THE EFFECT OF RECIPROCAL TEACHING METHOD ON STUDENTS' READING COMPREHENSION

Meida Rabia Sihite[1], Yunita Mutiara Harahap[2] & Tika Nandasari[3]
1) Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Indonesia
2) Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Indonesia
3) Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, FKIP, Universitas Alwashliyah, Indonesia

Email: meidarabia55@gmail.com

ABSTRACT - The objective of the study is to investigate if Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM) significantly affects students' reading comprehension. This study was conducted by using experimental research design. The population of the study was the students of the eleventh grade at Madrasah Al Washliyah 12 Perbaungan academic year 2020-2021. The total number of students was 172. By applying cluster random sampling technique, two classes were selected as the sample namely XI IPA 1 and XI IPA 2. There were 36 students in each class. The experimental group was XI IPA 1 taught by employing Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM) and the control group was XI IPA 2 taught without applying Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM). The instrument for collecting the data was a multiple choice test consisting of 40 questions of analytical exposition text. The data were analyzed by using t-test formula. It was found that $t_{observed}$ value was higher than that of t_{table} (34.21 > 4.11) with degree of freedom df =58 at level significance α= 0.05. It means Ha was accepted and Ho was successfully rejected. Thus, Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM) significantly affects students' reading comprehension.

Keywords: Reading comprehension, Reciprocal Teaching Method

INTRODUCTION

Reading, according to Anderson (2013), is an active, fluid process that engages both the reader and the reading material in the construction of meaning. Reading entails the ability to recognize and comprehend words in order to construct a meaning. According to this statement in the Senior High School Curriculum of 2013, solid reading abilities will undoubtedly make it easier for pupils to solve all types of English questions. Students must also be able to read aloud a variety of textual variations that are discussed with proper pronunciation and intonation, identify the topic of the text being read, and certain information.

Another issue stems from the instructional method used in the classroom. Teachers are at the center of learning to this day. According to Wichadee (2013),

the teacher-centered strategy used in classroom activities does not produce engaged receivers, and the outcomes petrify language learning. It is insufficiently effective in stimulating language acquisition. The reading activity continues to be dependent on the teachers' reasoning, resulting in lower student participation. Pupils who have a high level of knowledge are more active, whilst the remainder of the students is more passive. It is seen as dull by the kids, and as a result, they do not learn to read optimally.

Based on the observation conducted in the area, the students of Madrasah Al Washliyah 12 Perbaungan Sumatera Utara still have low motivation in reading comprehension, especially in Grade XI MIA1. They do not have high interest in reading. It can be proven with their habit to go to the library. It is rare to find out students visiting the library in their spare time. Another negative fact can be discovered from the daily score examination result. Out of 36 students, only 5 students get score up to Minimum Completeness Criteria (Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimum : KKM) which is 75. It can be displayed in the following table:

Table 1. Daily Examination Results

No	Score Interval	Number of students	Annotation
1.	86 – 100	-	Complete
2.	75 – 85	5	Complete
3.	61 – 74	10	Incomplete
4.	41 – 60	15	Incomplete
5.	0 – 40	6	Incomplete
Total		36	

Source: English teacher of XI MIA1 at Madrasah Al Washliyah 12 Perbaungan

Based on the table above, there is an interest to change the teaching method, especially for teaching reading comprehension. Teacher center teaching learning must be changed to student center learning. It will encourage students to develop effective reading skills. There are various teaching and learning strategies which can be used by the teachers in classroom. One of them is Reciprocal Method. It is one of the teaching methods focusing on comprehension in reading. In Reciprocal

Method the readers or students will learn new information, main idea of the text, argument of the writer, and so forth.

Reciprocal Teaching Method, according to Gay (2011), is an educational technique in which small groups of students learn to improve their reading comprehension through scaffolding instruction of comprehension-fostering and comprehension-monitoring strategies. In this teaching style, the teacher leads a small group discussion of three or four pupils and then allows them to share their thoughts on the book they have just read. Students are encouraged to be more engaged in this activity since they must be able to summarize the material and explain it to the rest of the group. Reciprocal Teaching Method facilitates good communication or contact between students and teachers because in this method, the instructor and students will have a good dialogue by asking questions and providing comments on the material.

Another reason to utilize the Reciprocal Teaching Method is that it teaches the four core skills of reading comprehension: predicting, questioning, clarifying, and summarizing. All of these fundamentals of reading comprehension are necessary for students' engagement and interaction with the teacher. A positive contact will result in a positive teaching and learning process, as well as a reduction in student anxiety (Vandifer, 2011).

This article reports the result of research entitled "The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching Method on Students' Reading Comprehension".

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Reciprocal Teaching Method

According to Palincsar and Brown (2014), Reciprocal Teaching is the interaction between teacher and student in which they take turns acting as dialogue partners. Questioning, summarizing, clarifying, and forecasting tactics are used in the organized dialogue. Palincsar and Brown (2014) chooses each of these tactics to assist students in constructing meaning from the text and monitoring their reading to ensure that they comprehend what they have read.

Reciprocal Teaching Method, according to Slavin (2016), is a small group teaching method based on the ideas of question generating through interaction and

model. The teacher checks metacognitive skill in the reciprocal teaching style primarily to improve the reading performance of pupils who have low skill. It can be concluded that Reciprocal Teaching Method is a learning method which focuses on students' metacognitive processes including clarifying, predicting, questioning, and summarizing.

2. Reading

Reading is one of the four essential abilities to acquire, and it plays an important role in the teaching and learning process. Reading is a receptive talent that allows readers to learn any subject through written materials, therefore readers may quickly obtain information. Reading, according to Winten (2013), is the process of recognizing written and printed text in order to comprehend its meaning. Similarly, Tarigan (2014) claims that getting information or a message from a writer via printed media is a reading process. It is a complex process in which the reader must detect and grasp written symbols, which is influenced by familiarity, language background, perceptual skill, decoding, viewpoint, and interpretation. Thus, Reading is all activities carried out by readers to gain information contained in a reading material. The product of reading is the result of the reading process, namely understanding of the reading content.

3. Reading Comprehension

To avoid misinterpretation, readers must comprehend the content of the text when reading, which is why reading comprehension is so crucial. According to Richard and Renandya (2012), reading for comprehension is the most important goal of reading. Reading without comprehension may result in the omission of important information or messages. Reading and comprehension are inextricably linked since understanding the text is required to read and comprehend the written symbols. Reading is the process of extracting information from a text. As a result, reading comprehension entails comprehending the text that has been read, as well as comprehending the content of the text. Reading is an active process that is influenced by the readers' prior knowledge and language background, as well as their comprehension skills. McNamara and Magliano (2012) emphasizes that this process is the result of both text and reader elements occurring in a larger social context.

There are also a number of hypotheses about reading comprehension. Reading comprehension, according to Klinger, Vaughn, and Boardman (2013), is a very complex process that involves a lot of interplay between what people bring to the text (strategies, prior knowledge,) and the readers themselves, as well as the variables associated to the text (understanding of text kinds and interest in the text). Reading comprehension, according to Brassell and Rasinski (2013), is the ability to comprehend or construct meaning from a written material. Furthermore, according to Lenz (2015), the goal of reading is to comprehend the text through deducing meaning from it.

Thus, the writer and the reader are at least two people that are involved in reading comprehension. The decoding of a writer's words and the reader's past knowledge to build up a proximate grasp of the writer's messages is part of the text comprehension process.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

The experimental research design was employed in this study, which included a randomization group, pre-test, and post-test design. Reciprocal Teaching Method was used as the independent variable, and reading comprehension was used as the dependent variable in this study. This research was split into two groups: experimental and control.

Population and Sample

The population of this study was all the students of grade XI of Madrasah Aliyah Perbaungan in the academic year of 2020/2021. The eleventh grade covered 5 (five) classes, 3 (three) for science classes and 2 (two) for social classes. It consisted of 170 students.

The students were randomly assigned to a survey by cluster sampling technique. The sample in this study were two classes, namely XI MIA1 and XI MIA2. The number of sample was 72 students. The sample can be seen in the following table:

Table 2. Population and Sample

No	Class	Population	Sample	Group	Treatment
1.	XI MIA1	36	36	Experimental	RTM
2.	XI MIA2	36	36	Control	Conventional (without RTM)
3.	XI MIA3	36	-	-	-
4.	XI IPS1	34	-	-	-
5.	XI IPS2	30	-	-	-
Total		172	72		

Instrument for Collecting Data

In collecting the data, the students of both groups were asked to a reading test in the form of multiple choice questions. The number of items was forty (40) questions covering analytical exposition text. The answer options consisted of a, b, c, d and e. The instruments were compiled from some sources such as Buku Kumpulan Soal Ujian Nasional Bahasa Inggris Tahun 2015, Buku Bahasa Inggris Kelas XI K13, and internet sources.

The Procedure of Collecting Data

The research was conducted in three stages namely pre-test, treatment, and post-test.

1. Pre-test

Pre-test was given before the treatments. A test of reading comprehension consisting of 40 multiple choice questions was administered to the sample of both groups. It was done to measure the students' reading comprehension before receiving the treatments.

2. Treatment

The experimental class, namely XI MIA1 was treated by employing Reciprocal Teaching Method. The steps of this treatment were delivered as follows:

1. A group of four students was chosen by the teacher, and each was assigned a distinct job, such as summarizer, questioner, clarifier, or predictor.

2. The teacher then requested the class to read a paragraph of text. Recommend that they take notes while reading, such as highlighting, coding, and so on.

3. The predictor student assisted his peers in connecting earlier sections of the book by generating a prediction based on cues provided by the title or illustrations before reading. The trainer then instructed them to meet with their team to discuss the results of their predictions. They were instructed to reread the material to validate their predictions. The questioner's next task was to assist his group in asking and answering questions regarding the text being discussed in order to obtain more knowledge. The summarizer's job was to assist his group in identifying the main themes based on his and his peers' perspectives. The clarifier assisted the group in identifying and resolving confusing areas (words and sentences).

4. As the following section of the book was read, the students in each group exchanged positions with their colleagues. They went through the process again, this time in accordance with their new role. The debate was then repeated until the entire text had been read.

5. The trainer instructed the pupils to continue using the four tactics until they were able to do it independently.

The control class, XI MIA2, was processed with traditional methods. The followings are the steps of this treatment:

1. The students were instructed to open their books and study an analytical exposition text.

2. The teacher instructed the students to open a dictionary and look up the definitions of the difficult words.

3. The teacher asked the students to communicate some information about the topic by translating the major themes from the reading text.

4. The teacher was requested to respond to the questions and have a group discussion.

3. Post- test

Following the completion of all treatments, a post-test was undertaken. The post-test items were identical to those used in the pre-test. The purpose of the post-test was to determine the final score and to determine the difference between the students' scores before and after treatment. This test was designed to assess students' reading comprehension after they had been taught using the Reciprocal Teaching Method.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Data

The data in this study were obtained for the reading test scores. Based on the data of the experimental class, the results of pre-test showed that only 2 students (5.5%) reached KKM. While in post-test, there were 27 students (75%) who accomplished KKM.

Table 3. Students' Scores of Experimental Class

No	Student Initial	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gained Score
1.	AW	45	80	35
2.	AMS	35	75	40
3.	AML	50	85	35
4.	ATM	40	70	30
5.	AR	35	70	35
6.	ASP	50	90	40
7.	ATS	60	90	30
8.	AH	45	80	35
9.	BKS	30	60	30
10.	BAH	25	55	30
11.	CAH	60	80	20
12.	DP	60	85	25
13.	DS	50	75	25
14	DFS	30	80	50
15	DSM	50	85	35

16.	FSA	60	90	30
17.	FCS	40	75	35
18.	HMN	45	80	35
19.	HNS	30	75	45
20.	JJDAP	25	60	35
21.	LA	30	65	35
22.	MNP	40	75	35
23.	MS	50	80	30
24.	NS	55	80	25
25	NSP	55	85	30
26.	PIPR	60	85	25
27.	RRR	60	90	30
28.	RPS	25	60	35
29.	RNS	30	70	40
30.	RH	45	75	30
31.	RMS	50	80	30
32.	SKP	75	90	25
33.	SLM	75	95	20
34.	TNP	65	90	25
35.	UFK	55	85	30
36.	ZMS	60	85	25
Total score		1.695	2.830	1.145
Mean score		47.1	78.6	31.8
Max		75	95	50
Min		25	55	20

Table 3 above shows differences between the scores of the students in pre-test and those of post-test. All of the students gained score in the post-test.

Based the results of pre-test in the control class, only 1 student (2.7%) reached KKM. In the post-test, the number of the students who accomplished KKM was 2 students (5.5%).

Table 4. Students' Scores of Control Class

No	Students	Pre-test (X)	Post-test (Y)	Gained Score
1.	AT	35	50	15
2.	ADK	20	45	25
3.	ATML	50	65	15
4.	BSC	60	70	10
5.	BSK	35	50	15
6.	BYH	30	40	10
7.	CTK	40	30	-10
8.	DIN	35	30	-5
9.	DJK	20	40	20
10.	EFS	25	35	10
11.	EKS	50	40	-10
12.	FIM	70	75	5
13.	FMS	40	55	15
14	GH	20	30	10
15	HSP	20	25	5
16.	IM	30	30	0
17.	ISTM	40	35	-5
18.	KLP	35	40	5
19.	LAM	30	65	35
20.	LDP	25	40	15
21.	MATR	30	45	15
22.	MI	30	25	-5
23.	NS	60	70	10
24.	NTK	35	70	35
25	OV	45	65	20
26.	PATK	70	75	5
27.	PCR	20	40	20
28.	RSM	25	60	35
29.	RTGK	40	50	10

30.	SAS	25	45	20
31.	SBSK	30	40	10
32.	TUP	75	80	5
33.	USM	35	65	30
34.	VGX	35	60	25
35.	WKN	25	55	30
36.	ZL	30	55	25
Total score		1320	1790	470
Mean score		36.7	49.7	13.1
Max		75	80	35
Min		20	25	-10

Table 4 displays the differences between the results of the students of control group both in pre-test and post-test. It could be observed that not all of the students gained score in post-test.

Hypotheses Testing

   The hypotheses were tested in order to investigate whether the hypotheses were accepted or rejected. The calculation employed t-test formula.

$$t = \frac{m_{a}-\ m_{b}}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{da_2+db2}{n_a\ +\ n_b-2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{n_a}+\frac{1}{n_b}\right]}}$$

Notes :

T = Total Score

Ma = Mean of pre-test and post-test of experimental group

Mb = Mean of pre-test and post-test of control group

da^2 = Total of standard deviation of experimental group

db^2 = Total of standard deviation of control group

Na = Total number of students in experimental group

Nb = Total number of students in control group

The calculation of the results of pre – test and post – test of experimental and control groups is as the following:

Ma   = 62.8

Mb   = 43.2

da^2 = 19.9^2 = 396.01

db^2 = 16.5^2 = 272.25

Na   = 36

Nb   = 36

$$t = \frac{m_a - m_b}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{da_2 + db2}{n_a + n_b - 2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{n_a} + \frac{1}{n_b}\right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{62,8 - 43,2}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{396,01 + 272,25}{36 + 36 - 2}\right]\left[\frac{1}{36} + \frac{1}{36}\right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{19,6}{\sqrt{\left[\frac{668,26}{70}\right]\left[\frac{2}{36}\right]}}$$

$$t = \frac{19,6}{\sqrt{(9,55)(0,06)}}$$

$$t = \frac{19,6}{\sqrt{0,573}}$$

$$t = \frac{19,6}{0,54}$$

$$t = 34.21$$

The hypotheses testing aimed to show the result of the analysis. In this study t-observed value was 34.21. It was higher than that of t-table which was 4.11 with degree of freedom (df) = 70 at level of significance α = 0.05.

t-obs> t-table (P = 0.05) with df =70 α = 0.05

34.21>4.11 (P = 0.05) with df = 70 α = 0.05

Thus, it was indicated that the alternative hypothesis (Ha) stating that Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM) significantly affects students' reading comprehension was accepted. Whilst, the null hypothesis (Ho) stating that Reciprocal Teaching Method (RTM) does not significantly affect students' reading comprehension was successfully rejected.

Discussion

According to the result, it was found there were significant differences of the students' reading comprehension after being taught by using Reciprocal

Teaching Method. The mean score of pre-test of experimental students was 47.1 and the post-test was 78.6. The results showed that the mean score of post-test was higher than that of pre-test. There was an improvement of the mean score in the post-test. The difference of the mean score between the pre-test and the post-test was 31.8. Based on the result, teaching reading by using Reciprocal Teaching Method was good and effective for the Eleventh Grade at MAS 12 Perbaungan.

Furthermore, t-test formula was used to compare the results of pre-test and post-test in determining whether the treatments could give an effect on the students' reading comprehension or not. The result showed that the mean score of post-test was higher than pre-test 78.6>47.1). Then the data analysis showed that t-$_{observed}$ was higher than t-$_{table}$ (34.21 > 4.11). For that result it was concluded that the Null Hypothesis is rejected and Alternative Hypothesis is accepted

This pre-experiment research has a role in order to get some improvement in teaching reading comprehension. Reciprocal Teaching Method can help the teacher in the instructional process. There are some factors that caused the significant effect of the students' ability in comprehending analytical exposition text by using Reciprocal Teaching Method. Teachers tend to be more active and more focuses as a facilitator, mediator, motivator, and evaluator (Nur Aini, 2011). The students tend to be more active in teaching learning process since Reciprocal Teaching Method had been applied. Every student in their group have two roles; learn for themselves and help group members to learn in order to get the improvement score (Sawendra, 2014). Further, in this strategy, the students have a good interaction between them because of their sharing in their own group.

CONCLUSION

Based on the finding and discussion, Reciprocal Teaching Method is one of alternative solutions that the teacher can use to teach reading comprehension to their students. It makes the students have responsibility for mastering material to share their understanding about the text with each other in order to get the comprehension from the text. Based on the data of this study, the mean in pre-test of experimental class was 47.1 and the mean was 78.6 or (78.6 ≥ 47.1). The result of reading comprehension in post-test of students' reading comprehension in experimental

class was 78.6 and the result of students' reading comprehension in control class was 49.7 or (78.6 ≥ 49.7). Moreover, the score of t-test by using paired sample t-test with a significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ showed that t-$_{observed}$ value was higher than that of t-$_{table}$ (34.21 > 4.11). It means that Reciprocal Teaching Method is effective to be applied to increase students' reading comprehension at the eleventh grade at MA Alwashliyah 12 Perbaungan because there was a significant difference between the students' reading comprehension scores taught by using Reciprocal Teaching Method and those taught by without using Reciprocal Teaching Method. Thus, Reciprocal Teaching Method significantly affects students' reading comprehension.

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. & Anderson, K. (2013). *Text Types in English 3*. South Yarra: Macmillan.

Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., Sorensen, C.K. & Walker, D. (2014). *Introduction to Research in Education (9 th Ed)*. London: Wadsworth.

Brassel, D., Rasinski, T. (2013). *Comprehension that Works – Taking Students Beyond Ordinary Understanding to Deep Comprehension*. California: Shell Education.

Cooper, T. &Greive, C. (2015). *The Effectiveness of the Methods of Reciprocal Teaching. Research Online@Avondale, 45-47. research.avondale.edu.au/.* Accessed on 10 July 2020.

Creswell, John W. (2012). *Educational Research: planning, conducting, evaluating, quantitative and qualitative research (Fourth Edition)*. London: Pearson.

Erfanpour, M. A. (2013). The Effect of Intensive and Extensive Reading Strategies on Reading Comprehension: A Case of Iranian High School Students. *English for Specific Purposes World, 14(41)*. Retrieved from http://www.esp-world.info

Gay, L. R. (2013). *Educational Research (4th Ed)*. New York: Merril.

Ghorbani, M.R., Ardeshir Gangeraj, A., &Zahed Alavi, S. (2013). Reciprocal Teaching of Comprehension Strategies Improves EFL Learners' Writing ability. *Current Issues in Education. 16,1*.

Grabe and Fredicka L. Stoller, William. (2011). *Teaching and Researching Reading*. London: Pearson Education.

Harmin, J. M. (2016). Interactive Word Walls: More than just reading the writing on the walls. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 52(5), 398–408*.

Hasibuan and Simbolon. (2016). The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching Model on Student's Reading Comprehension of Discussion Text (A Study at The XII Grade SMA Negeri 1 PinangSori in 2016/2017 Academic *Year). Journal MELT : Medium for English Language Teachin9 Vol 1 No 2. http://e-journal.potensi-utama.ac.id/ojs/index.php/MELT/article/view/357*

Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., Boardman, A., Swanson, E. (2013). *Boosting Comprehension with Collaborative Strategic Reading*. San Fransisco: Jossey Bass.

Kulesz, P. A., Francis, D. J., Barnes, M. A., & Fletcher, J. M. (2014). The Influence of Properties of the Test and Their Interactions with Reader Characteristics on Reading Comprehension: An Explanatory Item Response Study. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 108(8), 1078–1097. https://doi.org/10.1037/edu0000126.*

Lenz, K. 2015. *An Introduction to Reading Comprehension*. Available website: http//www.specialconnections.ku.edu. Retrieved on July 21st, 2020

Lodico, Marguerite G. et. al. 2012. *Methods in Educational Research: From Theory to Practice*. USA: A Wiley Imprint

McNamara, D.S., & Magliano, J. P. (2012). *Towards a comprehensive model of comprehension. In B. Rose (Ed.), The psychology of learning and motivation (pp.297-384).* New York: Academic Press.

Nuraini, Atiek, (2011). *Improving Student's Reading Comprehension Using Reciprocal Teaching*. Unpublsished Thesis. Universitas Sebelas Maret.

Mikulecky, B. & Jeffries, L. (2011). *More Reading Power*. London : Longman.

Palincsar, A. S., & Brown, A. L. 2014. *Reciprocal Teaching: Activities to Promote "reading with your mind"*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Perfetti, C. A., Landi, N., & Oakhill, J. (2014). *The Acquisition of Reading Comprehension Skill. In M. J. Snowling&C. Hulme (Eds). The science of reading: A handbook (pp. 227–247)*. Oxford : Blackwell.

Qanwal. S, & Karim. S. (2014). Identifying Correlation between Reading Strategies Instruction and L2 Text Comprehension. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 5, 1019-1032*. doi:10.4304/jltr.5.5.1019-1032.

Sawendra, Vesi. (2014). *The Influence Reciprocal Teaching Technique toward Students' Reading Comprehension*. Unpublished Thesis. Jakarta: Universitas Islam Negeri Syarif Hidayatullah.

Slavin, R. E. (2016). *Mastery learning re-reconsidered. Review ofEducational Research, 61), 300-302*.

Sudjana. (2002). *Metode Statistika*. Bandung: Tarsito.

Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tarigan, H. G. 2014. *Berbicara Sebagai Suatu Keterampilan Berbahasa*. Bandung: Angkasa.

Taylor, George R&Mackkeney, Loretta. (2018). *Improving Human Learning in Classroom: Theories and Teaching Practice*s. New York: Addison Wesley Longman

Urquhart, A. H., & Weir, C. J. 2010. *Reading in a Second Language: Process, Product and Practice*. London and New York: Longman.

Vandiver, Vikki L. 2011. *Introducing Health promotion and Mental Health: An Introduction to Policies, Principles, and Practices*. Oxford: University Press.

Vansickle, Timothy. (2015). *Test Reliability Indicates More the Just Consistency*. Minnesota: Quesstar Assessment.

Wichadee, S. (2013). *The Effect of Cooperative Learning on English Reading Skill and Attitudes of the First Year Students at Bangkok University*. Bangkok: BU Academic.

Winten, K. (2013). *Improving Reading Comprehension through Jigsaw Technique at the Eighth Students of SMPN Satu Atap Jungutan in Academic Year 2012/2013*. Denpasar: Universitas Mahasaraswati.