CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter presents conclusion and suggestions after having analyzed the finding and discussion. The first section discusses conclusion which consists of summary of the study. Then, the suggestions are presented in the next section.

5.1 Conclusion

A coursebook has important role to achieve the objectives of learning. The study was done to evaluate the reading materials presented in the series of Look Ahead course books. The reading materials evaluated were the reading texts and the reading exercises. There were three course books of Look Ahead which were evaluated by the researcher together with a colleague as another researcher. The course books evaluated were Look Ahead 1, Look Ahead 2 and Look Ahead 3. The researchers tried to find out the compatibility of the reading texts and the reading exercises presented in the Look Ahead course books with the learning objectives in the English syllabus of KTSP.

According to the English syllabus of KTSP, English is taught through the text types approach. Therefore, the reading texts presented in an English course book should be compatible with the text types required in the English syllabus of KTSP. The basic competencies in the English syllabus of KTSP require senior high school students to learn short functional text and the other twelve text types. The twelve text types are recount, procedure, narrative, descriptive, news item,
report, analytical, spoof, hortatory, explanation, discussion and review texts. Those text types are taught to get the students achieve the literacy level required in the *English syllabus of KTSP* for senior high school students. The senior high school students should achieve the informational literacy since they are prepared to enter the university level. Therefore, the varieties of those text types guide them to be able to access knowledge with the English language.

Moreover, the *English syllabus of KTSP* requires students to achieve the basic competence of reading regulated by the government. It requires students to comprehend the message of a text. Therefore, the researchers evaluate the reading exercises presented in the *Look Ahead*. The researchers tried to find out whether the reading exercises guide the students to comprehend the message of a text as the goal of the English reading. The previous curriculum in this country explicitly mentioned some indicators that should be achieved by the students. However, KTSP as the current curriculum does not explicitly mention the indicators that should be achieved by students. Therefore, the researcher of this study evaluated reading exercises in the course books based on six reading taxonomies by Anderson and Krathwol (2000).

The findings show that the text types presented in *Look Ahead 1* and *Look Ahead 2* are compatible with the text types in the English syllabus of KTSP. However, one text type is missing in *Look Ahead 3*. The basic competence requires students to learn short functional, narrative, explanation, discussion, and review texts; however, none of short functional text is found in the *Look Ahead 3* course book.
The findings also show that the numbers of some text types in the series of *Look Ahead* are less than other text types. In *Look Ahead 1*, each text type is learnt four times or more but the procedure text is only learnt once. Then, in *Look Ahead 2*, each text type is also learnt more than four times but short functional, report, analytical exposition, and hortatory exposition are learnt less than four times. The short functional, report, and analytical exposition texts are only learnt twice in the course book while the hortatory exposition is learnt three times there. However, all text types presented in *Look Ahead 3* are presented four times or more.

Then, based on the evaluation toward the reading exercises presented in the series of *Look Ahead* course books, the *remembering* category as the lowest cognitive level of reading taxonomy dominates the reading exercises in *Look Ahead 1* and *Look Ahead 3*. There are approximately 50% reading exercises in those course books are compatible with this level. *Look Ahead 2* presents 39% reading exercises to achieve this level.

Then, there are approximately 30% reading exercises in the series of *Look Ahead* are compatible with the *understanding* level. While, there are only 2% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 2* and *Look Ahead 3* are compatible with the *applying* level. It is the third level of the reading taxonomy. In addition, none of the reading exercises in *Look Ahead 1* guides students to achieve this level.

Next, There are approximately 10% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 1* and *Look Ahead 3* compatible with the *analyzing* level of reading taxonomy. While, there are 21% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 2* compatible with this level.
There are approximately 3% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 1* and *Look Ahead 3* compatible with the *evaluating* level of reading taxonomy. While, there are 8% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 2* compatible with this level.

Finally, Less than 3% reading exercises in *Look Ahead 1* and *Look Ahead 3* are compatible with the *creating* level of reading taxonomy. In addition, none of the reading exercises in *Look Ahead 2* is compatible with this level.

In short, there are approximately 70% reading exercises in the series of *Look Ahead* compatible with the lower cognitive levels of reading taxonomy, especially the *remembering* level. While, there are less than 30% reading exercises in the course books compatible with the higher cognitive levels of reading taxonomy: *analyzing*, *evaluating*, and *creating*.

### 5.2.1 Suggestion

The researcher gives her suggestions in the light of the results of analyzing the text types and reading exercises in the series of *Look Ahead* course books.

Teachers are suggested to use all of the text types presented in the series of *Look Ahead* since all of them are compatible with the text types in the English syllabus of KTSP. However, teachers need to add some short functional texts from other sources to be learnt by the third grade students both in the first and the second semester. *Look Ahead 3* does not provide any short functional text in the reading materials while the English syllabus of KTSP requires the third grade students to learn it both in the first and the second semester. In addition, teachers
are suggested to add some text types in Look Ahead 1 and Look Ahead 2 since they are presented less than the other text types. They are procedure text in Look Ahead 1; short functional, report, analytical, and hortatory texts in Look Ahead 2.

Then, teachers are suggested to add some exercises to achieve the higher levels of reading taxonomy: analyzing, evaluating, and creating. Students of senior high school are prepared to enter university level; therefore, the students need to learn to activate their critical thinking by learning the higher cognitive levels of reading taxonomy. In addition, teachers are also suggested to add some exercises to achieve the applying level since there are only 2% reading exercises in Look Ahead 2 and Look Ahead 3 compatible with this level while none of the reading exercises in Look Ahead 1 is compatible with this level.

5.2.2 Suggestions for further studies:

The findings show that the series of Look Ahead are good course books to be used to teach English reading through text types since the text types presented there are compatible with the text types required by the basic competence of reading in the English syllabus of KTSP. However, they are not good course books to activate students’ critical thinking since the course books do not present enough text types to learn the higher cognitive levels of reading taxonomy.

This study gives significant advantage for English teachers who are using Look Ahead course books. Therefore, suggestions for further studies are:
1. Conducting other studies similar to this study in evaluating reading texts and exercises in other English course books to see to what extent the reading texts and reading exercises are compatible with the English syllabus of KTSP.

2. Compare this coursebook with other coursebook which is also written based on English syllabus of KTSP to know whether the coursebooks are compatible with the English syllabus of KTSP.

3. Evaluate this coursebook deeper, for example the language content.

4. Carrying out other studies of evaluating other skills like writing, speaking or listening in English course books.

5. Carrying studies on measuring to what extent the goals of teaching reading stated by the Ministry of Education have been accomplished by teachers.
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