

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF KNOW-WHAT-LEARN (KWL) AND JIGSAW TECHNIQUES IN TEACHING READING FOR COMPREHENDING NARRATIVE TEXT

Rinaefi Rahmadi

Universitas Islam Al-Ihya Kuningan
email: rinaepirahmadi@gmail.com

Abstrak

This study was a factorial experimental research which aimed to describe: the effectiveness of KWL and Jigsaw technique towards reading comprehension of high achievers, the effectiveness KWL and Jigsaw to reading comprehension of low achievers, the effectiveness of KWL and Jigsaw technique towards reading comprehension of high achievers, and the interaction effect between techniques and students' types towards reading comprehension of the students. The samples of this study were the second grade students of SMAN Cidahu in the academic year of 2012/2013. It consisted of 44 students. They were divided to be two groups. The group of experiment that used the KWL technique and the control group used jigsaw technique. Two-ways ANOVA was conducted to test the hypotheses, two ways analysis of variance with F-test at the 5% (0.05) level of significance. The result revealed that jigsaw was more effective to teach reading comprehension than KWL with the significant difference of $0.000 < 0.05$. Based on these results, KWL and jigsaw recommended to be applied when peajaran reading comprehension to improve the reading skills.

Kata Kunci : Key words: Reading Comprehension, KWL, Jigsaw, High and Low Achievers

Pendahuluan

Reading is an important activity in language learning. It has lead people to understand, retrieve and recover meaningful information. For this reason, then reading is placed as one of the important skills for students to be mastered. Students are expected to develop their knowledge concerning with a specific context given to them to learn through adequate reading proficiency. They are also expected to be able to extract meaning from specific cues in the text, get the gist and obtain specific information from reading text. There are many kinds of teaching techniques of reading comprehension and among of them are KWL and Jigsaw. KWL stands for (K) what they know , (W) want to learn, and, after reading, (L) what they learned . It was introduced by Ogle. In

spite of KWL, jigsaw is one of technique in teaching reading comprehension. Jigsaw technique was developed by Aronson et al as cooperative Learning technique. It can be implemented in teaching listening speaking, reading, and writing.

This study was carried out to the students of the second grade of SMA Cidahu. The participants were 22 students from two classes. Class A was the experiment class. The students of class A were given the treatment of KWL. Another treatment, jigsaw, was given to class B or control class. Students of SMA Cidahu were from different levels of English achievement. It is a common phenomenon that in every class high and low achievers are found in mastering all English subjects taught at the school. Relating to this study, the writer chooses reading as one of the four skills taught in school. The writer focused on narrative text, since this genre is an interesting ways and easy to comprehend for students. Students, then, try to use various techniques in comprehending the texts. The objectives of the study were: 1.to describe the effectiveness of KWL and Jigsaw towards students' reading comprehension of high achievers, 2. to describe the effectiveness of KWL and Jigsaw towards students' reading comprehension of low achievers, 3.to explain the effectiveness technique for high and low achievers' reading comprehension and 4.To describe the interaction effect between methods and students' achievement towards reading comprehension of the students.

The techniques that were applied in this case are KWL and jigsaw. They are predicted to be easier for students in comprehending the text. Therefore the reason for choosing this topic was because the researcher is eager to know whether the implementation of jigsaw and KWL technique is effective to enhance the student's comprehension in the selected text. Every teacher knows at least one student who "could do better". These are students who come to school without books or homework, the students who appear to choose not to study for exams. These students commonly dub as "low achievers" or "underachievers". Underachievement is most commonly defined as a discrepancy between potential (or ability) and performance (Reis & McCoach, 2000 in McCoach 2001:74). Therefore, a student who seems capable of succeeding in school but is nonetheless struggling is often referred to as an underachiever. Brainbridge (2014) defines "high achievers are those who achieve a goal".. Not like a high achievers students who seem easy to gain success in academic,

the low achievers students should make a struggle and effort first to be success in academic.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is an experimental research and use factorial design for the research design. There were two experimental treatments. One group of the students got a treatment of KWL (experimental group), while the other group had a treatment that was Jigsaw (control group). Before they got the treatment, they were tested to be used as a basic line to evaluate changes that occurred and to provide any control for selection bias. After they were given the treatment and then they were tested to know their reading comprehension. This study had 3 different variables. They are the independent variables are the treatments that would be given to the students. They were the method of KWL which would be treated to the students in class experiment and the Jigsaw method which would be treated to class control. While the dependent variable in this study was the students achievement. The moderator variables are students who have high and low achievement (high achievers and low achievers).

Procedure of the Study

In this study, the researcher investigated the effectiveness of KWL and Jigsaw on high and low achievers to increase student's achievement in comprehending narrative text. There were two treatments of this study. The first treatment is KWL technique. It was given to class XIB as experiment class. The other treatment was jigsaw technique. It was given to the class C as the control class. The try out test was conducted before the test given to the treatments classes. While the procedures of the implementation of the KWL technique were : the first is teacher explained what is KWL. Then, she gave the topic of reading. Next, she asked students to prepare a worksheet. It could be in student's workbook. The students were asked to make three columns. The first column has the word K, the second column for W and the last for L. The teacher asked students to write down about what students know about the topic in the first column. The teacher then guided students to write down what students' questions about that topic. She told students that if they want to know something about

the topic, they should write it in the second column. After that, the teacher gave the text that contains the topic given. The text should be read by students accurately.

While they did reading, they should relate their questions and the text. They should know that do the text can answer their question in column W. then they are asked to write in third column about what have they learned from that text. For the second technique, teacher divided the students into some group. It was through numbering them one until four. It called home group. Each of them was given a topic. The students should be responsible for their task. Then students who got number one should make new group with number one from the others group, number two and number two from all groups and also for number three and four. This group called expert group. This expert group discussed the same topic until the members mastered the topic. Then they returned to their home group and conveyed the result of his /her discussion in expert group.

Findings And Discussion

The result showed that the wide variations of the score of pretest in narrative reading comprehension for experimental group which treated by KWL technique are varies. The score varies from 2.00 until 7.50 for both students' type -high and low achiever – using the Know What Learn (KWL) technique. It looked the same as the highest score in the class that would be treated by Jigsaw technique that was 7.50. While the lowest score was showed by number 3.00 in the pretest of Class that was treated by Jigsaw and 2.00 in the class that was treated by KWL. The test of normality and homogeneity also was done. The data on pretest in experimental and control group for high and low achievers students $p\text{-value} > 0.05$, where the Sig. (2-tailed) were 0.716, 0.764, 0.667 and $0.657 > 0.05$. It indicated that H_0 was accepted. Following this, it could be concluded that the data on pre-test were accounted as normal data distribution. Homogeneity test was used to make sure the homogeneity of variants, it mean that the biggest and lowest variants were calculated by statistical analysis of Levene Test. The test of homogeneity showed that Sig. based on mean was $0.168 > 0.05$, based on median was $0.214 > 0.05$, based on median and with adjusted df was $0.214 > 0.05$ and based on trimmed mean was $0.170 > 0.05$. Then it could be concluded that the data was homogeny .

The result was there were significant differences before and after the treatment, and in this case was KWL. From the data KWL had improved students' reading comprehension. In other words, KWL was effective in teaching reading comprehension for high achievers. The means score of pretest was 6.6818 and after the treatment was 7.9091. It could be said that the students' mean score treated with jigsaw was increased. There was a rising in score before and after the treatment, and it was 1.22 point. The treatment of KWL which employed on low achievers was effective. This was due to it could improve students' reading comprehension achievement. In addition, it indicated that the students in experimental class showed excitement with KWL technique as a medium to teach reading comprehension. The means score of pretest in low achievers was 3.86 and after the treatment was 6.09 It could be said that the low achievers' mean score treated by jigsaw was increased. There was a rising point in score before and after the treatment, and it was 2.23 point.

The result of the jigsaw treatment showed that the means score of pretest was 3.59 and after the treatment was 5.59 It could be said that the students' mean score treated with JIGSAW was increased. There was a rising in score before and after the treatment, and it was 2 point. So it could be drawn a conclusion that the low achievers were enthusiastic in doing the test and exercise in the classroom, because the mean of posttest was higher than the pretest. And based table 6b on the paired sample test at the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$. The Sig. was $0.000 < 0.05$, then it mean that there was significant difference after the low achievers were treated by KWL. In other words the treatment of KWL employed on low achievers was effective. This was due to it could improve students' reading comprehension achievement. In addition, it indicated that the students in experimental class showed excitement with KWL technique as a medium to teach reading comprehension. The means score of pretest was 3.86 and after the treatment was 6.09 It could be said that the low achievers mean score treated with jigsaw was increased. There was a rising in score before and after the treatment, and it was 2.23 point. The paired sample statistics of low achievers taught using jigsaw showed that the difference between pre-test and posttest was 2.23 point. The Sig. (2-tailed) value was $0.000 < 0.05$. This mean that there was significant difference before and after the treatment was employed. So, H_a was accepted and H_o was rejected. Based

on the data above, the results of this study supported the study hypothesis that jigsaw was effective to teach reading comprehension especially for low achievers.

The difference mean score between pretest and posttest for low achievers treated by KWL was 2 point while the ones who treated by jigsaw was 2.23 point. The result of the table above showed that the difference of the mean score of pretest and posttest of low achievers treated by jigsaw was higher than KWL. From the data findings then it could be concluded that jigsaw was more effective to teach reading comprehension for low achievers than KWL.

Tabel 1
Mean Score of Pre Test and Post Test of KWL and JIGSAW
Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std Deviation	Std Error Mean
Pair 1	KWL_posttest	6.7727	22	1.44525	.30813
	Jigsaw_posttest	6.9545	22	1.29016	.27506
Pair 2	KWL_pretest	5.0909	22	1.68775	.35983
	KWL_posttest	6.7727	22	1.44525	.30813
Pair 3	Jigsaw_pretest	5.2727	22	1.60896	.34303
	Jigsaw_posttest	6.9545	22	1.29016	.27506

The data on the table above showed that the mean of KWL pre-test was 5.0909 and the post test was 6.7727. Then it could be concluded that there was 1.6818 point of the difference before and after KWL technique was employed for both high and low achievers. In the other hand the mean of jigsaw pre test was 5.2727 and the post test was 6.9545, then there was 1.6818 point of rising score. So it could be said that both jigsaw and KWL were effective, since they have the same point on means (1.6818). F value or F-test for method was 0.843 since significant (Sig.) was $0.364 > 0.05$, then it could be concluded that there was no significant differences between method and students' reading comprehension achievement. The statistics result of the interaction effect between method the score gain by the students showed on F value or F-test was 0.843 since significant (Sig.) was $0.364 > 0.05$, then it could be concluded that there was no significant difference between students taught using KWL and JIGSAW in their reading comprehension achievement. Both methods had given positive effect. The students taught using KWL showed an increasing of mean score before and after this method was employed.

It was found that there was a significant difference between students' type in this case high and low achievers with the students' reading comprehension. High achievers students performed better than the low achievers students. F value or F-test for interaction between techniques and students' type showed was 1.214 with coefficient significant (Sig.) 0.277. Since significant (Sig.) $0.277 \geq 0.05$ then the interaction between method and students' type did not affected the students' reading comprehension. Students mean score which taught using KWL was 6.59 and the mean score of the students taught using jigsaw was 7.16. This mean that the students taught using jigsaw performed better than the students taught using KWL. In other words, jigsaw was more effective than KWL regardless of the students' type. The difference means of high and low achievers was 2.00 point. Regardless of the treatment, high achievers performed better than low achievers. The data revealed no interaction between treatments, students' type and reading comprehension achievement.

Both jigsaw and KWL were effective to teach reading comprehension for high achievers since both methods could improve the high achievers achievement in reading comprehension. But the statistical calculation showed that the high achievers who taught using KWL performed better than the ones who taught using jigsaw. In this case, it could be drawn a conclusion that KWL was more effective to teach reading comprehension for high achievers. It can be found the difference of the mean score of pretest and posttest of low achievers treated by jigsaw was higher than KWL. From the statistical calculation then it could be concluded that JIGSAW was more effective to teach reading comprehension for low achievers than KWL. In general the students taught using jigsaw performed better than the students taught using KWL. In other words, jigsaw was more effective than KWL regardless of the students' type. For the last research question it can be drawn that the data revealed no interaction between treatments, students' type and reading comprehension achievement.

REFERENCES

- Bainbridge, C. 2014. Gifted Children: High Achiever. Available at <http://giftedkids.about.com/od/glossary/g/High-Achiever.htm> Accessed on (February 10, 2014)
- Brown, A., and Palinscar, A. S. 1986. *Guided Cooperative Learning and Individual Knowledge Acquisition*. University Of Illinois: Centre for the Study of Reading
- Brown, J. 1988. *Understanding Research in Second Language Learning*. NJ: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, D. W. and Johnson, R. T. 2005. *An Overview of Cooperative Learning*. Available at: <http://www.co-operation.org/home/introduction-to-cooperative-learning/> [Accessed on January 15, 2013]
- McCoach. 2001. A Comparison of High Achievers' and Low Achievers' Attitude, Perceptions and Motivations. *Academic Exchange Journal*. Summer 2001 Available <http://www.gifted.uconn.edu/siegle/publications/AEQComparisonOfAchievers.pdf> Accessed on (August 23, 2013)