IMPROVING THE LITERAL READING ACHIEVEMENT OF GRADE VII STUDENTS OF SMPN 11 PALU THROUGH COOPERATIVE LEARNING

Rina Yusuf
rinayusuf@gmail.com
SMPN 11 Palu

Abstract

The research aims at Improving the Literal Reading Achievement of Grade VII Students of SMPN 11 Palu through Cooperative Learning. The subject of the research was Grade VII Students of SMPN 11 Palu consisted of 26 students of Grade VII. The research was classroom action research which was conducted in two cycles where each cycle consisted of planning, implementation, observation and reflection. The data of this research were obtained from the results of the test and observation sheet, field notes, during the implementation of the action. The findings of the research showed that The students' literal reading comprehension could be developed by implementing the Cooperative Learning. The students were able to answer the literal questions on their reading a text. During the process of implementing cooperative learning, I distributed the students equally and paid attention to the discussion in the group.. In addition, I used my time effectively to help the students during discussion time and give more chance for the low ability students. Comparing the result of students' achievement in the first cycle, the students' achievement on second cycle has significant development This can be studied from the result of teacher's performance was categorized as good enough. The same thing happened for the students' performance. The average score of the students in the test in cycle I increased from 62.12 to 79.32 in cycle II, while the mastery level improved from 38.46% in cycle I to 92.30% in cycle II.

Keywords: developing, speaking, tablemate, interview.

Background

Learning other language is difficult for foreign language learners. To get maximum result of learning different language, learners have to master that language well. Otherwise, they will find it difficult to communicate with others. Language is very important to enable someone to interact with others (Marzuki and Bandu, 2014).[1]

English is being used as a means of interaction among non-native speakers all over the world who use English as a second or foreign language. The teaching and learning of English as a foreign language aims to develop the student's skill in listening, reading, speaking and writing. The success of teaching foreign language skill is determined by some factors, which include the teacher, students, materials, methods and teaching aids.[2] As each factor plays important role in the teaching foreign language skill, none of them can be neglected.

Nowadays, students are expected to master those four skills in order to be able to use English communicatively. This aim will not be successfully achieved if the language teaching does not consider the language components (grammatical structure, vocabulary, spelling, and pronunciation) (Marzuki, 2016).[3] The teaching and learning of English as a foreign language aims to develop student's skill in listening, reading, speaking, and writing.Therefore, integrating the langauge components in the teaching of language skills should be done to get the best result in learning English language.

---

[1]Abdul Gafur Marzuki and Darwis Jauhari Bandu, Implementing Quantum Teaching and Learning in Developing Writing Skill of PAI Students of Tarbiyah Faculty IAIN Palu, , *Istiqra*, Vol. 2 No. 2 (2014), p. 309-329.

[2]J. McDonough and C. Shaw. (1993). *Material and Method in ELT: Teachers' Guide*. (Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1993) p. 21

[3]Abdul Gafur Marzuki, Utilizing Cooeperative Learning in Islamic College Students' Classroom, *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education)*, Vol. 3 No. 2 (2016), p. 123-139.

As one of the basic skills, reading is very useful and important for academic purposes or formal education (Marzuki, 2016).[4] With this skill, the learners are able to broaden their knowledge through reading different kinds of text. Reading is one of the diffficult activities for some students. It involves combination of abilities, such as linguistic and cognitive abilities. Regarding those explanation above, reading comprehension is one of the important skills that should be taught first to students, especially for the grade VII of SMP Negeri 11 Palu. As the teacher in that school, I realize that the students at class VII B had difficulties in understanding literal reading. This was seen from the result of their test that did not achieve the minimum mastery criteria of 70. For that reason, I chose this class as the subject of this classroom action research.

Based on the preliminary observation, there were some difficulties faced by students in reading activities. First, most students had difficulty in reading a text. Second, they did not know how to answer explicit questions based on the reading text. In this oppurtunity I will try to solve students' problem by applying a different method of teaching, in the classroom. I will use cooperative learning model in the classroom to encourage students to work together to solve their problem. This model is chosen because it connects closely to reading skill. It also encourages students to work together to answer a question based on a reading passage. By using this model, I hope that the students' literal comprehension ability will improve and they will achieve the minimum mastery criteria.

Besides the low achievement of the students, I also realize that I had been using a traditional way of teaching. This way of teaching will cause the students to get bored with teacher's explanation and therefore did not experience the learning. I want to improve my teaching by

---

[4]Abdul Gafur Marzuki, Developing Reading Skill of Islamic Education Department Students through Guided Reading, *Paedagogia*, Vol. 5 No. 2 (2016), p. 38-60.

encouraging the students to be actively involved in the learning through cooperative learning. I will design reading tasks that motivate the students to work together to answer questions based on reading passages.

Problem Statement

From the above background, it is learnt that the students' of grade VII of SMP Negeri 11 Palu had low achievement in reading. To solve this problem, I wanted to improve the achievement by applying different method of teaching in the classroom, which is cooperative learning model. So, the problem statement was:

"How can students' literal reading achievement be improved through cooperative learning?"

Objectives of the Research

The objective of this research was to improve the literal reading achievement of grade VII students of SMPN 11 Palu through cooperative learning.

Significance of the Research

The significance of this study can be viewed from both theoretical and practical aspects, as described below:

The result of this study will be expected to give benefit to the students, other teachers and me myself.

(a) For students; this study is expected to help them learn reading skill in a good and enjoyable way through cooperative learning.

(b) For teacher; the result of this study will be directly intended to provide them with more understanding of the effectiveness of teaching reeading skill through cooperative learning.

(c) For other researcher, this can be used as a reference in conducting the teaching and learning process to obtain better learning result.

Scope of the Research

This research was limited to literal reading, on the ability to answer reading comprehension questions based on texts. The questions were limited to the literal meaning of the contents of reading texts.

Type of the Research

This research was a classroom action research. It was done to improve the condition of teaching and learning of English, especially

reading skill.[5] An action research was performed to improve a present condition, in this case the condition of the students in the teaching and learning of reading skill in English.

Setting and Subject of the Research

This research was conducted at SMPN 11 Palu. The school was located in Jl. Keramik, Desa Duyu, Kecamatan Tatanga, Palu. It was one of the public schools in this city and was established in 1991.

The subject for this research was the students of Class VII B of SMPN 11 Palu. They were chosen because of their low achievement in reading test. There were 26 students involved in this research, 13 boys and 13 girls. I acted as the the teacher during the teaching and learning process by implementing Cooperative Learning. I also asked a fellow teacher to act as a collaborator and an observer during the teaching and learning process.

Procedure of the Research

This research was conducted in cycles. At the beginning, I planned to implement the action within two cycles. Since the result in cycle 2 was already satisfying, so I did not add another cycle to implement the method. Each cycle included planning, acting and observing, then reflecting

Research Results

Cycle I

The first meeting was conducted on Monday, May 12th, 2016. The meeting was done at 07:15 am up to 08:35 am. It consisted of three phases, thowe were pre-activity, while-activity, and post-activity. The detail of each phase can be seen below.

1) Pre activity

To begin the class, my collaborator and I came into the classroom and the students spontaneously greeted them, "*Good morning, mam,*" both my collaborator and I replied the greeting "*Good Morning*

---

[5]Kemmis, S., and McTaggart, R. (Eds.). *The Action Research Reader*. (Geelong: Deakin University Press, 1988) p. 88

students". Then, we entered the classroom, and took their seats. My collaborator went directly to the back of the class and took a vacant chair to sit on.

Based on the motivating activities, the teacher led the students to the material of the day, which is a descriptive text. Most of the students were quiet when they were asked by the teacher. They followed what was told and informed by the previous students.

Then, I wrote the objectives of learning on the whiteboard. I informed them about each point and gave indicator to achieve those objectives. The explanation was given mostly in English so as to make the students accustomed to this way of teaching English, but the teacher then explained in bahasa Indonesia as well to prevent students' confusion. All students listened to my explanation attentively. In order to check their understanding after my explanation, I asked a confirmation question, like "*Do you understand what I said?*" Most students answered the question with "*Yes*".

Furthermore, to lead the students to the topic and to introduce the cooperative learning technique, I showed a text/passage by using a projector and asked them some questions related to the text. Some questions I addressed to the students were: *What is in the picture*? *Who is the man riding a cow*? *What is the man's job*? and I translated these questions in bahasa Indonesia. These were aimed at finding out students' basic and previous knowledge about the topic. Some of the students' asnwers were: *Mountain, rice fields, a woman, a tree, birds, cow.* I wrote all the answers on the whiteboard and praised the students for giving their answers by saying "*Good, excellent, good on you, good answer*".
While activity

In this phase, I firstly organized the students into six groups (4 students per group) and explained how the groups would work. I put the students into equal distribution. Those considered smart are distributed equally among the groups. The students who were considered to have low achievement were also distributed equally among the groups. This was very important because I wanted to make sure that in each group there was one student who could facilitate the group. She expected the discussion in the group to run smoothly as one student could become

tutor for others. Then I numbered the groups 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and appointed a leader in each group. Next, the collaborator distributed the material which consisted of passage and tasks to the students. I informed the students to answer the questions correctly based on the text. Additional information in the text were also asked, like generic structure and language features.

In while-activity, I told the students what they should do. Then the students worked and discussed together within their group in doing the task given, explained and helped each other to understand the material and to answer the questions correctly. This was done to ensure that all the members of the group had the same understanding on the material. When the students were working on the task, I walked around the group to see if any group was having problems. In order to gain real data on students' and teacher's activities, my collaborator used the observation checklist. At the same time, I was seriously directed the students to classroom task and jotted down important information from students' activities on my field notes.

After finishing the task, I collected the students' worksheet. Then, I discussed the answer of the reading task given to check whether the students' answers were correct or not. The discussion was done by asking each group representation to answer the question. After each group finished their presentation, I asked if other groups had different answer. Then, I gave the correct answer to the students.

2) Post activity

Post-activities were the last teaching session conducted. In this phase, I did three main activities. The three activities were: (1) concluded the material together with the students; (2) flashed back to the previous classroom activity; and (3) administered homework to the students.

The details of the post-activities were described as follows: (1) Conclusion was drawn together with the students. I asked again what they had learnt by asking *"what did we learn today?"*. (2) I asked the students about the group work, what they liked from working as a group. Some students said that they could help each other in the group, but other students complainted that not everyone in the group was willing to work. (3) I asked the students to pay attention to the instructions given to them.

In this session, I gave homework. The homework required the students to memorize the words that had been studied in the classroom activities.

Pre activity

I initiated teaching by conducting reading review using words that the students had learnt from the previous meeting. I asked the meaning of some words from the reading, Mr. Kartolo, like *plough, fresh, harvest*. The students answered enthusiastically.

Next, I moved to the topic of this meeting. The topic of reading text that was assigned to discuss in this meeting was Black Cat. In my pre activities, I attracted students' learning interest to the topic by showing them some pictures of animals and asked them some questions. I asked the name of the animals and whether they had them at home to keep as a pet or not. Then I told the objectives of the subject matter. Based on my plan, the instructional objectives for this meeting were: to find out the literal meaning of the words so that students can answer the literal questions.

While activity

The students sat with their group and paid attention to my presentation. During the presentation time, I explained the main idea of paragraph, language features, and generic structure of a descriptive text. Then, I asked the students to group themselves just like the previous meeting, so they could work again as a group.

After students had put themselves in the group, I gave the learning material which consisted of passage and asked the students to answer the questions following the reading text and discussed the answers. During the discussion, the teacher walked around the classroom to help the students in understanding the task and making sure that everyone took part in the group discussion.

Post activity

Post-activities were the last teaching session conducted. In this phase, I did three main activities. The three activities were: (1) concluded the material together with the students; (2) flashed back to the previous classroom activity. She also reminded the students to memorize some words from the text. Before closing the meeting with greeting, I let the

students know that in the coming meeting there would be a test assigned to them.

Pre activity

The third meeting was carried out on Monday, May 19th, 2016. All of the students were present at this meeting. In this third meeting, to begin the class, I did the same action as she did in the first meeting. My collaborator and I come to the class and greeted to the students, checked to students' attendance list and showed the objectives of learning. Meanwhile, my collaborator directly stepped to the back of the class to find an unoccupied chair to sit on.

I reminded the students again that this meeting was done to evaluate what they had learnt before and they would be working individually after they had learnt in the group on how to answer literal questions. Yet, they were asked firstly to work on one reading passage in a group before they were asked to work individually.

While activity

In while activities I gave instruction after distributing the reading passage along with worksheet to the students. Then, I reminded the students of the main point they would do from the reading text, namely: to answer the literal questions. I reminded the students of 5 W plus 1 H questions with specification of each question such as: 'What' indicates 'thing', 'Where' indicates 'place', 'When' indicates 'time', 'Why' indicates 'reason', 'Who' indicates 'person' as a subject and 'How' indicates 'way' of doing activities. While students did the task, I controlled them, reminded them the time limit, and forbade them to consult their dictionary. When the time limit was off, I collected the result.

Then, I gave a test to the students. The test was a descriptive passage with some literal questions. This time I asked the students to go back to their own seat and arranged the classroom in traditional setting for a test. I gave one reading passage along with 10 questions on it. The result of this test was presented in the next sub chapter.

Post activity

In the post-activity, I asked problems they faced during working on literal reading questions. Some of them still focused on the meaning

of the words in bahasa Indonesia. I then explained again the way to answer the questions based on the key of 5 WH + 1 H. I reminded the students before answering the questions they should pay attention whether the questions used *what, why, where, when* or *how*.

Cycle II

Cycle II was implemented three times, on 21st, 26th, 28th June 2016. Based on the reflection and research instrument (observation sheet, field notes, and final test of cycle 1), I performed the actions in cycle II.The presentation of the data in cycle II is organized on the basis of four steps in classroom action research; planning action, implementing action plan, observing, and reflecting. Each of them was explained in the following description.

1. Planning of action

The planning of action in cycle II was constructed based on the result of both observation and test in cycle I. It covered classroom setting, time management, class reward, class encouragement and grouping system. Classroom setting was done to avoid high ability students to dominate the classroom presentation and group discussion. On time management, I planned to limit time to help each group to five minutes only, so the total time spent on helping the groups to discuss the work was 30 minutes. For class reward, I gave reward to the students by giving them encouraging comments such as *good job, try again, nicely done, excellent, any other idea?* Class encouragement was focused on less ability students to make them participate more in the classroom. I pointed the less ability students to answer questions during the class presentation time. The grouping system was changed by giving the chance to weak ability students to become leader of the group and distributing the more able students equally.

2. Implementing plan

In implementing the action plan of Cycle II, I still employed the same research instruments as they were in cycle I. Observation check-list was employed to gain data from teacher and students' activity during the teaching and learning process. Field notes were employed to obtain data related to teacher and students' activities during learning process. The teaching learning process was also conducted into three meetings.

Pre activity

My collaborator and I came into the classroom. The students directly greeted them, "*Good morning, mam*". Both my collaborator and I replied the greeting "*Good morning students*". Then, we entered the classroom. I sat at the front desk. My collaborator went directly to the back of the class and took an empty chair to sit on.

Based on the motivating activities, the teacher led the students to the material of the day, which is a procedure text. Then, I wrote the objectives of learning on the whiteboard. I informed them about each point and gave indicator to achieve those objectives. The explanation was given mostly in English so as to make the students accustomed to this way of teaching English, but I then explained in bahasa Indonesia as well to prevent students' confusion. All students listened to my explanation attentively. In order to check their understanding after the teacher's explanation, I asked a confirmation question, like "*Did you get what I say?*" The students answered the question by saying "*Yes*".

Then, to lead the students to the topic and to introduce the cooperative learning technique, I showed a text/passage by using a projector and asked them some questions related to the text. Some questions I addressed to the students were: *What is in the picture*? *Do you like eating it*? *How to cook it*? and I translated the questions in bahasa Indonesia. These were aimed at finding out students' basic and previous knowledge about the topic. Some of the students' asnwers were: *Egg, fry, boil.* I wrote all the answers on the whiteboard and praised the students for giving their answers by saying "*That's right, good, excellent, true*".

Then, I asked the students to read the whole text/passage. I told them to do silent reading just to get an idea about the content of the text/passage. When I had simple oral interaction with students, my collaborator was seriously paid attention to class interaction between the researcher and students. I sometimes jotted down on the observation sheet and wrote on a paper about the students' response to my questions. The collaborator took note on some of the interaction. I paid attention to the revised plan like the time teacher spent in observing and helping the group to do the task.

While activity

In this phase, I firstly organized the students into six groups (4 groups had 4 students and 2 groups had 5 students) and explained how the groups work. I reminded them of the task and grouping system they had in the previous week. Then, I put the students into equal distribution. Those considered smart were distributed equally among the groups. The students who were considered to have low achievement were also distributed equally among the groups. It is very important because I wanted to ensure that in each group there was one student who could facilitate the group. I expected the discussion in the group to run smoothly as one student could become tutor for others. Then I numbered the group 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, and appointed a leader in each group. However, this time I gave the chance for the less able students to become the leader in the group. This was done to motivate those with low ability to have active participation in the discussion.

Next, the collaborator distributed the material which consisted of passage and tasks to the students. She informed them that the task was the same, essay questions and True-False. I informed the students to answer the questions correctly based on the text. I reminded them that the worksheet would be collected as part of their portfolio.

In while-activity, I told the students what they were going to do. Then the students worked and discussed the task given within their group, explained and helped each other to understand the material and to answer the questions correctly. This was done to ensure that group members had the same understanding on the material. When the students were working on the task, I walked around the group to see if any group was having problems. This time I timed myself in each group to make sure that all the groups got the same help and the same amount of time. In order to gain real data on students' and teacher's activity, my collaborator used observation checklist. At the same time, I seriously directed students to classroom task and jotted down important information from their activity, such as students who were active in group discussion.

After finishing the task, I collected the students' worksheet. Then, I discussed the answer of the reading task given to check whether

the students' answers were correct or not. The discussion was done by pointing a representative of each group to answer the question. I pointed the students with low ability to read their group work in front of the class. After a group representative finished presenting, I asked if other groups had different answer. When the answers were different, she gave the chance to the students to say their idea. Then, I gave the correct answer to the students.

Post activity

Post-activities were the last teaching session conducted in the classroom. In this phase, I did three main activities. The three activities were: (1) concluded the material together with the students; (2) flashed back to the previous classroom activity; and (3) administered homework to the students.

Second meeting

Pre activity

The second meeting was carried out on Wednesday, May 26th, 2016. The class also run from 07.15 to 08.35 a.m. In this second meeting, to begin the class, I did the same action as she did in the first meeting. My collaborator and I came to the class and greeted the students. Then, I checked to students' attendance list. Meanwhile, my collaborator directly stepped to the back of the class and took her seat.

I started my teaching by conducting reading review using words that the students had learnt from the previous meeting. I asked the meaning of some words from the reading, How to Boil an Egg, like *boil, saucepan, stove, drain*. The students answered enthusiastically. I spent a few minutes to review ten words from the previous reading to ensure that the students know everything I asked. To ensure that I spent the time wisely, I timed myself to stick to the schedule promptly.

Next, I moved to the topic of this meeting. The topic of reading text that was assigned in this meeting was Create Menu Games. In my pre activity I attracted students' learning interest about the topic by showing them some pictures of menu and asking them some questions, such as *have you ever been to a restaurant*. I asked the name of the food they liked and whether they had them regularly. Then I told the objectives of the lesson. Based on the research plan, the instructional

objectives for this meeting were: to find out the literal meaning of the words so that students were able to answer the literal questions.

While activity

The students sat in their group and paid attention to my presentation. During the presentation time, I explained about the definition of a procedure textr, main idea of paragraph, language features, and generic structure of a procedure text. Then, I grouped the students. I changed the members of each group to ensure that there was variation in the group.

After students are in the group, I gave the material which consisted of the passage and tasks to them and asked them to answer the questions following the reading text and discussed the answers. During the discussion, the teacher walked around the classroom to help the students understand the task and made sure that everyone took part in the group discussion. She spent 5 minutes in each group to help the students when working and discussing the tasks.

Post activity

Post-activities were the last teaching session conducted in the classroom. In this phase, I did three main activities. The three activities were: (1) concluded the material together with the students; (2) flashed back to the previous classroom activity. I also reminded the students to memorize some words from the text. Before closing the meeting with greeting, I let the students know that in the coming meeting there will be a test assigned to them.

Pre activity

The third meeting was carried out on Monday, May 28th, 2016. All of the students were present at this meeting. In this meeting, to begin the class, I did the same action as she did in the first meeting. My collaborator and I come to the class and greeted the students, checked students' attendance list and showed the objectives of learning. Meanwhile, my collaborator directly stepped to the back of the class and to look for an unoccupied chair to sit on.

I reminded the students that this meeting was done to evaluate what they had learnt before and they would be working individually after they had learnt in the group on how to answer literal questions. Yet, they

were asked firstly to work on one reading passage in a group before they were asked to work individually.

While activity

In while activity I gave instruction after distributing the reading passage with worksheet to the students. Then, I reminded the students with of main point they would do from the reading text, namely to answer literal questions. While students did the task, I controlled them, reminded them the time limit, and forbade them to consult their dictionary. When the time limit was off, I collected their tasks.

Then, I gave a test to the students. The test was a procedure passage with some literal questions. This time I asked the students to go back to their own seat and arranged the classroom in traditional setting for a test. I gave one reading passage with 10 questions on it. The result of this test could be seen in the next sub chapter.

Post activity

In the post-activity, I asked problems they faced during working on their literal reading questions. Some of them still focused on the meaning of the words in bahasa Indonesia. I then explained again the way to answer the questions based on the key of five WH + one H. I reminded the students that next time before answering the questions they should pay attention whether the questions used *what, why, where, when* or *how*.

Observation

To gain accurate data from the implementation of the plan, my collaborator and I were together doing ongoing observation (the observation that was conducted when the teaching and learning activity were going on). The observation covered (1) the students' performance in the teaching and learning activities, and (2) the teacher performance (teaching steps) in implementing the plan.

1) Findings from an observation check-list cycle I

In action research, I analyzes the findings. To determine whether or not the treatment gave a significant improvement, and to decide whether or not the treatment would be continued because the students' achievement had met the criteria of success, in which I had provided in advance, my collaborator and I did reflection by analyzing and validating

the data that were taken from the observation checklist and the field notes. The data from the observation and field notes were compared and reflected to the teacher' and students' performance during the teaching learning activities. To make it clearer, the following was the result of observation taken by us during the teaching and learning process.

The result showed the steps in applying cooperative learning in the classroom and what teacher supposed to do during each step. The steps were stating objectives and motivating students, presenting the material, organizing the students into group work, guiding students in working and learning, and evaluating. From the observation on teacher's performance, the average score of the teacher was 2,22 or good enough (*cukup baik*). There were two items that received the lowest score in teacher's performance, which were: giving reward and giving spirit.

On the other hand, some items had achieved good criteria. They were stating the objectives of learning, which I did at the beginning of the lesson. Then, giving information correctly ad accurately which was pointed by my collaborator. I also helped the students in forming the groups by helping them to appoint the members of each group to ensure equal distribution. I did evaluation also in my material and concluded the lesson of the day. However, although I performed well in some of the activities, the result was still not satisfying for this resaerch. Based on the percentage, the result had not achieved 70%, so this cycle should be continued to cycle II.

My collaborator also made checklist on students' performance in the classroom by looking at the items in the observation checklist. Students' performance was considered important to be observed because they were the subjects of this research who implemented the cooperative learning in the classroom activities.

The students' performance in the classroom was also reviewed and it was found that one item scored very low (courage to ask questions). Not all students seemed willing to ask questions to the teacher. So, the total score of the students' performance in the classroom was 2,00 or categorized as good enough (*cukup baik*). The score was not enough (<70%). Therefore, the cycle should be continued to cycle II.
2) Findings from an observation check-list cycle II

To determine whether or not the treatment had given a significant improvement, and to decide whether or not the treatment would be continued because the students' achievement had met the criteria of success which I had provided in advance, my collaborator and I did reflection by analyzing and validating the data that were taken from observation checklist and field notes. The data from the observation and field notes were compared and reflected to the teacher' and students' performance during the teaching learning activities.

The Observation Checklist on Teacher's Performance shows the steps in applying cooperative learning in the classroom and what teacher was supposed to do during each step. The steps were stating objectives and motivating students, presenting the material, organizing students into group work, guiding students in working and learning, and evaluating. From the observation of the teacher's performance, the average score of the teacher was 3,42 or very good (*sangat baik*). There were no more items received the lowest score in teacher's performance. Based on the percentage, the result had achieved above 70% of the minimum requirement. So, this cycle should be stopped in cycle II.

There were six items that I have achieved very good score in this research. Those items were communicating and creating mutual interaction, giving instruction to the students in doing worksheet, explaining to the students how to make groups, helping students in forming a group, giving chance to all groups to present thier work, and concluding the meeting. Because of the verry good result I have achieved at this stage, I intended to maintain them for the coming meeting so that the result of the learning would be satisfying.

Thus, my collaborator also made checklist on students' performance in the classroom by looking at the items in the observation checklist. Students' performance was considered important to be observed because they were the research subjects who implemented the cooperative learning in the classroom activities.

Students' performance in the classroom was also reviewed. It was found that one item scored very low (courage to ask questions). There was one item though that scored 2 (courage to ask questions). The students did not hesitate in this cycle compared to the previous one. This

might be due to the shared responsibility between the less able and more able students. Because in this cycle I gave more chances to those with low ability to ask questions.

The total score of students' performance in the classroom was 2.00 or categorized as good enough (*cukup baik*). The score was not enough (<70%). Therefore, the cycle should be stopped since the score of students' performance already reached above the minimum target of 70.

Test and Reflection

After two meetings, I gave a test to the students. The result of the test was presented below.

Table 1 Students' Results in Cycle I

No.	Initial	Point				Criteria
		Essay	T/F	Total Gain	Score	
1	Abs	4	6	14	70	Successful
2	Agl	2	5	9	45	Failed
3	Ahm	4	6	14	70	Successful
4	Ard	3	5	11	55	Failed
5	Akb	2	4	8	40	Failed
6	Ary	3	5	11	55	Failed
7	Drm	5	4	14	70	Successful
8	Dwr	2	6	14	70	Successful
9	Evy	4	7	15	75	Successful
10	Fby	3	4	10	50	Failed
11	Gst	2	5	9	45	Failed
12	Irs	3	6	12	60	Failed
13	Ldr	4	5	13	65	Failed
14	Msn	3	8	12	60	Failed
15	Mhg	4	7	9	45	Failed
16	Mhm	3	5	11	55	Failed
17	Mhr	3	7	13	65	Failed
18	Rzd	3	7	13	65	Failed
19	Rdw	3	9	15	75	Successful

20	Sfn	2	8	12	60	Failed
21	Smt	3	7	13	65	Failed
22	Syr	4	7	15	75	Successful
23	Tir	4	7	15	75	Successful
24	Wll	3	8	14	70	Successful
25	Yyn	3	7	13	65	Failed
26	Yey	4	9	17	70	Successful
Total				326	1615	
Average				12,54	62,12	
Failed						16
Successful						10

To know the students successful in literal reading, I used the following formula as proposed by Harahap, 1992: 187):[6]

$$\text{Successful Percentage} = \frac{\text{Total successful students}}{\text{Total students joint the test}} \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Successful Percentage} = \frac{10}{26} \times 100\%$$

$$= 38.46\%$$

Table 1 was analyzed based on the data in technique of data analysis in Chapter III. The data above showed that there were 10 students scored above 70. However there were still 16 students Failed because they scored less than 70. Since the passing require a minimum score of at least 70%, so I calculated students' successful percentage using the formula proposed by Harahap (1992: 187) as shown above.[7] The result was that there was only 38.46% students' succeded. Having

---

[6] Harahap, N. *Tehnik Penilaian Hasil Belajar*. (Jakarta: Bulan Bintang, 1992) p.187

[7] *Ibid*

converted to the criteria of success where 38.46% < 70% (38.46% is less than 70%), the research was not successful yet and should be continued to the next cycle.

The analysis of findings from field notes corresponded to the teacher's performance and students' response done in the checklist. The findings showed that in opening the class, I stood up close to the door and greeted the students before getting inside the classroom. My collaborator took position at the back corner of the class to make herself easy to observe the class. After asking some simple questions to the students, I directed the students to the core of discussion by organizing them into six groups of 4-5 students and explained how the groups would work. I selected the students based on their capacities, so those who were considered as smart were distributed equally. This is very important to avoid the so-called a smart or poor group. So the process of learning and discussing among the students in their groups could run smoothly. Then I numbered the students in each team as group 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 and I also appointed a leader in each group. Then I gave the material which consisted of passage and tasks to the students and asked the students who had the same tasks to meet in a group and discussed their task. Finally I asked the students to return to their own group/team and discussed with their mates what they had learned. I evaluated their task through asking them to present their discussion result (answer sheet) in front of the classroom.

The students involved actively in the process of teaching and learning. It seemed that the students still got difficulties to answer the questions from the passage and to understand the messages from written text/passages. They sometimes got confused and stuck to the translation. They translated the sentences word per word and could not get the full meaning of a sentence. The habit of translating before doing was the main problem when answering the literal questions because the students tried to connect and use every word in translation, even preposition, to be and articles, such as *the, of, at, is.*

Reflection in action research is the place where researcher reflects the results of the data analysis, and the findings of the research. To determine whether or not the treatment made an improvement and

should be continued, my collaborator and I did reflection by analyzing the data that were taken from observation checklist, test, and field notes. The data from the observation and field notes were compared and reflected to the students' performance during the teaching learning activities and completing classroom reading task.

Table 2 Reflection and Revised Plan for Cycle I

No.	Reflection	Revisions
1	Some students did not participate fully in group discussion.	The researcher planned to encourage the students to participate actively in the group, for example by asking them to work together and share one another to complete the task.
2	Group discussion was still dominated by the high ability students.	The researcher planned to give more opportunity by encouraging the low ability students to take part in class presentation. She planned also to ask the high ability students to help their friends within the group.
3	The teacher did not give reward to the students.	The researcher planned to give reward to students' performance, especially those with low ability so that they are more willing to participate in group discussion and class presentation.
4	The teacher did not give encouragement to the unsuccessful groups.	The researcher planned to encourage the unsuccessful groups to try harder and to keep their confidence during the class presentation and group discussion.
5	The teacher did not control the group discussion	The researcher planned to time the students in working on their worksheet and in discussing the material. She

	by allocating certain time for discussion and for class presentation.	would also control the class presentation to ensure that no students dominate it.
6	The teacher did not change the group formation, which could lead to students' boredom within the group.	The researcher planned to rotate and change the students' group in three meetings.
7	The teacher spent too much time when helping the group in working and discussion.	The researcher planned to allocate maximum time in one group.

Source: The result of Secondary data analysis

Based on those revised plans, I expected to have the maximum result in the teaching and learning process of literal reading comprehension using cooperative learning. This would create more opportunities and chances for the students to improve themselves and therefore increase their achievement in doing an evaluation at the end of the cycle.

I also administered another test for the students to measure their improvement after the treatment. I expected after the students did their test, the score achieved the maximum results. The improvement in cycle II showed that cooperative learning was effective to improve the students' ability.

Table 3 Students' Results in Cycle II

Number	Initial	Point				Criteria
		Essay	T/F	Total Gain	Score	
1	Abs	5	7	17	85	Successful
2	Agl	3	7	13	65	Failed
3	Ahm	4	7	15	75	Successful
4	Ard	4	8	16	80	Successful
5	Akb	3	7	13	65	Failed
6	Ary	4	7	15	75	Successful
7	Drm	5	8	18	80	Successful
8	Dwr	4	7	15	75	Successful
9	Evy	5	7	17	85	Successful
10	Fby	4	7	15	75	Successful
11	Gst	3	8	14	70	Successful
12	Irs	3	8	14	70	Successful
13	Ldr	5	7	17	85	Successful
14	Msn	3	9	15	75	Successful
15	Mhg	4	8	16	80	Successful
16	Mhm	5	7	17	85	Successful
17	Mhr	5	6	16	80	Successful
18	Rzd	3	7	13	65	Failed
19	Rdw	3	9	15	75	Successful
20	Sfn	4	9	17	85	Successful
21	Smt	5	8	18	90	Successful
22	Syr	5	8	18	90	Successful
23	Tir	5	8	18	90	Successful
24	Wll	5	8	18	90	Successful
25	Yyn	4	8	14	70	Successful
26	Yey	5	10	20	100	Successful
Total				414	2060	
Average				15,92	79,23	
Failed						2
Successful						24

To know the students' success in literal reading, I used the following formula as proposed by Harahap, 1992: 187):[8]

$$\text{Successful Percentage} = \frac{\text{Total successful students}}{\text{Total students joint the test}} \times 100\%$$

$$\text{Successful Percentage} = \frac{24}{26} \times 100\%$$

$$= 92{,}30\%$$

Table 3 was analyzed based on the data in technique of data analysis in Chapter III. The data above showed that there were 24 students scored above 70. Only 2 students as Failed because they scored less than 70. Since the criteria of success require an individual score of at least 70%, I calculated students' success rate using formula proposed by Harahap (1992: 187) above. The result indicated that 92.30% of the total students succeded. Having converted to the criteria of success where 92.30% < 70% (92.30% is more than 70%). This research was successful and should be stopped.

Discussion

a. Research results

Discussion is based on the research findings presented in this chapter. I started the discussion with the solid preparation before conducting the research. The preparation was done with respect to the research needs. It comprised research instrument used in gathering the data from the field.

My collaborator and I worked together in preparing the research instrument, instructional materials as well as the media. I provided the instructional materials and media that were necessary for teaching. Meanwhile, my collaborator copied the observation checklist she used to

---

[8] *Ibid*

observe the teacher's and students' performances during the teaching process. She also took some notes on the conversation during the teaching and learning process.

There were four main preparations we made before doing the action.

b. Instructional material and media

I chose the instructional media carefully. I looked at it closely (the types of test that the students should be familiar with in the second semester). By considering the types of text, I decided to do the first cycle with teaching descriptive text, and the second cycle with that of procedure text. The texts were selected carefully, too. Then, my collaborator and I picked the passages from a suitable textbook to suit the development of the students in that school. I selected the passages that might not be too difficult for the students.

Then, to present the material, I used a laptop and projector to save time. I typed the material at home and used it in the classroom to be presented as a learning material for the whole class. I showed the text to the students and the concepts of both descriptive and procedure text.

c. Student's Performance

Students' performance in the teaching and learning process was also observed by using an observation checklist developed after considering the steps in applying cooperative learning. The checklist was purposely prepared in order to see the difference in students' performance from cycle to cycle. What my collaborator saw was mostly around the teaching and learning process in while activity in which I applied treatment.

Based on the revision plan for the second cycle, many students who were passive in the first cycle was motivated to involve more in the second cycle. This was shown by the field notes, those who had low achievement in the first cycle became the focus of the teacher during the second cycle. For example Ard and Fby, who had low achievement in the first cycle, they improved their score in the second cycle. Three students (Agl, Akb, and Rzd), although failed in the second cycle, their score improved as well compared to the resylt in the first cycle. This has

shown that the teacher and students activities during this research impacted the teacher and the students.

d. Students' improvement

The students' improvement in reading through cooperative learning was investigated and analyzed through evaluation phase of the teaching and learning process. I focused on two criteria of success, the result in the test and the performance during group discussion. After two cycles were implemented, it was found that the students had improved their activity and score after the teacher implemented the action.

One of the main point that the teacher improved in students was taking into account of their ability in dividing them among groups. Gender was also cosidered in group division to ensure that boys and girls work together. As expected in cooperative learning, less able students should also be given chance to participate in the discussion and class presentation.

The students' score improved well in the second cycle. Some students scored double in the second cycle. This went along with the result of observation sheet which showed that their understanding on the material was very good. In addition, the students who were active in group discussion also had spreaded. Some of the students who did good during the test in the first cycle could maintain the work and improved the score, like Yey. She was also able to help the other members in her group who were considered had low ability. The improvement of the score went along with the performance in the teaching and learning process because they are both used as the indicator of successfulness of this classroom action research. It was important to set the target of the teaching and learning process.

For example, a student who participated actively during the classroom discussion improved the score significantly, like Mhg and Gst. They were also the students who would give their opinion later in the classroom when they were asked to answer the questions. Some other students who were also had low achievement in the first cycle test improved their score in the second cycle. This was due to the chance of the students to share their answer during the group discussion time.

e. Teacher's improvement

The main point in applying this cooperative learning method was the ability of the teacher to apply the steps and to act as expected by the learning model. It was also necessary for the teacher to realize own weaknesses and made some improvement from time to time. One of the improvements she made was the time allotment she gave to the group. Not all group was given the same amount time for teacher's help. Therefore, in the second cycle I determined to improved it well. Then, at the end of second cycle, the score of the teacher's performance had improved, too.

It was also important to set the target for teacher's activity as it relates closely to the result of the teaching. When a teacher cannot apply the teaching properly, then the result of the learning will not be satisfying (Bandu and Marzuki, 2014).[9] So, I set the activities of the teacher based on what should be improved in the teaching and learning process by using cooperative learning. It was seen during the teaching and learning process, when the teacher made revision in the teaching based on the result from the previous cycle, the result of the students was satisfying. There were more students taking active participation when the teacher changed her classroom performance.

Conclusion

Based on the research findings, I can conclude that the use of cooperative learning improves literal reading comprehension of grade seven students of SMPN 11 Palu. This was seen from three aspects: students' performance, teacher's performance and the result of the students's test at the end of each cycle. The students' literal reading comprehension could be developed by implementing the Cooperative Learning.The students were able to answer the literal questions on their

---

[9]Darwis Jauhari Bandu and Abdul Gafur Marzuki, A Correlational Study between Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Comprehension of PAI Students of Tarbiyah STAIN Datokarama Palu, *Istiqra*, Vol. 2 No. 1 (2014), p. 75-94.

reading a text. During the process of implementing cooperative learning, I distributed the students equally and paid attention to the discussion in the group.. In addition, I used my time effectively to help the students during discussion time and give more chance for the low ability students. Comparing the result of students' achievement in the first cycle, the students' achievement on second cycle has significant development This can be studied from the result of teacher's performance was categorized as good enough. The same thing happened for the students' performance. The average score of the students in the test in cycle I increased from 62.12 to 79.32 in cycle II, while the mastery level improved from 38.46% in cycle I to 92.30% in cycle II.

Suggestions

Based on all of the findings and conclusion, I would like to make some suggestions. Teachers of English should implement cooperative learning in literal reading in conducting teaching and learning process. The students should stay in the classroom as they may find an interesting way of learning English. Other researchers, should motivate themselves through this research to do similar research in their own classroom.

Bibliography

Acikgoz, K. (1992). *Cooperative Learning, Theory, Research, Practice*. Malatya: Ugurel Publications.

Anderson, N. (2006). *Exploring Second Language Reading: Issues and Strategies*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.

Arifin, M. (1987). *Filsafat Pendidikan Islam.* Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Bandu, D.J. and Marzuki, A.G. A Correlational Study between Vocabulary Mastery and Reading Comprehension of PAI Students of Tarbiyah STAIN Datokarama Palu, *Istiqra*, Vol. 2 No. 1 (2014), p. 75-94.

Bogdan, C.R. and Biklen, K.S. (1998). *Qualitative Research in Education. An Introduction to Theory and Method*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Calderón, M E, Tinajero, J, and Hertz-Lazarowitz, R. (1992). Adapting Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition to Meet the Needs of Bilingual Students. *The Journal of Education Issues of Language Minority Students.* Volume 10 Special Issue, Spring 1992. Pp. 79-106.

Danello, R. (2009). *Preparing for the SOL EOC English Test Reading/Literature Research*. New York: Amsco.

De Boer, J J., and Dallman, M. (1964). *The Teaching of Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Durukan, E. (2011). Effects of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) Technique on Reading-Writing Skills. *Educational Research and Reviews*. Vol. 6(1), pp. 102-109, January 2011.

Grabe, W and Stoller, F. (2002). *Teaching and Researching Reading.* London: Pearson Education Longman.

Harahap, N. (1992). *Tehnik Penilaian Hasil Belajar*. Bulan Bintang, Jakarta.

Harras, K.A and Sulistianingsih, L. (1997). *Materi Pokok Membaca I.* Depdikbud: Jakarta

Heilman, A W. (1981). *Principles and Practices of Teaching Reading.* Columbus: Charles E. Merill Publishing.

Kemmis, S., and McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The Action Research Reader*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Marzuki, A.G. and Bandu, D.J., Implementing Quantum Teaching and Learning in Developing Writing Skill of PAI Students of Tarbiyah Faculty IAIN Palu, , *Istiqra*, Vol. 2 No. 2 (2014), p. 309-329.

Marzuki, A.G., Developing Reading Skill of Islamic Education Department Students through Guided Reading, *Paedagogia*, Vol. 5 No. 2 (2016), p. 38-60.

Marzuki, A.G., Utilizing Cooperative Learning in Islamic College Students' Classroom, *IJEE (Indonesian Journal of English Education),* Vol. 3 No. 2 (2016), p. 123-139.

McDonough, J and Shaw, C. (1993). *Material and Method in ELT: Teachers' Guide*. Massachusetts: Blackwell.

McMillan, J H and Schumacher, S. (1993). *Research in Education. A Conceptual Introduction*. Harper Collins Publisher, Virginia.

Robert E S, (2005). *Cooperative Learning: Teori, Riset, dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.

Robert E S, (2010). *Cooperative Learning: Teori, Riset, dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.

Rubin, D. (1982). *A practical Approach to Teaching Reading*, CBS College Publishing: New York

Slavin, Robert E. (1996). Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: WhatWe Know, What We Need to Know. *Contemporary Educational Psychology* 21**,** 43–69.

Smith, R J. (1980). *Teaching Children to Read*. Newbury House Inc.: USA

Sugiyono. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Alfabeta, Bandung.

Syaiful B D. (2005). *Guru dan Anak Didik Dalam Interaksi Edukatif.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Trianto, (2009). *Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif–Progresif*, Jakarta: Prenada Media.

Senduk dan Nurhadi. (2003). *Pnedekatan kontekstual (Contextual Teaching and Learning/CTL) dan Penerapana dalam KBK.* Malang: Universitas Negeri Malang.

Tarigan, H G. (1984). *Menulis Suatu Keterampilan Deskriptif.* Bandung: Angkasa.

Stenlev, J. (2003). Cooperative Learning in Foreign Language Teaching. *Sprogforum.* Number 25, 2003.