



## Original Article

### Improving Reading Comprehension of Eighth Grade Students of SMP Negeri 15 Palu Through Jumbled Summary Strategy

Nur Ana<sup>1✉</sup>, Mukrim<sup>2</sup>, Grace Novenasari Manurung<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Universitas Tadulako Palu.

Correspondence Author: nurranaaaa@gmail.com<sup>✉</sup>

#### Abstract:

The focus of this research was to find out if eighth-grade students at SMP Negeri 15 Palu could improve reading comprehension by using the Jumbled Summary Strategy. Two groups participated in the study's quasi-experimental design: one was taught the Jumbled Summary Strategy, while the other was taught conventional methods. Pre- and post-tests were administered to both groups to determine their reading comprehension development, particularly at the literal comprehension level with narrative texts. Statistical tests such as the t-test, homogeneity test, and normality test were used to assess the data. With the mean score rising from 28.72 on the pre-test to 56.70 on the post-test, the experimental group's reading comprehension scores shown a significant improvement, according to the data. The mean score for the control group, however, dropped from 31.48 to 26.32. The experimental group's pre-test and post-test scores differed in a statistically significant way ( $p < 0.05$ ), according to the paired sample t-test, while the control group did not significantly improve. These results show how well the Jumbled Summary Strategy improves students' ability to identify main ideas, recall details, and arrange data rationally. In conclusion, the use of the Jumbled Summary Strategy has a positive effect on students' reading comprehension. It encourages active learning, critical thinking, and better engagement with the text. Therefore, this strategy is recommended as an effective alternative for English teachers to improve students' reading comprehension skills, particularly in understanding narrative texts.

**Keywords:** Reading Comprehension, Jumbled Summary Strategy, Narrative Text, Literal Comprehension, Experimental Study

#### Introduction

English Language is used for worldwide communication, especially spoken and written which is needed in the era of globalization, technology is offered in English language instruction. A lot of the books are written in English on science, technology, art, and other topics that have been published. Four integrated language skills in English to learn as they complement each other in effective communication are reading, listening, speaking and writing. Reading and listening help understand



<https://jurnal.usk.ac.id/riwayat>

information, while speaking and writing allow one to express ideas clearly. The integration of these skills is essential to communicate fluently in a variety of academic, professional and social situations. According to [Allaberganova & Bozorboyeva \(2025\)](#), integrating speaking, listening, reading and writing through task content and project based strategies significantly enhances learners communicative competence and academic literacy. Similarly, Asrimawati, Elyani, and Rosalina (2024), reveal that applying an Online Extensive Reading and Listening (OERL) program substantially improves students' comprehension skills by combining digital technology with interactive language exposure. Therefore, learning English is crucial for individuals to succeed and participate effectively.

Reading is one of the basic skills to learning English beside listening, speaking, and writing. By reading, readers receive information or messages from writers who communicate with them through written text. According to [Ferdiyanto \(2025\)](#), student who engaged in pre-reading activities to activate their prior knowledge achieved significantly higher reading comprehension scores than those who did not, indicating a strong pedagogical effect of activating background knowledge. In addition, [Azwar, Ristiyanti & Puspita \(2023\)](#), Integrating multimedia and KWL in the pre-reading stage not only increased comprehension but also improved students' attitudes toward reading, especially when student were familiar with the topic. It means that reading comprehension is not just about decoding text but also depends heavily on the reader's prior knowledge, making it essential for reading instruction to include strategies that explicitly activate and build up background knowledge.

Reading comprehension is not an easy language skill to be mastered by the students. Based on the researcher's experience when teaching and observing *Asistensi Mengajar* at SMP Negeri 15 Palu, it was found that the students of the grade eight students have some problems in learning English, especially in reading. First, the students have limited vocabulary which make them difficult to understand the reading text. Second, many students have difficulties in comprehending the reading text. Third, they found difficulties in finding main idea of the text. These problems make the students difficult to answer the question from the text.

In relation to the aforementioned issue, the researcher was focus her research on employing a jumbled summary strategy to create a learning process in order to improve the reading comprehension of the students. According to [Irawati \(2020\)](#), Jumbled Summary means that the teacher presents a selection of vocabulary or phrases arranged randomly and asks students to correctly rearrange them in a logical order and make connections based on their understanding of the lesson. A jumbled summary is a disorganized or scrambled version of a summary where key points or events are presented in a mixed-up order rather than in a logical sequence. This can happen due to intentional shuffling for activities like educational exercises, where learners are asked to rearrange the information correctly. Jumbled summaries challenge comprehension skills, requiring the reader to identify main ideas, recognize logical connections, and reconstruct the intended meaning. They are often used in language learning, reading comprehension tasks, and critical thinking exercises to enhance cognitive skills. That is why the researcher conducted this study entitled improving reading comprehension of grade VIII students at SMP Negeri 15 Palu.

### **Narrative Text**

A narrative text is a spoken or written text that narrates the story of one or more characters who encounter particular circumstances; the main goal of the narrative is to amuse, capture, and maintain the reader's attention. A narrative text is typically used to tell an imaginative story or personal experience that contains a message or moral value for the reader. According to [Anderson \(1997\)](#), the language

Original Article

features that are typically found in a narrative are specific characters, time to tell when they occur, verbs to show the actions that occur in the story, and descriptive words to portray the character and setting. [Hyland \(2003\)](#) defines a narrative as “a text a story”.

Three elements make up the narrative text: orientation, complexity, and resolution. In the orientation, the story explains the characters, setting, and time to the readers or listeners in order to help them comprehend. The narrative then explains the issue that occurred in the story to their readers or listeners in complication, the narrative in the resolution demonstrates how the participants resolved the issues. When producing a narrative work, authors should be aware of certain characteristics. These consist of: (1) Plot: What will transpire? (2) Setting: Where the location of the story? When is the tale going to happen? (3) Characterization: Who are the primary characters in terms of characterization? How do they appear? (4) Structure: What will be the opening of the story? What will be the issue be fixed? (5) Themes: What message or topic is the author trying to convey? Carlisle and Duke (2011).

### **Jumbled Summary Strategy**

Making the teaching process successful is one of the main objectives of English teaching tactics. The goal of applying the tactics is to improve instruction compared to not utilizing them. While group investigation models such as those proposed by [Sharan and Sharan \(1992\)](#) and other give students the chance to work extensively on a topic or thee of their own choosing, the instructor may occasionally use a different repertoire of shorter interactive segments during class time. These resources – also known as “activators” or “energizers” – are presented, read, seen, or experienced firsthand through practical, hands-on experience.

According to Willis (1996:78), “The purpose of Jumbled Summary is to have students arrange certain passages of the entire text in a certain sequence”. Students must study each section and determine the best sequence, as it indicates that they are not in the correct order. Sequencing often requires a thorough understanding of the overall coherence of the text, as well as linguistic processing of its individual parts.

Furthermore, according to Samaras and Freese (2008:16), “Students must actively follow a jumbled summary before reconstructing the arguments expressed during a brainstorming or discussion sessions”. This implies that students recognize the value and relevance of their ideas. As the discussion progresses, the instructor (or a student) records key points on the board, but they are deliberately arranged in a disorganized manner. Students must then use this jumbled summary of key ideas to create a coherent set of notes at the conclusion of the discussion.

In a jumbled summary, the instructor presents important terms and phrases from a course in a random order. Students must then rearrange these words into coherent sentences or paragraphs, organizing the material in the correct sequence.

Based on the aforementioned quotes, it can be concluded that a jumbled summary is essentially the reverse of a structured summary while still maintaining students' intellectual engagement. In this approach, the teacher writes important terms and phrases on the board in a random order. Instead of revealing the intended grouping, the teacher allows students to analyze the words, determine patterns, and assign appropriate subheadings. This process encourages critical thinking as students reconstruct the content into a meaningful structure.

### **Reading Comprehension**

Reading comprehension is the ability to understand, interpret, and extract meaning from written texts. Expert have different opinions about the levels of reading comprehension, but the goal remains the same. According to Rubin (1982:206), “Reading comprehension is a complex intellectual process that includes

two stages". Similarly, [Somadoyo \(2011:7-8\)](#) states, "Reading comprehension is an intellectual process that includes two main abilities, namely mastery of word meaning and the ability to think about verbal concepts". This opinion views that in reading comprehension simultaneously two-way concentration occurs in the reading mind in doing reading activities, the reader actively responds by expressing the sound of writing and language used by the author for that readers are required to be able to reveal the meaning contained in the text, namely the meaning that the author wants to convey.

## Methods

This research used a quasi-experimental design. There were two groups in this research: the experimental class and the control class. A pre-test, post-test, and treatment were administered to the experimental class. However, the control class received no treatment and was given a pre-test and post-test. The identical pre-test and post-test were given to these two groups.

The sample is the representative of population. Related to the statement, Best and Kahn (2006:13) also state, "A sample is a small proportion of the population that is selected for observation and analysis". In taking the sample, the researcher used random sampling technique. Regarding the population, the researcher chose only two classes as a sample in this research. The experimental class is VIII A, and the control class is VIII B. Based on the advice of the teacher at that school, the researcher enrolled in these classes. The teacher claimed that the level of knowledge of these two classes was relatively the same.

According to Joe (1993:110), the structured jumbled summary strategy can be applied in reading comprehension through several steps:

1. Reorder a jumbled summary of a story. Students become more prepared for the next task of rearranging the paragraphs, which provide a more detailed account of the events.
2. The story is supplied in the correct order. After reading story, students rearrange the jumbled summary into the correct order.
3. Each sentence in the summary is put on separate card. The cards are distributed randomly, one per student. After memorizing their lines, the students call them out and reconstruct the story in the correct order.

In a Jumbled Summary activity for a narrative text, the teacher first selects key events from the story and presents them in a random order. For example, in *Cinderella*, events such as the fairy godmother helping Cinderella, losing the glass slipper, and the prince searching for its owner are mixed up. Students then work in pairs or groups to rearrange these events into the correct sequence. After organizing the events, they use them to write a summary of the story in a coherent manner. Once completed, the teacher facilitates a class discussion, where students explain their reasoning for the sequence they chose. The teacher also highlights key narrative elements, such as characters, setting, conflict, and resolution, helping students understand how a story is structured. This activity enhances reading comprehension, logical thinking, and collaboration, as students actively engage with the text and reconstruct its meaning.

The researcher conducted a statistical analysis of students' scores on the pre-test and post-test using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) by following these steps:

1. To determine whether the pre-test and post-test data will follow a normal distribution, the researcher conducted a normality test.
2. To assess whether the data gathered from the sample were homogeneous, the researcher performed a homogeneity check after conducting the normality test.
3. To determine whether there was a significant difference between the student's reading skill before and after treatment, a paired sample t-test will be used.

4. Finally, the average scores from the pre-test and post-test were compared, and any differences were identified using an independent t-test.

## Results

The researcher collected data from September 18<sup>th</sup> to October 17<sup>th</sup> 2025 using tests as main instrument of the research. The researcher has conducted studies in SMP Negeri 15 Palu, class VIII A and class VIII B. The experimental group receives a treatment, while the control group receives no treatment. This serves as a benchmark to assess how well the jumbled summary strategy improves reading comprehension. The researcher, gave a pre-test to the control group and experimental group at the start of the meeting to ascertain the reading skills of the students in both groups. The findings of the two groups are compared following a post-test to see if the experimental group performs better than the control group, which was not given any treatment. The effectiveness of the treatment is gauged by this comparison.

The researcher administered a pre-test to the students to determine their basics comprehension of reading comprehension techniques before to starting the treatment. The experimental class's pre-test was held on September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2025, and the control class's pre-test was held on September 22<sup>th</sup>, 2025. Standard deviation, mean, lowest, and highest values are examples of descriptive statistical data that the researcher calculated using SPSS version 30. The table that follows displays all of the analysis's findings:

Table 1 Students' Score of Control Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

No	Initials	Score	
		Pre-test	Post-test
1	AAS	25.7	25.7
2	AR	37.1	17.1
3	AS	8.5	20
4	AA	28.5	11.4
5	ARA	40	37.1
6	FN	31.4	8.5
7	FRR	45.7	34.2
8	HJH	37.1	37.1
9	KSA	42.8	25.7
10	MH	22.8	8.5
11	MI	22.8	22.8
12	MPAL	20	25.7
13	MN	34.2	5.7
14	MA	34.2	28.5
15	ME	31.4	40
16	MU	31.4	40
17	MF	37.1	40

<b>18</b>	MIM	31.4	22.8
<b>19</b>	MY	34.2	14.2
<b>20</b>	NR	34.2	34.2
<b>21</b>	PA	34.2	28.5
<b>22</b>	RBL	17.1	11.4
<b>23</b>	RPM	31.4	11.4
<b>24</b>	RA	40	51.4
<b>25</b>	RS	40	20
<b>26</b>	SR	40	42.8
<b>27</b>	SU	45.7	14.2
<b>28</b>	VL	20	11.4
<b>29</b>	ZCW	42.8	45.7
<b>30</b>	ZAF	8.5	42.8
<b>31</b>	MMA	25.7	37.1

The score of 31 students in the control class is shown in the table. The pre-test had a highest score of 45.7 and a lowest score of 8.5. The post-test data showed that the highest score was 45.7 and the lowest was 8.5.

Table 2 Students' Score of Experimental Class (Pre-test and Post-test)

<b>No</b>	<b>Initials</b>	<b>Score</b>	
		<b>Pre-test</b>	<b>Post-test</b>
<b>1</b>	AP	22.8	77.1
<b>2</b>	ARIA	22.8	57.1
<b>3</b>	AM	22.8	54.2
<b>4</b>	ATZ	22.8	57.1
<b>5</b>	ARA	31.4	74.2
<b>6</b>	DEOA	60	68.5
<b>7</b>	DA	28.5	28.5
<b>8</b>	FAZ	17.1	45.7
<b>9</b>	FA	22.8	65.7
<b>10</b>	IZ	31.4	74.2
<b>11</b>	JA	31.4	42.8
<b>12</b>	MR	14.2	74.2
<b>13</b>	MS	34.2	37.1
<b>14</b>	MZA	31.4	37.1

15	MEF	48.5	51.4
16	MZAF	40	54.2
17	MAAPP	20	71.4
18	MAA	37.1	45.7
19	MEM	20	60
20	PMA	8.5	65.7
21	PR	31.4	48.5
22	RA	28.5	37.1
23	KPA	28.5	88.5
24	SNZ	31.4	77.1
25	SR	28.5	40
26	SAA	34.2	45.7
27	SDF	37.1	68.5
28	AS	25.7	42.8
29	SS	20	54.2

The score of 29 students in the experimental class is highlighted in the above table. In the pre-test, the lowest score was 8.5, and the highest was 60. The post-test determined that the lowest score was 28.5 and the highest score was 88.5.

## Results Descriptive Statistics Description

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics Description

	Descriptive Statistics				
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Pre-Test_Control	31	8.50	45.70	31.4806	9.72239
Post-Test_Control	31	5.70	51.40	26.3194	12.94456
Pre-Test_Experimental	29	8.50	60.00	28.7241	10.19085
Post-Test_Experimental	29	28.50	88.50	56.7000	15.25989
Valid N (listwise)	29				

The outcomes of the experimental and control groups in the pre-test and post-test are shown in the descriptive statistics table. With a minimum score of 8.50 and a maximum score of 45.70, the control group's pre-test mean score was 31.48. The mean score dropped to 26.32 on the post-test, with the lowest score being 5.70 and the best being 51.40. This outcome suggests that following the learning process without treatment, the control group did not exhibit any improvement. The pre-test mean score for the experimental group was 28.72, with scores ranging from 8.50 to 60.00. With a minimum score of 28.50 and a maximum score of 88.50, the post-test mean score climbed significantly to 56.70 following the treatment.

**Results of Test Normality and Homogeneity**

Table 4 Tests of Normality

		Tests of Normality		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Results	Pre-Test Control Class	.937	31	.068
	Post-Test Control Class	.949	31	.145
	Pre-test Experiment Class	.937	29	.084
	Post-Test Experiment Class	.967	29	.480

\*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

As a result there were less than fifty participants in this study, the Shapiro-Wilk test was used during the normality test. The Tests of Normality table shows the outcomes of the normality test. According to the analysis's findings, the control class pre-test's significance value was 0.068 ( $> 0.05$ ), and the control class post-test's was 0.145 ( $> 0.05$ ). The experimental class's pre-test and post-test significance values were 0.084 ( $> 0.05$ ) and 0.480 ( $> 0.05$ ), as shown. The data in the experimental class and the control class, both before and after the test, can be determined to be normally distributed as all significance values are higher than 0.05.

Table 5 Test of Homogeneity of Variance

		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Results	Based on Mean	.894	1	58	.348
	Based on Median	.790	1	58	.378
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.790	1	54.647	.378
	Based on trimmed mean	.902	1	58	.346

The results of the homogeneity test indicate that the significant value is 0.348 by the mean calculation, 0.378 by the median, 0.378 by the median with adjusted df, and 0.346 by the trimmed mean. It is possible to conclude that the data in the experimental group and the control group have homogeneous variance because all of these significance values are higher than 0.05.

**Result of the Hypothesis Testing**

Table 6 Paired Samples-Test

		Paired Samples Test					Significance			
		Paired Differences								
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	One-Sided p	Two-Sided p
					Lower	Upper				
Pair 1	Pre-Test	-	19.19910	3.565	-	-	-	2	<,001	<,001
	Experiment – Post-Test Experiment	27.97586		18	35.27881	20.67291	7.847	8		
Pair 2	Pre-Test	5.161	14.20351	2.55103	-	10.37	2.	3	.026	.052
	Control – Post-Test Control	29			.04860	118	02	3		

The difference in learning outcomes between pre-tests and post-tests within the same group is ascertained using the Paired Samples Test. With a t-value of -7.847 and a level of significance of  $p < 0.001$ , the average difference between the pre-test and post-test scores in the experimental class is -27.97586. This suggests that the experimental class's pre-test and post-test results differ significantly, with the post-test score being greater than the pre-test score. As a result, the experimental class's treatment was successful in raising student learning results.

In contrast, the control class's test results found a two-tailed significance of 0.052 ( $> 0.05$ ), an average difference of 5.16129, and a t-value of 2.023. These results show that the control class's pre-test and post-test outcomes did not differ significantly. Stated differently, the control class's learning outcomes did not significantly improve.

Students in the experimental group, who were taught using the jumbled summary strategy, demonstrated a significant increase in their reading comprehension scores when compared to the control group, who were taught using conventional methods, based on the findings of the jumbled summary strategy study conducted at SMP Negeri 15 Palu. The experimental group's pre-test and post-test scores differed significantly, according to the paired sample test findings, however the control group's scores did not significantly improve. Furthermore, the independent sample test verified that the experimental group's post-test results were significantly improved than the control group's.

These findings show how well the Jumbled Summary Strategy worked to improve students' reading comprehension. Students were urged to actively interact with the material, recognize important concepts, and arrange them rationally using this method. By forcing them to differentiate between key concepts and illustrative details, as well as by strengthening their capacity for summarizing and paraphrasing

information, this technique enhanced their literal comprehension abilities. These kinds of exercises support Anderson's (2003) theory that reading comprehension involves both active processing—the process of creating meaning from text—and word decoding.

### Conclusion

The results of this study demonstrate that Improving reading comprehension of eighth-grade students of SMP Negeri 15 Palu through jumbled summary strategy. The mean score of the experimental group increased significantly from 28.72 in the pre-test to 47.65 in the post-test, while the control group's score decreased from 31.48 in the pre-test to 26.32 in the post-test. These results demonstrate that when it comes to improving some areas of reading comprehension—namely, recognizing key ideas, comprehending supporting details, and arranging material logically—the Jumbled Summary Strategy betters traditional teaching techniques.

### Suggestion

It is suggested that further research be carried out in various settings and with a bigger sample size to improve the findings' generalizability. To ascertain which approach produces the best results, future research may also look into long-term effects, lengthen the course of treatment and contrast the Jumbled Summary Strategy with other reading comprehension techniques.

### References

- Allaberganova, S. X. Q., & Bozorboyeva, I. M. Q. (2025). Integrating listening, speaking, reading, and writing: Effective approaches for university-level ESL students. *International Journal of Academic Research in Education*, 11(2), 45–56.
- Asrimawati, I. F., Elyani, E. P., & Rosalina, E. (2024). How online extensive reading and listening program enhances students' reading and listening comprehension: An experimental study. *Journal of Languages and Language Teaching*, 12(3), 155–164. <https://doi.org/10.33394/jollt.v12i3.11580>
- Azwar, R., Ristiyanti, E., & Puspita, L. (2023). Enhancing Indonesian EFL students' reading comprehension of report texts through KWL strategy with multimedia: A classroom action research. *Journal of English Teaching and Learning*, 13(1), 56–70.
- Anderson, N. J. (1997). *Exploring second language reading: Issues and strategies*. Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Anderson, N. J. (2003). *Active skills for reading: Book 1*. Thomson/Heinle.
- Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (2006). *Research in education* (10th ed.). Pearson Education Inc.
- Ferdianto. (2025). Exploring the effects of background knowledge on reading comprehension in EFL learners. *Proceedings of the Annual International Conference on Research and Education (AICoRE)*, 3(1), 145–156.
- Hyland, K. (2003). *Second language writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Irawati, E. (2020). Improving students' reading comprehension through cooperative learning strategies. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 5(2), 125–137.
- Joe, A. (1993). Vocabulary learning and speaking activities. *English Teaching Forum*, 31(1), 110–121.
- Rubin, J. (1982). *Learner strategies in language learning*. Prentice Hall.
- Samaras, A. P., & Freese, A. R. (2008). *Self-study of teaching practices: Primer*. Peter Lang Publishing.
- Sharan, Y., & Sharan, S. (1992). \*Expanding cooperative learning through group

investigation\*. Teachers College Press.  
Somadoyo, S. (2011). \*Strategi dan teknik pembelajaran membaca\*. Graha Ilmu.  
Willis, J. (1996). \*A framework for task-based learning\*. Longman.