CHAPTER V CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

This study was carried out in order to identify the ways of initiating, responding, and giving feedback occurring in the expert and home team. This study was also conducted to identify whether high-achieving students initiate, respond and give feedback more than low-achieving students.

The population of this study was second grade of a senior high school in Tulungagung. The subjects of this study were students in an expert team and a home team in their reading class. The groups taken as subjects were arranged based on their achievement. In the expert team, there were three students. In the home team, there were five students.

The data were the recordings of the students' discussion in the expert and home teams. The writer then transcribed the recordings. Having transcribed, then the writer translated the transcript because the students talked mostly in Bahasa Indonesia. Next, the writer analyzed the transcripts based on initiationresponse-feedback moves.

It is found there were several ways of doing initiation, response and give feedback in the expert team. The ways of doing initiation that high achievers did were questioning, directing and informing while low achiever did not do Initiation move. The ways of doing response that were done by high achievers in the expert team were replying a question, acknowledging previous initial information, and making completion to previous information while low achiever's ways were replying a question and acknowledging. High achievers' ways of doing give feedback were providing repair, accepting and commenting and low achiever's way of giving feedback was commenting

The findings of research question number 2 are summed up in this paragraph. High achievers' ways of doing initiation in home team were questioning and directing. Low achievers' ways of doing initiation were questioning and directing. Several ways of high achievers' response in home team were replying a question, acknowledging previous initial information, making completion of an unfinished assertion and repetition of what has been spoken by peers. Low achievers's ways of doing response were replying a question, acknowledging and making repetition. The ways of giving feedback that high achievers used in the expert team were accepting and providing repair while low achievers' ways were accepting, commenting and providing repair.

It is found in that in the expert team, high achieving students initiated, respond and give feedback more than low achieving students. In the home team, high achieving students initiated more than low achieving students. However, high achieving students did not contribute response and feedback moves more than low achieving students in the home team. High achieving students produced the same number of response moves as low achieving students did. Moreover, low achieving students produced more feedback moves than high achieving students in the home team. It can be concluded that high achieving students initiated, responded and gave feedback more than low achieving students in the expert team. High achieving students also contributed more of initiation moves than low achieving students in the home team. However, high achieving students contributed the same number of response moves as low achieving students and low achieving students produced more feedback moves than high achieving students in the home team.

5.2 Suggestions

In this study, high achievers contributed initiation, response and feedback more than low achievers in the expert team but in the home team high achievers only contributed initiation moves more than low achievers. The writer would like to suggest to the English Department students to extend this research more.

This study observed one home team and one expert team because of the limited time. Further study is suggested to observe high-low achieving students' contribution in expert team and in their home team. It is also suggested to have a triangulator for Initiation-Response-Feedback analysis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Al-Sheedi, M. A. (2006). *Teachers' Beliefs About Using Group Work in Basic Education*. Batinah North Region.
- Aronson, E. (2000-2008). Jigsaw Classroom: overview of the technique. Retrieved 2008, February 15, from <u>http://www.jigsaw.org/overview.htm</u>
- Bratt, C. (2008). The jigsaw classroom under test: No effect on intergroup relations present. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*
- Brisk, Maria and Margaret M. Harrington, 2000. Literacy and Bilingualism A Hand Book for All Teacher, Elburn; Lawrence
- Brown, D. (2001). Teaching by Principles: An InteractiveApproach to Language Pedagogy (2nd ed.). New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Crist, James L. (2012). The effectiveness of the Jigs aw Approach and Other Cooperative Learing Strategies with Students with Learning Disabilities. Ohio: The Faculty of Patton College of Education and Human Services.
- Graves, M.F., & Watts-Taffe, S.M. (2002). The Place of Word Consciousness in a Research-Based Vocabulary Program.
- Hall, J. K. (1998). Differential Teacher Attention to Student Utterances: The Construction of Different Opportunities for Learning in the IRF. Linguistics and Education, 9, 287– 311.
- Harmer, J. (1994). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (new ed.). New York: Longman.
- Johnson, David W. (1981). Student-Student Interaction: The Neglected Variable in Education. Minnesota : American Educational Research Association.

- Johnson, David W, Roger T. Johnson, and Karl A. Smith. (1991). Active Learning: Cooperation in the College Classroom. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.
- Jones, Leo. (2007). The Student-Centered Classroom. USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lee, Y.-A. (2007). Third Turn Position in Teacher Talk: Contingency and the Work of Teaching. Journal of Pragmatics, 39, 1204–1230.
- Mehan, H. (1979). Learning Lessons: Social Organizational in the Classroom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Mengduo, Qiao & JIN Xiaoling. (2010). Jigsaw Strategy as a Cooperative Learning Technique: Focusing on the Language Learners. Harbin Institute of Technology
- Mxoli, L. (2007). Study Guide: Issues and Methods in Research, Underdale: University of South Africa.
- Nystrand, M. (1997). Dialogic instruction: When Recitation Becomes Conversation. In M. Nystrand, A. Gamoran, R. Kachur, & C. Prendergast (Eds.), Opening dialogue: Understanding the dynamics of language and learning in the English Classroom (pp. 1–29). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Ross, J.,& Smythe, E. (1995). Differentiating Cooperative Learning to Meet the Needs of Gifted Learners: A Case for Transformational Leadership. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 19, 63-82.
- Rusmawan, P. N. (2011). The Effectiveness of Using Jigsaw Technique in Narrative Text. Unpublished Thesis Universitas Surabaya.
- Slavin, R. E. (1985). An Introduction to Cooperative Learning Research. In R. Slavin, S. Sharon, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Larowitz, C. Webb & R. Schmuck (Eds.) Learning to Cooperate, Cooperating to Learn (pp. 5-15). New York: Plenum.

Syahril, Iwan. (2007). Characteristics of Teacher-Centered & Student-Centered Instruction. Unpublished S1 Padjajaran University Thesis.

`

- Tamah, S. M. (2011). Student Interaction in the Implementation of the Jigsaw Technique in Language Teaching. Groningen Dissertation in Linguistics 91.
- Waring, H. Z. (2009). Moving out of IRF (Initiation-Response-Feedback): A Single Case Analysis. Columbia
- Weimer, M. G., ed. 1987. *Teaching Large Classes Well*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wells, G. (1993). Reevaluating the IRF Sequence: A Proposal for the Articulation of Theories of Activity and Discourse for the Analysis of Teaching and Learning in the Classroom. Linguistics and Education, 5.
- White, A. (2003). The Application of Sinclair and Coulthard's IRF Structure to a Classroom Lesson: Analysis and Discussion. Retrieved on 17 September 2010 from <u>http://www.cels.bham.ac.uk/resources/essays/AWhite4.pdf</u>