II.   FRAME OF THEORIES

A. Review of Previous Relevant Research

Based on the previous research that was carried out to investigate about reading comprehension, the writer finds that there are some research which investigated about reading comprehension, its learning strategies, and motivation that can be used in it and relevant to this research, as follows:

1. Increasing students' reading comprehension achievement through TPS technique (Sari, 2010). She found that teaching reading by using TPS is able to increase the students reading comprehension. The improvement can be shown by the mean given between experimental group (taught by using TPS) and control group (taught by conventional technique) $76.55 > 62.68$ at the level of significance ($p= 0.000$, $p < 0.05$).

2. Teaching reading comprehension through fairytale at the second year students of SMP Muhammadiyah 3 Bandar Lampung (Ulfa, 2010). She found that teaching reading by using fairytale was able to increase the students reading comprehension. The improvement can be shown by the mean score which increased from 49.586 in pretest and it became 60.35 in posttest. It means that there was difference about 10.764 ($p= 0.000$, $p < 0.05$).

3. Increasing students' reading comprehension of Narrative text through SQ3R technique at the first year of SMA Muhammadiyah 1 Kotabumi (Marsiyah, 2009).). She found that the total scores of the pretest were 1860 up to 2380 in posttest and the mean of pretest 62.00 up to 79.33 in the posttest with the gain score was 520 (mean=17.33). It means that there was an increase of the students' reading comprehension.

4. Increasing students' reading comprehension achievement through Contextual clues training at the first year students of SMUN 3 Kotabumi (Alfarini, 2010). The increase also happened in this research. It can be seen from the increase of the mean score of the pretest and posttest for about 4.166 point (45.00 in the pretest into 49.166 in posttest (after being given the treatments).

5. Increasing students' reading comprehension achievement through questioning technique at the second year of MTSN 2 Bandar Lampung (Helmi, 2010). The total score of pretest in experimental class was 2,290 up to 2,783, the mean from 57.25 up to 69.58. On the other hand, in the control class, the pretest score was 2,233 up to 2,379, with the mean was from 55.83 up to 59.48. It can be seen from the result that there was an increase of students' reading comprehension when they were taught by using SQ3R technique.

Based on the previous research mentioned above, the following has been found:

1. There are many techniques and strategies that can be used to make the students' reading comprehension achievement increase.

2. After getting some new techniques, the students showed their positive difference of reading comprehension.

3. Compared with the students who are taught by using no technique (conventional technique), students who are taught by communicative technique have better reading comprehension achievement.

Based on the previous research and explanation above, the researcher assumes that *think-pair-share* technique is also able to give the same positive effect on students' reading comprehension.

B. Review of Related Literature

Considering the review of previous relevant research, the writer is going to propose a review of related literature which has a relationship with this research as follows:

1. Reading Comprehension

There are so many definitions of reading according to many experts. In this chapter, there will be some definitions of reading.

Grabe (1997) defines *reading* as an interaction between reader and text. Grabe states that *reading* requires efficient knowledge to world and given topic also an efficient knowledge of the language. It can be said that more background knowledge the reader have, easier they comprehend the text. Nuttal (1982) in Simanjuntak (1988: 14) says that *reading* as the meaningful interpretation of printed or written verbal symbol and Smith (1982) states that *reading* is something that makes sense to the reader and always should. According to Smith, *reading* is seen as having four distinctive and fundamental characteristic and one of them is that reading should be based on comprehension. He states that

comprehension in reading as a matter of understanding or logical judgment of the text that relate to written language to what we already know and require to know.

It can be said that *reading* always relates with printed materials or verbal symbols that has many meaningful meanings in it. *Reading* also always has strong relationship with the reader, which the reader has to understand and "make sense" the meaning in the text or printed materials using their background knowledge and their logical judgment. The more skillful the reader, the closer meaning that the reader makes to the writer intends about the text.

Meanwhile, comprehension is one of the influential aspects of *reading* because *reading* will be not success without comprehending. As Smith (1982) stated above that *reading* is a "make sense" process of the text. This "make sense" can be said as the comprehension process, which is a process where the reader tries to connect their background knowledge, understanding, and their logical judgment of the text. It is also supported by Richard (1986) in Ellyana (1998: 8) defines *comprehension* as the process by which the person understands the meaning of the written or spoken language. Moreover, Thompson in Apriyanti (2001: 8) adds in *comprehension* process, readers carry their background knowledge, ability to recognize, a use rhetorical structure, and ability to use *reading* strategies in storing information contained in a text. It confirms that some capability in inviting and bringing the knowledge toward the text that was called recognizing and *reading* strategies are also important in comprehending process beside the background knowledge.

In other hand, Richard (1999) defines *comprehension* as the process by which the person understands the meaning of the written or spoken language. In *reading*, it is sometimes easy to read the text, but it is difficult to take its meaning. In addition, Williams (1981) in Ellyana (1999: 8) says that *comprehension* is mind's act of power of understanding what has been written. It proves that when the readers read the text without comprehending, there will be nothing that they mind catch about the text at all.

Bernhardt (2005) pointed out that L2 reading process has relied primarily upon explanatory models borrowed from first language research. Bernhardt asserted that in this process the reader can be involved in the construction of meaning from a text, based partly on new information presented by that text and partly on background knowledge, feelings and opinions that a reader brings in making sense of the printed materials. Research into the nature of the reading process is abundant and various reading models have been proposed (see Ruddell, P., Ruddell, R. & Singer, 1994) based on a variety of theoretical perspectives.

Reading is not merely a receptive process of gathering information from the page in a word-by-word manner (Grabe, 1991). Rather, it is a selective process and characterized as an active process of comprehending.

In addition, there are the reading aspects that should be considered in measuring reading comprehension: (1) Determining main idea; the main idea refers to the author develops through out the paragraph. It is not always explicitly sated in the sentences, so that the readers should be able to comprehend the text and think out the text. (2) Inference; it refers to the prediction about something unknown based

on the available facts and information in the text by using the readers' logical thinking. (3) References; it contains words or phrases used as a signal to know other meaning referring the words provided in the text in order to avoid unnecessary repletion of words or phrases. (4) Finding detail information; in order to comprehend all about the text, the readers should be able to find the details or specific information which affects the meaning by giving definition, examples, facts, the process of comparison or analogy etc. (5) Vocabulary; it plays an important role to understanding the meaning of the text by identifying the synonyms, antonyms, compound words and their components, and also grammatical category.

From the definition above, it can be said that *reading comprehension* is a process not just to read the sequences of alphabets, but to discover and reveal what they mean and then sends it to the readers' mind in order to understand what they are all about and the writer intends about the text by bringing the readers background knowledge and reading strategies.

2. Hortatory Exposition Text

According to the syllabus of 2006 Curriculum, in reading skill, students of the second year of senior high school have to be able to comprehend short text in form of narrative, report, spoof, and hortatory exposition text. In this research, the researcher used hortatory exposition text. Hortatory exposition is a type of spoken or written text that is intended to explain the listeners or readers that something should or should not happen or be done. To strengthen the explanation, the speaker or writer needs some arguments as the fundamental reasons of the given

idea. In other words, this kind of text can be called as argumentation or opinion. The researcher uses Hortatory Exposition text because she assumes that this text can attract the students think more critically.

According to Grace (2005), hortatory exposition text has certain characteristics, they are:

1. **Social Function**

   - To persuade the readers that something should or should not be the case or be done.

2. **Generic Structure**

   a. Thesis: Statement or announcement of issue concern. Thesis is similar to tentative conclusion which needs to be proven by certain facts and argument. In the end, it can be true or false.

   b. Arguments: Reasons for concern that will lead to recommendation. This is the phase which tries to examine and support that the thesis stated above is true

   c. Recommendation: Statement of what should or should not happen or be done based on the given arguments. This is what should or should be done on the given arguments. This is what should or should not be done in the hortatory text.

3. **Language features:**

   1. Using Simple Present Tense, e.g. Is it important to know what your kids are watching?

   2. Using modals, e.g. Television can expose your children to things that

you have tried to protect them…

3. Using action verbs, e.g. expose, know, and protect, etc

4. Using thinking verbs, e.g. I believe, I think, I trust, etc

5. Using adverbs, e.g. absolutely, certainly, early, etc

6. Using adjective, e.g. important, significant, aggressive, etc

7. Using technical terms, e.g. resistance, adolescence, etc

8. Using general and abstract noun, e.g. advantages, differences, etc

9. Using connectives/transition, e.g. meanwhile, in addition, contrary, etc

Watching TV

Thesis:

Is it important to know what your kids are watching? Of course it is. Television can expose your children to things that you have tried to protect them from, especially violence, drug abuse, etc.

Argument 1:

One study demonstrated that watching too much TV during the day or at bedtime often causes bedtime resistance, sleep onset delay and anxiety around sleep, followed by shortened sleep duration.

Argument 2:

Another study found a significant association between the amount of time spent watching television during adolescence and early adulthood, and the like hood of subsequent aggressive acts against others.

Argument 3:

Meanwhile, many studies have found an association between kids watching a lot of TV, being inactive and overweight.

Recommendation:

Considering some facts above, protect your children with some following tips:

1. Limit television viewing to 1-2 hours each day.
2. Do not allow your children to have a TV set in their bedrooms.
3. Review the ratings of TV shows that your children watch.

4. Watch television with your children and discuss what is happening during the show.

Here is the language feature of spoof text above:

1. Using Simple Present Tense, e.g. *Is it important to know what your kids are watching?*

2. Using modals, e.g. *Television can expose your children to things that you have tried to protect them…*

3. Using action verbs, e.g. *expose, know, protect*

4. Using thinking verbs, e.g. *I believe, I think, I trust*

5. Using adverbs, e.g. *early*

6. Using adjective, e.g. *important, significant, aggressive*

7. Using technical terms, e.g. *resistance, adolescence*

8. Using general and abstract noun,e.g. *time, anxiety*

9. Using connectives/transition, e.g. *meanwhile*

3.   Think-Pair-Share

Think-Pair-share is one of cooperative learnings which are developed by many experts and first proposed by Franks Lyman (1981) and his colleagues in Maryland. It is named from three stages of student's action (*thinking, pairing*, and *sharing*) with emphasis on what students are to be doing at each of those stages. According to Lyman (1981) think-pair-share is a summarization strategy that can be used in before, during, and after a lesson. There are three basic steps of *think-pair-share* technique. The first is *think* stage, where the students are asked and to ponder a question of problem that can impulsively come to their mind in the first

time. The second is *pair up.* In this stage, each student is paired up to discuss their answer or solution to the problem in order to revise or alter their original ideas. The last one is *share.* The students are called up to share with the rest of the class.

Kagan (1992) states that *think-pair-share* consists of three steps cooperative structure. During first step, individuals think silently about the question or a problem that is given by the teacher. In the second steps, they are paired up to exchange their thoughts. In the third step, the pairs share their thought and response to the other team or entire group.

Allen (2007: 107) argues about the advantages of *think-pair-share* are provides students with think time prior to discuss, permit for independent and collaborative learning, gives students opportunities to collaborate to refine definitions, gives some more triggers to more equal participation as all students share with one other and then with another pair of students, engages students in active learning.

According to Lie (2002: 57) *think-pair-share* is a technique which gives the students opportunity to work alone and in a group also, so the participation of all the students will increase. Arends (1997: 123) also states that *think-pair-share* helps student to develop their understanding and their ability in considering other sights.

In line with the statements above, Carss (2007, p.iii) states that the use of *think-pair-share* makes the cognitive and social aspects to be in one and maximize the background knowledge and thinking. It seems that *think-pair-share* is able to increase the students' ability to thing, but also their social abilities.

Based on the descriptions above, it can be stated that *think-pair-share* techniques give s the students the opportunity to develop their way of thinking, their ability to solve the problem not only independently, but also in a group and catch some ideas and compare them to the others, also develop their ability methodology of problem solving.

3.1. Team Formation in T*hink-Pair-Share Technique*

In process of making a team in cooperative group work will depends on the situation. They are formal and informal way. An in formal, for example, the group is made in contemporary time, in specific study or topic and can change everyday. On the other hand, in formal formation, students work in the same group in a long period of time, occasionally for one semester. In this formation, teacher assigns group by homogeneous or heterogeneous grouping, random grouping, and interest grouping (Olsen and Kagan et al, 1992) as citied in Kassiler (1992: 13).

First, *homogeneous or heterogeneous* grouping is formed when the grouping depend on some varieties such as ethnic, gender, achievement level, language proficiency and so on. Second is random formation. There is no specific category in grouping the students like in the homogeneous or heterogeneous. The teacher can distribute many color papers, shapes and cards. The students will be grouped based on the same colors, shapes, and cards. The last one is interest group. The teacher gives some topic to the students and they will be grouped based on the topic that they choose and interested in. In this research, the researcher will use heterogeneous formation, where high motivation students will be work together and in a group with the low motivation students.

3.2. The Advantages and Disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share (TPS)

3.2.1. The Advantages of Think-Pair-Share (TPS)

Here are some advantages of *think-pair-share* technique according to Johnson and Johnson (2001):

a. **Thinking Time Provision**

Think-time in *think-pair-share* allows the students to develop their answer. It because it helps the students to control the first answer that come first in their mind to be more reliable and better answer that is full of justification and reasonable.

b. **Making Students Actively Involved**

This strategy has power to make all the students get involve in the learning process. *Pair* and *share-time* triggers the students to talk and discuss with each other about their own thoughts. They also used to appreciate ones opinion about the problem and the answer. So, it makes the students more actively involve in group discussion and class participation.

c. **Resolving Students' Misunderstandings**

Students' misunderstanding about the topic are resolved during *peer-tutoring* or *peer-teaching*; they would be argue their ideas and then discuss it together, so if there are some misunderstanding or opinions. It can be solved clearly.

d. Easy to Implementing on the spur of the moment

Think-pair-share is easy to be implemented because it does not take much time for the class preparation.

e. **As a cooperative Learning Strategy**, *Think-pair-share* benefits students in the areas of peer acceptance, peer support, academic achievement and self-esteem.

3.2.2. The Disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share (TPS)

Besides having some advantages, *think-pair-share* according to Lyman (1981) also has disadvantages as follow:

A. **Time Consuming**

Applying *think-pair-share* will be time consuming if the process does not run well. The teacher should be able to create an amusing atmosphere and give some rules for prevention.

B. **Odd number of students**

Problem may appear when the number of students is odd, for example 27. In such case, the teacher may let one a group with odd number, i.e. *three students, for the pairing stage (leaving one students alone in pairing process is not preferable and inconsistent with the procedure of TPS).*

C. Domination of Certain Students

Students who are in upper level of knowledge usually have many opportunities to share their idea because they have more ideas in their mind than the lower students. It can create a situation where the upper students try to dominate the process of learning (especially in *sharing stage*). Therefore, the teacher should always check and monitor the entire process to ensure that such thing does not happen. Students should also be provided an understanding about equal opportunity and participation in classroom learning.

D. Assigning The member of The Groups

Think-pair-share technique allows all of the students to share their ideas one by one. It makes the teacher should assigned every students in order to monitor their participation. It will be hard because the teacher will work harder to remember and recognize the students who are good or not in the process of learning in the classroom.

E. limited Information

The information received by the students is limited to what their friends know. The ideas that come up from the students' mind usually appear from their previous knowledge and acquired knowledge from the text given. The information can be limited if the students are not able to elaborate their ideas, so the information given only rotate in the same place or not elaborate well and not so many information that students get from their friends.

3.3. Teaching Reading Comprehension through Think-Pair-Share (TPS)

The researcher proposes the procedures of teaching reading through *think-pair-share* technique as follows:

Pre-Activities:

1. The teacher introduces the topic and constructs the students' background knowledge related to the topic by asking some questions.

2. The teacher informs the material which is going to be learned and introduces *think-pair-share* procedures.

3. The teacher pairs the students

While-Activities:

1. The teacher distributes hortatory text and asks them to read the text and asks them to read the text individually and silently.

2. The teacher asks the students about the difficult words that they do not understand and lead them to discuss it.

3. The teacher leads the students to analyze the text and explain the generic structure and language features used in a hortatory text given.

4. The teacher applies the procedures of *think-pair-share* as follow: (Here, teacher monitors the students' interaction and draws attentions to successful discussion so that the students understand exactly what they need to do).

A. **Think**: The teacher delivers students' work sheet (questions' and answers' sheet) and asks them to think about the following questions silently and individually for 1 to 3 minutes each question. Then, the teacher asks the students to write down their thoughts on a piece of paper and collect them later (It is useful for the teacher to see if there is problem in comprehending the text).

B. **Pair**: the teacher asks students to work in *pair* with their partner to discuss the results of their individual thinking for 3 to 4 minutes for each question.

C. **Shares**: The teacher randomly asks a representative of students to *share* their ideas in front of the class. Other pairs will give argument, suggestions, or revision when they find opposite opinion.

5. The teacher responses the students' ideas by giving revision, additional information, and leads the students to reach the conclusion of discussion.

Post-Activities

1. The teacher asks students to evaluate what they have learnt.

2. The teacher asks students' difficulties in understanding the lesson.

C. Theoretical Assumption

Based on all the literatures reviewed above, the researcher assumes that *think-pair-share* technique are good in students. It is because *think-pair-share* has *Thinking, pairing,* and *sharing* time which help the students to comprehend the

text freely, gives a big opportunity for students to speak up their ideas about the text and discuss it with their friends based on their own background knowledge. So it makes the students motivated in arguing their ideas in front of all their friends and class. There is no wrong judgment for the wrong answer. Therefore, it may seem that *think-pair-share* can give positive effect, which is an increase in students' reading comprehension achievement

D. Hypothesis

Based on the theories and the assumptions above, the researcher formulated the hypotheses ''There is any significant increase of students' reading comprehension achievement when they are taught by using *think-pair-share* technique''.