

# INCREASING READING COMPREHENSION OF THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS THROUGH THINK-PAIR-SHARE (TPS) TECHNIQUE

Dede Rillyanto Naluraya<sup>1</sup>, Nadrun<sup>2</sup>, Budi<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

The objective of this research was to increase the students' reading comprehension by using TPS technique. This research applied a pretest and posttest design. It involved two groups, experimental and control groups. The population of this research was the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tolitoli. The sample of this research was selected by using cluster random sampling technique. The sample was 61 students of class XI IA<sup>4</sup> as the experimental group and XI IA<sup>3</sup> as the control group. These groups were given pretest and posttest. The data were analyzed by using statistical analysis in order to know the significant difference of the pretest and posttest. Having analyzed the data, the researcher found that the value of the t-test was 18.16. The mean score of experimental group in the pretest and posttest were 51.6 and 87.1. The mean score of control group in the pretest and posttest were 57.7 and 84.2. Consulting to the  $t_{table}$  value by applying the degree of freedom (df)  $(31+30-2=59)$  and 0.05 level of significance, the researcher found that the value of  $t_{table}$  was 2.002. The result of the data analysis showed that the hypothesis was accepted by regarding to the analysis that t-test was higher than the  $t_{table}$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that the use of TPS technique can increase reading comprehension of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tolitoli.

**Keywords:** reading comprehension; think-pair-share technique.

## INTRODUCTION

Reading is a complex process. It involves not only idea, but also recognizing the relationship and structures among ideas. To read efficiently readers need to be able to grasp each idea which author expresses, and determine how it is related to the other ideas, expressed in that piece of writing. To be able to do these, readers must be familiar with the basic structure and organization of sentences, paragraphs, and any longer selection.

---

<sup>1</sup> E-mail: [dederillyanto@yahoo.com](mailto:dederillyanto@yahoo.com)

<sup>2</sup> E-mail: [nadrun.untad@gmail.com](mailto:nadrun.untad@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup> E-mail: [budi\\_lero73@yahoo.com](mailto:budi_lero73@yahoo.com)

Reading comprehension is the main point of the act reading. When a person reads a text engages in a complex array of cognitive process. He is simultaneously using his awareness and understanding of phonemes (individual sound “pieces” in language), phonics (connection between letters and sounds and relationship between sounds, letters, and words) and ability to comprehend or construct meaning from the text.

Comprehension refers to the ability or the skill to understand. Comprehension is the ability to grasp the meaning of material. This may be shown by translating material form, by interpreting the material (explaining or summarizing) and by estimating future (predicting consequences or effects). Reading comprehensions is the ability to understand the whole content of the reading text. It means the dialogue between the reader and author. William in Depdiknas (2004:15) defines “Reading comprehension is reader power to find and understand sense of print passage. This may be in words, phrases and sentences or in paragraph.” It is complex process in which reader uses their mental content to obtain from written material. Readers can interpret reading comprehension is a process. It involves construction on an author’s message by using readers’ prior knowledge, especially the knowledge of language. Thoughts and language become one when readers read with understanding. However, the process of communication is not depending solely upon readers’ understanding of words and the way they used. The results of reading activities are:

- a. the ability to comprehend the content of reading passage.
- b. the ability to understand the sentence structure in reading passage.
- c. the ability to grasp the ideas or the information on the reading passage.
- d. the ability to recall words meaning of the reading passage.
- e. the ability to recall the content or he ideas of the reading passage in one’s own words, when necessary (Dines, 1982:3).

To some students, understanding a reading material is difficult, especially in identifying the words that has more than one meaning. It is not for them because they are not familiar with the words used. Nuttal (1985:77) states:

Any word that has more than one meaning is bound to cause trouble to the inexperienced, and we are all in some field-some of the most dangerous misunderstanding arouse when apparently everyday words are used in specialized sense by researchers in specialized fields.

In order to encourage the students' reading comprehension, we can use Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique. TPS is a collaborative learning strategy in which students work together to solve a problem or answer a question about an assigned reading. This technique requires students to think individually about a topic or answer to a question and share ideas with classmates. Discussing an answer with a partner serves to maximize participation, focus attention and engage students in comprehending the reading material. TPS technique is strategy in teaching by providing more time to the students to express their ideas to their friends in the class. David and Roger (2004) in Lestary (2011:13) argue:

Think-Pair-Share Technique is the procedure of the experiment was as follows: The students read silently the reading passages for 10 minute. During this step, individuals thought silently about a question posed by the in structure. Individuals' pair up and exchange thoughts for 20 minutes. The pair's are given 30 minute to share their responses with other pairs, other teams, or entire group.

TPS is a strategy designed to provide students with "matter for thought" on a given topics enabling them to formulate individual ideas and share these ideas with another students. It is learning strategy developed by Lyman and his team of educators in Maryland to encourage student classroom participation. Rather than using a basic recitation method in which a teacher poses a question and one student offers a response, TPS encourages a high degree of students' response and can help keep students on task.

The most important part when applying this technique is the student can enjoy their self when they study English. Besides, students can help each other to solve the problem by sharing to their friends because they do not feel clumsy to share with their own friends.

In individual or competitive ways, some students are not active and only smart students dominate the class (as dominators). They can read and answer question from the text easily. Consequently, the slow students just follow lessons incorporated in curriculum without satisfactory result. Moreover, some students can achieve while others students may fail to gain their goals. They work hard to do better than other students, or they take care easy because they believe that they will chance to win.

This technique also gives advantages to teaching reading. Concluded from Bell (1998) in Abdurrahman, Susilawati, and Arifin (2012:4), the benefits gained from TPS technique are:

- a. It is quick since it does not take much preparation time.
- b. The personal interaction motivates many students with little intrinsic interest in the subject taken.

- c. Multiple kinds and levels of questions can be asked.
- d. It engages the entire class and allows quiet students to answer questions without having to stand out from their classmates.
- e. Teacher can assess student understanding by listening in on several groups during the activity, and by collecting responses at the end.
- f. Teacher can do think-pair-share activities once or several times during a given class period.

In addition, some advantages of TPS technique are the students can help each other when they share with their friends, beside that the students engage in direct situation in the teaching and learning process that make them will enjoy because the teaching and learning process based on the students need. Ledlow (2001) in Abdurrahman et al (2012:4) also declared that Think Pair Share (TPS) technique in education is also about:

1. Think about your answer individually.
2. Pair with a partner and discuss your answers.
3. Share your or your partner's answer, when called upon.

Using student(s) from your classroom, model the procedure to ensure that students understand how to use the strategy. Allow time for students to ask questions that clarify their use of the technique once students have a firm understanding of the expectations surrounding the strategy, monitor, and support students as they work through the steps below. Teachers may also ask students to write or diagram their responses while doing the Think-Pair-Share activity. In applying TPS technique, there are some steps; the students are divided into several pairs, the teacher distribute the material to be discussed to the students, the students give their opinion or suggestion about the material, the teacher as a moderator in this discussion and the teacher and the students in the class make a conclusion about the material have been discussed.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This research used true experimental design. The researcher applied pretest and posttest to the experimental group and control group. The experimental group received special treatment whereas the control group did not. The population of this research was the eleventh grade students. The total number of the students is 153. All of them become the population of this research as seen in Table 1.

**Table 1: Class Distribution**

No.	Name of Classes	Number of Students
1	XI IA <sup>1</sup>	31
2	XI IA <sup>2</sup>	31
3	XI IA <sup>3</sup>	30
4	XI IA <sup>4</sup>	31
5	XI IA <sup>5</sup>	30
Total		153

The pretest was given to both experimental and control groups. It was intended to know the students' ability before treatment. The data in the pretest were analyzed by computing the standard scores and the mean scores of both groups. After giving the pretest, the researcher gave the students treatment. He conducted his treatment in six meetings. Each meeting took about 2 x 45 minutes. The treatment was held on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2013 until 17<sup>th</sup> August 2013.

In conducting the treatment, the teacher did several steps. Firstly, the students were divided into several pairs. Secondly, the teacher explained about the material before telling about the competences to the students. Thirdly, the teacher introduced this topic to be discussed in a group. Fourthly, the students analyzed the topic. In while activity, the teacher guided the students to share their opinion to their pair and the whole class. Then, the teacher asked questions orally to the students. Finally, after giving the treatment, the teacher gave the posttest to the students. The kind of test and difficulty level given in the posttest was the same as the pretest. The posttest was the test used to know the students' reading comprehension after receiving the treatment. It was given on Friday, 23<sup>th</sup> August 2013 and Saturday, 24<sup>th</sup> August 2013.

To determine the individual standard scores the researcher counted the raw scores obtained by using the formula (Sutomo, 1985:123) as follow:

$$X = \frac{\sum x}{N} \times 100$$

Where:

X = standard score

$\sum$  = mean score

N = maximum score

To compute the mean score of the class on the pretest and the posttest the researcher used the following formula (Arikunto, 2006:25).

$$M = \frac{\sum \sum x}{N}$$

Where:

$M$  = mean score

$\sum x$  = total amount of students' score

$N$  = number of students

Next, the researcher computed the square deviation by using formula proposed by Arikunto (2006:276) as follows:

$$\sum x^2 = \sum X^2 - \frac{(\sum X)^2}{N}$$

$$\sum y^2 = \sum Y^2 - \frac{(\sum Y)^2}{N}$$

Where:

$\sum x^2$  = number of deviation quadrate in experimental group

$\sum y^2$  = number of deviation quadrate in control group

$N$  = number of students

Finally, after getting the result of deviation square, the researcher used t-table test to find out the significant difference between the result of the pretest and the posttest as well as to prove either the hypothesis accepted or rejected. The researcher used the formula (Arikunto, 1989:249) as stated below:

$$t = \frac{Mx - My}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{\sum X^2 + \sum Y^2}{Nx + Ny - 2}\right) \left(\frac{1}{Nx} + \frac{1}{Ny}\right)}}$$

Where:

$t$  = value of t-test

$M$  = mean per group.

$x$  = deviation of every  $x_1$  and  $x_2$

$y$  = deviation of every  $y_1$  and  $y_2$

$N$  = number of students

## FINDINGS

The result of the pretest was presented in Table 2:

**Table 2:**  
**Pretest Score of Experimental Group**

No	Initials	Multiple Choice	Essay	True or False	Completion	Raw Scores	Standard Scores
1	And	4	10	6	9	29	48.3
2	Andr	6	8	7	9	30	50.0
3	Ang	7	10	5	11	33	55.0
4	Arf	4	12	5	8	29	48.3
5	Ayu	8	14	6	10	36	63.3
6	Dea	5	10	7	11	33	55.0
7	Edi	5	14	6	7	32	53.3
8	Eri	8	16	8	7	39	65.0
9	Fik	4	12	5	8	29	48.3
10	Has	6	12	4	7	29	48.3
11	Has	5	12	8	8	33	55.0
12	I pu	5	12	4	10	31	51.6
13	Int	6	14	5	9	34	56.7
14	Ire	2	12	6	7	27	45.0
15	Ami	4	14	4	9	31	51.6
16	Mag	6	12	5	8	31	51.6
17	Meg	5	14	6	4	29	48.3
18	Dis	7	12	6	7	32	53.3
19	Mul	6	14	7	9	36	60.0
20	Nad	7	14	3	6	30	50.0
21	Nur	6	12	6	6	30	50.0
22	Rah	5	14	4	8	31	51.6
23	Reg	6	12	5	7	30	50.0
24	Riz	4	12	4	8	28	46.7
25	She	6	14	4	7	31	51.6
26	Sit.	5	12	7	5	29	48.3
27	Sri. A	4	16	6	2	28	46.7
28	Sri H	6	14	5	7	32	53.3
29	Suw	4	12	7	6	29	48.3
30	Win	6	12	4	5	27	45.0
31	Zul	5	14	6	5	30	50.0
<b>Total</b>						958	1599.4

After computing the students' score, the researcher computed their mean score. The mean of the pretest score of experimental group was 51.6.

**Table 3:**  
**Pretest Score of Control Group**

No	Initials	Multiple Choice	Essay	True or False	Completion	Raw score	Standard Score
1	Ama	6	18	4	8	36	60.0
2	And	8	12	6	10	36	60.0
3	Azi	4	14	7	10	35	58.3
4	Cho	5	16	6	8	35	58.3
5	Chr	4	12	7	8	31	51.7
6	Cla	7	10	8	9	34	56.7
7	Ded	6	12	9	5	32	53.3
8	Feb	6	14	8	7	35	58.3
9	Fra	3	12	7	8	30	50.0
10	Gem	7	14	5	9	35	58.3
11	Hak	3	12	8	4	27	45.0
12	Irm	6	12	6	10	34	56.7
13	Lan	6	14	10	8	38	63.3
14	Mag	9	12	9	6	36	60.0
15	Naf	6	14	5	10	35	58.3
16	Nuf	8	12	10	7	37	61.7
17	Pri	5	12	8	7	32	53.3
18	Put	7	16	7	6	36	60.0
19	Regn	9	12	9	4	34	56.7
20	Regt	6	14	8	8	36	60.0
21	Rey	5	12	9	10	36	60.0
22	Rez	6	16	9	3	34	56.7
23	Ria	7	12	8	8	35	58.3
24	Sat	4	16	8	4	32	53.0
25	Sit	5	16	7	6	34	56.7
26	Win	8	12	7	10	37	61.7
27	Wiw	6	14	8	9	37	61.7
28	Yua	8	10	10	8	36	60.0
29	Zha	7	12	7	10	36	60.0
30	Zul	7	14	9	7	37	61.7
<b>Total</b>						1038	1729.7

After computing the students' score, the researcher computed their mean score. The mean of the pretest score of control group was 57.7.

After conducting treatment, the researcher administered the posttest as seen on Table 4.



**Table 4:**  
**Posttest Score of Experimental Group**

No	Initials	Multiple Choice	Essay	True or False	Completion	Raw score	Standard Score
1	And	8	20	8	13	49	81.7
2	Andr	9	22	8	14	53	88.3
3	Ang	10	18	9	14	51	85.0
4	Arf	8	22	10	14	54	90.0
5	Ayu	8	20	9	12	49	81.7
6	Dea	9	18	10	14	51	85.0
7	Edi	8	22	9	13	52	86.7
8	Eri	10	24	9	16	59	98.3
9	Fik	8	18	10	14	50	83.3
10	Has	8	20	8	12	48	80.0
11	Has	10	24	10	16	60	10.0
12	I pu	10	20	8	13	51	85.0
13	Int	9	20	8	13	50	83.3
14	Ire	8	18	10	14	50	83.3
15	Ami	8	18	8	14	48	80.0
16	Mag	9	18	10	16	53	88.3
17	Meg	8	24	8	13	53	88.3
18	Dis	8	20	9	14	51	85.0
19	Mul	10	24	10	16	60	10.0
20	Nad	8	22	9	14	53	83.3
21	Nur	9	24	7	14	54	90.0
22	Rah	8	24	9	13	54	90.0
23	Reg	9	18	10	13	50	83.3
24	Riz	10	20	9	16	55	91.7
25	She	9	20	8	14	51	85.0
26	Sit.	10	18	8	16	52	86.7
27	Sri. A	9	20	8	14	51	85.0
28	Sri H	8	22	9	13	53	86.7
29	Suw	10	18	8	14	50	83.3
30	Win	9	22	9	16	56	93.3
31	Zul	8	24	7	14	53	88.3
<b>Total</b>						1624	2699.8

After computing the students' score, the researcher computed their mean score. The mean of the posttest score of experimental group was 87.1.

**Table 5:**  
**Posttest Score of Control Group**

No	Initials	Multiple Choice	Essay	True or False	Completion	Raw score	Standard Score
1	Ama	8	18	7	16	49	81.7
2	And	9	20	7	13	49	81.7
3	Azi	8	18	6	14	46	76.7
4	Cho	7	20	7	14	48	80.0
5	Chr	10	18	8	16	52	86.7
6	Cla	7	20	8	12	47	78.3
7	Ded	9	20	7	13	49	81.7
8	Feb	6	20	8	14	48	80.0
9	Fra	10	18	7	16	51	85.0
10	Gem	8	18	8	16	50	83.3
11	Hak	8	20	10	12	50	83.3
12	Irm	9	20	7	13	49	81.7
13	Lan	9	24	9	16	58	96.7
14	Mag	10	20	9	14	53	88.3
15	Naf	7	18	10	16	51	85.0
16	Nuf	8	20	7	13	48	80.0
17	Pri	9	20	7	14	50	83.3
18	Put	8	22	7	16	53	88.3
19	Regn	10	20	8	12	50	83.3
20	Regt	8	24	7	14	53	88.3
21	Rey	9	18	9	13	49	81.7
22	Rez	10	20	10	16	56	93.3
23	Ria	10	24	10	16	60	100.0
24	Sat	7	20	8	14	49	81.7
25	Sit	7	18	8	13	46	76.7
26	Win	9	20	7	14	50	83.3
27	Wiw	7	22	8	14	51	85.0
28	Yua	9	20	9	13	51	85.0
29	Zha	10	18	9	14	51	85.0
30	Zul	9	20	8	12	49	81.7
Total						1516	2526.7

After computing the students' score, the researcher computed their mean score. The mean of the posttest score of control group was 84.2.

**Table 6:**  
**Score and Deviation of Experimental Group's Pretest and Posttest**

No	Initials	Score		Deviation O <sub>2</sub> -O <sub>1</sub> (X)	X <sup>2</sup>
		Pretest (O <sub>1</sub> )	Posttest(O <sub>2</sub> )		
1	And	48.3	81.7	33.4	1115.6
2	Andr	50.0	88.3	38.3	1466.9
3	Ang	55.0	85.0	30	900
4	Arf	48.3	90.0	41.7	1738.9
5	Ayu	63.3	81.7	18.4	338.6
6	Dea	55.0	85.0	30	900
7	Edi	53.3	86.7	33.4	1115.6
8	Eri	65.0	98.3	33.3	1108.9
9	Fik	48.3	83.3	35	1225
10	Has	48.3	80.0	31.7	1004.9
11	Has	55.0	100	45	2025
12	I pu	51.6	85.0	33.4	1115.6
13	Int	56.7	83.3	26.6	707.6
14	Ire	45.0	83.3	38.3	1466.9
15	Ami	51.6	80.0	28.4	806.6
16	Mag	51.6	88.3	36.7	1346.9
17	Meg	48.3	88.3	40	1600
18	Dis	53.3	85.0	31.7	1004.9
19	Mul	60.0	100	40	1600
20	Nad	50.0	83.3	33.3	1108.9
21	Nur	50.0	90.0	40	1600
22	Rah	51.6	90.0	38.4	1474.6
23	Reg	50.0	83.3	33.3	1108.9
24	Riz	46.7	91.7	45	2025
25	She	51.6	85.0	33.4	1115.6
26	Sit.	48.3	86.7	38.4	1474.6
27	Sri. A	46.7	85.0	38.3	1466.9
28	Sri H	53.3	86.7	33.4	1115.6
29	Suw	48.3	83.3	35	1225
30	Win	45.0	93.3	48.3	2332.9
31	Zul	50.0	88.3	38.3	1466.9
Total		1.599.4	2699.8	1100.4	40101.9

The result of mean deviation of experimental group was 35.5

**Table 7:  
Score and Deviation of Control Group's Pretest and Posttest**

No	Initials	Score		Deviation O <sub>2</sub> -O <sub>1</sub> (Y)	Y <sup>2</sup>
		Pretest (O <sub>1</sub> )	Posttest(O <sub>2</sub> )		
1	Ama	60.0	81.7	21.7	470.9
2	And	60.0	81.7	21.7	470.9
3	Azi	58.3	76.7	18.4	338.6
4	Cho	58.3	80.0	21.7	470.9
5	Chr	51.7	86.7	35	1225
6	Cla	56.7	78.3	21.6	466.6
7	Ded	53.3	81.7	28.4	806.6
8	Feb	58.3	80.0	21.7	470.9
9	Fra	50.0	85.0	35	1225
10	Gem	58.3	83.3	25	625
11	Hak	45.0	83.3	38.3	1466.9
12	Irm	56.7	81.7	25	625
13	Lan	63.3	96.7	33.4	1115.6
14	Mag	60.0	88.3	28.3	800.9
15	Naf	58.3	85.0	26.7	712.9
16	Nuf	61.7	80.0	18.3	334.9
17	Pri	53.3	83.3	30	900
18	Put	60.0	88.3	28.3	800.9
19	Regn	56.7	83.3	26.6	707.6
20	Regt	60.0	88.3	28.3	800.9
21	Rey	60.0	81.7	21.7	470.9
22	Rez	56.7	93.3	36.6	1339.6
23	Ria	58.3	100	41.7	1738.9
24	Sat	53.0	81.7	28.7	823.7
25	Sit	56.7	76.7	20	400
26	Win	61.7	83.3	21.6	466.6
27	Wiw	61.7	85.0	23.3	542.9
28	Yua	60.0	85.0	25	625
29	Zha	60.0	85.0	25	625
30	Zul	61.7	81.7	20	400
Total		1729.7	2526.7	797	22268.6

The result of the mean deviation of control group was 26.6.

Before analyzing the data by using t-test formula, the researcher computed the sum of square both experimental and control class. The result of square of experimental was 1041.2

and the result of square of control group was 1095. After that, the researcher continued to find out the significant score of both groups by using t-test formula that have the result  $t=18.16$ .

## **DISCUSSION**

According to the result of the students' pretest, it can be seen that none of the students of the experimental group got high score. All students got lower score (below 7). The highest score was only 65 and the lowest score was 46.7. It means that many students got deficiency in reading comprehension

The result of the students' pretest of control group shows that all of the students got lower score (below 7), the highest score was 61.7 and the lowest score was 50. The ability of students in control group was almost the same as the students in the experimental group in reading comprehension.

The researcher found that it is hard for most students to find the meaning of some words in sentence. They have less vocabulary. Consequently, it made most students could not answer the transformation exercises. They got hard to understand the passage. This is relevant to the research (Ferawati, 2007) confirming that vocabulary mastery has strong influence with reading comprehension for the reader to understand the reading passage.

During the treatment, the researcher gave treatment to both groups. The researcher used TPS technique for the experimental group and conventional method for the control group. In the experimental group, the researcher applied TPS technique for the students. He let the students discuss and share their own ideas to each other. Their minds are free when they share with their own friends because they do not feel clumsy to share with them. At the end of the meeting, the teacher allowed the students to ask some difficult words or difficult sentences.

After comparing the result of the posttest to both experimental and control groups, the researcher found that mean score of the experimental group after treatment was 87.1 whereas the mean score of the control group after treatment was 84.2. It indicates that the students reading comprehension of the experimental group has increased.

After having the mean scores of the experimental and control groups, the researcher found that the standard deviation of the experimental group was 1041.2 whereas the standard deviation of the control group was 1095. Based on the standard deviation, the result of the t-test was 18.16. In relation to this, Umam (2012) reported that the implementation of the TPS

technique successfully improve students' reading comprehension. This means that TPS technique had a strong influence to reading comprehension.

By showing the result, the researcher found some strengths of this TPS technique. It can motivate students to work cooperatively in order to help their friends in reading activities. Besides, this technique can improve their ability in comprehending the material and explaining each other about the reading text.

## CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

After analyzing the data in previous chapter the researcher draws conclusions. There was a significant difference between the two groups. By applying 0.05 level of significance and 59 (df), the researcher found that the t-test value (18.16) was higher than the  $t_{table}$  value (2.002). It could be stated that the hypothesis was accepted. In other words, the use of TPS technique can increase reading comprehension of the eleventh grade students.

The researcher confirms that TPS technique is effective in increasing the reading comprehension. It is suggested as follows.

1. Think-Pair-Share can be used as a technique to teach the students, particularly reading comprehension.
2. When applying TPS technique, the teacher should control the students' superiority in which they feel the clever one in pair discussion.
3. Further research on the use of TPS technique need to be done by others.

## REFERENCES

- Abdurrahman. E, Susilawati, E, and Arifin, Z. (2012). *Improving Students' Ability in Reading Comprehension through Cooperative Learning (Think-Pair-Share)*. Pontianak: Tanjungpura University.
- Arikunto. S. (1989). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Arikunto. S. (2006). *Prosedur penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Edisi Revisi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Depdiknas. (2004). *Reading III*. Depdiknas Dirjen Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah Direktorat Tenaga Kependidikan.
- Dines . D. (1982). *Reading in the Content Areas: Strategies for teacher*. Illinois: Freshman and Company.

- Ferawati. (2007). *The Correlation between English Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Comprehension of the Second Year Students of SMP Negeri 2 Banawa*. Palu: FKIP Universitas Tadulako.
- Lestary. D. F. (2011). *Influence of Think-Pair-Share on the Students' Reading Ability at the Eight Grade Students of SMP PGRI Batuceper Tangerang*. Tangerang: STKIP Setia Budhi Rangkasbitung.
- Nuttal. C. (1985). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Sutomo. (1985). *Teknik Penelitian Pendidikan*. Surabaya: Bina Mulia.
- Umam, Z. (2012). *Improving Students Reading Comprehension through Think Pair Share Technique at The Eighth Grade of SMP 1 Tlanakan. Undergraduate*. Pamekasan: The State of Islamic College (STAIN) Pamekasan