ARTICULATION LEARNING EFFECTS IN READING SKILL AT ISLAMIC EDUCATION STUDENTS OF ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY OF KUANTAN SINGINGI

PUSPA GUNDARY[1], GUSPARIA[2]
Program Studi Tadris Bahasa Inggris STAI Habbulwathan Duri[1], Program Studi Peternakan Universitas Islam Kuantan Singingi[2]
e-mail: puspagundary.mpd87@gmail.com[1], guspariaemzet@gmail.com[2]

Abstract: The research was carried out in Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi. It started 14 April 2025 at Study Program of Islamic Education . The data collection techniques in this research are observation, test and documentation. The samples of this research were 62 students, consist of 31 students as control class (PAI IA) and 31 students as experimental class (PAI IB). The instrument used to collect the data is test (Pre test and Post test) The subject of this statistic analysis that t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000, because t_{count} is 2.141 > $t_{tabel\ is}$ -2.000. so the conclusion is that Ho is rejected and hypothesis alternative (Ha) is accepted. The final result of the students' ability in reading recount text is taken from experimental class and the characteristic is good. The results of this research is "There is a significant The Effect Of Using Articulation Learning Model Toward Students' Reading Skill at Islamic University of Kuantan Singingi ".
Keywords: Articulation Learning Model, Reading, Skill

Abstrak: Penelitian ini dilaksanakan di Universitas Islam Kuantan Singingi. Penelitian ini dimulai dari tanggal 14 April 2025 pada pragram studi Pendidikan Agama Islam. Tekhnik pengumpulan data pada penelitian ini adalah observasi, tes, dokumentasi. Sampel dari penelitian ini terdiri dari 62 mahasiswa yang terdiri dari 31 mahasiswa di kelas kontrol (PAI IA) dan 31 siswa dikelas eksperimen (PAI IB). Instrument pada penelitian ini menggunakan test (pre-test and post-test) sabject dari analisis statistik t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000, karena t_{count} is 2.141 > $t_{tabel\ is}$ -2.000. jadi, dapat disimpulkan bahwas Ho ditolak and hypothesis alternative (Ha) diterima. Hasil akhir dari kemampuan siswa dalam membaca recount teks di ambil dari kelas experiment dan karakteristik nya adalah baik . Hasil dari penelitian ini adalah adanya Pengaruh Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Artikulasi Untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca Siswa Pada mahasiswa Universitas Islam Kuantan Singingi..
Kata Kunci: Model Pembelajaran Artikulasi, Membaca, Kemampuan

A. Introduction

Reading is an activity with a purpose. A person may read in order to gain information or verity existing knowledge, or in order to critique a writer's ideas or writing style. A person may also read for enjoyment, or to enhance knowledge of the language being read. The purpose (s) for reading guide the reader's selection of texts (Kalayo Hasibuan,M. Muhammad Fauzan,2007). In this learning activities at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi, some students are lazy and easily bored in good reading skill because some students low grammatical and vocabulary, currently some problems in the process of learning to read students, students did now knowledge of past tense verb regular and irregular verb.

The purpose for reading also determines the appropriate approach to reading comprehension. A person who needs to know whether she can afford to eat at a particular restaurant needs to comprehend the pricing information provided on the menu, but does not need to recognize the name of every appetizer listed. A person reading poetry for enjoyment needs to recognize the words the poet uses and the ways they are put together, but does not need to identify main idea and supporting detail. However, a person using a scientific article to support an opinion needs to know the vocabulary that is used, understand the facts and cause-

effect sequences that are presented, and recognize ideas that are presented as hypotheses and givens (Ibid, P.114)

Definition the skill of reading is used by the reader to anticipate text information, selecting key information, repair comprehension breakdowns, and match comprehension output to the reader goals. Every reader has their own way of reading to do that which is appropriate with them. The teacher should give some skills to the students to make them comprehend text easily. Using the skills, the students may increase the pleasure and effectiveness of reading activity.

According to burns there are four levels of reading comprehension, the following levels of comprehension can tell us about how far the students understand about reading material and which level has been achieved[1]. They are Literal Comprehension, Interpretative Comprehension, Critical Comprehension and Creative Comprehension.

According to Heilman reading is a process of making sense of written ideas through meaningful interpretation interaction with language. A good reader is one who understands what he reads, and the faster he able to get meaning from his reading the more efficient he is. The rate of comprehension needs to be adjusted to the purpose of reading skills, and like skill development in any area, reading rate can be improved with training and with practice.[2] Heilman explains that reading is essentially a meaning-making activity, where readers interpret written ideas by actively engaging with the language. A proficient reader is someone who not only understands the text but can also extract meaning quickly and accurately. The speed of comprehension, however, should depend on the reader's purpose—whether they are reading to find specific information, to study in detail, or to gain a general understanding. Just like any other skill, reading speed and comprehension can be improved over time through consistent training and practice. Having a skill makes the students can solve any problem in reading a written text. The readingskillsalso can increase pleasure and effectiveness of reading activity. When the students master skills of reading, they can be helped in all other subjects and in the personal and professional lives. However, being a skilled reader is not a simple effort. They have to struggle and do any activity gradually any time to produce a good reader to be a good concept maker from the information gained from the text reader.

The solution that using to improve students reading ability is using articulation learning model Articulation is a learning model that requires students to be able to play a role as a "message recipient" as well as "messenger". The lesson that the teacher gives must be forwarded by the students and explain it to the other students in the group (Aris Shoimin, 2014). Learning with a chain messaging system. Messages that will be brought is a subject matter that is being learned at that time. Technically, each student is required to forward the message and explain it to another student (his or her spouse).

Researcher choose articulation model as a model toward students meaning that teachers may choose appropriate learning model and efficient to achieve the purpose of education. In detail about the learning models will be discussed at the end after the learning approach (Rusman, 2017). This is the advantages and uniqueness of this model of learning of articulation, because students will act as a "message recipient" as well as role as "messenger". In addition, this learning model by itself will require active students because students are formed into small groups where each student in the group has the task of interviewing his or her group's friends about the new material (Imas kurniasih & Berlin Sani, 2015).

The average value of students' learning achievement was still low, and some of the students were unable to write the generic structure of a recount text. This condition shows that their understanding of the material had not yet reached the expected standard, particularly in identifying and organizing the elements of orientation, events, and re-orientation. These difficulties also reflected their limited ability to process and convey information effectively in written form. Therefore, the articulation learning model was selected as an effort to address

 P-ISSN 2567-0297
E-ISSN 2657-0289

these challenges, with the expectation that its interactive and communicative nature would help students improve their comprehension and strengthen their writing skills through active engagement and peer-to-peer explanation.

B. Research Method

The research using is a Ex-perimental research. The location of the research was in Islamic University of Kuantan Singingi at Kebun Nenas Street of Jake. The subject in this research is the students at First Semester of Islamic Education of UNIKS and the object in this research was The Effect Of Using Articulation learning model to Improve Students Reading Skill at Islamic Education of UNIKS.

Population was all of the research subject like person or thing something can get the data information. The population in this research was all the students Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

C. Result

Persentation of Data

This chapter explains the result of research with title: "The effect *of using Articulation Learning Model to Improve Students Reading Skill At* Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi ″ This study conducted in Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi. There were 126 students of Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi. They spread into four classes. Two classes were chosen as the samples; class D consists of 31 students as control class and class A consists of 31 students as experimental class. Those classes were chosen by purposive sampling based on the result of near average value students' learning achievement in pre-test, the result of pre-test. This research used post-test only control design.

Articulation learning model was treated on the experimental class, meanwhile the control class did not used articulation learning model or used others model. Before giving treatment, the tests were given to both classes in order saw students' achievement. The data analysis in this research was t-test and then to know the effect size by finding out eta square.

To know the students' score in pretest and posttest, it can be seen in this following table:

Table 1
The Result Of Experimental Class Test

NO	**Subject**	**Pre-test**	**Post-test**
1	Students 1	65	**100**
2	Students 2	75	95
3	Students 3	80	90
4	Students 4	30	90
5	Students 5	35	90
6	Students 6	78	90
7	Students 7	85	88
8	Students 8	70	88
9	Students 9	60	85
10	Students 10	50	85
11	Students 11	60	80
12	Students 12	55	80
13	Students 13	60	79
14	Students 14	80	79

15	Students 15	65	77
16	Students 16	75	76
17	Students 17	81	75
18	Students 18	76	75
19	Students 19	65	75
20	Students 20	70	75
21	Students 21	73	72
22	Students 22	75	72
23	Students 23	65	70
24	Students 24	60	70
25	Students 25	70	70
26	Students 26	65	70
27	Students 27	55	70
28	Students 28	64	65
29	Students 29	75	65
30	Students 30	65	65
31	Students 31	45	60
Total (Σ)		**2027**	**2421**
X		**65.38**	**78.09**

From table above, it can be seen that in pretest the students who got score of 30 was 1 student. The student who got score of 35 was 1 student. The student who got score of 45 were 1 student. The student who got score of 50 was 1 student. The student who got score of 55 were 2 students. The student who got score of 60 were 4 students. The student who got score of 64 was 1 student. The student who got score of 65 were 9 students. The student who got score of 70 were 3 students. The student who got score of 73 was 1 student. The student who got score of 75 were 4 students. The student who got score of 78 was 1 student. The student who got score of 80 were 2 students. The student who got score of 81 was 1 student. The student who got score of 85 was 1 student. The student who got score of 76 was 1 student.

And in posttest the student who got score of 100 was 1 student, the student who got score of 95 was 1 student. The student who got score of 90 were 4 students. The students who got score of 88 were 2 students. The student who got score of 88 were 2 students, the students who got score of 85 were 2 students. The student who got score of 80 were 2 students, the students who got score of 79 were 2 students, the students who got score of 77 was 1 student, and the student who got score of 76 was 1 student, and the student who got score of 75 were 4 students. the students who got score of 72 were 2 students, the students who got score of 70 were 5 students, the students who got score of 65 were 3 students, the students who got score of 60 was 1 student. The total score of the result of experimental class in pretest was 2027 and in posttest was 2421. The mean of the result of experimental class in pretest was 65,38 and in posttest was 78,09 And for controlled class, the data can be seen in this following table;

Table 2
The Result Of Controlled Class Test

NO	**Subject**	**Pre-test**	**Post-test**
1	Students 1	50	**100**
2	Students 2	60	92
3	Students 3	50	90
4	Students 4	80	88
5	Students 5	60	85

P-ISSN 2567-0297
E-ISSN 2657-0289

6	Students 6	70	85
7	Students 7	60	80
8	Students 8	80	80
9	Students 9	70	79
10	Students 10	65	77
11	Students 11	70	76
12	Students 12	75	76
13	Students 13	70	75
14	Students 14	50	75
15	Students 15	55	75
16	Students 16	70	72
17	Students 17	60	72
18	Students 18	80	70
19	Students 19	80	70
20	Students 20	80	69
21	Students 21	80	65
22	Students 22	60	65
23	Students 23	50	65
24	Students 24	65	60
25	Students 25	75	60
26	Students 26	65	60
27	Students 27	77	60
28	Students 28	83	60
29	Students 29	70	50
30	Students 30	65	50
31	Students 31	55	50
Total (Σ)		**2064**	**2231**
X		**66.58**	**71.96**

From those tables, it can be seen that the student who got score of 50 were 4 students, the student who got score 55 of were 2 students, the student who got score of 60 were 5 students, the student who got score of 65 were 4 students, the student who got score of 70 were 5 students, the student who got score of 75 were 2 students, the student who got score of 77 was 1 student. The students who got score of 80 were 6 students, the student who got score of 83 was 1 student.

And in posttest of control class the student who got score of 100 was 1 student, the student who got score of 50 were 3 students, the student who got score of 92 was 1 student. The students who got score of 90 was 1 student, the student who got score of 88 was 1 student, the student who got score of 85 were 2 students, the students who got score of 80 were 2 students. The students who got score of 79 was 1 student, the student who got score of 77 was 1 student, the student who got score of 76 were 2 students. The student who got score of 75 were 3 students. The student who got score of 70 were 2 students, the student who got score of 72 were 2 students. The student who got score of 69 was 1 student. The student who got score of 65 were 3 students. The student who got score of 74 was 1 student. The student who got score of 60 were 5 students. The student who got score of 50 were 3 students. The total score of the result of control class in pretest was 2064 and in posttest was 2231. The mean of the result of control class in pretest was 66.58 and in posttest was 71,96.

From the score of pretest and posttest of experimental class and controlled class, it can be seen that the higher score was gotten by experimental class, and it means that the experimental class was better than controlled class. And it means Articulation Learning Model has an effect to the students.

Discussion

Since the T-test on the Group data the posttest value between the experimental class and the control class has the same variant then the t test uses the Equal Variance Assumed value. Here some steps in analyze the data:

Formulate the Hypothesis

H_0: There is no effect in posttest value between the experimental class and the control class.

H_a: There is effect in posttest value between the experimental class and the control class.

Normality of the Test

Assessing normality of data is used to describe a symmetrical, shaped bell curve, which has the greatest frequency of scores in the middle, with smaller frequency towards the extremes. Before analyzing the data by using t-test formula, the researcher had to find out the normality test of the data. It was used to know whether the data are normal or not.

In order to know whether the data have normal distribution or not, the writer used Kolmogorov-Smirnov method as the formula to analyze the data. In this research, the writer analyzed the data by using SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solution) 22 version program. The SPSS result for Kolmogorov-Smirnov test can be seen as follows:

p-value (Sig.) > 0.05 = the data are in normal distribution.

p-value (Sig.) < 0.05 = the data are not in normal distribution.

Based on the SPSS output, the test of normality is showed as follows:

Table 3
Tests Of Normality

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
eksperimen	.107	31	.200*	.964	31	.374
kontrol	.089	31	.200*	.976	31	.684

This is a lower bound of the true significance.

Lilliefors Significance Correction

Based on the table above, it is obtained that the significance level in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of Experimental Class was 0.200; in other words, 0.200* > 0.05, and significance level of Control Class was 200* it means that 200 > 0.05. In brief, the data were distributed normally.

Homogeneity of the Test

The homogeneity test was used to measure whether the data are correlated from true population or not. Data homogeneity of variance test was calculated by using SPSS version 22. The SPSS result for Levene test was interpreted as follows:

p-value (Sig.) > 0.05 = the data are homogeneous.

p-value (Sig.) < 0.05 = the data are not homogeneous.

Based on SPSS output, the homogeneity of the test can be seen as follows:

P-ISSN 2567-0297
E-ISSN 2657-0289

Table 4
Test Of Homogeneity Of Variances Populasi

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
1.186	1	60	.280

Based on the table above, it is found that the value of significance (Sig.) was 0.280. The data are homogeneous or variant when the value Sig. is higher than 0.05. So, it is clear that Sig. is higher than 0.05 which indicates the homogeneity of the data. The comparison can be stated by 0.280 > 0.05

Independent Sample T-test

Since the T test on the Group data the posttest value between the experimental class and the control class has the same variant then the t test uses the Equal Variance Assumed value.

1. Formulate the hypothesis

H_0: There is no effect in posttest value between the experimental class and the control class.

H_a: There is effect in posttest value between the experimental class and the control class.

2. Determining t_{count} from the output can be seen the value t count of in equal variance assumed is 2.141
3. Determining the t_{table} can be seen in the statistical table on the significance of 0.05: 2 = 0.025 (2-sided test) with degrees of freedom (df) n-2 or N-2, then t_{table} will be obtained by looking at the attachment of t_{table}

Table 5
The Data Analysis of Independent Sample T-test of Post-Test of Experimental Class and Control Class
Independent Samples 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
nilai	Equal variances assumed	1.186	.280	2.141	60	.036	6.129	2.862	.403	11.855
	Equal variances not assumed			2.141	56.901	.037	6.129	2.862	.397	11.861

Criteria Testing (based on significance)

-Accepted it t_0 (t-test) < t_t (table)

-Rejected if t_0 (t-test) ≥ t_t (table) Based on Significance:

- If Significance> 0,05 then is H_a accepted.

-If Significance <0,05 then is H_a accepted

Conclusion

This is based on statistics analysis that t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is - 2.000, because t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000. So, the conclusion is that Ho is rejected and hypothesis alternative (Ha) is accepted. The results of this research is "There is a significant The Effect Of Using Articulation Learning Model Toward Students' In Reading Skill at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi".

Then, to identify the level significant effect of using articulation learning model the researcher provided the effect size formula from the post-test score in experimental and control classes. The data were taken by using manual that can be seen as follow:

That the guidelines for interpreting this value are:

0,01= small effect

0.06 = medium effect

0.14 = large effect

Explanation:

t^2 = t count of Independent Sample t-test

N = Number of Students

=

=

= 0,07

Furthermore, the effect size of 0, 07 is large effect.

Based on the data analysis about the students' understanding above, it is found that the level of significant effect of using articulation learning model Object Model was large effect (0.07). Therefore, teaching using Articulation learning model was better than students who were taught without using articulation learning model.

Thus, it can be concluded that there is a significant effect of using articulation learning model to improve students' reading skill At Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

Finding

The Result of normality test is the significant level in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of Experimental class was 0.200* in other words 0.200* > 0.05, and significance level of Control Classwas 200^* it means that 200>0.05. In brief, the data were distributed normally and the value of significance (Sig.) was 5 %. The data are homogeneous or variant when the value Sig. is higher than 0.05. So, it is clear that Sig. is higher than 0.05 which indicates the homogeneity of the data. The comparison can be stated by 0.280> 0.05.

And Result of Independent of sample t test it is found that t_0 was that t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000, because t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000. so the conclusion is that Ho is rejected and hypothesis alternative (Ha) is accepted. and finally result of research furthermore, the effect size of 0, 07 is large effect.

D. Conclusion

According to Sugiyono states that in experimental research there is treatment (treatment) given to certain groups, thus the method of experimental research is "a method used to find the effect of a particular treatment of objects to be examined under controlled

 P-ISSN 2567-0297
E-ISSN 2657-0289

conditions" (Sugiyono, 2012: 107). According to my opinion that I agree what the experts say sugiyono opinion that posttest is better than pre-test.

The final result of the students, it can be concluded that Articulation Learning Model is better than the students' ability in reading skill that used conventional method. The Articulation learning model can be used in English language learning especially of reading recount texts and the Articulation Learning Model can increase students' learning outcomes on Recount text at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

This is based on statistics analysis that t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000, because t_{count} is 2.141> $t_{tabel\ is\ -}$2.000. So, the conclusion is that Ho is rejected and hypothesis alternative (Ha) is accepted. The final result of the students' ability in reading recount text is taken from experimental class average, it is 70, and the characteristic is good. The results of this research is "There is a significant using Articulation Learning Model at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

The Result of normality test is the significant level in Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of Experimental class was 62 in other words 200 > 0.05, and significance level of Control Class was 200^{*} it means that 200>0.05. In brief, the data were distributed normally and the value of significance (Sig.) was 200. The data are homogeneous or variant when the value Sig. is higher than 0.05. So, it is clear that Sig. is higher than 0.05 which indicates the homogeneity of the data. The comparison can be stated by 200 > 0.05.

And Result of Independent of sample t test it is found that t_0 was that t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000, because t_{count} is 2.141 and t_{table} is -2.000. so the conclusion is that Ho is rejected and hypothesis alternative (Ha) is accepted. and finally result of research furthermore, the effect size of 0, 05 is small effect.

Suggestions

After doing this research, the writer has some Articulation Learning model useful to increase the students' achievement in recount text at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

1.English teachers should use Articulation Learning Model in teaching English in other to improve and to Reading ability of students so that the students' learning outcome is better.
2.This research is one of the ways in improving students' learning outcome. It is expected that the finding will be used as starting points to conduct another research.
3.The next researchers can give contribution in conducting the research especially about students' achievement.
4.There are many other strategies to make teaching and learning process more effective. Other researchers are expected to find new strategies, methods, technique.

The results of this research is "There is a significant the effect of using Articulation Learning Model in at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi", Articulation Learning Model is better than the students' ability that used conventional method. The Articulation Learning Model can be used in English language learning especially of Reading text and the Articulation Learning Model can increase students' learning outcomes on Reading text at at Islamic Education (PAI) University of Kuantan Singingi.

References

Amumpuni, A. (2025). Collaborative strategic reading to improve EFL undergraduates' reading outcomes. Journal of English Language Education, 12(1), 45–59.
Anwar, M. (2025). The effectiveness of articulation learning strategy in classroom instruction. International Journal of Education and Teaching, 8(2), 120–132.
Bayumi, R. (2025). Applying articulation method to enhance students' learning engagement: A classroom-based study. Indonesian Journal of Classroom Pedagogy, 5(1), 33–47.

Durriyah, T. (2016/2017). Peer discussion and comprehension improvement in narrative and recount texts. Language Teaching Review, 4(2), 88–102.

Flores, J. (2024). Peer tutoring and reading comprehension gains among EFL learners. Journal of Literacy and Language Studies, 9(3), 210–225.

Gubalani, N. (2023). The effect of peer tutoring on students' narrative and recount comprehension. Journal of English Pedagogy, 7(1), 14–28.

Hasibuan, K., & Ansyari, M. M. F. (2007). Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL). Pekanbaru, Indonesia: Alaf Riau Graha UNRI Press.

Imas Kurniasih, & Sani, B. (2015). Ragam pengembangan model pembelajaran. CV Solusi Distribusi.

Joyce, B., Weil, M., & Calhoun, E. (2015). Models of teaching (9th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Komara, U. (2023). Student activeness through articulation-based learning activities. Journal of Educational Strategies, 11(2), 75–90.

McWhorter, K. T. (2012). Reading across the disciplines: College reading and beyond (6th ed.). Pearson.

Rusman. (2012). Model-model pembelajaran. Depok: Kharisma Putra Utama.

Shoimin, A. (2014). 68 model pembelajaran inovatif dalam Kurikulum 2013. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

Silalahi, M. (2025). Articulation learning to improve knowledge transmission in higher education classrooms. Higher Education Pedagogy Journal, 6(1), 50–63.

Slavin, R. E. (2014). Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tovani, C. (2000). I read it, but I don't get it: Comprehension strategies for adolescent readers. Portland, ME: Stenhouse Publishers