CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In the fifth chapter, the writer presents the conclusion and suggestions. In the first sub chapter, the writer concludes about what have been discussed in the previous chapters. And in the second sub chapter, the writer gives suggestion for English teaching and further research.

3.4 Conclusion

The reading ability is essential because the students can broaden their knowledge through reading. Besides that, being able to read English text comprehensively is very important for senior high school students since some of textbooks used in the university are written in English. 2004 English curriculum states that through communicative reading as one of the integrated skills taught in senior high school, the students are expected to be able to read English textbooks mostly used in the university.

Actually, many of them still have a low ability to read and comprehend the content of a reading passage. This could happen due to the unvaried technique of teaching reading used in the class. When the students get bored in the reading class, they can not comprehend the passage well. As a result, they can not develop their reading proficiency.

Some studies to overcome the problem have been done. Most of them analyzed about implementation of the jigsaw technique of cooperative learning method compared to that of the traditional technique in reading class. The results

showed that there is an improvement of students' reading achievement taught by using jigsaw technique. This encouraged the writer to conduct a study about the implementation of the cooperative learning method by using another technique namely M.U.R.D.E.R technique compared to that of the grammar translation method by using the translation technique in the senior high school students.

In brief, the writer conducted a study about the effect of cooperative learning method and grammar translation method in the reading achievement of senior high school students. The objective of this study is to find out whether the Grammar Translation Method or the M.U.R.D.E.R technique can improve the reading ability of eleventh grade students of senior high school better. Besides, the writer also examined the students reading achievement in answering factual, inference, and main idea questions.

The study was included in the quantitative study which was quasi experimental study applying nonequivalent – groups posttest – only design. The subject used in the study was the eleventh grade of natural science students of St. Louis I Surabaya. The data used in this study were taken from the scores of mid term test and posttest of the students. And the writer administered three meetings for treatments.

The analysis of the mid term test scores using One Way ANOVA assisted by SPSS 13 program for Windows showed that the mean scores of the classes used for try out (XI IA 5 AND XI IA 6) and posttest (XI IA 1 and XI IA 3) were not significantly different. It means that the used classes had equal reading ability. On the next analysis, the writer used t-test for independent samples in

order to know whether there was a significant difference between the posttest means of the two groups. The writer tested the mean scores of posttest at .05 level of significance with 75 degrees of freedom.

The result of the t-test formula for the comparison of the mean scores of the posttest of the two groups (XI IA 1 and XI IA 3) showed that there was significant difference where grammar translation method through translation technique affects students' reading achievement better than cooperative learning method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique. Besides that, the writer also calculated the effect of the two techniques in the students' reading achievement to answer factual, inference, and main idea questions. The result showed that there was significant difference where translation technique affects the students in answering factual and inference questions better than M.U.R.D.E.R technique. While in answering main idea questions, the result showed that there was not significant difference where grammar translation method through translation technique affects students' reading achievement as well as cooperative learning method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique.

The result obtained proved that the students taught by translation technique of the grammar translation method have better reading achievement than those taught by M.U.R.D.E.R technique of cooperative learning method.

3.5 Suggestions

This sub chapter deals with two main points. They are suggestions for English teacher and suggestion for further study.

5.2.1 Suggestions for English Teacher

This study reveals that the students taught by translation technique have higher reading achievement than those taught by MURDER technique. The writer has some suggestions dealing with the implementation of cooperative learning method through the M.U.R.D.E.R technique to the eleventh grade students:

- Since M.U.R.D.E.R technique is relatively new for the students, the students might get confused with the instructions or the steps they should follow. The writer suggests that the teacher should give clear instructions and check if the students understand the task or not.

- The writer recommends that the treatment should be given more than three meetings so that the students have enough time to adjust their learning.

- In applying cooperative learning by using the M.U.R.D.E.R technique, the teacher should actively supervise the students when they are doing the task since working in a group can lead some problems.

- Sometimes students do not know how to work in a group or how to solve a problem together. So, the writer suggests that the teacher could literally tell the students about the purpose of working together. When the students do a fair share of the work, they get success in accomplishing the task given.

5.2.2 Suggestions for Further Study

Finally, the writer realizes that this study is still far from being perfect. Nevertheless, she hopes that this study can be used as a reference for other researchers who will carry out further research in improving students' reading achievement through the cooperative learning method and the grammar translation

method. By sharing the weaknesses found in this study, the writer expects that the next researcher will get a better and valid result by using a better research design and a wider scope of subjects. Due to the limited time to finish the study, the writer only gave three times treatment since she conducted her experiment one month before the national examination held. The writer suggests that the next researcher will have more time and opportunities to conduct his or her experiment so that the students will have enough time in adjusting new technique.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Richard C. and P. David Pearson. 1988. A Schema – Theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading Comprehension. Patricia L. Carrell et al (eds) Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading. Melbourne: Cambridge university press.

Arcana, Nyoman. 1996. Pengantar Statistika II: untuk Ekonomi bagian inferensial. Faculty of Economy: Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.

Bowen, J. Donald et al. 1985. TESOL Techniques and Procedures. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.

Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents

Carrell, Patricia and Joan C Eisterhold. 1987. Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richard (eds). Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings. New York: Newbury House Publisher.

Clarke, Mark A. and Sandra Silberstein. 1987. Toward a Realizationof Psycholinguistic Principles in the ESL Reading Class. Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richard (eds). Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings. New York: Newbury House Publisher.

Coelho, Elizabeth. 1992. Jigsaw: Integrating Language and Content. Carolyn Kessler (eds). Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.

Depdikbud. 2004. 2004 English Curriculum for SMU. www.puskur.net retrieved at May 15th, 2007.

Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. 1969. Introduction to Statistical Analysis International Student edition. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogakusha, LTD.

Ebel, R. L. 1979. Essentials of Educational Measurements 3rd edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Eskey, David E. 1983. Learning to read versus Reading to Learn: Resolving the Instructional Paradox. English Teaching Forum, Volume 21, Number 3.

Evangelidou, Evangelia et al. 1990. Reading Skills. English Teaching Forum, Volume 28, Number 4.

Fantini, Alvino E. and Timothy G. Reagan. 1992. Language Pedagogy. www.esperantic.org/esf/f-r3.htm retrieved at January 29th, 2007.

Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. Constructing Achievement Test 3rd edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.

Gronlund, Norman E. 1981. Measurements and Evaluation in Teaching 4th edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Holburt, Idell. 1981. How to Improve Your Reading Comprehension Skills. New York: Monarch Press.

Hornby, A.S. 2000. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 6th edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hythecker, V.I., Dansereau, D.F., and Rocklin, T.R. 1988. An Analysis of the Processes Influencing the Structured Dyadic Learning Environment. Educational Psychologist 23. 23-37.

Jacobs, George and Stephen Hall. 1994. Implementing Cooperative Learning. English Teaching Forum, Volume 32, Number 4.

Jacobs, George and Stephen Hall. 2002. Implementing Cooperative Learning. Jack C. Richard and Willy A. Renandya (eds). Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, David W, Roger T. Johnson, and Mary Beth Stanne. 2000. Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis. www.co-operation.org.html retrieved at May 18th, 2006.

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: unpublished thesis. Widya Mandala.

Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1986. Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching. New York: Oxford University Press.

Larsen, Richard J. and Morris L. Marx. 1981. An Introduction to Mathematical Statistics and Its Application. USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

McMillan, James H. 1992. Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.

Olsen, Roger E. W-B, and Spencer Kagan. 1992. About Cooperative Learning. Carolyn Kessler (eds). Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.

Prapphal, Kanchana. 1993. Cooperative Learning in a Humanistic Class. John W. Oller, Jr. (eds). Methods That Work: Ideas for Literacy and Language Teachers 2nd Edition. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.

Pratisto, Arif. 2004. Cara Mudah Mengatasi Masalah Statistik dan Rancangan Percobaan dengan SPSS 12. Jakarta: Gramedia.

Sannia. 1998. The Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of SMU Kristen Petra 3 Students. Surabaya: unpublished thesis. Widya Mandala.

Silberstein, Sandra. 1987. Let's Take Another Look at Reading: Twenty – Five Years of Reading Instruction. English Teaching Forum, Volume 25, Number 4.

Slavin, R.E. 1990. Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vacca, Richard T. 1981. Content Area Reading. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Williamson, Julia. 1988. Improving Reading Comprehension: Some Current Strategies. English Teaching Forum, Volume 26, Number 1.

Yun, Yue Mei. 1989. Teaching Efficient EFL Reading. English Teaching Forum, Volume 27, Number 2.

--. --. Language Training Methods. www.altalang.com/training/default.aspx retrieved at January 29th, 2007.

--. --. The Grammar Translation Method. www.englishraven.com/method _gramtrans.html retrieved at January 29th, 2007.

--. --. Cooperative Learning. http://www.co-operation.org/pages/cl-methods.html retrieved at May 18th, 2007.