

*will be developed in an experimental research to improve the learning and teaching process in reading class as well as to help students develop skills in oral communication and to promote the use of this method among lecturers in the English Education Department of Muria Kudus University. This study is concerned with the use of student centered learning approach. Cooperative learning as one of the types of this approach is the core topic of this study. This study aims to determine the effectiveness of cooperative learning model in teaching reading comprehension at the English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muria Kudus University. By a quantitative quasy experiment design, it is found that there is a significant difference in reading test score between the students taught by cooperative learning model and those taught by traditional model. Those who are taught by cooperative learning model get better grade than those who are not. This finding shows that cooperative learning model has been proven to be effective in improving students' reading comprehension ability.*

**Key words:** *Student centered learning, cooperative learning, reading comprehension, quantitative quasy experiment*

## **INTRODUCTION**

In the purpose of creating a good climate for learning which involves an active participation of students, it has now been developed student based teaching methods. Some of these methods include *cooperative learning, problem solving, inquiry learning, and independent study*. These methods are concerned with *student centered learning* approach in which a teacher should give a broad chance to students to study autonomously. In this context, motivation and creativity of teachers or lecturers in optimizing student's activeness in learning is highly needed. The existence of these methods has more or less helped teachers enrich their academic treasure of teaching techniques. Some techniques of *student centered learning* have been applied by lecturers, at least referring to the real atmosphere of learning and teaching activities in English Education Department, FKIP, Muria Kudus University. Based on the interview with some lecturers, it is said they have applied technique of *student centered learning* by giving much assignment to the students. In this view they may be considered to have applied *task based teaching*. Some of them have also used methods of group discussion, like those in linguistic, sociolinguistic, speaking, and psycholinguistic class.

However, the lecturers' creativity still need to be developed so that they will have treasure of teaching method. Based on an observation in daily classes in the English Education Department of Muria Kudus University, some lecturers still use what so called "one way communication's model of teaching". They haven't optimized the use of *student centered learning* method. This is assumed to be caused by the lack of understanding of the lecturers and the poor application of creative teaching methods in teaching. As a result,

students may find the learning atmosphere seem not motivating. In fact atmosphere of learning and technique of teaching developed by teachers has big influence to the success and motivation of learning. Based on an interview with some lecturers, it has also shown that students of the English Education Department of Muria Kudus University still have low communicative competence. This competence covers *speaking, reading, writing, and listening*. Therefore, factors which influence students' achievement in learning, like media, facility, and method of teaching need improving. At this point teaching methods based on *autonomous learning* which is considered to be one way to improve the learning process should be promoted.

Referring to this situation, it is necessary to promote and develop *cooperative learning* model of teaching. Since the objective situation in English Education Department of Muria Kudus University has shown that students' reading competence still needs improving, so cooperative learning model needs to be developed to improve the learning and teaching process in reading class as well as to help students develop skills in oral communication and to promote the use of this method among lecturers in the English Education Department of Muria Kudus University. The above facts have motivated us to do an educational research, which tries to answer a question of whether there is significant difference between the learning achievement of the students taught by using cooperative learning model in teaching reading comprehension and of those who are taught by using traditional learning model. The objective of this research is to determine the effectiveness of cooperative learning model in teaching reading comprehension at the English Education Department of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muria Kudus University. The effectiveness is determined by comparing the achievement of the students taught by using cooperative learning model in teaching reading comprehension and of those who are taught by using traditional learning model. This research concerns with the use of cooperative learning technique in developing student's reading skill especially reading comprehension. It is done in reading class of the third semester students of the academic year 2008 – 2009 of English Education Department of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muria Kudus University. cooperative learning model is assumed to be effective to develop students' reading comprehension ability.

## **COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL**

Some of the cooperative learning models are STAD, Jigsaw, Group Investigation and Structural Approach Teacher using STAD presents new academic information each week or on regular basis, the students to students each week or on regular basis, either through verbal

presentation or text. STAD is one of the techniques developed by Slavin. In this technique there is competition among the small groups. The Students are grouped heterogeneously. There may be 4 – 5 students. During the teaching and learning the teachers give materials and students learn them in their own groups. After that, the teachers give them questions to every individual. The score of individual will be the group's score. STAD is very useful to motivate the students in mastering the materials. When the group wants to get the reward, every member of the group should help each other. Every member should present her best, because the group score is based on the individual success, the best group will be given the reward.

Jigsaw was developed and tested by Elliot Aronson and his colleagues (Aronson & Patnoe, 1977). Using jigsaw, students are assigned to five or six member heterogeneous study teams. Academic materials are presented to the students in text form, and each student is responsible for learning a portion of the material. Members from different teams with the same topic (sometimes called the expert group) meet to study and help each other learn the topic. Then students return to their home teams and teach other members what they have learned. Figure 2.2 illustrates the relationship between home and experts teams. Following home team meetings and discussions, students take quizzes individually on the learning materials.

Many of the key features of the group investigation (GI) approach were designed by Herbert Thelen. More recently, this approach has been extended and refined by Sharan and his colleagues at Tel Aviv University. Group investigation is perhaps the most complex of the cooperative learning approaches and the most difficult to implement. In contrast to STAD and Jigsaw, the group investigation approach involves students in planning about the topics for study and the way to proceed with their investigation. This required more sophisticated classroom norms and structures than do approaches that are more teacher-centered.

Teacher who use the group investigation approach normally divide their classes into five or six member heterogeneous group. In some instance, however, group may form around friendships or around in interest and in a particular topic. Student select topics for study, pursue in-depth investigation in choose subtopics, and then prepare and resent a report to the whole class.

Another approach to cooperative learning has been developed over the past decade mainly by Spencer Kagan (1992). Although it has much in common with other approaches, the structural approach emphasizes the use of particular structures designed to influence student interaction patterns. The structures developed by Kagan are intended to be alternatives to the more traditional classroom structures, such as recitation, in which the teacher poses

questions to the whole class and students provide answer after raising the hands and being called on. Kagan's structures call students to work interpedently in small group and are characterized by cooperative rather than student rewards. Some structures have goals for increasing student acquisition of academic content; other structures are designed to each social or group skill.

### Comparison of Four Approaches to Cooperative Learning

	<b>STAD</b>	<b>Jigsaw</b>	<b>Group Investigation</b>	<b>Structural Approach</b>
Cognitive Goals	Factual academic Knowledge	Factual and academic Knowledge	Conceptual academic knowledge and inquiry skills	Factual academic knowledge
Social Goals	Group work and Cooperation	Group work and cooperation	Cooperation in complex groups	Group and social skills
Team Structure	Four – to – Five Member Heterogeneous Learning teams	Five-to-six member heterogeneous learning teams; use of home and experts teams	Five-to-six member learning groups may be homogeneous	varies-pairs, trios four-to-six member groups
Lesson Topic	Usually teacher	Usually teacher	Teacher and/or students	Usually teacher Selection
Primary task	Students may use Worksheet and Helps each other Master learning Materials	Students investigate materials in expert group; help member of Home group Learn materials	Student complete complex inquiries	Students do assigned tasks- social and cognitive
Assessment	Weekly test	Varies-can be Weekly tests	Completed projects and reports; can Be essay test	Varies
Recognition	Newsletters and Other publicity	Newsletters and other publicity	Written and oral presentations	Varies

## RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a Quasy Experiment applying a non randomized pretest posttest control group design as suggested by Ary (1979:160). The choice of the research was based on some considerations. First, this research would be conducted in the organized classroom setting where the researcher was not permitted to reorganize the classes. Second, since the two groups of the students have been separated since they entered the institution. The researcher assumed that they were equal and the random assignment could not be done. Third, the two groups had to follow the schedule planned by the department of English of this institution. These situations made the researcher use this design.

**Table 3.1**

**Non randomized control group, pretest – posttest design**

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
D	Y1	Z	Y2
E	Y1		Y2

Where:

- D : refereed to the experimental group
- E : referred to the control group
- Y1 : referred to he observation in the pretest
- Y2 : referred to the observation in the post test
- Z : referred to the treatment

This figure shows that before the experiment was conducted, a pretest was administrated to the two groups to see whether or not the two groups are homogeneous. After the treatment had been completed, a post test was administrated to both groups. Their mean score were compared at the .05 level of significance to determine the effects of each treatment.

## RESEARCH FINDING

In determining whether the scores obtained by the students in both experimental and control groups differ significantly, the writer applied the t-test for independent sample with the critical value of  $p = .05$ . The presentation of the results of the analysis is the result of the t-test for general comprehension.

By using computer with SPSS version 11 program, the data obtained for general comprehension were analyzed. It was found that the mean score of the experimental group

was 87.88 and the mean score of the control group was 73.97. It was proved that the mean score of experimental group was greater than the mean score of the control group.

To prove whether the mean score of both groups differs significantly, see the table below:

**The computation of T-test for the reading comprehension**

**Group statistics**

Group	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean
Experimental	40	87.88	7.446	1.177
Control	40	73.97	11.930	1.886

**Independent Sample Test**

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test Equality of Means			
	F	Sig	T	Df	Sig (2-tailed)	Mean difference
Post Test Equal Variances assumed	6.459	.013	6.251	78	.000	13.900

The table shows that the t score is 6.251; with the significance from equal variances assumed is .000

Based on the results of the data analysis presented in the previous section, this section deals with the hypothesis testing. The presentation of the hypothesis testing is sequenced in the order of the hypothesis formulated in the previous part . The hypothesis deals with the reading comprehension of the two groups.

Hypothesis:

H<sub>0</sub> : the mean score of the students in experimental group did not differ significantly from the mean scores of the students in the control group

H<sub>a</sub> : the mean score of the students in experimental group differed significantly from the mean scores of the students in the control group

Interpretation

In the probability > .05 ; H<sub>0</sub> is accepted

In the probability < .05 ; H<sub>a</sub> is accepted

The general hypothesis of this says says; “there is a significant difference between the students’ learning achievement taught by using cooperative learning model in teaching reading comprehension and those who are taught by using traditional learning model”. This hypothesis deals with the different effects of the two group learning models to the students’ reading comprehension. The hypothesis was tested by comparing the post test scores obtained by the two groups. To compute the comparison of the scores, t-test for independent sample at the level of significance .05 was applied.

The results of the computation discussed in 4.1. shows that the probability is smaller than .05; that is .000. Statistically, this finding shows that the alternative hypothesis formulated above is accepted. The null hypothesis which is formulated as: there is no significant difference between the students’ learning achievement taught by using cooperative learning model in the teaching of reading comprehension and those who are taught by using traditional learning model, is rejected

Thus, comparative learning model gives better contribution to the students’ comprehension than the traditional learning model. The implication is that cooperative learning model gives positive effect on improving the students’ ability in reading comprehension.

## **Conclusion and Recommendation**

Referring to the discussion in the previous chapter, it can be concluded that the cooperative learning model is proven to be effective in improving the reading comprehension ability (achievement) of the students of the English Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Muria Kudus University. This conclusion is based on the finding that there is a significant difference between the reading test score of the students who are taught by using conventional teaching model and those who are taught by using cooperative learning model. For more details, the following is the conclusion of the finding:

1. The reading comprehension achievement of the students who are taught by using cooperative learning model is good. It is shown by the mean of the test which is 87.88 and by the standard deviation which is 7.446.
2. The reading comprehension achievement of the students who are taught by using conventional model is enough. It is shown by the mean of the test which is 73.97 and by the standard deviation which is 11.930
3. There is significant difference of achievement between both groups, it can be seen from the result of the t-test which shows  $t_0 = 6.251 > t_t = 6.459$

The analysis has shown that the cooperative learning model can encourage the students to be active in an intensive group discussion. Technique of Students Team Achievement Devision (STAD) and Jigsaw as part of the cooperative learning technique is found to have stimulated students to share their idea and understanding about a reading text which as a consequence help them grasp the content of the text in various points of view. This activity has also given an experience for them to which they can refer when they have a reading comprehension test in the next session. When the post test is held, it is known that the experiment group get better reading test score compared with the control group with significant difference. It points out the effectiveness of cooperative learning model in improving students' reading comprehension achievement.

Since the two cooperative learning techniques (STAD and Jigsaw) have been proven to be effective to improve the students' reading comprehension achievement, it is recommended to use these two techniques for other experiments on students' reading ability, for example: students' understanding of the generic structure of a reading text. The next research can extend the area of reading ability besides reading comprehension, such as the text orientation and linguistic feature of a text. This research was done naturally since the subject of the research was the third semester students of the regular English Education Program of Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muria Kudus University. The research faced some conditions which are not ideal, such as the limited time of research, lack of preparation and too big number of students. These problems are actually not on purpose, but it is due to the fact that the research is done in natural occurrence of the regular class of reading. The research starts in the middle term of semester. Consequently, the number of meeting is limited. It is assumed that the result of the future research will be more satisfying if these conditions are improved or early anticipated. Additionally, in the implementation of cooperative learning techniques, there should be more than one session of class for each type of cooperative learning method and it needs more preparation. This technique is also recommended to be applied in other subjects, especially those which have big number of students.

## REFERENCES

- Aronson, E, et al. (1978). *The Jigsaw Classroom*. Bevery Hills. CA: Edisson Wesley Longman
- Ary Donald, et. al. (1979). *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Holt, Renehart and Winston

- Gronlund, Norman Edward. (1982). *Constructing Achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (1992). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. London: Longman
- Harris, David P. (1969). *Testing English as Second Language*. New York: Mc. Grom Hill Book Company
- Nuttal, Christine. (1989). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heineman Educational Books. Ltd
- Wallace, C. (1992). *Reading*. Oxford: OUP