

EFL Students' Attitude toward Collaborative Strategic Reading in Reading Classroom

Riwayat draf artikel
Diserahkan 28-07-2022
Direvisi 11-08-2022
Diterima 12-08-2022

Hanifah Oktarina
Tadris Bahasa Inggris, STAIN Mandailing Natal
Email korespondensi: hanifahoktarina@stain-madina.ac.id

ABSTRACT: Focusing on attitude toward teaching strategies and promoting collaboration in teaching reading have been widely acknowledged to have impact on students' achievement and attitude. This study explores the students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR. Conducted under qualitative research design, this study involved 21 high school students who were classified into low- and high-achievers. To collect the data, the study administered a set of instruments: questionnaire, and interview. The data from the questionnaire were analysed by determining the means of the items and percentages of the students' responses, and the interview data were analysed qualitatively. The findings from questionnaire and interview were in line with the students' reading performance in which the high achievers gave more "agree" responses. They believed that CSR helped them develop their reading comprehension in terms of determining main idea, and increasing vocabularies. However, for the low achieving group, the only effect of CSR was the acknowledgement of its contribution to their increase in vocabulary. The study offers recommendations for teaching practice as well as for further research.

Keywords: Collaborative Strategic Reading, reading comprehension, attitude

ABSTRAK: Berfokus pada sikap terhadap strategi pengajaran dan mempromosikan kolaborasi dalam pengajaran membaca telah diakui secara luas berdampak pada prestasi dan sikap siswa. Penelitian ini mengeksplorasi sikap siswa terhadap implementasi *Collaborative Strategic Reading* (CSR). Dilakukan dengan desain penelitian kualitatif, penelitian ini melibatkan 21 siswa SMA yang diklasifikasikan prestasinya menjadi rendah dan tinggi. Untuk mengumpulkan data, penelitian ini menggunakan seperangkat instrumen: kuesioner dan wawancara. Data dari angket dianalisis dengan menentukan rata-rata item dan persentase tanggapan siswa, dan data wawancara dianalisis secara kualitatif. Temuan dari kuesioner dan wawancara sejalan dengan kinerja membaca siswa di mana siswa berprestasi lebih banyak memberikan tanggapan "setuju". Mereka percaya bahwa CSR membantu mereka mengembangkan pemahaman bacaan mereka dalam hal menentukan ide utama, dan meningkatkan kosakata. Namun, untuk kelompok berprestasi rendah, satu-satunya efek CSR adalah pengakuan atas kontribusinya terhadap peningkatan kosakata mereka. Studi ini menawarkan rekomendasi untuk praktik pengajaran serta untuk penelitian lebih lanjut.

Kata Kunci: *Collaborative Strategic Reading*, pemahaman membaca, sikap.

INTRODUCTION

The importance of reading has been widely acknowledged by researchers and experts. Eskey (1970) argues that the ability to read the written language at a reasonable rate, and reading is recognized to be as important as productive skill. Besides, reading is also crucial for broader learning, success in education, and employment (Oakhill et al., 2015). Without the skills of reading and the motivation for reading to learn, the students' academic progress is limited (Guthrie et al.,

2004). Yet, most importantly it is considered paramount for students at any level (Alsamadani, 2011; Oakhill et al., 2015).

Literatures of teaching reading have acknowledged and introduced numerous teaching methods and techniques that can be applied to teaching reading. These teaching procedures are usually classified based on the objectives of the instruction. According to Liang and Dole (2006), teaching reading emphasizes two major concerns: 1) instruction that focuses on helping students understand the content of a text, and 2) instruction that focuses on comprehension strategies to help students understand all texts. Currently, much more attention is being paid to the second category, which is often referred to as “comprehension strategy instruction” (Liang & Dole, 2006).

Numerous advantages of this strategy instruction have been put forward by some researchers and experts. Palinscar and Brown (1984) argue that strategy based instruction helps struggling students be more aware of how to learn, use and develop control over learning strategies. Such awareness may help students become independent readers that can cope with the kinds of comprehension problems (Pearson, 1982). One of which and to which this study mainly concerns with is CSR. CSR which stands for Collaborative Strategic Reading is a framework originally developed to help students with learning disabilities to comprehend the text (Liang & Dole, 2006). Klingner and Vaughn (1998), the main proponents of this strategy, describe CSR as a teaching technique for teaching students’ reading comprehension, building vocabulary, and working together cooperatively.

In its implementation, CSR concerns with teaching strategies. Klingner and Vaughn (1998) propose four different strategies that are taught in the CSR instruction. They are previewing, click and clunk, get the gist, and wrap-up strategies. These strategies are explicitly implemented in the class. “Previewing” is done before reading. The aims are to activate students’ previous knowledge, encourage students’ interest in the assigned text, and predict what the text is about. Then, “click and clunk” and “get the gist” are applied during reading.

In teaching and learning process, the students’ not only use thinking, but also the attitude plays a crucial role. The student’s attitude has been widely examined particularly when the objective is to see how the students respond to what they have been exposed (Sugano & Mamolo, 2021). The student’s attitudes are often counted because they are claimed to be crucial to the language learning itself. This is clarified by Padwick (2017) stating that the nature of language learning does not primarily depend on the intellectual quality, but also it relies on psychological and social aspects. Thus, this places attitudes as contributing factors to the betterment of the language learnings, which are as equally important as intellectual facets.

Numerous studies have been intensely conducted to capture the effect of CSR on reading comprehension. Moreover, another variation was pursued such as investigating students’ perception or attitude toward CSR (Gani et al., 2016; Karimabadi et al., 2015; Khonamri & Karimabadi, 2015; Rahman, 2015; Rajaei et al., 2020). The effect of CSR on other students’ factors such as students’ level of proficiency is potential to be investigated since most studies in Indonesian context

such as (Babapour et al., 2018; Gani et al., 2016; Rahman, 2015; Riani, 2013) concerned mostly with students' reading attitude toward Collaborative Strategic Reading. Thus, this present study attempts to fill the gap by exploring students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR in reading class.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The purposes of the study is to explore the students' attitudes toward the implementation of the CSR instruction based on their level of proficiency (high- and low- achieving levels). The present study employed qualitative design since the present research to provide specific description and analysis of the quality of the human experience (Marvasti, 2010).

The population of the research was one of the private Senior High Schools in Garut, West Java. In regard to the sample, this study applied convenience sampling (Best & Kahn, 2006) because the school only has two classes for the eleventh grade. Thus, the sample was selected based on the availability of the class. The class comprised 21 students. Moreover, the students were further differentiated based on their level of proficiency. In this study, the levels were classified into two levels of proficiency; high and low achievers. The data to determine these two levels were drawn from placement test. The data were calculated and the classification was determined by using the following criteria from Paramawarti (2013).

Table 1 Criteria of students' levels of proficiency

Criteria for classifying level of proficiency	Students' levels of proficiency
$\text{Nilai} \geq \text{mean} + \frac{1}{2} \text{SD}$	High
$\text{Mean} - \frac{1}{2} \text{SD} < \text{nilai} < \text{mean} + \frac{1}{2} \text{SD}$	Middle
$\text{Nilai} \leq \text{mean} - \frac{1}{2} \text{SD}$	Low

Note: SD = Standard Deviation

The data were gained by using closed- ended questionnaire (Dawson, 2002.) with 30 items as a tool to acquire the students' attitude toward the CSR implementation. The questionnaire was basically divided into three aspects (Eshghinejad, 2016), including positive or negative sides: cognitive, affective, and behavioural aspects. Each of them consisted of 10 items. The combination of questionnaire items was produced from some researchers' attitude questionnaire (Al-Roomy, 2013; Fan, 2009; Karimabadi et al., 2015) who operated the five Likert-scale questions. They were "strongly agree (SA)", "agree (A)", "neutral (N)", "disagree (D)", and "strongly disagree (SD)". The elaborations for the questionnaire items are presented in the following table.

Table 2 Categories of Questionnaire items

No	Categories	Item Numbers	Total
1	Students' attitudes on cognitive aspects (belief)	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10	10

2	Students' attitudes on affective aspects (feeling)	11,12,13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20	10
3	Students' attitudes on behavioural aspects (tendency)	21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30	10
	Total		30

The present study also used interview. The interview's purpose was to triangulate the data obtained from the questionnaire. It was to gain further information about the students' attitudes toward the implementation of CSR. To get a deeper information about students' attitude, a semi-structured interview was used because, according to Hatch (2002), "it is open to following the leads of informants and probing into areas that arise during interview interactions" (p. 94).

The semi-structured interview was guided by six questions. It was mainly asking about the CSR method, the steps and the roles of CSR method, the students' feeling about the CSR implementation, and the effects of the CSR method on students' reading comprehension. These questions were asked to the six students who have been divided to three high- and three low-achieving students. The students involved in the interviewing session were given the label "P" for Participant. Low-achieving students were named *P1*, *P2*, and *P3*, while *P4*, *P5*, and *P6* were used for high-achieving students.

The questionnaire was to find out the students' attitude towards the implementation of CSR in reading class. As explained before, this questionnaire has 5 Likert-scale questions. After obtaining the data from the questionnaire, the researcher firstly calculated the number of students in each scale and analysed it by converting into a percentage using the formula below.

$$\frac{\text{Number of students choosing certain option}}{\text{Total number of the students}} \times 100\%$$

The interview was used to verify the data from the questionnaire which served as data triangulation (Best & Kahn, 2006). The interview enabled the researcher to probe for further information, elaboration, and clarification of students' responses (Creswell & David Creswell, 2012). The data gathered from the interview were first transcribed for the purpose of the analysis. Then, after the data were transcribed, the interviews were analysed based on qualitative procedures developed by Best and Kahn (2006). The procedures covered categorization, description, and interpretation. In the data categorization stage of the students' interview, it included categorizing or sorting the data based on the predetermined categories. Then, in the next two steps, after the data have been analysed descriptively and presented in narrative forms. The presented data were then interpreted and justified with the relevant studies and theories for the purpose of clarifications.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

Students' Attitude toward the Implementation of CSR Method in the Reading Class

The general finding about the students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR method is presented. The mean scores are first categorized as the mean score of the overall aspects and the second are the mean scores of each aspect of the attitude. It is important to note that the decision to determine the students' attitude is not solely based on the questionnaire. The data from the interview are taken into account to clarify the finding from the questionnaire. To be more specific, the data from the questionnaire are used to generate general attitude of the students, while the data from the interview are used to provide more detailed information about the attitude of specific students i.e. high and low achieving students. Thus, in the next section, the explanation of each aspect of the students' attitude covers both data from the questionnaire and the interview.

Table 3 The students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR

Number of Participants	Mean score of cognitive aspect	Mean score of affective aspect	Mean score of behavioural aspect	The mean score of all aspects
21	3.79	3.67	3.46	3.64

The students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR. It can be seen from the table that the mean score of all aspects is 3.64. This final result is obtained by averaging the three aspects of the attitude i.e. cognitive, affective, and behavioural aspects. It is apparent in the table that the mean score of cognitive aspect is 3.79. In affective aspect, the mean score is 3.67. In behavioural aspect, the mean score is lower than those of the other aspects, that is, 3.46.

To determine whether the mean score indicated positive or negative attitude, the study made reference to the categorization of the students' attitude level. According to the categorization, positive attitude, in term of score, falls within the range of 3.41 to 4.20, while negative attitude is categorized within the range of 1.81 to 2.60. Scores between those two ranges are categorized as neutral level, and the scores that are either lower or higher than those two ranges are categorized as highly negative and highly positive respectively. Therefore, referring to this criteria, the mean score of the students' attitude in general (3.64) can be placed within the range of "positive" attitude.

However, if examine closely into the group level, the positive attitude can actually be found in the group of high achieving students. It is evident in the interview results in which the high achieving students acknowledge more positive things as the effect of the CSR instruction than the low achieving students. To get thorough understanding about the findings, the following provides explanation of the students' answers in each aspect of the attitude.

Cognitive Aspect of Students' Attitude toward the Implementation of CSR Instruction in Teaching Reading Comprehension

This section discusses the cognitive aspect of the students' attitude. This cognitive aspect definitely reflect the students' belief in the use of CSR method in reading class. To explore the students' attitude of this item, there are 10 items consisting on eight positive and two negative statements. From the analysis, it was found that students generally render positive responses toward the implementation of CSR method with 3.79 mean. The more result is shown in the table below.

Table 4 The calculation of students' cognitive aspect

Item	Characteristics of Item	SA	Students' Responses			SD	Mean of the score
			A	N	D		
1	Positive	7	12	2	0	0	
	General	33%	57%	10%			4.24
	High	33%	56%	11%			4.22
	Low	38%	50%	13%			4.25
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
2	Positive	1	12	8	0	0	
	General	5%	57%	38%			3.67
	High	11%	44%	44%			3.67
	Low		63%	38%			3.63
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
3	Positive	5	12	4	0	0	
	General	24%	57%	19%			4.05
	High	22%	56%	22%			4
	Low	25%	50%	25%			4
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
4	Positive	5	12	4	0	0	
	General	24%	57%	19%			4.05
	High	33%	44%	22%			4.11
	Low	13%	75%	13%			4
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
5	Positive	4	6	7	4	0	
	General	19%	29%	33%	19%		3.48
	High	22%	11%	33%	33%		3.22
	Low	13%	50%	38%			3.75
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
6	Positive	1	9	10	1	0	
	General	5%	43%	48%	5%		3.48
	High	11%	22%	56%	11%		3.33
	Low		38%	63%			3.38

	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	3	11	5	2	0	
7	General	14%	52%	24%	10%		3.71
	High	22%	44%	33%			3.89
	Low	13%	38%	25%	25%		3.38
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	8	9	4	0	0	
8	General	38%	43%	19%			4.19
	High	33%	33%	33%			4
	Low	50%	38%	13%			4.38
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Negative	0	2	9	6	4	3.57
9	General		9%	43%	29%	19%	
	High		11%	33%	22%	33%	3.78
	Low			63%	38%		3.37
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
	Negative	0	4	6	8	3	
10	General		19%	29%	38%	14%	3.48
	High		22%	44%	22%	11%	3.22
	Low		13%	25%	50%	13%	3.62
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
	General						3.79
Mean	High						3.74
	Low						3.78

Note: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

Relating to the item 1, this item carried out the statements about benefit of CSR method. The first item stated that CSR is beneficial for students with different abilities in the class. There are 90% of students agreed with mean score (4.24). The result is also supported by the students' responses in the next item that CSR helps students to get involved in the process of learning (Item 4). More specifically, both high achieving and low achieving students in the questionnaire agree that CSR is beneficial for various levels of students and helps students to participate in the class. However, when further clarified through the interview, the students' responses appear to be varied and inconsistent. The student from low achieving group stated that the students were not all active. Some students involved actively in the class and some other did not. The participation only occurred in the middle and at the end of the learning as well as during group activities.

In the questionnaire, the students, looked from the mean score of the items, were so sure that CSR may generate active participation. Yet, in the interview they confirmed that not all students participated actively during the learning activity. During teaching and learning process, most of students participated actively are from high achieving students.

Furthermore, students believed that materials in CSR such as “learning logs” and “cue card” can help them remember the learning given and understand the steps of CSR intervention (item 2 and 6). While the students agreed with the advantage of the learning logs (item 2), the high and low achieving students gave neutral responses toward “cue card” (item 6). It is reasonable because during the implementation of CSR, cue card was only given to the leaders of the groups which they used as the guidance to do the activities. Thus, the other students did not have direct exposure toward the use of cue card.

Beside using certain materials, CSR instruction also involves assigning roles to the students during group activities. In the study, the students in the group were assigned 4 different roles. Some students became leaders, gist experts, clunk experts, and some others became reporters. In regard to these roles, the students both from high achieving and low achieving groups agreed that the roles given are appropriate (item 3). Moreover, both of these groups of students believe that the roles given help them in group discussion (item 8). Yet, when it comes to the topic whether it is appropriate to rotate the roles (item 5), high achieving students disagreed while low achieving students agreed with the statement. However, confirmed by the interview, the high achievers actually agreed that the roles should be rotated.

The interview responses above indicated that high achievers agreed that the roles should be rolled to each student. They argued that by rolling the roles, the students may experience different responsibilities. Beside item 6, the low achieving students also gave neutral responses to item 9 with a mean value of 3.37. This item discusses the students’ understanding of the four strategies in CSR. 63% of low achievers gave neutral responses. Similarly, the data from interview found that students are unsure when they are asked about the steps in CSR. Nevertheless, 55% of high achieving students believe they can understand the four strategies well, with a mean score of 3.78. Based on the students’ responses, it can be concluded that the low achieving students did not fully understand the four strategies of CSR particularly click and clunk. Moreover, during the intervention, the researcher saw that the students still struggled in using wrap up strategies. Different from this, the high achieving students seems to understand the strategies quite well even though *P4* said that in one occasion she got difficulty in using some of the strategies. This indicates that high achieving students understand the strategies even if they still need teacher’s guidance in its implementation.

All student responses above can be concluded that low level students still do not really understand the four strategies, especially on click and clunk. During the intervention, the researcher also witnessed that the low student is still difficult in the wrap up strategy. While high achievers can understand these four strategies well even though *P4* says there are sometimes doubts in applying them. This indicates that high achievers understand the four strategies but still need guidance from teachers in their application.

From the aforementioned findings, it can be concluded that in regard to the cognitive aspect of the attitude, the students gave positive responses toward the

implementation of CSR instruction. It was indicated by mean score of the ten items, 3.79 which was higher than normal score. However, viewed from the individual item, there were two items (5 and 6) received normal scores which were given by the high achievers. Meanwhile, low achievers gave normal responses to item 6 and 9. Yet, in general, the mean scores of the items in high achieving and low achieving groups with 3.74 and 3.78 respectively indicated that the students gave positive response toward the implementation of CSR.

Affective Aspect of Students' Attitude toward the Implementation of CSR Instruction in Teaching Reading Comprehension

This affective aspect of attitude refers to students' feeling on the use of CSR method in reading class. Similar to cognitive aspect, the number of the items for eliciting students affective response was ten items, labelled from item 11 to 20. Ten items that were divided into 7 positive and 3 negative items cover several aspects like students' confidence in reading, motivation in learning, feeling in working collaboratively, and their certainty in giving the correct answer. The description of the students' responses toward these items was presented in the following table.

Table 5 The calculation of students' affective aspect

No	Characteristic of Item	Students' Responses				SD	Mean of the score
		SA	A	N	D		
11	Positive	1	12	7	1	0	
	General	5%	57%	33%	5%		3.62
	High		44%	44%	11%		3.33
	Low	13%	50%	38%			3.75
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
12	Positive	1	9	10	1	0	
	General	5%	43%	48%	5%		3.48
	High		44%	56%			3.44
	Low	13%	50%	25%	13%		3.63
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
13	Negative	0	2	5	11	3	
	General		10%	24%	52%	14%	3.71
	High		11%	22%	44%	22%	3.78
	Low		13%	13%	63%	13%	3.75
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
14	Negative	0	1	10	9	1	
	General		5%	48%	43%	5%	3.48
	High			56%	33%	11%	3.56
	Low		13%	50%	38%		3.25
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
15	Positive	1	9	11	0	0	
	General	5%	43%	52%			3.52
	High		22%	78%			3.22

	Low	13%	75%	13%			4
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	0	12	8	1	0	
16	General		57%	38%	5%		3.52
	High		56%	44%			3.56
	Low		50%	38%	13%		3.38
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	3	11	7	0	0	
17	General	14%	52%	33%			3.81
	High		78%	22%			3.78
	Low	13%	38%	50%			3.63
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	7	12	2	0	0	
18	General	33%	57%	10%			4.24
	High	44%	33%	22%			4.22
	Low	25%	75%				4.25
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Negative	0	1	2	10	8	
	General		5%	10%	48%	38%	4.19
19	High		11%	11%	33%	44%	4.11
	Low				63%	38%	4.38
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
	Positive	0	5	13	3	0	
	General		24%	62%	14%		3.10
20	High		11%	67%	22%		2.89
	Low		25%	63%	13%		3.13
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	General						3.67
Mean	High						3.59
	Low						3.72

Note: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

Item 11 asked whether students like CSR in the reading class. The general analysis for this item showed that 62% of the students agreed. The mean score for the item was 3.62 that was higher than the normal score. To be more specific, the students that gave more “agree” responses were low achieving students. The mean score was 3.75 which was higher than that of the high achieving students. High achieving students, on the other hand, gave neutral responses to the item with mean score 3.33. Yet, high achieving students agreed when asked if CSR makes them more confident in reading (item 12). The mean score for the item was 3.44 which was slightly higher than the normal score.

In the interview, P5 confirmed that he felt more confident with his reading since CSR instruction allowed him to read step by step. On the other hand, P6 showed uncertainty in her response. She felt more confident when she read the text that is familiar to her. From the result of this interview analysis, it can be

concluded that the high achieving students' confidence was relative depending on the kind of text that they read. Therefore, it is in line with the mean score of the item that is not too far from the neutral score.

Similar to high achieving students, the low achieving students also gave similar responses in the questionnaire and their interviews. Based on the mean score above, 3.63, it can be concluded that the low achieving students feel more confident with their reading when they use CSR method. It was also supported by their interview responses in which they admitted that they become a little bit more confident. This can be seen from the response of P3 as the representative of the low achieving group.

The response above indicated that the students feel more confident after they involved in the CSR activities. They admitted that CSR gave them several procedures to tackle the words that they do not know. However, this finding was not in line with their performance in which their scores were found to have no significant difference after they learn with CSR method.

Different from students' confidence, 78% of high achieving students did not confirm whether or not they are interested in reading class when working collaboratively. The mean score of this item was 3.22 which means that they gave neutral response. However, 88% of low achieving students believed that they are interested in reading class when working collaboratively with mean score 4. Low achieving students are actually interested in learning with others, so that they gave good response toward this item. They also said in interview of their interested in working in group activity.

Based on the students' responses, the low achieving students believe that the reading class is interesting if the learning process is held in group. It is because low achieving students can ask the other member questions when they need help. Meanwhile, the high achieving students gave neutral responses to the statement.

Even though the students agreed with all the aforesaid items; they like CSR, CSR helps them become more confident in reading and more motivated in learning, the students were not yet sure if CSR makes them more certain in choosing or giving the right answer when they were asked questions (item 20). Therefore, the mean score for this item was 3.10 which falls within the range of normal score. In the interview, both high and low achieving students have similar responses in which they admitted that they were not completely sure with their answers. This was represented by the low achieving student.

To sum up, the items in the affective category deals with the students' affective responses when they were taught with CSR in the reading class. If viewed from the overall mean score (3.67) in the questionnaire, the students' responses can be categorized as positive responses. Yet, when confirmed through interview, the students' responses were not actually similar. CSR does not entirely improve students' confidence. They were confident when they read only familiar text. Besides, CSR does not make them sure in determining the right answer either. Thus, the students' attitudes particularly in affective domain were not completely positive.

Behavioural Aspect of Students' Attitude toward the Implementation of CSR Instruction in Teaching Reading Comprehension

Different from the previous aspects, behavioural aspect has to do with the effect of CSR on the students' reading comprehension. There were 10 items that were projected to capture the students' attitude on this aspect. These ten items were composed of 9 positive statements and 1 negative statement. They mainly covered statement about CSR's effect on determining the main idea and the purpose of the author, making conclusion, and improving vocabulary mastery. The results of the questionnaire were presented in the following table.

Table 6 The calculation of students' behavioural aspect

No	Characteristic of Item	Students' Responses				SD	Mean of the score
		SA	A	N	D		
21	Positive	3	10	7	1	0	
	General	14%	48%	33%	5%		3.71
	High	22%	22%	44%	11%		3.56
	Low	13%	50%	38%			3.75
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
22	Positive	2	11	8	0	0	
	General	10%	52%	38%			3.71
	High	22%	44%	33%			3.89
	Low		88%	13%			3.88
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
23	Positive	3	9	9	0	0	
	General	14%	43%	43%			3.71
	High	22%	44%	33%			3.89
	Low	13%	63%	25%			3.88
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
24	Positive	2	7	10	2	0	
	General	10%	33%	48%	10%		3.43
	High	11%	56%	33%			3.78
	Low	13%	13%	50%	25%		3.13
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
25	Negative	1	4	5	11	0	
	General	5%	19%	24%	52%		3.24
	High	11%	33%		56%		3
	Low		13%	25%	63%		3.5
	Score	1	2	3	4	5	
26	Positive	1	8	8	4	0	
	General	5%	38%	38%	19%		3.29
	High		56%	22%	22%		3.33
	Low	13%	25%	38%	25%		3.25

	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	0	5	12	3	1	
27	General		24%	57%	14%	5%	3
	High		22%	44%	22%	11%	2.78
	Low		38%	50%	13%		3.25
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	2	13	6	0	0	
28	General	10%	62%	29%			3.81
	High	11%	67%	22%			3.89
	Low	13%	63%	25%			3.88
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	0	11	8	2	0	
29	General		52%	38%	10%		3.43
	High		56%	44%			3.56
	Low		50%	25%	25%		3.25
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	Positive	0	7	13	1	0	
30	General		33%	62%	5%		3.29
	High		44%	44%	11%		3.33
	Low		25%	75%			3.25
	Score	5	4	3	2	1	
	General						3.46
Mean	High						3.5
	Low						3.5

Note: SA = Strongly Agree, A = Agree, N = Neutral, D = Disagree, SD = Strongly Disagree

Item 21 asked whether CSR helps the students in activating their background knowledge prior to the reading activity. The majority of the students' responses arrived at the "agree" level, 48% and "strongly agree", 14%. Therefore, about 62% of the students agree with this statement. Besides, it was also indicated by the mean score of the item, 3.71 which was closed to 4. From the percentage, low achieving students took bigger portion. 63 % of the students gave "agree" response. The mean score for their response to item 21 was 3.75 which was higher than that of the high achieving students (3.56). This indicated that low achieving students agreed that CSR can activate their background knowledge.

The next item deals with whether CSR enables the students to determine the main idea of the text. Based on the table 4.21, 66% of high achieving students responded that CSR enables them to determine the main idea in group activity. It is in line with the data from the interview in which they admitted that they know how to determine the main idea of what they have read.

Similarly, low achieving group gave "agree" responses toward the item. 88% of low achieving students agreed that they can get the main idea of the text in collaboration with others (item 22). Different from the high achieving groups, their responses in the questionnaire were not in accordance with their responses in the

interview. The students admitted that they were not yet able to determine the main idea.

The plausible explanation for the different responses is probably due to the word "collaboration" that appeared in the questionnaire. The students might think that they can determine the main idea with the help of their friends. This indicated that individually the students from low achieving groups are not yet able to determine the main idea of the text.

In addition, the questionnaire explored if the use of CSR affected the students' vocabulary mastery. 67% of the high achieving students agreed that their vocabularies have improved after learning through CSR method. The mean score for their responses was 3.78 which was categorized as positive level of attitude (see table 3.4). The result was also supported by the following interview responses from the group of high achieving students.

Meanwhile, only 26% of the low achieving students agreed that CSR helps improve their vocabularies. Their responses in the questionnaire were also in line with their responses in the interview in which they answered that CSR enables them to know new words.

However, it can be seen that high achieving students gave more convincing answers than low achieving students. All students with high level of proficiency share agreement that CSR helps improve their vocabularies. Meanwhile, for low achieving students, there was only a small portion of the students that agree with the statements. These two different answers are relevant with the results of their tests in which high achievers gained better scores than did low achieving students.

In CSR method, to de-clunk the unfamiliar words the students used "fix-up strategy" through which the students guessed the meaning of the words or sentences in the text. However, the students still have difficulty in understanding the meaning of the difficult words based on the context (item 27). The students both high achievers and low achievers admitted that they still relied on the dictionary to understand the difficult words. This finding is also supported by the students' responses in the interview in which both groups of the students admitted that they still use dictionary.

From the students' responses, it was clear that both high achieving and low achieving students were still unable to get the meaning of the difficult words without dictionary despite the teaching of CSR. With the mean score 2.78 for high achievers and 3.25 for low achievers, it can be concluded that guessing meaning from the context was still considered difficult by the students in their reading.

Furthermore, the topic whether CSR helps the students in determining the author's purpose was also included in the questionnaire. It is wrapped in item 29 which includes the statement "I can identify the purpose of the writer in the text through CSR". For this item, 56% of the students responded that CSR helps them determining the purpose of the author. The mean score of their answer is 3.56 which is above the normal score 3.40.

Despite the fact, not all the high achieving students are capable of determining the author's purpose. It is because the rest of the students which is around 44% gave neutral or normal response. This indicated that there were

students who were still uncertain in determining the author's intention in the text. Similar responses were also given by the group of low achieving students. 50% of low achieving students responded that CSR helps them in determining the author's purpose. *P2*, for instance, clarifies the statement through the interview.

However, 25% of low achieving students were not certain about their answers and the other 25% of low achieving students disagreed with the statement. Based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the low achieving students are not yet capable of determining the purpose of the author. The mean score of their response was 3.25 which falls between normal category.

The next aspect explored in the questionnaire was whether CSR helps the students in drawing conclusion of the text (item 30). Regarding this item, there were only 33% of the students agreed that CSR help them in making a conclusion of the text. The mean score of their response was 3.29 which indicated that the students were not sure in determining the conclusion. It was also reflected in the responses of the high achieving students.

Based on the script above, the students did not give positive response to the statement whether CSR helps them in determining the conclusion of the text. *P5* and *P6* state that they are able to draw conclusion if the main idea of each paragraph has been identified. Different from those two students, *P4* are not entirely sure about her answer. In term of percentage, her ability to conclude the text was about 75%. Moreover, low achieving students also feel uncertain whether they are able to determine the conclusion or not. This can be seen from one of the students' response in low achieving group. Beside the interview, the students also gave neutral response in the questionnaire. There are 75% of low achieving students who gave such responses. This indicates that low achieving students disagree that CSR helps students in drawing conclusion.

DISCUSSION

Regarding the students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR, there are two sources through which the students' attitudes were captured. They were data from the questionnaire and the interview. In general, if viewed from the mean score of the students' responses toward the items in the questionnaire, it can be concluded that most of the students gave positive responses toward the implementation of the CSR instruction. The mean scores of the three aspects of CSR (affective, cognitive, behaviours) are above 3.40 which actually fall within the range of positive level. However, when confirmed through the interview, the students' responses were varied. From those three aspects, it is only affective aspect in which both high and low achieving students gave similar responses.

In the affective domain, both high and low achieving students responded that they feel more confident when they read the familiar text and motivated in reading the texts after learning with CSR method. It is in accordance with AL-Roomy (2013); Fan (2009); Karimabadi, Khonamri, and Mahdavi (2015) who argue that CSR can motivate students in learning and helping each other in the group activity. Moreover, based on the questionnaire, the students responded that the

collaborative feature of CSR makes the reading activity more interesting. This finding supports a study conducted by Akhtar, et al. (2012) who state that cooperative activity makes students interested in learning and helps the learning be meaningful.

Different from the affective aspect, in cognitive aspect the students' reaction is varied. Particularly regarding the statement whether CSR instruction helps the students to participate actively in the learning. High achieving students gave more positive response than the low achieving students. They conveyed that CSR helps improve the students' participation. Their responses were also reflected in the learning process in which they actively engaged in the activity. This supports the theory from Fan (2015) in which CSR may generate active participation from the students.

In regard to behavioural aspect, the students also gave different responses in which high achievers gave more positive points of CSR. In this aspect, high achieving students confirmed that CSR helps them to determine the main idea, increase vocabulary, and somewhat help them in determining the author's purpose. However, low achieving students only confirmed that CSR instruction slightly increases their vocabularies. They gave "no" responses when they were asked whether CSR helps them in determining the main idea of the text or identifying the authors' purposes. Yet, in the behavioural aspects, there was an agreement between high and low achieving students when they were asked if CSR enables them to draw conclusion about the text. They responded that CSR instruction did no help them in drawn conclusion from the text and understanding the difficult words without dictionary. From this, it can be concluded that the effect of CSR in the research site does not go beyond the literal level of the reading comprehension. Thus, the finding is not in accordance with the theory from Karimabadi et al. (2015); Khonamri and Karimabadi (2015) who state that their engagement in group work activity enabled them to grasp the author's purpose better.

CONCLUSION

The results of students' attitude toward the implementation of CSR instruction are drawn from the three aspects. First, in the cognitive aspect, both high and low achieving students gave similar responses. However, if viewed from the learning process, CSR instruction helps high achieving students to involve more in the activity. Secondly, in the affective aspect, both groups of students confirm that CSR relatively increases their confidence with reading depending on the kind of text that they read. Besides, CSR helps their motivation in learning increase through CSR. Moreover, particularly for low achieving students, they are interested in reading class when learning in group activity. Finally, concerning the behavioural aspect, for high achieving students, CSR helps them activate their background knowledge before reading, increase their vocabularies, and determine the main ideas. For low achieving students, CSR can help them only activate their background knowledge before reading and slightly increase their vocabularies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I express my deepest gratitude to Miss Rasti as the teacher who was willing to lend the classes and give me time and opportunity to conduct this experimental research. Besides, I completely give my gratitude to the students for their willingness to participate in this study. Their participation and contribution are really appreciated.

REFERENCES

- Akhtar, K., Scholar, M. P., Khatoon, A., & Scholar, S. M. P. (2012). A Study of Student's Attitudes towards Cooperative Learning. In *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science* (Vol. 2, Issue 11). www.ijhssnet.com
- Al-Roomy, M. (2013). *An Action Research Study of Collaborative Strategic Reading in English with Saudi Medical Students*. University of Sussex.
- Alsamadani, H. (2011). The Effects of the 3-2-1 Reading Strategy on EFL Reading Comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 4(3). <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v4n3p184>
- Babapour, M., Ahangari, S., & Ahour, T. (2018). The effect of shadow reading and collaborative strategic reading on EFL learners' reading comprehension across two proficiency levels. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, 13(4), 318–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17501229.2018.1465059>
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. v. (2006). *Welcome to Research in Education*. www.ablongman.com/researchnavigator.com.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2012). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*.
- Dawson, C. (2002). *Practical research methods: A user-friendly guide to mastering research*. <http://www.howtobooks.co.uk>
- Eshghinejad, S. (2016). EFL students' attitudes toward learning english language: The case study of Kashan University students. In *Cogent Education* (Vol. 3, Issue 1). Taylor and Francis Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2016.1236434>
- Eskey, D. E. (1970). *A New Technique for the Teaching of Feading to Advanced Students*. PUP DATE' Mar 70.
- Fan, Y.-C. (2009). *Implementing Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) in an EFL Context in Taiwan* [Dissertation]. University of Leicester.
- Fan, Y.-C. (2015). Fostering Learner Autonomy through a Socio-Cognitive Model of Reading Comprehension Instruction. *British Journal of Education, Society & Behavioural Science*, 9(2), 105–117. <https://doi.org/10.9734/bjesbs/2015/18161>
- Gani, S. A., Yusuf, Y. Q., & Susiani, R. (2016). Progressive outcomes of collaborative strategic reading to EFL learners. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 37(3), 144–149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.kjss.2016.08.004>
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scaffiddi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. In *Journal of*

- Educational Psychology* (Vol. 96, Issue 3, pp. 403–423).
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.3.403>
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *DOING QUALITATIVE RESEARCH IN EDUCATION SETTINGS*. State University of New York Press.
- Karimabadi, M., Khonamri, F., & Mahdavi, O. (2015). Investigating Iranian Students' Attitude toward Using Collaborative Strategic Reading in their Reading Course. *WALIA Journal*, 31(S3), 260–265.
<https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312499658>
- Khonamri, F., & Karimabadi, M. (2015). Collaborative Strategic Reading and Critical Reading Ability of Intermediate Iranian Learners. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(7), 1375. <https://doi.org/10.17507/tpls.0507.09>
- Klingner, J. K., & Vaughn, S. (1998). Using Collaborative Strategic Reading. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*, 30(6), 32–37.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/004005999803000607>
- Liang, L. A., & Dole, J. A. (2006). Help With Teaching Reading Comprehension: Comprehension Instructional Frameworks. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(8), 742–753. <https://doi.org/10.1598/rt.59.8.2>
- Marvasti, A. B. (2004). *Qualitative Research in Sociology* (D. Silverman, Ed.). SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Oakhill, Jane, Cain, Kate, Elbro, & Carsten. (2015). *UNDERSTANDING AND TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION: A handbook*. Routledge.
- Padwick, A. (2017). Attitudes towards English and varieties of English in globalising India - Hasglobalisation affected Indian identifications with 'Indian English' and generated new interest. *Research Gate*.
- Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension-Fostering and Comprehension-Monitoring Activities. *Cognition and Instruction*, 1(2), 117–175. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xci0102_1
- Paramawarti, L. (2013). EKSPERIMENTASI PEMBELAJARAN TEAM GAME TOURNAMENT DAN REALISTICS MATHEMATIC EDUCATION TERHADAP HASIL BELAJAR DITINJAU DARI KEMANDIRIAN SISWA. *Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta*.
- Pearson, P. D. (1982). *Literacy Design Collaborative View project Subtext View project*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.3945.2004>
- Rahman, I. F. (2015). *THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COLLABORATIVE STRATEGY READING (CSR) AND ITS EFFECTS ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION: Vol. I*.
- Rajaei, A., Talebi, S. H., & Abadikhah, S. (2020). The effects of collaborative and non-collaborative approaches to teaching reading strategies on iranian efl learners' reading comprehension and attitude toward reading. *Ikala*, 25(1).
<https://doi.org/10.17533/udea.ikala.v25n01a05>
- Riani, D. O. (2013). *COLLABORATIVE STRATEGIC READING IMPLEMENTATION TO IMPROVE STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION*. 1(2).
<http://journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE>
- Sugano, S. G. C., & Mamolo, L. A. (2021). The effects of teaching methodologies on students' attitude and motivation: A meta-analysis. In *International Journal*

of Instruction (Vol. 14, Issue 3, pp. 827–846). Gate Association for Teaching and Education. <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2021.14348a>