

IMPROVING THE READING COMPREHENSION OF THE SECOND GRADE STUDENTS OF MAN PANGKEP THROUGH TOPIC SENTENCE TRANSLATION ACTIVITY (TSTA)

Abdul Karim

Program Studi Diploma IV Kebidanan STIKES Graha Edukasi Makassar

Email: dulkarimpc2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Purpose: the purpose of this research was to study the influence or the effect of Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) in improving the reading comprehension of the second-grade students of MAN Pangkep. **Method:** the design of this research applied *quasi experimental research design* which involved one controlled group with a treatment and one common group with no treatment applied. The population of this research was 4 classes of science class, 2 classes of social class and 1 class of language class. Each class consisted of 29 to 33 students so the total population was about 231 students. The research technique sampling was purposive sampling technique involving 62 students as the sample. The instrument was in the form reading text test from which the result was analyzed by using *Statistical Package for Social Science* (SPSS) application. **Result:** There was a significant difference and improvement in reading comprehension specifically literal and inferential comprehension between the students who were taught by using TSTA. The findings also showed that t-test value (-5.94) in posttest was significant ($0,000 < 0.05$). **Conclusion:** this research concluded that TSTA strategy gave a significant effect to improve students' literal and inferential comprehension in MAN Pangkep, rather than general explanation. **Suggestion:** In applying the TSTA strategy it is important if the treatments are combined with some reading strategies and reading models even not all at once. This will help to both students and researcher to run the main strategy learning effectively.

Key Words: *Reading Comprehension, TSTA, Literal and Inferential Reading*

Background

Many students have difficulty with comprehension (Atwood 2007:12). Comprehension in this case becomes the concern of the reading itself to influence the students' learning outcome. Comprehension is dependent on three factors (Tankersley, 2005). The first factors is that the reader has knowledge about the structure of the text. The second one is that the reader is able to monitor and reflect on his or her own level of understanding while read the material. The last one is that the reader has adequate background in the content and vocabulary being presented. In other words, those factors are basic in learning reading comprehension. Those three factors shows us that the existence of comprehension in students' reading activity will strongly affects their learning outcomes especially for their reading score.

However the issue of reading that mostly talked is that most of students are unfamiliar with everyday terms that they find in a text and make them difficult to understand it (Tankersley 2005:5). This issue is supported by the finding of Asmawati (2014) that students have low skills in comprehending English text which makes them difficult to answer the question because they do not know what is the content of the text. Effective reading requires not only accurate reading skills, but also to be able to comprehend easily and automatically (Lyon, 2001).

Specifically, based on the researcher's experience and observation in MAN Pangkep that was committed on Februari 7th – 8th 2021, he found that the reading comprehension of the second year students was low. Most of them find it difficult to comprehend a given text. It can be seen from the score that they achieve (under 70 points) and when they cannot provide sufficient correct answers for questions of the text specifically for literal and interpretative/inferential question, and seem too difficult to write, portray or tell the teachers what the text is about. Thus, the present researcher intends to conduct his research in that school to see whether or not his strategy namely Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) can improve students' reading comprehension specifically for their literal and inferential comprehension. Reading comprehension is often discussed in terms of being a process involving the integration of decoding ability, vocabulary knowledge, prior knowledge of the topic considered, and relevant strategies to make sense of a text and understand it (Kintsch & Kintsch, 2005; Pressley & Block, 2002).

In relation to the researcher experiences in learning English in senior high school, the researcher believes that the teacher's notion of reading comprehension is very important to determine the most suitable strategies and methods for reading effectively. Traditionally students asked by the teachers to read a text and then answer questions of the text. One of the most general ways instructed by teachers is to translate word by word. Word-by-word readers often concentrate so hard on decoding that

they do not absorb the meaning of what they read (Tankersley 2005:5). Thus the traditional and conventional strategy above should be perfected.

One strategy that may perfect the text translation activity (TTC) is topic sentence translation activity (TSTA). It will show us how the students will be provided time and background knowledge to predict, interpret or estimate immediately what text is about and indirectly and naturally guided to understand and know supporting sentences of each paragraph.

Based on the ideas mentioned above, the researcher proposes this research under the title "Improving the Reading Comprehension of the Second Grade Students of MAN Pangkep through Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA)" in order to give a clear picture for making the reading task enjoyable and more efficient to the need of the students in searching the information. This research can be an additional source for any teachers in performing the reading subject in the class.

RESEARCH METHOD

The researcher applied a quasi-experimental design within pretest-posttest design. The design involved two groups – experimental and control group - to which the researcher administered a pretest, exposed a treatment, and administered a posttest. The success of the treatment was determined by comparing the result of the pretest and the posttest.

E	O1	X1	O2
CO	X2	O2	

The top line represents the experimental group and the second line represents the control group.

E : Experimental Group

C : Control Group

O1 : Pretest

O2 : Posttest

X1 : Treatment by using the schemata strategy

X2 : Treatment by using general (verbal)

explanation

(Gay,Mills, Airasian, 2006: 225).

There were two variables in this research namely dependent variable and independent variable. The dependent variable was the reading comprehension of the students while the independent variable was the Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) that was chosen as the strategy that was implemented in this research.

The population of this research was the second grade students of MAN Pangkep in 2013/2014 academic year which comprised of 7 classes, namely 4 classes of exact class, 2 classes of social class and 1 class of language class. Each class consisted of 29

to 33students so the total population was about 231 students.

The selected sample was based on cluster random sampling system. It was used to ensure that the chosen class was a mix ability class, so we could see that Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) could improve the reading comprehension of various students' ability. The researcher took two classes of exact class by considering that exact class possessed more population then other classes. Moreover in the prior observation it was found that exact class was the only class which was appropriate to be the sample to implement TSTA strategy, specifically concerning with their English capability. The class which was chosen are Two Exact 3 and Two Exact 4. There were 29 students in Two Exact 3 and 33 students in Two Exact 4. So the amount of sample was 62 students.

The researcher employed one kind of instruments namely test of reading text in the form of multiple choice. The test consisted of five sorts of narrative English reading textand 25 items of multiple choice to be answered by the students either in the pretest or post-test. The pretest was administered before providing students a strategy in the form of topic sentence translation activity while post-test was administered after providing students the strategy in the treatment to know whether those strategy improve the reading comprehension of the students or not. The teaching materials were written English text and researcher made own material based on *the School Level Curriculum (KTSP)*.

The data obtained from the test will be analyzed by using *Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS)* version 22.0 to find out the mean score of the students, the standard deviation of the students pretest/posttest, and the value of t-test to find out the significant difference between the result of the pretest and posttest.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the findings of this research and the discussion of the findings. The findings presented in this part consist of the data collected through reading test to find out the students literal and inferential comprehension of reading comprehension itself by implementing Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) strategy.

The findings of the research deal with students' reading comprehension in general and specifically cover literal and inferential comprehension of the students themselves in relation to the implementation of TSTA strategy to improve their literal and inferential comprehension.

1. Students' Reading Comprehension in General

This analysis describes detail explanation of the rate percentage of pre-test and post-

Classification	Score	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		F	P (%)	F	P (%)	F	P (%)	F	P (%)
Very Good	91-100	0	0	3	9.09	0	0	1	3.448
Good	75-90	1	3.03	24	72.7	2	6.9	7	24.14
Fair	61-74	10	30.3	4	12.1	6	20.7	7	24.14
Poor	51-60	6	18.2	2	6.06	9	31	10	34.48
Very Poor	0-50	16	48.5	0	0	12	41.4	4	13.79
Total		33	100	33	100	29	100	29	100

test, mean score and standard deviation of students' sample from MAN Pangkep. It can be seen in table 4.1 as follow:

Table 4.1 : The Students' Reading Comprehension Rate Frequency and Percentage of Experimental and Control Group in Pretest and Posttest

Table 4.1 shows the students' classification of score for both experimental and control group in pretest and posttest.

In experimental group, students' reading comprehension at pretest was classified as very poor with the mean score of 48.36. Increasingly, in the posttest, the mean score changed to 81.09 and it was classified as good. This means generally students' scores were improved. This was supported by the data above, where there were 3 students (9.09%) got very good score posttest than in the pretest no one could get such score. It also shown that the number of students who were classified as good was increasing from 1 (3.03%) to 24 students (72.7%). An increase also could be seen where there were only 2 students who were classified into poor as there were 6 students before classified into poor. Then, the most significant increase from the posttest result was in the very poor range score where there was no student classified than in the pretest there were 16 students (48.5%). By this analysis, we could say that most of the students experiencing increasing points in experimental group after the posttest.

For control group, there were also improvements. The mean score got better in the posttest with mean score 65.66 from 53.03 in the pretest, but it was classified as fair. It

could be seen from the data that even though there was a student (3.44%) got very high score in posttest, and there were 7 (24.14%) students in the range good, increased from only 6 (20.7%) students in the pretest but the number of students in the range poor increased from 9 (31%) to 10 (34.48%) student. Moreover there were 4 (13.79%) students still lagged behind in the range of very poor score.

However this class could be predicated as poor, since the number of students in the range good increase significantly from 2 (6.9%) to 7 (24.14%). In summary, by mean score, this group got slightly improved and by the score classification, most students got better even if they were still classified into fair.

From the analysis above, it could be concluded that both group got improved even if they were taught through different strategies. Experimental group which was taught by TSTA strategy as treatment got highly improved within 32 points in the mean score, while control group, which was taught by conventional methods and general explanation also got improved about 12 points in

	t-test	t-table	S/NS
Pretest	1.21	2.00	Non-Significant
Posttest	5.94	-2.00	Significant

mean score. Then, it could be stated that the superiority of TSTA strategy toward conventional methods is proven.

Table 4.2 : The Students' Reading Comprehension Mean Score and Standard Deviation

NO	GROUP	Mean Score		Standard Deviation	
		Pret est	Postt est	Pret est	Postt est
1	Experim ental	48.38	81.09	15.4	7.8

2	Control	53.0 3	65.66	14.8	13.5
---	---------	-----------	-------	------	------

Table 2 describes for experimental group in which the mean score of pretest was 48.38 with standard deviation was 15.4 while the mean score in posttest improved to 81.09 with standard deviation was 7.8. It indicated that the students' reading comprehension improved significantly after the given treatment by applying the TSTA Strategy toward reading passages in the post-test to enhance students' reading comprehension score. On the contrary, the mean score of control group in pretest was 53.03 with standard deviation is 14.8. Control group also made some progress but it was not as significant as experimental group. The mean score of control group in posttest is 65.66 with standard deviation was 13.5.

From the data above, the researcher concluded that the student's rate percentage in posttest was greater than the rate percentage in pretest. Experimental group score was also greater than control group score in terms of mean score and also greater on improvement. It means there was a significant improvement of students' reading comprehension after special treatment had been given toward the experimental group.

Table 4.3 : T-Test and T-Table Value

After finding the mean score and standard deviation, also students classification score, the researcher calculated whether or not both groups were in statistically significant difference at level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) 60. The result of the calculation in pretest showed that t-test value was 1.21 and t-table value was 2.00. In this case, t-test value was smaller than t-table value ($1.21 < 2.00$). It indicated that there was no significant difference between those mean scores that were acquired by both groups in pretest phase.

That pretest finding was different from the result found in posttest. The t-test value was -5.94 and t-table value was 2.00. In this condition, t-test value was still lower than t-table. It indicated that the difference between those mean scores from posttest was statistically significant. Therefore, the hypothesis of this research was accepted.

Now, we found that there was significant difference between experimental and control group in posttest. Even if control group's mean score also got improved, superiority of experimental group still could be seen. This was supported by the increasing number of mean score difference in the two groups from 4.65 in pretest up to 15.43 in posttest. Therefore, the research hypothesis, that TSTA strategy can improve students' reading comprehension, was proven.

2. Students' Literal Comprehension

a. Students' Literal Comprehension in Pretest

The results of the data analysis show that there was no significant difference between students' literal comprehension in the pretest of both experimental and control group, as indicated by the rate frequency and percentage of students' literal comprehension score that can be seen in table 4.4 as follow:

Table 4.4 : The Students' Literal Comprehension Rate Frequency and Percentage of Experimental and Control Group in Pretest

Range of Score	Classification	Experimental Literal		Control Literal	
		F	%	F	%
91-100	Very Good	0	0	0	0
75-90	Good	0	0	2	7
61-74	Fair	3	9	3	10
51-60	Poor	3	9	6	21
0-50	Very Poor	27	82	18	62
Total		33	100	29	100

Table 4.4 illustrates that from both experimental and control group in literal comprehension test there is no student categorized in very good level. However there were two students of control group categorized in good level (7 %). Meanwhile, there were 3 students categorized in fair level for both group (9 – 10%). In the poor level there were three students (9%) in experimental group and 6 students (21%) of control group. Finally there were 27 students (82%) of experimental group and 18 students (62%) of control group categorized in very poor level.

The mean score and standard deviation of students' literal comprehension of both group in the pretest also proved that there was no significant difference of literal

comprehension between the two groups. It can be seen in table 4.5 as follow:

Table 4.5 : The Students' Literal Comprehension Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Group in Pretest

Group Statistics				
	Kelas	N	Pre-Test	
			Mean	Std.Dev
Score	EXP	33	41.21	15.362
	CON	29	47.93	18.970

The table showed that the mean score of experimental group was 41.21 and the standard deviation was 15.362, meanwhile the mean score of control group was 47.93 and its' standard deviation was 18.970. It shows us that there was no a significant difference of both group for literal comprehension in the pretest.

b. Students' Literal Comprehension in Posttest

The results that we found in posttest in relation to the students' literal comprehension of both group is totally different. There was a significant difference between the two groups after the experimental group taught through TSTA strategy. It can be seen in the table 4.6 as follow:

Table 4.6 : The Students' Literal Comprehension Rate Frequency and Percentage of Experimental and Control Group in Posttest

Range of Score	Classification	Experimental Literal		Control Literal	
		F	%	F	%
91-100	Very Good	4	12	0	0
75-90	Good	22	67	8	28
61-74	Fair	5	15	10	34
51-60	Poor	2	6	3	10
0-50	Very Poor	0	0	8	28
Total		33	100	29	100

The table above explicitly showed that there was a significant improvement of experimental group which was taught through TSTA strategy. There were 4 students (12%) in experimental group categorized in very good level and no student in control group reached that level. There were 22 students (67%) in experimental group and only 8 students (28%) in control categorized in good level. There were 5

students (15%) of experimental group and 10 students (34%) of control group achieved fair level. In the poor level there 2 students (6%) of experimental group and 3 students of control group. However, there was no student of experimental group categorized in very poor level, while there were 8 students of control group categorized in the very poor level.

The mean score and standard deviation of students' literal comprehension of both group which was gained in posttest also proved the significant divergence of those groups that can be seen in table 4.7 as follow:

Table 4.7 : The Students' Literal Comprehension Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Group in Posttest

Group Statistics				
	Kelas	N	Post-Test	
			Mean	Std.Dev
Score	EXP	33	84.55	10.923
	CON	29	64.14	19.733

From the table above, it was shown that the mean score of experimental group was 84.55 and the standard deviation was 10.923, the mean score control group was 64.14 and its' standard deviation was 19.733.

The significance improvement of students' literal comprehension analysis can be seen in the table 4.8 as follow:

Table 4.8 : The Significance Improvement of Students' Literal Comprehension Analysis in Posttest

Variable	Probability Value	Level of Significance	T-Table	T-Value
Post-test	0.00	0.05	2.00	4.94

3. Students Inferential Comprehension

a. Students' Inferential Comprehension in Pretest

The results of data analysis in pretest showed that there was also no significance difference of students' inferential comprehension between experimental and control group. It can be seen in table 4.8 below:

Table 4.9 : The Students' Inferential Comprehension Rate Frequency and Percentage of Experimental and Control Group in Pretest

Range of Score	Classification	Experimental Infer		Control infer	
		F	%	F	%
91-100	Very Good	1	3	2	7
75-90	Good	2	6	2	7
61-74	Fair	7	21	6	21
51-60	Poor	10	30	9	31
0-50	Very Poor	13	39	10	34
Total		33	100	29	100

Table 4.9 above illustrated the non-significance difference of inferential comprehension between the two groups. There were 1 student (3%) of experimental group and 2 students (7%) of control group categorized in very good level, 2 students (6-7%) of both groups categorized in good level, 7 students and six students (21%) for each group categorized in fair level. In the poor level there were 10 students (31%) of experimental group and 9 (31%) students of control group, while in the very poor level there were 13 students (39%) of experimental group and 10 students (34%) of control group.

The mean score and standard deviation of the two groups in pretest also showed the non-significance difference of inferential comprehension of those groups that can be seen in table 4.9 below:

Table 4.10 : The Students' Inferential Comprehension Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Group in Pretest

Group Statistics				
	Kelas	N	Pre-Test	
			Mean	Std.Dev
Score	EXP	33	52.97	18.411
	CON	29	56.55	17.256

The table above showed us the mean score and standard

deviation of experimental and control group in pretest of inferential comprehension test. The mean score of experimental group was 52.97 and the standard deviation was 18.411. Meanwhile 56.55 for control group mean score and 17.256 for its' standard deviation.

b. Students' Inferential Comprehension in Posttest

The results of data analysis of inferential comprehension test between those two groups in posttest toughly showed a significance divergence. It can be seen in table 4.11 as follow:

Table 4.11 : The Students' Inferential Comprehension Rate Frequency and Percentage of Experimental and Control Group in Posttest

Range of Score	Classification	Experimental infer		Control infer	
		F	%	F	%
91-100	Very Good	4	12	1	3
75-90	Good	18	55	5	17
61-74	Fair	9	27	11	38
51-60	Poor	2	6	10	34
0-50	Very Poor	0	0	2	7
Total		33	100	29	100

From table 4.10 we found it that there were 4 students (12%) of experimental group categorized in very good level and only 1 students (3%) of control group categorized in very good level. In the good level there were 18 students (55%) of experimental group and 5 students (17%) of control group. Meanwhile, there were 9 students (27%) of experimental and 11 students (38%) of control group reached fair level, there were only 2 students (6%) of experimental group categorized in poor level and 10 students of control group categorized in poor level. Impressively, there was no students of experimental group categorized in very poor level but there were 2 students (7%) of control group categorized in that level.

The mean score and standard deviation of inferential comprehension test in the posttest between the two groups also strengthened the notion that there was a significant divergence between those groups. It can be seen in the table 4.12 below:

Table 4.12 : The Students' Inferential Comprehension Mean Score and Standard Deviation of Experimental and Control Group in Posttest

Group Statistics				
	Kel as	N	Post-Test	
			Me an	Std.D ev
Sco re	EX P	3 3	79. 21	9.522
	CO N	2 9	66. 59	13.87 3

Table 4.11 showed the mean score and the standard deviation of the two capered groups. From that table it can be seen that the mean score of experimental group was 79.21 and standard deviation was 9.522. Meanwhile, the mean score of control group was 66.59 and the standard deviation was 13.873.

The significance improvement of students' inferential analysis can be seen in the table 4.13 as follow:

Table 4.13 : The Significance Improvement of Students' Inferential comprehension Analysis in Posttet

Variabl e	Proba bility Value	Leve l of Signi fican ce	T- Table	T- Value
Post- test	0.00	0.05	2.00	4.12

Discussion

This section displays the interpretation of the findings based on the result of statistical analysis and the description of the data gained. It consists of three parts, namely students' reading comprehension in general, students' literal comprehension and students' inferential comprehension.

1. Students' Reading Comprehension in General

The previous findings on students' reading comprehension in general of the second grade students of

MAN Pangkep in pretest show that there was no significant difference of reading comprehension between the experimental class and the control class. It can be seen from the mean score gained by those class. It was 48.38 for experimental group and 53.03 for control group. The difference was only 4.65. However, the researcher remained continuing his study considering that there was still a gap between those class specifically there were 16 students of experimental group categorized in very poor level while in the control group there were only 12 students categorized in that level. Moreover, the salient purpose of this research was to see whether or not Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA) strategy improves students' reading comprehension significantly.

This kind of phenomena underlined the notion of Deutsch (2005:11) that EFL/ESL students lack the skill to cope with reading comprehension tests because they do not read effectively. Considering this gap, the present researcher applied TSTA strategy in his treatment to improve experimental group students reading comprehension. The treatment was conducted for 6 meetings.

In the first and the second meeting the researcher introduce the students what narrative text and TSTA strategy is, how to find and realize topic sentence and supporting details of one text immediately.

In the third and fourth meeting the students started to do translation on some given texts and specifically translate the topic sentence of the given text by implementing free translation method (See Appendix 5), and then implemented their understanding on their translation to answer the related questions of the text in the form of multiple choice.

In the fifth and sixth meeting the students remained doing translation activity to the topic sentence of the some texts and then to see whether or not it stimulates the students to also understand supporting details of the text, they were instructed to make summary of the text in Bahasa (See Appendix 5).

Finally, based on the findings in posttest, it could be stated that there was improvement on students' literal and inferential comprehension score after

they were equipped with translating skill. This statement was supported by the posttest mean score of experimental group which got improved by 15 points from 48.38 to 81.09. The T-test value is -5.94 with significance 0.000. This indicates that posttest result was significant ($0.000 < 0.05$).

For control group, there was also improvement showed in mean score, where it got improved by 2.9 points from 58.5 to 61.4. In terms of improvement, experimental group got higher than control group. The difference of posttest mean scores between experimental and control group was 14.50. In line with that, posttest t-test value showed there was significant difference between these two groups. Therefore, it could be concluded that the alternative hypothesis, TSTA strategy improves reading comprehension of students significantly, was accepted.

By comparing the result of both groups in posttest, especially in the mean score, the researcher concluded that there was improvement for experimental group which was taught how to apply TSTA strategy to deal with reading tests. However, there was also improvement for control group which was taught by various conventional methods, such as, word per word translation activity, paired discussion, etc. Nevertheless, the improvement for experimental group was more significant than control group.

As stated in the research significance, where the researcher tried to support and develop the translation activity, it was necessary to highlight again the translation theory by Stoddart (2007:17). He emphasized that translation activity could be a highly effective way of drawing learner's attention to the linguistic, semantic and pragmatic features of the target language. It means that it was strongly supporting students on building up their comprehension to passages they were reading. And this theory has been proved through the finding of this research from which students were able to elaborate their understanding on a text by answering questions of the text correctly.

In this research, another major thing which was completely necessary to be underlined was that,

students' understanding on topic sentence in a passage while reading. As had been stated before by Kaplan (1996) who defined that topic sentence appeared both at the beginning and at the end of paragraphs, students then in this research found it easier to recognize the existence of the topic sentence. Further, this research showed the effect of topic sentence in attracting students' attention leaving to read and understand the details of the given text to read.

2. Students' Literal Comprehension

The prior findings on students' literal comprehension of both experimental and control group in pretest showed that the control group possessed higher mean score than the experimental group namely 47.93 for control group and only 41.21 for experimental group. Thus, it was not deemed as a significant difference. However, inside the rate frequency and percentage analysis it was found that there were more students in experimental group categorized in very poor level namely 27 students while in the control group there were only 18 students. It showed us that there were more students in experimental group completely lack of literal comprehension, and the continuous study was necessary to be conducted.

During the treatment for experimental group, the present research found that most of students found it difficult to cope with reading comprehension tests because they could not recognize topic sentence of one text and spending too much times only to translate word by word the text. That is why, TSTA strategy was chosen to be implemented in the treatment.

Subsequently, the results of posttest was satisfied both group got increased on their literal comprehension. There were 4 students of experimental group categorized in very good level while before there was no students reached that level. Moreover, there was no more students categorized in the very poor level. Although in this case control group was also got it increased from 18 students in the very poor level to 8 students, the difference between those groups was decide to be significantly different. It was strengthen by the mean score gained by those groups namely 84.55 for experimental group and 64.14 for control group.

Based on the students' result obtained and stated in the findings above, the researcher used t-test in the inferential statistic through SPSS version 22.0 program to test the hypothesis. On statistic test result in the table 4.8, it showed that the probability value is higher than alpha ($0.00 < 0.05$). It

means that the hypothesis of this research is accepted. Moreover the T-table is also lower than the T-value ($2.00 < 4.12$), it also proved that there was a significance improvement after treating the students through TSTA strategy.

3. Students' Inferential Comprehension

The previous findings on students' inferential comprehension in this research, showed that there was no a significant difference between experimental and control group for their inferential comprehension in the pretest. In this case, both group achievement in the pretest was almost equal. A little difference was shown by the number of students who were categorized in very good level and very poor level. There was only one student of experimental group categorized in very good level and 13 students categorized in very poor level. Meanwhile, there were 2 students of control group categorized in very good level and only 10 students categorized in very poor level. However both group were categorized in below average in pretest.

However, based on the students' work in the posttest, it was found a different condition. The experimental group got increased whether from its' mean score or rate frequency and percentage score. 4 students of experimental group successfully reached very good level and no more of its' students stay down in very poor level. Meanwhile, there were still 2 students of control group left behind in very poor level, and one more student added the number of poor level from 9 to 10 students. The mean score also completed the significant divergence in the posttest of those groups. The mean score of experimental group was 79.21 and only 66.59 for control group.

In relation to the data obtained from inferential comprehension test which was shown in table 4.13, it can be seen that the probability value was higher than alpha ($0.05 > 0.00$). The data strengthen the assumption before that the hypothesis of this research was absolutely accepted. It also proven by the score of T-table and T-value described in table 4.13. T-table was lower than T-value. It showed than there was exactly a significant improvement of students inferential comprehension after experiencing several treatments through TSTA strategy.

In the process of conducting this research, the researcher also noticed several positive effects resulted by teaching students how to translate text in the form of free translation. Firstly, students enriched their vocabulary as they do translating. Students deal with new words and term founded in the

text they read. Secondly, the teaching of TSTA strategy developed students' grammar and structure understanding, since they translated the topic sentence by considering the tenses, pattern of the sentences and contextual meaning of the text as the requirements to produce a translation which touched the meaning and the intention of the topic sentence or the passage that they translated. And the last but not least, through this technique, the possibility of students' misunderstanding and misconception on a text also became smaller.

In this research, there were several weaknesses and also factors influencing the result examined by the researcher in the process of teaching and collecting the data. Firstly, before conducting the research, researchers had to make sure the validity and reliability of their research instruments. Secondly, it was also important to consider any possible factor that may influence the result, such as, students' prior ability (e.g. course experienced students and non-course experienced students), class condition, and vocabulary level of the text. These factors were subjective which means could not be counted in exact number but had their influence in the process of teaching English.

Conclusion

Based on the result of data analysis and findings in the previous chapter, the researcher put forward the following conclusions:

1. There was a significant difference and improvement of students' reading comprehension in general after displayed in several meetings through Topic Sentence Translation activity (TSTA). It was proven by the probability value gained by both experimental group and control group (0.00) in posttest was lower than the level of significance at t-table (0.05). Furthermore, T-value of those groups in posttest was also lower than t-table (-5.94 < -2.00). It indicated that TSTA improved students' reading comprehension significantly.
2. There was a significant improvement of students' literal comprehension who are taught by implementing Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA). It was supported by the findings before that t-table was lower than t-value (2.00 < 4.94). In deeper analysis the level of significance score was also lower than the probability value (0.00 < 0.05), which also emphasizes the significance improvement achieved by experimental groups.
3. There was a significant improvement of students' inferential comprehension who are taught by implementing Topic Sentence Translation Activity (TSTA). It was supported by the findings before that t-table was lower than t-value (2.00 < 4.12). In deeper analysis the level of significance score was also lower than the probability value (0.00 < 0.05), which also emphasizes the significance improvement achieved by experimental groups.

There was a significant difference and improvement in reading comprehension specifically literal and inferential comprehension between the students who were taught by using TSTA strategy and the students who were taught by using general explanation. The positive effect could be seen and felt to the students who were able to use TSTA strategy. Furthermore, the findings of the research answered both the major and the minor research questions of this research. Both literal and inferential comprehension of the students got increased. It was proven by the increasing of mean score in post-test. The students' mean score of experimental class which was 81.09, higher than control class with only 65.66. The findings also showed that t-test value (-5.94) in posttest was significant (0,000 < 0.05). Then, it could be concluded that TSTA strategy gave a significant effect to improve students' literal and inferential

comprehension in MAN Pangkep, rather than general explanation which resulted in mediocre learning process.

Suggestion

Considering the conclusion above, the researcher further states some suggestion as follows:

1. In applying the TSTA strategy it is important if the treatments are combined with some reading strategies and reading models even not all at once. This will help to both students and researcher to run the main strategy learning effectively.
2. Students deal with meta-cognitive awareness and cognitive process as they read and these affect their comprehension ability. These factors must be considered by the researcher especially in applying TSTA strategy.
3. The teacher, who teaches TSTA strategy, has to stimulate the students to expose all thing and information they know about the reading texts. This is the key point to ensure the successfulness of the strategy.
4. In applying TSTA strategy, the teacher has to consider the time management carefully. Each section of this strategy has specified time to spend, in order that the students have an adequate time to finish all instruction and questions in time.
5. The teacher has to establish a good relation with all the students in class firmly to create a good atmosphere in learning and reinforce them with a good motivation to get success.

REFERENCE

- Agudelo, Sandra, Calderon. 2007. *How to Improve Sixth Graders' Reading Comprehension through the Skimming Technique*. Published Thesis: Institucion Educativa Distrital Venecia, Colombia.
- Alderson, J. Charles. 2000. *Reading Assessing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Asmawati, Andi. 2014. *The Effectiveness of Skimming – Scanning Strategy in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension at the Second Grade SMK Darussalam Makassar*. Unpublished Thesis: Post Graduate of: UNM.
- Atwood, Sonja. 2007. *Teaching Comprehension Strategies in the Inclusive Elementary Classroom*. Published Thesis: Flinders University.
- Cooper, J. D., Warncke, E. W., Ramstad, P. A., & Shipman, D. A. 1979. *The What and How of Reading Instruction*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill.

- Deutsch, Nellie. 2005. *ESL/EFL Lack the Skills to Cope with Reading Comprehension Text*. Israel: University of Phoenix Publisher.
- Gay, Mills, Airasian. (2006). *Education Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications*. New Jersey: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Guangye, Zhao. 1997. *Teaching English in China*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Hamra, Arifuddin. 2003. *The Reading Attitude, Interest, and Habit in Reading Comprehension of EFL Students of Universitas Negeri Makassar*. Unpublished Dissertation, Makassar: PPs UNHAS.
- Hanafi, Nurachman. 1986. *Teori dan Seni Menerjemahkan*. Ende, Flores: Nusa Indah.
- Hasyim. 2011. *Increasing Students' Reading Comprehension through Cognitive Strategies of the 10th Grade Students of SMA Negeri 1 Tompobulu*. Unpublished Thesis: State University of Makassar.
- Jabu, Baso. 2008. *English Language Testing*. Makassar: Badan Penerbit UNM
- Kaplan, R. 1966. *Cultural Thought Patterns in Inter-Cultural Education*. Landmark Essay on ESL Writing.
- Khodra, M.L., Widyantoro, D.H., Azis, E.A., & Trilaksono, B.R., *Free Model of Sentence Classifier for Topic Sentences*. ... J. ICT. 2011.
- Kintsch, W., & Kintsch, E. (2005). Comprehension. In S. G. Paris & S. A. Stahl (Eds.), *Children's reading: Comprehension and assessment* (pp. 71-92). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Lyons, C.A. & Pinnell, G. S. 2001. *Systems for Change in Literacy Education: A guide to Professional Development*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.
- Mansyur. (2002). *Developing Reading Comprehension ability of the second student's of SMU Negeri 1 Wonomulyo through Pairwork*. Thesis at FBS Makassar State University
- McNamara, Danielle S & Kendeou Panayiota. 2011. *Translation Advances in Reading Comprehension Research to Educational Practice*. United States: International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education (IEJEE).
- Meltzer, D.E. 2002. *The Relationship Between Mathematics Preparation and Conceptual Learning Gains in Phisycs*. American Journal of Physics. 70(7).
- Muchtar, N. 2008. *The correlation between Reading Attitude and Comprehension of 2nd Semester Students of English Department at State University of Makassar*. Unpublished Thesis: Post Graduate of UNM
- Newmark, Peter. 1981. *Approaches to Translation*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Setyorini, Ajeng. 2008. *Teaching Paragraph Writing Through Interactive and Process Aproaches*. Unpublished Desertation, Semarang: IKIP PGRI Semarang.
- Smith, C.G. 2008. *Braddock Revisited: The Frequency and Placement of Topic Sentences in Academic Writing*. DOAJ. The Reading Matrix .
- Smith, R J. 1980. *Teaching Children to read*. New York: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Stoddart. J. 2007. *Teaching through Translation*. The Journal No.11. Online. (<http://www.pt.britishcouncil.org/journal/j1106js.htm>). Retrieved on March 24th 2014).
- Sukmawati. 2014. *The Correlation Between Cognitive Test-Taking Strategies and Achievement in Toefl Reading Comprehension of The Students Of English Department at State University of Makassar*. Unpublished Thesis: Post Graduate of UNM.
- Tankersley, Karen. 2005. *The Struggling Reader*. Online Pdf (<http://www.literacyconnects.org/img/2013/03/The-Struggling-Reader.pdf>). Retrieved on March 10th 2015).
- Westwood, Peter. 2008. *What Teachers Need to Know about Writing and Reading Difficulties*. Australia: Acer Press.
- Widyamartajaya, A. 1989. *Seni Menerjemahkan*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius