up several purposes of reading. They are; (1) to obtain information for some purposes, (2) to obtain instructions on how to perform some tasks for our work or daily life, (3) to keep in touch with friends by correspondence or to understand business letters, (4) to know when or where something will take place or what is available, (5) to know what is happening or has happened (as reported in newspapers, magazines, reports), and (6) for enjoyment or excitement.

Thus, the difficulties in reading and understanding text which were found are caused by some factors that come from both students and teacher's side. The first factor from student's side is lack of motivation. The second factor is limited vocabulary that the students have. From teacher's side, the teacher does not offer a new text/material for the students. The last factor is the teaching technique used by the teacher. Teaching technique also takes a big role in learning process.

Based on the researcher's observation, the researcher found that the teacher in the school commonly used a short term quiz to know the students' understanding of the text. The quiz given to the students after they have finished their discussion about the text given in their group. After that the teacher will give a quiz to the students individually. The teacher reads some statements dealing with the text which consist of correct and incorrect statements. The students will respond it by stating whether the statement is true or false by writing it down in their book directly, where "T" for correct statement and "F" for incorrect statement.

Concerned about the technique before, the researcher thinks that the technique is not good enough. It can be seen from the students' ability in understanding the text is not satisfactory enough. Thus, it will be useless when the teacher used inappropriate teaching technique while she already used an interesting material. Hence, the researcher offers an appropriate teaching model which can be used to help the students to comprehend a text; CIRC.

CIRC which stands for Cooperative Integrated Reading Composition is one of models in cooperative learning. Slavin (1995:7) says that CIRC is a comprehensive program for teaching reading and writing in the upper elementary and middle grades. The students will be placed in groups which each consist of about four students and work cooperatively in their group. The same research also has been done by some researchers; they are Madden, Stevens, and Slavin in 1986, Stevens et al in 1987, Mahdum in 2007, and also Erhan Durukan in 2010.

Slavin (1995) states that this model can be applied in reading narrative and expository text. So, the researcher decided to apply it in teaching narrative and hortatory exposition; since hortatory exposition belongs to expository text; to develop students' reading and writing skills. Slavin (1995) also writes some major elements of CIRC, they are (1) Reading Group, (2) Teams, (3) Story Related Activities (Partner reading, Story grammar and Story-related writing, Words out loud, Word meaning, Story retell, Spelling), (4) Partner Checking, (5) test, (6) Direct Instruction in Reading Comprehension, and (7) Integrated Language Art and Writing. From those elements, the researcher only used some elements, they are (a) reading group, (b) story-related activity (partner reading, story grammar, word meaning, story retell), (c) tests, (d) integrated language art and writing.

From the curriculum used for teaching English in the school where the researcher did a research; KTSP (*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*), senior high school students have to learn many monolog texts. However, the eleventh grade students at the second semester only learn three of them; they are narrative, spoof and hortatory exposition text. In this school, the teacher allocates the meeting for reading narrative text are 3 meetings. Meanwhile the allocations for hortatory exposition are 4 meetings.

Narrative text is one of genre that is learned by High School's student. Gerot and Wignell (1994:204) determine the purpose of this text is "to amuse, entertain and to deal with actual or explicit experience in different ways" They also state the generic structures and the significant lexicogrammatical features of the text, they are: (1) Orientation, (2) Evaluation, (3) Complication, (4) Resolution, (5) Re-orientation (optional). Whereas the significant lexicogrammatical features of this text are: (1) Focus on specific and usually individualized participants, (2) Use of material processes, (3) Use of relational processes and mental processes, (4) Use of temporal conjunctions and temporal circumstances, (5) Use of past tense. Besides, there are two types of narrative based on Honig, Diamond, and Gutlohn (2008); they are fiction and Literary Nonfiction. Moreover, they also state some elements of narrative text; setting, character, plot, and theme.

Hortatory exposition text is another genre is also learned by High School's students. Gerrot and Wignell (1994) said that this text type is used to influence the reader or listener that something should or should not be the case. In addition, Refnaldi (2010) also states that this text is a kind of spoken and written text that is proposed to explain to the listeners or readers that something should or should not be done. Here the writer will persuade them to think at the same way with him. It was strengthened by Refnaldi (2010) who states the purpose of this text is to

attract the readers or listeners to think and act like the writer's idea as stated in the text.

Gerot and Wignell (1994) state the generic structures and the significant lexicogrammatical features of the text. Likewise, Refnaldi (2010) also classifies the same generic structure, they are: (1) Thesis, (2) Arguments, (3) Recommendation. Whereas the significant lexicogrammatical features are: (1) Focus on generic human and non human participants, (2) Use of mental and material processes, (3) Use of simple present tense and present perfect tense, (4) Use of temporal connective, and passive voice.

Moreover, the teacher has to select indicators that should be achieved by the students. Based on the purposes of reading by McDonough and Shaw (2003), the researcher decides the indicators of reading consist of:

- a. Identifying the topic of the text.
- b. Finding general and supporting idea from the text.
- c. Guessing the meaning of vocabulary in the text, such as synonym, antonym, reference and definition of the word.

The researcher also sets several indicators for narrative text based on Gerot and Wignell (1994) and also from Honig, Diamond, and Gutlohn (2008), they are:

- a. Identifying the text type (Narrative text).
- b. Indicating the purpose of the text.
- c. Indicating the language features, text elements (setting, characters, etc) and generic structure of the text (Orientation, Evaluation, Complication, Resolution)

Furthermore, the researcher also sets several indicators for hortatory exposition text based on Gerrot and Wignell (1994) and Refnaldi (2010), they are:

- a. Identifying the text type (Hortatory exposition text).
- b. Indicating the purpose of the text.
- c. Indicating the language features and generic structure of the text (Thesis, Arguments, and Recommendation)

## **B. Methodology**

This research was designed based on an experimental research that belongs to quantitative research. The researcher used *Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design* as explained by Gay (2009) that this group design will involve at least two groups. Those groups are experimental and control group. Experimental group got the new treatment in teaching reading, by using CIRC model, meanwhile, the control class got teaching technique commonly used by the teacher; a True-False quiz.

The population of this research was the students at grade XI in SMAN.1 Akabiluru which consists of four classes. Meanwhile the samples are two classes with same ability in the second grade students enrolled 2012/2013 academic years. The classes are XI.IPS 1 and XI.IPS 2. The researcher used random sampling to decide the sample of the research. From those classes, one class was control group and another one was experimental group.

The researcher applied the model of teaching for eight meetings. Both groups were given pre-test in the first meeting. After that, the second until the fourth meetings were the treatment for narrative text, the fifth until seventh meetings were the treatment for hortatory exposition text. At the end of the research (eighth meeting), the researcher gave post-test.

Since this research is a quantitative research, the instrument used was a test in form multiple choice which consist of 40 questions for around 80 minutes. Before the test was given to the students, the instrument had been tested first. The testing of the instrument was done in another school in the same grade with the sample. After the instrument tested to other students in different school, the researcher checked the validity, item difficulties, discriminative index, and reliability of the test, as followed:

### **1. Validity**

Validity is used to check whether the test is valid or not. The criterion of validity is:  $r_{xy} > r_{table}$ . After the researcher checked the validity of the test on the try out, from 40 questions, the researcher got 7 questions which were invalid because  $r_{xy} < r_{table}$ . They are items number 1, 9, 13, 14, 18, 35, and 37, where the  $r_{table}$  from 36 students is 0.329. Those items were discarded from the instrument.

### **2. Difficulties Index (P)**

In order to identify the difficulty of each test item, the researcher used Difficulties Index. After the researcher checked the difficulties index of the test on the try out, from 40 questions, the researcher got 1 question cannot be used for the research because the criteria of the test is easy and the item was discarded.

### **3. Item Discrimination (D)**

The ability of the test to differentiate the students' ability can be measured by using Item Discrimination (D). After the researcher checked the discrimination index of the test on the try out, from 40 questions, the researcher got 2 questions cannot be used for the research because the criteria of the test is bad and those items were discarded. They are items number 31 and 34.

### **4. Reliability**

The reliability will concern to the reliability of the text which means two samples have a consistent score with the same test (Brown: 2004). After the researcher checked the reliability of the test, the researcher found that the reliability of the test is 0.81. It means the test had a very high reliability.

After the researcher did those test, the researcher got 30 questions from 40 questions used for the instrument of the research. The test was given as pre test and post test. In the first meeting, the researcher gave the test to both of the sample called pre-test. After that the researcher applied different treatment to both of experimental and control classes. This action was done from the

second meeting until the seventh meeting; the control class got a common technique used by the teacher; meanwhile the experimental class got CIRC model. Finally, both of them got post-test at the last meeting in order to know the result of the treatment.

The test used in post-test was similar with the test used in the pre-test. After did a post-test, the score of student's pre-test and post-test were analyzed and compared in order to identify whether the result of experimental classes is better than the result of control class. To analyze the data, the researcher will use t-test to check the hypothesis. Before checking the hypothesis, the researcher did normality and homogeneity test first.

### 1. Normality

Normality is used to see whether the sample come from a population which is distributed normally. The researcher used Lilieford test. If the  $L_0 < L_{\text{tabel}}$ , the distribution of the sample is normal.

### 2. Homogeneity

Homogeneity is used to know whether two groups of sample is homogeneity or not. If  $F_{\text{observed}} < F_{\text{table}}$  the sample is homogeneity, and if  $F_{\text{observed}} > F_{\text{table}}$  the sample is not homogeneity.

### 3. Hypothesis

After finished the normality and homogeneity of the data, the researcher come to the hypothesis test (t-test).

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2} \left( \frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2} \right)}}$$

This t-test is used to analyze the differences in the test had given to both of classes. If the t-test is  $\leq t_{\text{table}}$ , so the hypothesis proposed in chapter one is rejected.

## C. Discussion

### 1. Data Description

The sample of this research was XI.IPS 1 (experimental group) and XI.IPS 2 (control group). Actually, the numbers of the students in XI.IPS 1 are 41 students, and in XI.IPS 2 are 40 students. However, not all of those students were participated in the pretest, treatment, and posttest. Related to this case, Tuckman in Zafri (1999) states when some of samples who are involved in a research did not follow the research fully, the researcher should omit those students because it will ruin the result of the research. From XI.IPS 1, there is 1 student and from XI.IPS 2 there are 7 students who skipped some meeting of the research. So, the total number of the students who were participated fully are in XI.IPS 1 are 40 students, and in XI.IPS 2 are 33 students.

At the first meeting of the research, the researcher gave pretest to both experimental and control group. The highest score in the experimental group was 83 and the lowest score was 40. The mean of this group was 53.70. Meanwhile, the highest score in the control group was 77 and the lowest score was 40. The mean of this group was 54.48.

At the last meeting or the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the research, the researcher gave posttest for both experimental and control group. The highest score in the experimental group was 90 and the lowest score was 63. The mean of this group was 79.08. Meanwhile, the highest score in the control group was 87 and the lowest score was 57. The mean of this group was 73.30.

## 2. Data Analysis and Finding

Before the pre-test data can be analyzed by using t-test, the researcher should analyze the normality and homogeneity of the pretest first. To find the normality and the homogeneity of the pre-test, we need to find the value for mean ( $\bar{X}$ ), and variant ( $S^2$ ), and standard deviation (SD). From the calculation of pre-test from experimental group, the researcher got the value of mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) for is 53.7, variant ( $S^2$ ) is 72.27, and standard deviation (SD) is 8.5. Meanwhile the pre-test data from control group are, the value of mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) for is 54.48, variant ( $S^2$ ) is 55.53, and standard deviation (SD) is 7.45.

From the normality test of the pre-test data, the researcher found the Lo of experimental group was 0.0469 and Lo of control group was 0.0444. In addition, the  $L_{table}$  of experimental group was 0.1402 and control group was 0.1543. It can be concluded that from experimental group, Lo (0.0469) < Lt (0.1402), and from control group, Lo (0.0444) < Lt (0.1543). So, the researcher assumes the distribution is normal. Besides, from the Homogeneity test of the pre-test data, the researcher found that;  $F_{observed}$  was 1.30 and  $F_{table}$  was 1.74. So,  $F_{observed}$  (1.30) <  $F_{table}$  (1.74), it means the two group have a homogeneity variant.

After that, the data of the post-test also should be analyzed at the same way of analyzing the pre-test data. From the calculation of the post-test from experimental group, the researcher got the value of mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) for is 79.08, variant ( $S^2$ ) is 18.61, and standard deviation (SD) is 4.31. Meanwhile the pre-test data from control group are, the value of mean ( $\bar{X}$ ) for is 83.30, variant ( $S^2$ ) is 29.37, and standard deviation (SD) is 5.42.

From the normality test of the post-test data, the researcher found the Lo of experimental group was 0.0621 and Lo of control group was 0.0845. In addition, the  $L_{table}$  of experimental group was 0.1402 and control group was 0.1543. It can be concluded that from experimental group, Lo (0.0621) < Lt (0.1402), and from control group, Lo (0.0845) < Lt (0.1543). So, the researcher assumes the distribution is normal. Besides, from the Homogeneity test of the pre-test data, the researcher found that; ;  $F_{observed}$  was 1.58 and  $F_{table}$  was 1.74. So,  $F_{observed}$  (1.58) <  $F_{table}$  (1.74), it means the two group have a homogeneity variant.

### 3. Hypothesis Testing

When the normality and the homogeneity of the test founded, the researcher continue the analysis to the value of t-test (hypothesis). Based on the t-test of pretest data, the researcher found  $t_{\text{observed}} (-0.22) < t_{\text{table}} (1.99)$ , it means  $t_{\text{table}} > t_{\text{observed}}$ . The conclusion is the hypothesis is rejected. Whereas the t-test of posttest data, the researcher found  $t_{\text{observed}} (4.48) > t_{\text{table}} (1.99)$ , it means  $t_{\text{observed}} > t_{\text{table}}$ . The conclusion is the hypothesis is accepted.

### 4. Discussion

In this research, the researcher had seen the effect of using CIRC teaching model toward students' understanding in narrative and hortatory exposition text. It accords with the theory stated by Slavin in chapter I that the CIRC model is appropriate to be applied in Narrative and expository text. The researcher had applied the CIRC model in teaching Narrative and Hortatory Exposition text, and the result of the research showed the positive effect.

As explained in the previous study, some researchers had done some researches about CIRC. The first research was done by Madden, Stevens, and Slavin in 1986, then in 1987 the second research was done by Stevens. Recently, Mahdum in 2007 and Durukan in 2010 also did the same research. All of them state that this model of teaching has better effect than a teaching technique which was being compared.

As well as on those researches, this research also showed a better result of applying CIRC model than a common technique used by the teacher in the school. It can be seen from the mean score of experimental class in post test was 79.08 meanwhile the mean score of control class was 73.30

### D. Conclusion and Suggestion

Based on the hypothesis testing, the value of  $t_{\text{observed}}$  was bigger than the value of the  $t_{\text{table}}$  at the level of significance 0.05. The  $t_{\text{observed}}$  was 4.48 and the  $t_{\text{table}}$  was 1.99. Based on the data analysis and the finding in the chapter IV, it can be concluded that the applying of CIRC teaching model gives better effect in improving students' reading comprehension at the second grade students of SMAN 1 Akabiluru in 2012/2013 academic year. Therefore,  $H_1$  was accepted.

The writer proposes several suggestions in using CIRC model in teaching:

1. For teachers, it is advisable to use an interesting way of teaching. In this case, the researcher suggests the teachers to use the CIRC model continually.
2. For teachers, it is suggested to apply CIRC model, not only in Narrative and Expository genres, but also in other genres.
3. For the school committee, it is suggested to socialize the CIRC model, not only to English teachers but also to the other teachers from other subjects.
4. For the researcher and other researchers, it is expected to do further research about CIRC teaching model in other schools and other materials.



Note: This article was written based on writer's thesis that is supervised by Dr. Desmawati Radjab, M.Pd and Fitrawati, S.S., M.Pd

### **Bibliography**

- Anderson, J. Neil. (1999). *Exploring Second Language Reading: Issues and Strategies*. Canada: Heinle & Heinle Publisher
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2009). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara.
- Brown, Douglas. (2004). *Language Assesment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Longman
- Depdiknas. (2006). *Kurikulum 2004 standar kompetensi mata pelajaran bahasa inggris sekolah menengah pertama dan madrasah tsanawiah*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, Peter. (2000). *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Gay, L.R. 2009. *Educational Research*. New Jersey: Pearson Education Inc.
- Gerot, Linda and Peter Wignell. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Antipodean Educational.
- Grabe, William., & Stoller, Fredericka L. (2002) *Teaching and Researching Reading*. London: Pearson Education
- Grabe, William., & Stoller, Fredericka L. (2001). Reading for Academic Purposes. In Celce, Marianne., & Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a Second of Foreign Language (3<sup>rd</sup> edition)*. Boston: Heinle, Cengage Learning
- Honig, Bill., Diamond, Linda., & Gutlohn, Linda. (2008). *Teaching Reading Sourcebook (2<sup>nd</sup> edition)*. California: Arena Press
- Marksheffel, Ned D. (1966). *Better Reading in the Secondary School*. Oregon: Ronald Press
- McDonough, Jo., & Shaw, Christopher. (2003). *Materials and Methods in ELT: A Teacher's Guide, Second Edition*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing
- Nunan, David. (2003). *Practical English Language Teaching*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc
- Refnaldi. (2010). *Essay Writing*. Padang: UNP Padang

Sharan, Sholomo. (1999). *Handbook of Cooperative Learning*. London: Praeger Westport

Zafri. (1999). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Padang: UNP Padang

