

Rahayu Fitri, Ninit Alfianika. (2017). Effect of Student Teams Achievement Division and Vocabulary Mastery to Reading Comprehension Ability. *Journal of Education and Learning*. Vol. 11 (4) pp. 453-459. DOI: 10.11591/edulearn.v11i4.6190

Effect of Student Teams Achievement Division and Vocabulary Mastery to Reading Comprehension Ability

Rahayu Fitri*
STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

Ninit Alfianika**
STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat, Indonesia

Abstract

This research aimed to describe the effect of STAD technique and vocabulary mastery to reading comprehension ability. This is a quantitative research with quasi-experimental research with factorial design 2x2. Sampling was done by using simple random sampling technique. Data were collected by using objective tests. The results of this research were: (1) there was a difference in reading comprehension between students taught using STAD technique with conventional technique; (2) there was a difference in reading comprehension between students who had a high vocabulary taught by STAD technique type with students having high vocabulary taught using conventional technique; (3) there was a difference in reading comprehension between students who had low vocabulary are taught using STAD technique with students who had low vocabulary taught using conventional technique; and (4) there was an interaction between the use of STAD technique and vocabulary mastery in influencing the students reading comprehension ability.

Keywords: *STAD, vocabulary mastery, reading comprehension*

* Rahayu Fitri, M.Pd. STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Jln. Gunung Pangilun, Padang – Indonesia
E-mail: rahayu@stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id

** Ninit Alfianika, M.Pd. STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat, Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia, Jln. Gunung Pangilun, Padang – Indonesia
E-mail: ninit@stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id

Introduction

Learning to read, especially reading comprehension is one of the lecture material contained in Pengajaran Keterampilan Membaca Course at Program Studi Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. This material required students to be able to understand the text, both the literary and non-literary texts. This can be seen on the Curriculum at Program Studi Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Razak (2009, p. 11) stated that reading comprehension is the reader's ability to mention again the content of the argumentation, exposition, or reading of the description of a particular topic. There are four aspects that should be controlled by learners in reading comprehension. The four aspects are: (1) must know the main idea; (2) must know sentence or idea explanatory; (3) must conclude the reading; and (4) must know the mandate or author's views.

But in reality, reading comprehension learning has not been done properly, so that it can be said that the students have not been able to understand a reading well. According Somadayo (2011, p. 29), a factor that was partly responsible for the low ability to read a person in the context of Indonesia, were (1) the tradition of orality, which as we all know that historically the culture of our society pocketed the cultural heritage of oral or oral tradition fossilized; and (2) our school system failed to give sufficient opportunity for the presence of a tradition of literacy or read the tradition of reading to students, such as too much of a speaker educators and learners too many listeners. Soedarso (2008, pp. 58-59) states that each person's ability to understand the readings were read differently. It depends on the vocabulary owned, interest, reach the eyes, the speed of interpretation, the background of previous experience, intellectual ability, familiarity with the idea of being read, the purpose of reading, and the flexibility to set the pace.

One of the factors affecting the low reading comprehension is the selection of learning techniques. Selection of learning techniques can be adapted to the characteristics of the student and the teaching materials. This is in accordance with the opinion of Rusman (2012, p. 133) that learning model selection should consider the objectives to be achieved, the material or subject matter, and the viewpoint of learners. The use of appropriate learning approaches also has an impact on the results obtained by the students later. It is also revealed by Djumingin (2017, p. 104) that "the success of the quality of Indonesian language learning Also highly depends on the skill of the teacher to design and Realize learning activities". This can be done by selecting the approaches and learning methods appropriate to the nature of the material teaching and in accordance with the desired conditions of students. In order for learning outcomes in reading comprehension for the better, in this research, used Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) technique. According to Slavin (2009, p. 143), STAD technique can be applied to various materials. The author considers the STAD method suitable for students because of the STAD method, students are required to cooperate with the group. The cooperation can be done by a discussion. If the discussions held in the classroom, the classroom atmosphere will be lively and the students would be motivating.

In addition to the selection of teaching methods, other factors that affect the low reading comprehension of students is low mastery of vocabulary. Lack of knowledge about the applicable rules of language, lack of vocabulary of students, and the limited knowledge or experience that will be delivered to the listeners also be a limiting factor in the students' reading comprehension. Atmazaki (2007, p. 53) states that the wording carefully and precisely to represent the thoughts and feelings of the authors and speakers will inspire readers and listeners thought carefully and precisely anyway. It was not because every word has a meaning different area so that the resulting impression is also different.

In line with that, Tarigan (2011, p. 2) says that the quality of one's language skills depending on the quantity and quality of its vocabulary. The increasingly rich vocabulary we have, the more likely we are skilled language. It is also revealed by Susanti (2002, p. 90) that the reading will be easier and fun when someone knows a lot about the vocabulary in a discourse, therefore it is important to learn the vocabulary. Vocabulary as one element of language plays an important role in the act of reading. Through words, a person can express his thoughts, ideas, and feelings to others. Therefore, students are also required to further enrich their vocabulary in order to more easily understand the readings and present his ideas in oral and written form.

Method

The type of this research is quantitative with a quasi-experimental design in the form of a factorial design 2x2. The population of this research was all students in the 4th semester at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Sampling was done by using simple random sampling technique. Samples were selected by 2 classes are divided into experimental class and control class. After calculation of the average value of all students, selected A sessions as the control class with 27 students and C session as the experimental class with 25 students.

The instrument used to measure student mastery of vocabulary and reading comprehension were an objective test that has been tested for validity and reliability. For the vocabulary mastery test consists of 42 questions with answer choices A, B, C, D, and E with indicator about: (1) a synonym, (2) antonyms, and (3) homonyms. For the reading comprehension test, consists of 30 questions with answer choices A, B, C, D, and E with indicator about: (1) to answer questions; (2) summarize the literature; (3) look for the main idea; (4) complete paragraphs; (5) Group Cloze/GC; and (6) techniques to organize readings (Group Sequencing/GS). A score of 1 was given if the student answered correctly and a score of 0 is given if the student answers incorrectly. Data were analyzed with the following steps. First, description the score and value with percentage, average value, and standard deviation. Second, testing requirements analysis include test normality test Liliefors (Sudjana, 2005, p. 466) and the homogeneity test with F test (Sudjana, 2005, pp. 249-251). Third, hypothesis testing 1, 2, and 3 performed using t-test formula. For the fourth hypothesis testing, carried out with 2-way ANOVA formula by the method of unweighted means.

Result

Research Result in Control Class

Based on the results of vocabulary mastery data in control class, the highest score was 31 and the lowest score was 10. The average value of vocabulary mastery students in the control class is 49 with standard deviation was 13,05. Based on the score, value, frequency, and percentage that vocabulary mastery of students in the control class can be divided into 16 groups. Student who received score of 10 with value of 23,81 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 11 with value of 26,19 was 1 (3,7%). Student who received score of 12 with value of 28,57 was 1 (3,7%). Student who received score of 14 with value of 33,33 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 15 with value of 35,71 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 17 with value of 40,48 were 2 (7,41%). Students who received score of 19 with value of 45,24 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 20 with value of 47,62 were 5 people (18,52%). Students who received score of 21 with value of 50 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 22 with value of 52,38 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 23 with value of 54,76 were 3 (11,11%). Students who received score of 24 with value of 57,14 were 4 (14,81%). Students who received score of 26 with value of 61,9 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 28 with value of 66,67 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 29 with value of 69,05 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 31 with value of 73,81 were 2 (7,41%).

Based on the results of reading comprehension data in control class, the highest score was 26 and the lowest score was 4. The average value of reading comprehension was 54,2 with standard deviation was 22,11. Based on the score, value, frequency, and percentage that reading comprehension of students in the control class can be divided into 15 groups. Students who received score of 4 with value of 13,33 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 6 with value of 20 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 7 with the value of 23,33 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 8 with value of 26,67 were 3 (11,11%). Students who received score of 9 with value of 30 were 3 (11,11%). Students who received score of 12 with value of 40 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 14 with value of 46,67 were 2 (7,41%). Students who received score of 14 with value of 56,67 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 17 with value of 66,67 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 20 with value of 70 were 4 (14,81%). Students who received score of 21 with value of 73,33 were 3 (11,11%). Students who received score of 22 with value of 76,67 were 3 (11,11%). Students who received score of 24 with value of 80 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 25 with value of 83,33 was 1 (3,7%). Students who received score of 26 with value of 86,67 was 1 (3,7%).

Research Result in Experimental Class

Based on the results of vocabulary mastery data in experimental class, the highest score was 41 and the lowest score was 22. The average value of vocabulary mastery students in the experimental class was 77,26 with standard deviation was 13,17. Based on the score, value, frequency, and percentage that vocabulary mastery of students in the experimental class can be divided in to 16 groups. Students who received score of 22 with value of 52,38 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 23 with value of 54,76 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 26 with value of 61,9 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 27 with value of 64,29 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 28 with value of 66,67 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 29 with value of 69,05 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 31 with value of 73,81 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 32 with value of 76,19 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 34 with value of 80,95 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 35 with value of 83,33 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 36 with value of 85,71 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 37 with value of 88,1 were 2 (8%).

Students who received score of 38 with value of 90,48 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 39 with value of 92,86 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 40 to 95,24 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 41 with score of 97,62 was 1 (4%).

Based on the results of reading comprehension in experimental class, the highest score was 29 and the lowest score was 12. The average value of vocabulary mastery students in the experimental class was 75,2 with standard deviation was 17,79. Based on the score, value, frequency, and percentage that reading comprehension of students in the experimental class can be divided in to 13 groups. Students who received score of 12 with value of 40 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 13 with value of 43,33 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 14 with the value of 66,67 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 15 with the value of 50 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 16 with value of 53,33 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 19 with value of 63,33 were 3 (12%). Students who received score of 21 with value of 70 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 22 with value of 73,33 were 3 (12%). Students who received score of 23 with value of 76,67 was 1 (4%). Students who received score of 26 with value of 86,67 were 3 (12%). Students who received score of 27 with value of 90 were 5 (20%). Students who received 28 with value of 93,33 were 2 (8%). Students who received score of 29 with value of 96,67 were to 2 people (8%).

Normality Tests

Normality test used in this research was Liliefors test. In connection with the normality test, so in this section described two subdiscussion, were (1) the results of normality test from vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension in control class; and (2) the results of normality test from vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension in the experimental class. The results of normality test can be seen in table 1.

Table 1. The results of normality test in Control and Experimental Class

| | Groups | N | L_0 | L_t | Conclusion |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----|-------|-------|-------------------------|
| control class | vocabulary mastery | 27 | 0,089 | 0,166 | had normal distribution |
| | low vocabulary mastery | 27 | 0,195 | 0,234 | had normal distribution |
| | high vocabulary mastery | 27 | 0,220 | 0,227 | had normal distribution |
| | reading comprehension | 27 | 0,164 | 0,166 | had normal distribution |
| | low reading comprehension | 27 | 0,220 | 0,234 | had normal distribution |
| | high reading comprehension | 27 | 0,134 | 0,227 | had normal distribution |
| experimetal class | vocabulary mastery | 25 | 0,108 | 0,173 | had normal distribution |
| | low vocabulary mastery | 25 | 0,130 | 0,242 | had normal distribution |
| | high vocabulary mastery | 25 | 0,093 | 0,227 | had normal distribution |
| | reading comprehension | 25 | 0,129 | 0,173 | had normal distribution |
| | low reading comprehension | 25 | 0,130 | 0,242 | had normal distribution |
| | high reading comprehension | 25 | 0,156 | 0,227 | had normal distribution |

Based on the result of data normality test at alpha (α) of 0,05, the data acquired vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension of students in the control and experimental class had normal distribution, because $L_0 < L_t$.

Homogeneity Tests

Homogeneity test is performed to determine whether the results of tests vocabulary and reading comprehension of students in the control and experimental class had homogeneous variance or not. Homogeneity test in this research used F test. The explanation of the homogeneity test is divided into two sub discussion, were were (1) the results of homogeneity test from vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension in control class; and (2) the results of homogeneity test from vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension in experimental class. The results of homogeneity test can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. The Results of Homogeneity Test in Control and Experimental Class

| groups | classes | N | \bar{x} | S | S ² | F ₀ | F _t | conclusion |
|----------------------------|--------------|----|-----------|-------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|
| vocabulary mastery | control | 27 | 49 | 13,05 | 170,30 | 1,02 | 1,98 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 25 | 77,26 | 13,17 | 173,45 | | | |
| low vocabulary mastery | Control | 13 | 38,46 | 7,74 | 59,91 | 1,26 | 2,79 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 12 | 66,08 | 6,89 | 47,47 | | | |
| high vocabulary mastery | Control | 14 | 60,21 | 6,68 | 44,62 | 1,65 | 2,66 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 13 | 88,58 | 5,20 | 27,04 | | | |
| reading comprehension | Control | 27 | 54,63 | 22,11 | 488,85 | 1,54 | 1,98 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 25 | 76,50 | 17,79 | 316,66 | | | |
| low reading comprehension | Control | 13 | 30,85 | 11,39 | 129,73 | 1,02 | 2,79 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 12 | 59,33 | 11,30 | 127,69 | | | |
| high reading comprehension | Control | 14 | 74,25 | 6,26 | 39,19 | 1,47 | 2,66 | homogeneous |
| | experimental | 13 | 89,54 | 5,16 | 26,63 | | | |

Based on the calculation of homogeneity test data on alpha (α) 0,05, data vocabulary mastery and reading comprehension of students in control and experimental class had homogeneous variances, because $F_0 < F_t$.

The Results of Research Hypothesis

Tested the hypothesis was aimed to see the significance of the treatment applied to the sample. Hypothesis 1st, 2nd, and 3rd used the t-test, whereas the 4th hypothesis used analysis of variance (ANOVA) two-way method of unweighted means. The results of hypothesis testing showed the following results. First, for the 1st hypothesis, at $\alpha = 0,05$ and $df = 50$, obtained that $t_{count} = 3,91$ and $t_{table} = 1,67$. Thus, H_1 accepted and H_0 is rejected. So, there were differences in reading comprehension between students taught by using STAD technique with students taught by using conventional technique at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Second, for the 2nd hypothesis, at $\alpha = 0,05$ and $df = 25$, obtained that $t_{table} = 1,71$ and $t_{count} = 11,97$. Therefore, it can be concluded that $t_{table} < t_{count} = 1,97 < 11,97$. Thus, H_1 accepted and H_0 is rejected. So, there were differences in reading comprehension between students who had a high vocabulary mastery were taught by using STAD technique with students who had a high vocabulary mastery were taught by using conventional technique on students at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Third, for the 3rd hypothesis, at $\alpha = 0,05$ and $df = 23$, obtained that $t_{table} = 1,71$ and $t_{count} = 10,43$. Therefore, it can be concluded that $t_{table} < t_{count} = 1,71 < 10,43$. Thus, H_1 accepted and H_0 is rejected. So, there were differences in reading comprehension between students who had low vocabulary were taught by using STAD technique with students who had a low vocabulary mastery were taught by using conventional technique at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Fourth, for the 4th hypothesis, at $\alpha = 0,05$, obtain that $F_A(count) > F_A(table) = 178,79 > 4,04$; $F_B(count) > F_B(table) = 18,04 > 4,04$; and $F_{AB}(count) > F_{AB}(table) = 266,99 > 4,04$. So that, $F_{count} > F_{table}$. Thus, H_1 accepted and H_0 is rejected. So, can be concluded that there was an interaction between STAD technique and vocabulary mastery in influencing reading comprehension the students at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat.

Discussion

Based on the results of the research, the discussion of this research is as follows. First, for hypothesis 1, the result of the research shows that there was a difference of reading comprehension ability between the students of Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat which is taught by the conventional technique with the students who are taught by cooperative approach STAD type. The results showed that the average count of reading comprehension ability in the control class taught by using the conventional technique is 54,2, while the average count of reading comprehension skills in the experimental class taught by using the cooperative approach STAD type is 75,2. This was because the use of cooperative approach STAD type was suitable and can be applied to improve students' reading comprehension. With the formation of a heterogeneous group, making students help each other and work together in understanding the material lectures. In addition, with the quiz, can improve student sense of responsibility. Cooperative approach STAD type enables students to be able to argue, respect other students' opinions, and record things that are useful for mutual interest. At the end of the lecture, the prize or award provided encouragement for students to achieve higher results. This is in accordance with the results of research Suryani et al (2014: p.8) that "Cooperative

learning model STAD type is one of the learning models that can be used to improve the ability of reading comprehension. The ultimate goal is to ensure that each group can master concepts and materials”.

The cooperative approach STAD type is applied in five stages according to Asma's opinion (2006: 59), were (1) class presentation, (2) group learning activities, (3) tests, (4) determination of individual improvement score, and (5) group. In the first step, in this case, the lecturer performs the presentation of the class that is by explaining the reading comprehension materials and the purpose of the lecture. In this step, the students listen to the explanation from the lecturers and do the question and answer about the lecture material. In the second step, the lecturers make the students into several heterogeneous groups. That is, high-ability students are combined with moderate and low-ability students. In this group, excellent communication exists between students. This is similar and supported by Slavin's (2009: 143) opinion that STAD is one of the simplest methods of learning and is the best model for the beginning for new teachers using communicative approach. In this step, the ability to communicate students increased.

In the third step, the lecturer conducts a comprehension reading test. In this step, tested reading ability on each student. After that, the ability of each student is analyzed in detail in order to see the score of individual improvement. The final stage, in the group with the highest achievement or the highest score, is awarded. The existence of this award can spur and improve student's motivation to learn. This is appropriate and supported by Harahap's opinion (2013: 73) ”Teaching and learning activities with cooperative learning model STAD type done in a planned and touch the psychological aspects of students so that motivate students to do learning activities so that students are able to achieve high learning results”.

Thus, the advantages of using STAD type cooperative approach in this research lies in the ability to communicate with group members. Given this ability, students with moderate and low-ability feel supported by highly skilled students. In addition, the advantages of this technique can also increase student motivation by giving awards. This was appropriate and supported by Sinaga (2016: p. 362) that the advantages of the cooperative model STAD type are as follows. First, students are more interested, interested, and happy in learning because of the cooperation between groups and awards for the group so that the material can be delivered properly. Second, creativity increases because of the willingness of students who excel and active to present the results of group discussion, also answer questions raised by other groups. Third, motivation given by the teacher, by giving opportunity and trust to passive and underachieving students to be able to present and ask questions as well as answer questions, make the classroom atmosphere more varied and no longer dominated only by outstanding students.

Second, for 2sd and 3rd hypotheses, the results showed that there was a difference in reading comprehension among students who have high and low vocabulary mastery taught using cooperative approach STAD type with students who have high and low vocabulary mastery taught by using conventional methods on students of Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. That was, students who have high and low vocabulary mastery taught by cooperative approach STAD type have better reading comprehension skills than students with high or low vocabulary mastery taught by conventional technique. This is due to the results of the research for the 1st hypothesis. The use of the cooperative approach STAD type is better than the use of lecture methods on students' reading comprehension. This result also applies to students who have high or low vocabulary mastery.

Third, for the 4th hypothesis, there was the interaction between cooperative approach STAD type and vocabulary mastery in influencing reading comprehension ability students of Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. Interaction is a different symptom of the primary treatment if the major variables are intervened by another variable. The successful use of the cooperative approach STAD type is influenced by student vocabulary mastery. Therefore, there is a reciprocal relationship between the cooperative approach STAD type and the conventional technique with vocabulary mastery in influencing students' reading comprehension skills. The effectiveness of using cooperative approach STAD type will be more noticeable in teaching and learning process with students who have high vocabulary mastery compared with conventional technique. This is consistent with the results of Aulina's research (2012: p.140) "there was a significant interaction between gameplay and vocabulary mastery of the early reading ability of children aged 5-6 years".

Thus, vocabulary is needed in discussion activities when implementing the cooperative approach STAD type. Vallente (in Aulina, 2012: p. 138) suggests "vocabulary is a word or group of words that have a certain meaning". The higher the vocabulary mastery of students, the higher the ability to read students' understanding and vice versa, the lower the vocabulary mastery of students, the lower the ability to read the student's understanding. This is appropriate and supported by the results of research conducted by Susanti (2002: p. 90) that someone who has a high vocabulary mastery, has a

high reading ability, conversely vocal mastery low, has a low reading ability as well. This sort of thing can happen because the vocabulary is the essence of a reading. What one reads is the vocabulary represented by words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs into a reading or discourse. Without extensive knowledge and vocabulary mastery, one will not get a wide reading meaning anyway.

Conclusions

Based on these results, the conclusions of this research are as follows. *First*, there were differences in reading comprehension between students taught by using STAD technique with students taught by using conventional technique at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. *Second*, there were differences in reading comprehension between students who had a high vocabulary mastery were taught by using STAD technique with students who had a high vocabulary mastery were taught by using conventional technique on students at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. *Third*, there were differences in reading comprehension between students who had low vocabulary were taught by using STAD technique with students who had a low vocabulary mastery were taught by using conventional technique at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. *Fourth*, there was an interaction between STAD technique and vocabulary mastery in influencing reading comprehension the students at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat.

Acknowledgement

Our thanks go out to the parties as follows. *First*, for the Kementerian Riset, Teknologi, dan Pendidikan Tinggi (Kemenristek Dikti), in accordance with the Assignment Agreement Implementation Research Program No.010/SP2H/LT/DPRM/II/2016 dated February 17, 2016, which was fully prepared to fund this research. *Second*, the students at Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia in STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat which was ready to be samples of this research. *Third*, the leader of Unit Penelitian dan Pengabdian pada Masyarakat (UP3M) STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat. *Fourth*, the editorial team of *Journal of Education and Learning* who has been willing to publish this article.

References

- Aulina, Choirun Nisak. (2012). Pengaruh Permainan dan Penguasaan Kosakata terhadap Kemampuan Membaca Permulaan Anak Usia 5 Tahun, *Journal PEDAGOGIA*, 1(2), 131-143.
- Asma, Nur. (2006). *Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Atmazaki. (2007). *Kiat-kiat Mengarang dan Menyunting*. Padang: UNP Press.
- Djumingin, Sulastri. (2017). "The Practice of Lesson Study Model in Teaching Writing Report Text". *Journal of Education and Learning*, 11 (1), 103-110.
- Harahap, Nurmahni. (2013). "Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD terhadap Hasil Belajar Kognitif, Motivasi, dan Aktivitas Belajar Siswa pada Konsep Ekosistem di MTSN Model Banda Aceh". *Jurnal Visipena*, IV(2), 57-76.
- Razak, Abdul. (2009). *Membaca Pemahaman Teori dan Aplikasi Pengajaran*. Pekanbaru: PT. Autograpi.
- Rusman. (2012). *Model-model Pembelajaran: Mengembangkan Profesionalisme Guru*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sinaga, Dearlina. (2016). "Penerapan Model *Student Teams Achievement Division* untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Kreativitas Belajar Ekonomi", *Cakrawala Pendidikan, Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, XXXV, 357-364.
- Slavin, Robert E. (2009). *Cooperative Learning: Teori, Riset, dan Praktik*. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Soedarso. (2008). *Sistem Membaca Cepat dan Efektif*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia.
- Somadayo, Samsu. (2011). *Strategi dan Teknik Pembelajaran Membaca*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Sudjana. (2005). *Metoda Statistika*. Bandung: Tarsito.
- Suryani, Ni W.E. (2014). "Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Stad Terhadap Kemampuan Membaca Pemahaman Ditinjau Dari Minat Belajar Siswa Di Kelas V Sd Tunas Harapan Jaya Denpasar", *e-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha Program Studi Pendidikan Dasar*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Susanti, Ratna. (2002). "Penguasaan Kosakata dan Kemampuan Membaca Bahasa Inggris", *Jurnal Pendidikan Penabur*, 01(1), 87-93.
- Tarigan, Henry Guntur. (2011). *Pengajaran Kosakata*. Bandung: Angkasa.