Journal of Teaching of English
Volume 7 No. 4
e-ISSN: 2548-6810

The Effectiveness of Team-Assisted Individualization Method on Seventh Grade Students' Reading Comprehension at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang

Puja Afriyanti[1], **Desi Surayatika**[2]
Pujaafrie.pa@gmail.com
[1,2] *Indo Global Mandiri University, Indonesia*

ABSTRACT

Reading is typically solitary and quiet activity that people engage in to understand information from the text. By reading, reader hopes to gain the information that will be valuable. The objective of this research is to investigate the impact of team-assisted individualization method on students' reading comprehension. In this research, quantitative approach was used, which was a form a quasi-experimental methodological approach. The sample used for this research included of seventh-grade students at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang, fifty-eight students participated in this research. The experimental group's paired sample t-test results revealed that, at significance level 0,05, t-obtained was 15,441 > t-table (df=28) was 2.048. It indicated that after employing the team-assisted individualization, the reading comprehension of students was significantly improved. Additionally, at 0,05 was the level of significance, the outcome of t-test of independent sample indicated that t-obtained was 6.923 > t-table (df=56) was 2.003. it denoted that experimental and control group means significantly differed. After having the outcome of t-test it can be concluded, team-assisted individualization was useful and applicable for improving seventh-grade of students' descriptive text reading comprehension achievement at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang. Therefore, English teacher should use a variety of techniques, including team-assisted individualization.

Keywords:
Reading comprehension, descriptive text, team-assisted individualization.

1. Introduction

Learning language has become a critical requirement for the students. Students can enhance their knowledge by learning a new language. English is one of several languages spoken worldwide. English is frequently used to communicate with people whose first or second languages are different. According to Harmer (2007, p. 1) The most important language in the world is English. By learning English, the students can learn more about world and communicate verbally, writing, reading using English. Al-Arifi (2020) also underlined that English is the language of publishing and scientific research in a variety of fields, as well as the language of conferences and forums for politics and science. English is also communication language and understanding between a significant number of countries around the world. As stated in the description given above, students today must learn English because it is a communication language.

According to PISA (Program for International Student Assessment), Indonesia has a low literacy rate. It can be seen from the PISA 2018 results, which indicated that the 2015 PISA score reading was 397 and the 2018 PISA score reading was 371. It indicates that Indonesia's reading scores have decreased by -26 points (OECD, 2019). Previously, The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) reported from 2016 found how Indonesia's reading level index was under 0.001%, indicating that only one out of 1,000 Indonesians had a high interest in reading. In the assessment of the Human Development Index (HDI), Indonesia came in 124th place out of 187 countries. In brief, based on the explanation above, the reading achievement of students in Indonesia was decreased.

Indonesian education faces significant challenges, particularly in terms of developing education in the globalization period. The satisfaction of four English language learning skills remains a challenge at all stage of school in Indonesia, especially in reading comprehension. Tavoosy (2019) stated that to encourage students in order to participate completely in the academic parts of school life, educators must comprehend how the phenomena affects teaching and learning and then develop strategies to enhance language development. To overcome the following problems, the researcher used an approach called Team-Assisted Individualization in cooperative learning. Robert Slavin and his colleague developed this method in 1985. The researcher was motivated to do the research at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang on how to increase reading comprehension of the students by the used of Team-Assisted Individualization, as the strategy was new to the school and had not been used in the teaching of English. The researcher considered carrying out a research with the title: The Effectiveness of Team-Assisted Individualization Method on Seventh Grade Students' Reading Comprehension at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang.

Reading is an essential skill for students to learn. Tarigan (2008, p. 7) notes that readers use reading to get messages from the writers through written language sources. Also, Oakhill, Cain, and Elbro (2015) claimed that reading and comprehension is a tough challenge it needs the coordination of a variety of cognitive abilities and skills. From the basis of the statements before, the researcher concluded that reading comprehension is the capacity to fully understand a book in order to obtain knowledge and increase the reader's knowledge from the reading text. According to Brown (2007, p. 107) teaching is the process of leading and enhancing learning, allowing the learner to understand and providing learning conditions. Furthermore, Salam (2017) states that good teaching materials are those that can be put to use and aid students in their learning. Find an appropriate technique to use that will encourage students to participate actively in learning process. This suggests that teaching is the process of assisting and leading students in acquiring new knowledge and information, as well as assisting someone in learning or comprehending anything. This indicates that the teacher must provide and lead students in order for them to gain knowledge and build their abilities.

Team-assisted individualization is a part of cooperative learning method. Team-assisted individualization combines group learning and individual instruction. Students are divided into groups thus they can learn collaboratively. Each team member is responsible for earning points and receiving a reward for their efforts.

Students should assist their teammates in improving their skills. They check each other's work, share ideas, and discuss problems in order to pass the final exam. Harris (2018) stated that, cooperative learning is one style of instruction that some believe can improve the process of learning. The goal of this method was encourage students to teach their peers. In short, teaching a friend provides students with a chance to learn and educate simultaneously at the same moment, and thus prepares them to become teachers for their friends.

2. Methods

The quantitative approach was taken in this research. Analyzing data numerically and statistically is typical in the quantitative approach (Sugiyono, 2017, p. 7). According to Creswell (2012, p. 12), the quantitative technique has three design, namely experimental, correlation, and survey. The research's methodology was based on experiments conducted by the researcher. The greatest way to establish a connection between variables is through experimental research, in the accordance to Fraenkel & Wallen, (2009, p. 261). The researcher did experimental research in order to investigate the independent variable's influence on the dependent variable. Additionally, a quasi-experimental research methodology known as a non-equivalent design of control groups. This research employed the design of quasi-experimental so that to compare outcomes of the experiment and control group without using random sampling.

Table 1. Non-equivalent Control Group Design

Group	Pre-test	Treatment	Post-test
Experimental group	O1	X	O2
Control group	O3	-	O4

O1 : Experimental group pre-test
O2 : Experimmental group post-test
X : Treatment for experimental group
- : No treatment in control group
O3 : Pre-Test for Control Group
O4 : Post-Test for Control Group

A population was a collection of people who shere a characteristic, according to Creswell (2012, p. 142). The seventh-grade students at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang served as the research's population. There were 343 populations in total. According to Sugiyono (2017, p. 81) the selection of a sample is sampling. In this study, purposive sampling was used. According to Sugiyono (2017, p.85), the strategy of purposive sampling is affected by some multiple factors. Some factors such as: first, the sample taught by the same teacher, second, in accordance with the researcher's experience instructing at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang, the students in VII.6 and the students in VII.8 has the same abilities, third, this sample choose based on a recommendation from the English teacher at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang. According to Creswell (2012, p.142), an investigational sample is a portion of the overall audience that was targeted. A sample was a subset of a population chosen to reflect the entire population. The researcher

selected a sample from a general population. On the basis of the purposive sampling method, group VII.6 was chosen to be the experimental group, and group VII.8 was chosen to serve as the control group.

Table 2. Sample of Research

Experimental Group	VII.6 (29 students)
Control Group	VII. 8 (29 students)

The level of validity of an instrument is indicated by its validity level according to Arikunto (2014, p. 211). validation of the research instrument that was used in this study was accomplished though the application of the content validity. The validity content test was determined using expert judgment. Experts in this case were persons with knowledge of the topic, as well as the relevant fields for research instruments. Because the researcher of this study wanted to assess students' cognitive capacities in learning English, the validators in this study were English teachers.

The validator gave an assessment used a Likert scale, namely: (A score of 1 indicates that it is not valid, a score of 2 indicates that it is less valid, a score of 3 indicates that it is sufficiently valid, a score of 4 indicates that it is valid, and a score of 5 indicates that it is very valid. After the validator gave an assessment, then to found out the results of the agreements of these experts, it was calculated using Microsoft Excel and the Aiken's V index. An object can be classified depending on the outcomes of the Aiken's V index computation. In accordance with Budiastra, Wicaksono, & Sanjaya (2020), the category for validity such as:

Table 3. Score Range Validity Category

CVI < 0.4	Low Validity
0.4 ≤ CVI < 0.8	Medium Validity
CVI ≥ 0.8	High Validity

Creswell (2018, p. 215) stated that reliability as the stability of an instrument's score.The researcher conducted reliability in this research through try-out first. The sample for try-out is VII.7 class consist of 31 students. In addition, the researcher assessed the test's reliability applying Cronbach's Alpha by using SPSS v.25. In accordance with Guilford (1956 p.145), the categories of reliability were detailed in the following column.

Table 4. The Categories of Reliability Coefficients

Score	The Categories of Reliability
0.8 - 1.0	Very high reliability
0.6 - 0.8	High reliability
0.4 - 0.6	Moderate reliability
0.2 - 0.4	Low reliability
-1.0 - 0.2	Very low reliability (nor reliable)

Table 5. Reliability Statistics

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.735	.739	40

In this research, the outcomes of the try-out of VII.8 class after calculated by using Cronbach's Alpha were 0.739 based on standardized items. It indicated that the item was high reliability for used in actual research. In the other words, 40 questions have internal consistency.

The researcher used the test to collect data in both the experimental group and the control group. Both groups were subjected to the test. In this research, both the pre-tests and the post-tests consisted of the multiple choice questions. The items on the pre-test and post-test were identical, but scheduled differently. In a classroom, pre and post-tests served the same purpose. The preliminary test that was carried out before the treatment. The researcher went around to both VII.6 and VII.8 to administer the pre-test to the students there. It assessed students' knowledge of reading comprehension text before being taught the team-assisted individualization technique. Meanwhile, the post-treatment evaluation was conducted. The post-test measured text of students' reading comprehension following after being taught the team- assisted individualization technique. Students in VII.6 received the post-test, whereas students in VII.8 received the post-test without receive the treatment using team-assisted individualization technique.

According to Saebani (2008) data analysis is the preparation of data for interpretation. To evaluate data, the researcher used SPSS v.25's T-test. In this study, both paired and independent sample T-tests were used to analyze the data. A paired sample T-test was utilized to compare the achievement of reading comprehension mean scores and determined whether or not the reading comprehension of students improved after being taught by the applied team-assisted individualization. The data that researcher used in analyzing the data by using paired sample T-test is the pre-test and post-test scores of class VII.6 (experimental group). The independent sample T-test was employed to compare the two groups and see whether there were any significant mean differences in reading comprehension of students between those who were taught utilizing the team-assisted individualization method and those who were not. The data examined by the researcher using the T-test of independent samples was the post-test between VII.6 and VII.8.

3. Result

The data collection process was carried out by the researcher by using the pre-test and post-test reading test scores from both sets of participants (experimental and control). A pre-test was administered before the treatment, and a post-test was administered following treatment. After the data were collected, they were analyzed with a T-test through the SPSS V.25 program after the program had been run on them. When comparing the mean reading achievement scores of students before and after treatment, the researcher made use of both the T-test for paired sample and the

independent sample T-tests. The findings of the paired sample T-test provided responses to the first set of research questions. The T-test of an independent sample was used to evaluate whether there was a significant mean difference between the experimental and control groups.

The researcher conducted an analysis the homogeneity and normality of the data before proceeding the analysis of the hypothesis. The objective of this analysis is to determine whether the data obtained through the research followed a normal and homogeneous distribution or not. The researcher looked at the significance of the data while using the SPSS V.25 tool to determine whether or not the data were normal and homogeneous.

Table 6. Normality and Homogeneity

	Normality Shapiro-Wilk				Homogeneity	
	Experimental Group		Control Group			
	Statistic	.Sig	Statistic	.Sig	Levene Statistic	.Sig
Reading Pre-Test	.937	.082	.940	.100	.327	.570
Reading Post-Test	.964	.421	.938	.087	.113	.739

As a result of table 6, the pre-test score significant level in experimental group found on Shapiro-Wilk was 0.082, because 0.082 was greater than 0.05, the probability that the data were normally distributed was assumed. According to Febry and Teofilus (2020), if the p value was larger than 0.05, it suggested that the data followed a normal distribution; on the other hand, if the p value was lower than 0.05, it suggested that the data did not follow a normally distributed pattern. Furthermore, the significance level of the post-test in experimental group score based on Shapiro-Wilk was 0.421. The data were normally distributed because 0.421 was more than 0.05. The Shapiro-Wilk significance value for the pre-test of the control group was 0.100, because 0.100 was more than 0.05, it can be inferred that the data were normally distributed. Furthermore, the significant level of the post-test in the control group was 0.87, because 0.87 was more than 0.05, the data can be classified as being normally distributed. The researcher identified that all of the pre-test and post-test data for the experimental and control groups were normally distributed employing the normality calculation. The data must have a normal distribution due to a pre-requisite t-test.

The results of the experimental group's descriptive statistics were displayed in the Table 7 below. In the experimental group, there were 29 students.

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation

Pre -test experimental group	29	57.5	17.5	75.0	1135.0	39.138	16.7742
post-test experimental group	29	25.0	70.0	95.0	2340.0	80.690	6.4744

From Table 7 above, the pre-test scores ranged in the experimental group from 17,5 to 75,0, with 75,0 being the highest score. Additionally, in the group of experimental, the lowest post-test score was 70,0 and the highest was 95,0. the mean pre-test mean was 39.138, on the other hand, the mean score on the post-test was 80,690. the difference between the mean scores on the pre-test and post-test was 41,552.

Table 8. Pre-Test, and Post-Test Scores Analysis in Experimental Group

Score Range	Category	Pre-Test	Mean	Post-Test	Mean
		Frequency / Percentage		Frequency / Percentage	
85-100	Very Good	0 (0%)	39,138	9 (31,03%)	80,69%
75-84	Good	1 (3,40%)		16 (55,17%)	
65-74	Fair	1 (3,40%)		4 (13,79%)	
55-64	Poor	3 (10,30%)		0 (0%)	
<55	Very Poor	24 (82,75%)		0 (0%)	
Total		29 (100%)		29 (100%)	

Table 8 showed the analysis of pre-test results for the experimental group: in the good category there was 1 student, in the fair category there was 1 student, there were 3 students who derived the "poor" category, and there were 24 students who derived the "very poor" category. In the other words, 3.40% of students were in the good and fair category, 10.30% were in the poor category, and 82.75% were in the very poor category. In summary, before the treatments, the majority of students were in the categories of poor and very poor.

The post-test results in experimental group analysis were presented on the table 8. There were 9 students who scored in the very good range, in the good range there were 16 students, in the fair range there were 4 students, and no students was in poor and very poor range. In the other words, there were 31,03% of very good students, 55,17% of good students, and 13,79% of fair students. The table showed that 80,603 was the post-test mean. In brief, the vast majority of students fell into the very good group after receiving the treatment.

Based on the explanation above, the experimental group's mean post-test score (80,690) was more than the pre-test mean score (39,138). The pre- and post-test of experimental group mean differences were 41,552. it suggests that after being taught the team-assisted individualization technique, reading comprehension improved significantly for the students.

The results of control group's descriptive statistics shown in the table 9 below. The control group included 29 students.

Table 9. Descriptive Statistics

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation
pre-test control group	29	75.0	10.0	85.0	1275.0	43.966	20.6103
post-test control group	29	30.0	50.0	80.0	1977.5	68.190	7.2548

The pre-test scores of control group varied form 10,0 to 85,0 with 85,0 being the highest score, as shown in Table 4.4 above. Additionally, the lowest and the highest post-test scores of control group were 50,0 and 80,0 respectively. The pre-test mean was 43,966, compared to the post-test mean was 68,190. There was a mean difference of 24,224 between the pre- and post-test.

The descriptive analysis of the pre-and post test scores of the control group are summarized in the table below.

Table 10. Analysis of Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores in the Control Group

Score Range	Category	Pre-Test	Mean	Post-Test	Mean
		Frequency / Percentage		Frequency / Percentage	
85-100	Very Good	0 (0%)	43,966	0 (0%)	68,19
75-84	Good	0 (0%)		4 (13,79%)	
65-74	Fair	4 (13,79%)		17 (58,62%)	
55-64	Poor	2 (6,89%)		6 (20,68%)	
<55	Very Poor	23 (79,31%)		2 (6,89%)	
Total		29 (100%)		29 (100%)	

Table 10 analyzed the control group's pre-test scores. In the fair category there were 4 students, in the poor category there were 2 students, and 23 students were in very poor category. In the other words, 13,79% of students were the fair category, 6,89% of students were the poor category, and 79,31% of students were the very poor category. The pre-test mean was 43,966. In conclusion, the majority of students were in the very poor category.

The outcomes of post-test score analysis for the control group were presented in table 10. There were a total of 4 students were in the good category, in the fair category there were 17 students, 6 of students were in category of poor, and in the very poor category there were 2 students. To state that another way, in good category there were 13,79% of students, in fair category there were 58,62% of students, 20,68% of students in the poor category, and 6,89% of students were into very poor category. The mean score obtained from the post-test was 68,190. In brief, the majority of students achieved good category.

Based on the explanation above, the control group's average pre-test score was significantly lower than the control group's mean post-test score (68,190), which was significantly higher than the average pre-test score in the control group (43,966) the average difference between pre-test and post-test results for the control group was 24,224 points. This indicated that the progress was being made in the control group, nevertheless it was not as significant as the progress that has been made in the experimental group.

According to the previous explanation, all of the data were normally and homogeneous distributed. The paired sample t-test was employed in this research to determine whether the implementation of team-assisted individualization technique improved reading comprehension achievement or not.

Table 11. Paired Sample T-test in Experimental Group

Variable	Paired Sample T-Test in Experimental Group			Paired Sample T-test in Control Group		
	t	df	.Sig (2-Tailed)	t	df	.Sig (2-Tailed)
Pre- and Post-Test of Experimental Group	-15.441	28	.000	-6.712	28	.000

Table 11. presents the outcomes of in experimental group of paired sample t-test. In this test, the researcher used 0,05 as a significant alpha so the level of confidence is 95% in the other words, only the biggest 5% of errors can be tolerated by the researcher. As shown in the Sig. (2-tailed) column, the significant degree of improvement in students' reading comprehension achievement in the experimental group was 0.000, which was less than 0.05, and the t-obtained was 15.441, whereas the t-table (df=28) was 2.048. To put it another way, the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected while the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted. In a simple terms, using a team-assisted individualization approach to teaching resulted in significant gains in students' reading comprehension.

All the data were normally distributed and homogeneous. In this research, the independent sample to evaluate whether due to the significant mean difference between experimental and control groups, the t-test was selected. The outcomes of the analysis in statistical of the experiment and control groups are reported in the Table 12 below.

Table 12. Independent Sample T-test

Variable	Independent Sample T-Test		
	t	df	.Sig (2-Tailed)
Post-test of Experimental and Control Groups	6.923	56	.000

The results of the t-test on independent samples were displayed in table 12, as can be seen there. In this assessment, the researcher used 0,05 as a significant alpha so the level of confidence is 95% in the other words, only the biggest 5% of errors can be tolerated by the researcher. As shown in the .Sig (2-tailed) column, the levels of significant improvement in reading comprehension that were achieved when

compared to those in the control group, those in the experimental group had a value of 0.000, which was lower than 0.05, and the t-obtain was 6.923 > t-table (df=56) was 2.003. To put it another way, it was agreed that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) should be accepted, while the null hypothesis (Ho) should not. It suggested that using the team-assisted individualization strategy improved students' reading comprehension achievement significantly.

4. Discussion

Throughout the course of this study, the researcher made use of both the null hypothesis (Ho) and the alternative hypothesis (Ha). To answer the research questions, the research hypotheses were applied. In addition, the following criteria were used:

When the two-tailed significance level (Sig) is less than 0.05, the alternative hypothesis is accepted and the null hypothesis (Ho) is rejected. According to the findings, a noticeable distinction existed.

If the value of the Sig (2-tailed) statistic is more than 0.05, then the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is rejected and the null hypothesis (Ho) is accepted. A statistical analysis showed no discernible variation.

The experimental group's paired sample t-test revealed that the significance level with two tails was 0.000 lower than 0.05 (0.00 < 0.05), and the t-obtain was 15.441 > t-table (df=28) was 2.048. It implied that Ho was rejected while Ha was accepted as the correct interpretation of the data. It indicated that the seventh-grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Palembang showed a reading comprehension significantly improved after being taught by the used of team-assisted individualization technique. Thus, the research question number 1 has been answered.

In addition, according to the outcome of independent sample t-test, 0.000 was a Sig. (2-tailed) less than 0.05 (0.000 < 0.05), and the t-obtain was 6.923 > t-table (df=56) was 2.003. It is possible to state that the null hypothesis, denoted by the letter Ho, was disproved, and that the alternative hypothesis, denoted by the letter Ha, was validated. This indicated that the second research question has been satisfactorily answered. There was a discernible gap between the students who were instructed using the technique of team-assisted individualization and those who were instructed using another method at the students at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang who are in the seventh grade.

In light of the previous explanation, it seems to be stated that the team-assisted individualization was effective in improving students in seventh grade at SMP Negeri 3 Palembang were tested on how well they understood what they read.

5. Conclusion

The experiment group's paired sample t-test confirmed this conclusion as well. The findings indicated that the significance level, two-tailed, was lower than 0.05%. It was determined that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) is more plausible than the null hypothesis (Ho), thus Ho was rejected. Seventh-grade students of SMP Negeri 3 Palembang were taught utilizing team-assisted individualization technique, and the

findings showed a significant improvement in their descriptive text reading comprehension achievement. In addition to this, it was discovered that the mean post-test score of the experimental group was higher than that of the control group. The findings of the independent sample t-test backed up this assumption. In accordance with the findings, the significant level with two-tailed was lower than 0.05. In this study, the researcher came to the conclusion that the alternative hypotheses (Ha) were more plausible than the null hypotheses (Ho). The findings showed a difference of significant in students' descriptive text reading and comprehension among the students who were instructed by employed team-assisted individualization and those who were not.

The researcher intended to suggest the other researchers. It could be utilized as a reference by other researchers. Other researcher could employ team-assisted individualization technique in a variety of educational levels. In addition, other researchers who are interested in conducting similar research should add more treatment to improve the quality of their research.

References

Al-Arifi, R. S. (2020). Difficulties facing teaching English Language at the primary level from the point of view of teachers and the proposed solutions for them in Al-Quwaiyah Governorate. Reading and Knowledge Journal, 20(2), 117-148.

Arikunto, S. (2014). *Prosedur penelitian: suatu pendeketan praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Budiastra, A. A., Wicaksono, I., & Sanjaya, I. (2020). The New Generation Self-Directed Teaching Materials of Natural Science in Elementary Schools Validity Tests. International Journal of Instruction, 13(4), 763-780.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment (principle and classroom practices).* New York: London.

Brown, H. D. (2007). Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. White Plains: Pearson Education Company.

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th Ed). Boston: Pearson.

Creswell, J. W. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (5th Ed). Boston: Pearson.

Febry, Dr. T & Theofilus. (2020). *SPSS aplikasi pada penelitian manajemen bisnis*. [i]Bandung : Media Sains Indonesia.

Fraenkel, J. & Wallen, N. (2009). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (7th Ed). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.

Guilford, J. P. (1956). *Fundamental statistic in psychology and education* (3rd Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Harmer, J. (2007). *How to teach English*. London: Longman.

Harris, T. E., & Sherblom, J. C. (2018). Small group and team communication. Waveland Press.

Oakhill, J., et al. (2015). Understanding and Teaching Reading Comprehension. New York: Rutledge.

OECD. (2019). PISA 2018 results: combined executive summaries. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling, 53*(9), 1689-1699.

Saebani, B. A. (2008). *Metode penelitian*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.

Salam, S. (2017). Developing needs analysis based-reading comprehension learning materials: A study on the Indonesian language study program students. Advances in Language and Literary Studies, 8(4), 105-113.

Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian (Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tarigan. (2008). Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman. Bandung: Angkasa

Tavoosy, Y. & Jelveh, R. (2019). Language teaching strategies and techniques used to support students learning in a language other than their mother tongue. International Journal of Learning and Teaching. 11(2), 077–088.