CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter discusses the literatures supporting the study. It includes reading comprehension, Collaborative Strategic Reading, and group formation.

2.1. Reading Comprehension

Reading comprehension is one of the important skills need to be mastered because our life is inseparable from the existence of text. This skill is particularly crucial in the area of education. The lack in reading comprehension skill may result in students struggling in many subjects. This complex cognitive process is quite challenging especially for EFL learners. They would not be able to make sense of the text if they fail to make connections or process the words, sentences, and ideas they read at the thinking level (Tankersley, 2003 as cited by Ziyaeemehr, 2012). McNamara asserts that reading comprehension is the ability to go beyond the words, to grasp the ideas and the relationships between ideas conveyed in a text (2007). It is a process of constructing meaning while the reader interacts with the text, resulting in the elaboration of a mental representationThe meaning constructed depends on the reader's prior knowledge about the language and also about the topic being discussed (Gani et al., 2016; Meneghetti et al., 2006; Zagoto, 2018)

Reading comprehension has several levels based on the difficulties (Davis, 1944; Day & Park, 2005; Mikulecky & Jeffries, 1996 in Komariah, Ace, Ramadhona, Silviyanti, 2015; Rahmat, 2017) and the role of metacognitive and strategic aspects of reading comprehension (Meneghetti et al., 2006). The table below shows the components of reading comprehension according to several researchers.

Table 2.1Components of Reading Comprehension

Mikulecky& Jeffries, 1996	Burns et. al, 1984	Meneghetti et al., 2006	Day and Park, 2005
Determining The Main Idea	Main Idea Question	Characters, Times And Events	Literal Comprehension
Guessing Word Meanings	Vocabulary Questions	. Inferences	Inference
Finding Detailed Information	Detail Questions	Events And Sequences	Reorganization
Making Inferences	Inference Questions	Syntactic Structure	Evaluation
	Sequence Questions	Connections Between Parts Of The Text	Personal Response
	Evaluation Questions		Prediction
	Creative Response Questions		

To sum up, reading comprehension is divided into three levels as follow:

1. Basic Comprehension

   Basic comprehension is the first thing reader need to master. Although considered shallow, this type of comprehension is important because it is the underlying skill needed and also prerequisite for higher level understanding. The term basic comprehension refers to literal comprehension or the ability to recall information and understand straight forward meaning that has been explicitly stated in a text such as facts, vocabulary, dates, times, and locations(Day & Park, 2005; Rahmat, 2017)and also the sequence of the text.

2. Higher Comprehension

   Higher comprehension requires the reader to process the literal information to find the main idea, making inference, drawing conclusion, identifying cause and effect relationship and making prediction.

3. Complex Comprehension

   Complex comprehension, the highest level of comprehension, involves not only cognitive but also metacognitive aspect. The reader have to be able to evaluate the content of the text, make judgment, decide the tone, mood, and also the writer's purpose, intent, or point of view

Unfortunately, there are many challenges in teaching reading comprehension. Twinning in Mendietaet. al (2015) stated that comprehension might fail because of a) failure to understand a word, sentence or how sentences relate to one another, b) failure tounderstand how the information fits together ina meaningful way (organization), and c) lack ofinterest and concentration. Some other challenges come from students' defective habits. Swan (1992) as cited by Rahmat (2017:24) stated that some students may read slowly and carefully,focusing to individual points, but without succeeding in getting a clear ideaof the overall meaning of a text. Some others do not always pay enough attention to detail. They may have a good idea ofthe general meaning of a text, but misunderstanding certain points. There might also some "imaginative readers". They know something about thesubject, or have strong opinion about it. They may understand the text in the light of theirown experience and viewpoints, so that they find it difficult to separate what the writersays from what they feel themselves. Other types of comprehension problem arise directlyfrom the text itself. Even when a student is familiar with all words and structures in apassage, complexities in the way the writer expresses himself may present obstacles toefficient comprehension.

Reading comprehension is indeed not an easy task especially for EFL students. They have to work twice as much as when they comprehend reading text in their native language. Thus, teachers need to help students by teaching them reading strategy. It is believed that the application of reading strategy is crucial factor determining the success in reading comprehension. By mastering reading strategy, students will become independent readers.

2.2. Collaborative Strategic Reading

The application of cognitive and metacognitive reading comprehension strategies in cooperative learning to improve reading comprehension has brought out new approach referred as Collaborative Strategic Reading (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998). There are two basic concepts underlying this approach. One of them is the idea that reading comprehension is the result of the active strategies the reader employs to enhance understanding and retention, and to circumvent comprehension failure (Palinscar & Brown, 1984:118) And the other basic concept underlying this approach is that :

> It can be assumed that academic learning is an active, generative and effortful process, that is-a mindful activity. Cooperative student teams are expected to increase participants' mindfulengagement in learning and thus to improve its outcomes(Salomon & Globerson, 1989)

In CSR, students monitor their understanding, choosing what to remember, and regulating strategy used. Furthermore, they use cognitive strategies such as previewing text, clarifying unknown words, determining main ideas, and generating questions and summarizing about what they have read. The teacher guides the students to work collaboratively with their peers to read and use comprehension strategies(Vaughn et al., 2013). The four comprehension strategies namely: 1) preview, 2) click and clunk, 3) get the gist, and 4) wrap up. The *preview* strategy which is done before the students read the whole text, aims to learn as much as the reader can about the text in a brief period of time. It is also used to activate prior knowledge about the topic as well as helping them to predict what they are going to learn. *Click and Clunk* are used many times while reading the text to monitor comprehension and identify breakdowns in understanding. *Click* refers to part of the text that is understood by the reader. On the contrary, *clunk* happens when reader comes across unfamiliar words or ideas that do not make sense resulting a breakdown in comprehension. Whenever readers experience clunk in word, concept, or ideas, they can figure it out by using fix up strategy which can be done by rereading the sentence without the word, rereading the sentence with the clunkand the sentences before or after theclunk looking for

clues, looking for a prefix or suffix in the word, or breaking the word apart and look forsmaller words you known. The third strategy, *get the gist*, teaches students to restate the most important point the text using their own words to make sure whether they understood what they have read. Students are asked to identify the most important person, place or thing in the text and tell about the most important ideas about them in their own words, leaving out the details. This way, students' memory and comprehension regarding the text can be improved. The final strategy in Collaborative Strategic Reading which aims to improve students' knowledge, understanding, and memory ofwhat was read is called *wrap up*. Students ask questions about significant information in the text they have read and other students answer them. They are also encouraged to make literal questions as well as questions that need higher-level thinking skill.

The strategies in Collaborative Strategic Reading will run smoothly if the all members are actively involved. To maximize students' involvement, each member of the group is assigned different role. Those roles can be rotated so each member experiences a variety of roles. In addition, students can perform more than one role at a time if necessary. There are 6 roles proposed. They are *leader, clunk expert, announcer, encourager, reporter, and time keeper.The leader* leads the group in implementing CSR. He or she decides what strategy to apply. *The clunk expert*utilizes clunkcards to remind the group of the stepsto follow when trying to find out adifficult word or concept. *Announcer* choose different member of the group to read or share their ideas. He or she makes sure everybody participate and only one person talks at a time. This will avoid free riders as well as student that is being too dominant. *Encourager* observes thegroup and provides feedback. He or sheseeks for behaviors to praise. The student encourages all group members have active participation in the discussion and help each other. He or she evaluates howwell the group has worked togetherand gives suggestions to improve the group work.*Reporter* reports themain ideas the group learned and shares the best question the grouphas formulated to the class. And the final role is the *Time Keeper*whose job is to set the timer and lets the group know when to more from one portion of CSR to another.

Several studies indicate positive outcome from the implementation of this approach. It does not only improve reading comprehension for students' with positive and negative attitudes (Babapour et al., 2019; Rosari & Mujiyanto, 2016; Zagoto, 2018) but also increase vocabulary (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998), enriching content area learning (Vaughn et al., 2001), improving critical reading (Khonamri & Karimabadi, 2015), improving motivation and participation (Riani, 2015) and also improving cooperative skills (Klingner & Vaughn, 1998). Yet, there were also studies resulted in negative outcome. Those studies did not prove that CSR was more effective than traditional approach (Fan, 2010; Zoghi et al., 2010).

A 14-week experimental study done by Fang (2009) on Taiwan's University students for instance, showed that although the experimental group outperformed the control group, the difference did not reach significant level. However, CSR had positive result on comprehension questions regarding getting the main idea and supporting details. Similar result was shown by Zoghi, Mustapha, & Rizan, (2010). The experimental study over for 6 week with 90 minutes treatment per week was done on 42 University level EFL freshmen in Iran. The quantitative data showed that there was no significant result on the effectiveness of modified CSR, but the qualitative data from the opinionaire indicated that students developed positive attitude toward the modified CSR. Unfortunately, the research design which did not provide control group may weaken the effect of the study.

On the opposite, compared to the studies yielded negative outcome, there were more studies resulting in positive ones. One of the quasi experimental studies of CSR yielded positive result was done by Karabuga and Kaya (2013). The study aimed in finding out the effect of CSR on 40 prep class university students' reading comprehension and reading related problems. The experimental group was given treatment using CSR as much as three hours reading classes per week. The result of the posttest illustrated that there was significant difference between the reading comprehension level of the experiment and the control group. Moreover the study found that the student liked the collaboration and group discussion because it made comprehension easier and more comfortable.

Furthermore, CSR helped students overcome vocabulary and reading related problems.

In light of the aforementioned elucidation, it can be concluded that CSR is promising reading instruction. However, the prevailing CSR studies were mostly done in the context of adult EFL learners. Whether the result can be generalized into Indonesian upper elementary students who are more familiar with the teacher-centered approach (Juniarta, 2017; Satriaman et al., 2019)is still questionable.

2.3. Group Formation

Despite the effectiveness of Collaborative Strategic Reading in fostering reading comprehension, the implementation of this approach is not without problem. The collaborative nature of this approach brings its own challenges. Putting several students into a group does not mean that they can work together. Thus teachers need to consider several options in how to form the group. It plays an important roleas it can significantly influence the process of collaborativelearningTeacher can either assign students into groups, give freedom to students to choose their own group members or mix the two methods (Chapman et al., 2006; Hilton & Phillips, 2010).

Student selected group is formed by students themselves with little or no interference from the teacher. In self-selected group, students tend to choose to form group with their friends they feel comfortable to work with or have experience working together. Teacher-assigned group on the other hand, does not allow students to choose their own group. Teacher has control in assigning students to certain group. There are several methods used by teacher in determining group composition: homogeneous, heterogeneous, simple random group, stratified group (Hilton & Phillips, 2010). Homogeneous group is formed with the goal of creating group with similar abilities or other characteristics. In contrast, the goal of heterogeneous group is to form balanced team consisting of students with different abilities,skills, majors, genders, or ethnicbackgrounds.Simple random group only considers the final group size.

Teacher assigned students randomly into groups without paying attention to students' ability or other characteristics. A final method of teacher-assigned group formation, stratified random assignment, combines heterogeneous group with simple random group. Thismethod of group formation involves creating groups of students stratified along certain dimension e.g., achievement, and then randomly choosing group members from each of these 'strata'.The purpose of this composition is to create groups that are balanced across the dimension usedto form the strata.In addition, the mixed method or hybrid approach is where teacher allow students to choose their own group member, and assign the remaining students randomly into groups (Chapman, et al, 2006). This approach serves as the compensation to the lack in student-selected group where there might be several students who are left behind without any group.

Although there were not many studies concerning group formation methods done in EFL setting, the existing studies have considered the different methods of group formation and how they impact group dynamics, outcome,(Chapman et al., 2006; Hassaskhah & Mozaffari, 2015) student's performance and satisfaction (Mahenthiran & Rouse, 2000). Not only from the teacher, some studies also investigate from the student's perspectives (Bacon et al., 1999; Hilton & Phillips, 2010; Leeming, 2014; Mitchell et al., 2004). Some studies were in favor of student-selected group formation method while some others argued that teacher-assigned group formation method was a better option.

Bacon et al. (1999) asked students to rate their best and worst group experiences. He found that students in self-selected group tend to have positive group experiences compared to random selection, and teacher-assigned group. Another study yielded similar result was conducted by Mahenthiran and Rouse (2000). The experimental study done on introductory management accounting course students proved that two pairs of friends who were randomly combined to make groups, developed more positive attitudes toward group work, thus lead to better group performance compared to groups where all four members were randomly assigned. This was shown by both the dependent variables (the satisfaction score and group project grade) which were significantly higher when

students paired than when randomly assigned to groups, at the 0.025 and 0.003 levels respectively.In line with previous studies, Chapman (2006) argued that the students in the self-selected groups communicate better with each other, were more enthusiastic about working together, took more interest in each other, and were more confident in other team members' abilities. They were also more likely than students in the randomly assigned groups to resolve conflict effectively and to be more comfortable asking others in their group for help. The students in the self-selected groups also indicated that it was less likely that group members would do others' work. In terms of attitude, students in the self-selected groups had a slightly more positive overall attitude toward their group experience than those in the randomly selected groups (means of 5.33 and 5.14, respectively).These students felt that the group process was more valuable, useful, and effective than their counterparts in the random selection groups. The positive results of the studies on student selected groups suggested that this was the best option for group formation.

In contrast, mixed method study done on students' preferences for teacher selected vs student selected grouping in science classes showed the shift in students' choice of grouping method. Before the pretest, students in honor class prefer to choose their own group member as they think that they know better than the teacher as who would be "good" group member because they know each other outside the class. However, students in lower ability classes oppose the idea of selecting their own group member. Since students tend to choose group member from the same ability, the low achieving students questioned the value of working with similar others. On the second stage of the research, there were shift in attitudes toward preferences on grouping method. Some students realized that 'good friend' is not always a 'good member of the group'. One student admitted that in student selected group, there were a lot of talking with friends while in teacher-assigned group there were nothing much to do except to work. So they preferred the teacher choose the group (Mitchell et al., 2004)

Similar study from student's perspective indicated that although being allowed to choose their own groups was the best option, some students claimed

that they improved more when the teacher chooses. In the context of the study where most students were relatively low in English proficiency, they were generally reasonably conscientious and the prevailing atmosphere in the classroom was to speak English when on task. This meant that when students did not know each other well they generally observed the norm and spoke English. When students knew each other well, although relaxation may have led to smoother conversation, some students admitted that with friends they would be less likely to make an effort to speak English in class(Leeming, 2014)

The more recent study was done to investigate the impact of group formation method(student-selected vs. teacher-assigned) on groupdynamics and group outcome in EFL creative writing. The study suggested that although participants' initial perception toward teacher-assigned group formation method seemed negative, during the actual group work the majority found their partners as satisfactorily cooperative which in turn led them to regard the outcome as quality work. On the other hand, many of student-selected groups did not accomplish group task -revision- and many of those who did exhibited lower quality than those of teacher-assigned groups is indicativeof the fact that despite the reported benefits of grouping based on pre-existing friendship, student-selected groupformation method poses certain problems. In terms of the outcome, groups formed based on the teacher's decision outperformed groups which were selected by thestudents. In other words, teacher-assigned groups were more successful at accomplishing the task of revision than theother group (Hassaskhah & Mozaffari, 2015)The results are consistent with previous study (Mitchell et al., 2004)which argued that in comparison with student-selected groups, teacher-assigned groups are more task oriented and thus fulfill group activities much more successfully.

The studies conducted suggest that there are some advantages as well as disadvantages from each methods of group formation. Teacher needs to carefully consider which method to choose since it affects group dynamics. Poorconsideration of grouping method can lead to a disaster in class. On the other hand, appropriate decision will determine group's success.