

## **The Use of the Jigsaw Technique on Students' Reading Comprehension**

**Fitri Zulyanis**

[fitrizulyanis@gmail.com](mailto:fitrizulyanis@gmail.com)

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau

**Harum Natasha**

[harum.natasha@uin-suska.ac.id](mailto:harum.natasha@uin-suska.ac.id)

Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau

### **Abstract**

This study was aimed at determining whether there is a significant effect on reading comprehension of class IX Junior High School *Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah (MTI)* Agam Regency. This research is classified as quasi-experimental research. This study involved 53 students consisting of two groups, namely Class XI A as the experimental group and Class IX B as the control group. The experimental group was taught using the jigsaw technique, while the control group was taught using textbook-based techniques. Data were obtained using pre-test given to both groups before treatment and post-tests given after treatment. The pre-test and post-test data of both groups were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. After the data was tested and declared homogeneous and normal, the hypothesis was tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The results showed that there was a significant effect in reading comprehension between students who were taught using the jigsaw technique and students who were taught using textbook-based techniques. The calculated significance value is 0.055 greater than 0.05 (sig value = 0.055 > 0.05). Therefore, this research hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is significant effect in the reading comprehension of students who are taught using jigsaw technique as learning technique in class IX Junior High School *Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah (MTI)* Bayur.

*Keywords: Jigsaw Technique, Reading, Reading Comprehension,*

### **Introduction**

Reading, as one of the skills in English is considered important for students in learning since it helps them understand all kinds of written texts. It is named a receptive skill through which we receive information. Reading can develop knowledge and experiences and enrich one's thoughts. According to Brown (2001) in Surahmawati (2016), reading is a process related to how a reader thinks and the rest of the communication parts: writing, listening, and speaking. It is also a recreating process of printed ideas, where the author shares information. Further, Pourhosein (2016) contends that reading is a kind of activity that includes an interactive process of readers establishing a text's meaningful representation by using appropriate reading strategies.

Reading is essential because the success of students' studies depends on their ability to read. Brown (2004) stated that reading is a process of understanding meaning and connecting to the

text through a correlation of the reader's existing knowledge and background knowledge, the information in the text, and the attitude of the reader in reading. Suherdi (2017) defined reading as the process of looking at a series of written symbols and getting meaning.

Meanwhile, Frank (2004) in Latifa (2018) define reading as a process of setting up new knowledge in the mind. It requires the reader's attention to get new knowledge. Next, Grabe and Stoller (2002) in Latifa (2018) defined reading as an ability to understand meaning from the written page and understand the information correctly. Perhaps, students just read without knowing the meaning of what they read. So, it emphasizes not only reading practice in a reading activity but also comprehending a reading passage. As a complex activity, there are two activities included in reading which are seeing and thinking activities. Moreover, Harmer (2001) in Latifa (2018) add that the eyes and brain are frequently used in this activity. Since reading is visual information, eyes play an important role. Their role in reading is frequently used. In addition, reading is an exercise dominated by the eyes and the brain. Thus, it can be inferred that reading is the ability to understand written words and understand their meaning correctly. It involves both seeing and thinking activities. The eyes collect and deliver information to the brain, and then the brain processes the information to construct the meaning. In addition, reading is an active thinking process that depends not only on word recognition skills but also on the reader's own experiences and previous knowledge. The readers will understand the text easily if they are familiar with the text given.

Reading comprehension is the substance of reading. A reader's victory in reading is assessed by the capacity and the degree of understanding of the thoughts or data found in reading content. Nunan (2003) in Latifa (2018) defined reading comprehension as a process of constructing meaning by integrating the information from the text and readers' background knowledge. Background knowledge helps the reader to comprehend the text easily. Further, Snow (2002) mentions that reading comprehension is the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. It can be defined as an active thinking process through which a reader intentionally constructs meaning to form a deeper understanding of concepts and information presented in a text and the researcher focuses only on reading comprehension of narrative text. In addition, Lehr (2013) in Varita (2017) suggest reading comprehension is the process of simultaneously extracting and constructing meaning through interaction and involvement with written language. While Mahfoodh (2007) stated that there are five aspects in reading comprehension, they are finding the main idea, finding factual information, finding the meaning of vocabulary, identifying references and making inference. Identifying the Main idea refers to crucial details that elucidate a paragraph's or section's overall theme. The key concept is not mentioned clearly in any of the sentences. Instead, the reader is left to conclude or reason it out. The reader needs to establish the topic sentence by providing a description, an example, a fact comparison, an analogy, and so on to find factual details. While identifying references it helps students to understand the text by identifying the word. In making inference the students have to guess and predict something unknown based on available facts and information. Regarding the definition of reading comprehension above, the researcher concludes that reading comprehension is a complex process in terms of constructing the meaning purpose to know what the texts talk about. When the readers read, they will make a connection between their background knowledge and the new information from the text. In comprehending texts, the readers also need to identify the elements of the text such as finding the main idea, factual information, the meaning of vocabulary, identifying references, and making inferences.

*Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah Bayur* is one of the Islamic junior high schools in Maninjau Regency, in West Sumatra Province. This Islamic school offers English as one of the compulsory subjects to the students including the four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. The students learn English within one meeting in a week in 45 minutes. Based on curriculum 2013 (K13), the aim of learning English is to utilize the potential of the students to have communicative competence in three points of views: interpersonal, transactional, and functional text both by using Spoken and Written of English. The teachers of English at Islamic Junior High School of *MTI Agam Regency* informed that the minimum criteria for completeness score (KKM) in IX year is 75. There is also information that the students of grade IX still had difficulties in reading English text, especially narrative text. The reading comprehension does not match the curriculum expectations.

There are various techniques in reading that the teacher could use. One of them is cooperative learning. This kind of learning can remarkably guide the students' activities in learning. Some researchers surprisingly found that students are more active in the classroom when this technique is applied. Johnson, Johnson, & Stanne (2000) asserted in Permata (2016) that there are four kinds of cooperative learning; 1) Student Team- Achievement Divisions (STAD), Jigsaw, Teams-Games-Tournament (TGT), and Team Assisted Individualization (TAI). The jigsaw technique is one technique that is considered very well-known in cooperative learning. The Jigsaw technique is reported that it could provide a significant impact on the reading comprehension of students (Surahmawati, 2016). While Refai (2012) proposes that this technique has been victorious in improving the ability of students to comprehend a narrative text. Various studies have implemented Jigsaw technique to improve the reading comprehension of students. These studies mostly were conducted as experimental research. Understanding the jigsaw technique is necessary to teach students to become involved in a discussion and to take personal responsibility to help comprehend something about the problem based on their classmates.

Following Piaget's cognitive hypothesis and constructivist theory, the jigsaw technique learning may show a cooperative learning model with understudying bunch work arranged in the form of tiny bunches. The jigsaw technique might exhibit in which understudies learn in little bunches which consist of five to six individuals working together autonomously of good reliance and obligation. The data acquired in the jigsaw technique includes some openings to the exact supervision and suppositions which, therefore, enable the communication competence from many dependable individuals for the successful sets and the wholeness from the element under consideration.

The jigsaw technique was designed to replace some of the competitive behavior in the classroom with cooperative behavior (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997). Thus, the Jigsaw Technique is a cooperative technique that is effective in increasing student's awareness in learning and understanding the text since everyone is essential within the learning process, it deals with the cooperative activity in two main groups 'home group' and 'expert group'. In the Jigsaw Technique, students are expected to gain their understanding by discussing in both 'expert group' and 'home group', here the students gain more understanding and have the probability to get inference rightly by experiencing discussion in two groups.

Based on a preliminary study at the one of private schools in Maninjau, West Sumatera, it was initiated that the students found it difficult to get the main ideas of a text. Some of them also got confused in identifying the supporting details of the text, and some others had difficulties in getting information from the text. Therefore, the researchers want to use the

jigsaw technique in reading comprehension of narrative text. Thus, this research seeks for the following research questions: a) How is the students' reading comprehension of narrative text taught without using the Jigsaw Technique at ninth-grade students of Islamic Junior High of Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah Agam Region? b) How is the student's reading comprehension of narrative text taught by using the Jigsaw Technique of the ninth-grade students at Islamic Junior High School of Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah Agam Region? c) Is there any significant difference in the students' reading comprehension of narrative text who were taught without and by using the Jigsaw Technique?

## Methodology

The method of this research is experimental research. Creswell (2012) mentioned that there are three designs of experimental research: true, quasi, and pre-experimental research. The design of this research is a quasi-experimental research design. Then, it used a nonequivalent control group design. The nonequivalent control design involves the random assignment of intact groups to treatment, not the random assignment of individual Groups.

Table 1.  
Quasi-Experiment Design

| Group         | Pre-Test | Treatment | Post-Test |
|---------------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| Experimental  | X1       | T         | Y1        |
| Control Class | X2       | -         | Y2        |

From the population, the researchers took the sample by using a saturated sampling technique. Saturated sampling is a sampling technique when all members of the population are used as samples (Sugiono, 2016). Therefore, the researcher took the sample by using the saturated sampling technique. Then, the researcher took A class as an experimental class and B class as a control class. The reason why the researcher took A class as an experimental because A class is more active than B class. So, the researcher used the A class as an experimental class. In this research, the tests consisted of two types: pre-test and post-test.

### (1) Pre-test

The pre-test has been given to determine the early background ability of the student's reading comprehension of narrative text. It is given to the students before applying the treatment. In this research, the test consisted of 8 passages; 7 passages consisting of 3 questions for each and 1 passage consisted of 4 questions, so the total of items in the test are 25 questions. The questions are based on the components of reading comprehension of narrative text. The questions are in the form of multiple-choice questions. The score for every question is 4. Therefore, the total correct score would be 100 points.

### (2) Post-Test

The post-test was conducted after giving the treatment in the teaching and learning process. It is used to know whether there is an improvement in students' reading comprehension or not. The test consists of 25 questions. The test used in the post-test is similar to the test in the pre-test. Therefore, the total score answer correctly is 100 points.

## Results and Discussion

### Results

#### *(1) Students' Reading Comprehension Taught Without Using the Jigsaw Technique*

The data of student's reading comprehension taught without using the Jigsaw Technique were obtained from the pre-test and post-test of class IX B as the control class (26 students). The data can be seen in the table below:

Table 2.

| The Score of Students Reading Comprehension<br>Taught Without Using the Jigsaw Technique |             |          |           |
|--|-------------|----------|-----------|
| Control Class  |             |          |           |
| No   | Respondents | Pre-Test | Post-Test |
| 1.   | Student 1   | 44       | 20        |
| 2.   | Student 2   | 32       | 28        |
| 3.   | Student 3   | 32       | 36        |
| 4.   | Student 4   | 28       | 16        |
| 5.   | Student 5   | 36       | 48        |
| 6.   | Student 6   | 8        | 12        |
| 7.   | Student 7   | 36       | 56        |
| 8.   | Student 8   | 24       | 36        |
| 9.   | Student 9   | 20       | 36        |
| 10.  | Student 10  | 44       | 48        |
| 11.  | Student 11  | 52       | 48        |
| 12.  | Student 12  | 32       | 28        |
| 13.  | Student 13  | 52       | 28        |
| 14.  | Student 14  | 56       | 17        |
| 15.  | Student 15  | 56       | 36        |
| 16.  | Student 16  | 48       | 52        |
| 17.  | Student 17  | 28       | 16        |
| 18.  | Student 18  | 16       | 28        |
| 19.  | Student 19  | 12       | 32        |
| 20.  | Student 20  | 13       | 56        |
| 21.  | Student 21  | 48       | 56        |
| 22.  | Student 22  | 40       | 48        |
| 23.  | Student 23  | 10       | 60        |
| 24.  | Student 24  | 32       | 16        |
| 25.  | Student 25  | 52       | 56        |
| 26.  | Student 26  | 52       | 56        |
| TOTAL  |             | 1064     | 988       |

Table 2. shows that the total score of pre-tests in the control group was 1064, the highest score was 56 and the lowest was 8. The total score of the post-test experimental group was 988, the highest score was 60, and the lowest was 12.

*(2) Student Reading Comprehension Taught by Using the Jigsaw Technique*

The data on student's reading comprehension taught by using the Jigsaw Technique was obtained from the pre-test and post-test of class IX A as the Experimental class (27 students). The data can be seen in the table below:

Table 3.  
The Score of Students Reading Comprehension  
Taught By Using the Jigsaw Technique

| No    | Respondents | Experimental Class |           |
|-------|-------------|--------------------|-----------|
|       |             | Pre-Test           | Post-Test |
| 1.    | Student 1   | 60                 | 75        |
| 2.    | Student 2   | 48                 | 65        |
| 3.    | Student 3   | 70                 | 84        |
| 4.    | Student 4   | 45                 | 65        |
| 5.    | Student 5   | 62                 | 75        |
| 6.    | Student 6   | 65                 | 84        |
| 7.    | Student 7   | 52                 | 65        |
| 8.    | Student 8   | 52                 | 70        |
| 9.    | Student 9   | 60                 | 72        |
| 10.   | Student 10  | 70                 | 80        |
| 11.   | Student 11  | 55                 | 70        |
| 12.   | Student 12  | 60                 | 76        |
| 13.   | Student 13  | 65                 | 76        |
| 14.   | Student 14  | 52                 | 68        |
| 15.   | Student 15  | 56                 | 72        |
| 16.   | Student 16  | 45                 | 70        |
| 17.   | Student 17  | 65                 | 85        |
| 18.   | Student 18  | 70                 | 85        |
| 19.   | Student 19  | 65                 | 78        |
| 20.   | Student 20  | 58                 | 72        |
| 21.   | Student 21  | 56                 | 72        |
| 22.   | Student 22  | 70                 | 85        |
| 23.   | Student 23  | 65                 | 72        |
| 24.   | Student 24  | 58                 | 76        |
| 25.   | Student 25  | 68                 | 80        |
| 26.   | Student 26  | 52                 | 75        |
| 27.   | Student 27  | 70                 | 85        |
| TOTAL |             | 1615               | 2032      |

Table 3. shows that the total score of pre-tests in the experimental group was 1615, the highest score was 70 and the lowest was 45. The total score of the post-test experimental group was 2032, the highest score was 85, and the lowest was 65.

(3) *Descriptive Analysis*

a. *The Description of Students' Pre-Test Scores of Experiment Class*

Table 4.  
The Pre-Test Percentage of Experimental Class

| No           | Categories | Score   | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| 1            | Very Good  | 80 -100 | 0         | 0.0%       |
| 2            | Good       | 66-79   | 6         | 22.2%      |
| 3            | Enough     | 56-65   | 13        | 48.1%      |
| 4            | Less       | 40-55   | 8         | 29.7%      |
| 5            | Fail       | 30-39   | 0         | 0.0%       |
| <b>Total</b> |            |         | 27        | 100%       |

Table 4. shows that the category of very good got a frequency of 0 (0%), the category of good got a frequency of 6 (22.2%), and the category of enough got a frequency of 13 (48.1%). The category of less got the frequency 8 (29.7%), and for the failure category got the frequency 0 (0.00%) Then; the highest percentage was 13 (48.1%).

b. *The Description of Students' Post-Test Scores of Experimental Class*

Table 5.  
The Post-Test Percentage of the Experimental Class

| No           | Categories | Score   | Frequency | Percentage |
|--------------|------------|---------|-----------|------------|
| 1            | Very Good  | 80 -100 | 8         | 29.6%      |
| 2            | Good       | 66-79   | 16        | 59.3%      |
| 3            | Enough     | 56-65   | 3         | 11.1%      |
| 4            | Less       | 40-55   | 0         | 0.0%       |
| 5            | Fail       | 30-39   | 0         | 0.0%       |
| <b>Total</b> |            |         | 27        | 100%       |

Table 5 shows that the category of very good got a frequency of 8 (29.6%), the category of good got a frequency of 16 (59.3%), and the category of enough got a frequency of 3 (11.1%). The category of less got the frequency 0 (0.0%), and for the failure category got the frequency 0 (0.0%) Then; the highest percentage was 16 (59.3%).

c. *The Effect of Using the Jigsaw Technique on students' Reading Comprehension in Narrative Text*

Table 6.  
Independent Sample T-Test

|                  |                             | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances |      | t-Test for Equality of Means |        | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference |                 |                       |          |          |
|------------------|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|---|-----------------|-----------------------|----------|----------|
|                  |                             | F                                       | Sig. | t                            | df     | Sig. (2-tailed)                           | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower    | Upper    |
| EXPERIMENT CLASS | Equal variances assumed     | 18.128                                  | .000 | 12.465                       | 51     | .000                                      | 37.25326        | 2.98357               | 31.26848 | 43.24303 |
|                  | Equal variances not assumed |   |      | 12.333                       | 34.903 | .000                                      | 37.25326        | 3.02104               | 31.12661 | 43.39391 |

Ha accepted if sig value  $< 0.05$

Ho accepted if sig value  $> 0.05$

It can be concluded that there is a significant effect of using the Jigsaw technique on the experimental class.

### *Discussion*

This section explains the findings of the study about not only the previous research but also the current issue related to the implementation of the Jigsaw Technique in teaching Reading Comprehension to students in Indonesia. This will focus on the effect of using the jigsaw technique toward the students of private junior high schools in West Sumatera. The jigsaw technique was designed to replace some of the competitive behavior in the classroom with cooperative behavior (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997). Thus, the Jigsaw Technique is a cooperative technique that is effective in increasing students' awareness in learning and understanding the text since everyone is essential within the learning process, it deals with the cooperative activity in two main groups 'home group' and 'expert group'. In the Jigsaw Technique, students are expected to gain their understanding by discussing in both 'expert group' and 'home group', here the students gain more understanding and have the probability to get inference rightly by experiencing discussion in two groups.

Zahra (2014) researched improving students' ability to write a descriptive text by using the jigsaw technique. In her research, it was found that the final result of using the jigsaw technique was that the significance value was lower than the significance level which was  $0.043 < 0.05$  which means that the jigsaw technique improved students' ability to write a descriptive text.

Then, Hildayati (2017) also applied the technique to Reading Comprehension of Analytical Exposition Text. The result showed that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension of analytical exposition text between students who are taught by using jigsaw learning and those who are taught by using grammar-translation methods. Next, research from Silalahi (2019) entitled Jigsaw Method in Reading Comprehension. The result demonstrated that there is significantly increasing reading at the VIII neap tide students of junior high school PGRI 4 Medan.

Finally, research from Surahmawati (2016) entitled The Effectiveness of Using Jigsaw Technique to Improving Reading Comprehension of First Grades resulted that the jigsaw technique had a significant effect on the students' reading comprehension at first graders of SMK 4 Kendari.

Therefore, the researchers came to the assumption that the Jigsaw technique is very likely to have an impact on increasing students' reading comprehension. If the technique used can be understood easily, it motivates students to pay more attention and be more active in the teaching-learning process. It is believed that the jigsaw technique can be used to increase students' reading comprehension of narrative text. It proved by the result of this study that there was a significant effect of using the jigsaw technique on students' reading comprehension at one of Islamic Junior High School in Maninjau, West Sumatera.



## Conclusion

This research was done to find out the effect of using the Jigsaw Technique on students' reading comprehension at Islamic Junior High School *Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah (MTI) Bayur Maninjau*. Finally, the researchers found that the students' reading comprehension who were taught by using the jigsaw technique at Islamic Junior High School *Madrasah Tarbiyah Islamiyah (MTI) Bayur Maninjau* was categorized into “**Good**” level at score 85. Next, the students' reading comprehension who were taught without using the jigsaw technique was categorized as “**Less**” level at score 56. Then, there is a significant effect of using the jigsaw technique on students' reading comprehension at Islamic Junior High School *Madrasah Tarbiyah (MTI) Bayur Maninjau*, West Sumatera.

## References

- Ali, Mohammed F.A.E. (2001). The Effect of Using Jigsaw Reading Technique on the EFL Pre-Service Teachers' Reading Anxiety and Comprehension. *Journal of Education College No. 3 (Pp. 1-17)*. Cairo, Egypt: Helwan University. From <http://www.fayoum.edu.eg/english/education/CurriculaTeaching/pdf/Jigsaw.pdf>.
- Aronson, E. (2008). *Jigsaw Classroom*. from <http://www.jigsaw.net>. Retrieved March 5, 2020.
- Aronson, E. (2000). *The Jigsaw Classroom*. from <http://www.jigsaw.org>. Retrieved April 5, 2020.
- Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. (1997). *The Jigsaw Classroom: Building Cooperation in the Classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching (5th Ed)*. New York: Pearson Education Inc. from [http://angol.uni-miskolc.hu/wp-content/media/2016/10/Principles of language learning.pdf](http://angol.uni-miskolc.hu/wp-content/media/2016/10/Principles_of_language_learning.pdf). Retrieved April, 2020.
- Brown, H. Douglas. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. 2ndEd. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education. From <https://dokumen.pub/qdownload/teaching-by-principles-an-interactive-approach-to-language-pedagogy-4th-edition-4nbsped-0133925854-9780133925852.html>. Retrieved April 5, 2020.
- Cahyono. (2011). *The Teaching Language Skill and English Language Components*. Malang: State University of Malang Press.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Hillsdale New Jersey.:L. Erlbaum Associates.
- Cohen, L. M. (2007). *Research Method in Education*. London and New York: the Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Creswell, John W. (2012). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Harmer, Jeremy. (1983). *The Practice of English Language Teaching*. New York. Person Longman.

- Hildayati, Febriani. (2017). The Effectiveness Of Jigsaw On Reading Comprehension Of Analytical Exposition Text. *Journal Of Applied Linguistics And Literacy*, 1-9. From <https://jurnal.unigal.ac.id/index.php/jall/article/view/1732>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Isjoni. (2010). Pembelajaran Kooperatif: Meningkatkan Kecerdasan Komunikasi Antar Peserta Didik. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Latifa, Nurul A. M. (2018). Teaching Narrative Text By Using Preview, Question, Read, State, An (Refai, 2012)d Test (PQRST) Technique. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 243-260. From <http://www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/11547>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Mahendra, R. N. (2014). Teaching Writing a Narrative Text By Using the Spin-A-Story Writing Prompt to Junior High School. *English Education Journal/JELT Vol 3*, 79-86. From <http://ejournal.unp.ac.id/index.php/jelt/article/view/4360>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Mahfoodh, O. H. (2007). *Reading for EFL College Students*. (Online), (<http://www.yementimes.com/article.shtml>, retrieved on December 11, 2014).
- Oller, John W, Jr., and Patricia A. Richard-Amato. ed. (1983). *Methods that Work*. Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers Inc.
- Permata, Dian. (2016). Implementation of Cooperative Learning Model Type Jigsaw in Social Science to Increase Students' Learning Outcome. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 61-67. From <https://ejournal.undiksha.ac.id/index.php/JPP/article/view/15415>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Pourhosein, A, Gilakjani. (2016). How Can Students Improve Their Reading Comprehension Skill? *Journal of Studies in Education*, 229-240.
- Pradiyono, (2007). *Teaching Genre-Based Writing*, Yogyakarta: C.V. Andi Offset
- Refai. (2012). Implementing Jigsaw II Strategy to Improve the Reading Comprehension. *ISSN 2089 Vol-1*, 55-63. <https://ojs.fkip.ummetro.ac.id/index.php/english/article/view/1107>
- Sari, R.F. (2017). Hubungan Pengetahuan Guru Tentang Manajemen Pembelajaran Dengan Kinerja Guru Di MTS Negeri 2 Medan. *Jurnal Benchmarking*, 1-11. From <http://jurnal.uinsu.ac.id/index.php/benchmarking/article/view/1124>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Silalahi, Elfrida. BR. (2019). Jigsaw Method In Reading Comprehension. *Enjourme (English Journal Of Merdeka): Culture, Language, And Teaching of English*, 11-17. From <http://jurnal.unmer.ac.id/index.php/enjourme/article/view/3184>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Snow, Chathrine, E. (2002). *Reading for Understanding Toward an R&D Program in Reading Comprehension*. South Hayes Street: RAND Education. From <https://videnomlaesning.dk/media/2526/reading-for-understanding.pdf>. Retrieved October 10, 2020.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung. ALFABETA.

- Surahmawati, Dahlia, H. H. (2016). The Effectiveness of Using Jigsaw Technique to Improve Reading Comprehension of First Graders Of SMK 4 Kendari In 2015/ 2016 Academic Years. *Journal of Language Education and Educational Technology*, 1-14. From <http://ojs.uho.ac.id/index.php/JLEET/article/view/6657>. Retrieved March 5, 2021.
- Susilawati, F. (2017). Teaching Writing of Narrative Text through Digital Comic. *Journal of English and Education*, 103-111. From <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/9939>. Retrieved October 6, 2020.
- Suherdi, N. H. (2017). The Effectiveness of Jigsaw in Improving Students' Reading Comprehension. *Journal of English and Education*, 1-12. From <https://ejournal.upi.edu/index.php/L-E/article/view/9895>. Retrieved October 6, 2020.
- Syafi'i, M. (2017). *From Paragraphs To A Research Report: A Writing Of English For Academic Purposes*. Pekanbaru: Kreasi Edukasi.
- Varita, Detty. (2017). Improving Reading Comprehension Through Literature. *English Education Journal (EEJ)*, 234-244. From <http://jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id/EEJ/article/view/7231> Retrieved March 5, 2020.
- Zahra, R, Oktariani. (2014). The Use of Jigsaw Technique in Improving Students' Ability in Writing a Descriptive Text. *Journal of English and Education*, 64-75. From <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/193285-EN-the-use-of-jigsaw-technique-in-improving.pdf>. Retrieved March 5, 2020.