CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

5.1 Summary

In this globalization era, English has become one of important qualifications that Indonesian people must have in order to get a better economic life, since there are many job fields requiring English competence. Realizing the importance of English, Indonesia has tried to implement English in its educational curriculum as early as possible. As the consequence, English has become a compulsory subject that is taught starting for elementary school.

There are four basic skills in learning English. They are listening, speaking, reading and writing. One of the basic skills that can make the students become active in exploring and constructing new knowledge is reading. This skill is important for children since they can broaden their background knowledge. In reality, however, many children find difficulties in comprehending a reading passage. Besides the limited time, most teachers still deal with the traditional reading techniques. The teacher holds the main role and thus reducing students' opportunity to participate actively. To overcome the problem above, the teacher is suggested to apply one of the cooperative learning methods. In this study, one of the methods employed is Jigsaw technique.

Some studies about the implementation of Jigsaw technique in reading class have been done. Most of them revealed that there is an improvement of students' reading achievement taught using Jigsaw technique. However, the studies mostly have focused on high school level. This encouraged the writer to conduct a study about the implementation of Jigsaw technique in elementary school level. The writer intended to know whether the Jigsaw technique would also improve the students' reading achievement in lower level of education, especially in the fifth grade of elementary school.

In short, this study is conducted to reveal the effect of the implementation of Jigsaw technique in elementary school level. The particular objective of this study is to find out whether there is a significant difference between the reading comprehension achievement of the fifth year students of elementary school taught using Jigsaw technique and the one of those taught using traditional technique.

A quasi-experimental applying a non-randomized pretest-posttest control group design was administered to get the data to answer the research question. More particularly, the data used in this study were taken from the scores of the pretest and the posttest of the fifth grade students of SDK St. Yohannes Gabriel year 2006-2007.

The analysis of the pretest using t-test assisted by SPSS showed that the mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It means that the two groups had equal reading ability at the beginning of the treatment administration. On the next analysis, the writer directly also used t-test provided

in SPSS in order to know whether there was a significant difference between the posttest means of the two groups.

The result of the t-test provided in SPSS for the posttest of the two groups showed that the posttest mean scores between the two groups were not significantly different. It means that there was no significant difference between the reading comprehension achievement of the experimental group taught using Jigsaw technique and the one of the control group taught using traditional technique. This proved that the use of Jigsaw technique in reading class of young learners was not beneficial in improving the students' reading achievement.

5.2 Recommendations

This study reveals that the implementation of Jigsaw technique in reading class did not show beneficial effect on the students' reading comprehension. It was statistically proven that there was no significant difference on the reading comprehension achievement between the students who were taught using Jigsaw technique and the ones who were taught using traditional technique. After the third treatment, which was the last treatment, the students' reading comprehension achievement was not significantly better.

There are some recommendations dealing with this study.
- The activities in Jigsaw class are mostly done in group work. It is believed that the teacher's role is just as the facilitator, so the students have to build and formulate their own understanding about the passage given. However, it is difficult to make the students to work in group, especially because they are

still young. Young learners have varied characteristics that are very different from adults'. Young learners are active and cannot sit still. The teacher always spends much of his or her energy in grouping the students. Moreover, the teacher should be aware that in making groups the students need to be mixed. The best group is a heterogeneous group, a group that has different characteristics of the students. In fact, the students are very difficult to put into heterogeneous group. They usually want to be in group that have the common things with them. For example, in terms of their achievement. The bright student wants to group with other bright students, so do for the low students. This should not happen because it will effect on the group discussion. This kind of group will not result in a good group discussion. The teacher must hold full authority in grouping the students. The teacher also must think of a way to put the students in a good group.

- The lack of experience in learning through group discussion makes it difficulty for the students to perform a good and serious group discussion. They tend to be busy with themselves also chat and joke with other students. It is because they still do not understand what they have to discuss in group, even some do not know what discussion means. In order to create a serious group discussion, the teacher must give simple and clear explanation and examples. The teacher also has to float from one group to other group, in order to make sure whether the groups perform the correct discussion or not.

- In Jigsaw class, most of the time is spent for the group discussion. It means that the students have to help one another in order to construct and build their

knowledge. This might be good for higher-level students, but not for the students in lower level. The background knowledge of young learners is different from the adults. Their background knowledge is still limited. To solve this problem a longer discussion with the teacher after the group discussion is needed to enable the teacher to know the students' understanding about the passage. It will also be easier for the teacher to notice the students' wrong understanding about the passage. This will make the students comprehend the passage better.

- One of young learners' characteristics is that they get bored easily. They tend to do just what they like to do. The same technique used by the teacher will make them bored. One of the solutions to overcome this problem is the use of an interesting activity in the end of the lesson, for example, a game. The teacher should make the students consider that the game is a reward for them since they perform well in the lesson given before. This will surely attract the students' attention and encourage them to do well in the next lesson.

- The problem that the students do not consider the treatments, quizzes and the posttest after the pretest and first treatment as serious ones can be solved by showing them the scores of their pretest and quiz. It was because the students always feel curious with their scores. Knowing their scores will make the students think that the next quizzes and the posttest as important. This will also encourage the students to perform better. If they know that they get bad score in the pretest or the quiz, it is expected that they will follow the

treatment and do the quizzes and posttest better. Therefore, the teacher should let the students know their scores of every test and quiz given.

- The treatment given was a short time treatment, so the result might not be as good as the writer's expectations. If the treatment was done in longer time, the students might show different achievement. In implementing a new technique, it needs a quite long time to be able to show its real result for the students.

- The treatments in this study were given only three times to both of the groups, experimental and control groups. The population and sample were limited to the certain subjects. And the reading materials were also given in certain parts. In conclusion, the writer realizes that this study is still far for being perfect. Therefore, the writer expects that a further research is conducted by other students using a better research design, with more treatments and a wider subject for getting more complete and valid result.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arcana I, Nyoman and Djoko. 1989. *Pengantar Statistik II*. Surabaya: UWM

Ary, Donald, Lucy Chesser Jacobs and Asghar Rezavich. 1979. *Introduction to Research in Education*. New York: Holt, Renehart and Winston.

Aronson, E., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., Blaney, N., and Snapp, M. 1978. *The Jigsaw Classroom.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

Aronson, Elliot. 2005. *Jigsaw Classroom*. Retrieved 24 May 2006 from http://www.jigsaw.org/overview.htm.

Arseneau, R., & Rodenburg, D. 1998. *The Developmental Perspective: Cultivating Ways of Thinking*. In D. D. Pratt (Ed.). *Five Perspectives on Teaching in Adult and Higher Education.* Malabar, FL: Krieger.

Badrawi, Nazly. 1992. *The Reading Dilemma: Meeting Individual Needs*. English Teaching Forum, Vol. 30, No.3

Brooks, Jacqueline G. and Brooks, Martin G. 1993 *In Search of Understanding: The Case for Constructivist Classrooms*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Bruner, J. 1990. *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Byrnes, J. P. 1996. *Cognitive Development and Learning in Instructional Contexts*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley. 1963. *Experimental and Quasi-experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago: Rand McNallly College Publishing Company.

Carrel, Patricia and John C. Eisterhold. 1983. "*Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy*. In Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards (eds). *Methodology in TESOL; A Book of Readings*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.

Clarke, J. 1994. *Pieces of the puzzle: The Jigsaw Method* In Sharan, S. (Ed.), *Handbook of Cooperative Learning Methods*, Greenwood Press.

Cook, Guy. 1990. *Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press

Departemen Pendidikan Nasional. 2001. *Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris*. Jakarta: pengarang.

Ebel Robert L. 1979. *Essential of Education Measurement.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Evangelidou, Evangelia et al. 1990. *Reading Skills*. English Teaching Forum, Vol XVIII, Vol X No.4, October

Ferguson, George A. 1959. *Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education.* London: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc.

Gronlund, Norman Edward. 1982. *Constructing Achievement Test*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

Hatch, Evelyn and Anne Lazaraton. 1991. *The Research Manual Design and* Statistics for Applied Linguistics. Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Harris, David P. 1969. *Testing English as A Second Language*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Company.

J. Thousand, A. Villa and A. Nevin (Eds). 1994. *Creativity and Collaborative Learning*. Baltimore: Brookes Press.

Jacobs, George M. 1996. *Cooperative Learning and Group Activities*. TEFLIN Seminar 44, 7-10 October.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. 1989. *Cooperation and Competition: Theory and Research*. Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company

Johnson, D. W. 1991. *Human Relations and Your Career* (3rd. Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Holubec, E. J. 1993. *Cooperation in the Classroom* (6th ed.). Edina, MN: Interaction Book Company.

Kaplan, Eitan. 2002. *Constructivism as a Theory.* Retrieved 20 November 2004 from http:// online.sfsu.edu/~foreman/itec800/final projects/eitan kaplan/pages/classroom.

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.

Millis, B. J., and Cottell, P. G., Jr. 1998. *Cooperative Learning for Higher Education Faculty*, American Council on Education, Series on Higher Education. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.

Nuttal, Christine. 1996. *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language (new edition).* Oxford: Heinemann Educational

Olsen and Kagan. 1992. *About Cooperative Learning*. In Kessler, Carolyn (ed). *Cooperative Learning: A Teacher's Resources Book*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Rixon, Shelagh. 1994. *The Role of Fun and Games Activities in Teaching Young Learners*. In Christopher Brumfit, Jayne Moonand Ray Tongue. *Teaching English to Children: From Practice to Principle.* London:Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.

Rogers, C.R. & Freiberg, H.J. 1994. *Freedom to Learn (3rd Ed).* Columbus, OH: Merrill/MacMillan.

Rumelhart, David E. 1980. *Schemata: The Building Blocks of Cognition*. In Spiro J.R.; Bertham CB and William FB (eds). 1980. Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension. New Jersey: Lawrence Earlbaum Association Publishers, 35-38.

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

Santrock, John W. 1999. *Life Span Development seventh edition*. USA: The Mc Graw Hill Companies.

Sherman.1995.*Constructivism Theory*. Retrieved 29 June 2006 from http://www.edb.utexas.edu/csclstudent/Dhsiao/theories.html.

Silberstein, Sandra. 1987. *Let's Take Another Look at Reading. Twenty Five years of Reading Instruction DiagnosticTeaching in Classroom.* New York: Mc. Millan House Publisher, Inc.

Slavin, R.E. 1990. *Cooperative Learning : Theory, Research, and Practice.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice Hall.

Tuckman, Bruce W. 1988. *Conducting Education Research* (third ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

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

Ward, James. 1984. *Techniques for Teaching Reading,* English Teaching Forum Vol 18 Number 11, April 2.

Wihartini, Tri & Happy Arie Anggraeni. 2005. *A Day with Didi.* Depok: PT Kawan Pustaka

Winardi, Lindawati. 1992. *The Effect of Advanced Organizer and Experience Text Relationship on The Reading Achievement of The Second Year High School Students at SMAK Frateran Surabaya.* Surabaya: Unpublished Thesis Widya Mandala.