



Improving the Reading Comprehension Using Jigsaw Model at the Grade VII Students of SMP Negeri 2 Samaturu

AUTHORS INFO

Agus Nasir
Universitas Sembilanbelas November Kolaka
agusnasir12@gmail.com
+6281341720210

ARTICLE INFO

ISSN: 2502-6909
Vol. 2, No. 1, June 2017
URL: <http://usnsj.com/index.php/JEE/article/view/2.1.18-24>

© 2017 JEE All rights reserved

Abstract

This study aimed to describe the increase in reading comprehension through a jigsaw model at the seventh grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu. The design of the study is a Classroom Action Research. This research data was process data and action outcome that obtained through observation, tests, and interviews. The data sources of this study were teachers and students. The results showed that the jigsaw model can improve the quality of learning in reading comprehension both in the aspect of learning outcomes as well as aspects of the learning process. In the aspect of the test results as well as aspects of the learning process, both showed significant improvement. In the first cycle of the obtained value of the test results of students were still more at the enough category, i.e. 53.13% of the total number of students. Similarly to aspects of the learning process, in the first cycle, only 12, or 37.5% of students who obtained excellent category. In the second cycle, an increase was in both aspects. For aspects of the test results, the majority of students were on the obtained value of the category of Good and Very Good, i.e. 87.5% of the total number of students. As for the aspects of the learning process, i.e. 32 or 100% of students gained excellent category. Thereby, it can be concluded that the jigsaw model can improve the students' reading comprehension for the students of grade VII SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu.

Keywords: reading comprehension, jigsaw model, cooperative learning

A. Introduction

In the world of education, reading is very important because it determines the quality and success of a person in his study. Reading is one of the aspects of language skills that are taught in school such as Senior School (Sekolah Menengah Pertama). It was stated in the Content Standard of Indonesian Subject for SMP / MTs, that the scope of the study includes linguistic components and the literary ability covering aspects of listening, speaking, reading, and writing (DEPDIKNAS, 2006).

In the Content Standard for Indonesian Subject for SMP / MTs, there are twelve aspects of reading competency standards that must be mastered by students. All aspects of the reading competency standards emphasize the student's ability to understand the reading text. This shows that after joining the reading subject, it is expected that students have adequate reading

skills. However, the expectation that the students have adequate reading skills are still not yet been achieved.

According to Sudaryanto (2001), Indonesian language learning which covers the four language skills, i.e. listening skills or listening, speaking, reading, and writing is still not succeed. In connection with the Sudaryanto's statement, a result of research suggested by Samsuri (2002) concluded that the reading comprehension of students in the aspect of understanding the meaning of words, the meaning of the sentence, the theme of the discourse and infer the content of the discourse has not yet reached complete learn because it still falls below the minimum 65 percent. It shows that the reading comprehension of students is still low.

The problem of low reading skills of the students is also expressed by Indonesian teacher class VII SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu in an unofficial conversation with the author. According to him, students of class VII SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu have low ability to read. Students' low ability in reading comprehension seen from the test results of students and tasks assigned. In general, students were only able to express things that are written and have not been able to interpret the content of reading. Most of the students have not been able to determine the main idea of a paragraph and still have difficulty distinguishing between facts and opinions contained in the text reading. In addition, there are still some students who struggle to revive the content of reading or commenting on the content of reading.

Based on informal observations by the authors of the study conducted by the Indonesian SMP Negeri 2 Samaturu teachers, authors can conclude that the main causes of low reading skills and unsuccessful students learning Indonesian in general is the use of learning strategies that are less precise. In general, teachers teach by lecture method alone. In the learning, the teacher ignores the process (of learning). In the learning, the teacher ignores the process (of learning). The learning process that is carried out the teacher makes students passive and simply follow the teacher's instructions.

Learning reading comprehension should shift to learning more student-centered, based on constructivism, and focus on the communicative approach and student interaction. Teachers should enable students in the learning process. In an effort to make learning activities more effective reading comprehension skills required application of appropriate learning strategies. One of the learning strategies that are considered to resolve the issue is the jigsaw strategy. Through the jigsaw strategy, such learning can be realized. Lie (2002) states that the jigsaw strategy can be used in learning to read, write, listen, or speak.

By applying the jigsaw model in learning to read multidirectional interaction takes place, i.e. the interaction between teachers and students, and the interaction between students and students. Students can freely work together and share knowledge in the home group, to a group of experts, and then back to the original group to refine and consolidate the results of the discussion. Higher ability students assist low-ability students that knowledge is deepening. Conversely, low ability of students get the opportunity to learn or be guided by the higher ability students. This was in line with the statement Arends (in Ratumanan, 2002) that learning through cooperative method is very beneficial for students who are capable of higher and for lower ability students.

Based on description above, this research is conducted with the aim of describing the improvement of reading comprehension through jigsaw model for the seventh grade students of SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu.

B. Literature review

1. Reading comprehension

Reading comprehension is a reading activity whose main objective is to understand the readings accurately and quickly. In reading comprehension, the understanding of the content of discourse becomes essential. According Kamijan (1996), there are a number of aspects that required the reader in reading comprehension, as follows: (1) have a lot of vocabulary; (2) have the ability to interpret the meaning of words, phrases, sentences, and discourse; (3) has the ability to capture the main ideas and supporting ideas; (4) has the ability to capture the outline of readings and details; (5) has the ability to capture the sequence of events in the passage.

In general, reading comprehension program has several goals, which enable the students to: (1) finding the main idea of a sentence, paragraph, or discourse; (2) selecting the key points; (3) following the instructions; (4) determine the organization of reading materials; (5) find visual imagery and other imagery from the text; (6) draw conclusions; (7) guessed the meaning and predicted impacts and conclusions; (8) summarizes what has been read; (9) distinguish fact

from opinion; (10) obtaining information from a variety of special facilities, such as encyclopedias, atlases, maps (Greene & Patty in Tarigan, 1994).

According to Nurhadi (1989), there are three levels of proficiency in reading comprehension, namely (1) the ability to read literal, (2) the ability of critical reading, and (3) the ability of creative reading. To improve the ability to read, everyone needs to master all three levels of reading it.

Literal reading ability level is the lowest level. The reader is only able to recognize and capture the information contained explicitly in the passage. The second level of reading comprehension is the ability to read critically. Critical reading skills is the ability to process the reader critically reading material to find the whole meaning of reading material, either explicit or implicit meaning, through the stage recognize, understand, analyze, synthesize, and judging. Furthermore, the highest level of literacy is the ability to read a person's creative. Someone who has the ability to read not only captures creatively explicit and implicit meaning from the text, but also creatively apply the results of reading in everyday life.

Someone is reading creative when he is able to bring changes in attitudes and behavior after the reading process is complete. The reader is also expected to assess critically and creatively reading material and provide feedback in the form of criticism feedback, direct assessment, or convert it into another form. For example, someone is reading an article. After that, he can make a comment or an article containing criticism of disapproval of the ideas expressed by the author. Such reading was classified as creative reading activities.

2. Assessment in Reading Activities

In learning to read, the assessment can be done through the assessment process and assessment of results. Both types of these assessments will be described below.

a. The assessment of the process in Reading activities

In addition to learning outcomes, assessment of learning is also directed to the learning process. Assessment process is a process of collecting data or information on learning activities, both concerning the difficulties faced by students and on students' progress on an ongoing basis as a form of recording on the development of student learning (Herman et al., 1992).

The purpose of the assessment of process are (1) to understand the problems and developmental levels of learners in mastering the learning content, (2) finding the data analysis that can be used as the basis for solving the problem of learners, (3) learn to solve problems, maintain, and develop the quality of the learning process.

In the perspective of learning to read, the effectiveness of learning to read is not only focused on the achievement of the results of learning to read. The learning process has also become an important focus in the assessment. The focus of learning to read does not only deal with what should be controlled by the student, but also how students learn. Thus the assessment of the reading process as important as the assessment of learning

b. The assessment of result in Reading activities

The meaning of ratings result in learning to read is an assessment of the student's ability to understand the information contained in the text. Activity of understanding information is the cognitive activity. Therefore the measured cognitive ability, the right measuring instrument used was a test. In the cognitive domain of Bloom's Taxonomy is a good alternative to a foundation in the manufacture of test results of learning to read.

According to Nurgiyantoro (2001), activity-understand information on the reading material as a cognitive activity can be done or made in stages, starting from the memory (C1) up to the level of evaluation (C6).

3. Definition of Jigsaw Model

Jigsaw learning model is a model of learning that gives students the chance to share with others, to teach and be taught by fellow students is an important part in the process of continuous learning and socialization (Anam, 2000).

Jigsaw learning model is designed to increase students' sense of responsibility towards their own learning and the learning of others (Ratumanan, 2002). Students not only learn the material given, but they must also be ready to give and teach the material to the group

members. Thus, students are dependent on each other and must work together cooperatively to study the assigned material.

From the above, it can be concluded that the jigsaw strategy is cooperative learning strategies that provide opportunities for students to share with others, to teach and be taught by a fellow student.

As one type of cooperative learning, jigsaw strategy has the characteristics and purposes no different from cooperative learning. Some characteristics of cooperative learning proposed by Ratumanan (2002), are as follows.

- a) The classes are divided into small groups. Members of the group consisted of students with varying abilities, namely high, medium, and low.
- b) If it is possible in the formation of the group also noted differences in ethnicity, culture, gender, socioeconomic background, and so on.
- c) Students learn in a cooperative group to master academic material. The task of the group is the group of their friends to help each other to achieve mastery learning.
- d) The award system is more oriented to groups rather than individuals.

According to Slavin (1997), cooperative learning activities can play many roles in the lesson. In one particular subject, cooperative learning can be used for three different purposes. For example, in a particular lesson the students work as groups that are trying to find something (e.g., mutual help reveal the principles of sound through observation and activity using a water bottle). After hours of lesson are complete, students can work as discussion groups. Finally, students have opportunities to work together to ensure that all members of the group have mastered everything about these subjects in preparation for the quiz, work in a group learning format. In the other scenario, cooperative groups can be used to solve a complex problem. Further, Arends & I. Richard (1997) emphasized that the cooperative learning model was developed to achieve three objectives, namely:

- a) Academic achievement. Cooperative learning is very beneficial for students who have high ability and low ability. Higher ability students can be tutors for students who are less capable. In this process the higher ability students benefit academically, because knowledge can be very deep.
- b) The acceptance of diversity. Cooperative study presents an opportunity for students from different backgrounds and social conditions, to work and depend on routine tasks, and through the use of cooperative reward structures can learn to respect each other.

Development of social skills. Cooperative study aims to teach students the skills of cooperation and collaboration. These are skills that are important in the community belongs.

C. Methodology

This research is a classroom action research. According to Kemmis & Taggart (1988), action research is a form of research of self-reflection that collectively conducted by researchers in social situations to improve reasoning and justice education practices and their social, as well as their understanding of the practice and the situation of the place made such practices, The research was conducted in SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu. Procedures for implementing the action research using the model Kemmis & Taggart (1988). Each cycle consists of four stages: (1) planning, (2) implementation, (3) observation, and (4) reflection (Depdikbud, 1999).

The research was conducted in classes VIIc with the number of students as many as 32 people. The data in this study are: (1) the observation of the learning process, (2) the value / learning outcomes of students on reading comprehension, (3) the results of the interview. To gather the necessary data, researchers used the main instruments and instrument support. Researchers became the main instrument in this study because researchers play an important role in the overall process of research (Moleong, 2000). The instruments used are the guideline supporting observation, achievement test, and interview guides.

Guidelines observation was made to obtain data through the process of learning to read jigsaw strategy that includes activities of teachers and students during the learning process. Guidelines observations are also used to observe the concordance between the implementation of learning the lesson plans created researchers with collaborators. Mechanical tests were used to collect data is the ability of students' learning outcomes determine the main sentence and the main idea of the paragraph. Meanwhile, interview techniques conducted to determine students' understanding and opinion of the activities in the learning process and results through a reading comprehension strategies jigsaw. The results of the interview are used as supporting data to the data of observation.

In this study, the process used forms of assessment, namely the observation of nonverbal and verbal communication directly in the classroom. Observation process nonverbal forms of assessment in this study using the guidelines observations (observation). Meanwhile, direct communication in the classroom is done by conducting interviews.

Data analysis was conducted based on the model data flow analysis techniques developed by Miles & Huberman in Rohidi, Tjejep R. (1992). The process of data analysis to follow the steps, namely (1) all data that has been collected; (2) conduct reduction; (3) present data or presented data; and (4) concludes data.

D. Findings and Discussion

1. Results

This Classroom Action Research was conducted by two cycles and each cycle consisting of two meetings. Assessment is done on two aspects, i.e. aspects of the learning process and learning outcomes. The aspects considered in the assessment process of learning reading comprehension in this study include: (1) The enthusiasm of students in apperception activities, (2) enthusiasm of students listening learning objectives, (3) the seriousness of the students read a paragraph that was assigned when the original group, (4) enthusiasm students discussed when the group of experts, (5) active students express ideas / opinions when in a group of experts, (6) involvement of the student to respond when a group of experts, (7) enthusiasm the students to explain the results of the discussion group of experts is currently back in the home group , (8) the seriousness of the students to explain the results of the expert group discussions when back at home group, (9) did not leave the classroom without permission, (10) always in the task.

Determining the level of qualification of students in the assessment process is based on the following criteria, i.e. if all aspects are considered fulfilled categorized as Very Good (SB), if 8 or 9 aspect rated fulfilled categorized as Good (B), if 6 or 7 the aspects that met categorized Enough (C), if four or five aspects assessed fulfilled categorized Less (K), if 1,2, or 3 aspects are considered fulfilled categorized Fail (G).

Assessment is to provide a test of literacy includes the ability to determine the main sentence and the main idea of the paragraph. Determining the level of students' reading comprehension through a jigsaw strategy following the determination of the benchmark intervals adapted from Nurgiyantoro (2001). As for the interval in question, namely: students who are at intervals of 85-100% of the acquisition value categorized as Very Good (SB), 75-84% categorized as Good (B), 65-74% category Enough (C), 40-64% category Less (K), and 0-39% category Fail (G).

Based on analysis of the data obtained, the following is presented the comparison of the Assessment Process Cycle I and Cycle II and Comparative Test Results pre-action, Test Cycle I and Cycle II test.

Table 1. Comparison of Results Assessment of Process for Cycle I and Cycle II

No.	Qualification	Number of Students				Percentage			
		Cycle I		Cycle II		Cycle I		Cycle II	
		Meet. I	Meet. II	Meet. I	Meet. II	Meet. I	Meet. II	Meet. I	Meet. II
1.	Very Good	12	15	28	32	37,5%	46,87%	87,5%	100%
2.	Good	12	9	4	-	37,5%	28,12%	12,5%	0%
3.	Enough	-	-	-	-	0%	0%	0%	0%
4.	Bad	-	5	-	-	0%	15,62%	0%	0%
5.	Very Bad	8	3	-	-	25%	9,37%	0%	0%

Table 2. Comparison of Test Results Pre-action, Test of Cycle I and Cycle 2

No.	Qualification	Number of Students			Percentage		
		Pre-action	Cycle I	Cycle II	Pre-action	Cycle I	Cycle II
1.	Very Good	1	2	6	3,125%	6,25%	18,75%
2.	Good	5	13	22	15,625%	40,63%	68,75%
3.	Enough	13	17	4	40,625%	53,13%	12,5%
4.	Bad	9	-	-	28,125%	0%	0%
5.	Very Bad	4	-	-	12,5%	0%	0%

2. Discussion

a. Comparison of Process Assessment Results for Cycle I and Cycle II

In the first cycle of meetings I, Table 1 shows that students who take the learning process with excellent qualifications i.e. 12 or 37.5% of students, qualification of either 12 or 37.5% of students, no students who obtain enough qualified and less qualified, and 8 or 25% of students who obtained the qualification failure.

In the first cycle of meetings II, Table 1 shows that students who take the learning process with excellent qualifications 15 or 46.875% of students, qualification either 9 or 28.125% of students, qualification enough no or 0% of students, qualification or less 5 or 15.625% of the students, and qualifications failed 3 or 9.375% of students.

In the second cycle the first meeting, table 1 shows that students who take the learning process with excellent qualifications of 28 or 87.5% of students, qualification either 4 or 12.5% of students, qualification enough no or 0%, no less qualified or 0%, and qualifications fails also no or 0%.

In the second cycle meeting II, Table 1 shows that all students who take the learning process gain excellent qualifications i.e. 32 or 100% of students. Thus, no student who obtained a good qualification, qualification enough, lacking qualification, or qualification, failed.

b. Comparison of Pre-action result, Test of Cycle I and Cycle II

This Classroom Action Research begins with a test of a pre-action that aimed at obtaining an initial picture of the level of students' abilities determine the main sentence and the main idea of the paragraph. An overview of the level of students' abilities determines the main sentence and the main idea of the paragraph is also used as the basis of grouping students in learning through a jigsaw strategy.

In the pre-action tests, Table 2 shows that 1 or 3.125% of the students qualified very good, 5 or 15.625% of the students qualified well, 13 or 40.625% of the students qualified enough, 9 or 28.125% of the students qualified less, 4 or 12.5% of the students qualified failure. According to the table 2 is known that 26 or 81.25% of the students qualified enough, less, and failed. Thus, it can be said that the test results of pre-action corroborate preliminary findings that the students of class VII SMP Negeri 2 Samaturu have difficulty in determining the main sentence and the main idea of the paragraph.

On the test cycle I, Table 2 shows that there are two students (6.25%) were obtained excellent qualifications, 13 students (40.63%) who obtained good qualification, 17 students (53.13%) obtain sufficient qualifications, and no fewer students who obtain qualifications and failed. Thus it can be said that an increase when compared to the test results of the pre-action. The pre-action on test results, students are qualified to fail and less, while the results of the first cycle tests no longer fail and less qualified students.

On the test cycle II, Table 2 shows that there are 6 or 18.75% of students who obtained excellent qualifications, 22 students or 68.75% were obtained the qualification of good, 4 students or 12.5% who obtained the qualification enough, and no students who obtain less qualification and failed. It shows that there is a very significant improvement when compared with the results of the first cycle test, a good number of students are very well qualified and the number of well-qualified students, while the number of students qualified enough to be reduced.

The results of the analysis of the above data, both the assessment process and assessment of the results found that the ability of students' reading comprehension through a jigsaw strategy has increased significantly. It shows that the strategy of the jigsaw has been applied successfully improve the students' reading comprehension.

E. Conclusion

Based on the presentation of the results of data analysis and discussion can be concluded that the jigsaw strategy can improve the quality of learning in reading comprehension both in the aspect of the learning process, as well as aspects of learning outcomes. In the aspect of the learning process, all students who take the learning process gain excellent qualifications i.e. 32 or 100% of students. In the aspect of the learning outcomes of most of the students get the qualification of Good and Very Good, i.e. 87.5% of the total number of students. Thus, we can conclude that the reading comprehension of students of class VII SMP Negeri 2 Kolaka Samaturu can be enhanced through learning model of jigsaw.

F. References

- Anam, K. (2000). Implementasi Cooperative Learning dalam Pembelajaran Geografi Adaptasi Model Jigsaw dan Field Study. *Buletin Pelangi Pendidikan*, 3(2).
- Arends, Richard I. (1997). *Classroom Instruction and Management*. New York: The McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Depdikbud. (1999). *Bahan Pelatihan: Penelitian Tindakan (Action Research)*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- Depdiknas. (2006). *Standar Isi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Indonesia Satuan Pendidikan SMP/MTs*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Kemmis, S. & Mc. Taggart, R. (1988). *The Action Research Planner*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Herman, et al. (1992). *Practical Guide to Alternative Assesment*. ASCD: Alexandria, VA.
- Kamijan. (1996). *Teori Membaca*. Surabaya: JPBSI FPBS IKIP Surabaya.
- Lie, A. (2002). *Cooperative Learning Mempraktikkan Cooperative Learning di Ruang-Ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Rohidi, Tjejep R. (1992). *Analisis Data Kualitatif: Buku Sumber tentang Metode-Metode Baru*. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia (UI-Press).
- Moleong, L. (2000). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Rosdakarya.
- Nurdiyantoro, B. (2001). *Penilaian dalam Pengajaran Bahasa dan Sastra*. Yogyakarta: BPFE Yogyakarta.
- Nurhadi. (1989). *Bagaimana Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca*. Bandung: Sinar Baru.
- Ratumanan, Tanwey G. (2002). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Surabaya: Unesa University Press.
- Samsuri. (2002). *Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Siswa Kelas I MTs Negeri Konda Kecamatan Konda Kabupaten Kendari*. Skripsi tidak diterbitkan. Kendari: Unhalu.
- Slavin, Robert E. (1997). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Second Edition. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon Publishers.
- Sudaryanto, et al. (2001). *Upaya Meningkatkan Keterampilan Menulis Wacana Siswa Kelas II melalui Pendekatan Proses, Sebuah Penelitian Tindakan di SLTP 9 Yogyakarta*. Laporan Hasil Penelitian tidak Diterbitkan. Yogyakarta: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta.
- Tarigan, Henry G. (1994). *Membaca Ekspresif*. Bandung: Angkasa.