EEJ JULY 2019

by Andi Tenrisanna Syam

USING COOPERATIVE INTEGRATED READING AND COMPOSITION (CIRC) TECHNIQUE TO TEACH RECOUNT TEXT

Andi Tenrisanna Syam[1]

State Islamic Institute of Palopo

ABSTRACT

The objective of the research was to find out whether the use of CIRC technique is effective to improve students' reading skill at the eighth grade of MTsN Model Palopo. This research applied quasi-experimental. The population of this research was the eighth grade students of MTsN Model Palopo. The number of population was 270 students. The sample were class VIII A consisting of 30 students as experimental group and class VIII B consisting of 30 students as control group. The sampling technique in this research was purposive sampling. The instrument of the research was reading test. The writer gave pretest and posttest to the students. The result showed that the students` mean score of posttest in experimental group was 85.33 and pretest was 71.03. The mean score of posttest is higher than the mean score of pretest (85.33 > 71.03). While the mean score of posttest in control group was 72.46 and the mean score of pretest was 70.86. The mean score of posttest was higher than the mean score of pretest (72.44 > 70.86). The result of statistical analysis the experimental group for a level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) = 29; the probability value was smaller than α 0.00 < 0.5 and the result of statistical analysis for the control group showed that the probability value was bigger than α .074 > 0.05. As a result, there is a significant difference in reading achievement between the students who were taught by using CIRC technique and those who were taught by non-CIRC technique. Based on the result of this study, the writer concluded that the use of CIRC technique was effective to improve students' reading skill.

---

[1] Corresponding Author: risannasyam23@gmail.com

Keywords: *Cooperative integrated reading and composition technique, Reading skill, Recount text.*

INTRODUCTION

Reading is considered as one of the important skills which has to be learned because it can influence the other language skills. Furthermore, reading is very important for students because there are many advantages from learning reading. By reading, the students will be able to increase their knowledge. They have to choose materials for them to read, for examples, newspaper, magazine, book, novel etc.

In teaching, there are many methods that the teachers used such as: explaining, demonstrating, collaborating or cooperative learning and learning by teaching. Explaining or lecturing is the process of teaching by giving spoken explanations of the subject that is to be learned and lecturing is often accompanied by visual aids to help students visualize an object or problem. Demonstrating is the process of teaching through examples or experiments. For example, a science teacher may teach an idea by performing an experiment for students.

The writer interviewed the English teacher at MTsN Model Palopo and the teacher said that many students were in low achievement. The students could read a mechanical text, but they found many difficulties to answer the reading questions in order to get main idea and information. In a process of learning when the teacher asked them to find the topic of text or answer the question from the text, they were still confused. Besides, most of the students often felt bored when they had to read a text and sometimes seemed to learn over their need on the table and talk each other. When the teacher gave exercise, there were some students who did not understand some of the materials being taught. To solve these problem the researcher consider to improve students' reading skill on recount text by using cooperative integrated reading and composition.

Gupta and Pasrija (2016) revealed cooperative learning as an efficient technique to convert students into active learners in classrooms and it makes teaching–learning more satisfying, momentous, enjoyable and effective. In the field of language, cooperative learning values the interactive view of language, which is known as developed combination of structural and functional views of language. It considers knowledge of appropriate use of language and the ability to structure discourse interactions. Cooperative learning is a learning that requires students to

work together on a common task and they must coordinate their efforts to complete the task. Cooperative learning offers many benefits, namely "raising the achievement of all students, helping the teacher build positive relationship among students, giving students the experiences, and replacing the competitive organizational structure of most classrooms and schools."

The cooperative learning has some techniques to conduct the learning process for instance Students Teams-achievement Divisions (STAD), Teams-Games Tournament (TGT), Jigsaw, Team Accelerated Instruction (TAI) and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) technique, one of the learning techniques based on cooperation, is designed to develop reading, writing and other language skills in the upper grades of primary education. CIRC technique presents a structure that increases not only opportunities for direct teaching in reading and writing but also applicability of composition writing techniques. The main goal of CIRC is to use the co-operative teams to help students comprehend reading. Some elements of CIRC is geared for this purpose. During follow-up activities, the students work in pairs to identify five important features of each narrative story: the characters, the background of the incident, problem, the work done, the final solution. Teaching about the structure of the story have been found to improve students' reading comprehension. The students in CIRC also make annotations to predict how the problems will be overcome and summarize the main elements of the story to each other, both of which are activities that are found to increase the understanding in reading.

Mubarak and Rudianto (2017) revealed that CIRC was seen as a good technique for students-workers type where in this technique the students were asked to read and compose the materials given in a small heterogenic group. Ginting (2017) found that the implementation of CIRC strategy can improve the students' ability in reading comprehension and the teaching learning can be effective.

RESEARCH QUESTION

Based on the explanation above, a research question is formulated as follows "Is the use of CIRC technique effective to improve students' reading skill at the eighth grade of MTsN Palopo?"

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this research, the writer applied a quasi-experimental design. The experiment involved two groups, an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received treatment by using CIRC Technique, a treatment under investigation, while the control group received treatment by using non-CIRC technique. The control group was needed for comparison purpose to see whether or not the use of CIRC technique was effective to improve students' reading skill at the eighth grade of MTsN Model Palopo. In this study, the writer took the students of MTsN Model Palopo as a population. The eighth grade had nine classes and there were 270 students. The writer took two classes as her sample: VIII A and VIII B in academic year 2017/2018, consisting of 60 students (30 students of experimental class and 30 students of control class) selected by means of purposive sampling. Purposive sampling was used because the samples had the characteristics needed to be researched by the writer (the samples were lack of vocabulary). The instrument of this research was written test in the form of reading and writing tests. Reading tests were done on five essays test, while in writing text, the students were instructed to write a paragraph. Pretest and posttest were given to the experimental and control groups. The writer collected the data and analyzed them by using inferential statistics SPSS 22.0.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Result
1. The Analysis of Students` Score of Experimental Group and Control Group

Having conducted the treatment, the writer found the scores for pretest and posttest of both groups on the students` reading achievement results. In this part, the writer reports the result of each group by comparing pretest and posttest and the result of both groups by comparing the pretest and posttest of both groups.

a. Students` Score of Experimental Group

1) Scoring Classification of Students` Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Group

In this classification, the writer presents the frequency and percentage of the students` pretest and posttest of experimental group. It

shows the improvement of the students' reading skill in experimental group after the treatment by using CIRC.

Table 1. Frequency and Percentage of Students` Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Group

No.	Classification	Score	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	96-100	0	0%	0	0%
2	Very Good	86-95	2	6.6%	16	53.3%
3	Good	76-85	5	16.6%	14	46.6%
4	Average	66-75	18	60%	0	0
5	Fair	56-65	5	16.6%	0	0
6	Poor	36-55	0	0%	0	0
7	Very Poor	0-35	0	0%	0	0
	Total		30	100	30	100

Table 1 shows that most of the students in experimental group were at the levels of average and fair in relation to reading ability before giving the treatment. Eighteen students or 60% were in average classification; five students or 16.6% were in fair classification; five students or 16.6% were in good classification; only two students were in very good classification, and none of them were in excellent classification. After giving the treatment, sixteen students or 53.3% were in very good classification, none of them were in average and fair classification, and fourteen students or 46.6% were in good classification.

2) The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students` Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Group

The result of the students` pretest and posttest of experimental group is indicated by the mean score and standard deviation. The analysis of the mean score is meant to know if there was a difference between the students` score in pretest and posttest of experimental group.

Table 2. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students`
Pretest and Posttest of Experimental Group

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
PRETEST	30	60.00	87.00	71.0333	6.99006
POSTTEST	30	77.00	93.00	85.3333	4.34966
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 2 shows that there was a difference between the mean score of pretest and posttest in experimental group. The mean score of posttest was higher than the mean score of pretest (85.33 > 71.03). It means that there was an improvement after giving the treatment by using CIRC technique. The standard deviation of posttest was lower than the standard deviation of pretest (4.34 < 9.66). It means that the score range of posttest was closer than the score range of pretest to the mean score.

3) The Calculation of t-test Pretest and Posttest for Experimental Group

The data shown in the Table 3 below indicates the students' score of experimental group before conducting the treatment (pretest) and after the treatment (posttest).

Table 3. The Paired Samples Test of Pretest and Posttest for
Experimental Group

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	PRETEST – POSTTEST	-14.30000	5.53453	1.01046	-16.36663	-12.23337	-14.152	29	.000

Table 3 indicates that the statistical hypothesis is based on statistic test of pretest and posttest in probability value (significant 2-tailed), which is lower than alpha (0.00 < 0.05). It means that there was a

statistically significant difference between students' score in pretest and posttest of experimental group. In the other words, giving treatment by using CIRC technique was effective to improve students' reading skill of experimental group.

b. Students` Score of Control Group

1) Scoring Classification of Students' Pretest and Posttest of Control Group

The following table was the data obtained from the control group before and after treatment by using non-CIRC technique.

Table 4. Frequency and Percentage of Students` Pretest and Posttest of Control Group

No.	Classification	Score	Pretest		Posttest	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	96-100	0	0%	0	0
2	Very Good	86-95	3	10%	3	10%
3	Good	76-85	8	26.6%	10	33.3%
4	Average	66-75	9	30%	9	30%
5	Fair	56-65	8	26.6%	8	26.6%
6	Poor	36-55	2	6.6%	0	0
7	Very Poor	0-35	0	0%	0	0
	Total		30	100	30	100

Table 4 shows that most of the students in control group were classified having average, fair and poor levels in reading skill before giving treatment. Two students or 6.6% were in poor classification; eight students or 26.6% were in fair classification; nine students 30% were in average classification; 8 students or 26.6% were in good classification and 3 students or 10% were in very good classification, and none of them were in excellent classification. After giving the treatment by using non-CIRC technique, most of students were still in average and fair classification; nine students or 30% were in fair classification; eight students or 26.6% were in average classification and none of them were in excellent classification; ten students 33.3% were in good classification, and three students or 10% were in very good classification.

2) The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students` Pretest and Posttest of Control Group

The result of the students' pretest and posttest of control group was indicated by the mean score and standard deviation. The analysis of the mean score was meant to know if there was a difference between the students' score in pretest and posttest of control group. The standard deviation was needed to know how closer the scores to the mean score were.

**Table 5. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students'
Pretest and Posttest of Control Group**

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pretest	30	50.00	87.00	70.8667	10.57236
Posttest	30	57.00	90.00	72.4667	9.50402
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 5 shows that the mean score of posttest was higher than the mean score of pretest of control group (72.46 > 70.86) and the standard deviation of posttest is lower than the standard deviation of pretest (9.50 < 10.57). It means that there was improvement of the students' score in control group after giving the treatment by using non-CIRC technique.

3) The Calculation of t-test Pretest and Posttest for Control Group

The data shown in the Table 6 below indicates the students' score of control group before conducting the treatment (pretest) and after the treatment (posttest).

**Table 6. The Paired Samples Test of Pretest and Posttest of Control
Group**

Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences					T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				

					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Pretest - posttest	-1.60000	4.72411	.86250	-3.36401	.16401	-1.855	29	.074

Table 6 indicates that probability value was higher than alpha (.074> 0.05). It means that there was no statistically significant improvement of students' score of control group after giving the treatment by using non-CIRC technique.

c. Students` Score of Experimental and Control Group

1) Scoring Classification of Students` Pretest Result of Experimental and Control Groups

The writer found the pretest results of the students in frequency and percentage for experimental group and control group as shown below:

Table 7. Frequency and Percentage of Students` Pretest of Experimental and Control Groups

No	Classification	Score	Experimental		Control	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	96-100	0	0%	0	0%
2	Very Good	86-95	2	6.6%	3	10%
3	Good	76-85	5	16.6%	8	26.6%
4	Average	66-75	18	60%	9	30%
5	Fair	56-65	5	16.6%	8	26.6%
6	Poor	36-55	0	0%	2	6.6%
7	Very Poor	0-35	0	0%	0	0%
	Total		30	100	30	100

Table 7 shows that most of the students' pretest results for experimental group were in average and poor levels of reading skill. The data showed that those eighteen students or 60 % out of thirty students got average classification; five students or 16.6% were in fair classification; 5 students or 16.6 % were in good classification; only 2 students out of 30 or 6.6 % were in very good classification.

In control group, Table 7 indicates that most of the students were in average, fair and poor levels of reading skill. Nine students or 30% out of forty students were in average classification; eight students or 26.6% were in fair classification; two students or 6.6% were in poor; eight students or 26.6% were in good classification; three students or 10% were in very good classification. In experimental group, there was none having excellent level of reading skill. It is found the same as in the control group that there was none in excellent classification.

2) Scoring Classification of Students' Posttest Results of Experimental and Control Groups

Table 8 shown below describes that the frequency and percentage of the students' posttest score taught by CIRC technique was different from those who taught by using non-CIRC technique.

Table 8. Frequency and Percentage of Students' Posttest of Experimental and Control Groups

No.	Classification	Score	Experimental		Control	
			Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage
1	Excellent	96-100	0	0%	0	0
2	Very Good	86-95	16	53.3%	3	10
3	Good	76-85	14	46.6%	10	33.3%
4	Average	66-75	0	0%	9	30%
5	Fair	56-65	0	0%	8	26.6%
6	Poor	36-55	0	0	0	0
7	Very Poor	0-35	0	0	0	0
	Total		30	100	30	100

Table 8 indicates that out of 30 students in experimental group, sixteen students (53.3%) were in very good classification. Fourteen students or 46.6% were in good classification, and no one of them were in excellent, average, fair, poor and very poor classification.

In control group, no students were in excellent classification, and most of them were still in fair classification (eight students or 26.6%).

Nine students or 30% were in average classification and ten others or 33.3% were in good classification, and three students or 10% were in very good classification.

3) The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pretest of Experimental and Control Groups

Before the treatment was conducted, both experimental and control groups were given pretest to know the students' achievement on their reading comprehension. The purpose of the test was to find out whether both experimental and control group were in the same level or not. The standard deviation was meant to know how close the scores to the mean score are.

Table 9. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Pretest of Experimental and Control Groups

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	30	60.00	87.00	71.0333	6.99006
Control	30	50.00	87.00	70.8667	10.57236
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 9 above shows that the mean score of students' pretest of experimental group was 71.03 and control group was 70.86. Based on the Table 4.9 shown above, it was concluded that the students' mean score of experimental group was statistically the same with control group.

4) The Calculation of t-test Pretest for Experimental and Control Groups

The data shown in the Table 10 below indicates the achievement of experimental and control group before giving the treatment.

Table 10. The Paired Samples Test of Pretest for Experimental and Control Groups

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair	Experimental – Control	.16667	14.90449	2.72117	-5.39876	5.73209	.061	29	.952

Based on the statistics test of pretest in probability value (significant 2-tailed), probability value was higher than alpha (0.952 > 0.05). It means that there was no a statistically significant difference between the average scores of the students' pretest in both experimental and control groups. In the other words, the students' score of both groups before conducting the treatments was almost the same.

5) The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest of Experimental and Control Groups

In this section, the writer presents the difference of the students' score after treatment of experimental and control groups. The result of posttest is shown in table below:

Table 11. The Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Students' Posttest of Experimental and Control Groups

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Experimental	30	77.00	93.00	85.3333	4.34966
Control	30	57.00	90.00	72.4667	9.50402
Valid N (listwise)	30				

Table 11 shows that the mean scores of both experimental and control group were different after treatment. The mean score of

experimental group was higher than control group (85.33 > 72.46) and the standard deviation for experimental group was 4.34 and control group was 9.50.

It shows that after giving the treatment, the result of experimental group on the mean score was higher than the control group. It proves that CIRC technique upgrades students' vocabulary rather than non-CIRC technique.

6) **The Paired Sample of t-test Posttest for Experimental and Control Groups**

The data were shown in the Table 12 below indicated the achievement of experimental and control groups after the treatment.

Table 12. The Paired Samples Test Posttest For Experimental and Control Group

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences							Sig. (2-tailed)
					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	Lower	Upper	T	df	
Pair 1	Experimental – Control	12.86667	11.77880	2.15051	8.46839	17.26494	5.983	29	.000

Table 12 above indicates that the statistical hypothesis is based on statistics test in Probability value (significant 2 tailed). The Probability value was lower than alpha (0.00 < 0.05). It means that H_1 was accepted and H_0 was rejected. It was concluded that the students' score of both groups was statistically different. It indicates that CIRC technique was more effective than non-CIRC technique to improve students' reading skill.

7) **Students' Score Achievement of Experimental and Control Groups**

The tabulation data for the students' score achievement can be seen as follows:

Table 13. Students' Reading Achievement of Experimental and Control Groups

	Pretest		Posttest	
	Experimental	Control	Experimental	Control
Respondents	30	30	30	30
Mean	71.03	70.86	85.33	72.46
SD	6.99	10.57	4.34	9.50

Table 13 above shows that the mean score and standard deviation showed difference in pretest and posttest of both groups.

From the data shown in the Table 13, the mean score of experimental group and control group pretests was statistically the same. After giving the treatment, the posttest score experimental group was significantly higher than that of the control group.

The result of this research was compatible with some related finding. One of them is Rusnaeni (2014) who found that using CIRC method made the students more active and enjoyable than the previous condition. They were able to identify some information in the text and to retell the main points of the text by using their own understanding. Besides, the students interacted with their friends as well in group collaboratively in solving the problem which was served by the teacher. Moreover, Gupta and Ahuja (2014) revealed that experimental group taught by using CIRC significantly outscored control group on post-test showing the obvious supremacy of co-operative learning technique (CIRC) over conventional method of teaching.

CONCLUSION

Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) technique was really effective to use in learning and teaching process because it made students involve directly and also made students become active in learning.

REFERENCES

Ginting, D. R. B. (2017, October). The implementation of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition Strategy to improve the students' ability in reading comprehension. In *2nd Annual*

International Seminar on Transformative Education and Educational Leadership (AISTEEL 2017). Atlantis Press.

Gupta, M., & Ahuja, J. (2014). Cooperative integrated reading composition (circ): Impact on reading comprehension achievement in english among seventh graders. *IMPACT: International Journal of Research in Humanities, Arts and Literature*, 2(5), 37-46.

Gupta, M., & Pasrija, P. (2016). Co-Operative learning: An efficient technique to convert students into active learners in classrooms. *MIER Journal of Educational Studies, Trends and Practices*, 2(1).

Mubarak, Z. H., & Rudianto, G. (2017, October). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) technique in Writing Subject of EFL context. In *Sixth International Conference on Languages and Arts (ICLA 2017)*. Atlantis Press.

Rusnaeni. (2014). *Deskripsi kemampuan pemecahan masalah Sistem Persamaan Linear Dua Variabel (SPLDV) pada siswa kelas VIII SMP Negeri 1 Wotu*. (Unpublished Undergraduate Thesis). Palopo: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan - Universitas Cokroaminoto Palopo.

EEJ JULY 2019

| 10 | Student Paper | 1% |

| 11 | **Submitted to Universitas Pelita Harapan**
Student Paper | 1% |

| 12 | **Submitted to Universiti Sains Malaysia**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 13 | **Submitted to University of Michigan, Dearborn**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 14 | **Submitted to University of Leicester**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 15 | **Submitted to iGroup**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 16 | **Submitted to Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 17 | **Submitted to Sriwijaya University**
Student Paper | <1% |

| 18 | **Submitted to UIN Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang**
Student Paper | <1% |

Exclude quotes   Off   Exclude matches   < 3 words
Exclude bibliography On