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#### Abstract

The aim of this research was to find out whether or not it is effective to teach reading comprehension by using Cooperative Learning method to the fourth semester students of English Education Study Program FKIP, Muhammadiyah University, Palembang. The 80 sample students who were the fourth semester students wereselected by using convenience nonrandom sampling. To collect the data, a test consisting of 25 items in form of multiple choices was given to the students. The data was statistically analysed by using t - test. The results of this study showed that the mean scores for pretest of the experimental group was 64.90 and the post test was 82.60 . Meanwhile, the mean scores for pretest of the control group was 59.90 and the post test was 66.10. The result of the independent sample $t$-test showed that the mean difference between the post test score of experimental and control groups was 22.70 , with significance value ( 2 -tailed) 0.000 , which was lower than the significant level 0.05 . This shows that there was a significant difference in the reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Cooperative Learning method and those who were not taught by using Cooperative Learning method. It is intepreted that teaching reading comprehension by using Cooperative Learning method was effective.
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Reading is necessary when students continue their study, especially at the university level. Today's world confronts educators with tremendous amount of information through advanced technologies such as newspaper, journals, internet, the world wide web, and other networks which require the ability of the students to grasp the idea and the use of sources of information for the needs of life. In this case, reading plays an important role in which the students can involve themselves into such kind of situation in
which they can read for information, read to learn, and use reading for great many things.

As reading is a part of academic literacy, lecturers in university usually have high expectation from students to cope with the demands of reading in English since reading skills are important throughtout their life span. However, the fact still shows the tendency that students' reading achievement at the university is not satisfactory. This is supported by Metighe (1991, p. 2) and Diem (1994)
who found that most of the new university students have difficulties in reading material which is relatively more complicated

Based on her experience and observationin in teaching reading comprehension, the writer found that the students' ability in reading was still low and they also got difficulties in comprehending reading text. In fact, there were sixty percent of students got low scores. Consequently, the reseacher must be able to change this method of teaching to solve this problem.

The teaching of reading must be well programmed and prepared by the teacher concerned in such away that students can comprehend the reading comprehension material well. It means that the teacher's strategy influences the result of students' learning. The reading strategy, which is used by the teachers greatly influences the students' reading comprehension.

Cooperative learning is a pedagogical approach that promotes students' interaction via working in small groups to maximize that learning, reach their shared goal, and emphasize cooperation in helping each other to acquire knowledge. According to Scaglion (1992), this type of learning approach decreases opportunity to actively construct the knowledge among students. Moreover, teacher can use this approach to stimulate the students to acquire the knowledge as well as to create team skill.

The objectives of this study were to find out whether or not it is effective to teach reading comprehension by using Cooperative Learning method to the fourth semester students of English Education Study Program, FKIP Muhammadiyah University, Palembang

## METHODOLOGY

Method of this research was quasiexperimental research method. Creswell (2005, p. 297) states that quasi experimental research involves selecting groups, upon which a variable is tested without any random preselection processes, and comparing the two groups: control group and experimental group. The method that was used in this research was the pretest-posttest nonequivalent group design.

In this study, all of the fourth semester students of the English Education Study Program of FKIP, Muhammadiyah University, Palembang, in the academic year 2011/2012 was the population. The sample was selected by a non-random sampling method; it was purposive sampling. The sample included IVA class, which was the experimental group consisting of forty students, and IVB class, which was the control group (Table 1).

Table 1. The Sample of the Research

| Group | Semester/Class | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Experimental | IV/A | 40 |
| Control | IV/B | 40 |
| Total |  | 80 |

In collecting the data, a reading comprehension test was given as a pretest and a posttest to the fourth grade students of English Education study Program FKIP, Muhammadiyah University. Creswell (2005, p. 285) states that the pretest provide a measure on some attribute or characteristics that asses for participant in experiment before they receive a treatment; a posttest measures some characteristics after a treatment. In this study, there were twenty-five questions in the form of multiple choices. The results of the students' pretest and post-test in both
control and in experimental groups were analyzed statistically.

## FINDINGS

## The Result of Students’ Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Group

Based on the result of the students' pretest scores in the experimental group, it was found that the mean was 64.90 , the median was 68.00 , the mode was 72 , the standard error of mean was 1.464 , and the range was 32. Furthermore, the lower score was 44 and the highest sore was 76. Meanwhile, based on the result of the students' posttest in the experimental group, the mean was .82 , the mode was 80 , the median was 84.00 , standard error of mean was 1.1667, and the range was 36 . In addition, the lowest scores was 60 and the highest score was 96 . The statistics of students' pretest and posttest is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Students' Pretest and Posttest in the Experimental group

|  |  | Pretest <br> Experiment | Postest <br> Experiment |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid | 40 | 40 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 64.90 | 82.60 |  |
| Std. Error of Mean | 1.464 | 1.667 |  |
| Median | 68.00 | 84.00 |  |
| Mode | 72 | $80^{\mathrm{a}}$ |  |
| Std. Deviation | 9.259 | 10.546 |  |
| Variance | 85.733 | 111.221 |  |
| Range | 32 | 36 |  |
| Minimum | 44 | 60 |  |
| Maximum | 76 | 96 |  |
| Sum | 2596 | 3304 |  |

## The Result of Students’ Pretest and Posttest in Control Group

Based on the result of the students' pretest in the control group, the mean was 59.90 , the mode was 64 , the median was 64.00 , the standard error of mean was 1.854 , and the range was 40 .

Furthermore, the lowest score was 36 and the highest score was 76 . The result of the students' posttest in the control group showed that the mean was 66.10 , the median was 72.00 , the mode was 76 , and the standard error of mean was 2.129 , and the range was 44 . The lowest score for the students' posttest in the control group was 40 and the highest score was 84 (Table 3).

Table 3. Students' Pretest and Postest in the Control Group

|  |  | Pretest <br> Control | Postest <br> Control |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| N | Valid | 40 | 40 |
|  | Missing | 0 | 0 |
| Mean | 59.90 | 66.10 |  |
| Std. Error of Mean | 1.854 | 2.129 |  |
| Median | 64.00 | 72.00 |  |
| Mode | $64^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 76 |  |
| Std. Deviation | 11.723 | 13.466 |  |
| Variance | 137.426 | 181.323 |  |
| Range | 40 | 44 |  |
| Minimum | 36 | 40 |  |
| Maximum | 76 | 84 |  |
| Sum | 2396 | 2644 |  |

## Reading Comprehension Scores between Experimental and Control Groups

The result of the independent sample t-test showed that the mean difference between the posttests of experimental and control groups was 22.70 , and the sig 2 -tailed was 0.000 (Table 4).

Table 4. Students' Posttest in Experimental and Control Group

| Variable | Mean <br> Diff | t | Sig. <br> (2-tailed) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Post-test <br> Control | 22.70 | 9.105 | 0.000 |
| Post-test <br> Exp |  |  |  |

Since 2 -sig tailed was lower than the the level of significant 0.05 , it could
be conluded that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Cooperative Learning method and those who were not.

## CONCLUSION

The findings of this study showed that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Cooperative Learning method than those who were taught by using conventional method. In addition, the mean score of the students'post-test in experimental class was 82.60 , and the mean score of students' post-test in control group was 66.10. It showed that the mean score of the students posttest in the experimental class was higher than the mean score of the students' post-test in the control class. Therefore, it was concluded that it was effective to teach reading comprehension by using cooperative learning method to the fourth semester students of English Education Study Program FKIP, Muhammadiyah University, Palembang.
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