USING SHARED READING BASED STRATEGY TO IMPROVE VOCABULARY AND READING COMPREHENSION ACHIEVEMENT IN NARRATIVE TEXT OF STUDENTS OF MTS MUQIMUS SUNNAH PALEMBANG

Husnaini[1]
Muyus Parendi[2]

[1]UIN Raden Fatah Palembang
[2]SMAN 28 Banyuasin Sumatera Selatan

Corresponding Author: husnaini_uin@radenfatah.ac.id

ABSTRACT

There are some issues that are associated with the teaching of English in Indonesia; two of them are concerned with vocabulary and reading comprehension. This study was conducted in order to know the use of Shared Reading based strategy to improve vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement in narrative text of the eight graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang. This study applied a quasi-experimental research design, specifically nonequivalent control group design. The population of this study was the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang in academic year 2013/2014. There were only two classes, therefore, one intact class that consisted of 22 students became experimental group and the other one that consisted of 26 students became control group. Vocabulary and reading comprehension tests were used in order to collect the data for this study. The findings of this study showed that there was a significant difference in vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement between the eighth graders who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were taught by using Lecturing. There was also a positive significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension, and there was a significant contribution of vocabulary to reading comprehension.

Keywords: Reading Comprehension, vocabulary, shared reading

1) INTRODUCTION

ASEAN Free Trade Area (AFTA) will be started in 2015. Indonesian labors must compete with labors from other countries. According to Hidayat (2013), being able to use English is one of the important skills that Indonesian labors have to have to succeed in competing with foreign labors. In relation to this, Indonesian students who will be the future labors should know how to use English orally and in writing so that they are ready to compete in the global era. To help students achieve this, it is worth saying that the teaching of English must be prioritized as early as possible.

However, teaching English in Indonesia is a challenging task. There are some issues that are associated with the teaching of English in Indonesia; two of them are concerned with vocabulary and reading comprehension. The first issue deals with a great number of vocabularies needed by language learners in order to help them succeed in learning English. In Indonesia, the 1984 Curriculum required the junior high school students to have 1,000 English word meanings and senior high school students had to master 2,500 English word meanings at the least (Cahyono & Widiati, 2008). In the 1994 Curriculum, 2004 Curriculum, 2006 Curriculum, and 2013 Curriculum, the specific numbers of English vocabulary that the Indonesian students have to have been not stated. However, it is arguable to say that having sufficient number of vocabularies is a prerequisite in learning English; even for the native English speakers having a sufficient number of vocabularies is very urgent. According to Biemiller (2007), native English speakers need to know around 400-500 more-word meanings during each primary grade. In addition, Graves (2006) says that the native English speakers have to master 1,000 to 3,000 words meanings in primary level. As previously described, the native English speakers do need to have a sufficient number of vocabularies in their study. This also applies for the EFL/ESL students. According to Laufer (1992), EFL learners need to have 3,000 words families of general English vocabulary in order to read effectively and for a good understanding of a general English text such as a novel. Hirsh and Nation (1992) estimate that having 5,000 words families is an adequate level for pleasure reading for EFL learners. Referring to the requirement of the word meanings for Indonesian junior high school students based on the Curriculum 1986, having 1,000 English word meanings is below the standard of the ideal numbers of vocabulary mastery for EFL learners as suggested by Laufer (1992) and Hirsh and Nation (1992).

The second issue that is associated with the teaching of English in Indonesia relates to reading comprehension. The results of some studies showed the facts that reading comprehension is an issue in Indonesia. For example, a study done 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 (Diem, 2011). This suggests that these students may get more difficulties in reading comprehension in their later learning at junior high and senior high schools. The study done by Payani, Diem, and Purnomo (2003)

showed that the English reading level of the students of the senior high school in Palembang were on the frustration level and this was resulted from their poor knowledge of English vocabulary. Internationally, the issue on reading also existed for Indonesian students, the report of the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) in 2011 showed that the average reading score of fourth graders in Indonesia was 428. The test was written in Bahasa Indonesia, but the score was significantly lower than the benchmark of the PIRLS scale that was 500 (IEA, 2012). In addition, the result of Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) study in 2012 showed that Indonesia was at number 64 out of 65 countries participated in the study with the score only 396 and this was below than the average score that was 496 (OECD, 2013). These facts show that there is a problem of the Indonesian students in reading comprehension.

For the purpose of this study, a small preliminary investigation was done concerning the students' reading comprehension. The English teacher and the 8th grade students of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang were given open-ended questionnaires in order to find out what problems they had in reading comprehension. There were four major issues based on the results of the questionnaires; they were vocabulary, facility, motivation, and the environment. In line with the focus of this study, the writer only focuses on the first issue that is vocabulary. Based on the information gathered from the English teacher and the students, it was found that having little vocabulary made the students have problems in comprehending an English reading text. This shows that vocabulary and reading comprehension are closely related; vocabulary plays an important role in reading. This is in line with what Biemiller (2007) state that vocabulary is prerequisite for language and reading comprehension, therefore, it is highly correlated with overall reading achievement (National Reading Panel, 2000).

The results of the previous studies showed that there was a relationship between vocabulary mastery and students' reading comprehension. Nuttall (1989), for example, found that students' vocabulary size affected their reading comprehension. Another study done by Wyk and Louw (2008) found that the students who had poor reading ability also had poor comprehension, poor vocabulary, and pronunciation. It is in line with the study conducted by Chall, Jacobs, and Baldwin (1990) who investigated reading abilities, writing and language achievement of children in the United Sates. Chall et al. (1990) found that the children with poor vocabulary by their third grade have declining text comprehension scores in their fourth and fifth grades. The

results of these studies confirm that the students' difficulty in reading comprehension were resulted from their poor knowledge of vocabulary.

Students' problem in vocabulary mastery can be overcome through reading. Reading can help solve problems of poor vocabulary. As Krashen (2009) argues, almost any reading will produce vocabulary growth. Reading is very important. According to the Expert Panel (2003), children success in school and throughout life depends in large part on the ability to read. However, reading is not a natural process therefore reading have tobe taught, especially reading in English as a foreign language. According to Grabe (2009), reading is not just a learning process but also comprehending and linguistic process.

English teachers can help their students improve their vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension. Conducting Shared Reading in the classroom can be an alternative strategy in teaching vocabulary and reading comprehension for EFL learners. Pidgeon (1990, p. 2) defines Shared Reading as "a text that is shared among the participants for their mutual pleasure and understanding". In addition, Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2008) describe Shared Reading as a classroom activities, including echo reading (students echoing the words aloud after the teacher reads), choral reading (students reading aloud while the teacher reads aloud), or close reading (teacher reads aloud and pauses periodically for students to fill in the missing word). Shared Reading is designed to make students love reading and it can be used to teach students from primary grades until middle school grades (Manning, 1997). Hyland (2005) believes that Shared Reading is a middle step between reading to the learner and independent reading.

Previous studies showed that implementing Shared Reading could help build students' vocabulary and reading comprehension. The study done by Coyne, Simmons, Kame'enui, and Stoolmiller (2004) that applied Shared Storybook Reading showed that the vocabulary knowledge of the kindergarten students who were at risk for reading difficulty improved. Another study done by Kesler (2011) who involved the students from immigrant homes at the third grade in a high-needs urban elementary school in a large Northeast city in the United States found that Shared Reading could build the students' vocabulary and comprehension. In addition, Kats and Boran (2004) who did a study involving students of middle school found that Shared Reading strategy triggered a significant change in the ability of less skilled students to comprehend text.

Taking into consideration what the writer had described, the writer conducted a research entitled "Using Shared Reading Based Strategy to Improve Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension Achievement in Narrative Text of Students of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang".

There were four problems of the study. The first problem, "Was there any significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were taught by using Lecturing?" The second problem, "Was there any significant difference in reading comprehension between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were taught by using Lecturing?" The third problem, "Was there any significant correlation between the students' vocabulary and their reading comprehension?" The last problem, "To what extent did vocabulary give contribution to the students' reading comprehension?"

2) METHOD

This study was experimental research. A quasi-experimental design, specifically nonequivalent control group design, was applied in this study. This study applied Shared Reading based strategy as the treatment for the experimental group. Intact nonequivalent classes were used, one class as the experimental group and the other class as the control group.

The population of this study was the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang in academic year 2013/2014. There were only two classes, so the writer flipped a coin to choose one intact class to be experimental group and the other to be control group. The two classes were parallel, taught by the same teacher, and they used the same curriculum. The result of homogeneity test showed that the two classes were homogeneous (Appendix-1). The population of the study consisted of 48 students of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang. The experimental class consisted of 22 students and the control class consisted of 26 students. However, only 18 students out of 22 students in the experimental class did the pre-test and the post-test and only 24 students out of 26 students in the control class took the pre-test and post-test.

This study was conducted in semester two academic years 2013/2014. The research was conducted for three months started from the preparation, pre-test, conducting the treatment, and post-test. The preparation was started from trying out the instruments of research in March

2014. The pre-test was given in April 2014, the treatment was conducted from April to May 2014, and post-test was given in May 2014.

Tests were used to collect the data. There were two kinds of test: vocabulary and reading comprehension tests. A ready-made vocabulary test was adopted from Bilingual Vocabulary Levels Test developed by Nation (2005) and it consisted of 30 items. The vocabulary test was used in order to measure the 1000 most frequent word families. The test of reading comprehension of narrative text was adopted from National Examination in the last six years from 2008 to 2013 and it consisted of 25 items with multiple-choice questions. The reading comprehension test consisted of five components: main ideas, details, cause/effect, inference, and vocabulary. There were 80 minutes to complete the two tests with time estimation: 25 questions for 60 minutes to finish the reading comprehension test and 30 items for 20 minutes to finish the vocabulary test.

The procedure of teaching to implement Shared Reading was conducted in sequences and it was adapted from Kesler (2011) and Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2008). The writer adapted from them because the writer combined four approaches, which were possible sentences, using context clues, repeated reading, and using our body approach, suggested by Kesler (2010) and some suggestions from Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2008), such as using pictures, peers and dictionaries, in order to match the condition of the students.

The data from the results of vocabulary test and reading comprehension test were analyzed statistically by using *t*-test, Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis, and Linier Regression analysis in order to answer the research questions.

In order to find out a significant difference in vocabulary achievement and also in reading comprehension achievement between the results of pre-test and post-test of both tests in experimental group, paired sample *t*-test was used. Furthermore, independent sample *t*-test was applied to assess the differences between experimental group and control group. Additionally, Tuckman and Harper (2012, p. 165) argue that 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 variable".

Pearson Product Moment Correlation analysis was used to find out whether or not there was a significant correlation between the students' vocabulary and their reading comprehension. In addition, Linier Regression statistical analysis was applied, if there was a significant

correlation, in order to find out a contribution of vocabulary to the students' reading comprehension.

3) RESULTS

The results of pre-test and post-test of vocabulary and reading comprehension of the control class and the experimental class are described in this section. The results of vocabulary test were categorized into two: satisfactory score and unsatisfactory score. Score 27 to 30 were categorized as satisfactory score and score 0 to 26 were categorized as unsatisfactory score (Nation, 2005). Table 1 presents the results of pre-test and post-test of vocabulary of experimental class (E) and control class (C).

Table 1. The Results of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Vocabulary

Test	Class	Satisfactory (percentage)	Unsatisfactory (percentage)	Maximum Score	Minimum Score	Mean Score
Pre-Test	**E**	1 Student (5.6%)	17 Students (94.4%)	27	19	22.4
	C	1 Student (4.2%)	23 Students (95.8%)	27	14	20.5
Post-Test	**E**	17 Students (94.4%)	1 Student (5.6%)	30	26	29.1
	C	2 Students (8.3%)	22 Students (91.7%)	29	16	21.5

In the experimental class, based on the results of pre-test there was only one student (5.6%) who got satisfactory score and 17 students (94.4%) got unsatisfactory score. However, there was a progress after the intervention. The results of post-test showed that there were 17 students (94.4%) who achieved satisfactory score and only one student (5.6%) who obtained unsatisfactory score.

In control class, one student (4.2%) got satisfactory score and the others (95.8%) got unsatisfactory score based on the results of pre-test. The results of post-test showed that two students (8.3%) succeeded obtaining satisfactory score and the others (91.7%) still got unsatisfactory score.

Based on the results of pre-test, the highest score was 27 in both experimental class and control class. The lowest score was 19 in experimental class and 14 in control class. The mean score of experimental class was 22.4 and control class was 20.5.

The highest score based on the results of post-test was 30 in experimental class and 29 in control class. The lowest score was 26 after the intervention in experimental class and the mean score was 29.1. The lowest score in control class was 16 and the mean score was 21.5.

At the beginning only one student in the experimental class and one student in the control class who had satisfactory score based on the results of pre-test. Furthermore, the application of Shared Reading based strategy in the experimental class increased the students' score; there were 17 students achieved satisfactory score after the intervention. However, there was also a progress in control class. There were two students could achieve satisfactory score based on the results of post-test.

Additionally, the results of reading comprehension test were classified based on standard of minimum completeness of mastery learning or *KKM* (*Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal*) in MTs Muqimus Sunnah. Scores < 75 were classified as uncompleted score of mastery learning and scores ≥ 75 were classified as completed score of mastery learning. Table 2 presents the results of pre-test and post-test of reading comprehension of experimental class (E) and control class (C).

Table 2. The Results of Pre-Test and Post-Test of Reading Comprehension

Test	Class	Completed (percentage)	Uncompleted (percentage)	Maximum Score	Minimum Score	Mean Score
Pre-Test	**E**	1 Student (5.6%)	17 Students (94.4%)	76	24	37.1
	C	1 Student (4.2%)	23 Students (95.8%)	80	8	36
Post-Test	**E**	6 Students (33.3%)	12 Students (66.7%)	88	52	70.2
	C	1 Student (4.2%)	23 Students (95.8%)	92	12	32.2

In the experimental class, based on the results of pre-test there was only one student (5.6%) who could achieve completed score and 17 students (94.4%) got uncompleted score. The results of post-test after the intervention showed that there were six students (33.3%) who achieved completed score and eleven students (66.7%) who obtained uncompleted score.

In the control class, one student (4.2%) got completed score and the others (95.8%) got uncompleted score based on the results of pre-test. The results of post-test were the same as the pre-test results.

Based on the results of pre-test, the highest score in the experimental class was 76 and in the control class 80. The lowest score was 24 in the experimental class and 8 in the control class. The mean score of experimental class was 37.1 and the mean score of control class was 36.

The highest score based on the results of post-test was 88 in the experimental class and 92 in the control class. The lowest score was 52 after the intervention in the experimental class and the mean score was 70.2. The lowest score in the control class was 12 and the mean score was 32.2.

It is interesting to see that the student who achieved the highest score and the student who achieved the lowest score of both pre and post-test were in the control class. However, after the treatment only six students in the experimental class who could achieve completed score.

Furthermore, the writer used paired sample *t*-test to compare the results of pre-test and post-test in both experimental class and control class. Table 3 shows the summary statistics of paired sample *t*-test statistical analysis.

Table 3. Summary Statistics of Paired Sample *t*-Test

Class	Test	Mean Score		Mean Difference	*t*	Sig. 2 tailed (0.05)
		pre-test	post-test			
E (N=18)	Vocabulary	22.44	29.06	6.61	10.73	0.000
	Reading Comprehension	37.11	70.22	33.11	11.05	0.000
C (N=24)	Vocabulary	20.54	21.50	0.96	1.26	0.221
	Reading Comprehension	36	32.17	-3.83	1.14	0.267

The mean difference of the results of pre- and post-vocabulary test in experimental class was 6.61 and the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05 in two tailed testing. It meant that the mean difference was significant. Moreover, the value of *t*-table (df = 17) was 2.10982. The results of paired sample *t*-test statistical analysis in the experimental class showed that the value of *t*-obtained of vocabulary was 10.73 and it was higher than *t*-table at the significant 0.000 < 0.05 in two tailed testing. Based on the analysis, H1 was accepted and H01 was rejected.

For reading comprehension, the mean difference in the experimental class was 33.11 and the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05 in two tailed testing. It indicated that the mean difference was significant. Moreover, *t*-obtained of reading comprehension was 11.05 and it was also higher than *t*-table, so that H2 was accepted and H02 was rejected.

Therefore, it can be inferred that there was a significant difference in vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement of the students of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang after the treatment in the experimental class.

In the control class, the mean difference between the results of pre- and post-test of vocabulary was 0.96 and the mean difference of reading comprehension was -3.83. The values of significant of vocabulary (0.221) and reading comprehension (0.267) were higher than 0.05 at two tailed testing. It meant that the mean difference was not significant. Moreover, the value of *t*-obtained of vocabulary was 1.257 and it was lower than *t*-table (2.06866) at 0.05 in two tailed testing with df = 23. For reading comprehension achievement, the values of *t*-obtained was 1.138 and it was lower than *t*-table (2.06866) at the significant 0.05 in two tailed testing with df = 23. Based on the results, there were no significant differences in both vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement between the results of pre-test and post-test in control class.

Additionally, the table below shows the progress of the students' reading comprehension achievement after the treatment in the experimental class based on the five components of reading comprehension.

Table 4. Summary Statistics of Paired Sample *t*-Test based on the Five Components

Class	Test	Mean Score		Mean Difference	*t*	Sig. 2 tailed (0.05)
		pre-test	post-test			
E (N=18)	Main Ideas	7,1111	13,3333	6.22222	4.389	0.00
	Details	6,6667	13,3333	6.66667	6.519	0.00
	Cause/Effect	9,5556	16,4444	6.88889	4.562	0.00
	Inferences	4,8889	13,3333	8.44444	6.008	0.00
	Vocabulary	9,1111	13,5556	4.44444	3.448	0.03

The highest mean difference in reading comprehension components obtained by this group was inferences (8.44), followed by cause/effect (6.89), details (6.67), main ideas (6.22), and vocabulary (4.44). The significance value of all aspects was below than 0.05, so it meant that there was a significant difference of all aspects after the treatment.

Moreover, the writer continued analyzing the data by using independent sample t-test. Table 4 shows the summary statistics of independent sample t-test.

Table 5. Summary Statistics of Independent Sample *t*-Test

Variables	Class	Mean	Mean Difference	*t*	Sig. 2 tailed (0.05)
Vocabulary	E	6.61	5.65	5.48	0.000
	C	0.96			
Reading Comprehension	E	33.11	36.94	7.89	0.000
	C	-3.83			

The mean difference of vocabulary between experimental and control class was 5.65 and the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05 in two tailed testing. It indicated that the mean difference was significant. Moreover, the value of *t*-obtained of vocabulary was 5.48 and it was greater than *t*-table (2.02), so that H1 was accepted and H01 was rejected.

For reading comprehension, the mean difference between experimental and control class was 36.94 and the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05 in two tailed testing. It meant that the mean difference of reading comprehension was significant. Furthermore, the value of *t*-obtained of reading comprehension was 7.89 and it was higher than *t*-table (2.02), so that H2 was accepted and H02 was rejected.

The results of paired sample and independent sample t-test statistical analysis showed that H1 and H2 were accepted and H01 and H02 were rejected. Hence, it can be concluded that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were not and there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were not.

The writer continued analyzing the data with Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistical analysis in order to know whether or not a significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension. Table 5 shows the results of Pearson Product Moment correlation statistical analysis in experimental class (18 students), control class (24 students) and the total number of the students in both classes (42 students).

Table 6. Summary of Correlation Statistical Analysis

Variable	r (N=42)	Sig. 2-Tailed	r (N=24	Sig. 2-Tailed	r (N=18)	Sig. 2-taied

Vocabulary	0.712	0.00	0.465	0.02	0.325	0.19
Reading Comprehension						

The results of correlation statistical analysis showed that a positive correlation existed between vocabulary and reading comprehension in experimental class (18 students), control class (24 students) and the total number of the students in both classes (42 students).

Based on the total number of the students in both experimental and control class, the correlation coefficient between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement was 0.712 with significant level 0.000. It meant that there was a positive significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement. According to Sugiyono (2007), the association of the variables was strong.

In addition, based on the data in control class the correlation coefficient between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement was 0.465 with significant level 0.02. It meant that there was a positive significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement in control class. The association of the variables that existed in control class was medium (Sugiyono, 2007).

However, it is interesting to see the results of correlational statistical analysis in experimental class. The correlation coefficient between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement was 0.325 with significant level 0.19. It meant that there was a positive correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement but not significant and the association of the variables was low (Sugiyono, 2007).

Although there was no significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension in experimental class, it was worth to find out the contribution of vocabulary to reading comprehension based on the data in the control class and based the data of the total number of students in both classes. Table 6 shows the results of Linier Regression statistical analysis in control group (C) and the total number of the students (E & C).

Table 7. The Contribution of Vocabulary to Reading Comprehension

Class	R Square	F	Sig.
E & C (N=42)	0.507	41.09	0.000
C (N=24)	0.216	6.06	0.022

Based on the total number of the students, the coefficient of R square was 0.507. It meant that the contribution of vocabulary to the students' reading comprehension achievement in

both classes was 50.7% and 49.3% was contributed to the students' reading comprehension achievement by other factors. In this case, H4 was accepted and H04 was rejected because F-obtained (41.09) was greater than F-table (4.08).

In the control class, the coefficient of R square was 0.216. It meant that the contribution of vocabulary to the students' reading comprehension achievement was 21.6% and 78.4% was contributed to the students' reading comprehension achievement by other factors. Based on the data in control class, H4 was accepted and H04 was rejected because F-obtained (6.06) was greater than F-table (4.28).

4) DISCUSSION

Four hypothesis findings were interpreted. The first hypothesis of this study, there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were not taught by using Shared Reading based strategy. The finding showed that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement of the 1000 most frequent word families test between the students who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were not taught by using Shared Reading based strategy. This finding was supported by the results of the statistical analysis of t-test. It showed that the mean difference of vocabulary achievement of the students in experimental class was significantly difference than those in control class. The finding of this study was in line with what Kesler (2011) found; Shared Reading was effective to increase vocabulary achievement of the students. It can be assumed that the use of cloze passages to help the students to practice contextual clues in every meeting was resulting in a significant vocabulary growth of the eight graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang. Using cloze passages to help the students practice contextual clues was suggested by Kesler (2011). The assumption was in line with the Fountas and Pinnell's (1999) statement. They argued that cloze reading exercises developed strategic synthesis of meaning, syntactical, and visual cues for word solving. Moreover, the significant result was happened because of the implementing of using our bodies approach (gesture) and the use of resources, such as peers and dictionaries to help the students understand challenging vocabulary. Using our bodies approach was suggested by Kesler (2011). In teaching English as a foreign language the use of resources, such as peers and dictionaries was important. Fisher, Frey, and Lapp (2008) argue that context clues and resources can be used to teach students to

solve for unknown word. Therefore, it can be assumed that the use of gesture, peers, and dictionaries likely also gave the contribution to vocabulary growth of the students in experimental class. Therefore, Shared Reading based strategy is appropriate to be used by the English teacher of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang in the classroom to teach vocabulary.

The second finding showed that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement of narrative text between the students in the experimental class and in the control class. This finding was in accordance with Kats and Boran's finding (2004); Shared Reading succeed 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. Applying possible sentences approach and repeated reading approach likely gave the significant impact to the students in comprehending an English text. The approaches were suggested by Kesler (2010). It can be also assumed that the significant result was occurred because of the vocabulary growth. It was in line with Nuttall's (1989). He argues that students' vocabulary size affects their reading comprehension. Therefore, the English teacher of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang to teach reading comprehension in the classroom can apply Shared Reading based strategy.

The third finding showed that there was a positive significant correlation between vocabulary achievement and reading comprehension achievement. A positive significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension achievement happened when the writer used all the students in control and experimental class (N=42). The correlation coefficient was 0.712. It was considered as very good for prediction (Cohen & Manion, 1994) and the association of the variables was very strong (Sugiyono, 2007). Therefore, it means that vocabulary was a very good predictor for reading comprehension. A positive significant correlation also appeared when the writer checked in control class only (N=24). It could be interpreted that the higher the students' vocabulary achievement, the higher their reading comprehension achievement. Nevertheless, there was a positive correlation, but not significant, between vocabulary and reading comprehension in experimental class (N=18). The writer assumed that the possibility might due to the number of the students that was only 18. It was not sufficient number for the correlation statistical analysis as suggested by Creswell (2012) who states that correlation statistical analysis needs approximately 30 samples. The writer assumed

that if the sample size in experimental class was more than 18, the significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension would be occurred.

The last finding showed that there was a contribution of vocabulary to the students' comprehension based on the total number of the students in control and experimental class (N=42). There was 50.7% contribution of vocabulary to the students' comprehension and 49.3% was contributed by other factors. Moreover, based on the data in control class only (N=24) there was 21.6% contribution of vocabulary to the students' comprehension and 78.4% was contributed by other factors.

However, the findings of correlational and linier regression statistical analysis cannot be interpreted as cause and effect relationship. According to Kendall and Stuart (1961, p. 279), "a statistical relationship, however strong and however suggestive, can never establish a causal connection: the ideas on causation must come from outside statistics, ultimately from some theory or other". Some theories, as described in chapter one and two, showed that the students' vocabulary affects their reading comprehension. Therefore, although based on the statistical analysis of correlation and linier regression in the experimental class there was no significant correlation and no contribution of the students' vocabulary to their reading comprehension, it can be stated that the improving of the students' reading comprehension achievement was affected by their vocabulary growth. The English teacher should pay more attention to vocabulary mastery besides developing reading comprehension strategies in the classroom. Hence, the English teacher should have a target how many English words that the students must have, so the students can have better achievement in reading comprehension.

This study had some limitations. Intact classes were used, the conditions were not controlled and randomized assignment was not done. A quasi-experimental research design, specifically the nonequivalent control group design, was applied. Therefore, the interpretations and the conclusions of the findings were limited only to the population of this study. However, the results of this study can be generalized to the schools with the same characteristics with MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang.

5) CONCLUSION

There were four conclusions based on the findings of this study. First, the results of t-test statistical analysis showed that there was a significant difference in vocabulary achievement

between the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who were taught by using Lecturing.

Second, there was a significant difference in reading comprehension achievement between the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang who were taught by using Shared Reading based strategy and those who did not get the same treatment.

Third, the results of correlation statistical analysis showed that generally there was a positive significant correlation between vocabulary and reading comprehension of the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang.

Fourth, there was a significant contribution of vocabulary to reading comprehension of the eighth graders of MTs Muqimus Sunnah Palembang.

REFERENCES

Biemiller, A. (2007). *Words worth teaching*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Cahyono, B. Y., & Widiati, U. (2008). The teaching of EFL vocabulary in the Indonesian context: The state of the art. *TEFLIN Journal, 19* (1), 1-17.

Chall, J. S., Jacobs, V.A., & Baldwin, L.E. (1990). *The reading crisis: Why poor children fall behind*. New York, NY: Harvard University.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). Research method in education (4th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Coyne, M., Simmons, D., Kame'enui, E., & Stoolmiller, M. (2004).Teaching vocabulary during shared storybook readings: An examination of differential effects. *Exceptionality, 12*(3), 145-162.

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

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

Expert Panel. (2003). *Early reading strategy*. Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/document/reports/reading/reading.pdf.

Fisher, D., Frey, N., & Lapp, D. (2008). Shared readings: Modeling comprehension, vocabulary, text structures, and text features for older readers. *The Reading Teacher, 61*(7), 548–556. DOI:10.1598/RT.61.7.4.

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

Graves, M. F. (2006). *The vocabulary book: Learning & instruction*. New York, NY: Teachers College.

Hirsh, D., & P. Nation. (1992). What vocabulary size is needed to read unsimplified texts for pleasure? *Reading in a Foreign Language, 8*(2), 689-696.

Hyland, F. (2005). Shared reading: Making it work in the second language classroom: Classroom Connections. *The HCT Education Journal.* (1), 99-112.

IEA. (2012). *PIRLS 2011 international results in reading*. Retrieved from http://timssandpirls.bc.edu.

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

Kendal, M. G., & Stuart, A. (1961). The advanced theory of statistics: Inference and relationship. London, England: Butler & Tanner Ltd.

Kesler, T. (2011). Shared reading to build vocabulary and comprehension. *The Reading Teacher, 64*(4), 272–277.

Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research*. Porstmouth, NH: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Laufer, B. (1992). *How much lexis is necessary for reading comprehension?*. Retrieved from http://www.savingthewahyanites.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Laufer-1992-HowMuchLexisIsNecessaryForReadingComprehension.pdf

Manning, M. (1997). 14 ways to use shared reading. *Teaching Pre K – 8, 28* (1), 129-13.

Nation, I. S. P., & Waring, R. (1997). *Vocabulary size, text coverage and word lists*. Retrieved from http://www.fltr.ucl.ac.be

National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read.* Retrieved from www.nichd.nih.gov.

Nuttall, C. (1989). *Teaching reading skills in a foreign language.* Oxford, England: Heinemann.

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

Payani, D., Diem, C. D., & Purnomo, M. E. (2003). The readability levels of the EFL text and the reading comprehension levels of the State High School students in Palembang. *Lingua Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra,5* (1), 43-69.

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

Sugiyono. (2010). *Statistika untuk penelitian*. Bandung, Indonesia: Alfabeta.

Wyk, G., & Louw, A. (2008).Technology-assisted reading for improving reading skills for young South African learners.*The Electronic Journal of e-Learning, 6*(3), 245-254.