Applying Collaborative Strategic Reading Strategy in Improving Reading Comprehension Achievement of 7th Grade Students at Buddhis Bodhicitta School

Wednie Aprillia Tantry[1], Rohani Ganie[2], Liza Amalia Putri[3]*

[1,2,3] *English Department, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia*

Abstract. This study attempts to explore the application of collaborative strategic reading strategy in improving reading comprehension achievement of 7th grade students at Buddhis Bodhicitta School and difficulties faced by the students in learning it. The methodology used in this research is Classroom Action Research (CAR). The data of this research are the result of reading tests taken from pre-test I & II and supported by the results of the questionnaires. The subjects of the research are forty-four students of the seventh grade of Buddhis Bodhicitta School. The findings of the research are the mean of pre-test I is 54,3 and the mean of post-test I is 70,2, the mean of pre-test II is 73,6 and the mean of post-test II is 75. It is concluded that using collaborative strategic reading can improve students' achievement in reading comprehension. Then, there are some difficulties faced by the students in learning reading comprehension such as difficult to get the point of the text in preview strategy, did not know the meaning of difficult words, wrote the text by using their own words, did not know how to wrap up the text, difficult to work in a group, and could not follow the instruction.

Keywords: Collaborative Strategic Reading, Reading, Reading Comprehension.

1   Introduction

Communication is an activity that human does to express their feelings, ideas, knowledge, information, and experience. To communicate and establish a relationship with others, people use language as a tool of their communication (Wardhaugh, 1986). If people did not have a tool to communicate, people's activities and interactions would be very difficult. Wardhaugh (1986) states that language is what the members of a particular society speak. In communication, there is language. It is impossible to communicate without language.

A language is a tool which is used by human to express their feelings, ideas, knowledge, information, and experience to another human or a media to communicate with other human or

* Corresponding author at: English Department, Universitas Sumatera Utara, Indonesia

E-mail address: ganierohani@gmail.com

creatures. It is a communication media between speaker and listener or writer and reader. There is no human activity with no use of language. There are millions of languages in this world; one of them is the English language. Therefore, to know and to understand the English language whether it is spoken or written, we have to learn.

The English language has been considered as one of the most spoken languages in the world. Harmer (1983) states that however, every language has its own rules and uniqueness, English does too. English has four basic language skills. They are listening, speaking, writing, and reading skills.

Reading, as one of the language skills, has a very important role (Romli, 2014). According to Grellet (1981), reading is a construction process of guessing and an active process of deriving meaning. Reading is one of the most important foreign language skills. Students who learn the English language should comprehend the reading for several purposes. However, to comprehend and improve reading skills, it needs a suitable method.

Carnie (1990) says that reading is the ability to get information from the text. The habit of reading also helps readers to receive new words or phrases which for sure will come across in their daily conversation. Harmer stated that "reading is not a passive skill. Reading is an active occupation. It involves many skills as guessing, predicting, checking, and asking oneself question".

Reading comprehension is defined as the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language (Catherin, 2002). It is also a strategic process that can be taught. It means that a good reader is one who understands what they read and can interact with the text to get meaning from their reading.

From those statements above, it is understood that comprehension is the most important in reading. Since comprehension of the text is the principal goal in reading.

Comprehension or understanding in every reading activity is an important part of skill learning. The readers must be able to read a text consisting of many sentences and select the main idea to which all the sentences refer. After the reader can comprehend what the most important thought is, they need to be able to identify the details that support the main idea. He must think about what they read to interpret the meaning as well as to get the factual information given. Yet, reading comprehension can be described as understanding a text that is read, or the process of constructing meaning from a text.

Good reading comprehension will be accomplished if learners have four reading abilities: determining the main idea, guessing word meanings, finding detailed information, and making inferences. Grabe and Stoller (2014) state reading as the ability to draw meaning from the

printed page and interpret the information appropriately. They mention seven purposes of reading, which are:

1. Reading to search for simple information.
2. Reading to skim.
3. Reading to learn from the text.
4. Reading to integrate the information.
5. Reading to write (search information needed for writing).
6. Reading to critique texts.
7. Reading for general comprehension.

A readers' purpose determines how he treats a passage and which comprehension skills he uses. Because what the readers get from reading also depends on what they bring to the reading of selection and the purpose for reading it.

The idea of this research comes from research by Agustiara (2014). According to Agustiara (2014) in her research at SMPN 13 Bandar Lampung, she found that the students still faced some problems and difficulties in answering the questions in English especially in answering the questions in reading comprehension exercise. The same case was found in the 7th Grade students of Buddhis Bodhicitta School. During the observation, it was found that there were some problems and difficulties faced by the students in their reading, such as: getting the idea or the main idea of the text, finding the important or specific information, finding the reference, and making an inference. The students also do not have the amount of knowledge in vocabulary. This happened for the reading activity in the class only focused on asking students to read a text and answering the questions based on the text without facilitating them to comprehend texts properly. The lack of explanation and monotonous strategy used by the teacher discouraged students to comprehend reading. The other reason is that the writer also experienced those things above because the writer used to study at Buddhis Bodhicitta School and it has happened to most of the students.

Teacher's role is very important to improve the reading ability of the students to solve this problem. Teacher, as the facilitator, needs to have and select a suitable strategy to help the students in improving their reading skill.

In this research, the researcher applied the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) strategy to comprehend a narrative text. Collaborative Strategic Reading is a collaborative strategy that teaches students to use comprehension strategies while working cooperatively (Klingner and Vaughn, 1999). According to Klingner, et al. (2004) Collaborative Strategic Reading helps students learn some specific strategies such as learning in cooperative environment (work in a group), brainstorming and predicting (Preview), monitoring understanding (Click and Clunk), finding the main idea (Get the Gist), and answering questions (Wrap Up).

Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) was found and developed by Klinger & Vaughn (1999). To improve the ability of reading comprehension, one of the available strategies suggested and being discussed here is used the Collaborative Strategic Reading (Klinger & Vaughn, 1999).

Collaborative Strategic Reading is a collaborative strategy that teaches students to use comprehension strategies while working cooperatively (Klingner and Vaughn, 2004). They add the characters feature of collaborative strategic reading are:

1. The four comprehension strategies

The strategies include :

1. Preview

Students preview the entire passage before they read each section. The goals of previewing are (a) for students to learn as much about the passage as they can in a brief period (2-3 minutes), (b) to activate their background knowledge about the topic, and (c) to help them make predictions about what they will learn. Previewing serves to motivate students' interest in the topic and to engage them in active reading from the onset.

2. Click and Clunk

Students click and clunk while reading each section of the passage. The goal of clicking and clunking is to teach students to monitor their reading comprehension and to identify when they have breakdowns in understanding.

3. Get the Gist

Students learn to "get the gist" by identifying the most important idea in a section of text (usually a paragraph). The goal of getting the gist is to teach students to re-state in their own words the most important point as a way of making sure they have understood what they have read.

4. Wrap up

Students learn to wrap up by formulating questions and answers about what they have learned and by reviewing key ideas. The goals are to improve students' knowledge, understanding, and memory of what was read. The best way to teach wrap up is to tell students to use the following question starters to begin their questions: who, what, when, where, why, and how (the 5 Ws and an H).

Students are not only encouraged to work together in comprehending the text but also increasing their responsibility to get and understand the idea which was given by the text well by doing this

activity. The teacher can do this by asking students to mention the elements of the task that will be used to determine the completion criteria.

By using this formation, the teacher can provide feedback on student performance, whether in the form of narrative reports or class reports. There are several techniques were used in obtaining the data; classroom action research, test (pre-test and post-test) and questionnaire.

In this research, the researcher wants to find out if collaborative strategic reading strategy can improve reading comprehension of 7th grade students at Buddhis Bodhicitta School through Collaborative strategic reading strategy (CSR) strategy.

2. Research Method

This research followed the principal working of classroom action research (CAR) that contained four stages they are: planning, implementation of the action, observation, and reflection. It is relevant because the study focuses on a particular problem and a particular group of students in a certain classroom. According to Arikunto (2009), it is action research that is carried out at the classroom aimed to improve learning practice quality.

There are elements in CAR according to Kunandar (2008), which are: (1) Research is an activity to improve an object by using an appropriate methodology rules for getting data and information and then analyze to solve the problem. (2) Acting is an activity that is done for a certain purpose, in cycle sequence form activity. (3) Class is a group of students when at the same time, they receive the same lesson from their teacher.

The procedure of research was conducted by making the classroom action research method. The procedure of research has six meetings which are divided into two cycles. Each cycle has three meetings and involves four phases: planning, acting, observing and reflecting.

a. Planning

According to Arikunto (2010) in action planning, the researcher determined point or event get special attention to be observed, and then make the observation instrument to help the researcher record the class condition when the learning teaching occurs. In this phase, the researcher prepared the lesson plan for six meetings and the researcher also prepares assessment and the equipment that were necessary like a laptop or LCD and paper.

b. Action

Action is the implementation or application of design content in the class, which was used class action (Arikunto, 2010). The acting was the process of doing things. It was the implementation

of planning. The researcher was flexible and welcome to the situation changing in the classroom.

c. Observing

It was a purpose to find out information on activities, such as the students" attitude during the teaching-learning process and to record how well the process of teaching and learning is. Thus, the observation was done through a questionnaire sheet.

d. Reflecting

Reflection is activities to restate what occurred (Arikunto, 2010). Reflecting was been a feedback process forms the action, which was done before. In this phase, the researcher reflected everything that was done. The reflecting process bases on the data: composition task, diary note, and interview sheet. Thus, based on the reflecting process, the second cycle was done. The second cycle was a revision of the first cycle.

This research was conducted at Buddhis Bodhicitta School which is located at Jl. Selam No. 30-11, Medan. This research was held in six days (May 13 until May 22, 2019, at 9 a.m. The population in this research is all of grade VII students at Buddhis Bodhicitta School in the 2018/2019 academic year. It consists of 174 students in 4 classes. In doing this research, random sampling was used as the technique of choosing the sample. In this research, the subjects of the study are the grade VII students at Buddhis Bodhicitta School in 2018/2019 academic year. Not all of the 7th-grade student will be the subjects, only 44 students (18 males and 26 females) who are between the ages of 12-13 will be respondents in this research.

The data in this research is the result of reading test which is answered by the students directly and the result of the questionnaire with the students about the strategy which is used. The researcher uses a written objective test type. They are pre-test and post-test. The questionnaire was given after the post-test. The scale model of measurement used is a Likert scale. The numbers of statements are about 10 points. Each statements consists of 4 possible answers that have been provided; strongly agree (SA), agree (A), disagree (DS) and strongly disagree (SDS).

The researcher used the qualitative descriptive in this study. Data were collected from various sources and techniques such as using the reading test and questionnaires. In this research, the researcher distributed the reading tests to the students. They answered the questions according to the narrative text given in pre-test and post-test to answer the first research question.

a. Pre-test

The pre-test aims to find out the initial ability of the students in reading comprehension. The pre-test in this research was done by giving the students a reading test consists of 10 multiple choice questions and each correct answer will be rated 10. At last, the score of the students was calculated by using the statistical formula as following (Sudjana, 2005):

$$X = \frac{X1\,f1 + X2f2 + \cdots + Xnfn}{f1 + f2 + \cdots + fn}$$

X : the mean of students' score in the pre-test

x : the score of students' in the pre-test

f : the frequency of the students

b. Implementation

The researcher divided the students into 5 groups (one group will consist of 8 students and four groups will consist of 9 students). After that, the researcher taught the students reading comprehension by using the CSR technique steps: Preview, Click and Clunck, Get the Gist, and Wrap Up.

c. Post-test

The post-test was conducted after teaching. Post-test aims to find out whether the technique used could influence the ability of the students in reading comprehension or not. Post-test in this research was done by giving the students a reading test consists of 10 multiple choice questions and each correct answer will be rated 10. At last, the score of the students was calculated by using the statistical formula as following (Sudjana, 2005):

$$Y = \frac{Y1f1 + Y2f2 + \cdots + Ynfn}{f1 + f2 + \cdots + fn}$$

Y : the mean of students' score in the post-test

y : the score of students' in the post-test

f : the frequency of the students

Also the researcher distributed the questionnaire to the students in table forms. They chose the answer according to their choice. In analyzing the questionnaires, the researcher used the following formula:

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100\%$$

In which:

P : percentage

f : frequency

n : number of sample

100% : constant value

3.   Result and Discussion

3.1.1. Cycle 1

The First Meeting

The researcher introduced herself and mentioned her purpose to research the class and explained about Collaborative Strategic Reading techniques. The researcher asked the students to answer pre-test I to know the students' ability. The title was "The Story of The Smart Parrot" consisting of ten multiple-choice questions with 2x40 minutes allocated time.

From the researcher's observation, the students were difficult to answer some questions as they were focusing on some difficult words. Many of the students got a lower scores at the first meeting.

The Second Meeting

The researcher divided the students into 5 groups which 4 groups consist of 9 students in each group and 1 group consists of 8 students and the researcher taught the students with narrative texts using Collaborative Strategic Reading technique steps: Preview, Click and Clunck, Get the Gist, and Wrap Up.

First of all, it was the Preview. In this step, the researcher gave reading comprehension questions to the student, activated their background knowledge about the title of the text which discussed and student predicted about what they learned. Then, the second step was to Click and Clunk. If students knew the words in the text, then it meant Click. But if the students did not know the meaning of the words, then it meant Clunck. The third step was Get the Gist. Teachers touch students to re-state in their own words the most important point as a way of making sure they understood what they have read. And the last step was Wrap Up or sum up the text which has been read to improve their knowledge, understanding, and memory of what was read.

In this meeting, students acted as good listeners and the students were able to find the ideas and the answers more easily. This meeting also lasted for 2x40 minutes.

The Third Meeting

The researcher did the post-test I with 2x40 minutes allocated time. She asked the students to answer the post-test about "Sangkuriang" which consists of ten multiple-choice questions. The purpose of doing the post-test is to find out whether the CSR technique improves the students'

reading comprehension or not. The result is many of the students' post-test I score is higher than the pre-test I score.

3.1.2. Cycle 2

The activities which were done on the second cycle are based on the reflection of the first cycle. The second cycle was the follow up to the first cycle.

The Fourth Meeting

The researcher asked the students to answer pre-test II. The title was "Please All And You Will Please None" consisting of ten multiple-choice questions with 2x40 minutes allocated time. The students were still difficult to answer some questions as they were focusing on some difficult words. But, many of the students' pre-test II score is higher than in pre-test I and post-test I.

The Fifth Meeting

After divided the students into 5 groups which 4 groups consist of 9 students in each group and 1 group consists of 8 students, the researcher taught the students with narrative texts which lasted for 2x40 minutes using Collaborative Strategic Reading technique steps.

The Sixth Meeting

The researcher did the post-test II with 2x40 minutes allocated time. She asked the students to answer the post-test about "The History of Jack and Beanstalk" which consists of ten multiple-choice questions. The purpose of doing the post-test is to find out whether the CSR technique improves the students' reading comprehension or not. The result is many of the students' post-test II score is higher than the pre-test II score.

3.3. The Result of Cycle 1
The Analysis of Pre-test I

Table 1. The result of pre-test I

No.	Name of the students (initials)	Score			
1.	AL	50	23.	MC	60
2.	AY	80	24.	MC	80
3.	AY	80	25.	MC	50
4.	AC	80	26.	NL	60
5.	AG	70	27.	NR	80
6.	CFA	50	28.	PCT	50
7.	DL	50	29.	P	50
8.	D	60	30.	RP	60
9.	DWT	70	31.	R	70
10.	E	40	32.	RF	40
11.	E	60	33.	RAU	70
12.	FWM	70	34.	R	80
13.	F	70	35.	SK	60

14.	GYBS	80	36.	SAL	70
15.	J	90	37.	SL	80
16	JT	60	38.	SDL	80
17.	J	70	39.	TC	50
18.	J	80	40.	VV	50
19.	JW	80	41.	VAW	50
20.	JC	40	42.	WT	90
21.	LW	70	43.	WL	80
22.	LAW	70	44.	ZW	60

There were 44 students in the class and all of them attended the class on the day of the pre-test. There were 3 students whose score was 40, 9 students whose score was 50, 8 students whose score was 60, 10 students whose score was 70, 12 students whose score was 80, and 2 students whose score was 90. The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps:

$$Xa = \frac{X1f1 + X2f2 + \cdots + Xnfn}{f1 + f2 + \cdots + fn}$$

Xa : the mean of students' score in the pre-test in cycle I

x : the score of students' in the pre-test

f : the frequency of the students

The mean of students' score in pre-test is $54{,}3 \approx 54$

The Analysis of Post-test I

Table 2. The result of post-test I

No.	Name of the students	Score			
1.	AL	60	23.	MC	70
2.	AY	90	24.	MC	80
3.	AY	80	25.	MC	60
4.	AC	80	26.	NL	70
5.	AG	80	27.	NR	80
6.	CFA	60	28.	PCT	60
7.	DL	60	29.	P	60
8.	D	60	30.	RP	60
9.	DWT	80	31.	R	80
10.	E	70	32.	RF	50
11.	E	60	33.	RAU	70
12.	FWM	70	34.	R	80
13.	F	70	35.	SK	70

14.	GYBS	90	36.	SAL	70
15.	J	70	37.	SL	80
16	JT	70	38.	SDL	80
17.	J	70	39.	TC	50
18.	J	90	40.	VV	60
19.	JW	90	41.	VAW	50
20.	JC	40	42.	WT	70
21.	LW	80	43.	WL	80
22.	LAW	70	44.	ZW	70

There was 1 student whose score was 40, 3 students whose score was 50, 10 students whose score was 60, 14 students whose score was 70, 12 students whose score was 80, and 4 students whose score was 90.The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps:

$$Y\,a = \frac{Y1f1 + Y2f2 + \cdots + Ynfn}{f1 + f2 + \cdots + fn}$$

Ya : the mean of students' score in the post-test cycle I

y : the score of students' in the post-test

f : the frequency of the students

The mean of students' score in post-test is 70,2 ≈ 70

3.4. The Result of Cycle 2

The Analysis of Pre-test II

Table 3. The result of pre-test II

No.	Name of the students	Score			
1.	AL	60	23.	MC	80
2.	AY	90	24.	MC	80
3.	AY	90	25.	MC	70
4.	AC	80	26.	NL	70
5.	AG	80	27.	NR	80
6.	CFA	60	28.	PCT	60
7.	DL	60	29.	P	60
8.	D	70	30.	RP	70
9.	DWT	90	31.	R	90

10.	E	80	32.	RF	60
11.	E	60	33.	RAU	70
12.	FWM	80	34.	R	80
13.	F	80	35.	SK	70
14.	GYBS	90	36.	SAL	70
15.	J	80	37.	SL	80
16	JT	70	38.	SDL	80
17.	J	70	39.	TC	50
18.	J	90	40.	VV	70
19.	JW	90	41.	VAW	50
20.	JC	50	42.	WT	70
21.	LW	80	43.	WL	80
22.	LAW	80	44.	ZW	70

There were 3 students whose score was 50, 7 students whose score was 60, 12 students whose score was 70, 15 students whose score was 80, and 7 students whose score was 90. The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps:

$$Xb = \frac{X1f1 + X2f2 + \cdots + Xnfn}{f1 + f2 + \cdots + fn}$$

Xb : the mean of students' score in the pre-test in cycle II

x : the score of students' in the pre-test II

f : the frequency of the students

The mean of students' score in pre-test is 73,6 ≈ 74

The Analysis of Post-test II

Table 4. The result of post-test II

No.	Name of the students	Score			
1.	AL	60	23.	MC	80
2.	AY	100	24.	MC	80
3.	AY	90	25.	MC	70
4.	AC	80	26.	NL	70
5.	AG	80	27.	NR	90
6.	CFA	60	28.	PCT	60
7.	DL	60	29.	P	60
8.	D	70	30.	RP	70
9.	DWT	90	31.	R	100
10.	E	80	32.	RF	70
11.	E	60	33.	RAU	70

12.	FWM	80	34.	R	80
13.	F	80	35.	SK	70
14.	GYBS	100	36.	SAL	70
15.	J	80	37.	SL	80
16	JT	70	38.	SDL	70
17.	J	70	39.	TC	50
18.	J	100	40.	VV	70
19.	JW	100	41.	VAW	60
20.	JC	50	42.	WT	70
21.	LW	80	43.	WL	70
22.	LAW	80	44.	ZW	70

There were 2 students whose score was 50, 7 students whose score was 60, 15 students whose score was 70, 12 students whose score was 80, 3 students whose score was 90, and 5 students whose score was 100. The data in the table above can be calculated by using the following steps:

$$Y b = \frac{Y_1 f_1 + Y_2 f_2 + \cdots + Y_n f_n}{f_1 + f_2 + \cdots + f_n}$$

Yb : the mean of students' score in the post-test cycle II

y : the score of students' in the post-test

f : the frequency of the students

The mean of students' score in post-test is $75 \approx 75$

The aim of determining the mean score was to know the average ability of students in the pre-test and post-test. The writer found out that the mean score between the two tests in cycle 1 and cycle 2 was different. There is an improvement of students' ability in reading comprehension through Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) between pre-test I (before the action) and post-test I (after the action). There is also an improvement of students' ability in reading comprehension through Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) between pre-test II (before the action) and post-test II (after the action). Due to the improvements from cycle 1 and cycle 2, the writer concluded that Collaborative Strategic Reading is effective to improve students' reading comprehension even though the improvement is not significant.

3.5. The Analysis of the Questionnaire

The data is processed in the form of a frequency distribution table by using the formula:

$$P = \frac{f}{n} \times 100\%$$ In which:

P : percentage

f : frequency

n : number of the sample

100% : constant value

The results of the questionnaires are calculated in the tabulations which are the process of changing the data collection instrument (questionnaire) to the tables of numbers (percentage).

I like learning reading comprehension by using Collaborative Strategic Reading technique

<p align="center">**Table 5.** The result of question number 1</p>

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q1	a. **Strongly agree**	5	11,4%
	b. **Agree**	39	88,6%
	c. **Disagree**	0	0
	d. **Strongly disagree**	0	0
	Total	44	100%

It can be seen from the table above that all of the students (11,4% of the students strongly agree and 88,6% of the students agree) like learning reading comprehension by using Collaborative Strategic Reading because this is a new method which never implemented in their class.

"Preview" Strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading facilitate me to understand the reading text

<p align="center">**Table 6.** The result of question number 2</p>

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q2	a. **Strongly agree**	6	13,7%
	b. **Agree**	36	81,8%
	c. **Disagree**	0	0
	d. **Strongly disagree**	2	4,5%
	Total	44	100%

Based on the table above, it shows that almost all of the students (13,7% of the students strongly agree and 81,8% of the students agree) understand reading a text by using preview strategy to activate their background knowledge about the reading text so it will help them to start getting the point of the whole text. On the contrary, 4,5% of them strongly disagree because it will not help them to activate their background knowledge of the text.

"Click and Clunk" Strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading facilitate me to understand the reading text

Table 7. The result of question number 3

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q3	a. Strongly agree	8	18,2%
	b. Agree	30	68,2%
	c. Disagree	6	13,6%
	d. Strongly disagree	0	0
	Total	44	100%

The table above shows more than half of the students (18,2% of the students strongly agree and 68,2% of the students agree) agree that "Click and Clunk" Strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading facilitates them to understand reading the text. In Click and Clunk strategy, the writer asked students to underline difficult words which everyone in their group did not know the meaning of the words. Then, they have to guess the meaning of difficult words by reading them many times. Furthermore, the rest of the students (13,6%) state Click and Clunk did not help them to understand the reading text because when they read difficult words many times, they still could not find the meaning of the words.

"Get the Gist" Strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading facilitates me to understand the reading text

Table 8. The result of question number 4

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q4	a. Strongly agree	4	9,1%
	b. Agree	36	81,8%
	c. Disagree	3	6,8%
	d. Strongly disagree	1	2,3%
	Total	44	100%

The third strtegy in the Collaborative Strategic Reading technique is Get the Gist. Students have to identify the most important person, place or thing in the paragraph they have just read. Some students (2,3% of the students strongly disagree and 6,8% of the students disagree) difficult to state important people in the reading text.

"Wrap Up" Strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading facilitates me to understand the reading text

Table 9. The result of question number 5

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q5	a. **Strongly agree**	7	15,9%
	b. **Agree**	29	65,9%
	c. **Disagree**	5	11,4%
	d. **Strongly disagree**	3	6,8%
	Total	44	100%

The goals of Wrap Up strategy are to improve students' knowledge, understanding, and memory of what was read. But, some students (6,8% of the students strongly disagree and 11,4% of the students disagree) did not know how to wrap up the text because they did not get the idea of the reading text.

Have no obstacles in applying four techniques of Collaborative Strategic Reading (Preview, Click and Clunk, Get the Gist and Wrap Up)

Table 10. The result of question number 6

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q6	a. **Strongly agree**	8	18,2%
	b. **Agree**	30	68,2%
	c. **Disagree**	6	13,6%
	d. **Strongly disagree**	0	0
	Total	44	100%

From the table above, it can be seen that 13,6% of the students faced diffculties in applying the technique while most of the students (18,2% of the students strongly agree and 68,2% of the students agree) didn't face the difficulties in applying the technique.

I become more active in learning by using this technique

Table 11. The result of question number 7

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q7	a. **Strongly agree**	2	4,6%
	b. **Agree**	37	84%
	c. **Disagree**	3	6,8%
	d. **Strongly disagree**	2	4,6%
	Total	44	100%

According to the table above, it can be seen that some of the students (4,6% of the students strongly agree and 84% of the students agree) didn't face difficulties working in a group while most of the students (4,6% of the students strongly disagree and 6,8% of the students disagree) faced the difficulties working in a group.

Collaborative Strategic Reading Technique used by teacher help me in learning reading comprehension

Table 12. The result of question number 8

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q8	a. Strongly agree	3	6,8%
	b. Agree	39	88,6%
	c. Disagree	1	2,3%
	d. Strongly disagree	1	2,3%
	Total	44	100%

The data in the table implies that the percentage of the students who strongly agree about improving reading comprehension by using Collaborative Strategic Reading is 6,8%. Then the rest of them (2,3%) choose strongly disagree because they did not understand the instruction and they missed one of the steps in the Collaborative Strategic Reading technique.

I feel easy in answering reading comprehension exercises after learning by using Collaborative Strategic Reading Technique

Table 13. The result of question number 9

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q9	a. Strongly agree	6	13,6%
	b. Agree	30	68,2%
	c. Disagree	8	18,2%
	d. Strongly disagree	0	0
	Total	44	100%

It can be seen from the table above that most of the students (13,6% of the students strongly agree and 68,2% of the students agree) felt easy answering the questions using the technique while the other 18,2% disagree about it.

The material taught become easier because of Collaborative Strategic Reading

Table 14. The result of question number 10

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q10	a. Strongly agree	5	11,4%
	b. Agree	37	84,1%
	c. Disagree	2	4,5%
	d. Strongly disagree	0	0
	Total	44	100%

The table indicated after using the Collaborative Strategic Reading technique, some of the students (4,5% of the students disagree) still did not understand the material because lack of vocabulary and difficult to follow the instruction of the technique. While the other 95,5% felt the material became easier.

Collaborative Strategic Reading technique learning model is effective to improve reading comprehension

Table 15. The result of question number 11

	Options	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Q11	a. Strongly agree	5	11,4%
	b. Agree	33	75%
	c. Disagree	4	9,1%
	d. Strongly disagree	2	4,5%
	Total	44	100%

It can be seen that 86,4% of the students felt that the technique effective to improve their reading comprehension ability while 13,6% of the students felt that the technique didn't effective.

4   Conclusion and Suggestion

Based on the data from the tests, it could be concluded that using the Collaborative Strategic Reading technique in teaching reading could enhance students' reading comprehension. It was proved by the mean score of post-test I (70) and II (75) increased from the pre-test I (54) and II (74). There are some difficulties faced by the students in learning reading comprehension such as difficult to get the point of the text in preview strategy, did not know the meaning of difficult words, wrote the text by using their own words, did not know how to wrap up the text, difficult to work in a group, and could not follow the instruction.

The writer would like to propose some suggestions for those who are interested in this study. In teaching-learning process, especially in teaching reading, the teacher has to choose an appropriate technique to enhance students' ability because an appropriate method will enhance students' ability. So, the teacher should be active, creative and also innovative in teaching-learning process.

References

[1]   Agustiara, Y. (2014). *Improving Reading Comprehension Through Get-The-Gist Strategy At The Second Grade Of SMP.* Bandar Lampung: University of Lampung.

[2]   Arafah, F. (2016). *The Use Of Collaborative Strategic Reading Technique To Improve Students' Reading Comprehension.* Banda Aceh: Ar-Raniry State Islamic University

[3]   Arikunto, S. (2009). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

[4]   Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik.* Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

[5]   Alison M. and Gass, S.M. (2005). *Second Language Research: Methodology and Design.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[6]   Burns et. al. (1984). *Teaching Reading in today's Elementary School* (3rd edition). New York: Longman.

[7]   Carnie. (1990). *Instruction Reading.* Columbus Ohio: Meril Publishing Company.

[8]   Creswell, J.W. (2008). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods.* United States of America: SAGE publications.

[9]   Grabe, W., & Stoller, F. (2014). Teaching reading for academic purposes. In M. Celce-Murcia, D. Brinton & M. Snow (Eds.) *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (4th ed.) (pp. 189-205). Boston, MA: National Geographic Learning.

[10]   Grellet, F. (1981). *A Practical Guide To Reading Comprehension Exercises.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[11]   Harmer, J. (1983). *The Practice Of English Language Teaching.* New York: Longman.

[12]   Hornby A. S. (1995). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

[13]   Klingner, J. K. and Sharon V. (1998). Using Collaborative Strategic Reading. Teaching Exceptional Children, July/Aug 1998. Copyright 1998 CEC.

[14]   Klingner, J.K., and Vaughn, S. (1999). Teaching Reading Comprehension through Collaborative Strategic Reading. Intervention in School and Clinic.

[15]   Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., Arguelles, M. E., Hughes, M. T., & Leftwich, S. A. (2004). Collaborative strategic reading "real-world" lessons from classroom teachers. *Remedial And Special Education.*

[16]   Kunandar. (2008). *Langkah Mudah Penelitian Tindakan Kelas Sebagai Pengembangan Profesi* Guru. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

[17]   Likert, R. (1932). A Technique for the Measurement of Attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 140, 1–55.

[18]   McNamara, D.S. (2007). *Reading Comprehension Strategies.* New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

[19]   Pradiyono. (2007). *Pasti Bisa! Teaching Genre-Based Writing.* Yogyakarta: Andi

[20]   Primula, D. F. (2016). The Effectiveness Of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) In Improving Students' Reading Comprehension In Narrative Text. Bandung: University of Education.

[21]   Richards, J.C., Platt, J., and Heidi, W. (1998). *Longman dictionary of applied linguistics.* Essex: Longman.

[22]   Romli, M. (2014). *Improving The Student's Reading Comprehension Of Narrative Text Through Story Mapping.* Jakarta: Unpublished Thesis, The State Islamic University Of 'Syarif Hidayatullah.

[23]   Rosalina, A. (2014). *The Influence Of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) Technique On Students' Achievement In Reading Comprehension Of Narrative Text.* Jakarta: Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University.

[24]   Sudjana. (2005). *Metoda Statistika.* Bandung: Tarsito.

[25]   Wardhaugh, R. (1986). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics.* New York: Brasil Blackwell.