IMPROVING READING COMPREHENSION AND SPEAKING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE EIGHTH GRADERS OF SMP NEGERI 18 PALEMBANG THROUGH SHARED

READING STRATEGY

TIRAY FEBRIA ZANANDA
febriatiray@yahoo.com

Abstract

This study aimedat investigatingwhether or not the use of Shared Reading Strategy was effective to improve the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements. Quasi experimental research method was applied. The sample consisted of 44 eighth graders which were divided equally into experimental and control groups. The data were collected by using reading and speaking tests. Both groups were tested before and after the treatment. Using paired sample, the results of the experimental group showed that the two variables reading comprehension and speaking achievementssignificantly improved. Furthermore, the result of the independent t-test showed that the experimental group outperformed the control group with a significant mean difference of 9.545 (p=.000) on reading comprehension and 2.5000(p=.000) on speaking achievement. The results showed that the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy had better improvement in their reading comprehension and speaking achievements. Thus, it can be concluded that Shared Reading Strategy could improve the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements.

Keywords: Shared Reading Strategy, reading comprehension, speaking achievement

1. Introduction

English has been used globally either for communication or academic purposes. Therefore, it is introduced starting from elementary to university levels. Indonesian government has made a decision that English is one of the compulsory subjects to be taught to the students of Junior High and Senior High Schools (Depdiknas Kantor Wilayah Provinsi Sumatera Selatan, 2003). In order to reach the success of English teaching, the four language skills (listening, speaking, reading, and writing) must be taught integratedly. To help the students achieve these skills, it is worth it that English language teaching and learning process should be prioritized as much as possible, especially in terms of reading and speaking because one of the demands in living in the global era is having the ability to communicate with people of other countries in which reading becomes the prerequisite of any other productive languange skills (Geske & Ozola, 2008).

The process of communication may start with reading for getting informationand through speaking to share information with others. Speaking is the most common and important means of providing communication among human beings, it is one of the expressive language elements (Ulas, 2008, p.876).The students often get difficulties in speaking; because they do not know what they should talk about. It causes from lacking of reading. According to Mikulecky and Jeffries (1998), there are five reasons why reading is important, firstly, reading in English helps the reader learn to think a lot,secondly, reading in English helps the reader to build their English vocabulary, thirdly, reading in English makes the reader more comfortable because they feel enjoyable with language, fourthly, reading in English may be the only way for the reader to use English if they live in a non-English-speaking country, and finally reading in English is helpful if a reader plan to study in an English-speaking country. It indicates reading is important because it provides access to information due to the fact thatcan give valuable information to the readers and also the impacts of reading to enhance readers' understanding and discover new insights.

In addition, the problems found in terms of reading achievement of the Indonesian students. OECD/PISA (2013) reported the reading ability of Indonesian students in Bahasa Indonesia is still low. The score on the students' ability on the overall reading scale was 396 while the OECD average score was 496. This mean score puts Indonesia at 60th place out of 65 countries and more than half of Indonesian students are proficient only at or below level 1. The result of some studies show the facts that reading comprehension is still low. It is proved by Diem (2011), which involved the elementary students in Palembang, found that literacy skills achievement in English of the fifth graders was still in the poor level. Particularly, the mean score of the students' reading comprehension achievement was only 28.83 in 100 scales. Similarly, Diem and Novitasari (2012) also found that reading comprehension achievement of fifth graders in Palembangwas still problematic. It was shown by the mean score of the reading achievement testthat was only 30.30and itwas below the standard score.This suggests that the students may get more difficulties in reading comprehension in their later learning at junior

high and senior high schools. This is in line with Grabe (2009) reading is not only a learning but also comprehending the linguistic process.

Not only reading comprehension should be mastered by students, but also speaking ability. Speakingability also plays prominent roles in learning and understanding the language. At least one billion people speak or are trying to speak English and about 300 million people are actively studying the English language (British Council, 2010). In line with that, it is one of the abilitieswhich isvery essential for the students to acquire. According to Egan (1999), speaking is at the heart of second language learning; it is arguably the most important skill for business and government personnel working in the field. Unfortunately,Richards (2006) reports that there are four reasons why speaking English is still weak. Firstly, the students lack of emphasis on speaking skill. Secondly, teacher'slimited English proficiency. Thirdly, students' limited opportunities to express their ideas. Fourthly, less of contributive factors such as environment, friend, and family. Kurniati (2011) did a research about speaking achievementat eleventh grade in SMA 12 Palembang; she found that 90 students (44.3%) of 203 students got score less than 67 as the passing grade (KKM). The mean score of all the students was 67.5. In line with that, a study proved by Nazara (2011) 90% of the students of the English Teaching Study Program of FKIP-UKI Jakarta responded that the time provided for practicing speaking in speaking classes is too limited.Itcan be implied that on one hand, most of the students in Indonesia still come across with those problems, it happens due to English is not spoken in Indonesian community and besides the studentsare not fully and actively exposed English in the classroom. Therefore, the ability to speak in Indonesia is still weak.

For the purpose of this study, the writer had done a preliminary investigation concerning the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements. The eighth graders of SMP Negeri 18 Palembang were givenreading comprehension and speaking achievements tests in order to find out what problems they had in reading comprehension and speaking achievements. It was found that, the eighth graders of SMP Negeri 18 Palembang still had difficulties in gaining their score. The results show that their reading level was in level 2 with the average 27.9. Since, speaking

achievement still needed improvement. Based on the information gathered from teacher of English and the students, it was found that having little prior knowledge made the students have problems in comprehending an English reading text and braveness to talk in English. In connection with this situation, Hamra and Syatriana (2012) who state English reading comprehension of Indonesian students need improvement as out of the context of the curriculum standard for later education.

Teachers of English should consider any other resources that offer various types of text, values, and enjoyment as well as the instructional activities carefully. Based on some problems above, this study focuses on reading comprehension and speaking achievements through narrative text.Narrative text is a kind of text which has the purpose to entertain the readers or listeners with actual or imaginary experiences. The students are expected to have the ability in identifying and understanding the elements of the story. The elements are as follows: (1) plot refers to what happens in the story, (2) characters refers to who is involved in what happens in the story, (3) point of view refers to how the story is told, (4) setting refers to where and when the story takes place, (5) theme refers to the moral value from the story. Therefore, the story in narrative text consists of (a) orientation is who were involved in the story that consists of setting, characters and plot, (b) complication is a problem arises followed by other problem, (c) resolution is solution to the problem, and (d) reorentation is the ending of the story. A story provided a meaningful context in communication and gave pleasure by engaging reader' emotions with the text (Hill, 1994). According to Cameron (2001), stories can give learners information and a positive feeling about other countries and cultures. Furthermore, narrative text is one of materials that the students learnt in the eighth grade based on KTSP curriculum 2006.

Dealing with teaching and learning process, Zuraida and Diem (2001) found out that teaching English for the students through various media as well as techniques or strategy used in teaching and learning process. Since there are many techniques or strategy that can be used in teaching and learning process, the teachers should apply the appropriate technique or strategy depends on the material or skill that will be taught to the students. It indicates that the strategy used by the students

may influence the result of learning and determine the success or failure of learning activities. The writer believes that the appropriate strategy is using Shared Reading Strategy. Shared Reading Strategy is an interactive reading experience that occurs when students join in or share the reading of a big book or other enlarged text while guided and supported by a teacher or other experienced reader. In Shared Reading Strategy, children participate in reading, learn critical concepts of how print works, get the feel of learning and begin to perceive themselves as readers (Fountas & Pinnell, 1996). Shared Reading Strategy provides an excellent opportunity for teachers as a model that can be applied to unfamiliar reading. Pidgeon (1990) defines Shared Reading as "a text that is shared among the students for their mutual pleasure and understanding".

Considering the fact above, the writer was interested in conductinga study entitledImproving Reading Comprehension and Speaking Achievements of the Eighth Graders of SMP Negeri 18 Palembang through Shared Reading Strategy.The focus of this study was to answer the following questions: (1) Was there any significant improvement in reading comprehension achievement and its aspects of the eighth graders of SMP N 18 Palembang after they were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy?, (2) Was there any significant improvement in speaking achievement and its aspects of the eighth graders of SMP N 18 Palembang after they were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy?, (3) Was there any significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy and those who were not by using Shared Reading Strategy?, (4) Was there any significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy and those who were not by using Shared Reading Strategy?

2. Method

This study applied quasi-experimental research method, specifically nonequivalent control group design. This study applied Shared Reading Strategy as the treatment for the experimental group. Nonequivalent classes are used; one class as experimental group and the other class as a control group. According to Creswell

(2005), the steps for conducting the pretest-posttest non equivalent group method as follows: the researcher assigns experimental and control groups, administers a pretest to both groups, conducts experimental activities with the experimental group only, and then administers a posttest to both groups to assess the differences between the two groups.

To find out the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements, the writer gave the students a pretest and posttest to experimental and control groups. The students of the experimental group got the treatmentintensively by using Shared Reading Strategy. Therefore, there were 26 meetings including pretest and posttests in this study. Each of which consisted of 2x45 minutes. It takes two teaching hours for each meeting due to various goals that need to be achieved.

Sample

The writer used a purposive sampling technique to select the sample based on the result of the test. In this study, the writer divided the sample into two groups. They are experimental group and control group. Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) state it is a sampling technique in which the sample is selected based on the researcher' specific judgment and certain consideration. The writer considered the sample selected based on the criteria: the students taught by the same English teacher, they did not join an English course, the same age, and the students have the same numbers of levels of their reading achievement. The students selected based on the result of the IRI reading comprehension test (Burns & Roe, 1985).

There were some steps done in selecting the sample of this study. First, reading comprehension test was given to the students of VIII.G and VIII.H as they were taught by the same English teacher. Second, the result showed that they were in below level 1, level 1, level 2, level 3 and level 4. To decide the students who in experimental and control group, the writer listed each name of the students' on a piece of paper. Next, the list divided equally into experimental and control groups. Therefore, the classification of the sample was 22 students for each group.

Teaching Procedure for Experimental Group

In conducting this study, the writer provided several of reading comprehension texts which the readability already checked by Flesch Kincaid and the result of the text showed each text is appropriate in each level. The writer used Flesh Kincaid (online) from http://www.readibilityformulas.com.

Shared Reading Strategy implemented to improve the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements. The writer adopted the teaching procedure from Fountas and Pinnell (1996) modified the teaching procedures as needed for this present study. Meanwhile, the control group was only given pre and posttests with no treatment. The teaching procedure for the experimental group is

1. Pre-Activities

The writer introduced the story, talked about the title, cover, and title page. It is a good time to engage the students in what the students see in the cover picture, and what the students think it tells them about the story to be read and what will happen in the story. Next, The writer conducted a picture walk through the book, briefly pointing out specific character actions or events, asking probing questions to engage the students in thinking about the pictures and story, but not telling the story.

2. Whilst-Activities

The writer pointed to each word as it is read. Then, the writer asked to the students to follow along "with their eyes." Read the text as naturally as possible. After that, the writer might pause from time to time asking students to predict a word, phrase or to make predictions about what is happening.

3. Post-Activities

The writer could take the students back to the point of making predictions, whether at the word or story level, and ask how the students knew they were right or how they knew if their prediction wasn't quite correct. Then, the writer asked open-ended questions and helps students build connections to the text by activating students' prior knowledge to the theme or main idea of the book.

Validity and Reliability of the Tests

It is very important for the writer to have valid test in order to obtained the information based on her purposes. Wallen and Fraenkel (1991) point out validity

refers to extent to which an instrument gives us the information based on the purpose. Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) of the study (Burns & Roe, 1985). It is used as the instrument consisted of five passages with the total questions are 50 questions. The purpose of the instruments is to give the text of reading comprehension varied in many levels of reading comprehension with the different difficulties in every level. Validity is an important thing in research in order to obtain the information based on her purposes. For the content validity of the test, the writer asked to the expert judgments to know the match between the questions and the contents or subject area that is intended to assess. Next, the writer has tested the reading comprehension test to non sample students. The reliability of the test has been measured by using *Cronbach Alpha.*A test is considered reliable if the reliable coefficient of the test is higher than 0.70. The result showed that there were 36 valid questions with the reliability of *Alpha Cronbach* coefficient was .908.

Next, for speaking test, the writer asked to the students told a story based on their interestsome for45 minutes. There were four aspects measured by the raters (1) main idea/gist, (2) organization, (3) element story, and (4) linguistic spillover. The writer has been checked the inter reliability from each rater. The result showed that there were significant correlations from each rater. In speaking tests, inter-rater reliability test for speaking using Pearson Product-Moment Correlation coefficient showed that there was a significant correlation between two raters' judgments. This means the two raters' judgments ware reliable.

Table 1. Inter-rater Reliability of Pretest and Posttest

Variable	Pearson Product Moment Correlation							
	Experimental Group				Control Group			
	Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
	r	Sig.	r	Sig.	R	Sig.	r	Sig.
Speaking	.988	.000	.871	.000	.987	.000	.806	.000

Data Collection

In order to get the data from the fields, the writer provided readingcomprehension and speaking tests.

1208

Test

In order to find out what the students accomplished after the learning process, the writer provided a test in this study. A test is a method of measuring a person's ability, knowledge and performance in giving domain, (Brown, 2004). The purpose of this study is to know the students' improvement in speaking and reading comprehension achievements. In this study, before the writer gives the students pretest, the writer has given them the test (Informal Reading Inventory, IRI) and it was in level 2. By reading levels mean the comprehension levels into which category of the students in the sample belongs. The categories of reading levels, they are independent reading level, instructional reading level, and frustration reading level (Burns & Roe,1985). A student is categorized in independent level when they could answer 90% or misses no more than one question. In instructional level if they could get could get 75% or misses no more than two questions and the last in frustration level means only obtain 50% or misses more than five questions.

The writer provided reading comprehension test with five passages and 36 valid questions that already tested. All the questions cover main idea, cause/effect, vocabulary, inference, detail and sequence. The writer took the reading test from www.englishforeveryone.org. and Informal Reading Inventory (IRI).

The speaking test was conducting in the form of oral performance. The students told the information based on the material. It was recorded by the writer. The writer provided two raters based on threecriteria: a graduate from strata 2 of English study program, having teaching experience more than 5 years, and achieving TOEFL score above 525. The two raters involved to assess students' speaking test. Since, speaking rubric was provided in the form of narrative text and appropriate for level 2. There are two categories in the rubric. The categories are aspect and scale. The aspects consist of main idea/gist, story elements, organization, and linguistic spillover. Thescales of the score are 4, 3, 2, and 1. 4 means mature, 3 means capable, 2 means developing, and 1 means needs beginning. To be clear, see the Appendix J.

Data Analysis

To answer research questions, paired sample t-test and independent sample t-test wereapplied. Paired sample t-test compares the means of two variables of a single group. It is used to see significant improvement made by the students in pretest and posttest. Meanwhile, independent sample t-test is used to see the significant improvement between experimental and control group after the treatment. In nonequivalent control group design, "the effect of the treatment was assessed by comparing the gain scores (that is, posttest minus pretest) of the two groups on the dependent variables (Tuckman & Harper, 2012, p. 165).

3. Result and Discussion

Result

Before analyzing the data, the two assumptions of normal distribution of scores and homogeneity of variances had to be met. Since all the p-values of the normality and homogeneity tests exceeded .05, it can be concluded that the data on pretest and posttest of reading comprehension and speaking achievements were both normal and homogeneous (see Appendix L).

Descriptive Statistics

The pretest was given to the students both in experimental and control groups before the experiments were conducted and posttest was given to the students after accomplishing the treatments using Shared Reading Strategy. The score of reading comprehension and speaking achievements from the whole sample (N=65) were categorized into 5 levels of achievement.

For the purpose of categorizing the score into five levels of achievement, the writer converted the raw score into the score ranging from 10-100. Table 1 presents the score distribution of each group before and after the treatments.

Table 2 The Score Distribution of Reading Comprehension (RC) and Speaking Achievement (SA)

Category	Experimental Group						Control Group					
	Mean		Frequency (%)		SD		Mean		Frequency(%)		SD	
	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
RC												
E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
G	-	75.92	-	6(27)	-	4.536	-	-	-	-	-	-
A	55.56	63.14	2(10)	15(68)	.000	4.511	58.33	-	2(10)	-	.000	-
P	47.77	52.77	10(45)	1(5)	3.885	-	46.52	47.72	12(54)	11(50)	3.768	3.688
VP	32.77	-	10(45)	-	4.863	-	34.37	31.56	8(36)	11(50)	3.618	6.367
TOT	41.66	66.16	44(100)	44(100)	9.508	7.793	43.18	39.64	44(100)	44(100)	8.343	9.705
SA												
E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
G	72.92	76.56	3(14)	12(55)	1.801	4.317	75.00	-	3(14)	-	3.125	-
A	63.54	64.68	6(27)	10(45)	6.145	4.670	63.54	59.37	6(27)	13(59)	6.145	4.773
P	43.49	-	12(55)	-	6.027	-	46.87	50.00	9(41)	9(41)	3.828	.000
VP	25.00	-	1(4)	-	-	-	32.81	-	4(18)	-	5.983	-
TOT	52.13	71.16	44(100)	44(100)	14.31	7.466	52.70	55.54	44(100)	44(100)	14.66	5.939

Note:
E : Excellent, G: Good, A: Average, P: Poor, VP: Very Poor
RC : Reading Comprehension   SA : Speaking Achievement

It can be seen from Table 1 that after giving the treatments RC_{Tot} of the students (N=22) in experimental group improved from Poor level ($\bar{X}$ = 441.66) to Average level ($\bar{X}$ = 66.16). Meanwhile, RC_{Tot} of the students (N=22) in control group was still on Very Poor level ($\bar{X}$ = 39.64). Another result showed SA_{Tot} of the students (N=22) in experimental group improved from Poor level ($\bar{X}$ = 52.13) to Good level ($\bar{X}$ = 71.16). Meanwhile, SA_{Tot} of the students (N=22) in control group was on Poor level ($\bar{X}$ = 55.54).

The Results of Paired Sample and Independent Sample t-Test

The result of total score of each variable and its aspects were analyzed using paired sample t-test and independent t-test. The score that the writer used was raw score.

Table 3 Result of Paired and Independent Samples t-test of Reading Comprehension and Speaking Achievements and the Aspects

Aspects	Pretest		Posttest		mean diff pre and post exp within	mean diff pre and post cont within	mean diff of posttest between exp and cont	-value and sig. et eenpre and post exp within	-value and sig. et een re and post cont within	-value and sig. posttest between exp and cont
	mean exp	mean cont	mean exp	mean cont						
Reading (total) Main Idea	5.00	5.55	3.82	4.27	.82	1.28	.545	0.445	2.231	.992
								000	037	000
Detail	.73	.32	.05	.55	.32	.23	500	.084	.418	.653
								050	171	011
Inference	.09	.09	.95	.32	.86	.23	636	.078	961	.546
								000	348	000
Cause Effect	.18	.68	.36	.32	.18	.64	.045	.144	.993	.862
								005	059	000
Vocabulary	.18	.27	.68	.32	.5	.05	.364	.651	568	.315
								000	576	000
Sequence	.00	.45	.95	.32	.95	0.13	.636	.690	.617	1.63
	.82	.73	.82	45	.00	2.28	.364	000	544	000
								.317	7.689	0.15
								003	000	000
Speaking (total) Main Idea	.34	.43	1.39	.89	.05	.44	.500	.645	4.545	.682
								000	343	000
Element Story	.18	.14	.09	.27	.91	.13	8182	.684	1364	.804
								000	378	000
Organization	.11	.07	.05	.36	.94	.29	6818	.098	2955	.524
Linguitic Spillover	.64	.73	.55	.02	.91	.29	5227	000	120	000
	.41	.50	.70	.23	.29	0.27	4773	.924	2955	.343
								001	091	000
								2.409	.2727	.479
								025	130	001

a. Reading comprehension

The mean difference within the experimental group was 8.82, t value 10.445, Sig. =.000 while within the control group was -1.28, t-value -2.231, Sig. =.037. For each reading aspect, the improvements made by the experimental group were as follows: (1) *detail*, with the mean difference = 1.86, (2) *sequence*= 1.00, (3) *cause*

and effect = 1.5, (4) *vocabulary* = 2.95, (5) *main idea* = 0.32, and (6) *inference* = 1.18. Meanwhile, the control group were as follows: (1) *detail*, with the mean difference =0.23, (2) *sequence*=-2.28, (3) *cause and effect* =0.05, (4) *vocabulary* = -0.13, (5) *main idea* =0.23, and (6) *inference* =0.64. did not show any significant improvement.

Furthermore, there were also significant differences between the experimental and the control group in terms of the posttest result with t obtained =9.992 and p<.000.

b. Speaking achievements

Among other variables, the improvement achieved by the experimental group was in speaking achievement. The mean difference was 3.05and Sig. = .000. Unlikely in the experimental group, the control group had no significant improvement with the mean difference0.44 and Sig. = .343. Then, for four aspects of speaking, experimental group also showed significant improvement in all aspects.

Besides, the results of posttest between the experimental and the control group show significant difference with t value of posttest = 7.682, p<.000.

The Analysis of Stepwise Regression Result of Reading Comprehension and SpeakingAchievements

The stepwise regression analysis was used to describe the statistical contribution of the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements to all aspects of reading comprehension and speaking achievements.

Table 4. The Results of Model Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis of Reading Comprehension and Speaking Achievements to Its Aspects

Variables	Aspects	R Square	R Square Change	Sig. F Change
Reading Comprehension Achievements	Cause Effect	.530	.530	.000
	Cause Effect, Main Idea	.703	.173	.004
	Cause Effect, Main Idea, Inference	.841	.138	.001
	Cause Effect, Main Idea, Inference, Vocabulary	.935	.094	.000
	Cause Effect, Main Idea, Inference, Vocabulary, Detail	.962	.027	.004
	Cause Effect, Main Idea, Inference, Vocabulary, Detail, Sequence	1.000	.038	.
Speaking Achievements	Main Idea	.723	.723	.000
	Main Idea, Organization	.879	.156	.000
	Main Idea, Organization, Lingusitic Spillover	.975	.096	.000
	Main Idea, Organization, Lingusitic Spillover, Element Story	1.000	.025	.

In reading comprehension, the result indicated that the students' reading comprehension achievement was contributed by the aspects of sequence (3.8%), vocabulary (9.4%), main idea (17.3%), cause effect (53%), inference (13.8%), and detail (2.7%). Meanwhile, in speaking achievement, the aspect of main idea (72.3%) made the highest contribution toward students' improvement of speaking achivement. The other contributions were from element story (2.5%), organization (15.6%), linguistic spillover (9.6%).

Discussion

The fact that the mean of English reading comprehension of the whole sample was still below the school standard score of at least 75 (SMP N 18 Palembang) is quite dissatisfying. It seems that the students of this study were not used to practicing their English reading and speaking in their regular school hours. They only did the taskswhen they had certain purposes, such as for getting information needed and for accomplishing tasksgiven by teachers. In other words, insufficient exposure to English reading and speaking practice might affect to this problem. In line with that, Andreson, Wilson, and Fielding (1998,pp. 21-22) state the amount of time spent on reading correlated significantly to gain in students' reading achievement. Therefore, to increase their English reading and eventually speaking need more time and continuous practice.

Concerning to the significant improvement on English reading comprehension of experimental students, there were some affecting factors that need to be explained. First, reading in English texts through digital devices increased the students' interest and stimulate in reading. As National Council of Teachers of English (2006) confirms that giving the students diverse texts (including electronic and visual media) and self-selection texts is effective to foster students to gain reading comprehension because reading materials which are related to students' interests can help them make connections of texts and their own worlds. The exposure of reading material is a factor that influences reading comprehension (Kush &Watkins, 1996).And, the easiness in catching reading information also caused improvement of students' reading comprehension as they had chance to read

theinformation of the story provided on digital devices (big book). In addition, every student in the classroom could catch the information through big book. It is proved by the condition of the whole sample (N=40) from very poor to poor levels for reading comprehension in the posttest.

There was improvement in all aspects of reading comprehension achievement.During the intervention, the writer also introduced new vocabulary to the students before showing the material. So, the students did not have any difficulties when they did the reading. If they had, they asked their friend who knew the meaning of the words. This finding was in accordance with Kats and Boran's finding (2004); Shared Reading succeeded increasing the student's achievement in reading comprehension. Shared Reading also succeeded increasing all components of the reading comprehension: main ideas, details, cause/effect, inferences, and vocabulary.

Another aspect of reading that was least improved significantly in control group was, *inference*. It indicates that the students only did the reading, they just focus on the easy one likevocabulary. Struggling readers just focused on figuring out the unknown words and not on attending to the text which help them to make inferences (Cain & Oakhill, 1999). The result of stepwise regression analysis showed that cause/effect gives the most contribution to the students' reading achievement. This means, during the intervention the students dealt mostly with the element of the story such as the characters, the setting, the plot and the problem and the solution of the story. As Huitt (1992) convinces that when people deal with an information problem, they tend to gather information relevant to overcome the problem (making a decision in order to reach the point of the story).

The intention of the students in reading the texts in this study was reading followed by brainstorming activity before speaking. As the result, they tried to get information only as they needed it. In other words, reading was only used to search for information which is beneficial to add some supporting theoretical framework of their speaking task.

Correspondently, in terms of the speaking achievement, the findings also showed that the eighth graders' speaking achievement in experimental group was

improved. The students had worked very hard to be in average and goodlevels since their score in pre-test was in very poor and poor level. Not only individually but also in group, Shared ReadingStrategy could help the students in gaining thescore of the students' speaking achievement.It is believed that a big book is more effective to improve students' speaking achievement. According to Aziz (2013), discussion is a useful strategy for students in communicating to the members of groups through oral interaction. Therefore,the students felt challenging to speak and share their ideas freely, and it made them enthusiastic to learn through digital devices (a big book).Through such activities, students had opportunities to improve their compositions and be motivated to speak better. As Piaget and Vygotsky's statement, using computer as an expert pee or collaborative partner to support skills and strategies that can be internalized by the students and using computer as a tool to link the students to more knowledgeable and scaffold the student's learning.

Furthermore, the improvements in all aspects of speaking indicate that oral performance of the students in this study was getting much better. As the result, the quality of the content was also improved. The process of participation and interaction among students during discussion section has made learning atmosphere become interactive and collaborative.

In detail, the significant improvement of all speaking aspects reveal that during speaking process, students tend to be more focus on their speaking of the organization such as the beginning, middle and ending of the story. Furthermore, *gist/main idea* like the setting, the characters, moral value, and plot was most significantly improved because most of the students did not include the gist/main idea in their previous speaking pretest. They did not sum up their speaking at all. This means that at the beginning of the study, students' knowledge about speaking aspects especially in narrative text for level 2 was still weak. Furthermore, reading before speaking really helped students in getting the ideas. Input from reading helped the students elaborate about the ideas that would be expressed into oral performance. As a result, they could produce the ideas correctly.

The results of independent sample t-test of reading comprehension and speaking achievements showed that there was a significant difference between the

post-test in experimental and control groups. It was shown by students' scores after being given a treatment in the experimental group which was higher than students' scores in the control group. The result of stepwise regression analysis also gives much contribution to the students' reading comprehension and speaking achievements. The students could be active readers and obtain the best result to comprehend the reading comprehension through the students' work in their team (Slavin, 1990). In addition, Aziz (2013)argues that discussion is a useful strategy for students in communicating to the members of groups through oral interaction. Therefore, the students felt challenging to speak and share their ideas freely, and it made them enthusiastic to learn through digital devices (a big book). This is in line withPidgeon's statement (1990) thatShared Reading as "a text that is shared among the students for their mutual pleasure and understanding".

4. Conclusion and Remark

To sum up, it was found that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy and those who were taught with no treatment. In addition, experimental group showed a significant improvement for reading (total) and all its aspects. The improvement of the aspects from the highest to the lowest was described as follows:*vocabulary, detail, cause effect, inference, sequence, and main idea.*Meanwhile, there was no significant improvement in reading comprehension$_{(total)}$and its aspects in the control group, except *inference*. Next, there was a significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy and those who were not. Furthermore, there was a significant improvement made by the experimental students in speaking $_{(total)}$ and its aspects. The improvement of the aspects from the highest to the lowest was described as follows: *element story, main idea, organization, and linguistic spillover.* However, the students in the control group did not improve on their speaking achievement$_{(total)}$ and its aspects, except *element story and organization*.

In short, Shared Reading Strategy is effective to improve reading comprehension. There was significant difference in speaking achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading Strategy and those who were not. Furthermore, speaking had the highest significant improvement among other variables. This means that Shared Reading Strategy is appropriate to gain speaking achievement. Besides, all its aspects also significantly improved.

As there were still some shortcomings found in this study, it raises some important points that need to be suggested for further research both for EFL teachers and students. For teacher, using Shared Reading Strategy for learning purpose in classroom is effective as long as the facility and teacher's guidance support the learning process. Second, it is suggested to a researcher who is interested in this study to have more sample size for experimental group and control group. It is better to have big number of each group in order to know whether Shared Reading is applicable to be applied in Indonesia. Third, it is also suggested to a researcher who is interested in this study to use other genres of English text, such as procedure text, descriptive text, and so on, in order to know whether Shared Reading is effective to develop the students' comprehending an English text in general or in narrative text only. Finally, some obstacles could not be avoided but it could be anticipated. Therefore, teacher should be well prepared before integrating ICT into EFL learning. Meanwhile, for students, they have to use digital devices effectively for learning purpose so that they can optimize their EFL learning. Moreover, they have to be creative and innovative because they can be active and independent learners when they know how to operate digital devices properly. In addition, they have to upgrade their ICT skill as technology develops rapidly in this era.

References

Anderson, R. C., Wilson, P. T., & Fielding, L. G. (1988). Growth in reading and how the children spend their time outside of school. *Reading Research Quarterly, 23*, 285-303. doi: 10.1598/RRQ.23.3.2

Aziz, F. (2013). Improving speaking skill by using group discussion. *JP3, 1*(13), 97-103.

British Council. (2010) *Teaching English: The English in development.* Retrieved fromwww.teachingenglish.org.uk/article/english-language-development.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy.* San Fransisco, CA: Harper and Row Publisher.

Burns, P. C., & Roe, B. D. (1985). *Informal Reading Inventory: Preprimer to twelfth grade* (2ⁿᵈ ed.). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Comp.

Cain, K., & Oakhill, J. V. (1999). Inference making ability and its relation to comprehension failure in young children. *Reading and Writing: Interdisciplinary Journal, 11*, 489-503.

Cameron, L. (2001). *Teaching languages to young learners*. New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.

Creswell. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and quantitative Reasearch*. Colombus, OH: Pearson.

Depdiknas Kantor Wilayah Provinsi Sumatera Selatan. (2003). *KTSP 2006: Bahasa Inggris SMP/MTS.* Palembang: Depdiknas.

Diem, C. D. (2011). 3-Ls: A model for teaching young learners. *TEFLIN, 22*(2), 125-149.

Diem, C. D., & Novitasari, R. (2012). Exploring online resources for/with fifth graders tocultivate reading habits and increase English literacyachievement. *Basic Research Journal of Education Research and Review,1*(3), 38-47.

Egan, K. B. (1999). Speaking: A critical skill and a Challenge. *CALICO Journal, 16*(3), 277-293.

FKIP, UNSRI. (2012). *Buku Pedoman Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Sriwijaya.* Indralaya:FKIP UNSRI.

Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1996). *Guided reading: Good first teaching for all children.* Portsmouth. NH: Heinemann.

Geske, A., & Ozola, A. (2008). Factors influencing reading literacy at primary school level. *Problems of Education in the 21ˢᵗ Century, 6*, 71-77. Retrieved fromhttp://www.jbse.webinfo.lt/71-77.Geske.pdf

Grabe, W. (2009). *Reading in a second language: Moving theory to practice*. New York, NY: Cambridge University.

Hamra, A.,& Syatriana, E. (2012). A model of reading teaching for university EFL students: Need analysis and model design. *English Language Teaching, 5*(10), 1-11.

Hill, J. (1994). Using literature in language teaching. London: Macmillan.

Huitt, W. (1992). Problem solving and decision making: Consideration of individual differences using the Myers-Briggs type indicator. *Journal of Psychological Type, 24*, 33-44. Retrieved from http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/ prbsmbti.html

Kats, C. A., & Boran, K. (2004). Shared reading theatre: An invitation to the world of story. *ALAN Journal, 31*(3), 4-7.

Kurniati. (2011). *Improving the speaking skill of the eleventh grade students of SMA Negeri 12 Palembang through Australiasm Parliamentary debate*

technique(Unpublished Master's Thesis).Sriwijaya University, South Sumatra, Indonesia.

Kush, J. C. & Watkins, M. W. (1996). Long-term stability of children's attitudes toward reading. *The Journal of Educational Research, 89*(5), 315-319. Retrieved from http://www.bwgriffin.com/gsu/courses/edur9131/content/Reading_Attitudes_ Kush _Watkins_1996.pdf

Macomb Intermediate School District. (2006). *Speaking rubric in narrative grade K-2*. Retrieved from: http:///CONSER/Weber/MLPP K3-2006/MLPP K-3 Assessment Toolkit/K-3 2006 assessment.doc.

Mikulecky, B. S., & Jeffries, L. (1998). *Reading power*(2nd ed.).White Plains, NY: Longman Publishers.

National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE). (2006). *NCTE principles of adolescent literacyreform*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/nctefiles/ resources/policyresearch/adollitprinciples.pdf

Nazara, S. (2011). Students' perception on EFL speaking skill development. *Journal of Language Teaching, 1*(1), 28-43. Retrieved from http://jet.uki.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/Students-Perception-on-EFL-Speaking-Skill-Development-pp-28-43.pdf

OECD. (2013). *PISA 2012 results in focus: What 15-year-olds know and what they can dowith what they know*. Retrieved from www.oecd.org.

Pidgeon, S. (1990). *Shared reading and shared writing*. London, England: ILEA/CLPE.

Richards, S. (2006). The effects of high-structure cooperative versus low-structure collaborative design on online debate in term of decision making, critical thinking, and interaction pattern. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 64*(10), 3652. Retrieved from www.professorjackrichards.com.

Slavin, R. E. (1990). Cooperative Learning : Theory, Research, and Practice(Second Eddition). Engelwood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Tuckman, B. W., & Harper, B. E. (2012). *Conducting educational research* (6th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Ulas, A. H. (2008). Effect of creative, educational drama activities on developing oral skills in primary school children. *American Journal of Applied Science, 5*(7), 876-880.

Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. R. (1991). *Educational research: A guide to the process*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Zuraida, A. H., & Diem, C. D. (2001). The use of English instructional media for students of elementary school. *LINGUA, 3*(1), 83-99.