

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarizes what has been presented in the previous chapters and supports some recommendation for further studies related to students' perception on the implementation of Jigsaw.

5.1 Summary

This study is about perception of fifth grade elementary school students on Jigsaw. More particularly, this study is conducted to answer the research problem: "What is the elementary school students' perception on the implementation of Jigsaw technique in their reading class".

As implied in the research problem, this study is descriptive study. This study employs questionnaire which is initially tried out, interview, observation, and video recordings to obtain the data. The respondents are taught by using Jigsaw in three meetings. The revised questionnaire is then distributed. The interview, observation and video recording are conducted.

There are 46 respondents from Yohanes Gabriel Elementary School and 39 respondents from Santa Theresia 2 Elementary School. Their answers are analyzed and discussed with the focus on perception on expert group, home group and general perception on Jigsaw. The answers of the respondents to the questionnaire items are summarized as follows:

1. All respondents at Yohanes Gabriel have positive self-perception in sharing ideas while almost all respondents (97.44%) at Santa Theresia 2 have positive self-perception too.

2. All respondents at Santa Theresia 2 (100%) have positive self-perception on listening to others' ideas. Fewer respondents (97.83%) at Yohanes Gabriel have positive self-perception on listening to others ideas.
3. The majority of the respondents at Yohanes Gabriel (91.3%) and Santa Theresia 2 (92.31%) have positive self-perception on helping others understand the text during the discussion. Only a small percentage of respondents (8.7 % of respondents at Yohanes Gabriel and 7.69 % of respondents at Santa Theresia 2) claim that they do not help others understand the text during the expert groups' discussion.
4. Only 6.52 % respondents at Yohanes Gabriel and 2.56 % respondents at Santa Theresia 2 have negative group-perception on sharing ideas. These students believe that their group mates do not contribute ideas during the expert groups' discussion.
5. Most of respondents at Yohanes Gabriel (86.96%) and at Santa Theresia 2 (89.74%) think that their group mates have helped them understand the text during their discussion in the expert group.
6. Asked to respond to "My group mates listen to me attentively when I share ideas during the discussion", 97.83 % respondents at Yohanes Gabriel and 92.31 % respondents at Santa Theresia 2 claim that their group mates listen to them attentively.
7. More respondents at Yohanes Gabriel (95.65%) than those at Santa Theresia 2 (89.74%) have positive self-perception on explaining ability. They claim that they have explained clearly so their group mates understand what they have explained.

8. The majority of the respondents at Yohanes Gabriel (89.13%) and Santa Theresia 2 (89.74%) admit that their group mates have explained clearly so the respondents can understand the paragraphs that their group mates have explained.
9. Interesting findings are found at Yohanes Gabriel and Santa Theresia 2. Thirty-seven respondents (94.87%) at Santa Theresia 2 and forty-one respondents (89.13%) at Yohanes Gabriel claim that they like to be taught by using Jigsaw. Fewer respondents at Yohanes Gabriel (82.61%) and Santa Theresia 2 (89.74%) are willing to be taught by using Jigsaw. There are some respondents who like Jigsaw are not willing to be taught by using Jigsaw.

This result of data analysis suggests that the majority of respondents have positive perception on the implementation of Jigsaw technique on their reading class. They have not only positive general self-perception on jigsaw but also positive self-perception and group-perception on expert and home groups. These students are willing and prefer to be taught by using Jigsaw technique in their English lesson.

5.2 Recommendation

Due to numerous reasons, this study is far than perfect. There are factors that should have been taken into account. Accordingly, the following recommendations are worth indicating for better further study.

This study uses the questionnaire that only covers the closed items that can limit respondents' perception to the options given. Therefore, it is suggested that further study can make use of questionnaire that covers closed and open items in order to obtain more descriptive data.

As previously said, this study uses video recordings as one of the instrument. This instrument was conducted only to record the class situation during the lesson. It is suggested that it can be used to record the condition or situation in a certain expert and home groups during their discussion in order to obtain more supportive data.

This study is limited to students' perception on Jigsaw after they have experienced Jigsaw for three meetings. Therefore the similar study can be conducted to reveal students' perception on Jigsaw for the first time they have experienced Jigsaw and after they have experienced it. A further study can be focusing on the perception on the beginning and the end of the treatment.

This study is limited to reveal elementary school students' perception on Jigsaw technique in reading class. They have experienced the technique only for three meetings. The result of the data analysis shows that majority of the students have positive perception on Jigsaw technique which is new for them. A similar study can be conducted to involve students who have already used Jigsaw as their daily learning activities.

From the findings of study, the writer wants to recommend the implementation of Jigsaw in all levels of elementary school students. It is a technique where students learn by playing. They can learn in a fun and non-threatening way in order to acquire English language effectively. The implementation of Jigsaw needs to be adapted to the students' language development so that the students will not face much difficulty in the learning process. Jigsaw can be implemented to teach language components to other level of students.

In summary, this particular study is not without its weaknesses. Further studies need conducting. More conclusive and descriptive findings can then be presented.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aronson, Elliot. 2006. *Jigsaw Classroom*. Retrieved on 21 June 2006 from <http://www.jigsaw.org> 2000-2006
- Bell, Judith. 1993. *Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science*. Philadelphia: Open University Press
- Bencze, J. L. 2005. *Constructivist Learning Theory*. Retrieved on 19 June 2006 from <http://leo.oise.utprntp.ca/~lbencze/Constructivism.html>
- Berk, Laura E. 2001. *Infants, Children, and Adolescents*. Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.
- Birley, Graham and Moreland, Neil. 1998. *A Practical Guide to Academic Research*. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Fourth Edition. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Coelho, Elizabeth. 1992. Jigsaw: Integrating Language and Content. In Kessler, Carolyn (ed). *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Cook, Guy. 1990. Second Edition. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Curtain, Helena and Dahlberg, Carol Ann. 2004. *Languages and Children Making the Match: New Languages for Young Learners, Grades K-8*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2001. *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: Pengarang
- Field, Mary Lee. 2003. Text Features and Reading Comprehension. In Renandya, Willy A and Richards, Jack C (ed). *RELC Portfolio Series 10*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Holzman, Mathilda. 1997. *The Language of Children: Evolution and Development of Secondary Consciousness and Language*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publisher Inc.
- Jacobs, George M., Lee, Gan Siowck and Ball, Jessica. 1997. *Learning Cooperative Learning Via Cooperative Learning: a Sourcebook of Lesson Plans for Teacher Education*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan Cooperative Learning.
- Johnson, Roger T. and Johnson, David W. 1994. *An Overview of Cooperative Learning*. Retrieved on 21 March 2006 from <http://www.co-operation.org/pages/overviewpaper.htm>
- Kaplan, Eitan. 2002. *Constructivism as a Theory*. Retrieved on 20 June 2006 from http://online.sfsu.edu/~foreman/itec800/finalprojects/eitan_kaplan/pages/classroom
- Kennesaw States University. 2004. *Class Activities that Use Cooperative Learning*. Retrieved on 31 March 2006 from <http://edtech.kennesaw.edu/intech/cooperativelearning.htm>
- Key, James P. 1997. *Research Design in Occupational Education*. Retrieved on 19 August 2006 from <http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage110.htm>

- _____. 1997. *Questionnaires and Interview as Data-Gathering Tools*. Retrieved on 19 August 2006 from <http://www.okstate.edu/ag/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage17.htm>.
- Kristindottir, Solrun B. 2001. *Constructivist Theory*. Retrieved on 19 June 2006 from <http://starfsfolk.khi.is/construct.htm>
- 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 1 students*. Surabaya : Unpublished Thesis. Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Layton, James R. 1979. *The Psychology of Learning to Read*. New York: Academic Ress, Inc.
- Lyman, Lawrence and Foyle, Harvey C. 1988. *Cooperative Learning Strategies and Children*. Retrieved on 19 June 2006 from <http://www.ericdigest.org/pre-9211/cooperative.htm>
- Magnan, Sally Sieloff. 1997. From the Editor: This Special Issue “Interaction, Collaboration, and Cooperation: Learning Language and Preparing Language Teachers”. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, IV: 439.
- Marksheffel, Ned D. 1966. *Better Reading in The Secondary School*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.
- McMillan, James H. 1992. *Educational Research*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Olsen, R.E.W-B, and Kagan, Spencer. 1992. About Cooperative Learning. In Kessler, Carolyn (ed). *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher’s Resource Book*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. 2002. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Second Edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Sania. 1998. *The Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Reading Achievement of SMU KRISTEN PETRA 3*. Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis. Widya Mandala Catholic University.
- Santrock, John W. 1999. *Live-span Development*. Seventh Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- _____. 2003. *Educational Psychology*. Second Edition. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Savage, John F. 1998. *Teaching Reading and Writing Combining Skills, Strategies and Literature*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Smith, Nila B and Robinson, H. Alan. 1980. *Reading Instruction for Today’s Children*. Englewood cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Stahl, Robert J. 1995. *The Essential Elements of Cooperative Learning in Classroom*. *Eric Digest*. ED 370881. <http://www.ericdigests.org/1995-1/elements.htm>
- Taylor, Insup and Taylor, M. Martin. 1983. *The Psychology of Reading*. New York: Academic Press, Inc.
- Walker, Debra, Kiefer, Kate and Reid, Steve. 2006. *Cognitive Reading Theory*. Retrieved on 19 June 2006 from <http://writing.colostate.edu/guides/reading/critread/pop3a.cfm>.