THE EFFECT OF THINK-PAIR-SHARE MODEL AND MOTIVATION ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENT

Al Furqon
alfurqonalfurqon@ymail.com

Abstract: This study was conducted to find out the effect of Think-Pair-Share model and motivation on students' reading comprehension achievement. This experimental research applied nonequivalent control group design. The population of this study was in the academic year of 2013/2014. There were four classes divided into two groups as control group and experimental group which consisted of 20 students each. Reading comprehension test along with questionnaire from Teacher Ratings of Student Motivation to Read (TRSM) were used to collect the data. The findings of this study showed that there were significant differences in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using Think-Pair-Share model. In addition, a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Think-Pair-Share model and those who were taught by using Teacher-Centred method was also found. However, the interaction effect was not found between teaching reading by using Think-Pair-Share model and levels of students' motivation (high, average, low) on students' reading comprehension achievement.

Key words: *Think-Pair-Share Model, Teacher-Centred, motivation, reading comprehension achievement, eight graders*

Reading can be classified into two types: initial reading and reading comprehension. "Initial reading is an effort made by those who have not been able to read to learn reading (e.g., how to read the alphabets and combination of letters or simple words), whereas reading comprehension is an activity aimed to understand the messages of a particular text" (Cahyono & Widiati, 2006, p. 2).

In the context of Indonesian education, the skill of reading English as a part of English subject is taught integratedly with other English skills since the students study it in elementary school for 6 years. Some pre Elementary schools have also included English subject in their curriculum. English subject is then continuously taught in the secondary (Junior and Senior High) school for 6 years and tertiary education for two semesters/one

year on the average (Iftanti, 2012, p. 2). This means that EFL students in Indonesia generally learn English and are engaged in reading English texts for at least 13 years, but still most of them think that reading is one of the difficult skills.

Reading is the ability to comprehend the written texts in English. In School Based Curriculum (KTSP), the students are expected to achieve the basic competency of reading achievement as follows: 1) The ability to obtain general and specific information in the written texts, 2) The ability to get the main ideas of the written texts. 3) The ability to guess the meaning of words, phrases, or sentences, based on the context, and 4) The ability to guess the meaning of reference (Depdiknas,2006).

However, in fact, the teaching of reading has been developed in a longer period of teaching and learning time. But the students are still encountered by the great difficulties in comprehending the four competencies of reading as stated in School Based Curriculum above.

The role of the teacher as the facilitator in teaching learning process is very important to investigate out what factors that make the students fail in comprehending a written text. It is in line with Nuttall (1982) who said that reading is a process in the readers to confirm, reject, or refine the information presented in the written text as reading progress. This activity deals with the meaningful interpretation of the written text. If the learners are lacking of cognitive ability, background knowledge, and reading strategies, they will find difficulties in comprehending reading text.

In relation to the learning of English as a compulsory subject at the school there are two factors which play an important role in influencing thea chievement of the students in learning English. There are internal factor and external factor. The internal factor was students' motivation while the one of the external factors is teaching strategies. They are related one and another in teaching learning process.

Many factors make learning difficult, so that diagnosis and analysis of them are needed to be done. Slameto (1995, p. 96) points out, "teachers must develop and implement remedial instruction for students who need it. In this case, interactions are expected increasing and teachers can teach effectively which means that the lesson that has been taught can be easily absorbed by them". Therefore, it is necessary to determine the most suitable strategies or methods for reading effectively. Learning reading comprehension requires a strategy where lesson plan progressively develop and reinforce reading comprehension skill, but a student does not seem to really get it by reading. It means that the student is successfully decoding words, but decoding without reading comprehension will not get him far.

Reading comprehension skills is the activity in which the readers are able to predict what will happen next in the story using clue presented in text, create question about the main idea, message, or plot of the text, and monitor understanding of the sequence, context, or characters (Sanders, 2001). Students will comprehend better when they see the text organized in such a way which can be easily understood, and which indicates the relationship between ideas.

Before starting this present study on students reading comprehension achievements of the eighth grade students of SMP Negeri 1 Gelumbang, the interview with the eighth grade English teachers was conducted and it was found that the students' motivation and reading comprehension achievement in English did not meet the criteria of success. The students still did not understand every word and they

were somehow not completing the task. He found that students have applied several strategies such as making prediction of the words that they did not know, searching for words in the dictionary, and many others to overcome the obstacle in their reading task. It is in line with previous related study concerning with the problem of teaching reading comprehension who conducted by Sunandar. He found that many teachers in some Indonesian schools only employ teacher-centered method covering activities of making list of difficult words, translating their meanings into L1 (First Language), asking students to read loudly and/or silently, and having students answer the questions related to the text, whereas this kind of method may cause negative effects on students' reading skill (Sunandar, 2006)

The implementation of teacher-centered method and the lack of reading strategies of the students are problems in teaching and learning English. Particular reading techniques are needed not only to overcome student difficulties but also to improve their reading abilities.

Reading is not only help the teachers to increase their knowledge but also it is a way of using a text to understand meaning. The two key words here are creating and meaning. If there is no meaning, there is no reading taking place. Moreover, Perfetti, Van Dyke, and Hart (2001) point out that the study of reading is, in part, the study of language processes, including reading comprehension. What distinguishes reading is most clearly from spoken language processes is the conversion process, or decoding. Beyond decoding, reading shares some linguistic and general cognitive processes with spoken language in the process of comprehension. In addition, Chard and Santoro (2008, p. 4) state, "reading comprehension relies, in part, on fluent reading". The unexpected condition of

pupils reading comprehension achievement has attracted many researchers to do some study on this topic.

Based on the survey from BPS in 2003 the Indonesian children, 10-19 years old, were 16.8% who read newspaper and magazine, whereas 90.6% of the children preferred to watch TV. In 2006, there was an improvement of the children growing to be 23.46% who had read the newspaper and magazine.

In addition, World Bank and IEA (2008) states that in East of Asia Indonesian people had the lowest level in reading English text. Indonesia only got 51.7, Philippine got 52.6, Thailand got 65.1, Singapore got 74.0, and the highest point was Hongkong, i.e. 75.5. Moreover, Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) (2013) states that the percentage of 4th-grade students reaching the PIRLS international benchmarks in reading, Indonesia is in the rank 45 out of 46 countries in the world.

In addition, one of factors that could influence reading is students' motivation. In classroom context, motivation refers to students' subjective experiences, particularly students' willingness to participate in class activities and their reasons for doing so (Brophy, 1998).

According to Ormrod (1999), there are two kinds of motivation, namely: extrinsic motivation and intrinsic motivation. "Extrinsic motivation occurs when the cause of motivation exists outside of an individual and the task performed. It arises from environmental incentives and consequences (e.g., food, money)" (Reeve, 2005, p. 134). Intrinsic motivation occurs when the cause of motivation exists within an individual and task (Ormrod,1999). It emerges spontaneously from psychological needs, personal curiosities, and innate

striving for growth (Reeve, 2005, p. 134). I

n the study of assessing motivation for reading, Baker and Wigfield (1999, p. 453) find that engaged readers are motivated to read for different purposes, utilize knowledge gained from previous experience to generate new understandings, and participate in meaningful social interactions around reading. Ivey and Broaddus (2001) also explore reading motivators by utilizing a survey of 1765 students followed by interviews with 31 of those students. Their finding is that students are interested in reading for information and enjoy reading texts connected to popular culture. This means that when motivation is high, children will tackle (and understand) much more difficult texts than those they usually read (Harrison, 1980).

There are many teaching models that may be used by the teachers to teach reading comprehension. One of model is think, pair, share, it is first developed by Lyman at the University of Maryland in 1981 and adopted by many writers in the field of co-operative learning since then. It introduces into the peer interaction element of co-operative learning the idea of 'wait or think' time, which has been demonstrated to be a powerful factor in improving student responses to questions. It is a simple strategy, effective from early childhood through all subsequent phases of education to tertiary and beyond. It is a very versatile technique, which has been adapted and used, in an endless number of ways. This is one of the foundation stones for the development of the 'co-operative classroom' (Bell, 1998). The previous studies dealing with Think-Pair-Share were done by Azlina in 2008 and Carss in 2007. The first study was done by Azlina, in her study entitled "Collaborative Teaching Environment System Using Think-Pair-Share Technique". She found that through the use of TPS she has revealed the importance of interaction in teaching by understanding teaching theory that involves knowing not only the 'teacher' himself and the students only but also the 'stuff' or materials used for teaching. She utilizes this technique in teaching and learning activities, especially in science subject. It is proved it can be well-achieved by acquiring students' to work in group since they can share opinions and thought. The second study was done by Carss, in her study entitled "The effects of Using Think-Pair-Share during Guided Reading Lessons". The results showed the positive effects of the strategy on reading achievement, especially for students whose reading above their chronological age, although an extended period of intervention may have had more significant effects on those reading below. The positive effects on aspects of oral language use, thinking, metacognitive awareness, and the development of reading comprehension strategies were noted with both of the intervention groups. The results are significant for those which concerned with implementing effective literacy practice. In addition, developing appropriate methods that enabled students to improve their reading comprehension is very crucial for English teachers. One of the technique that enabled students to improve their reading ability was cooperative learning. Many researchers believed that cooperative learning could improve students' work in their academic learning, help them to understand hard concept of learning material, and develop their critical thinking (Trianto, 2009).

Furthermore, National Institute for Science Education (2006) mentions that the think-pair-share model also enhances the student's oral communication skills as they discuss their ideas with the one another. Normally, students will feel very shy to

shoot out their ideas or answer in traditional way of teaching, for fear that they will be criticized, or the answer might be wrong. They do not have enough courage to express themselves as they are trained to think alone. However, with think-pair-share model the students are more willing to take risks, suggest ideas because they have already discussed with their partner and it helps them to be more active in class by presenting their ideas with no fear.

There were four problems discussed as follows: (1) Was there any significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using think-pair-share? (2) Was there any significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using teacher-centered method? (3) Was there any significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using think-pair-share model and those who were taught by using teacher-centered method? (4) Was there any significant interaction effect between think-pair-share model and students' motivation on reading comprehension achievement?

RESEARCH METHOD

This study used an experimental research. A quasi-experimental design, specifically nonequivalent control group design, was applied in this study. The writer divided the samples into two groups. This study applied think-pair-share model as the treatment for experimental group and teacher-centered method as the treatment for control group. Before both techniques implemented, the students' motivation scores were classified into three categories: high, average, and low. Suhadi (2008) classified students' motivation scores into three categories: (1) high motivation with the score level 45.5-60.0, (2) average motivation with

the score level 25.5-45.0, and (3) low motivation with the score level 10.0-25.0.

Next, the students' pretest and posttest scores were categorized based on the students' motivation categories. In addition, he administered a pretest to both groups, conducts experimental treatments activities to both groups, and then follows a posttest to assess the differences between the two groups (Cresswell, 2012). The diagram of a quasi-experimental design is as follows.

Experimental Group	O_1 X_1 O_2
Control Group	
	O_3 X_2 O_4

Where:
O_1 : Pretest for experimental group
O_2 : Posttest for experimental group
O_3 : Pretest for control group
O_4 : Posttest for control group
X_1 : Treatment for experimental group
X_2 : Treatment for control group

In this study, the experimental group utilizes think-pair-share model in teaching reading comprehension and then the control group was given teacher-centered method to develop their reading comprehension achievement. The population of this study was the eighth graders' of SMPN 1 Gelumbang in the academic year 2013/2014. The teaching and learning activities in this study were done after class hour and both classes were taught by the writer with different technique. This study was conducted in semester two in academic year 2013/2014. The research started at 29th March 2014 until 3rd May 2014 and it was done for seventeen meeting included pretest, the treatment, and posttest. The preparation was started from trying out the instruments of research on March 2014. The pretest was applied on April 2014. Then, the treatment was conducted from April to May, and posttest was given on May 2014.

The writer used written test and questionnaires to collect the data. In this

study the writer used reading test, for pre-test and post-test to the sample. A ready-made reading comprehension test items with multiple choice questions was taken from www.mrnusbaum.com and the questionnaire was adapted from Teacher Ratings of Student Motivation to Read (TRSM) that was designed by Marsh, Craven, Hinkley, and Debus (2003) and it was modified and translated into Bahasa Indonesia by writer. There were 70 minutes to complete both the test and questionnaire with the time estimation: 20 questions for 50 minutes to finish reading comprehension test and 13 items for 20 minutes to finish the questionnaire. Based on the statistic calculation of reading comprehension test, the validity coefficient was 0.78 and reliability coefficient was 0.78. It meant that the test was considered reliable since it was higher than 0.70.

The procedure of teaching to implement think-pair-share model was conducted in sequences and it is integrated in the lesson plan, the writer applies three stages as the students' activities. According to Nurhadi (2004), teaching procedures using think-pair-share instruction as follows.

1) The students are asked to propose questions about topic in relation to the subject and then think its answer individually.
2) The students are asked to discuss and share their answers with his/her pairs.
3) The students are asked to discuss and share their answers with the whole class.

In the teaching of reading comprehension through think-pair-share model, the writer will provide instruction to the students and expects they will find the information as best as they can answer comprehension that follows. The students are guided to produce their error-free vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills.

Moreover, in teacher-centered method, a specific creative assignment is made by the writer as a teacher and as the controller of teaching and learning classroom process.

Richards and Rodgers (1986) mention 10 steps or procedures of teaching reading comprehension by using teacher-centered method. They are as follows.

1) The teacher gives instruction to the students in order to make them ready for receiving the new lesson that will be given.
2) The teacher reviews the previous structure and vocabulary that have been learnt.
3) The teacher asks the students to open their book or writes the passage on the board and reads orally.
4) The teacher asks the students whether they have difficult words, writes them on the board, and discussed them.
5) The teacher reads the words from the top bottom and the students follow her/him.
6) The teacher asks some students to read the passage paragraph by paragraph.
7) The teacher explains the new vocabularies in the passage one by one. First, he/she writes the new vocabularies on the board then pronounce them once or twice and ask the students to repeat her/him. Finally, the teacher explains the meaning of the words and make some sentences.
8) The teacher explains the structure used in the passage.
9) If the teacher finds that the students still have difficulties; she/he will probably need to explain the matter once more.
10) The teacher asks the students to answer the comprehension questions.

Considering the teaching of reading comprehension through teacher-centered method, the writer provides little or no instruction to the students and expects the students found the information as best as they can in answering the comprehension that follows. The students are required to produce their error-free vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills by themselves.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATION

Descriptive Statistics of Reading Comprehension in the Control Group

From the calculation scores of the students' reading comprehension tests in the control group, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the pretest was 30 while the highest score was 60, the mean score of the pretest was 40.50, and the standard deviation of the pretest scores in the control group was 8.414.

Meanwhile, the statistical calculation in the posttest scores from the control group showed that the lowest score was 45 while the highest score was 65, the mean score of the posttest was 53.75, and the standard deviation of the posttest scores in the control group was 6.463.

Descriptive Statistics of Reading Comprehension in the Experimental Group from Students' Pretest and Posttest Scores

Based on the calculation with descriptive statistics by using SPSS from students' pretest scores in the experimental group, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the pretest was 45 while the highest score was 55, the mean score was 50, standard error of the score was 0.960, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 4.292.

Meanwhile, descriptive statistics from students' posttest scores in the experimental group, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the posttest was 50 while the highest score was 80, the mean score was 65, standard error of the score was 1.850, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 8.272.

Descriptive Statistics of Motivation from Students' Pretest Questionnaire in the Control Group

From the calculation scores of the questionnaire on the students' high motivation in the control group, it was found that the lowest score was 46 while the highest score was 50, the mean score was 48.75, standard error of the scores was 0.946, and the standard deviation of the scores in the control group was 1.893.

Meanwhile, the calculation scores of the questionnaire on the students' average motivation in the control group, it was found that the lowest score was 35 while the highest score was 44, the mean score was 38.56, standard error of the scores was 1.107, and the standard deviation of the scores in the control group was 3.321.

Next, from the calculation scores of the questionnaire on the students' low motivation in the control group, it was found that the lowest score was 15 while the highest score was 25, the mean score was 21.29, standard error of the scores was 1.375, and the standard deviation of the scores in the control group was 3.638. The distribution of Descriptive Statistics of the Questionnaire on the Students'

Motivation Level	Lowest Score	Highest score	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev
High	45	55	48.62	1.101	3.114
Average	34	39	36.88	0.639	1.808
Low	24	25	24.50	0.289	0.577

Motivation in the Control Group was displayed in Table 1.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Motivation from Students' Pretest Questionnaire in the Control Group

Descriptive Statistics of Motivation from Students' Pretest Questionnaires in the Experimental Group

The calculation of the scores for the students with high motivation in the experimental group showed that the lowest score was 45 while the highest score was 50, the mean score was 48.62, standard error of the scores was 1.101, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 3.114.

Meanwhile, the calculation scores of the questionnaire for the students with average motivation in the experimental group revealed that the lowest score was 34 while the highest score was 39, the mean score was 36.88, standard error of the scores was 0.639, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 1.808.

The calculation scores for the students belonged to the low motivation level in the experimental group showed that the lowest score was 24, the highest score was 25, the mean score was 24.50, standard error of the scores was 0.289, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 0.577. The distribution of the questionnaire concerning the students' motivation level is presented in Table 2.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Motivation from Students' Pretest Questionnaires in the Experimental Group

Motivation Level	Lowest Score	Highest score	Mean	Std. Error	Std. Dev
High	46	50	48.75	0.946	1.893
Average	35	44	38.56	1.107	3.321
Low	15	25	21.29	1.375	3.638

Test Normality

Before the collected data were analyzed, firstly, the normality of data distribution had been tested. The normality test was based on the students' pretest and posttest in the control and experimental group by using SPSS. The distribution of the data could be classified into normal if the p-value was higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 level (Pratisto, 2012).

Students' Pretest and Posttest in the Control and Experimental Group

From the statistical analysis by using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, it was found that the students' pretest and posttest in the control group were 0.270 and 0.110. Meanwhile, the students' pretest and posttest in the experimental group were 0.250 and 0.902. It means that all scores are categorized into normal since the p-value is higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 level. The further calculation of the normality test from the students pretest and posttest in the control and experimental group are displayed in Table 3. Test distribution is normal.

Table 3
Normality Test from the students' Pretest and Posttest in the Control and Experimental Groups

Groups	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pretest_Control	0.270
Posttest_Control	0.110
Pretest_Experiment	0.250
Posttest_ Experiment	0.902

Students' Questionnaire Scores in the Experimental Group & Control Group

From the statistical analysis by using One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, it was found that the students' questionnaire on the students' motivation in the experimental group. The p-value was 0.891 in high motivation category, 0.992 in average motivation category, and 0,846 in low motivation category. Whereas, the students' questionnaire on the students' motivation in the control group. The p-value was 0.858 in high motivation category, 0.712 in average motivation

category, and 0,890 in low motivation category. It means that all scores are categorized into normal since the p-value is higher than mean significant difference at 0.05 level. The further calculation of the normality test from the students' questionnaire in the experimental group is displayed in Table 4.

Table 4
Normality Test from the Students' Questionnaire in the Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Motivation Level		
	High	Average	Low
Experimental	0.891	0.992	0.846
Control	0.858	0.712	0.890

Homogeneity Test
Students Posttest Scores of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Group

To determine the samples are homogeneous or not, the students' posttest score in the control and experimental group are analyzed by using Levene Statistic. The samples are considered homogeneous whenever the p-value is higher than mean significant difference at the 0.05 level.

Based on the calculation of Levene Statistic, it was found that the p-value was 0.768. From the p-output, it is assumed that the samples are homogeneous since the p-output is higher than the significant difference at the 0.05 level. The further calculation of test homogeneity by using Levene Statistic is displayed in the Table 5.

Table 5
Test Homogeneity Students' Posttest Scores of Reading Comprehension in the Control and Experimental Groups

Levene Statistic	Sig.
0.454	0.768

Students' Questionnaire Scores of Motivation in the Control and Experimental Group

Based on the calculation of Levene Statistic, it was found that the p-value was 0.442. From the p-output, it is assumed that the samples from the students' questionnaire on high motivation scores in the control and experimental group are homogeneous since the p-output is lower than the significant difference at the 0.05 level. The further calculation of test homogeneity by using Levene Statistic is displayed in the Table 6.

Table 6
Test Homogeneity of Students' Questionnaire Scores of Motivation in the Control and Experimental Groups

Levene Statistic	Sig.
0.856	0.442

Measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using think-pair-share model

From the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using think-pair-share model, it was found that the mean score of pretest in experimental group was 50, the mean score of posttest in experimental group was 65 and the mean difference in experimental group was 15. The t-value for experimental group was 6.892 and p-value was 0.000.

Measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students were taught by using teacher-centred method

From the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement before and after the students were taught by using teacher-centered method, it was found that the mean

score of pretest in control group was 40.5, the mean score of posttest in control group was 53.75 and the mean difference in control group was 13.25. The t-value for control group was 6.892 and p-value was 0.000. Since the p-value was lower than the significant difference at the 0.05 level. It was assumed that overall the think-pair-share model was significantly affected students reading comprehension than teacher-centered method. The result of analysis of paired sample t-test is displayed in Table 7.

Table 7
The Analysis of Paired Sample *t*-Test
in the Control and Experimental Groups

Group	Mean Score		Mean Diff	t	Sig.2 tailed (0.05)
	pre-test	post-test			
E (N=20)	50	65	15	6.892	0.000
C (N=20)	40.5	53.75	13.25	6.892	0.000

Measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using think-pair-share model and those who were taught by using teacher-centered method

From the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between students who were taught by using think-pair-share model and those who were taught by using teacher-centered method, it was found that the mean score in experimental group was 65, the mean score in control group was 53.75, the mean difference for both groups was 11.25, The t-value for both groups was 4.793 and p-value was 0.000. Since the p-value was lower than the significant difference at the 0.05 level. It was assumed that the think-

Group	Mean	Mean Diff	t	Sig.2 tailed (0.05)
Experimental	65	11.25	4.79	0.000
Control	53,75			

pair-share model was significantly affected students reading

comprehension than teacher-centered method. The result of analysis of independent sample t-test is displayed in Table 8.

Table 8
The Result of Independent Sample *t*-Test

Measuring a significant interaction effect between teaching reading using think-pair-share model and students' motivation on reading comprehension achievement

From the statistics calculation, the significant interaction effect between teaching reading using think-pair-share model and students' motivation toward reading comprehension was 0.640. It meant that there was no significant interaction between think-pair-share model and students' motivation. Then, the p-value of motivation score was 0.495.

It showed that motivation did not have effect on students' reading comprehension achievement. It was assumed that all motivation levels did not have effect on students' reading comprehension achievement either. Whereas the p-value of group was 0.017, it meant that there was main effect of group, in this case think-pair-share model in the experimental group toward reading comprehension achievement of the students. It was assumed that students' reading comprehension achievement was affected by think-pair-share model. Since the p-value is lower than the significant difference at 0.05 level. The result of two-way ANOVA is displayed in Table 9.

Table 9
Two-way ANOVA Analysis between Teaching Reading Using Think-Pair-Share Model and Students' Motivation on Reading Comprehension Achievement

Variables	Sig.
Group	0.017
Motiv_score	0.495
group * Motiv_score	0.640

Based on the findings of this research, some interpretations are made as follows. First, from the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students who were taught by using think-pair-share model was 0.000. It meant that the p-value was lower than the mean significant difference at the 0.05 level. It was predicted that significant difference was found between teaching reading comprehension using think-pair-share model. This meant difference was assumed to be caused by acquiring students' to work in pair. This was also in line Darmarianti (2011) who said that the application of think-pair-share technique was significant to improve the students' reading comprehension.

Second, from the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between before and after the students who were taught by using teacher-centered method was 0.000. It meant that the p-value was lower than the mean significant difference at the 0.05 level. It was predicted that significant difference was found between teaching reading comprehension using teacher-centered method. But overall, think-pair-share model was significantly affected students reading comprehension than teacher-centered method. This was also in line with Damayanti (2011) who said that the application of Think-Pair-Share technique was significant to improve the students' reading comprehension and writing achievement.

Third, from the statistics calculation measuring significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using think-pair-share model and those who were taught by using teacher-centered method was 0.000. It meant that the p-value was lower than the mean significant difference at the 0.05

level. It was predicted that significant difference was found between teaching reading comprehension using think-pair-share model. This meant difference was assumed to be caused by acquiring students' to work in pair. This was also in line with Azlina (2008) who said that through the use of TPS she has revealed the importance of interaction in teaching by understanding teaching theory that involves knowing not only the 'teacher' himself/herself and the students only but also the materials used for teaching. She utilizes this technique in teaching and learning activities, especially in science subject.

Fourth, from the statistics calculation the significant interaction effect between teaching reading using think-pair-share model and students' motivation toward reading comprehension was 0.640. It meant that there was no significant interaction between think-pair-share model and students' motivation. Then, the p-value of motivation score was 0.495. It showed that motivation did not have effect on students' reading comprehension achievement. It was assumed that all motivation levels did not have effect on students' reading comprehension achievement either. Whereas the p-value of group was 0.017, it meant that there was main effect of group, in this case think-pair-share model in the experimental group toward reading comprehension achievement of the students. It was assumed that students' reading comprehension achievement was affected by think-pair-share model. Since the p-value is lower than the significant difference at 0.05 level. This mean difference was assumed to be caused by acquiring students' to work in pair.

It was also in line with Carss (2007) who said that through the use of TPS has showed the positive effects of the strategy on reading achievement,

especially for students whose reading above their chronological age.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings and interpretations of this study, it can be concluded that reading comprehension achievement not only before and after but also between the students who were taught by using think-pair-share in the experimental group and those who were taught by using teacher-centered method in the control group was more significantly better than that of those in the control group. It was proven that think-pair-share model was more effective than teacher-centered method. And last but not least, the significant interaction effect was not found between teaching reading by using think-pair-share model and students motivation in high, average, low on reading comprehension achievement.

SUGGESTIONS

The success of teaching and learning processes involves many aspects. Those aspects are teacher's teaching strategies, students' active participation, interesting learning materials and many others factor. The findings of this study encouraged the writer to suggest to the teachers of English to apply many kinds of teaching strategies in helping the students learn English, especially to develop the students' reading comprehension skill. Through this research, it is hoped that this can be became an alternative teaching model since the effect of think-pair-share model has been proven in developing eighth graders' reading comprehension achievement.

REFERENCES

Azlina, N. (2008). *Collaborative teaching environment system using think-pair-share technique.* Retrieved from http://dspace.fsktm.um.edu.my/

Baker, L., & Wigfield, A. (1999). Dominions of children's motivation for reading and their relations to reading activity and reading achievement. *Reading Research Quarterly, 34*(7)*,* 452-477.

Bell, J. (1998). *Improving student learning and college teaching.* Retrieved from http://classweb.howardcc.edu/

Brophy, J. (1998). *Motivating students to learn*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Cahyono, B. Y.,& Widiati, U. (2006). The teaching of EFL reading in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal, 17*(1),36-37.

Carss, W. D. (2007). *The effects of using think-pair-share during guided reading lessons*. Retrieved from http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz

Chard, D. J.,& Santoro, L. E. (2008). *What is reading comprehension and why is it important?.* Retrieved from *http://www.maine.gov/education/*

Cresswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating qualitative and quantitative research*. Columbus, OH: Pearson Merrill Prentice Hall.

Damayanti. (2011). *Improving reading and writing achievement of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 1 Tanjung Lago through think-pair-share technique*

(Master's thesis). University of SriwijayaPalembang, Palembang, Indonesia.

Darmarianti. (2011). *The influence of think-pair-share technique and students' reading Interest toward students' reading comprehension achievement for the eleventh grade students of SMA Tri Dharma Palembang(Master's thesis)*. University of PGRIPalembang, Palembang, Indonesia.

Depdiknas. (2006). *KTSP: Mata pelajaran bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta:Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Fraenkel, J. R., &Wallen, N. E.(2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Harrison, C. (1980). *Readability in the classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Iftanti, E. (2012). A survey of the English reading habits of EFL students in Indonesia. *TEFLIN Journal*, *23*(2),2-5.

Ivey, G.,& Broaddus, K. (2001). "Just plain reading": A survey of what makes studentswant to read in middle school classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly, 36*(4),350-377.

Marsh, H. W., Craven, R., Hinkley, J. W., & Debus, R. L. (2003). Evaluation of the big two-factor theory of motivation orientation: An evaluation of jingle-jingle fallacies. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *38*(2),189-224.

National Institute for Science Education. (2006). *Collaborative learning*. Retrieved from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu

Nurhadi. (2004). *Kurikulum 2004 pertanyaan dan jawaban*. Jakarta: Grasindo.

Nuttall, C.(1982). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language*. Retrieved from http://www.alessays.com/sample_ writing/pdf/onteaching.pdf/

Ormrod, J. E. (1999). *Human learning* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Perfetti, C.A., Van Dyke, J., & Hart, L. (2001) The psycholinguistics of basic literacy. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 21*(4),127–149.

PIRLS. (2013). *Highlights from PIRLS 2011*: *Reading achievement of U.S. fourth-grade students in an international context*. Retrieved from http//nces.ed.gov/pubs2013/201301rev.pdf

Reeve, J. (2005). *Understanding motivation and emotion* (4thed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Richards, J. C.,& Rodgers, T. S. (1986). *Approach and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Sanders, M. (2001).*Understanding dyslexia and the reading process: A guide for educators and parents*. Retrieved from http://www.resourceroom.net.

Slameto. (1995). *Belajar dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhinya*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.

Suhadi. (2008). *Mengukur motivasi dan minat belajar siswa*. Retrieved from http://suhadinet.files.angket-model-arcs-untukmengukur-motivasi-belajar-dan-minat-belajar-siswa1.pdf.

Sunandar, K. (2006). Reading instruction on the comprehension of narrative and expository text. *Reading Research Quarterly*, *26*(3),142-159.

Trianto. (2009). *Mendesain model pembelajaran inovatif progresif: Konsep, landasan, dan implementasinya pada Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP)*. Jakarta: PT. Kencana.

About the author

Alfurqon, S.Pd., M.Pd is the graduate of the English Education Study Program of Postgraduate Study, Sriwijaya University. He completed his Magister Pendidikan (M.Pd) in 2014. He teaches English at SMPN 1 Gelumbang, Prabumulih, South Sumatera.