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ABSTRACT: The purposes of this research are to find out, 1) whether C-ID, R2D2 model is effective to be implemented on learning Reading comprehension, (2) college students’ activity during the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model on learning Reading comprehension, and 3) college students’ learning achievement during the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model on learning Reading comprehension. All data are gained from observation sheets from two observers and test given to 31 college students. All data are analyzed by using descriptive quantitative study. The result shows that C-ID, R2D2 model is effective to be implemented. It can be seen from the result of observation that 3.96 which can be called as high category level. In college students’ activity during its implementation is high, that is 3.97, and also from the total result of college student’s learning achievement, all students get score more than 90.
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INTRODUCTION

Constructivist Instructional Design or C-ID is a learning design which originally comes from constructivist approach. This approach is as the outcome from the changing of basic components of behaviouristics approach. There are some differences between constructivists and behaviouristics approach. Behaviorists tend to assume that language is a theory-neutral medium through which meaning about an external world can pass without being influenced or changed, while constructivists tend to believe that meaning of a language develops through use of the language and thus is contextual. Regarding nature of truth, behaviorists think that truth and reality are universal and independent of perception, while the constructivists believe that truth and reality are local and transitory. The behaviorists propose that through the use of proper methods (e.g., scientific research) human can know what that external reality is. They assume that objective knowledge is universal knowledge and that objective can be distinguished from subjective. Constructivists deny that objective knowledge exists. They say that humans cannot take a “God’s-eye view” and make objective decisions. Positions of the Alternative Model Currently, the majority of the ID models are built upon an objective-rational behavioral theoretical framework. The constructivist approaches to educational technology, however, focus mainly on instructional theory rather than instructional design models.

In learning activity, mostly, the lecturers thought if they cannot attend and give the material in the classroom, the students are assumed that they do not master anything. This assumption can be true because in fact when students come to campus and the lecturers cannot attend, they mostly are lazy to do a scientific learning activity. Besides that, when the college students are in the classroom though the lecturer exists and give the material in the classroom, they generally like chatting into one another, or just sitting without doing a scientific and critically thinking. They are really passive on doing so. Hassosubah (2004) states that students can be said less on thinking scientifically because students in doing their activity is less on the process of thinking itself. Therefore, the lecturer must encourage themselves or improve their teaching process for making the students are interested in learning. According to Ardhana (1997) dan Degeng (1999), the less of its optimal in teaching process because (1) lecturers are unable to conduct the learning process which is in line with the development of instructional technology, (2) lecturers have a negative perception or misunderstanding about a learning process, (3) lecturers use learning concept which is not relevant with the development of instructional technology. Therefore, all lecturers are suggested to be more creative in designing and developing their learning process. One of them is by using C-ID, R2D2 model.

R2D2 comes from Recursive, Reflective, Design and Development model. (Colon, Taylor, & Willis, 2000). R2D2 is a procedure of constructivist learning design which focus on its learning process creativity. This procedure tends to iteratively on its learning and material process. The design is also non-linear, meaning that any aspects of the design which are not fundamentally required to be sequential can be done in any order (Chen & Toh, 2005), as well as revisited at any time. R2D2 has its characteristics as, 1) The process is recursive, nonlinear, and sometimes chaotic. It depends on real problems on learning which always grows up. (2) Planning is organic, developmental, reflective, and collaborative, (3) Objectives emerge from design and development work. (4) General ID experts do not exist, (5) Instruction emphasizes learning in meaningful contexts, (6) The goal is personal understanding within meaningful contexts, (7) Formative evaluation is critical, and (8) Subjective data may be the most valuable. R2D2 here focuses on 3 focal points, they are define, design and development and dissemination. In this research, the researcher explores these focal points as the procedure on doing learning reading comprehension.

Reading comprehension is derived from two terms, those are reading and comprehension. Reading is the process of receiving and interpreting information encoded in language form via the medium of print, Grabe (2009:14). Learning reading is not learning how to read a text only, but also learning about vocabulary, and grammar. These components are so crucial, if learners do not have these components, of course, they will never be able to comprehend the content of the text. Besides that, in reading activity, the readers have to construct the meaning of words or even sentences which exist as
the content of reading text. Meanwhile Comprehension occurs when the reader extracts and integrates various information from the text and combines it with what is already known, Koda, (2005:4) in Cahyono, (2012). We typically make use of our background knowledge, vocabulary, grammatical knowledge, experience with the text and other strategies to help us understand the written text. As learners, we have to have an ability to comprehend the content of a text. When we are in the purpose of comprehending the text, we must have a wide range of capacities and abilities. They include cognitive capacities, motivation and various types of knowledge. Here, we should be able to extract the content from any text at all. If we are only able to extract in a single text, of course, it is not satisfying enough. Besides that, comprehension does not occur by simply extracting meaning of from text. Language and content is interrelated to one another. We have to know how language is used for conveying the content. Therefore, we have to read a text carefully, because it relates to our own prior knowledge for interpreting the message that the writer sends to us. It is undeniable that sometimes when some one asks about the content of the passage, we sometimes cannot answer it well. It probably happens because we do not fully comprehend the content of the text.

Based on the explanation above, the researcher formulates these problems as follows:

1. How effective is the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model on learning Reading Comprehension?
2. How is college student’s activity during the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model on learning Reading comprehension?
3. How is the result of college student’s achievement during the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model on learning Reading comprehension?

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is designed through the use of C-ID, Willis (2000), R2D2 model. It has 3 focal points, they are define, design, and development, and dissemination.

1. Define

As the first step, the researcher defines a team. It consists of college students, lecturer from reading comprehension itself and observers. It has a purpose to help and support the researcher during the research being conducted. If there is a problem during the learning process, the team can give some valuable input for overcoming the problem.

2. Design and development

This stage is divided into four components, they are (1), determining the place of research, college students, lecturer and observers. In this step, the researcher chooses college students, lecturer and observers from STKIP PGRI Pasuruan, Indonesia as the subjects and place of the research. The college students here are in academic year of 2015, whereas the amount of college students are 31 and there are two observers who observe the learning process. Here, the observers give score quantitatively based on the aspects from observations sheets. The criteria on scoring from observation sheets are the reflection of observers’ choice. Therefore, the scoring is designed in observation sheets is 1-4. Getting bigger score means the students are getting better and appropriate with the scoring aspects in observation sheets. The criteria on scoring here based on likert (Sukmadinata, 2010:238). All data obtained are analyzed by using a descriptive quantitative study.

Below are some steps in calculating the data:

1. from the effectiveness of learning process observation sheet
   a. Calculating all scores from each meeting.
   b. Counting the average score from all meetings on each indicators, the symbol $I_k$
   c. Counting the average score from $I_k$ to all aspects and symbolised $P$. 

learning process is conducted, the researcher and collaborator design the learning through the use of SQ3R strategy and develop this strategy on learning process.

The design and development of SQ3R strategy as, (1) Surveying strategy. In this step the researcher uses a picture. The picture given has a relationship with the theory conducted. Here, lecturer or researcher asks learners to observe the picture given to explore their prior knowledge. Through this strategy, the lecturer (researcher) is able to know how far his learners’ knowledge are. The lecturer must encourage his learners by giving some questions, for example: Do you know what picture it is? etc. (2) Question strategy, after observing the picture given, the lecturer can continue questioning learners with some questions. Here, the lecturer can point some students to answer the questions given. The questions given have relationship with the theory. In this step, the learners have to answer the questions given. (3) Reading strategy, here, the lecturer asks all learners to read a text silently. This strategy is taken for making the learners are able to analyze the content of a reading text. Besides that, the analysis is also about the grammar and vocabulary used, and its pronunciation. (4) Reciting strategy, after reading a text silently, the lecturer asks some learners to pronounce some difficulties words which are given in the textbook. After pronouncing some difficulties words, the lecturer asks some learners to read the text aloud. Here, if the process of reading finds some improper pronunciation, the lecturer must improve the learner’s pronunciation. After reading aloud conducted, the lecturer asks some question through personal question orally. The question is divided into learner’s prior knowledge and the content of the text. It is taken for improving and encouraging learners to speak English spontaneously. After asking learners some questions orally, the lecturer asks learners to do an evaluation based on the text or theory given in written form, and (5), reviewing strategy, both, lecturer and learners altogether review the material given. The lecturer asks learners to review the theory.

3. Dissemination

After the first and second steps are gained, it is implemented in the classroom in 12 meetings. Like in the previous explanation, the amounts of college students are 31 and there are two observers who observe the learning process. Here, the observers give score quantitatively based on the aspects from observations sheets. The criteria on scoring here based on likert (Sukmadinata, 2010:238). All data obtained are analyzed by using a descriptive quantitative study.

Below are some steps in calculating the data:

1. from the effectiveness of learning process observation sheet
   a. Calculating all scores from each meeting.
   b. Counting the average score from all meetings on each indicators, the symbol $I_k$
   c. Counting the average score from $I_k$ to all aspects and symbolised $P$. 
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Table 1.1: The criteria for the effectiveness of learning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Learning category</th>
<th>Criteria for effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_T \leq 4$</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 \leq P_T &lt; 3$</td>
<td>Enough</td>
<td>Effective Enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 \leq P_T &lt; 2$</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Not effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Nengah Parta (2009)

Note:
- $P_T$ is effectiveness category
- 2. From student’s activity observation sheet
  a. Calculating all scores in all meeting.
  b. Counting the average score from all meetings on each indicators, the symbol $I_I$
  c. Counting the average score from $I_I$ to all aspects and symbolised $A_I$.
  d. Counting the average all score from each aspect $A_I$, symbolised $A_E$

Table 1.2: The criteria from student’s activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3 \leq \overline{a} \leq 4$</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2 \leq \overline{a} &lt; 3$</td>
<td>Enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 \leq \overline{a} &lt; 2$</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Parta (2009)

$\overline{a}$ is student’s activity

3. from students’ learning achievement

Scoring for test is based on scoring rubric which is managed by the researcher himself as follows:

Table 1.3: Scoring Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Aspects of scoring</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The answer is right, grammar is right, and has various vocabulary</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The answer is right, grammar is wrong, and has various vocabulary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The answer is right, grammar is wrong, and has monotonous vocabulary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The answer is wrong, grammar is right, and has monotonous vocabulary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The answer is wrong, grammar is wrong and has monotonous vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Below are some steps on calculating the score obtained from college students:

1. Scoring students’ achievement from the test given each meeting
2. Calculating the score and determining percentage category from the test material given by using the pattern below:
   
   Achievement level = $\frac{\text{score from the right answer}}{\text{Total score}} \times 100$

   Criteria:
   - $90 - 100\% = $ excellent
   - $80 - 89\% = $ satisfying
   - $70 - 79\% = $ satisfying enough
   - $< 70\% = $ low

3. Determining college students’ competence level category from the test given from each meetings. Here, the category is based on STKIP PGRI Pasuruan academic guidance, that is:
   a) If the score $< 50$, it can be said that college students have not mastered
   b) If the score $\geq 50$, it can be said that college students have mastered

In this case, college students can be said master by defining college students’ competence level category as follow:

a) if $\geq 80\%$ from total college students have mastered, it can be categorized “success”
b) if $< 80\%$ from total college students have mastered, it can be categorized “not success”
RESULT

After the data obtained, the researcher calculates and counts the result as follows: From observation

A. Table 1.4: Data and analysis data from the result of observation on learning process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting from</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the calculation above, it can be seen that there are different scores given by two observers. Observer one gives all meetings with 4, meanwhile the second observer gives 3 in meeting 1 for aspect number 4, 2 and 3 for aspects number 3. After all scores are calculated, the effectiveness of this learning process shows in high level, that is 3.96. It means that learning of Reading comprehension through the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model is effective.

B. Table 1.5: Data and analysis data from the result of observation on college student’s activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting from</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Result</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the calculation above, it can be seen that there are different scores given by two observers. Observer one gives all meetings with 4, meanwhile the second observer gives 3 in meeting 1 for aspect number 8, 10, meeting 2 for aspect number 5 and 9 and meeting 3 for aspects number 3, 5 and 8.

So, from the table above, it can be said that the result can be categorized high, that is 3.97. It means that the students have high activity during the learning of Reading comprehension through the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model.

Table1.6: Data and analysis data from the result from college student’s learning achievement
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As stated by students, knowledge process for students not only be obtained. Moreover, it can be said that all students are success on doing a test given. It is because all students get more than 90.

**DISCUSSION**

Teaching and learning process should be implemented well in the classroom. It can be said well if lecturer and college students cooperate and collaborate into one another in the learning process. In other words, this cooperation and collaboration can happen if lecturer and college students know their own existence and work together in the learning process. A good cooperation and collaboration in learning process will create a critical and creative thinking not only for students but also lecturers. So, the effectiveness and high achievement on learning process can be obtained. Therefore, lecturer must prepare his learning tools, such as lesson plan, material, media, and its strategy before learning process conducted. Meanwhile, for college students themselves, they should participate and take part in learning process itself. If they are not done well (lecturer and college students) the goal of learning is hard enough to be gained. Here, simply for arousing students’ participation and making the learning process effective, the lecturer must give a broad chance to college students to construct their own learning. Communication and collaboration must be conducted well in this learning. Moreover, lecturer must use a proper strategy on his learning and place himself as a facilitator which has a role to facilitate the college students to learn and explore his knowledge. In other words, lecturer and college students must mix to be one body (learners) for working, communicating, cooperating and collaborating in learning process for creating effective learning. As stated by Mustadji, (2009), Suparno, (1999), dan Nur, (1998) constructivist approach sees that students individually and or
collaboratively construct their own knowledge. But, if, lecturer and college students do not know their position, the learning process cannot run well. According to Ardhana (1997) and Degeng (1999), the less of its optimal in teaching process because (1) lecturers are unable to conduct the learning process which is in line with the development of instructional technology, (2) lecturers have a negative perception or misunderstanding about a learning process, (3) lecturers use learning concept which is not relevant with the development of instructional technology.

CONCLUSION

From the result of observation and test which were already obtained and calculated by researcher from 12 meeting, it shows that the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model high level, that is 3,96 on learning process. It can be said that the learning process is effective to be implemented and for students’ activity during the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model is categorized high, that is 3,97. Besides that, the result of students’ learning achievement shows success. It is because the result of calculation from first score until last score, all students get 90. It indicates that the implementation of C-ID, R2D2 model can be categorized high and can be implemented by all lecturers on learning process. It is suggested to other researchers to do a similar research in different subjects to make this research objectively can be proven. Besides that, hopefully, other researchers can broadly design and develop other strategy which enriches our knowledge in developing strategy for making the learning process especially students or college student interest and enjoy the material given in the classroom.
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