

## USING NUMBERED HEADS TOGETHER STRATEGY TO IMPROVE THE READING COMPREHENSION OF THE YEARNINTH STUDENTS OF SMP NEGERI 2 PANGSID SIDRAP REGENCY

**Darmawati**

*Dept. of English Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty,  
Bosowa University*

### ABSTRACT

English has four skills. one of the them is reading skills. As students, they must face reading in daily life, like in teaching and learning process. In teaching and learning process, the teacher asks the students to read and to do the tasks based on the reading text. For that, the students must have good ability to do the tasks. The fact, some students found difficulties in reading. That's why, the researcher tried to find a strategy to overcome this problem. One of the strategies that the researcher though can solve this problem is applying the Number Head Together in teaching reading. The purpose of this research is to find out whether the use of Numbered Head Together strategy can improve the students' reading comprehension. The method used in this research is quasi experimental design. The population of this research is all the students of year ninth of SMP Negeri 2 Pangsid. It consists of six classes and 138 students. The researcher chooses two classes randomly or 46 students as the sample of this research. The result showed that Using Numbered Heads Together Strategy can improve literal comprehension dominantly. The implication of this research refers to all English teachers to use this strategy in teaching reading comprehension. The researcher also suggests to the further researcher to do research on other objectives to support the results of this research.

**Key Words:** Reading skill, Number Head Together, Literal Comprehension

### Introduction

English subject provides students with communicating skill in daily life that appropriates with the global demand, and helps students to develop their communicating skill to a higher level. In learning English, the students must learn some language elements and skills such as grammar, vocabulary, part of speech, listening, speaking, reading and writing. The main purpose of teaching English in Indonesia based on the 2006 KTSP (School Level Curriculum) published by the Department of National Education is to prepare students to be able to communicate in various oral and written forms to achieve a certain functional literacy level. Referring to the curriculum the emphasis of teaching reading is to understand the meaning of written functional text and short simple essay in terms of procedure and report to interact in daily life context. Reading is one of the four skills in learning a

language. As students, they must face reading in daily life to improve their knowledge. In teaching and learning process, the teacher asks the students to read and to do the tasks based on the reading text. For that, the students must have good ability to do the tasks, whether in form of true-false questions or multiple choice, W-h questions or yes/no questions. The students will have a lot of reading text, such as in Final National Examination.

Reading takes a lot of numbers in the test, from 50 numbers of items, reading takes 44 numbers and the rest is writing. So, if they want to be success in national final examination, they must have a good ability in reading. To have it they must have a good character reader as stated in Kenneth Goodman (1988-p). "Proficient readers are both Efficient and Effective. They are Effective in constructing meaning throughout the reading process, and this meaning bears some level of agreement with the original meaning of the author. They are Efficient in using the least amount of effort to achieve effectiveness.

On July 16, 2019, the researcher did an interview with the English teachers to know the students' perception in learning reading at SMP Negeri 2 Pangsid. Based on the result of interview, the researcher found some problems, they were; first, learning process is boring, because they were teaching monotonously. The teachers didn't use variety techniques or model or strategy, the teaching method that usually used by the teacher was traditional method, where the students just wait the teachers' instruction and the teaching and learning process was teacher centre. The students didn't guide to be active, so the students have low motivation in learning. Second, in teaching reading skill, the teacher didn't select the material wisely, the reading text was not interesting for the students, because the level of the text was not suitable and it made them difficult to do the exercises, additionally the students lack vocabulary.

Based on the problems stated above, the researcher tries to find a strategy or method to solve them. There are some strategies and approaches that can be used to solve these problems such as using an interesting strategy to avoid boredom, giving an interesting reading text to grow the students' motivation, Contextual

Teaching and Learning, The Interactive Approach, STAD (Student Achievement Division), JIGSAW, TGT (Teams- Game-Tournaments), Word Recognition Strategies, Silent Reading, and Numbered Heads Together. In this study, the researcher chooses Numbered Head Together because it's still new for the students and commonly the new one is more interesting than the old one. However, the researcher has to select interesting reading text for the students. By using Numbered Heads together strategy, the researcher hopes that the students can be more active in learning and more motivated because the strategy is a cooperative learning strategy that holds each student accountable for learning the material. Kagen (1989) suggests the teacher phrases questions beginning with; "put your heads together and..." or "Make sure you can all..." There are many other ways of ensuring the teacher cues the students into the collaborative activity. The students work together. They quite literally "put their heads together" in order to solve the problem and also ensure that everyone in the group can answer the question. By having students work together in a group, this strategy ensures that each member

knows the answer to problems or questions asked by the teacher. Cooperative learning has been shown to increase student achievement, race relations, acceptance of special needs students, and self-esteem (Slavin, 1995). That's why, the researcher used two variables as the framework of this research.

## METHOD

This research applied quasi experimental design. The experiment involved two groups, an experimental group and control group. The experimental group received treatment by using Numbered Heads Together, while the control group was given treatment by using traditional method. This research had two variables namely independent and dependent variables. The independent variable of this research was using Numbered Heads Together strategy. The dependent variable was students' reading comprehension ability. The research used cluster random sampling technique to get sample. The sample of this research took lottery because all classes were homogenous. One class was Experimental Group and another class was Control Group. After taking lottery, the researcher got IX B as Experimental Group and IX E as Control Group. Each group consist of 23 students, so the number of the sample were 46 students. The instrument of the research was reading comprehension test. This test aims to get information about the students' improvement after teaching and learning process end. The tests given are multiple choice. The multiple-choice tests are taken from the reading text. There are two kinds of tests given to the students. The test are pretest and posttest. The pretest was conducted to check students' prior knowledge in reading comprehension. On the other hand, the posttest was used to check students' achievement in reading comprehension after giving treatment by using Numbered Heads Together for experimental group, while control group was given treatment by using traditional method.

## Finding Dan Discussion

### Findings

#### Students' Reading Comprehension

The findings of the research reveal that Numbered Heads Together Strategy improved the students' reading comprehension as shown in the following tables. The frequency score and the percentage of the students' reading comprehension in pretest and posttest both experimental group and control group were given in table 1.1; the mean score and the standard deviation of the students' reading comprehension were given in table 1; and the t-test result is given in table 2.

**Table 1 The Frequency and Percentage of Students' Pretest and Posttest Score**

Classification	Score	Experiment Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
<b>Excellent</b>	96-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Very Good</b>	86-95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Good</b>	76-85	0	0	4	17.39	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Fairly Good</b>	66-75	0	0	13	56.52	1	4.35	4	<b>17.4</b>
<b>Fair</b>	56-65	2	8.69	6	26.09	4	17.39	4	<b>17.4</b>
<b>Poor</b>	36-55	14	60.87	0	0	11	47.83	12	<b>52.2</b>
<b>Very Poor</b>	0-35	7	30.44	0	0	7	30.43	3	<b>13</b>
<b>Total</b>		<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 1 showed that in pretest of experimental group no student got excellent, very good, good, and fairly good, 2 students (8.69 percent) got fair, 14 students (60.87 percent) got poor and 7 students (30.44 percent) got very poor. Meanwhile, in control group 1 student (4.35 percent) got fairly good, 4 students (17.39 percent) got fair, 11 students (47.83 percent) and 7 students (30.43 percent) got very poor. It indicated that group and control group showed the difference from pretest and posttest. After treatment had been conducted, both groups showed improvement but the experimental group gained higher improvement than the control group.

**Table 2. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pretest and Posttest both Experimental Group and Control Group**

Group	Pretest		Posttest	
	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Mean Score	Standard Deviation
<b>Experiment Group</b>	40.5435	9.41338	70.2174	<b>7.90257</b>
<b>Control Group</b>	<b>44.2391</b>	<b>12.50988</b>	<b>52.2826</b>	<b>13.54523</b>

Table 2 above, showed the difference of standard deviation for pretest and posttest to both of the groups. The table indicated that the mean score of the students' pretest of experimental group was 40.54 with the standard deviation 9.41, while the mean score of the control group was 44.24 with the standard deviation was 12.51. Both groups had different mean score were 4.00 point and standard deviation 3.1 point. The mean score after the treatment was 70.22 for the

experimental group and the standard deviation was 7.90, while the mean score of the control group was 52.28 with the standard deviation was 13.54. It can be concluded that the mean score of experimental group is higher than control group ( $70.22 > 52.28$ ).

**Table 3. The T-test Analysis of the Students' Reading Comprehension in Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Group and control group**

Variables	t-test	t-table
Pretest of experimental and control group	1.132	2.015
Posttest of experimental and control group	5.645	2.015

Table 3 showed that after calculating the t-test value in pretest of both group experimental and control, it is compared with the t-table value at the level of significance  $p=0.05$  degree of freedom ( $df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 46 - 2 = 44$ ). The researcher found that the t-test value of the pretest was lower than t-table value or  $1.132 < 2.015$ . Meanwhile in the posttest of both groups showed that after calculating the t-test value, it is compared with the t-table value at the level of significance  $p=0.05$  degree of freedom ( $df = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 46 - 2 = 44$ ). The t-test value was higher than t-table value or  $5.645 > 2.015$ . This condition indicated that using Numbered Heads Together can improve the students' reading comprehension. This finding was used to determine the hypothesis. Null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) was rejected when the t-test value was greater than t-table and the alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) was accepted (Gay:1981;363).

## Discussion

After giving the students test; pretest and posttest, and after calculating and tabulating the data, the researcher calculated and tabulating data about literal and inferential comprehension by separating the number of the test. The the treatment, the mean score of the literal and inferential improved, but literal was higher than inferential ( $81.09 > 59.35$ ). Both literal and inferential comprehension increased because students have a better understanding of any given problem. There was a difference achievement between the literal comprehensions and inferential because literal comprehension level of analysis the question was relatively easier, whereas inferential comprehension level of the analysis was more difficult.

## Conclusion

Based on the research finding and discussion in the previous chapter, the researcher comes to the following conclusions (1) Using Numbered Heads Together Strategy improved the reading comprehension of the year 9 students of SMP Negeri 2 Pangsidi. It was proved that the mean score of the students' pretest to posttest in the experimental group using numbered heads together strategy improved from 50.54 to 70.22 and the mean score of students' pretests to posttest in control group using traditional method improved from 44.23 to 52.28. It means

that the improvement was higher in the experimental group than in control group (70.22>52.28). (2) Using Numbered Heads Together Strategy improved literal comprehension dominantly. It was proved that the students' pretest mean score to posttest improved from 46.09 to 81.09 for literal. For inferential, the means score of students' pretests to posttest improved from 35.43 to 59.35. It means that the mean score of the students' posttest of literal comprehension was higher than inferential comprehension (81.09>59.35).

## References

- Brown. 2001. Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. Second Edition. San Francisco State University.
- Dillenbourg, P. 1999. Introduction: What do you mean by "collaborative learning"? In P. Dillenbourg (Ed.), Collaborative Learning: Cognitive and computational approaches (pp. 1-19) Amsterdam: Pergamon, Elsevier Science. (Online) Accessed at <http://tecfa.unige.ch/tecfa/publicat/dil-papers-2/Dil.7.1.14.pdf>, on August 25, 2014.
- Doherty, R.W. 2002. Transformed Pedagogy Organization and Student Achievement. New Orleans, LA; USA.
- Eskey, D. (1970). A new Technique for teaching reading to advanced students. TESOL Quarterly, 4(4), 315-321.
- Gay, L.R. 1981. Educational Research for Analysis and Application, Columbus, Ohio: A Bell & Howell Company.
- Goodman, K. S., & Goodman, Y. M. 1979. Learning to Read is Natural. In L. B. Resnick & P. A. Weaver (Eds.), Theory and practice of early reading, Vol. 1 (pp. 137-154). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Kagan, S. 1989. The structural Approach to Cooperative Learning. Educational Leadership. 47(4): p.12-15.
- LeJeune, N. (1999). "Critical Components for Successful Collaborative Learning in CS1." Journal of Computer Sciences in Colleges, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 275-285.
- Smith, Frank. 1973. Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973)
- Slavin, Robert E., 1995. Cooperative Learning. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stone, Jeanne M. 2000. Cooperative Learning Reading Activities. Kagan Cooperative Learning, California: Kagan Publishing.
- Terenzini, P.T., & Pascarella, E.T. (1994). Living with Myths – Undergraduate education in America. Change, Jan./ Feb., 28–32.
- Trianto. 2010. Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-Progresif. Jakarta. Kencana.