

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION**

#### **5.1 Conclusion**

Nowadays English is emphasized to be learned by the students. It is simply because English is an international language. In this twenty first century, people should be able to speak and write in English since it is the tool to communicate with the other people from other country, especially for the third grade Senior High School students who will continue their study on the college. Most of the reference books are written in English so they should be able to master this language anyway.

The reason why the writer conducted the study on teaching reading was the fact that the students usually get bored easily in their reading class. It is suspected that the teachers still use the old method to teach reading. The teachers only ask the students to read the passage aloud, find the difficult words, and answer the questions. All those activities are held by the teachers. In order to solve that problem above, the writer applies SQ3R technique which concern on the students' orientation.

The objective of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference of the reading comprehension achievement between students who are taught using SQ3R technique and those who are taught using Translation technique. The research design of this study is the Non-equivalent pre-test post-test design. Then the data used in this study was taken from the scores of the pre-test and post-test of the third grade of SMA Negeri 9 Surabaya.

Before choosing the class for the study, the writer analyzed the scores of the latest summative to examine that there was no significant difference between these

three classes. By using SPSS program the writer concluded that these three classes were able to be used as a subject of this study.

After conducting the treatment, the writer held the post-test to know whether there was a significant difference between these two classes. Basing himself on the result, the writer came to the conclusion that there is a significant difference between these two classes. It means that SQ3R has given positive effect on the students' reading achievement.

## **5.2 Suggestion**

Based on the results of the study, the writer would like to give some suggestions which can give contribution to English teachers and further studies

### **5.2.1 Suggestion for Language Teacher**

The writer would like to give suggestion for the english teacher, especially in teaching reading.

1. The teacher should choose the text based on the students' level and background knowledge. If the text is too difficult, the students will not learn anything from the text.
2. The teacher should be able to control the class. Even it is a student-centered classroom, the teacher should not lose the control over the class.
3. The teacher should master the technique well so that he can apply it in a good way. He should be able to help the students to apply the new technique in their reading activity.

4. The teacher should be patient enough in teaching the new technique. He should give the students an extra time so that they are not confused in using the new technique.

### **5.2.2 Suggestion for Further Research**

There are some weaknesses when the writer was conducting the research. That is why the writer would like to give suggestion for the next researchers who are interested in making the same field of study so that the next researcher will not do the same. They are some certain things that will influence the result of the study such as:

1. The time.

This study only conducted three times treatment because several reason as presented in chapter four. The writer did not sure that they remember the SQ3R technique if the writer asked them again, because they need time to adapt with the new technique. If they confused about one step of the method and there was no one to be asked; they will go back using the old technique since their teacher still used the old technique. The writer succeeds in conducting the research because he worked hard in guiding the students through one step to another. So the writer hopes that the next researcher should conduct their study longer. It means that longer treatment should be given in order to give the students extra time to have full understanding of the new technique. Besides, the next researcher should give attention to the schedule of the treatment of these two classes. The schedule should be same in time. It means that if one class gets treatment in the first section, the other class should get the same time. Because usually the students will feel tired if the treatment is conducted at the last section.

## 2. The instructor.

In this study the writer acted as a teacher. Actually the writer was afraid of the bias but fortunately it did not happen. But it is still better to appoint other people to act as a teacher to avoid the bias. If the researcher points someone to be the teacher, he should explain about the SQ3R technique first to them and make sure that the person you choose master about the each step of SQ3R technique so that he can give clear explanation to the students.

## 3. The raters

This study used two raters in examining the students' test. The next researcher should use one rater to reduce the bias, because there must be only one person who knows exactly about the scoring system used in examining the students' test.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ngadiman, Agustinus. 2001. *The Importance of Metacognitive Skills in Reading Comprehension*. Magister, 10. 110-121.
- Carrel, A. 1987. *Content and Formal Schemata in ESL Reading*. TESOL Quarterly, vol 21, no 3: 461-447.
- Cassanave, Christian Pearson. 1988. *Comprehension Monitoring: A neglected Essential*. TESOL Quarterly, 22. 283-302.
- Cook, Guy. 1989. *Language Teaching: A Scheme for Teacher Education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dowdall, R. 2001. *SQ3R*. TESOL Quarterly, vol 17, no 2: 234 – 245.
- Dubin, F, D.E. Eskey and W. Grabe. 1986. *Teaching Second Language Reading for Academic Purposes*. California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company
- Dupuis, Marry M. And Askov, Eunice N. 1982. *Content and Reading: An Individual approach*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.
- Freeman, Diane Larsen. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. *Constructing achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.
- Heaton, J. B. 1979. *Writing English language Tests*. London: Longman Group, Ltd.
- Howe, D. H and Heapy, Dorothy. 1973. *Progressive Comprehension for the Certificate*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, Linda. 1986. *Advanced Reading Skills in a Comprehension Course*. Michigan: Michigan University Press.
- McWhorter, Kathleen T. 1990. *Academic Reading*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Milan, Deanne K. 1991. *Developing Reading Skill*. San Francisco: McGraw – Hill, Inc.
- Nuttal, Christina. 1982. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*. London: Heinemann Educational books.
- Shepherd, David L. 1973. *Comprehensive High school Reading Methods..* Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.

Smith, Nila B. 1963. "*Levels of Discussion in Reading*" in *Readings on Reading Instruction*, ed. Albert J. Harris. New York: David McKay Company.

Wassman, Ross and Faye, Anne. 1985. *A Reader's Handbook*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.