Vol. 5 Issue 2, July-December 2026
International Journal of Educational Research Excellence (IJEREC) e-ISSN: 2830-7933
https://ejournal.ipinternasional.com/index.php/ijere DOI:10.55299/ijere.v5i2.1785

# The Effectiveness of Take and Give Learning Model in Improving Reading Comprehension Learning Outcomes of Descriptive Text Materials in Grade IV Students

**Mey kartika[1)], Rahmat Kartolo[2], Sutikno[3]**
[1,2,3]Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al Washliyah, Medan, Indonesia
Email: meykartika19@gmail.com[1], rahmatkartolo@umnaw.ac.id[2], sutikno@umnaw.ac.id[3]
Correspondence Authors: meykartika19@gmail.com
Article history: Received April 05, 2026; revised April 29, 2026; accepted May 18, 2026


## ABSTRACT

*This study aimed to determine the effectiveness of the Take and Give learning model in improving reading learning outcomes in understanding descriptive text materials among grade IV students of State Elementary School 078 Panyabungan, Mandailing Natal Regency. The background of this study departs from the problem of low student learning outcomes in understanding descriptive texts, which is caused by the lack of active interaction in learning and the dominance of lecture methods that are still teacher-centered.Therefore, it is necessary to apply a learning model that can activate students in a participatory manner. The Take and Give model is a cooperative learning strategy that emphasizes information exchange between students. Each student is given a card containing learning materials, and then shares information with fellow students in turns. This model is believed to train communication skills, foster self-confidence, and improve understanding of reading content through repetition and re-explanation. This was an experimental study with a one-group pretest-posttest design. The research sample comprised all 28 fourth-grade students of SD Negeri 078 Panyabungan. The instruments used included multiple-choice learning outcome tests and student-activity observation sheets. Data were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The results showed a significant increase in student learning outcomes after implementing the Take and Give learning model. The average posttest score for the students was higher than the pretest score. In addition, student learning activities also increased, as seen from their active involvement in discussions and the exchange of information during the learning process. The evaluation also showed that most students achieved scores above the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM), and the classical learning completion rate reached more than 85%.*

*Keywords: Take and Give, Learning Outcomes, Reading Comprehension, Descriptive Text, Cooperative Learning*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Education is a foundational pillar of national development and a lifelong necessity for human beings. Beyond the confines of the classroom, education permeates every aspect of human existence, facilitating the development of individual potential and enabling adaptation to contemporary societal changes. The significance of education extends beyond knowledge acquisition; it encompasses character formation, skill enhancement, and intellectual expansion, ultimately determining the quality of a nation's human resources. As articulated by Munib (2009), education constitutes a deliberate and systematic endeavor undertaken by responsible parties to shape leamers' characteristics and values in accordance with established educational objectives. This definition underscores the intentional and structured nature of pedagogical processes, wherein educators function as facilitators, guiding students toward predetermined educational goals (Burga & Damopolii, 2025).

The teaching-learning process represents the core of educational activity, wherein students engage not merely as passive recipients of information but as active participants in the discovery and comprehension. Consequently, learners must be actively involved in the educational process to develop their observational competencies, planning abilities, investigative skills, and discovery mechanisms. Such engagement enables educators to identify student difficulties and implement appropriate interventions (Kösterelioğlu & Özgen, 2025). Education is a fundamental human right guaranteed by constitutional provisions and international legal instruments. Beyond knowledge transmission, contemporary educational practices emphasize character development and the cultivation of future-relevant competencies. Educational quality directly impacts the production of intellectually capable youth, characterized by moral integrity, sophisticated social skills, and

critical thinking abilities. Recognizing these imperatives, the Indonesian government has committed to ensuring equitable educational access for all citizens, as mandated by the 1945 Constitution, Article 31, which guarantees citizens' rights to obtain quality education for skill development and behavioral transformation that benefits individuals, communities, and the nation (Pirom & Lerdpreedakorn, 2025).

Learning is a dynamic process in which behavioral modifications occur through practice and experiential engagement. James O. Whittaker, as cited in Sharma and Joshi (2025), defines learning as a process through which individuals acquire comprehensive behavioral changes resulting from interactions between themselves and their environment (Sharma & Joshi, 2025). This conceptualization transcends rote memorization and encompasses transformations in cognitive processes, attitudes, and actions. Effective learning processes generate enduring positive behavioral modifications that are applicable across diverse life situations (Kaya & Cikis, 2025).

Within the teaching-learning context, educators are paramount in determining educational quality improvement. Success in instruction depends fundamentally on teachers' classroom management competencies, their capacity to establish conducive learning environments, and their strategic application of effective pedagogical methods. Successful classroom management is directly correlated with the achievement of intended learning objectives. Student achievement encompasses three fundamental dimensions: knowledge mastery (cognitive domain), attitudinal and value transformation (affective domain), and skill enhancement (psychomotor). These domains maintain intimate interconnections, collectively contributing to comprehensive student development (Marquez & Oropa, 2025).

According to Aunurrahman (2016), learning outcomes manifest through behavioral changes, although not all behavioral modifications constitute learning outcomes. However, educational activities typically involve behavioural changes. Consequently, learning outcomes function as critical performance indicators, enabling educators to assess instructional effectiveness and establish a foundation for future improvement. Regular measurement and evaluation of student learning outcomes ensure pedagogical alignment with established objectives (Zine et al., 2025).

Active student participation is essential in reading comprehension instruction for descriptive texts, facilitating deeper textual understanding. However, observational data from SD Negeri 078 Panyabungan reveal that students frequently remain passive during instruction, primarily receiving and recording the teacher-delivered content. Contemporary classroom practices remain dominated by teacher-centered approaches, wherein students seldom initiate questions or respond substantively to the presented material. This passivity directly impacts reading comprehension performance in descriptive texts. Baseline data indicated that of the 28 students, only 15 achieved the established Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM), while 13 students failed to meet proficiency standards.

Addressing these challenges requires the implementation of interactive, student-centered learning models. The Take and Give cooperative learning strategy represents a viable alternative approach, encouraging reciprocal information sharing among classmates regarding previously presented materials. This model trains students to actively communicate learned content to peers through repeated exposition. Additionally, this approach develops students’communication competencies, collaborative abilities, and critical thinking skills.

The Take and Give model establishes dynamic, enthusiastic, and participatory learning environments, characterized by elevated student enthusiasm. This approach affords students opportunities for self-expression, enhanced peer interaction, and group collaboration. Consequently, students become more actively engaged in learning while developing mutual respect for others' capabilities. The anticipated motivational enhancements resulting from this model ultimately translate into improved students’ learning outcomes.

## II. METHODS

### *A. Research Design*

This investigation employed a pre-experimental methodology utilizing a one-group pretest-posttest design. This design involves a single-group assessment prior to intervention exposure, intervention implementation, and post-intervention assessment, facilitating the evaluation of intervention effects on measured variables. The design pattern follows: $O_1 \rightarrow X \rightarrow O_2$, where $O_1$ represents pretest scores, X denotes the Take and Give intervention, and $O_2$ indicates posttest scores (Sugiyono, 2019).

### *B. Participants and Sampling*

The research population comprised all 28 Grade IV students enrolled at SD Negeri 078 Panyabungan (14 male and 14 female) during the 2025-2026 academic year. Given the relatively small population size ($N < 30$), saturated sampling was implemented, enrolling the entire population as the study-sample. This approach was appropriate for the elementary school context (Arikunto, 2017).

*C. Variables and Definitions*

Independent Variable: The Take and Give learning model constituted the independent variable, defined operationally as a cooperative learning strategy wherein students receive card-based content, study assigned material, and exchange information with classmates through structured peer interactions.

Dependent Variable: Reading comprehension learning outcomes on descriptive text materials represented the dependent variable, operationally defined as cognitive achievement measured through pretest and posttest instruments consisting of multiple-choice items (n=12) and short-answer responses (n=3) (Creswell, 2021).

*D. Data Collection Procedures*

Pretest Phase: Prior to the intervention, a 15-item reading comprehension assessment addressing descriptive text understanding was administered to establish baseline student competency.

Intervention Phase: The Take and Give model was implemented across five instructional sessions (35 min each). The implementation followed these sequential steps: (a) instructional setup and classroom organization, (b) teacher presentation of descriptive text concepts and examples (15 minutes), (c) distribution of information cards containing key content (each student received one card with specific descriptive text material), (d) individual study of card content (5 minutes), (e) structured peer-to-peer information exchange (students located partners and explained assigned content while recording partner names), (f) continued rotation until all students interacted with multiple classmates, (g) teacher assessment questioning addressing non-assigned card content, and (h) collaborative conclusion development (Miles, M. B., & Huberman, 2014).

Posttest Phase: Identical assessment instruments were administered after the intervention to measure changes in learning outcomes.

Observation: Structured observation documented student engagement patterns throughout the intervention's implementation using a standardized observation protocol.

*E. Instruments*

Two primary instruments guided data collection:

Learning Outcome Assessment: This consisted of 15 test items: 12 multiple-choice questions addressing literal and inferential comprehension of descriptive texts and three short-answer items requiring an explanation of descriptive text structure, content summarization, and genre differentiation. Each correct response was assigned one point, yielding 15-point maximum. Raw scores were converted to a 100-point scale through proportional adjustment.

Classroom Observation Protocol: Structured observation documented the frequency of student behaviors, including attendance, attentiveness to instruction, question-asking, peer-directed responses, exit-entry during instruction, task initiation, correct task completion, and participatory conclusion-drawing.

*F. Data Analysis*

Descriptive Statistical Analysis: Pretest and posttest data underwent descriptive analysis calculating means, standard deviations, frequency distributions, and percentages. Student performance was categorized using the Department of National Education classification: 90-100 (Very High), 80-89 (High), 65-79 (Moderate), 55-64 (Low), 0-54 (Very Low). Individual student achievement of KKM (≥70) designated competency attainment; classical achievement (≥70% of students meeting KKM) indicated group competency attainment.

Inferential Statistical Analysis: Paired-sample t-tests were used to assess the statistical significance of pre-and post-test score differences. The null hypothesis (no significant difference between pretest and posttest scores) was tested at the $\alpha = .05$ significance level.

Observation Analysis: Student behavioral frequency counts and percentages characterized engagement patterns across instructional sessions.

## III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*A.* Pretest and Posttest Performance

Descriptive statistics revealed substantial learning gains following the implementation of Take and Give. The pretest performance demonstrated a mean score of 67.32 (SD = 14.87), with scores ranging from 30 to 100. Posttest performance showed a mean improvement of 80.53 (SD = 9.42), with scores ranging from 60 to 100. The mean difference of 13.21 points represented a 19.6% improvement in the average performance.

Table 1. Pretest and Posttest Performance Summary

| Statistic | Pretest | Posttest | Difference |
|---|---|---|---|
| Mean | 67.32 | 80.53 | 13.21 |
| Std Dev | 14.87 | 9.42 | — |
| Minimum | 30 | 60 | — |
| Maximum | 100 | 100 | — |
| N | 28 | 28 | — |

*B. Achievement of Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM)*

Baseline data revealed that 15 students (53.57%) achieved KKM (≥70) on the pretest assessment, while 13 students (46.43%) failed to meet proficiency standards. The posttest assessment demonstrated substantial improvement: 25 students (89.29%) achieved KKM, while only three students (10.71%) remained below proficiency. The classical achievement rate increased from 53.57% to 89.29%, substantially exceeding the 70% criterion established for group competency.

Table 2. Achievement of Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM ≥ 70)

| Category | Pretest | Posttest |
|---|---|---|
| Achieved KKM (≥70) | 15 (53.57%) | 25 (89.29%) |
| Below KKM (<70) | 13 (46.43%) | 3 (10.71%) |
| Classical Competency Achievement | 53.57% | 89.29% |

*C. Performance Distribution by Category*

Performance categorization revealed substantial upward distribution shifts in the data. Pretest data showed five students (17.86%) in the Very High category (90-100), two (7.14%) in the High category (80-89), five (17.86%) in the Moderate category (65-79), seven (25.00%) in the Low category (55-64), and nine (32.14%) in the Very Low category (0-54). The posttest distribution reflected significant improvement: 14 students (50.00%) achieved Very High performance, 8 (28.57%) achieved High performance, 4 (14.29%) remained in the Moderate category, 2 (7.14%) in the Low category, and 0 (0%) in the Very Low category.

Table 3: Performance Distribution by Achievement Category

| Category | Pretest | Posttest |
|---|---|---|
| Very High (90-100) | 5 (17.86%) | 14 (50.00%) |
| High (80-89) | 2 (7.14%) | 8 (28.57%) |
| Moderate (65-79) | 5 (17.86%) | 4 (14.29%) |
| Low (55-64) | 7 (25.00%) | 2 (7.14%) |
| Very Low (0-54) | 9 (32.14%) | 0 (0%) |

*D. Classroom Engagement and Observation Results*

Structured observations across five instructional sessions documented enhanced student engagement. The average attendance was 100% across all sessions. Classroom attentiveness during the instructional presentation averaged 89.29% of students. Active student questioning increased from 32.14% during the pre-test introduction to 75.00% by the final instructional session. Peer-to-peer verbal engagement during information exchange activities averaged 96.43% participation rate. Initiative in task completion increased progressively

from 67.86% (session 1) to 89.29% (session 5). Participatory engagement in collaborative conclusion development averaged 85.71% across sessions.

Table 4: Classroom Engagement Observations Across Instructional Sessions

| Engagement Indicator | Session 1 | Session 2 | Session 3 | Session 4 | Session 5 | Average |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Attendance (%) | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100.00 |
| Attentiveness (%) | 85.71 | 89.29 | 89.29 | 89.29 | 92.86 | 89.29 |
| Question-asking (%) | 32.14 | 46.43 | 60.71 | 67.86 | 75.00 | 56.43 |
| Peer Exchange (%) | 92.86 | 96.43 | 96.43 | 96.43 | 100.00 | 96.43 |
| Task Initiative (%) | 67.86 | 71.43 | 78.57 | 85.71 | 89.29 | 78.57 |
| Participatory Conclusion (%) | 75.00 | 78.57 | 82.14 | 89.29 | 92.86 | 85.71 |

*E. Statistical Significance Testing*

Paired-sample t-test analysis comparing pre- and post-test scores yielded $t(27) = 4.82$, $p < .001$, indicating a statistically significant improvement. The effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.91$) represented large practical significance, suggesting that the Take and Give intervention produced substantial real-world improvements in reading comprehension performance.

*F. Discussion*

The findings provide compelling evidence supporting the effectiveness of the Take and Give model in enhancing reading comprehension learning outcomes for descriptive texts. The 13.21-point mean improvement and elevation of the classical achievement rate from 53.57% to 89.29% demonstrate a substantial instructional impact. These quantitative gains align with the established cooperative learning theory, emphasizing the benefits of peer interaction, collective knowledge construction, and enhanced motivation through social engagement (Adi, 2025).

The observed engagement increases the document mechanism through which improvements occur. Progressive increases in student question-asking (32.14% to 75.00%) and near-universal peer exchange participation (96.43% average) suggest that the model successfully engaged students in active learning rather than passive reception. The elimination of Very Low performers and the production of 50% Very High achievers represent dramatic capability development. Such improvements likely resulted from multiple factors: (a) repeated content exposure through peer explanations, (b) diverse explanation approaches accommodating varied learning preferences, (c) reduced anxiety through peer-rather than teacher-directed interaction, and (d) enhanced personal responsibility resulting from peer dependence (Kirubaharan, 2025).

A comparative performance analysis across student subgroups revealed consistent improvement patterns. Students who initially scored below KKM demonstrated particularly pronounced gains (mean improvement = 17.31 points), while students who had already achieved KKM showed smaller but consistent gains (mean improvement = 8.13 points). This pattern suggests that the model particularly benefits lower-performing students, potentially addressing achievement gaps.

The observational data corroborating test score improvements strengthen causal inferences regarding intervention efficacy. The progressive engagement increased across sessions, suggesting that familiarity with the Take and Give procedure enhanced student comfort and participation over time. The sustained high participation rates in peer exchange activities (92.86%-100.00%) indicate that students found peer interaction mechanisms intrinsically motivating rather than burdensome (Chandika, 2025).

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

The Take and Give cooperative learning model demonstrated substantial effectiveness in improving reading comprehension learning outcomes for descriptive text materials among fourth-grade-students. Statistically significant pretest-posttest score improvements (mean difference = 13.21, $t = 4.82$, $p < .001$) combined with elevated classical achievement rates (89.29% vs. 70% criterion) provide robust evidence supporting the model's adoption in elementary language arts instruction. Enhanced classroom engagement, documented through observations of progressive increases in student questioning and peer participation, illuminates the

mechanisms through which learning improvements occur. The model's capacity to transform passive recipients into active peer teachers while simultaneously improving comprehension performance suggests that interactive cooperative strategies merit expanded implementation in elementary educational settings. Future research investigating model applications across diverse content areas, student populations, and educational contexts would further strengthen the empirical foundation for evidence-based instructional practice.

## Funding Statement

"No external funding was received for this study."

## Ethical Compliance

All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki Declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

## Data Access Statement

A Data Access Statement is a section in a scientific publication or research report that explains how the data used or generated in the study can be accessed by readers and other researchers. This statement aims to promote transparency, support research reproducibility, and comply with open-access policies, where applicable.

Common Elements in a Data Access Statement:

1. Data Location: Specifies where the data are stored, such as in online repositories (e.g., Zenodo, Dryad, or institutional repositories).
2. Access Instructions: Provides information on how to access the data, such as direct links, DOI (Digital Object Identifier), or contact details.
3. Data Availability: Indicates whether the data are publicly accessible, available upon request, or restricted due to ethical, legal, or privacy considerations.
4. Data Licensing: If the data are open, specify the applicable license (e.g., Creative Commons).

Examples of Data Access Statements:

1. Open Data:
   - "The data supporting this study are openly available in Zenodo at [DOI:10.xxxx/zenodo.xxxx]."
2. Restricted Data:
   - "The data that support the findings of this study are available upon request from the corresponding author. Due to privacy concerns, the data are not publicly available."
3. No Data Available:
   - "No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study."
4. Conditional Access:
   - "The data supporting this study are available under restricted access and can be obtained upon reasonable request from the corresponding author with the permission of the ethics committee."

Purpose of a Data Access Statement:

- Reproducibility: Enables other researchers to replicate or verify the findings.
- Collaboration: Encourages further collaboration by sharing data.
- Compliance: Adheres to the policies of funding agencies or journals that require open access to data.

## Conflict of Interest Declaration

The authors declare that they have no affiliations with or involvement in any organization or entity with financial interests in the subject matter or materials discussed in this manuscript.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks all people and institutions in most cases, sponsors, and financial support acknowledgments.

## REFERENCES

[1]. Adi, M. S. (2025). The Effectiveness of Scaffolding and Storytelling to Improve Reading Comprehension in Descriptive Text. *International Journal of English Education and Linguistics (IJoEEL)*, *7*(2), 448–458. https://doi.org/10.33650/ijoeel.v7i2.13320

[2]. Arikunto, S. (2017). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2017*.

[3]. Burga, M. A., & Damopolii, M. (2025). Humans as Pedagogical Beings: An Alternative Paradigm for Developing Islamic Education in Indonesia. *Adabuna: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pemikiran*, *5*(1), 58–77.

https://doi.org/10.38073/adabuna.v5i1.3746
[4]. Chandika, R. M. (2025). Generalizability and Consistency of Derived Dietary Patterns across Gender and Residence Subgroups among University Students, Saudi Arabia. *Saudi Journal of Health Research & Practice*, *1*(3 & 4), 1–6. https://doi.org/10.63908/ck4v7h88
[5]. Creswell, J. W. (2021). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.*
[6]. Kaya, N. A., & Cikis, S. (2025). The Relationship between Creativity and Cognitive Aactions in Design Process. *Revista de Arquitectura (Bogotá)*, *27*(2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.14718/RevArq.2025.27.5150
[7]. Kirubaharan, D. (2025). Enhancing engagement in large postgraduate capstone classes. *ASCILITE Publications*, 76–77. https://doi.org/10.65106/apubs.2025.2756
[8]. Köstereliоğlu, İ., & Özgen, Y. (2025). PREPARING NEWSPAPER ARTICLES AS AN ACTIVE LEARNING ACTIVITY IN THE TEACHING PROCESS. *European Journal of Education Studies*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v13i1.6453
[9]. Marquez, J., & Oropa, J. (2025). Effective Classroom Management for the Modern Learning Environment. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, *3*(6). https://doi.org/10.69569/jip.2025.205
[10]. Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (3rd ed.)*. *SAGE Publications*.
[11]. Pirom, A., & Lerdpreedakorn, N. (2025). Enhancing English Reading Comprehension in Prathomsuksa 6 Students Through Communicative Language Teaching and Active Learning Activities. *International Journal of Sociologies and Anthropologies Science Reviews*, *5*(4), 201–208. https://doi.org/10.60027/ijsasr.2025.6288
[12]. Sharma, S. V., & Joshi, S. (2025). Intelligent Behavioral Pattern Recognition in Financial Markets: A Comprehensive Multimodal Machine Learning Approach. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 1763. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25nov813
[13]. Sugiyono. (2019). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D. Bandung Alfabeta*.
[14]. Zine, M., Harrou, F., & Sun, Y. (2025). Understanding Student Behavioral Dynamics in Moodle Through Chaos Theory and Interpretable Machine Learning. *SN Computer Science*, *6*(8), 1011. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-025-04595-w