THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIC READING (CSR) IN IMPROVING READING COMPREHENTION OF THE FIRST YEAR STUDENTS AT SMA PONDOK PESANTREN MODERN AL IKHLASH LAMPOKO CAMPALAGIAN POLEWALI MANDAR

Abd Hamid[1], Nurhamidah Idrus[2]
Institut Agama Islam DDI Polewali Mandar
E-Mail: ***abdhamid@ddipolman.ac.id, nurhamidahidrus012@iai.ddipolman.ac.id***

ABSTRAK

Tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah penggunaan CSR lebih efektif atau tidak dalam meningkatkan pemahaman membaca siswa kelas 1 SMA Pondok Pesantren Modern Al-Ikhlash. Sample dari penelitian ini adalah 40 siswa dari 2 kelas yang mempunyai level yang sama. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian quasi experimen dan data penelitian dikumpulkan melalui instrument tes membaca yang kemudian dianalisis dengan menggunakan statistik deskriptif dan inferensial.

Hasil statistik penelitian tidak menegaskan bahwa CSR lebih efektif dari GTM dalam meningkatkan pemahaman membaca siswa yang berhubungan dengan kosa kata. Akan tetapi hasil menunjukan bahwa CSR lebih efektif dari GTM dalam meningkatkan pemahaman membaca siswa yang berhubungan dengan pertanyaan tentang ide pokok, supporting detail dan membuat kesimpulan. Jadi disimpulkan bahwa CSR effective untuk digunakan dalam meningkatkan pemahaman membaca siswa khususnya berhubungan dengan pertanyaan ide pokok, menemukan ide pendukung dan membuat kesimpulan.

Kata Kunci: *Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR)*; *Reading Comprehension.*

Introduction

Reading has been considered the most important skill for the second and foreign English learners in academic contexts especially at the tertiary level because they need to access professional knowledge written in English (Anderson, 1999). With fluent reading proficiency, students are likely to not only gain greater success in English learning but also attain better academic performance (Chang, 1998). Based on reading research into how proficient readers achieve comprehension, it has been found that good readers are who can monitor their reading process carefully and consistently apply different reading strategies to comprehend the ongoing text (Almasi, 2003). Good readers possess a repertoire of self-monitoring reading strategies ranging from bottom-up vocabulary strategies, such as determining meanings from word parts and finding information from structural clues, to more comprehensive strategies, for example, activating background knowledge of related themes, skimming for the main ideas, making inferences, summarizing and determining the tone or purpose of the texts (Chang, 1998). In other words, strategic readers are aware of the interactive nature of reading and integrate both holistic techniques and decoding approaches in the process of reading. They read for general ideas and make sufficient inferences about the text by the application of their prior knowledge. Simultaneously, they perform automatic word recognition, extracting meaning from syntactic and lexical clues for text comprehension.

In SMA PPM Al-Ikhlash, reading instruction has been the central focus in EFL learning contexts as English is a required subject for students wishing to enter higher education. The students are often accurate translation from the

texts. Students rely heavily on decoding skills and they tend to read in a word-by-word, sentence-by-sentence fashion. This is echoed in discussion with English teacher there who show that, to deal with text difficulty, The learners at SMA PPM Al-Ikhlash often consult the bilingual dictionary for a translation. This analytical reading behaviour is perhaps influenced by their past learning experience. Consequently, students find it extremely difficult and frustrating to read their textbooks written in English because they rely heavily on local decoding skills and have limited knowledge of reading strategies to help them comprehend the text they are encountering.

Another dilemma that English teachers have to face in SMA PPM Al-Ikhash is large classes consisting of perhaps 30 or even 40 students with different learning styles, expectations, interests and motivation in English learning. It is almost impossible for teachers to meet every student's need or get them all involved in classroom activities under these circumstances. Moreover, because of the prevalent approach to teaching mentioned above, a number of students have developed passive attitudes and will not be able to take responsibility for their learning.

Encountering the above-mentioned difficulties gave me the motivation to conduct this study. As an English teacher, I have been searching for a feasible and effective reading approach which can help students to improve their strategic reading in a large class setting and provide opportunities for them to take more responsibility for their own learning. Among the reading approaches developed by researchers and educators, Collaborative Strategic Reading (hereafter called "CSR") is a reading approach theorising that learners' strategic reading comprehension can be enhanced by teaching them a repertoire of comprehension strategies through collaborative peer-led discussions. Empirically, CSR has been applied in ESL and EFL educational contexts, and the results of studies have shown positive outcomes in the improvement of students' reading comprehension, content learning and English acquisition (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000). However, despite its positive effects in various studies, there has been no study on the impact of CSR in Polewali Mandar especially in SMA PPM Al-Ikhlash. This is my reason for undertaking the present study.

Collaborative Strategic Reading

1. Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) Approach

CSR is an excellent teaching technique for teaching students reading comprehension and building vocabulary and also working together cooperatively (Klingner, 1998). This technique is a way to help second language learners engage with difficult text and use the key reading strategies to improve comprehension. In addition, according to Grabe (2009: 233), CSR is a promising approach to combined-strategies instruction that draws on both reciprocal teaching and cooperative learning, and this approach has been used with both L1 and L2 students. Here, students are working in groups and taught to activate prior knowledge, make predictions, monitor their comprehension difficulties, clarify information, restate important ideas, summarize the text, and form appropriate questions about the text.

To use this approach, first, the teacher presents the strategies to the whole class using modeling, role playing, and teacher think-aloud (students are prompted to voice their thoughts before, during, and after reading). After students have developed proficiency to use the strategies, the teacher then assigns the students to heterogeneous cooperative learning groups (Johnson and Johnson, 1989; Kagan, 1991, in Klingner, 2007: 139). All the students are actively involved, and everyone has the opportunity to contribute as group members learn from and understand the text with CSR. In more specific way, Spielberger (2002: 17) explains that CSR combines instruction in comprehension strategies and study skills with collaborative peer practice. Students learn four strategies through direct instruction and teacher modeling: (a) *preview* (i.e., preview and predicting), (b) *click and clunk* (i.e., monitoring for understanding and vocabulary knowledge), (c) *get the gist* (i.e., understanding the main idea, and (d) *wrap-up* (i.e., self questioning for understanding).

2. The Implementation of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR)

In CSR, learning is scaffolded by both teacher and students. Here, scaffold means temporary support and guidance in problem solving (Spielberger, 2002: 329). The teacher provides instruction in strategies, assigns group roles, and provides a guide for reading and discussion. Here, the teacher gives students multiple opportunities to practice the strategies before asking them to apply the strategies on their own in cooperative learning groups. Meanwhile, students then scaffold each other's learning by providing immediate feedback. There are two phases in implementing CSR in the reading class. An overview of how to apply CSR in classroom provided in the following sections.

a. Phase 1: Teaching the Strategies

The teacher provides explicit instruction to students to teach the CSR reading comprehension strategies. Here, as with reciprocal teaching, the teacher conveys the value in learning different comprehension strategies, emphasizing that these strategies are what good readers use to help them understand what they read, and that by learning the strategies, everyone can become a better reader. Moreover, as with reciprocal teaching, the students are exposed to all the strategies on the first day, so that they can get a sense of CSR-style strategic reading looks like. The teacher then provides additional instruction in each strategy, teaching students why, when, and how to apply each one.

In this phase, according to Klingner (1998: 32), in CSR students learn four strategies: *preview*, *click-and-clunk*, *get the gist*, and *wrap-up*. *Preview* is used only before reading the entire text for the lesson. Meanwhile, *wrap-up* is used only after reading the entire text for the lesson. The other two strategies, *click-and-clunk* and *get the gist*, are used many times while reading the text, after each paragraph or two. For more detail, an overview of how to teach each of the strategies provided in the following sections.

1) *Preview*

The goals of previewing are to (a) help students identify and learn as much about the passage as they can in a brief of time (2-3 minutes), (b) activate their background knowledge about the topic, and (c) help them

make predictions about they will learn. Previewing serves to motivate students' interest in the topic and to engage them in active reading from the beginning. Here, the teacher helps the students with previewing by reminding them to use all the visual clues in the text, such as pictures, charts, or graphs, and to look at the headings and subheadings used throughout the passage. This way will help students do two things: (a) brainstorm what they know about the topic, and (b) predict what they will learn about the topic. In addition, the teacher might help the students connect the topic to their own experiences and also preteach key vocabulary that is important to understanding the text but that does not show directly to the click-and-clunk fixup strategies. The teacher gives opportunity to the students to write down everything they have already known about the topic in their CSR Learning Logs (see the description of CSR Learning Logs in "Materials" section). Then, students share their responses with one another. Next, they write down their predictions of what they might learn, and they share their best ideas.

2) *Click-and-clunk*

Students use click-and-clunk process to monitor their comprehension of the text. When students understand the information, it "clicks"; when it does not make sense, it "clunks." For example, when students do not know the meaning of a word, it is a clunk. Clicking and clunking are designed to teach students to pay attention to when they understand – or fail to understand – what they are reading or what is being read to them. In this strategy, the teacher asks, "Is everything clicking? Who has clunks about the section we just read?" Students know that they will be asked this question and are alert to identify clunks during reading. Students work together to identify clunks in the text and use fix-up strategies to help them "declunck" the word or concept.

3) *Get the gist*

Getting the gist means that students are able to state the main idea of the paragraph or cluster of paragraphs in their own words. In this way, students learn how to synthesize information, taking a larger chunk of text and showing it into a key concept or idea. Students are taught to identify the most important *who* and *what*, leaving out details. Many teachers require that the students state the main point of the paragraphs in 10 words or less (Klingner, 2007: 145). The goal of getting the gist is to teach students to restate the most important point in their own words as a way of making sure they have understood what they have read. Furthermore, this strategy can improve students' understanding and memory of what they have learned.

4) *Wrap-up*

Students learn to "wrap-up" by formulating questions and answer about what they have learned and by reviewing key ideas. The goals of this process are to improve the students' knowledge, understanding, and memory of what they have read. Students generate questions about important information in the passage. They learn to use question starters to begin their questions: *who, what, when, where, why,* and *how* ("the five Ws and H"). As with reciprocal teaching, students pretend they are teachers and think questions they would ask on a test to find out if their students really understood what they have read. Meanwhile, other students should try to answer the questions. If a question cannot be answered, that

might mean it is not a good question and it needs to be clarified.

In order to review, students write down the most important ideas they have learned from the day's reading assignment in their CSR learning logs. Then, they take turns sharing what they have learned with the class. Many students can share their "best idea" in a short period of time, providing the teacher with valuable information about their level of understanding.

b. Phase 2: Cooperative Learning Group Roles

When students are proficient in using the comprehension strategies with the support of the teacher, they are ready to learn how to implement the strategies while working in heterogeneous cooperative learning groups. Johnson and Johnson (1989 in Klingner, 2007: 146) explains that cooperative learning should promote and include five main characteristics: (a) positive interdependence, (b) considerable face-to-face interaction among students, (c) individual accountability, (d) positive social skills, and (e) self as well as group evaluation or reflection.

In cooperative groups, students do not simply work together on the same assignment; each person must have a key role to play and everyone is responsible for the success of the group. Students are told that they have two responsibilities: to make sure they can learn the material and to help everyone else in their group learn it, too. In this stage, students who have not previously worked in cooperative learning groups may need preparation in order to work productively and effectively. Most experts on cooperative learning suggest that teacher-selected groups work best, at least until students become proficient at collaboration (Richards, 2007: 54). Teacher-selected groups aim to achieve a heterogeneous mix. In this case, the heterogeneous mix helps students break down barriers among them. In accordance with CSR, in cooperative groups students discuss what they have read, assist one another in the comprehension of the text, and provide academic and affective support for their classmates. Here, everyone has a chance to try out all of the roles. These roles may include (Klingner et al., 2001):

1. *Leader*

   The role of leader is leading the group in the implementation of CSR by saying what to read next and what strategy to apply next.

2. *Clunk expert*

   The role of clunk expert is using clunk cards to remind the group of the steps to follow when trying to figure out a difficult word or concept.

3. *Gist expert*

   The gist expert guides the group toward the development of a gist and determines that the gist contains the most important idea(s) but no unnecessary details.

4. *Announcer*

   This student calls on different group members to read or share an idea. He or she makes sure everyone participates and only one person talks at a time.

5. *Encourager*

   This student watches the group and gives feedback. He or she looks for behaviors to praise. The student encourages all group members to participate in the discussion and assist one another. He or she evaluates how well the group has worked together and gives suggestions for improvement.

6. *Timekeeper*

   This student sets the timer for each portion of CSR and lets the group

know when it is time to move on (the teacher might do this instead of students). Of those six, *leader*, *clunk expert*, and *gist expert* are essential; meanwhile, the other three can be combined. Those three roles may be done by one student in each group as well as *announcer*, *encourager*, and *timekeeper*. Dishon and O'Leary (1993 in Richards, 2007: 57) explain that in cooperative learning groups should stay together from 4 to 8 sessions. It will give students a chance to become comfortable with one another, allow them to form group identity and bond, and give themopportunity to learn how to overcome difficulties they have working together. In this study, the writer assigns the experimental group to cooperative learning groups for 6 meetings.

Methods

Since the present study is to measure the effect of CSR towards the students' reading comprehension achievement, it is classified into quantitative research. Here, the writer collected numerical data by comparing the results of pre-test and post-test between two groups of experimental study – control and experimental groups. The data is used to investigate whether there is a significant increase in students' reading comprehension achievement after being given the CSR treatment in reading class.

The subjects of the study were the first students of SMA Pondok Pesantren Modern Al-Ikhlash that consist of 40 students. There were 20 students for experimental group and 20 students for control group. Later, the pre-test and post-test were administered in those classes.

In constructing the instrument, the writer developed 6 items reading comprehension test. The test was constructed by drawing on the reading comprehension related on the questions of getting main idea, finding supporting details, dealing with vocabulary and making inference. The test was formed in multiple choice.

The analysis of the effectiveness of CSR in students' reading comprehension achievement was done through several steps. First, the writer collected the answer sheets of students' reading comprehension pre-test and post-test for both control and experimental group. This was followed by the second step in which the two tests are marked and given the score following the scoring system that had been already set up. The third step was tabulating the students' pre-test and post-test scores based on their groups, the control and experimental group. The fourth step was measuring the means scores of each group. It was computed by dividing the sum of all scores by the number of subjects of the study. Here, the means (*M*) of pre-test and post-test scores of the groups were compared to find out the progress before and after the treatments.

The last step was analyzing the students' reading comprehension score of the pre-test of the experimental and control groups by using the *independent t-test* to know whether the subjects of experimental and control groups had significantly different or equal level before the experiment was conducted. In addition, the similar statistics measure was applied to the students' reading comprehension score of the post-test of the experimental and control groups to know to what extent was the difference between students who were taught using CSR and those who were taught using GTM.

Results

In table below, the researcher calculated the mean score and the standard deviation of the students' score both Experimental Group and Control Group in pretest and posttest.

Before the treatment, both Experimental Group and Control Group are given pretest to know the students achievement on reading

The main score and standard deviation are shown difference in posttest to the both of the groups. The data based on the computation using SPSS 20. From the data shown in table above, the main score of experimental group and control group is mostly in the same score before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the posttest score to both of the groups show the different score of mean score. This means that there is an improvement after giving the treatment. The main score of the students' pretest of experimental group is 57.80 categorized as fair classification; and control group is 56.60 categorized as fair classification. The main score of both groups are different after the treatment executed. The main score after the treatment is 73.40 for experimental group categorized as fairly good classification and 62.60 for control group with categorized as fair classification; it means that the main score of experimental group is higher than control group (73.40 > 62.60).

Relating to the t-test, it indicated that CSR is more effective than GTM in improving the students

Variables	P-Value	(α)	Remarks
Pretest of experimental and control group	0.63	0.05	Not Significantly Different
Posttest of experimental and control group	0.00	0.05	Significantly Different

reading comprehension. It can be seen in the following table:

The researcher found that the Probability value (0.63) is higher than comprehension to find out whether or not both experimental and control group are at the same level and post test to find out students' improvement.

The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of the Students' Pretest and Posttest

	Group	Mean	Standard deviation
Pre test	Experimental Group	57.80	7.62
	Control Group	56.60	8.23
Posttest	Experimental Group	73.40	7.25
	Control Group	62.60	8.23

the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 38. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In the other words, there is no significant difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group before the treatment. It is supported by Gay (2006:124) states that when variables have equal interval, it is assumed that the difference between close score is essentially the same.

While the data on posttest of control and experimental group showed that the probability value is smaller than α (0.00<0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group

Variables	P-Value	(α)	Remarks
Pretest of experimental and control group	0.47	0.05	Not Significantly Different
Posttest of experimental and control group	0.00	0.05	Significantly Different

after the treatment.

The researcher also found that CSR is more effective than GTM related to the questions of getting main idea. It can be seen in the table below:

The table above indicated that the main score of experimental group and control group is mostly in the same score before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the posttest score to both of the groups show the different

score of mean score. The main score of the students' pretest of experimental group is 57.60 categorized as fair classification; and control group is 55.65 and standard categorized as poor classification. The main score of both groups are different after the treatment executed. The main score after the treatment is 72.05 for experimental group categorized as fairly good classification and 64.30 for control group categorized as fair classification. It means that the main score of experimental group is higher than control group.

Relating to the t-test, it indicated that CSR is more effective than GTM in improving the students reading comprehension particularly related to the question of getting main idea. It can be seen in the following table :

Group		Mean	Standard deviation
Pre test	Experimental Group	57.60	10.30
	Control Group	55.65	11.81
Posttest	Experimental Group	72.05	7.27
	Control Group	64.30	12.00

The researcher found that the Probability value (0.47) is higher than the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 38. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In the other words, there is no significant difference between the students achievment in getting main idea both groups before the treatment. While the data on posttest of control and experimental group shows that the probability value is smaller than α (0.00<0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the students reading comprehension of experimental and control group after the treatment. It can be concluded that the application of CSR is more effective in improving the students' reading comprehension ability in getting main idea.

The researcher also found that

Group		Mean	Standard deviation
Pre test	Experimental Group	57.60	10.30
	Control Group	55.65	11.81
Posttest	Experimental Group	72.05	7.27
	Control Group	64.30	12.00

CSR is more effective than GTM related to the questions of finding supporting details. It can be seen in the table below:

The Table above reveals that the main score of experimental group and control group is mostly in the same score before giving the treatment. After giving the treatment, the score of experimental and control group show the different score. The main score of the students' pretest of experimental group is 57.60 categorized as fair classification; and control group is 55.65 categorized as poor classification. The main score of both groups are different after the treatment executed. The main score after the treatment is 72.05 for experimental group categorized as fairly good and 64.30 for control group categorized as fair classification. It means that the main score of experimental group is higher than control group.

Relating to the t-test, it indicated that CSR is more effective than GTM in improving the students reading comprehension particularly related to the question of finding supporting details. It can be seen in the following table :

The researcher found that the Probability value (0.58) is higher than the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 58. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In the other words, there is no

Variables	P-Value	(α)	Remarks
Pretest of experimental and control group	0.58	0.05	Not Significantly Different
Posttest of experimental and control group	0.01	0.05	Significantly Different

significant difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group before the treatment. While the data on posttest of control and experimental group showed that the probability value is smaller than α (0.01<0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group after the treatment. It can be concluded that the application of CSR is more effective in improving the students' reading comprehension ability in finding supporting details.

The researcher also found that CSR does not confirm that CSR more effective than GTM related to the questions of dealing with vocabulary. It can be seen in the table below:

	Group	Mean	Standard deviation
Pre test	Experimental Group	54.00	9.59
	Control Group	58.85	15.12
Posttest	Experimental Group	65.80	10.25
	Control Group	63.85	12.56

The table indicated that there is an improvement on of the students' posttest in vocabulary of the experimental and control group. It can be seen on the main score of the pretest 54.00 (poor classification) to posttest 65.80 (fair classification) for experimental group and also for the control group, pretest 58.85 (fair classification) to posttest 63.85 (fair classification). In fact, the main score of posttest dealing with vocabulary at the experimental group and control group is not significantly different.

Relating to the t-test, it indicated that CSR is not more effective than GTM in improving the students reading comprehension particularly related to the question of vocabulary. It can be seen in the following table :

Variables	P-Value	(α)	Remarks
Pretest of experimental and control group	0.23	0.05	Not Significantly Different
Posttest of experimental and control group	0.59	0.05	Not Significantly Different

The researcher found that the Probability value (0.23) is higher than the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 38. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In the other words, there is no significant difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group before the treatment. The the data on posttest of control and experimental group also show that the probability value is higher than α (0.59<0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H0) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H1) is rejected. It means that there is no significantly difference between the students reading comprehension both groups, experimental and control group after the treatment. It can be concluded that the application of CSR is not more effective in improving the students' reading comprehension ability dealing with vocabulary.

The researcher also found that CSR is more effective than GTM related to the questions of making inference. It can be seen in the table below:

	Group	Mean	Standard deviation
Pre test	Experimental Group	50.85	8.89
	Control Group	54.90	10.48
Posttest	Experimental Group	74.70	9.27
	Control Group	57.60	12.52

The table below indicates that there is an improvement on of the students' posttest in making inference of the experimental and control group. It can be seen on the main score of the pretest 50.85 (poor classification) to posttest 74.70 (fairly good classification) for experimental group and also for the control group, pretest 54.90 (fair classification) to posttest 57.60 (fair classification). In fact, the main score of posttest in making inference the control group is higher than experimental group.

Relating to the t-test, it indicated that CSR is more effective than GTM in improving the students reading comprehension particularly related to the question of making inference. It can be seen in the following table :

Variables	P-Value	(α)	Remarks
Pretest of experimental and control group	0.23	0.05	Not Significantly Different
Posttest of experimental and control group	0.00	0.05	Significantly Different

The researcher find that the Probability value (0.23) is higher than the level of significance at t-table (0.05) and the degree of freedom 38. It means that H_0 is accepted and H_1 is rejected. In the other words, there is not significantly difference between the students reading comprehension both groups before the treatment. While the data on posttest of control and experimental group shows that the probability value is smaller than α (0.00<0.05). It indicates that the alternative hypothesis (H1) is accepted and the null hypothesis (H0) is rejected. It means that the application of CSR is more effective than GTM in improving the students' reading comprehension ability in making inference.

Discussion Of The Results

The results of the analysis of the data of this research indicated that the use of CSR strategy is 'effective' to increase the students' achievement in teaching reading comprehension for the first year students at SMA Pondok Pesantren Modern Al-Ikhlash particularly related to the questions of getting main idea, finding supporting details, dealing with vocabulary and making inference. It can be proved by the value of t-test is smaller than alfa in post test. But this research does not confirm that CSR to be more effective than GTM in improving reading comprehension dealing with vocabulary. It is proved by the value of t-test higher than alfa.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings and discussion in the previous chapter, the writer concluded the result of this research as follows:

1. The use of CSR in improving studens' reading comprehension at the first year students of SMA PPM Al-Ikhlash is more effective than GTM.. It is proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group is higher than control group. It can be seen from the students' mean score of posttest is 73.40 for Experimental Group, while for Control Group the students' mean score of posttest is 62.60. The T- Test of the students' reading achievement in experimental and control group in posttest is smaller than α (0.00 < 0.05).
2. The use of CSR in teaching reading comprehension is more effective the GTM in improving the students' reading comprehension in getting main idea. It is proved by the mean score of the students'

posttest in experimental group is higher than control group. It can be seen from the students' mean score of posttest is 76.25 for Experimental Group, while for Control Group the students' mean score of posttest is 60.60. The T-Test of the students' reading achievement in getting main idea of experimental and control group in posttest is smaller than α (0.00 < 0.05).

3. The use of CSR in teaching reading comprehension is more effective the GTM in improving the students' reading comprehension in finding supporting details. It is proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group is higher than control group. It can be seen from the students' mean score of posttest is 72.05 for Experimental Group, while for Control Group the students' mean score of posttest is 64.30. The T-Test of the students' reading achievement in finding supporting details of experimental and control group in posttest is smaller than α (0.01 < 0.05).
4. The use of CSR in teaching reading comprehension is not more effective than GTM in improving the students' reading comprehension dealing with vocabulary. It can be seen from the students' mean score of posttest is 65.80 for Experimental Group, while for Control Group the students' mean score of posttest is 63.85. The T- Test of the students' reading achievement dealing with vocabulary of experimental and control group in posttest is higher than α (0.59 < 0.05).
5. The use of CSR in teaching reading comprehension is more effective the GTM in improving the students' reading comprehension in making inference. It is proved by the mean score of the students' posttest in experimental group is significant different from control group. It can be seen from the T-Test of the students' reading achievement in making inference of experimental and control group in posttest is higher than α (0.00 > 0.05).

REFERENCES

Alderson, J. C. (1984). Reading in a foreign language: A reading problem or a language problem? In J. C. Alderson & A. H. Urquhart (Eds.), *Reading in a foreign language* (pp. 1-27). London: Longman.

Almasi, J. 2003. *Teaching strategic processes in reading*. New York: Guilford Press.

Chang, R. M. 1998. A qualitative inquiry: Strategy use by EFL students in dealing with text difficulties. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Conference on English Teaching and Learning*. Taipei: Crane Publishing Co. Ltd.

Grabe, William. 2009. *Reading in a Second Language: Moving from Theory to Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klingner, J., and Sharon Vaughn. 2000. "The Helping Behaviors of Fifth Graders while Using Collaborative Strategic Reading during ESL Content Classes". *TESOL Quarterly Journal*. Vol. 34, pp. 69-98.

Klingner, Janette K. and Sharon Vaughn. 1998. "Using Collaborative Strategic Reading". *Teaching Exceptional Children Journal*. Vol. 1, pp. 32-37.

Klingner, Janette K., Sharon Vaughn, and Alison Broadman. 2007. *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. New York: The Guildford Press.

Richards, Jack C. and Willy A. Renandya. 2007. *Methodology in Language*