

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 reseachers 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 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.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, G. and friends. 1981. *The Teaching of English as an International Language: A Practical Guide*. Great Britain: William Collins Sons & Co, Ltd.
- Alderson, J.C. 2000. *Assessing Reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, L. W. and D. R. Krathwohl, Eds. (2000). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York, Longman.
- Ali, Nai'ma Mosa. 2010. *An Evaluation of the Reading Text and Exercises in Sb and WB of English for Palestine- grade 9*. Gaza: Deanery of Higher Education.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP). 2006. *Model Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan (BSNP). 2007. *Standar Isi, Standar Kompetensi Lulusan Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Bloom, B. S. (Ed.), Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., & Krathwohl, D. R. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York: David McKay.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2001. *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy, Second Edition*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2004. *Language Assessment*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Butt, David and friends. 2000. *Using Functional Grammar*. Sydney: Macquarie University.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 1991. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Massachusetts: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

- Chastain, K. 1971. *The Development of modern Language Skills: Theory to Practice*. Philadelphia: The Centre for Curriculum Development.
- Chittravelu, N., Saratha S., and Teh S.C. 2005. *ELT Methodology, principles and Practice*. Malaysia: Oxford Fajar.
- Creswell, J. 2003. *Research Design*. USA: SAGE Publications.
- Cunningsworth, A. 1995. *Choosing Your Course book*. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Daoud, A. and Celce-Murcia, M. 1979. Selecting and Evaluating a Textbook. In M. Celce-Murcia and L. McIntosh (Eds.), *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers.
- DEPDIBUD. 1993. *Lampiran II Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan No. 060/U/ 1993*. Jakarta: DEPDIBUD.
- Depdiknas. 2005. *Peraturan Pemerintah No. 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. 2006. *PERMENDIKNAS No. 22* . Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. 2006. *PERMENDIKNAS No. 23* . Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Depdiknas. 2006. *PERMENDIKNAS No. 24*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.
- Dubin, F. and Olshtain. 1986. *Course Design*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gebhard, J.G. 2000. *Teaching English as a Foreign or Second Language: A Teacher Self-Development and Guide*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Grabe, W. and F. Stoller. 2002. *Teaching and Researching Reading*. Great Britain: Pearson Education.
- Harjanto, I. and Pramono, H. 2011. *The Evaluation of the School Electronic Books: Developing English Competencies for Senior High Schools*. Surabaya: Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Harmer, J. 1998. *How to teach English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Harmer, J. 2001. *The Practice of English Language Teaching*.. Harlow: Longman.
- Haris, A.J. 1962. *Effective Teaching of Reading*. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.

- Helena, Agustien. 2004. *The 2004 English Curriculum in a Nutshell*. A paper presented at the 50th Anniversary of Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Heigham, J. And Robert A.C. 2009. *Qualitative Research in Applied Linguistics*. UK: Palgrave Macmillan. `
- Higgs, Theodore V. 1982. *Curriculum, Competence and the Foreign Language Teacher*. USA: National Textbook Company.
- Litz, D. (n.d). Textbook Evaluation and ELT Management: A South Korean Case Study. *Asian EFL Jpurnal*. 5. Retrieved on May 2, 2011 from http://www.asian-efl-journal.com/Litz_thesis.pdf.
- Nunan, D. 1988. *Syllabus Design*. Oxford: Oxford University.
- Nuttal, C. 1996. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. Oxford: Macmillan Education.
- Renandya, W. 2003. *Methodology and Materials Design in Language Teaching*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richard, Jack C. 2001. *Curriculum Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard and Renandya. 2002. *Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ruddell, Martha R. 2008. *Teaching Content Reading and Writing*. USA: John Weley & Sons, Inc.
- Sheldon, L.E. 1988. *Evaluating ELT Textbooks and Materials*. *ELT Journal* 42/ 4.
- Singer, M. and John T. 1999. *National Research Council on Developingthe Capacity to Select Effective Instructional Materials*. USA: National Academy Press.
- Sutedjo, B. 2010. *Membentang Sayap Menuju Harapan*. Surabaya: Unesa University Press.
- Sudarwati, Th.M. and Eudia Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead 1: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year X*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Sudarwati, Th.M. and Eudia Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead 2: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XI*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

- Sudarwati, Th.M. and Eudia Grace. 2007. *Look Ahead 3: An English Course for Senior High School Students Year XII*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Titscher, S., Meyer M., Wodak and Vetter. 2000. *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. London, England: Sage Publication.
- Tomlinson, Brian. 1998. *Materials Development in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ur, Penny. 1996. *A Course in Language Teaching: Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.