EDUKASI *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*

TEACHING READING HORTATORY EXPOSITION TEXT BY USING GIVE ONE, GET ONE STRATEGY TO THE ELEVENTH GRADE STUDENTS OF SMAN 7 PALEMBANG

Zuria Kausari
UIN Raden Fatah Palembang
zuriakausari44@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The objectives of this study are to find out whether or not there is a significant improvement before and after the treatment on the eleventh grade students' reading comprehension scores of SMAN 7 Palembang by using Give One, Get One strategy and to find out whether or not there is a significant difference on the eleventh grade students' reading comprehension scores of SMAN 7 Palembang between the students who are taught by using Give One, Get One strategy and those who are not. In this study, the researcher used Quasi Experimental Design using pretest-posttest nonequivalent groups design. There were 80 students taken as sample. Each class consisted of 40 students from class XI IPA 1 as experimental group and class XI IPA 2 as control group. In collecting the data, test was used. The test was given twice to experimental and control groups, as a pretest and posttest. To verify the hypotheses, the data of pretest and posttest were analyzed by using independent sample t-test and paired sample t-test in SPSS program. The findings showed that the p-output from paired sample t-test (sig2-tailed) was 0.000 which was lower than 0.05 and t-value 11.955 was higher than t-table with df=39 (2.0227). The result of p-output from independent sample t-test was 0.002 which was lower that 0.05 and the t-value 3.250 was higher than t-table with df=78 (1.9908). it means that teching reading hortatory exposition text by using Give One, Get One strategy had significant effect on the students' reading comprehension scores.

Keywords: *Give One, Get One Strategy, Teaching Reading Hortatory Exposition Text*

Introduction

People use language for communication. They can communicate easily through language they use. According to Algeo (2010, p. 2), a language is a system of conventional vocal signs by means of which human beings communicate. He also adds that language is also defined as communication which always happens in social

context. Each country has different languages respectively. According to Crystal (2003, p. 1), English is the global language.

As global language, English is taught in every country all over the world, including Indonesia. It is taught in schools, from junior high school to senior high school. Matarrima and Hamdan (2011, p. 101) state that the teaching of English has become increasingly important as a first foreign language in Indonesia.

After conducting a small test to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 7 Palembang, the researcher found that the avarages score of students reading comprehension in hortatory exposition text was lower than narrative and spoof text. Because of that, the researcher focuses on hortatory exposition text. Furthermore, based on an informal interview to the teacher of English on January 6th 2016, there were some problems of students in learning reading comprehension. Those problems include (1) the students were lack of vocabulary, it made the students had difficulty in finding the main idea in each paragraph of the text and the students had difficulty in identifying the detail information of the text, especially hortatory text, and (2) the students were not able to convey their ideas of the text.

Sejnost and Thiese (2009, p. 74) state that the Give One, Get One strategy can be incorporated into all content disciplines and used with various text genres. It shows that The Give One, Get one strategy can be used to teach reading hortatory exposition text. According to Achugar and Cecilia (2008, p. 145), hortatory exposition text aims to persuade someone to do something and it possesses some characteristics of oral language. Achugar and Cecilia also mention that this text also persuades the audience of their point of view or position in the argument.

Nash (2010, p. 89) states that the advantage of Give One, Get One strategy in teaching reading is the students will be able to comprehend the text not only by reading the text but also by sharing their ideas from other students. The students can get many different ideas from the same text being discussed. Preszler, (2005, p. 22)

mentions that the design of Give One, Get One strategy is also appropriate for 4-12 grades. It means that this strategy is appropriate for the eleventh grade students.

From this background, it is interesting to conduct a research with the title *"Teaching Reading Hortatory Exposition Text by Using Give One, Get One Strategy to The Eleventh Grade Students of SMAN 7 Palembang"*.

Concept of Teaching

Teaching is the process in transferring knowledge and giving good model from the teacher to the students. According to Brown (2000, p. 7), teaching is showing or helping someone to learn how to do something, giving instructions, guiding in the study of something, providing with knowledge, causing to know or understand. According to Brown (2000, p. 8), teaching cannot be defined apart from learning.

Teaching is how the teacher give someone knowledge or to train someone to instruct, teaching also giving some information of a subject matter to the students in the classroom. According to Coe, Aloisi, Higgins and Major (2014, p. 2), great teaching is defined as that which leads to improved student progress. It can be defined as giving instruction, knowledge skill, etc to somebody or make somebody understand or be able to do something, while teaching English is how the teacher is transferring the language and skill to the students in the classroom.

Concept of Reading

Alyousef (2005, p. 144) states that reading can be seen as an "interactive" process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or (reading fluency). Reading is an important skill in English. According to Abdullah, Sabapathy, Theethappan and Hassan (2012, p. 233), reading is the most integral part in language learning. It enables students of a higher learning to open the window to the outside

world as readers with strengthened reading skills will be able to progress and attain greater development in all academic areas.

Hollingsworth, Sherman and Zaugra (2007, p. 17) state that 70% of student thought reading is important. According to Richards and Renandya (2002, p. 273), many foreign language students often have reading as one of their most important goals. In addition, Anderson (2003, p. 2) states that reading is an essential skill for learners of English. For most of learners it is the most important skill to master in order to ensure success in learning. With strengthened reading skills, learners of English tend to make greater progress in other areas of language learning.

Reading involves recognizing and comprehending words and sentence patterns (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007, p. 161). Wooley (2011, p. 15) adds reading comprehension is process of making meaning from text. The goal, therefore, is to gain an overall understanding of what is described in the text rather than to obtain meaning from isolated words or sentences.

Carver and Pantoja (2015, p. 118) mention that after reading, students can adjust the prediction they made prior to reading, or they can generate additional questions about the topic. An effective way to summarize might be to have the students add to information that was brainstormed prior to reading. In addition, reflecting in writing about what they have read is a strategy that will support comprehension and provide a window into students' understanding of a passage.

In addition, Urquhart and Frazee (2012, p. 29) allow students to share their previous reading experience with one another in small groups and in whole-group settings. Reading is defined as reacting to a written text as a piece of communication. Similarly, Alderson (2000, p. 13) states that reading involves perceiving the written form of language. It can be concluded that in teaching reading, there are many things that must be considered in comprehending reading texts.

Concept of Hortatory Exposition Text

Hortatory exposition is designed to persuade people to do something (Zhang, 2006, p. 297). Priyana, Riandi, and Mumpuni (2008, p. 132) state that the hortatory exposition texts is text to argue a case for or against a particular position or point of view and it proposes a suggestion at the end of the argumentation. Miki (2011, p. 3) states that in hortatory expositions, human subjects are highly visible, together with verbs of perception, feeling, thinking and saying in the active voice. According to Kodrat and Gusrayani (2007, p. 2), the purpose of hortatory exposition is to persuade reader or listener towards something that should be agreed or disagreed.

According to Priyana, et. al. (2008, p. 132), the elements of hortatory exposition texts are:

1. The general statement of topic discussed.

2. Arguments which are arranged according to the writer's choice. Usually it is based on the criteria of weak and strong arguments.

3. Suggestion which contains what should or should not happen.

Sudarwati and Grace (2006, p. 204) mention that the language features of hortatory exposition are:

1. The use of emotive words (e.g.: *alarmed, worried*)

2. The use of words that qualify statements (e.g.: *usual, probably*)

3. The use of words that link arguments (e.g.: *firstly, however, on the other hand, therefore*)

4. The use of present tense

5. The use of compound and complex sentences

6. The use of modal and adverbs (e.g. : *can, may, certainly, get, stop*)

7. The use of subjective opinions using pronouns *I* and *We*

Concept of Give One, Get One Strategy

Several theories about Give one, Get One strategy have been stated by a number of experts. Sejnost and Thiese (2009, p. 21) define that Give One, Get One is a strategy that helps develop or activate students' schema for a given topic by stimulating their background knowledge through social interaction among their community of learners. This strategy can be incorporated into all content disciplines and used with various text genres. Carver and Pantoja (2015, p. 120) states that oral retelling can be used with both narrative and expository text. They are one of the most effective ways to determine if the students understand the passage. An oral retelling can be used with a text that has been read orally or silently.

Preszler (2005, p. 22) states that Give One,Get One allows struggling students to gather new knowledge and information about a content topic. Since students share information and question each other, all students in the classroom-regardless of ability levels-can reap positive rewards from this strategy. The strategy can be used during the study of a lesson to reinforce key concepts or as a review after completing a unit of study.

Furthermore, Marzano and Heflebower (2011, p. 11) state that sometimes tasks are designed that used movement as a tool to deepen students' understanding of content. Often, these activities involve gathering or organizing information about a topic. In such situation, students must leave their seats to perform an activity that is necessary to further understand the content. One strategy to this end is Give One, Get One. Give One, Get One is a process in which pairs of students compare their understanding of specific information. Teachers can also incorporate physical movement to help students understand content in a different way or from a different perspective.

After the class has read the text, the teacher poses a question or states a topic related to the reading. Students have an opportunity to correct any of their original

responses if they have discovered an error in their thinking. (Carver & Pantoja 2015, p. 122)

Research Design

In this study, the researcher used the pre-test post test non equivalent groups design. This design is often used as quasi experimental groups in educational research (Cohen, Manion and Morrison 2007, p. 283). The design of the pre-test post-test non equivalent is as follows:

O_1 X O_2			**Experimental Group**

O_3 O_4			**Control Group**

O_1 = Pretest for experimental group

X   = Treatments (Give One Get One strategy) for experimental group

O_2 = Posttest for experimental group

O_3 = Pretest for Control group

O_4 = Postest for Control group

---   = Dashed line (Non random)

Population and Sample

Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (2012, p. 91) state that a population is a group to which the result of the study are intended to apply. The population of this research is the eleventh grade students in SMAN 7 Palembang. The total of population is 237 students in six classes for the eleventh grade. There are 3 classes of natural science and 3 classes of social science.

According to Fraenkel, et. al. (2012, p. 91), sample is a group of subjects on which information is obtained. In this study, the researcher took two classes as a sample to collect the data. In this study the researcher used non random sampling type

of convenience sampling. Fraenkel, et. al. (2012, p. 99) state that a convenience sampling is a group of individuals who (conveniently) are available for study. In addition, Cohen, et.al (2007, p. 113) state that convenience sampling is opportunity sampling involves choosing the nearest individuals to serve as respondents and continuing that process until the required sample size has been obtained or those who happen to be available and accessible at the time.

Then, the researcher determined the class of sample by using teacher recommendation. The teacher recommended to take XI IPA 1 class and XI IPA 2 class as sample. The number of students of XI IPA 1 class was 40 students and XI IPA 2 class was 40 students. So, the total number of sample was 80 students. Then, the sample was divided into two groups, XI IPA 1 class as the experimental group and XI IPA 2 class as the control group.

Data Collection

The researcher used reading comprehension test in the form of multiple choice to collect the data. The test items in the pretest were the same as those of posttest, because the purpose of giving them was to know the progress of students' reading comprehension scores before and after treatments. Pretest was given before the treatment. The purpose of giving pretest to the students was to know the students English reading comprehension scores before implementing Give One, Get One strategy. Posttest was given after the treatment. The posttest was administered to know the students English reading comprehension scores after implementing Give One, Get One strategy. The result of this test was compared to the result of pretest in order to measure the students' progress taught by using Give One, Get One strategy.

Data Analysis
Test Validity

The analysis is done to the instrument of the research before used in pretest and posttest activity are as follows.

- **Construct Validity**

In doing this measurement, the researcher asked three lecturers as validators to validate whether the instruments are valid or not. The validators checked all instruments of this research whether this instrument is connected to this study or not. The "someone" of course, should be an individual who knows enough about what is to be measured the format of the instrument test. They were Beny Wijaya, M.Pd, Eka Sartika, M.Pd, and Winny Risnanda, M.Pd who are the lecturers of UIN Raden Fatah Palembang. They measured including such things as the clarity of printing, size of type, adequacy of work space (if needed), appropriateness of language, clarity of directions, and so on regardless of the adequacy of the question in an instrument that it must be measured by giving test or tryout to students later on. After measuring the format of the instrument test, the three validators accepted it to continue doing tryout to the eleventh grade students.

- **Validity of Each Question Item**

In this study, validity of each question item was identified by number and the correct option indicated. The group of the students taking the test was divided in tryout to the basis of students' score on the test. The researcher did tryout to find validity of question items. The tryout of the test was held on on Tuesday, 22nd of February 2016 at 10.05.-11.35 a.m.The instruments of the test were tested to 33 students (XI IPA 4) to the eleventh grade students of SMAN 5 Palembang. If the result of the test shows that r_{count} is higher than r_{tabel} (0,344), it means that the item is valid. It was found that there were 42 test items from 60 test items provided by the researcher which could be used as the instrument since the scores of significance were higher that 0,344. The result indicated that 18 items were invalid and 42 items were valid.

- **Content validity**

According to Sugiyono (2012, p. 353), testing the validity of the content can be done by comparing the contents of the instrument with the subject matter that has been taught. A content validity is very important, since it is an accurate measure of what it is supposed to measure. In order to judge the test whether or not a test has content validity, the researcher checked the syllabus from school and then match them into test specification.

Test Reliability

To know the reliability of the test used in this study, the researcher calculated the students'score by using spearman brown formula prophecy formula found in spss 20 program. The scores of reliability were obtained from tryout analysis which is done once using the instruments test. The school where the tryout anaysis is different from the school where the research study was done. In this part, split half test method is used to obtain the scores of tryout analysis.

To measure the reliability test using split half method, the result shows that p-output of gutman split half coefficient was 0, 755 which was higher than 0.70. Since the result of reliability of test was higher than 0.70, it can be concluded that reading test was reliable for this study.

Normality Test

Normality test was used to determine whether the sample data has been drawn from normally distributed population or not. The data were obtained from students' pretest and posttest in experimental and control group. Moreover, Flynn also states that a value less than 0.05 indicate that the data are non-normal. (Flynn, 2003, p.17). However, the data can be catagorized normal when the p-ouput was higher than 0.05. In measuring normality test, one sample Kolmogorov-Smirno was used in SPSS 20 software application. The result showed that the pretest in control and experimental

groups were 0.809 and 0.572. Then, the scores in posttest in control and experimental groups were 0.583 and 0.707. It can be concluded that the data were considered normal since they are higher than 0.05.

Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test is used to measure the scores obtained whether it is homogen or not. According to Flynn (2003, p. 18), the data can be categorized homogen whenever it is higher than 0.05. In measuring homogeneity test, the researcher used Levene Statistics in SPSS 20 software application. The result showed that the pretest scores was 0.273 and posttest scores 0.274 it can be conluded that the data was homogeneous since the score was higher than 0.05.

Hypothesis Testing

A significant improvement is found from testing students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group, and a significant different is found from testing students' posttest to posttest score in control and experimental group using regression linear. It was found that the p-output is 0.000 with df=39 (2.0227), and t-value= 11.955, it can be stated that there is a significant improvement from students' pretest to posttest scores in experimental group taught using Give One, Get One strategy since p-output is lower than 0.05. It can be stated that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. And it was found that the p-output was 0.002 and the t-value was 3.250. Since the p-output was lower than 0.05 level and the t-value (3.250) was higher than critical value of t-table (1.9908). It can be stated that there is a significant different from students' posttest to posttest scores in control and experimental group since p-output is lower than 0.05. It can be stated that the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is accepted. It can be stated that there was a significant difference on students' reading

comprehension score taught by using Give One, Get One strategy and those who are not at SMAN 7 Palembang.

Conclusion

Based on the findings and interpretation, it can be drawn some conclusion. First, based on the result of pretest to posttest, Give One, Get One Strategy significantly improves students' reading comprehension achievement of the eleventh grade students at SMAN 7 Palembang. Second, there was a significant difference on students' reading comprehension score who were taught by using Give One, Get One Strategy and those who were taught by using the strategy that is usually used by the teacher of English at SMAN 7 Palembang. Therefore, it can be inferred that teaching reading comprehension through Give One, Get One strategy can be considered as one of the alternative strategy to be used in teaching English, especially to the EFL students.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, S., Sabapathy, E., Theethappan, R., & Hasan, N. S. I. (2012). Reading for pleasure as a means of improving reading comprehension skills. *Asian Social Science, 8*(13), 233-238. Retrieved from: www. Ccsenet .org/ journ al/index.php/ass/.../1413

Achugar, M. and Cecilia, C. (2008). *Systematic functional linguistic approaches to longitudinal study of Spanish heritage learners.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Alderson, J. C. (2000). *Assessing reading.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Algeo, J. (2010). *The origin and development of the English language* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Cengage Learning.

Alyousef, H. S. (2005). Teaching reading comprehension to ESL/EFL learners. *The Reading Matrix, 5*(2),143-154. Retrieved from http://www.readingmatrix.com/articles/alyousef/article.pdf

Anderson, J. N. (2003). Scrolling, clicking, and reading English: Online reading strategies in a second/foreign language. *The Reading Matrix, 3*(3), 1-33 Retrieved from: http: //www. Readingmatrix.com/articles/ anderson/ article.pdf.

Brown, H. D. (2000). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.

Carver, L & Pantoja, L. (2015). *Reading basic for all teachers: Supporting the common core.* Boulevard, SD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.

Coe, R., Aloisi, C., Higgins, S., & Major, L. E. (2014). *What makes great teaching: Review of underpinning research.* Washington, US: Centre for Evaluating and Monitoring, Durham University, The Sutton Trust.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research method in education* (6th ed.). NewYork, NY: Routledge.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.

Cristal, D. (2003). *English is a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Flynn, D. (2003). *Students guide to SPSS.* Retrieved from Barnard College-Columbia University Retrived from :https: //barnard.edu /sites/ default/f iles/inline/student_user_guide_for_spss.pdf

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). NewYork, NY: Mcgraw Hill Companies ,Inc.

Hollingsworth, A., Sherman, J., & Zaugra, C. (2007). *Increasing reading comprehension in first and second graders through cooperative learning.* Saint Xavier University & Pearson Achievement Solutions, Inc. Field-Based Master's Program Chicago, Illinois.

Kodrat, D & Gusrayani, D. (2007). *Think smart bahasa Inggris.* Bandung, Indonesia: Grafindo Media pratama.

Marzano, R. J. & Heflebower, T. (2011). *The highly engaged classroom.* Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research laboratory.

Mattarima, K.,&Hamdan, A. R. (2011). Learners' motivation and learning strategies in English foreign language (EFL) in Indonesian context. *Journal of Edupres, 1,* (1), *100-108.*

Miki, N. (2011). *Key colligation analysis: Discovering stylistic differences in significant lexico-grammatical units.* (Desertation). Osaka University, Yamadaoka, Osaka, Japan.

Nash, Ron. (2010). *The Active Workshop: Practical Strategies for Facilitating Professional Learning.* CA: Corwin.

Preszler, J. (2005). *On target: Strategies to help struggling readers.* Boulevard, SD: BHSSC.

Priyana, J., Riandi, & Mumpuni, A. P. (2008). *Interlanguage: English for senior high school students XI science and social study programme: SMA/MA Kelas XI IPA/IPS.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Pusat Perbukuan, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Richards, J.C., & Renandya, W.A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching* (2th ed.). Cape, US: Cambridge University Press.

Schoenbach, R., Greenleaf, C., & Murphy, L. (2014). *Reading for understanding: How Reading apprenticeship improves disciplinary learning in secondary and collage classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: WestEd.

Sejnost, R.L. & Thiese, S.M. (2010). *Building content literacy: Strategies for adolescent learner.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Sudarwati, M., & Grace Eudia. (2006). *Look Ahead: An English course for senior high school students year XI.* Jakarta, Indonesia: Erlangga.

Urquhart, V., & Frazee, *D. Teaching reading in the content areas: if not me, then who?* (3rd ed.). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Woolley, G. (2011). *Reading comprehension: Assisting children with learning difficulties.* New York, NY: Springer Science+Business Media B.V.

Zhang, Y. (2006). *The study of second language acquisition in the Asian context.* British, VI: Asian EFL Journal Press.