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Abstract

This research was to study the third year students’ ability at higher level thinking in reading comprehension at English Department of Bung Hatta University. In this research, the population was the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University. The number of population was 112 students. The researcher used cluster random sampling technique to get representative sample. The instrumentation used to get the data was reading test in the form of multiple choice of critical thinking. The researcher used Split-Half method and Pearson Product Moment Formula. After that, the result of correlation coefficient was analyzed by using Spearman-Brown formula. The result of this study showed that in general the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University had ability to think critically in reading comprehension especially in higher level of thinking skill (analysis level, synthesis level and evaluation level). Students can comprehend the text. It was found 5 students (20,8%) had high ability, 16 students (66,7%) had moderate ability and 3 students (12,5%) had low ability. At analysis level, it was found 5 students (20,8) had high ability, 13 students (54,2%) had moderate ability and 6 students (25%) had low ability. At synthesis level, it was found 5 students (20,8%) had high ability, 16 students (66,7%) had moderate ability, and 3 students (12,5%) had low ability. At evaluation level, it was found 3 students (12,5%) had high ability, 17 students (70,84%) had moderate ability and 4 students (16,7%) had low ability.
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Introduction

Reading is very important in our life. Through reading people can enrich their experience and broaden their knowledge. Generally, reading has many purposes, such as to improve our knowledge, to get available information, to overcome the problem, to get new ideas and to understand what the readers have read. If they can
read well, it supports to inform them as the receiver of information. Thus, it also improves your general skill as good readers. Harmer (2008:99) provides that students more understand what they read, the more they read, the better they get it. It means that, they get much information that improve their ability in reading process, so they are helped to get as much pleasure and information from reading as possible.

Paul and Elder (2008) declare that the way of thinking can help students to build their thinking skills. That is critical thinking. Critical thinking is, in short, self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. It presupposes assent to rigorous standards of excellence and mindful command of their use. It entails effective communication and problem solving abilities and a commitment to overcome our native egocentrism and sociocentrism.

When the researcher interviewed English lecturers at English Department the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Bung Hatta University Padang, she found that, there were some problems faced by students in critical thinking in reading comprehension. First, the students had less reading habit, and it might be affected by developments in technology and information such as internet and games. Thus, they prefered to use technology rather than reading book. Second, they could not stand reading long, because their lack of understanding of the existing vocabulary on reading. Thus, they felt bored in learning process. Third, they had lack of practice, they did not know which steps to take next in order to improve their critical thinking skills.

The purpose of this research was to describe the third year students’ ability at higher level thinking in reading comprehension at English Department of Bung Hatta University.

**Research Method**

The researcher used descriptive research in this research. Furthermore, Gay (1987) defines the descriptive research involves collecting data in order to test hypotheses or to answer
questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study.

According to Gay (1987), the population is the group to which the researcher would like the result of the study to be generalized. The population of this research was the third year students of English Department of FKIP Bung Hatta University, who registered in academic year 2012/2013. The researcher chose them because the members of population had learned about critical thinking in reading comprehension in Reading IV. The total number of the population was 112 students. They were divided into some classes.

The researcher used sample to study because the members of population were large. Sampling is the act, process, or technique of selecting a representative part of a population for the purpose of determining the characteristics of the whole population. For descriptive research, a sample of 10% of the population is considered minimum (Gay, 1987). It means that more than 10% is received. Finally the researcher took one class as a sample.

In this research, the researcher used cluster random sampling to select the sample. Gay (1987) says that cluster random sampling is a sampling technique in which the sample in group and not individual is randomly selected and all members selected group have similar characteristics. It means that the students have studied with the same material, same syllabus, by the same lecturer, and they are homogeneous.

In this research, the instrument used to collect the data was reading test. This test was constructed in the form of multiple-choice, which consisted of 30 items. It consisted of five texts, and each had six questions. The researcher gave 1 point for each correct answer and 0 for each incorrect answer. Therefore, the minimum score that the students get was 0 and the maximum score would be 30. The researcher had allocated 60 minutes for students to read and answered all of the questions from the test.

Reliability is the degree to which a test consistently measures
whatever it is measuring (Gay, 1987:135). To find out the reliability, split-half method was used. By this method, the test items were divided into odd and even items. To find out the correlation coefficient of the two groups of score, the researcher used Pearson Product Moment formula. The formula suggested by Arikunto (2012:87) is as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum x'y' - (\sum x' \sum y')}{\sqrt{[N \sum x'^2 - (\sum x')^2][N \sum y'^2 - (\sum y')^2]}}$$

After that, the correlation coefficient was analyzed by using Spearman-Brown formula suggested by Gay (1987:139) to know the reliability coefficient of the whole test:

$$r_{li} = \frac{2r_{xy}}{1 + r_{xy}}$$

Based on the result of analysis the data, the calculated coefficient correlation of text critically was 0.72. It was categorized high correlation.

In gathering the data, there are some steps that the researcher used, they are:

- The researcher read and checked the students’ answer sheet one by one
- The researcher gave score 1 for the correct answer and 0 for the wrong answer.
- The researcher counted the total score of each student.

In analyzing data, Mean (M) and Standard Deviation (SD) were used to measure the students’ ability in critical thinking in reading comprehension. The score was analyzed by the researcher to know how many students got high, moderate, or low ability.

The researcher used the following steps to analyze the data:


$$M = \frac{\sum x}{N}$$

b. Calculating the standard deviation by using the formula that suggested by Arikunto (2012:299):

$$SD = \sqrt{\frac{\sum X^2}{N} - \left(\frac{\sum X}{N}\right)^2}$$

c. Classifying the students’ ability into high, moderate, and low ability based on the criteria below:
>M + 1SD = High
= M – 1SD → M + 1SD = Moderate
> M – 1SD = Low
d. Calculating the percentage of the students who got high, moderate, and low ability by using the formula (Arikunto, 2009: 262):

\[ P = \frac{R}{T} \times 100\% \]

Findings and Discussions

Findings

1. Students’ Ability at Higher Level Thinking in Reading Comprehension

To measure the students’ ability at higher level thinking in reading comprehension, the researcher counted the students’ scores. Based on the result of data analysis, she found that the lowest score was 15 and the highest was 28, the mean was 20.37 for mean and standard deviation was 4.33. Students’ ability was categorized as high if their score were higher than 24.7, and it was categorized as moderate if their score were in range of 16.04 to 24.7, and it was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 16.04. The researcher calculated the percentage of students’ who were included in each of those three groups.

The Classification of Students’ Ability at Higher Level Thinking in Reading Comprehension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Analysis Level

To measure the students’ ability in reading comprehension at analysis level, the researcher counted the students’ scores. The result of data analysis demonstrated that the lowest score was 4, the highest was 10, the mean was 6.92 and standard deviation was 1.77. Students’ ability was categorized as high if their score were higher than 8.69, and it was categorized as moderate if their score were in range of 5.15 to 8.69 and it was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 5.15. The researcher calculated the percentage of students’
who were included in each of those three groups.

**The Classification of Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Analysis Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Synthesis Level

To measure the students’ ability in reading comprehension at synthesis level, the researcher counted the students’ score. Based on the result of data analysis, it was found that the lowest score was 3, the highest was 9, the mean was 6.70 and standard deviation was 1.79. Students’ ability was categorized as high if their score were higher than 8.49, and it was categorized as moderate if their score were in range of 4.91 to 8.49, and it was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 4.91. The researcher calculated the percentage of students’ who were included in each of those three groups.

**The Classification of Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Synthesis Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Evaluation Level

To measure the students’ ability in reading comprehension at evaluation level, the researcher counted the students’ scores. The result of data analysis revealed that the lowest score was 3, the highest was 9, the mean was 6.75, and standard deviation was 1.51. Students’ ability was categorized as high if their score were higher than 8.26, and it was categorized as moderate if the score were in range of 5.24 to 8.26, and it was categorized as low if their scores were lower than 5.24. The researcher calculated the percentage of students’ who were included in each of those three groups.
The Classification of Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Evaluation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussions**

As already discussed previously, in general the finding of this study was that the students’ ability at higher level thinking in reading comprehension (analysis level, synthesis level and evaluation level) was moderate. It is indicated by the fact that majority of students 66.7% had moderate ability in critical thinking in reading comprehension.

1. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Analysis Level

One of the findings of this study was that the students had moderate ability in reading comprehension at analysis level. This finding indicated that students still had difficulties in reading comprehension at analysis level. Theoretically to be able to analyze critical thinking in reading comprehension, the students should have concluded what the problem or information about. For example, the answer of question, ‘According to the text, where do the children get the sense of unity easily?’ is ‘in formal school’. In fact, this question could only be answered correctly by 15 out of 24 students.

Similarly, question, ‘Who are Federico and Sam, according to the text above?’ should be answered with ‘They are fortune men’. In fact, this question could be answered correctly by 15 out of 24 students.

2. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Synthesis Level

Another finding of this study was that the students had moderate ability in reading comprehension at synthesis level. This finding indicated that students still had difficulties in reading comprehension at synthesis level. For example, the answer of questions, ‘After reading the review, how would you judge this film?’ is ‘amazing’. In fact, this question could only be answered correctly by 10 out of 24 students. Similarly
question, “What is the writer’s argument on a sufficient number of dust bins?” should be answered with “They make school environment neat”. In fact, this question could only be answered correctly by 12 out of 24 students.

3. Students’ Ability in Reading Comprehension at Evaluation Level

The last finding of this study was that the students had moderate ability in reading comprehension at evaluation level. This finding indicated that students still had difficulties in reading comprehension at evaluation level. For example, the answer of question, ”What does the writer suggest to the readers?” is ”Make your school become clean with dust bins.” In fact, the researcher found only 11 out of 24 students could answer correctly. Similarly, question, “The purpose of the text is?” should be answered with “To review a film for the readers”. In fact, this question could be answered correctly by 13 out of 24 students.

Conclusions

Based on findings as already discussed in the previous chapter, the researcher drew the following conclusions:

1. In general, the ability of the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University in higher level thinking in reading comprehension was moderate. It was indicated by the fact that 66.7% students possessed moderate ability.

2. The ability of the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University in reading comprehension at analysis level was moderate. It was indicated by the fact that ability of most students (54.2%) was categorized as moderate one.

3. The ability of the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University in reading comprehension at synthesis level was moderate. It was indicated by the fact that ability of most students
(66.7%) was categorized as moderate one.

4. The ability of the third year students of English Department of Bung Hatta University in reading comprehension evaluation level was moderate. It was indicated by the fact that ability of most students (70.84%) was categorized as moderate ability.
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