



SEKOLAH TI Negeri Huda Sukaraja  
DAN D LAMU PONTI SIDA M  
NURUL HUDA SUKARAJA

Vol 1 No. 1 Edisi Oktober 2016

# 'CHANNING'

## JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND LITERATURE

### HERETORICAL STUDY OF THE TENNYSON'S POEMS

*Aimur Rohmah, English Language Program of STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja*

### THE INFLUENCE OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIC READING (CSR) AND READING ATTITUDE TOWARD READING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENT TO THE TENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMA NEGERI 1 BUAY MADANG OKU TIMUR

*Eka Agustina, English Language Program of STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja*

### THE ANALYSIS OF ELLIPSIS IN THE CHRONICLES OF NARNIA FILM BY CLIVE STAPLES LEWIS.

*Herlina, Management and Computer Science College (STMIK) Mura Lubuklinggan, Indonesia,  
Herlina6102@gmail.com*

### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING PAIR CHECK MODEL TO TEACH READING AT THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP N 02 BUAY MADANG

*Mohammad Muklas, English Language Program of STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja,*

### ANALYSIS ON THE USE OF SLANG ON EMINEM'S LYRICS

*Hastuti Retno Kuspiyah, hastutiiretnokuspiyah@yahoo.com,  
English Language Program of STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja*

### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING COOPERATIVE SCRIPT METHOD TO TEACH STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY AT THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENT'S OF SMP NEGERI 1 BUAY BAHUGA

*Rona Aulia Khumairah SMP N 1 Buay Bahuga Lampung*

Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (PBI)  
STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja

ISSN: 2541-4259

**THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING PAIR CHECK MODEL TO TEACH READING  
AT THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMP N 02 BUAY MADANG**

Muhammad Muklas

English Language Program of STKIP Nurul Huda Sukaraja

**Abstract**

The objective of this Research entitled “The effectiveness of using pair check model to teach reading at the eighth grade student of SMP N 02 Buay Madang”. The formulation of this research was there any significant difference between the students who are taught by using pair check model and the students who are taught by using conventional model to teach reading at the eighth grade students of SMP N 02 Buay Madang. The objective of this research was to measure whether or not there was any significant difference between students who are taught teaching reading through pair check model and who are taught through conventional model at the eighth grade students of SMP N 02 Buay Madang. In this research experimental method and true experimental design was used. It was involved two classes they are; experimental class and control class. The population of the research was 88 students of the eighth grade of SMP N 02 Buay Madang, and the sample of the research was 59 that taken through cluster random sampling that divided into two class they are 30 as experimental class and 29 as control class. Meanwhile, for collecting the data used reading test. After that, the data were analyzed by using independent t-test formula. And based on the results of findings, it was found that the mean of post- test score in experimental class was 68.66 and the mean of post- test in control class was 64.65. Beside that, the t-obtained was 0.000 and the t-table with df 57 (59-2) with 95% or 0.05 significant level was 2.0025. Therefore, the research concluded that the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted because the t- obtained was lowers than the t- table ( $0.000 < 2.0025$ ). It also meant that there was any significant difference between students who are taught through Pair Check Model and who are taught through Conventional Model.

**Keywords:** *Reading, Pair check model, Teaching Reading.*

**INTRODUCTION**

In learning English there are four language skills. They are listening, speaking, reading and writting. Besides, they have to master the language components, such as : phonology, grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation to support the four skills because the skills are very important. One of the four language skills is reading ( Jelita, 2005:1 ). Reading is one skills that a learner of foreign language should acquire. In the language classroom it is most often taught by careful reading ( or translation ) of shorter, more difficult foreign language texts. The goal of reading is usually complete and detailed understanding. But reading is also considered by many people as a very pleasure able free time activity that broadens ones

## ‘CHANNING’

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE EDUCATION AND LITERATURE

foreign language their answer will tend to be mostly negative. Students who are learning to read English usually dislike it and the time they spend reading is very limited.

Reading is usually recognized as necessary part in learning English. According to Grabe & Stoller (2009:9), reading is the ability to draw meaning from the printed page and interpret this information appropriately. Reading is necessary when they students continue their study, specially at the university level. They need good reading skill for acquiring knowledge and learning new information. Through reading people can improve their knowledge which is needed to insure the continue personal growth and adapt the change in the world.

There are several definitions of reading, one of them in academic setting, reading is assumed to be the central means for learning new information and gaining access to alternative explanations. Marianne (2001:187) states that reading also provides the foundations for synthesis and critical evaluation skills. In additions, reading is the primary means for independent learning, whether the goal is performing better on academic tasks, learning more about subject matter, or improving language abilities.

To make students more attractive to learning reading and make students actively in learning. In Permendiknas No 41:2007 states that in learning activities should follow standard process has been established which includes exploration, elaboration, and confirmation. One model of learning that can be applied is a model of tpe pair check.

One model that involves students' active learning is Pair Check method. In Pair Check the students are divided into some groups and each group consists of two people and each group have a problem. They must try to resolve the problem, then the results of their group discussion will be checked by a couple of other groups. Because it consists of only two people, the couple will learn to be more active in solving problems and can give new knowledge. Pair Check is one way to help students who are passive in group activities, they do the same work in pairs and pairs gets checking arrangement (Dana, 2008:18).

A model of type pair check is the paired group learning popularized by Spencer Kagan in 1993. This model implementing cooperative learning demanding in dependence and the ability of students in solving problems. This model also train students' social

responsibility, cooperation and the ability to give an assessment (Huda, 2013: 211).

The main problem in this research in the following question: Is there any significant different between the students who are taught by using pair check model and the students

who are not taught by using conventional model to teach reading at the eighth grade students of SMP N 02 Buay Madang ?

## **CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

### **The Concept of Teaching**

Brown (2007:7) says that the teaching is guiding and facilitating learning, enabling the learner to learn, setting the condition for learning. Based on the brown's explanation the researcher concluded that teaching is a processes that given by teacher in guiding and facilitating learner become the learner.

Meanwhile, Grasha (2004:113) states that teaching is an activity where one perso tries to facilitate in another person an appreciation of the complexities involved with in area of study. Teaching involves getting people to think critically about such issues. Based on Grasha's explantion, the researcher concluded that teaching is the actity that done by someone to facilitate the other persons to get knowledge in area of study.

Based on explanation from some experts above, the researcher concluded that “ Teaching is a process that given by teacher in guiding and facilitating learner to get knowledge in area of the research. We know that the teacher has to use his imagination, experience and intuition to choose suitable content and the most effective model so students interet to study and more actively in class room activities”.

### **The Concept of Reading**

It is a well known fact that when there were no televisions or computer, reading was a primary leisure activity. People would spend hours reading books and travel to lands far a way – in their minds. The only strategy is that, with in time, people have lost their skill and passion to read. There are many other exciting and thrilling options available, aside from books. And that is shame because reading offers a productive approch to improving vocabulary and word power. It is advisable to indulge in at least half an hour or reading a day to keep abreast of the various styles of writting and new vocabulary ( Isromiati, 2013:6).

### **The Principles of Teaching Reading**

There are ten principles for teaching reading according to Karlin, (1991:14). Ten principles for teaching reading as a tool for professional development. They posit ten principles in the hopes that others will consider them and reach to them. Ten principles are:



Firstly, the reading material is easy, the use of easy material is conventional. There is a pervasive view that, to accustom students to real-world reading, real-world texts should be used for extensive reading. This is to confuse the means with the end, and paradoxically to rob students of exactly the material, they need to progress to the goal of reading real-world texts. For the students to be motivated to read more and study more, and to be able to ladder up as their foreign language and reading skills improve, they must be reading texts that reflect their language ability texts find easy and enjoyable at every of the way.

Secondly, a variety of reading material on a wide range of topics must be available, the success of extensive reading depends largely on enticing students to read. To awaken or encourage a desire to read the texts made available should ideally be as varied as the learners who read them and the purposes for which they want to read. Books, magazines, newspapers, fiction, non fiction, text that inform, texts that entertain, general, specialized, light, serious.

### **The Concept of Pair Check**

A model of type pair check is the paired group learning popularized by Spencer Kagan in 1993. This model implementing cooperative learning demanding in dependence and the ability of students in solving problems. This model also train students' social responsibility, cooperation, and the ability to give an assessment (Huda, 2013: 211).

One model that involves students' active learning is cooperative learning model Pair Checks. In cooperative learning model Pair Checks the students are divide into some groups and each group consists of two people. To each group students have a problem. They must try to resolve the problem, then the results of their group discussion will be checked by a couple of other groups. Because it consists of only two people, the couple will learn to be more active in solving problems and can give new knowledge. Cooperative learning model Pair Checks is one way to help students who are passive in group activities, they do the same work in pairs and pairs gets checking arrangement (Dana, 2008: 18).

### **Method of Research**

The researcher used true experimental design to conducting this research. There are two groups of students in this research. There were experimental class as classes of students that teach by using pair check model and control class as classes of students that teach by using conventional model. The research design is diagrammed below (Arikunto, 2010:125).





E	O1	X1	O2
C	O3	X2	O4

Where :

- E : Experimental group
- C : Control group
- O1 and O3 : Pretest
- O2 and O4 : Posttest
- X1 : Treatment by using pair check model
- X2 : Treatment with out pair check model

### **Population and sample of The research**

The target of population in this research is all the eighth grade students of SMP N 02 Buay Madang with the total number of the population are 88 students consisting of 3 classes, the researcher chose cluster random sampling to determine sample from the tree classes of eighth grade students of SMP N 02 Buay Madang and the total number of the sample of the research was 59.

### **Technique for Collecting the Data of the research**

There are two kinds of test in this research : the pretest and the posttest. The pretest will be given before the experimental. The posttest will be given after the treatment in order to know the development of students' reading achievement.

### **Validity of the test**

The validity of the test material will check through the concept validity, The researcher will checked whether the instrument is a good validity or not, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment test. SPSS 16 was used by the researcher to calculate the validity of the istruments. The researcher determined the significance level of the the test was 0.05 or 5 % from the confidence interval 95% and the value rtable of this test was 0.344 ( $df = N-2 = 30-2 = 28$  ).

### **Realiability of the Test**

Reliability coefficient is statistical formula used as one estimate of the reliability of the test, which used on the number of item in the test the mean score, and its standard deviation. Reliability coefficient of the test should be at least 0.70 and preferably higher.



**TABLE 1**  
**Reliability Test**

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.792	25

The value of Cronbach Alpha Test was 0.792, it was more than criteria point 0.70. So, it meant that the test items were reliable to measure reading comprehension of the students

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.**

**The Result Pretest and Posttest in the Control Class**

Based on the descriptive statistics calculation about sample, range, minimum, maximum, sum, mean, std. Deviation, variance, skewness, and kurtosis. It could be seen in Table 9 :

**TABLE 2**  
**Descriptive Statistics Pretest and Posttest in the Control Class**

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean		Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness		Kurtosis		
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Std. Error	
scores' pretest control class	29	45	30	75	1745	60.17	2.450	13.194	174.076	-.767	.434	-.433	.845
scores' posttest control class	29	45	40	85	1935	66.72	2.278	12.268	150.493	-.773	.434	-.324	.845
Valid N (listwise)	29												

Based on the calculation of statistics about, it was found the distribution scores of pretest and posttest score in the control class . And the distribution scores as cited in Anteng (2014: 30).

**TABLE 3**

**The Students’ Distribution Score of Pretest and Posttest in the Control Class**

Pretest					Posttest	
No	Range	Category	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	86-100	Excelent	0	0 %	0	0 %
2.	71-85	Very good	5	17.241 %	12	41.379 %
3.	56-70	Good	15	51.724 %	11	37.931 %
4.	41-55	Moderate	5	17.241 %	5	17.241 %
5.	26-40	Poor	4	13.793 %	1	3.448 %
6.	0-25	Failed	0	0 %	0	0 %
Total				100 %	100 %	

29

**The Result of Pretest and Posttest in the Experimental Class**

After the researcher taught or gave treatments to the students by using Pair Check Model in teaching reading Comprehension , the researcher gave post- test in by using research instrument in which the validity and reliability had been tessted previously through the try out.

Meanwhile, based on the descriptive statistics calculation about sample, range, minimum, maximum, sum, mean, std. Deviation, variance, skewness, and kurtosis. It could been seen in Table 4.

**Dictribution Score of the Pretest and Posttest in the Control Class**

**Descriptive Statistics**

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance	Skewness	Kurtosis			
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error			
scores' pretest experimen tal class	30	45	30	75	1785	59.50	2.025	11.091	123.017	-.962	.427	.399	.833
scores' posttest experimen tal class	30	45	45	90	2060	68.67	1.856	10.165	103.333	-.271	.427	.459	.833
Valid N (listwise)	30												

Moreover, the students’ distribution score of pretest and posttest in the experimental class. It could be seen in Table 5.

**TABLE 5**

**The Students’ Distribution Score of Pretest and Posttest in Experimental Class**

Pretest					Posttest	
No	Range	Category	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1.	86-100	Excelent	0	0 %	1	3.333 %
2.	71-85	Very good	2	6.666 %	9	30.00 %
3.	56-70	Good	19	63.333 %	17	56.666 %
4.	41-55	Moderate	6	20.00 %	3	10.00 %
5.	26-40	Poor	3	10.00 %	0	0 %
6.	0-25	Failed	0	0 %	0	0 %
Total				100 %	100 %	

29

**The Statistical analysis**

**Normality and Homogeneity of the Data**

The result of the normality test of the pre-test score in Experimental and Control class were described as in the following Table 6.

**TABLE 6**

	Normality Test					
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
scores' posttest reading by using conventional model	.176	29	.122	.905	29	.113
scores' posttest reading by using pair check model	.139	29	.158	.961	29	.350

Based on the calculation of statistics above, it was found that sig. was 0.122. it is higher  $\alpha$  (0.05). So, it means that the data a normal distribution. The researcher concluded that the students in Experimental and Control class have the same ability in reading.

In addition, to know the homogeneity of the data, the reseacher calculated by SPSS. It could be seen in Table 7.

**TABLE 7**

Homogeneity Test			
Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
2.736	1	57	.104

Based on the table above, the Levene Statistic score of post-test in Experimental Class and Control Class was 2.736. Then, the value of Probabilitas or value of Sig was 0.104.



It was more than value of Sig (0.05). So, it means that the data of the post-test score in Experimental Class and Control Class is Homogen.

**The Statistical Analysis of Posttest Score in Control Class and Experimental Class by Using Independent t-test**

To find out whether or not there was any significant difference in reading comprehension, the researcher compared the result of the posttest in control class and experimental class by using Independent Sample t-test. The result of the SPSS calculation was described as follow:

**TABLE 8**  
**Independent Sample t test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	99% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
nilai posttest control dan experimental	Equal variances assumed	2.736	.104	2.357	57	.000	4.011	2.956	-3.865	11.888
	Equal variances not assumed			2.357	54.029	.000	4.011	2.966	-3.908	11.931

According to the Table 14, the mean score of the Experimental class was 68.67 and the mean score of the Control class was 64.66. The value of  $t$  obtained = 2.357 is higher than  $t$ table 1.672 and the value of sig. (2-tailed) = 0.000 less than the value Significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).

Finally, the researcher concluded that Hypothesis alternative ( $H_a$ ) of this research was accepted and ( $H_o$ ) of this research was rejected. It meant that there was any significant difference in teaching reading by using Pair Check Model in the Experimental class.

**CONCLUSION**

Based on this research, the researcher got the students' average score in Experimental class and Control class were 68.66 and 64.65. So, the students' average score in Experimental class was more than the students' average score in Control class. Then, it was found that the

result of the Independent Sample t-test of the posttest score in Experimental and Control class

gave the value of  $t$  obtained 2.357 and the value Sig. (2-tailed) were 0.000. It meant that the value of  $t$  obtained was more than  $t_{table} = 1.672$  with  $df = (N_1+N_2)-2=57$  and the value of Sig. (2-tailed) was less than the value of Significance level ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ). So, the alternative hypothesis ( $H_a$ ) was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

From the data above, the researcher concluded that Pair Check Model was an effective model to teach reading to the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 02 Buay Madang. It meant that application of Pair Check Model was effective way to teach reading and have influenced in teaching reading and this made easier to understand the reading material.

## REFERENCES

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2006). *Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Preaktek*, Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Bender, N. William. (1992). *Reading Strategy for Elementary Students With Learning Difficulties*. Jakarta.
- Fraenkel, Jack R & Norman E. Wallen. (1990). *How To Design And Evaluate Research In Education*. New York, NY: McGrawhil Publishing Company.
- Ogle, D.M. (1986). K-W-L: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher*, 3(9), 564-570.
- Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, M.A: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Rahmawati, L.E. (2012). “Pengaruh strategi know want to learn (KWL) dan direct reading activity (DRA) terhadap kemampuan membaca intensif ditinjau dari kebiasaan membaca (studi eksperimen pada siswa kelas 11 SMA Negeri Wilayah Sragen Barat)”. *Digital Library Universitas Sebelas Maret*. Retrieved from [http://digilib.uns.ac.id/pengguna.php?mn=detail&d\\_id=12563](http://digilib.uns.ac.id/pengguna.php?mn=detail&d_id=12563).
- Stahl, D.K. (2003). *The effects of three instructional methods on the reading comprehension and content acquisition of novice readers* (Unpublished Master’s Dissertation). University of Georgia Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Georgia, G.E.
- Stauffer, R. G. (1969). *Directing reading maturity as a cognitive process*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Thorndike, R. D. (1992). *Reading in a foreign language: Identification of subskills of reading comprehension by maximum likelihood factor analysis*. Chicago, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- UNESCO. (2009). *Mother tongue multilingual education*. Retrieved from <http://>



Grabe, W & Stoller, F.L ( 2001 ). *Reading for Academic purpose : Guidelines for the ESL / EFL teacher.*, *Teaching English as second foreign language* Buston : Heinle and Heinle.

Hill, Susan. (2008). *Developing Early Literacy; assessment and Teaching and Teaching*. Australia: Eleanor Curtain Publishing.

Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English*. New York: Oxford university press.

Mikulecky, Beatrice S. (1990). *Reading Power*. Longman inc.

Mukromin. (2009). *The Correlation Between Students Ability In Stating Main Idea In Paragraph And Reading Ability Towards Their Summary Writing Ability At The Second Semester Of Eight Class At SMP Negeri 4 Bandar Lampung In 2008/2009*.Thesis. Bandar Lampung: STKIP PGRI Bandar Lampung.

Sugiyono. (2012). *Statistika Untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta.