## CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the research finding and discussion. The research findings are based on the data obtained from preliminary study and during the teaching of reading comprehension using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) technique. The discussion based on research findings.

## A. Findings

This classroom action research carried out in two cycles, and the procedure of this study include four stages: planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting. Before presenting procedures of the classroom action research, it is started by presenting preliminary study. The preliminary study was done before classroom action research conducted. Preliminary study consists of preliminary interview and preliminary test.

## 1. The Result of Preliminary Observation

Before conducting the study, the researcher starts with do the observation at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar to determine the problem that appears in this school especially in reading activity. The activities conducted on Saturday, $15^{\text {th }}$ April 2017 at 09.00 a.m. te
researcher also conducted preliminary interview with English teacher. It is to collecting information about what is the problem and condition of the teaching learning in the classroom especially in reading.

Based on the interviewing with English teacher, she says the problem in teaching and learning of the eight grade students in MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar is students difficult to understand the reading text. It is caused because students just read the reading text without comprehend it, they found the difficult word that they did not know the meaning, and they cannot determine the main idea of the text. Moreover students also lack of motivation in study English because the teaching reading just focuses in one strategy in every meeting.

After collected data from preliminary observation and interview, the researcher gives the preliminary test to the students' of VIII G at MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar to measure students’ reading comprehension. The test conducted on March $30^{\text {th }}, 2017$ at the 10.00-11.20 a.m. The result of preliminary test showed that students get the poor result of reading comprehension, it showed that student's score is 9 students passed the test and 31 students others were failed. For detail score in preliminary study can be seen in table 4.1.

Table 4.1 The Result of Preliminary Study

| No | Name | Score | Result |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Passing | Fail |
| 1. | ADA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. | AFR | 55 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. | AZ | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 4. | AAS | 55 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 5. | BBI | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 6. | DP | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 7. | DL | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 8. | DSF | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 9. | EDR | 85 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 10. | EA | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 11. | FRK | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 12. | HYP | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 13. | HRK | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 14. | KMR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 15. | MP | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 16. | MR | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 17. | MAZ | 55 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 18. | MFF | 45 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 19. | MNW | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 20. | MAF | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 21. | MRC | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 22. | MS | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 23. | MDMA | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 24. | MAH | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 25. | MAA | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 26. | MAR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 27. | MRAA | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 28. | MF | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 29. | NDN | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 30. | NNL | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 31. | PANI | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 32. | RM | 55 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 33. | SZF | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 34. | SDA | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 35. | SAS | 50 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 36. | SNH | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 37. | SNA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 38. | WA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 39. | ZFM | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 40. | ZR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Total score |  | 2580 | 9 | 31 |


| Percentage |  | $=\frac{9}{40} \times 100$ <br> $=22,5 \%$ | $77,5 \%$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Mean's score |  | 64,5 |  |  |

So, it can be seen that students was obtained the score who passed the preliminary study were less than $75 \%$, it is only $22,5 \%$ ( 9 students) students were passed the preliminary test and the other 77,5\% (31 students) who failed. The result of means score in preliminary study that is still 64, 5. It is still far from passing score minimum which is 75. Therefore, from the result of student's score in preliminary study above it can be concluded that the criteria of success have not been achieved yet. The students got difficult to comprehend the recount text. Most of them were difficult in inferring meaning of certain word in the text, difficulty in identifying the main idea of the text, difficulty in finding the implicit and explicit information of the text, and also difficulty in determining the reference. So, most of them cannot answer correctly the preliminary test that given by the researcher.

## 2. The Result of Cycle I

The data was presented in cycle 1 in planning, implementing, observing, and reflecting. This cycle conducted in two meetings for teaching and learning process and giving the test. It is conducted in two days, on Saturday $1^{\text {st }}$ April 2017, and Thursday $6^{\text {th }}$ April 2017.

In cycle I the researcher collaborated with English teacher. The researcher implementing Collaborative Strategic reading (CSR) strategy in the class, and the collaborator teacher observed the students and researcher activities in reading class. After implementing this strategy in two meetings, the researcher giving the test cycle I for students. The result is showed in table 4.2.

Table 4.2 The Result of the Test in Cycle 1

| No | Name | Score | Result |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Passing | Fail |
| 1. | ADA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 2. | AFR | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 3. | AZ | 45 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 4. | AAS | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 5. | BBI | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6. | DP | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 7. | DL | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 8. | DSF | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 9. | EDR | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 10. | EA | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 11. | FRK | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 12. | HYP | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 13. | HRK | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 14. | KMR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 15. | MP | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 16. | MR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 17. | MAZ | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 18. | MFF | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 19. | MNW | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 20. | MAF | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 21. | MRC | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 22. | MS | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 23. | MDMA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 24. | MAH | 70 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 25. | MAA | 68 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 26. | MAR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |


| 27. | MRAA | 45 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28. | MF | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 29. | NDN | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 30. | NNL | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 31. | PANI | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 32. | RM | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 33. | SZF | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 34. | SDA | 70 | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 35. | SAS | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 36. | SNH | 75 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 37. | SNA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 38. | WA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 39. | ZFM | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 40. | ZR | 2798 | $=\frac{13}{40} \times 100$ | $67,5 \%$ |
| Total score |  | $=32,5 \%$ |  |  |
| Percentage |  |  | 69,95 |  |

From data above, it can be conclude that the students who passed the test cycle 1 were less than $75 \%$, it is only $32,5 \%$ (13) students who passing the test and $67,5 \%$ (27 students) who failed. The result of main score still was 69,95 . It is still far from the passing score minimum which is 75 . But, the result of test in cycle I was better than the test in preliminary study. So, from the result of the score in test cycle 1 it can concluded that the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) can improved student's reading comprehension but not maximally yet.

When implementing Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) strategy, the researcher and the collaborator teacher observed the students' activities using observation sheet. The observation was done by the English teacher who acted as observer. The English teacher wrote down the problem happened during teaching-learning activity and give comment
about the researcher's performance during classroom action research process using CSR strategy. The result of the observation showed that the researcher had implemented every step in teaching learning process as it was described in lesson plan. However, there are some problems in every step.

As the observation result in pre-reading activity, it was found that the researcher should needed improvement when she determined the roles of the students as a leader, a clunk expert, an announcer, an encourager, and reporter because the role needed students who had good ability, the researcher chose them randomly without concerning the student's ability, beside the teacher didn't explain the student's role well. So the students who have five roles could not perform their role properly, they looked confused to perform their role.

In preview phase, the researcher also spent too much time to brainstorm and made prediction with students. In this phase only clever students who answer all questions from the researcher. It is not effective because other students only silent and they did not give their opinion.

On the click and clunk and get the gist phase, the researcher did not explained how to make a main idea, it caused the students found difficulties to make a main idea properly. In this phase the teacher was manage the groups to share their idea in their own group member. The researcher also give motivation to students who still shy and afraid to speak up in their group. When the students found the difficult word, the
researcher asked them "is there any clunk?" and some of students rise their hand and mention their difficult word/clunk and the researcher asked to other group, then the other group answer the meaning of the difficult word, if the answer false the researcher support the students to think how to find the answer by their clunk card, there are re-read the sentence who have that difficult word and read the word before and after the difficult word and then they found their answer.

On the wrapped up phase, the researcher needed improvement in reflecting giving feedback. In this phase, students should present their task about making a question related to the text. The researcher didn't explain how to make a good question, so most of students make a question based on their own word without using the good formula. But the students understand about the questions that their friend make and also answer the questions properly.

In the beginning of using the collaborative strategic reading (CSR) strategy, the students didn't communicate well, it showed that the collaborative strategy did not appear. The observation sheet result showed the student's participation is not good. The percentage of observation sheet in meeting I was $63 \%$.

$$
\% 0=\frac{15+4}{30} \times 100 \%=63 \%
$$

Then the percentage of the observation sheet in meeting II was $66 \%$.

$$
\% 0=\frac{15+5}{30} \times 100 \%=66 \%
$$

From the percentage in the observation sheet above in Cycle I it can be known that the students' participation in classroom learning activity is too bad. The students did not pay attention in teacher's explanation the recount text and CSR technique, so it makes them confused and could not make the prediction, main idea, and summary clearly.

Based on the result of student's score, observation during teaching learning activities and percentage of students' participation in observation sheet showed that those are still did not reach the criteria of success. So, the researcher needs to conduct next cycle. The researcher revises the planning in cycle I and the implementing of CSR strategy in cycle I to conduct the cycle II.

## 3. The Revised Planning

The implementation in cycle I had not given the significant influence to reading comprehension of students' at class VIII G MTs Ma'arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar. The result of test cycle I was not satisfying yet. So, the researcher made some revisions to conduct the next cycle. The researcher revised the planning of implementing the strategy. The planning of implementing in cycle II was similar with cycle I, but the researcher applied the new strategy to conduct the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) strategy in reading class. The differences strategy can be seen in the table below:

Table 4.3 The Differences Strategy in Cycle I and Cycle II

| No. | The Differences |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- |
|  | Cycle I | Cycle II |
| 1 | Choose the students group <br> discussion and the students' role <br> randomly | Determined the students' group <br> discussion based on the their score in <br> test cycle I and choose the students' <br> role based on the student's ability |
| 2 | Asked students to predict the <br> recount text based on title and text <br> only | Asked students to predict the recount <br> text based on the picture, title, and <br> the text. Covered all of students' <br> need such as text material, CSR <br> learning log, cue sheet and picture by <br> using colorful map with the funny <br> animal name for the name of group |
| 3 | Explain the student's role | Explain the students' role and giving <br> them student's role card, so they <br> more easy to understand |
| 4 | The implementing of CSR strategy <br> without timer | The implementing of CSR strategy <br> using timer |
| 5 | Asked students to make questions <br> in Wrap Up strategy | Explain first about how to make the <br> good questions using W H questions <br> and then asked them to make <br> question in wrap up strategy |

## 4. The Result of Cycle II

The implementation of cycle II consists of two meetings for teaching and learning process and giving the test. It is conducted in two days, on II on Thursday, $13^{\text {th }}$ April, 2017 and Thursday, $13^{\text {th }}$ April, 2017. The researcher made some revisions in conducting the CSR strategy in cycle II.

The researcher began with give more explanation about recount text and CSR strategy which also giving the CSR cue sheet card (the procedure of CSR strategy) and clunk card to the students. The researcher explained more about the student's role in group discussion correctly with
giving them the student's role card. It makes the students felt enjoy and easy to understand and to do the task. The researcher also divides the group member based on the score of test cycle I, so the group discussions can going on better than at the first cycle.

After implementing the strategy with many revisions were done, the researcher giving the test cycle II to the students. For detail of student's score in test cycle II can be seen in the table 4.3 below:

Table 4.4 The Result of the Test in Cycle II

| No | Name | Score | Result |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Passing | Fail |
| 1. | ADA | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 2. | AFR | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 3. | AZ | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 4. | AAS | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 5. | BBI | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 6. | DP | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 7. | DL | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 8. | DSF | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 9. | EDR | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 10. | EA | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 11. | FRK | 90 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 12. | HYP | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 13. | HRK | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 14. | KMR | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 15. | MP | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 16. | MR | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 17. | MAZ | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 18. | MFF | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 19. | MNW | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 20. | MAF | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 21. | MRC | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 22. | MS | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |


| 23. | MDMA | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 24. | MAH | 85 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 25. | MAA | 65 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 26. | MAR | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 27. | MRAA | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 28. | MF | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 29. | NDN | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 30. | NNL | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 31. | PANI | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 32. | RM | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 33. | SZF | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 34. | SDA | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 35. | SAS | 90 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 36. | SNH | 75 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 37. | SNA | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 38. | WA | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 39. | ZFM | 80 | $\checkmark$ |  |
| 40. | ZR | 70 |  | $\checkmark$ |
| Total score |  | 3085 | 33 | 7 |
| Percentage |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =\frac{33}{40} \times 100 \\ & =82,5 \% \end{aligned}$ | 17,5\% |
| Mea | 's score |  |  |  |

From data above, it can be conclude that the student's reading comprehension has improved. It showed where the students who passed the test cycle II were $82,5 \%$ (33 students), it is only $17,5 \%$ (7 students) who failed. The result of main score was 77,125 . It is different with the mean's score of test cycle I which is only 69,95 . So it concluded that the criteria of success was achieved because some of the students got the score in the test cycle II was $\geq 75$ and have been reach the standard criteria, it's mean that collaborative strategic reading (CSR) strategy can improve student's reading comprehension in recount text.

The result of observation from teacher's performance at the first meeting in cycle II was the researcher followed every step in teaching
learning activity was suitable with lesson plan. On the pre-reading activity, the researcher had improvement when she assigned the student's role as leader, clunk expert, encourager, announcer and reporter. The researcher chose students that have good ability in every group and could explain the student's role well. It could make students do the task well. Therefore, students who had the five roles could do the role well. They did not look confused and could work together with their group members. The teacher had been describe the steps of the learning clearly. The teacher also explains the student's role card and CSR Learning Log well.

In the main activity of the pre-reading activity on the preview phase, the teacher was successful activated student's prior knowledge. As like in cycle I which cleverer students always responded the question from the teacher, but in this cycle the low students sometimes responded the teacher. It indicated that there was improvement in activating student's prior knowledge.

In the while-reading activity on click and clunk and get the gist phase, the teacher was explained how to make the main idea clearly. The researcher explained how to make the main idea using student's own word, so the students could construct the sentence to make the main idea by their own word. The researcher sometimes walked to the group to monitor and also manage the students' activity. The researcher gave solution when the student's still confused, she also remembering the announcer and encourager to motivate their group members to active in discussing. So,
every student was active in discussing although some of them still keep silent, shy or afraid when discussing in the group as like read the text or answer the question.

In the post-reading activity at wrap up phase, the researcher improved in giving feedback. The researcher had given useful feedback to the students in recount text. She could discuss all questions well.

The result of observations from the student's performance showed that the participation of the students is good. The percentage of observation sheet in meeting I was $76 \%$.

$$
\% 0=\frac{15+8}{30} \times 100 \%=76 \%
$$

Then the percentage of the observation sheet in meeting II was $86 \%$.

$$
\% 0=\frac{15+11}{30} \times 100 \%=86 \%
$$

The percentage of the observation sheet in Cycle II above identified that the participation of students is better than before in Cycle I. In the Cycle II in the first meeting the students more giving their attention when the researcher was explain about collaborative strategic reading (CSR), CSR learning Log and student's role. Students could make the prediction and main idea easily, but some student's still confused and difficult. Students who had the five roles as like leader, clunk expert, announcer, encourager and reporter could perform their role well.

At the second meeting, the teacher performance runs better than the first meeting. The teacher could explain collaborative strategic reading
(CSR) properly and arranging the group run well because the student's sit in the same group member as like in previous meeting. The teacher performance also looked better that in the first meeting, she could more clearly in explain about collaborative strategic reading, creative in arranging group member and student's role, controlled the time to activated the student's prior knowledge, explained how to make the good main idea based on student's own word and how to solve their problem when found the clunk by asked the clunk expert or teacher, explain how to make good question using W H question well and giving the clearly feedback in the end of the teaching learning activity.

Based on the result of student's score in test cycle II, observation during teaching learning activities and percentage of students' participation in observation sheet showed that students was reached the criteria of success in reading comprehension and the standard criteria, so it did not need continue on the next cycle, the study stopped. From the result of the cycle II, it was showed that the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) can improve student's reading comprehension ability at the eight students of MTs Ma’arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar academic year 20162107.

## B. Discussion

This research was conducted to know how the Collaborative Strategic reading (CSR) can improve student's reading comprehension at the eighth grade students of MTs Ma’arif Bakung Udanawu Blitar in academic year 2016/2017.

The Collaborative Strategic reading (CSR) increased the student's motivation, they enjoy to study reading text in learning activity in the class. Burn (1984:23) states "enjoyment of reading should be considered of prime importance". It means that we should prove that reading is a not boring activity even though the material deals with scientific topic. By using Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) the students did not feel bored on reading recount text, they also did not shy and afraid to share their idea or opinion in discussing the material in front of their friend or teacher and they are more confident to answer the question than before learning using CSR strategy.

This strategy changed from individual to teamwork. As stated by Klinger and Vaughn (2000:75) that CSR is a classroom technique developed to take advantage of the potentials of collaboration for language development in the classrooms that students of various reading and achievement levels work in small cooperative groups. The implementation of this strategy is by forming the groups. The researcher asked students to make a group consists of five students. By making the groups, the students felt comfortable when they study together to solve their problem together, they felt easy to do the task because they always share their idea with their friend. So, by forming students into
groups, it makes the teaching-learning more effective, interested and not monotone.

Brown (2007:119) defines strategies as the specific methods of approaching a problem or task, modes of operation for achieving a particular end, planned designs for controlling and manipulating certain information. In Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) applied four strategy, they are Preview, Click and Clunk, Get the Gist and Wrap Up. This strategy can solve the students' problem in reading comprehension because in every strategy include in three activities of reading (pre-reading activity, while-reading activity and post-reading activity).

The preview strategy enters in the post-reading activity. In this strategy the researcher reactivate the background knowledge of the students about the topic that will be learned by giving a number of questions to the students such as asking the meaning of the title of the text and then ask the students what they know about the existing title by using English, some students in the first cycle still looked shy and reluctant to answer and share their ideas, but in the second cycle the students are more active in asking and responding when the researcher asked questions. Many of them were not shy and want to share their ideas. After reactivating their background knowledge, the researcher divides students in groups to make predictions about what they will learn from the title of the given text and picture. This strategy makes students motivated and more interested in the topic and material they will read.

The second is click and clunk and get the gist strategy, this strategy is contained in while reading activities. Jannet K.Klingner and Sharon Vaughn (1996) state the goal of click and clunk is to teach students to monitor their reading comprehension and to identify when they have breakdowns in understanding. In the implementation of this strategy students were asked to write a word that they did not know the meaning into the CSR Learning Log. This makes it easier for them to monitor their reading comprehension. Each finds the difficulty word / clunk they discussing with a group of members, if one group does not understand the meaning of the difficult word then one student may asked the teacher and the teacher will ask the other group, and the other group will scramble to answer it.

The next strategy is get the gist. After finding the difficult word and understanding the meaning, students must write down the main idea or important things in each paragraph by using at least 10 words. According Jannet K.Klingner and Sharon Vaughn, the goal of getting the gist is to teach students to restate in their own words the most important point as a way of making sure they have understood what they have read. In this get the gist the students actually use their own words in writing the main idea. In groups they helped each other to find a suitable main idea for each paragraph. Usually in recount text learning they find it difficult in determining the main idea, but with CSR they find it easy to determine the main idea. This strategy can improve students' understanding and memory of what they have learned.

The next strategy is the wrap up strategy contained in the post-reading activity. Jannet K. Klingner and Sharon Vaughn state that goals of wrap up strategy are to improve student's knowledge, understanding and memory of what was read. In this strategy the researcher asked the students to make questions related to the text and make conclusions. After doing this stage the students become able to create questions that use $5 \mathrm{~W}+1 \mathrm{H}$. It was improve student's knowledge. From the first cycle to the second cycle students are able to make inquiries and also make good conclusions. It was indicated that they were understand about the material that was they read.

From the four strategies above it was suitable with Palinscar and Brown (1998) said that CSR is reciprocal reading strategy in which students use four strategies to help them to improve their ability to monitor and improve their own comprehension

In learning using this CSR students have their respective roles of leaders, Clunk expert, announcer, encourager and reporter. So in addition to groups, they also have their own duties or roles. According to Klinger and Vaughn (1996) states that student's roles are important aspects of CSR because cooperative learning seems to work best when all group members have been assigned a meaningful task. At the beginning of the CSR application students are still confused in playing their roles, but after several times using CSR students begin to understand and be able to play their roles and tasks. The collaborative strategic reading (CSR) also reached the students to increase the
social skills. It taught them to communicate with other, trust with other people and listen to other people says.

Teachers also have a role in the CSR of this strategy. Teachers monitor students in group activities by walking in each group to saw how their discussions are going. Sometimes there are problems in the group, students did not know how to determine the main idea, did not know the meaning of difficult words found, or did not understand about the role of students in each group, then the teacher gave a solution to their problems.

The improvement of the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) strategy will be successful to improve the student's reading comprehension of the eighth grade, if the score of students have achieved the criteria of success which is $75 \%$ and the students who get the score less 75 are considered failed.

From the preliminary of study, the student's mean score at the preliminary test was 64,5 . There are only 9 students ( $22,5 \%$ ) who passed the test and 31 students $(77,5)$ are failed. It showed that the teaching-learning for reading comprehension still low.

The test on cycle I showed that the students who passed the test cycle I were less than $75 \%$, it's only $32,5 \%$ ( 13 students) were pass in the test cycle I and the other $67,5 \%$ ( 27 students) was failed. The result of the mean's score $f$ the test cycle I is 69,95 . It is still far from the passing the score minimum which is 75 . Based on the result of the test showed that the CSR is effectively conducted but it is cannot run well yet. The result of cycle II it concluded that the Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) improve the students reading
comprehension. It showed from the mean's score of test cycle II which is 77,125. The students who passed the test cycle II were 82,5 ( 33 students) and the other $17,5 \%$ ( 7 students) was failed. From this result of test in cycle II can be concluded that the students have been achieved the standard criteria and fulfill the criteria of success that is the score of every students who passed the test $\geq 75$. It means that the Collaborative Strategic Reading can improve the student's reading comprehension in recount text.

