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ABSTRACT


This research compared the use of Thinking Aloud Pair Problem Solving (TAPPS) and Problem Posing Model (PPM) in teaching reading at the eleventh grade students of SMA IT Nur Hidayah, Sukoharjo. The objectives of the research are to investigate: (1) whether there is a significant difference in the achievement of reading comprehension between students taught using TAPPS and students taught using PPM; and (2) whether TAPPS is more effective to teach reading than PPM. The method used in this research is quantitative through experimental approach in order to analyze the data. The research was conducted in April – May 2017. The population of the research is the eleventh grade students of SMA IT Nur Hidayah, Sukoharjo which consists of 148 students. The sample consists of 2 classes in which each class consists of 24 students. The sample is XI IPA 1 as the experimental group and XI IPA 3 as the control group. The data are collected by conducting reading test and analyzed by using t-test formula. The result of the research shows that: (1) there is a significant difference between students’ reading comprehension taught using TAPPS and those taught using PPM; (2) TAPPS is more effective than PPM to teach reading for SMA School students.
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