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Abstract


Advisors: (1) Prof. Dr. Veronica L. Diptoadi, M. Sc., (2) Dr. Agustinus Ngadiman
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English as a foreign language in Indonesia is considered to be the most important language among other foreign languages. It is simply because of its status as an international language. It is spoken in most of the countries around the world. This fact leads Indonesian people to learn English, and even the government has put English as a compulsory subject included in the curriculum.

There are four skills in learning English; listening, speaking, reading and writing. Among those four skills, reading seems to occupy the most time, especially in senior high school. However, the students get bored easily in reading class because most of the teachers still using the old method such as reading the passage aloud, find the words, and answer the question. Most of the activities in the class are held by the teacher. To overcome the problem above, the writer applies jigsaw technique which concern on students’ orientation.

The aim of this study is to compare the effectiveness of Jigsaw and GTM on second grade of senior high school students’ reading achievement. The subjects of the study used are two classes of the second grade of St. Agnes Senior High School. A quasi-experimental research with a pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design was used to do this research. In order to know the effects of those two techniques, the writer used the pretest posttest as the instrument with 16 multiple choice items.

To calculate the data, t-test for significance of difference between two means for independent samples was used. After analyzing the data which had been collected, the writer found out that t-observation was 1.244 and t-table was 1.671. The t-observation was lower than t-table, it means the gain score was not significantly different. It means the students who were taught using Jigsaw technique did not have a better reading achievement than those who were taught using GTM.