



INCREASING THE STUDENTS' ABILITY IN READING COMPREHENSION BY USING GIVE ONE GET ONE STRATEGY AT THE EIGHTH GRADE OF SMP NEGERI 3 MANDREHE 2020/2021

Adieli Laoli¹, Elwin Piarawan Zebua²

¹Universitas Nias

email: adielilaoli@unias.ac.id

²Universitas Nias

email: elwinpiarawanzebua@unias.ac.id

Abstract: Reading activity has one of the ways to catch up information, to know enough science concepts, to know more knowledge, to understand scientific books and technology written in the English language. Through reading the reader may have satisfaction and comfort. Factually, the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe were unable to comprehend a descriptive text fully, lack vocabulary, unable to determine the main idea and the students were unable to identify the features and generic structure. To overcome the problems, Give One Get One Strategy was implemented to increase the students' ability in reading comprehension descriptive text. The research method was Classroom Action Research (CAR), conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of two meetings. The result of the data in Cycle I that there were 3 students (15%) in fail level, 12 students (60%) less level, 2 students (10%) in the enough level, 3 students (15%) in the good level, and 0 student in the very good level. The average of the students' value was 52.5. This result showed that the students were unsuccessful. In Cycle II that there were 12 students (60 %) in the enough level, 6 students (30%) in the good level, and 2 students (10%) in the very good level. The average of the students' value is 74.5. The result showed that the students' reading comprehension was increased.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Give One Get One Strategy, CAR

1. INTRODUCTION

Reading is one of the important basic skills in learning English besides listening, speaking, and writing. Reading activity has one of the ways to catch up information, to know enough science concepts, to know more knowledge, to understand scientific books and technology written in the English language. Through reading the reader may have satisfaction and comfort. In short, reading has an activity

by which we can improve our general knowledge, get information, and pleasure. Lewin in Nur (2017:47) stated that reading is understanding the meaning of a text in reading activity, the reader makes interaction among eyes and mind to gain what the author extend.

In a reading activity, someone did not only read a text but also has to be able to comprehend the text. According to Heilman in Sriwahyuni (2014:2)

Reading comprehension is a process of making sense of written ideas through meaningful interpretation and interactions with language” In other words, comprehension would be reached in the condition that a reader has able to interact and to interpret what the author wants to express on his/her written or printed language.

In the syllabus of *curriculum* (2013) particularly for the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe, the competence standard that should be reached by the students in comprehending the meaning of written functional text and simple short essay in descriptive related to the environs. Also, basic competence states that responding the meaning of the short functional text that is accurately, fluently to the environs. Furthermore, in indicator states that the students should read the descriptive

text aloud and clearly, identifying the meaning of descriptive, identify the communicative purpose of descriptive text. Ideally, the students should reach the competence standard that is provided in the syllabus. The MCC standard in the school is 63.

Based on the researchers’ observation in the field at the eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe, the problem of the students in learning reading comprehension, the students’ difficulty to comprehend descriptive text. This is caused by the lack of the students’ vocabulary so that they cannot comprehend the words in their daily language. Furthermore, the students were unable to determined the main idea that concerns in a descriptive text so that they cannot get the points. Next, the students could not identify the features and generic structure.

The factors above had become a series of problems and needed more attention. In this case, the English teacher as educator and motivator an important

role to design a teaching strategy that is interested, appropriate, and enjoyable for the students in teaching and learning processes.

Regarding the facts above, to find out appropriate strategies to increase the students’ ability in reading comprehension. They should view themselves as the facilitator, helps each student to discover what works best. The English teacher has the responsibility to be always creative and active to apply reading instruction to increase the students’ comprehension. As Braunger and Lewis (2004:66) say that to be effective in making meaning, students need to learn appropriate strategies for orchestrating the information provided in the text. The readers thought as they read, not only understand the text but also about the strategies and processes they are using to construct their understanding.

Hence, the researchers were inspired to apply the Give One, Get One Strategy to increase the students’ ability in reading comprehension. The researcher uses this strategy so that the researcher can build the students’ comprehension of reading. Give One, Get One Strategy has most effective in teaching reading comprehension, assessing students to brainstorm the words or phrases. According to Brunner (2011:10), “Give One, Get One gives students the opportunity select partners with whom to share information and get new information about an assigned topic”. Mekulecky (2010:10) asserts that Give One, Get One Strategy reading comprehension is a simple reading strategy that effectively gives and gets ideas from their partner.

Review of literature

Definition of Reading Comprehension

According to Haris and Hodges (2011: 9)), Reading comprehension is the construction of the meaning of written or

spoken communication through a reciprocal, holistic interchange of ideas between the interpreter and message. It means that reading comprehension is thinking processes of interpreter, that the content of the meaning is influenced by that person's prior knowledge and experience.

Klinger, Vaughn and Boardman (2007 : 8) confirming that reading comprehension is a multi component, highly complex process that involves many interaction between readers and what they bring to the text (previous knowledge, strategy use) as well as variables related to the text itself (interest in text, understanding of text types).

Based on the experts opinions, it can be concluded that reading comprehension has the process of getting the information by processing the reader's mind to understand the meaning of the reading text

Level of Reading Comprehension

There were four categories of reading comprehension. As stated by Burns in Nasution (2018:268) is divided into four categories:

a) Literal comprehension

Reading for literal comprehension acquiring information that is stated directly in a selection. In literal reading, the main ideas are directly stated in the text. The reader needs only to understand exactly what is stated to receive the author's literal message. Literal comprehension is generally accepted as the most simple or basic comprehension skill and one that requires little thinking and reasoning. Recognizing stated main ideas details, causes, effect and sequences as the basis and understanding of vocabulary, sentences meaning, and paragraph meaning is important.

b) Interpretation

Interpretive reading identifies the way to read between the lines of making inferences. This is the process of deriving ideas that implied rather than directly stated. Skill for this level of comprehension includes:

- Finding main ideas of passage in which main ideas are not directly stated
- Finding cause and effect relationship when they are not directly stated
- Determining referents of pronouns
- Determining referents of adverbs
- Inferring omitted words
- Detecting moods
- Detecting author's purpose in writing.
- Drawing conclusion

c) Critical Reading

Critical comprehension is evaluating written material, comparing the ideas discovered in the material with known standards and drawing conclusions about their accuracy, appropriateness and timeliness. When the reader read critically, they evaluate what is read. The critical reader must be an active reader, questioning, searching for facts and suspending judgment until he or she considered all of material. They examine critically the thoughts of the author, which have been identified through the lower level of comprehension and judge their validity or worth.

d) Creative Reading

In creative reading, the reader must be able to think and to use their imaginations. Creative reading going beyond what the author has written, applying the ideas from the text to new situations and recombining the

author's ideas with other ideas to form new concepts or to expand old ones. The reader must understand cause- effect relationship in a text although it is not stated directly. Through creative reading, the reader creates something new ideas, the solution to a problem, a new way of looking at something from the ideas gleaned from the text.

Process of Reading Comprehension

According to Nunan (2003: 70), there are three models of reading processes, as follows:

a) Bottom-up models

Bottom-up models consist of lower-level reading processes. Students start with fundamental basics of letter and sound recognition, which in turn allows from morpheme recognition followed by word recognition, building up to the identification of grammatical structure, sentences and longer texts. Letters, letter clusters, words, phrases, sentences, longer text, and finally meaning is the order in achieving comprehension. Within a bottom-up approach to reading, the most typically classroom focus is on what we call intensive reading. Intensive reading involves a short reading passages followed by textbooks used to teach first and second language reading using in interactive reading approach.

b) Top-down models

Top-down models, on the other hand, begin with the idea that comprehension resides in the reader. The reader uses background knowledge, makes prediction, and searches the text to confirm or reject the predictions that are made.

c) Interactive models

The models that are accepted as the most comprehensive description of the reading processes are interactive reading. An interactive approach to reading would include aspects of both intensive and extensive reading. We need to provide learners with shorter passages to teach specific reading skills and strategies explicitly. We also need to encourage learners to read longer texts without an emphasis on testing their skills. Extensive reading provides opportunities to practice strategies introduced during intensive reading instruction.

2. METHOD

Classroom Action Research (CAR) is a systematic inquiry with the goal of informing practice in particular situation. Furthermore, Corey (2012) defines Classroom Action Research as the process through which practitioners study their own practice to solve their personal practical problems. It means that CAR is collaborative activity where practitioners work together to help another design and carry out investigation in their classroom.

In addition, Kemmis and McTaggart in Schmuck (2009:23) state that CAR is deliberate, solution-oriented investigation that is group or personally owned and conducted. It is characterized by spiraling cycles of problem identification, systematic data collection, reflection, analysis, data-driven action taken, and finally problem redefinition. The linking of term "action" and "research" highlights the essential features of this method; tying out ideas in practice as means of increasing knowledge about or improving curriculum, teaching and learning.

The subject of this research was the students at eighth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe. There were 3 classes and the researcher chose 20 students of class VIII-1 of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe as the informant. The concepts of CAR according to Arikunto, Suhardjono and Supardi (2011:17-22) consist of four components they are: a) Planning, is a process of Classroom Action Research that is arranged based on preliminary study. From the study, the researcher will get the general description about the problem faced in the field; b) Action, is the process of teaching-learning activity in teaching vocabulary by implementing Give One Get One Strategy; c) Observation is searching evidence about the students' learning activities and the researcher's activities during the teaching-learning process; d) Reflection is an activity of analyzing, interpreting, and explaining all of the information gotten from the observation of what have been done in the action.

The quantitative data get from the students' evaluation sheet. To evaluate and analyze the data the researcher used cloze test. For the right answer is 1 (one), and the wrong answer is 0 (zero). The researcher used the formula suggested Tuckman in Nurgiantoro (1986: 3345-347) as follows:

$$TP = FB/N \times 100$$

Which:

TP : Value

Fb : Obtained score

N : Maximum score

100 : constant number

After getting the value, the researcher classified the value according to the degree of ability as follows.

- The value between 0 – 34 classified as fail
- The value between 35 – 62 classified as less

- The value between 63 - 74 classified as enough
- The value between 75 – 84 classified as good
- The value between 85 – 100 classified as very good.

The classification was compared to the Minimum Competence Criterion (MCC) that has been decided in SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe that is 63. In Cycle I in second meeting, the researcher gave the test for the students. There were many students who could not reach the MCC or unsuccessful. So, the researcher continued to Cycle II and gave the text in the second meeting. They got the mark at least 63 until 100. Or it can be classified "Enough" and "Very Good". Finally all of the students pass on MCC or they were successful. Therefore, the researcher stopped conducting the research and made a report.

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The the research finding based on the result of the observation sheet and evaluation sheet would be explained in the part. The researcher did the research in two cycles. There was the improvement of the students' ability in reading comprehension from Cycle I until Cycle II.

In Cycle I, the result of the students' evaluation, there were 3 students (15%) in the fail level, 12 students (60%) in the less level, 2 students (10%) in the enough level and 3 students (15%) in the good level. The average of the students' value is 52.5. The students still were unable to comprehend and to get information or content in the text. This result was poor but comprehensible, because this strategy never taught to the students before, it was the first time for them to learn it.

The students also got difficulties, such as there were some of the students got difficulties in translating their responses in the student's response sheets, they

wrote down their response in Indonesian, some of the students still felt afraid to answer the researcher's questions and their friends' questions because they were shy if their answers were wrong, the students were lack to master grammar and vocabulary.

So that the students depended on their friend's and the teacher's help or to the dictionary to find the meaning of the certain words (difficult words), the motivation of the students in reading was low, some of the students were not serious when they were reading the text, the students did not respect their friends' opinion, the researcher's explanation was so fast and incomplete, it made the students confused to follow the instructions, the students who were clever still dominated the class, some of the students still made a noisy in teaching and learning process, the students were still be afraid in asking questions to the researcher.

To overcome those weaknesses, the researcher was done some improvements such as, the researcher would motivate the students to be brave in responding the researcher's questions and the researcher would remind the students that in this process they had a right to write down everything what they want to write, they had a right to express anything in the students' response sheets, the researcher would motivate the students to pay attention when the researcher explains Give One Get One strategy, the researcher would give more clearly explanation to avoid the students' confusion and build the students' vocabulary by asking them to bring the dictionary. Based on the result above, the MCC could not be achieved, and then the researcher continued the research.

In Cycle II, the result of the students' evaluation paper there were no students in the fail level and less level anymore. There are 2 students (10%) in the good level and 6 students (30%) in the very

good level and 12 students (60%) in enough level. The average of the students' value is 74.5. All of the students are able to get information and comprehend content from the text.

They could choose and determine the best answers based the researcher's question in the evaluation sheet. This result could be reached because of the students' willingness to study English. A part of it, the improvement of both the students' and the researcher's weaknesses and repetition of explaining Give One Get One from Context Strategy procedures supported and increased the students' ability in reading comprehension.

Finally, all of the identification of the problems had been finished by using Give One Get One Strategy. Based on the exposure of the researchers, it can be concluded that Give One Get One Strategy could be used in teaching reading especially in reading comprehension for students' and so easy to conduct. The strategy could help students and encourage student's predictions list give and get so it is easy to understand the text that will be gave by the teacher.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the result of data analysis of the research, the students' achievement in Cycle I showed the highest mark was 80 and the lowest mark was 40. The average of the students' marks in Cycle I was 52.5. While the Minimum Competence Criterion has been decided as 63. It means that the students could not pass the MCC. So, the researcher continues to Cycle II.

The students' achievement in Cycle II showed the highest mark was 90 and the lowest mark was 65. The average of the students' marks in Cycle II was 74.5. So, all of the students pass on the MCC, or students' ability in Cycle II in reading comprehension was an increase. As the

result, the researcher does not continued in the next cycle. The students' achievement in cycle is higher.

In addition, the average of the students' score shows that the students of SMP N 3 Mandrehe at the eighth year were able to comprehend the reading text especially in descriptive text to achieve comprehension level. The students' average score is higher than the MCC that is 63 points. It can be said that the students are successful. Therefore this research is stopped by the researcher in this cycle.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher could conclude that the Give One Get One Strategy can increase the students' ability in reading comprehension, especially in the descriptive text at the eighth grade of SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

As the researcher accomplishes the research, the researcher gives her deep and immeasurable thanks to God who has bestowed blesses, strength and health upon her study in IKIP Gunungsitoli. In the process of arranging this thesis, it is not possible to be completed without help, guidance and prayers of blessing from valuable people. The researcher is deeply grateful to many people who supported her to finish this thesis.

REFERENCES

- Arbiansyah, 2014. The Effect of Using Give One Get One Strategy on Students' Reading Comprehension on Narrative Text of the Second Year at SMAN 12 Pekanbaru. Pekanbaru
- Afrizaman Deni, 2016. Teaching Reading Through Reciprocal Teaching Strategy. ELT Perspective. ISSN: 2354-7340
- Arikunto, Suharsimi, Suhardjono and Supardi. 2011. *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*, Bumi Aksara, Jakarta.
- Djiwandono, M. Soenardi. 2008, *Tes Bahasa*, PT Indeks, Jakarta.
- Driscoll, 2010, Reading Framework for the 2011 National Assessment of Educational Progress, National Assessment Governing Board U.S Department of Educational, Washington
- Ferrance, 2000, *Teaching, Learning and Action Research*. Addison Wesley Publishing Company, United States of America.
- Grabe, William & Stoller, Fredericka L., 2002, *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Pearson Education. Ltd, England.
- Grellet, 1981 *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. The Guilford Press. New York.
- Haladynah F, 1999, *Assessing Young Language Learners*, Cambridge: New York.
- June Preszler, 2005. *Strategies to Help Struggling Readers Grade 4-12*. Black Hills Region 7 : South Dakota Department of Education
- Kemmis, Stephen and Mc. Taggart Robbin. 2010. *The Action Research Planner*. Australia: Deakin University.
- Kispaal, 2008, *Effective Teaching of Inference Skills for Reading*, Foxit Corporation
- Mc Niff, 1991. *Fundamental of Research Methodology and Statistic*. New Age International.
- Mikulecky. 2011, *Advanced reading power : extensive reading, vocabulary building, comprehension skill, reading faster*, Pearson Education. London
- Nunan, David, 2003, *Practical English Language Teaching*, The McGraw-Hill Companies, New York.

- Nurdiyantoro, Burhan, 1986, *Penilaian Pembelajaran Bahasa*, BPFE-Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta.
- Nur Herdiana Andi, 2017. *Improving Students' Ability Reading Skill Through Interactive Approach at the First Grade of SMAN 1 Mare, Bone*
- Opitz, M, 2004, *Enhanced Scope and Sequence*, Department of Education, Virginia.
- Scott. 2009. *Reading Powder : Teaching Students To Think While They Read*. Canada: Pembroke publishers
- SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe. 2020/2021. *Silabus Bahasa Inggris Kelas VIII SMP Negeri 3 Mandrehe*
- Sriwahyuni, Wahyudi. 2014 *Developing reading Comprehension of the Eleventh Grade Students Through Think Pair Share Technique of English Language Teaching Society (ELTS)*. ISSN 2331-1841
- Stone Randi, 2009, *Best Practices for Teaching Reading*, Corwin Press, United States of America.
- Westwood, 2008, *What teachers need to know about Reading and writing difficulties*. ACER Press, Australia.
- Williams, R and Dallas, D, 1983, *aspects of vocabulary in the readability of content area L2 educational Textbooks: a case Study*. In J. C. Alderson and A. H. Urquhart, *Reading in a Foreign Language*, London: Logman.
- William & Stoller, Fredericka L., 1984, *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Pearson Education. Ltd, England.