

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part describes the conclusion of the thesis. It sums up some main points discussed in the previous chapters. The last part deals with the suggestions of the findings of this study. They are carried out for English teachers and also for further research.

5.1 Conclusion

Based on the School-Based Curriculum, EFL students are required to master four language skills which are listening, reading, speaking and writing in order to be able to use English communicatively. One of the essential parts in English language learning which can help students to communicate effectively is grammar. Since the students need to cultivate their communicative competence, developing grammatical competence is needed. Although grammar is the basic study in learning English, it is believed as the most difficult part of language components which is difficult to learn and teach. However, it is the teacher's duty to find ways to make the students interested in learning grammar. In teaching and learning grammar, there are several methods which can be used by the teachers to achieve the objectives of target structures. Generally, teachers used traditional teaching method to present the grammar points to the students. It is found that grammar started with the explanations is a difficult and boring lesson for the students because they have to memorize all the grammatical points. Cooperative learning is introduced to overcome the students' difficulties and boredom in learning grammar since nowadays students are also required to be able not only in mastering the grammatical points but

also increasing frequency and variety of second language practice through different types of interaction and social skills.

Therefore, in this study the writer wanted to investigate whether the Team Games Tournament technique and Flashcard teaching technique were effective or not in improving the second-grade students' grammar achievement and whether there was a significant difference on the grammar achievement between the students who were taught using Team Games Tournament technique and those who were taught using Flashcard teaching technique. The result of the study showed that first; both methods are effective for teaching grammar. Second, by analyzing the gained scores of both groups, the result unveiled that Team Games Tournament technique yielded significantly better result in the ninth-grade students' grammar achievement compared to the flashcards teaching technique.

5.2 Suggestions

Referring to the result of the study and the conclusion drawn, the writer would like to give some suggestions that hopefully will be useful for the English teachers and further researches.

5.2.1 Suggestions for English Teachers

There are some suggestions that the writer would like to contribute to English teachers, especially in teaching grammar in Elementary school.

1. The teachers should vary their teaching techniques which can avoid the students' boredom and difficulties in learning grammar. Generally, English teachers were likely to use traditional way in teaching grammar. Regardless of the difficulties, the teachers

- need to vary the techniques by using cooperative learning, TGT technique, to teach new grammatical points.
2. The teachers should be able to deliver enjoyable grammar lessons using some materials like story telling containing the target structures.
 3. Teachers should create an innovative and creative classroom for the students to enjoy the learning environment by applying varieties of quizzes or tournament as a review of the grammar material.
 4. The teachers should raise awareness on the grammar errors made by the students in order to anticipate typical problems to maximize learner success.
 5. Teacher should motivate the students by giving a reward as the symbol of teacher's appreciation.

5.2.2 Suggestions for Further Study

For further research, the writer would also like to give some suggestions, so that other researchers can get a better result in conducting similar studies. Nevertheless, she also hopes that this study can be used as a reference for other researchers who will carry out further research in improving students' grammar achievement through Team Games Tournament technique compared to Flashcard teaching technique.

Firstly, the suggestion will be related to the treatments. Due to the time given by the school to do the research, the writer limited her treatments to only three meetings, 35 minutes for each meeting since the students need to deal with their exam. The writer suggests that the next researcher will have more time and opportunities to conduct his or her treatments in more than

three meetings so that the students will have enough time in adjusting the new technique and the result of the study will become more valid.

The next suggestion will be about the subject of the study. More samples from different grade of students would improve the generalization of the research findings. In order to ensure the finding of this study, it's better for the next researchers to carry out the experiment to the different grade of students.

The last suggestion is concerning about the instructor who does the treatment. In conducting this study, the instructor was the writer herself. Regarding to the fact in conducting a research, the instructor who does the treatments has to be objective so that there are no other elements which can influence the result of the study. However, to avoid that interpretation, the writer asked the classroom teacher to accompany her during the treatments both in experimental and control groups. It was done to ensure that the instructor treated both groups in the same way which means that there was no desire to win one of the techniques. Therefore, it is better for the next researcher to ask another person to do the treatments in order to avoid the bias.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (1990). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT. Bumi Aksara
- Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stepan, C., Sikes, J., & Snapp, N. (1978). *The Jigsaw Classroom* (2nd ed.). Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ballantine, J., & Larres, P. M. (2007). Cooperative learning: A Pedagogy to Improve Students' Generic Skills? *Education and Training*, 49(2), 127-137.
- Belinda, Astra. (2014). *A Comparative Study of Teams-Games-Tournament and Deductive Application of Rule Techniques on Ninth Grade Students' Tenses Achievement*. Undergraduate Thesis. Faculty of Teacher training and Education at Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.
- Burns, A. & de Silva Joyce, H. (1999). *Focus on grammar*. Sydney: NCELTR.
- Brown, H. D. (1987). *Principal of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Campbell, Russel N. and Rutherford, William E. (2000). *Teaching Techniques in English as a Second Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). *Theoretical Bases of Communicative Approaches to Second Language Taching and Testing*. Applied linguistics, Vol.1, Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education. Mimeo. 1-47.
- Decoo, W. (1996). The Induction-Deduction Opposition: Ambiguities and Complexities of the Didactic Reality. *IRAL*, 34, 95-118.
- DeVries, David L. (1980). *Teams-Games-Tournament: The Team Learning Approach*. Educational Technology, Vol.37.
- Ellis, R. (1993). Second Language Acquisition Research: How Does It Help Teachers? *ELT Journal*, 47(1), 3-11.
- Ellis, R. (2006). Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83-107.
- Erlam, R. (2003). The Effects of Deductive and Inductive Instruction on the Acquisition of Direct Object Pronouns in French as a Second Language. *Modem Language Journal*, 87, 242-260.

- Fitriyanto, H. (2014). The Effectiveness of Teams Games Tournament (TGT) Technique on Students' Mastery of Simple Past Tense. Retrieved February, 2017 from [http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/25248/3/HERY%20FITRIYA NTO-FITK.pdf](http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/123456789/25248/3/HERY%20FITRIYA%20FITK.pdf)
- Fotos, S. (2001). Cognitive Approaches to Grammar Instruction. In M. Celce-Murcia, Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language (p. 272). United States of America: Heinle & Heinle.
- Gerard, H., Wilhelmy, R., & Conolley, E. (1965). Conformity and group size. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(1), 79-82.
- Goner, Phillips, and Walters. (1995). *Teaching Practice Handbook: Structures: Grammar and Function*. Heinemann, 129.
- Gronlund, N. E. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Heaton, J.B. 1979 *English Language Test*. New York: Longman.
- Harkins, S., & Petty, R. (1982). The Effects of Task Difficulty and Task Uniqueness on Social Loafing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(6), 1214-1229
- Hedge, T. (2000). *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Hooper, S., Ward, T., Hannafin, M., & Clark, H. (1989). The Effects of Aptitude Composition on Achievement during Small Group Learning. *Journal of Computer-Based Instruction*, 16, 102-109.
- Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring Grammatical Structures by Guided Induction. *The French Review*, 65, 708-718.
- Jensen, M., Moore, R., & Hatch, J. (2002). Cooperative Learning - Part I: Cooperative Quizzes. *The American Biology Teacher*, 64(1), 29-34.
- Joan Ballantine, Patricia McCourt Larres, (2007). *Cooperative Learning: a pedagogy to improve students' generic skills?*, *Education+Training*, Vol.49 Issue:2,126-137.
- Johnson, D. W, & Johnson, R. T. (1994). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, Individualistic learning*. Boston MA: Allyn & Bacon.

- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning together and alone: Cooperative, competitive, and individualistic learning 5th Ed.* Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, A. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2002). Cooperative Learning Methods: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Education*, 12(1), 5-14.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2008). Social interdependence, moral character, and moral education. In J. Nucci & D. Narvaez (Eds.), *Handbook on moral and character education*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An educational psychology success story: Social interdependence theory and cooperative learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365-379.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Houlubec, E. (1994). *The new circles of learning: Cooperation in the classroom and school (3rd ed.)*. Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis. Retrieved February, 2017 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.clcrc.com/pages/cl-methods.html>
- Kagan, S. (1994). Cooperative Learning. San Clemente, California: Kagan Publishing.
- Kerr, N., & Bruun, S. (1983). The Dispensability of Member Effort and Group Motivation Losses: Free-Rider Effects. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 78-94.
- Kerr, N. (1989). Illusions of efficacy: The effects of group size on perceived efficacy in social dilemmas. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44, 78-94.
- Kessler, Carolyn. (1992). *Cooperative Language Learning: A teacher's resource book*. Englewood Cliffs, N J: Prentice Hall Regents. 8-14.
- Knight, P. G., & Bohlmeier, M. E. (1990). Cooperative Learning and Achievement: Methods for Assessing Causal Mechanisms. In S. Sharan (Ed.), *Cooperative Learning: Theory and Practice* (pp. 1-22). New York: Greenwood Press, Inc.
- Kose, S., Sahin, A., Ergun, A., & Gezer, K. (2010). The Effects of Cooperative Learning Experience on Eighth Grade Students' Achievement and Attitude toward Science. *Education*, 131(1), 169-180.
- Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. Pergamon, Oxford.

- Lewis, Michael, (1996). *Implications of a Lexical View of Language*. In Willis, Jane. and Willis, Dave. (eds.) *Challenge and Change in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Macmillan Heinemann English Language Teaching. 10-16.
- Lin, M.H. (2007). *The Effects of the Inductive and Deductive Approaches on Elementary School Students' English Grammar Acquisition* (Unpublished master's thesis). Chaoyang University of Technology, Taiwan.
- Long, M. H., & Richards, J. C. (1987) *Methodology in TESOL: A reader*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- McCafferty, S. (2006). *Cooperative Learning and Second Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY.
- Mesch, D., Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. (1988). Impact of Positive Interdependence and Academic Group Contingencies on Achievement. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 345-352.
- Messick, D., & Brewer, M. (1983). Solving social dilemmas: A review. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 11-44.
- Miller, Laura; Eisele, Beat; Eisele, Catherine Yang; Hanlon, Rebecca York; Hanlon, Stephen M.;. (2010). *Hip Hip Hooray*. Hong Kong: Pearson Longman Asia ELT.
- Nunan, D. (2005). *Practical English Language Teaching: Grammar*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Phillips, S. (1993). *Young Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pinter, A. (2006). *Teaching Young Language Learners*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Purpura, J. E, (2004). *Assessing Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richard, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in Language Teaching an Anthology of Current Practice*, Cambridge University Press.
- Rivers, Wilga M., Temperley, Mary S, (1978). *A Practical Guide to the Teaching of English as a Second or Foreign Language*. Oxford University Press, 110.
- Robertson, L. (1990). Cooperative Learning A La Clip. In M. Brubacher, R. Payne & K. Rickett (Eds.), *Perspectives on Small Group Learning* (pp. 185-201). Ontario: Rubicon Publishing Inc.

- Seliger, H. (1975). Inductive Method and Deductive Method in Language Teaching: A re-examination. *IRAL*, 13(1), 1-18.
- Shaffer, C. (1989). A Comparison of Inductive and Deductive Approaches to Teaching Foreign Languages. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73(4), 395-403.
- Skinner, B. (1968). *The Technology of Teaching*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Slavin, R. E. (1991a). Synthesis of Research on Cooperative Learning. *Educational Leadership*, 48 (5), 70-88.
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). Neverstreaming: Preventing Learning Disabilities. *Educational Leadership*, 53 (5), 4-7.
- Slavin, R. E. (2002). *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research and Practice*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Slavin, R. E. (2011). *Instruction Based on Cooperative Learning*. In R. E. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction* (pp. 344-360). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Stern, H. H. (1983). *Fundamental Concept of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stevick, E.W. (1982). *Teaching and Learning Languages*, Cambridge: CUP.
- Suyanto, Kasihani K.E. (2007), *English for Young Learners Melejitkan Potensi Anak Melalui English Class yang Fun, Asyik, dan Menarik*, Jakarta : Bumi Aksara.
- Sylvia Chalker and Edmund Weiner. (1994), *Oxford Dictionary of English Grammar*. Oxford University Press.
- Thomas, E. J. (1957). Effects of Facilitate Role Interdependence on Group Functioning. *Human Relations*, 10, 347-366.
- Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Yager, R. E. (2000). The Constructivist Learning Model. *The Science Teacher*, 67(1), 44-45.
- Yamarik, S. (2007), Does cooperative learning improve student learning outcomes?, *Journal of Economic Education*, 38 (3), 259–77.