

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

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 particular objective of this study is to find out whether there is any significant difference between the reading comprehension achievement of the second grade of senior high school students who are taught using jigsaw than those who are taught using GTM.

To get the data of the research, the writer using a quasi-experimental research with a pretest-posttest non-equivalent control group design. In a

particular, the data used in this study were taken from the scores of pretest and posttest of the second grade of St. Agnes Senior High School.

The analysis of the latest summative using ANOVA by the help of SPSS program showed that the mean scores between the two groups that chosen for the experimental and control group were not significantly different. It means that the two groups had equal English proficiency at the beginning of the treatment administration. On the next analysis, the writer also used t-test provided in SPSS to know whether there was a significant difference in the means of the gain scores.

The result of the t-test for the gain scores of the two groups as provided in SPSS showed that the means scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It means that there was no significance different between the reading comprehension achievement of the second grade of senior high school students who were taught using jigsaw than those who were taught using GTM.

## **5.2. Suggestions**

This study shows that the implementation of Jigsaw technique in reading class of St. Agnes second grade of Senior High School students did not show the beneficial effect. It was statistically proven that there was no significant difference between the students who were taught using jigsaw technique and the ones who were taught using GTM.

Here are some recommendations for the next researchers who are interested in the same field of study, so the researchers can have better results.

1. The treatments given were only three times. It was too short for the student to adapt with the new technique, which concern in the students activity. So the writer suggests that longer treatments should be given.
2. It was also quite difficult in making the students work in groups seriously. Some problems occurred, for example some students did not want to be in the same group with other students whom they didn't like, so they didn't want to participate in the group. So the explanation about the role of Jigsaw technique before the lesson can be effective to make the students understand the function of the group work.
3. The differences in students' characteristics also influenced the application of jigsaw. For examples: some students did not like to work in groups; they didn't want to share what they know, some students wanted to work in groups with the other students they like, and some students were very talkative. Therefore the teacher's explanation about having their own responsibility of the groups was important. It also could make the students learn how to be concerned to others' needs.
4. The classroom in which jigsaw was implemented was not big enough for the students to have discussion. This condition made the space between the groups too close; it could make the class noisy because the students could easily chat with other students in other groups. It was also difficult for the writer to move from group to group to check the student's activities in expert team or in home team. If it is possible, choose the other place to implement jigsaw, such as the auditorium.

5. The number of the students were too many for the implementation of the jigsaw technique, since the teacher as the facilitator needs to move from one group to other group; the smaller number of the students can be more effective in implementing jigsaw.

## REFERENCES

- Aronson, Elliot. 2005. *Jigsaw Classroom*. Retrieved on June 13, 2007 from [www.jigsaw.org.html](http://www.jigsaw.org.html)
- Aronson, Elliot, et al. 1978. *The Jigsaw Classroom*. Beverly Hills: Sage
- Ary, Donald, Lucy Cheser Jacobs, Asghar Razavieh. 1979. *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Attamimi, Nasser O. 2002. *Grammar Translation: the dominant method in many ELT classrooms*. Retrieved on June 22, 2007 from [www.yementimes.com/print\\_article.shtml?i=657&p=education&a=2](http://www.yementimes.com/print_article.shtml?i=657&p=education&a=2)
- Barnett, Marva A. 1989. *More than Meets the Eye*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Brooks, Jacqueline G., and Martin G. Brooks. 1993. *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivism Classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1987. *Principles of Language Learning Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. Inc.
- Coelho, Elizabeth, Lise Winer, and Judy Win-Bell Olsen. 1989. *All Sides of the Issue*. New Jersey: Alemany Press.
- Depdikbud. 1994. *Kurikulum Sekolah menengah Umum, garis-Garis Besar Program Pengajaran (GBPP)*.
- Finnochiaro, Mary. 1974. *English as a Second Language*. New York: Regent Publishing Company. Inc.
- Freeman, Diane Larsen. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. England: Oxford University Press.
- Goodman, Kenneth S. 1967. Reading: A Psycholinguistic Guessing Game. *Journal of Reading Specialist*, vol 6.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Helgesen, Marc. 2005. *Extensive Reading Reports - Different Intelligences, Different Levels of Processing*. Retrieved in July 2007 from [www.asian-efl-journal.com/september\\_05\\_mh.php](http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/september_05_mh.php).

<http://stmail.fju.edu.tw/~b8720164/gtm1.htm>. Retrieved on June 13, 2007

<http://stmail.fju.edu.tw/~b8720164/gtm2.htm>. Retrieved on June 13, 2007

Johnson, D.W., R.T. Johnson, and E.J. Holubec. 1993. *Cooperation in the Classroom*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Kurnia, Evy. 2002. *The Effect of Using Cooperative Learning by Using Jigsaw Activities and the Traditional Technique on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of SMU YPPI-I Students Surabaya*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis. Widya Mandala.

Mickulecky, Beatrice S. Jeffries, and Linda. 1964. *Reading Power: Reading Faster, Thinking Skills, Reading for Pleasure, Comprehension Skills*. Massachusetts: Addison Wesley Pub. Co.

Ngadiman, A. 1990. *The Effectiveness of the Purpose-Based Model for Teaching Reading Comprehension at English Department*. Malang: IKIP Malang.

Nuttal, Christine. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Heinemann.

Oktarina. 2006. *SPSS 13 untuk Orang Awam*. Palembang: Maxikom.

Paulston, Christina Bratt and Mary Newton Bruder. 1976. *Teaching English as a Second Language Techniques and Procedures*. Massachusetts: Winthrop Publisher. Inc.

Richards, Jack C., and Theodore S.Rodgers. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sarwono, Jonathan. 2006. *Panduan Cepat dan Mudah SPSS 14*. Yogyakarta: Andi

Smith, Frank. 1973. *Psycholinguistic and Reading*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston. Inc.

Streven, Peter. 1977. *New Orientations in Teaching of English*. Great Britain: The Hertford Press.

Tewksbury, Barbara. 2007. *The Jigsaw Technique*. Retrieved in July 2007 from [www.serc.carleton.edu/NAGT/Workshop/coursedesign/tutorial/jigsaw.html](http://www.serc.carleton.edu/NAGT/Workshop/coursedesign/tutorial/jigsaw.html).

- Thuleen, Nancy. 1996. *The Grammar-Translation Method*. Retrieved on September 20, 2006. [www.nthuleen.com/papers/720report.html](http://www.nthuleen.com/papers/720report.html).
- Vacca, Richard T. 1981. *Content Area Reading*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company
- Wardhaugh, Ronald. 1969. *Reading: Linguistic Perspective*. Harcourt: Brace and World. Inc.
- Wikipedia Indonesia. 2004. *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi*. Retrieved on June 22, 2007. [www.id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurikulum\\_Berbasis\\_Kompetensi](http://www.id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kurikulum_Berbasis_Kompetensi)
- [www.allfreeessays.com/student/HISTORY\\_OF\\_ENGLISH\\_LANGUAGE\\_TEACHING.html](http://www.allfreeessays.com/student/HISTORY_OF_ENGLISH_LANGUAGE_TEACHING.html). Retrieved on June 13, 2007
- [www.co-operation.org/pages/cl.html](http://www.co-operation.org/pages/cl.html). Retrieved on June 13, 2007
- [www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/constructivism/index.html](http://www.thirteen.org/edonline/concept2class/constructivism/index.html). Retrieved on June 13, 2007