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The objectives of this research were to find out whether there was a significant difference of the students’ reading achievement after being taught through Jigsaw technique and Think-Pair-Share technique, what aspects of reading that improved significantly after implementing those techniques and what problems that the students faced in comprehending aspects of reading through the techniques. This research was a quantitative and qualitative which used a pre-test and post-test experimental design.

The population of this research was the tenth grade students of SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung. The research took two classes as the sample and they were X MIPA II as Jigsaw class which consisted of 25 students and X MIPA IV as Think-Pair-Share class which consisted of 26 students. A pre-test, post-test and questionnaire were administered to collect the data. The data were analyzed by using independent sample t-test in which the significance was determined t-value was higher than t-table and one way anova in which the significance was determined by p<0.05.

The result of this research showed that the t-value was higher than t-table (1.852 > 1.677). It meant that there was a significant difference of the students’ reading achievement in reading narrative text. Then, main idea was the aspect that improved significantly in Jigsaw class, meanwhile main idea and specific information were the aspects that improved significantly in Think-Pair-Share class. In addition, there were some problems that faced by the students in comprehending aspects of reading through Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share techniques.
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I. INTRODUCTION

This chapter indicates some points. They are background of the research, research questions, objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research and definition of terms.

1.1. Background

In the 2013 curriculum for the senior high school, reading is one of the four-language skills students need to master and one of the indicators of academic success since it is an active and receptive skill. It is also supported by Cain (2010) who states that “reading is clearly an important skill. In fact, it is much more than a single skill: it involves the coordination of a range of abilities, strategies and knowledge”. So, it is an important skill for all students, moreover foreign language learners who do not have a chance to communicate with other people using English in daily life.

Grabe as cited in Alyousef (2005) states that “reading can be seen as an active process of comprehending where students need to be taught strategies to read more efficiently, for example, guess from context, define expectations, make inferences about the text, skim ahead to fill in the context, and others”. Reading also can be defined as a way of communication between the writer and the reader. Reader can comprehend the idea that the writer wants to tell by reading and comprehending the text in order to find it, whether it is delivered explicitly or implicitly. Reading is also considered as a complex skill which involves not only the main idea but also the specific information, reference, inference and vocabulary.
Based on the researcher’s pre-observation in SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung, according to the English teacher in that school, there are some problems in teaching English. First, most students feel difficult when they read a text, it happens because of their lack of vocabulary. Second, in reading a text, students also get difficulties in getting information from the text, finding the main idea, finding the specific information, identifying the reference of the word, making an inference of the text and comprehending the vocabulary. Then, according to some students at the tenth grade, some English teachers still tends to use teacher-centered technique (monotonous technique). Those are the reasons why the students’ reading capability is not good enough in that school. Robinson (1991) states that the motivation of students could be affected by the type of the task which is given to them depending on the level of difficulty.

Narrative text is one of the texts in the 2013 curriculum that students have to master. There are some types of narrative text, such as folktale, fable, fairy tale, or science fiction. Then, folktale is used in this research. According to Bushel (2011:10) “a narrative paragraph describes an event, feeling or experience in story form or in the order the details of the event happened. Its aim is to entertain or amuse the readers”. It consists of orientation, complication and resolution.

Besides choosing the proper materials, teachers also should use the good technique in teaching English, especially reading. According to Dhand (2008) “a teaching technique can be thought of as an activity which affects the learner’s encoding process, that is, how the learner will learn and desired information, concept, generalization and/or skills. The technique can be either student-centered such as student-made reports or teacher-centered such as lecture”. In this research, jigsaw and think-pair-share techniques will be implemented in teaching reading narrative text at the tenth grade students of SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung.
There are some reasons of comparing jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique. First, both of them are categorized in cooperative learning, so that those technique are good and believed can make the students more active in the class. Then, it will be easy for students to work together with their friends in comprehending a text, it can be work in pairs or in groups. Next, both of these techniques improve the students’ social interaction with others by sharing the idea. After that, in these techniques, every student gets a chance to comprehend and elaborate the idea of the text because before sharing the idea to others, every student should comprehend their own part of text which is different from others. At last, in both techniques (jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique) the text is divided into some parts based on the number of the students, so that it is fair for the students in both classes. Therefore, the researcher wants to find out which technique that is better in reading narrative text, either work in groups or work in pairs.

Jigsaw technique can be called as students-centered technique because the target in the learning process is the students. In this technique, students will be divided into some groups, read the topic in different parts and share it to others, it means that students will get the information from other students not from the teacher. This technique can make students have a critical thinking and good relationship with other partners in a class. Researchers have found that jigsaw in particular improves students’ social-emotional learning, Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock, (2001). It happens when the students share the information that they have got to the others, hopefully it can make the students be good in their social interaction with others. Brisk and Harrington (2000: 83) define” the jigsaw approach is a way for students to work cooperatively and help each other to learn new material. Students take an active role their learning as they teach other students what they have learned”.
Another technique is think-pair-share technique. Think-pair-share technique is also a student-centered technique. According to Millis (2010) “Think-pair-share is a powerful cooperative learning structure because it employs the principle simultaneous interaction”. This technique is followed by some steps: think, pair, and share. In this technique, students will work in pair and will share the idea of different part of text to his/her pair. So, this technique also can build a good relation with other students. The basic foundation of this model is to make the students more active in the teaching-learning process by discussing with their classmates. Moreover, the teaching-learning process will be more attractive there will be more fun Kagan (2009). So, it will give positive influence to students in understanding the material given by the teacher.

So, based on the explanation above the researcher compared jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique in reading narrative text at the tenth grade students in SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung.

1.2. Research Questions

The research questions of this research are formulated as follows:

1. Is there any significant difference in students’ reading achievement of the tenth grade students at SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung after implementing jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique?
2. Which aspect of reading that improves more significant after implementing jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique?
3. What are the students’ problems in comprehending the aspect of reading through conducting jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique?
1.3. Objectives

It is expected that the objectives of this research are:

1. To find out whether there is any significant difference in students’ reading achievement after the implementation of jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique at the tenth grade at SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung.
2. To find out which aspect that improves more significant after implementing jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique.
3. To find out the students’ problems in comprehending the aspect of reading trough conducting jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique.

1.4. Uses

The result of this research can be used as follows:

1. Theoretically, this research is expected to give contribution to the English teacher or other researches who are interested with this topic and also to verify the theories dealing with theories about jigsaw technique think-pair-share technique in learning reading narrative text.
2. Practically, the result of this research hopefully can be used as reference or information for English teacher to decide the proper technique in learning reading narrative text for the students.

1.5. Scope

This research is an experimental quantitative and qualitative one. It focuses on reading skill. Jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique were compared in reading narrative text. The type of narrative text which was used was folktale. The subject of this research was students at the tenth grade in SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung. This research also used three classes in that school. The first class was X IPS I, in this class try-out test was conducted. The second class was X MIPA II, in this class Jigsaw technique was conducted in teaching reading. The third class
was X MIPA IV, in this class Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique was conducted in
teaching reading.

1.6. Definition of terms

In this research, there are several terms which should be defined well to give
understanding to readers as follows:

1. **Comparative**
   
   Comparative is considered as if in comparison to something else in order
to find out which one is better.

2. **Improve**
   
   Improve is an increase from low level achievement to high level
achievement in order to make something better.

3. **Reading**
   
   Reading is a process interrelated with thinking and with other
communication abilities listening, speaking, and writing. Reading is a
process of reconstructing from the printed pattern on the ideas an
information intended by the author. Brown (2001: 264)

4. **Narrative Text**
   
   According to Bushel (2011:10) a narrative paragraph describes an event,
feeling or experience in story form or in the order the details of the event
happened. Its aim is to entertain or amuse the readers.

5. **Jigsaw Technique**
   
   This is a teaching technique that creates a cooperative learning among
students and make them work to analyze certain unit of the text in the
group called “expert group” which at the end all of the students on “expert
group” are responsible to the wider group called “home group”. Ali as
cited by Bastian (2018).
6. Think-Pair-Share Technique

With this technique, students first work on an activity individually and then, after a short interval, in pairs. Finally, after partners have had some time to compare ideas, the entire class discusses the activity as a large group. Mc Tighe and Lyman (1988)

This chapter has discussed background of the research, research questions, objectives of the research, uses of the research, scope of the research, and the definition of terms.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is concerned with the discussion on the concept of reading comprehension, aspects of reading, teaching of reading, techniques in teaching of reading, Jigsaw technique in teaching of reading, Think-Pair-Share technique in teaching of reading, advantages and disadvantages of jigsaw technique, advantages and disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share technique, procedure of teaching through jigsaw technique, procedure of teaching through Think-Pair-Share technique, narrative text, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.

2.1. Concept of Reading Comprehension

In this part, there were some explanations about reading. They were the definition of reading comprehension and the aspects of reading comprehension.

2.1.1. The Definition of Reading Comprehension

One of the most important skills which foreign language students need to develop is reading. It is important because not only students but also all people can get information by reading text. Alyousef (2005:144) states that reading can be seen as an interactive process between a reader and a text which leads to automaticity or reading fluency.

Another opinion comes to Nunan (2003:68) that reading is a fluent process of readers combining information from a text and their own background knowledge to build meaning. Then, according to Mikulecky (2011:5), reading is a complex conscious and unconscious mental process in which the reader uses a variety of strategies to reconstruct the meaning that the author is assumed to have intended, based on data from the text and from the reader’s prior knowledge.
From these points of views, it can be concluded that reading is a complex and interactive activity. Reading activity is a process of gaining information or the writer’s idea in a text. In reading, people or students need to comprehend the text well to get the complete and accurate information. Furthermore, students also can combine the information from the text with their own knowledge. Then, they also have to consider the aspects of reading.

2.1.2. Aspects of Reading
In reading, there are several aspects which should be considered by students. According to Nuttal (1985), there are five aspects of reading which help the students to comprehend the English text: main idea, specific information, reference, and vocabulary. Here are the definition:

1. Determining Main idea
Finding the main idea of a paragraph is one of the most important reading comprehension skills. In some paragraph, the main idea is not explicitly stated in a topic sentence. Instead, it is left to the reader to infer or reason out. It can be said that main idea has the most important information developed from author throughout the paragraph. Main idea in narrative text especially folktale must be different from other texts, because the story of this text tells a legend story. For example:

“The woman told him that she was cursed. She asked Toba to keep it as a secret. Toba agreed it only with one condition that she would marry him. Then they got married and soon had one child named Samosir. This boy liked to eat much food.”

The example above was a paragraph from a story of Lake Toba, the main idea of the paragraph above is Toba married the woman because of the secret.
2. Finding the Specific Information or Part of Text

There is some information that covers as the specific information that develops the topic sentence. They are definition, examples, facts, comparison, analogy, because, and effect statistics and quotation. Asking specific information in narrative text, mostly researcher asked the problems which happened in the text to differentiate it from other texts. For example, a story of Prambanan Temple:

“Once upon a time, there was a powerful prince named Bandung Bondowoso. In a war, Bandung Bondowoso killed Prabu Baka. Then, Bandung Bondowoso fell in love with Prabu Baka’s daughter named Roro Jonggrang.

Bondowoso wanted to marry this beautiful princess. However, the princess hated him because he had killed her father. Roro Jonggrang was thinking of a way to refuse Bodowoso’s marriage proposal. Finally, she decided to marry Bandung Bondowoso if he could build a thousand temples before dawn.”

The question is “Why did the princess hate Bandung Bondowoso?” and the answer is “Because he killed Prabu Baka (the princess’ father).

3. Finding Reference

Words or phrases used before or after the reading material are called as reference. The purpose of reference is to prevent the repetition of words or phrases. It eases the reader to find out the meaning of the words specifically. Usually, people use reference to avoid the repetition of stating the subjects or characters in a text. One of the characteristics of narrative text is use specific character which means the character was clear in the text. Then, in narrative text, especially folktale, sometimes the name of the character sound strange and even difficult to read. For example:

“Not long afterwards, Bandung Bandawasa decided to marry Princess Roro Jonggrang., the daughter of his victim.”
The word “his” in that sentence which is underlined refers to “Bandung Bandawasa”.

4. Finding Inference

Inference is about prediction or guessing about unknown thing related to the information in the text. It is needed a logical connection that bridges the thing that readers know and the thing they do not know. Narrative text was used in this research, by asking the moral value of the text inference in narrative text can be different from other texts. For example a text from a story of crying stone,

“Eventually, mother’s heart hurt to hear her daughter’s answer. Mother prayed to God to punish her ungodly daughter. Suddenly, girl stopped then slowly turned to be a stone. Daughter cried; she apologized to his mother. But it was too late. A pretty girl was turned into a stone but continued to tear; it’s called A Crying Stone.”

From the example above, it can be concluded that moral value of the text is never hurt your mother’s heart.

5. Understanding Vocabulary

Vocabulary is essentially needed when the reading process goes on. It consists of the stock of word used for anyone in speaking or even producing the utterance for reading. Generally, some words which are used in narrative text sounds unfamiliar for the readers, especially in folktale because most of words in the text are not the common words. In this research, the researcher asked the synonym or the antonym of the word. For example, in a story of crying stone, there is a paragraph:

“On a hill in area of Borneo, there lived a poor widow and her daughter. The girl was really beautiful. However, she was very lazy and spoiled. She loved to dress up every day, but never helped her mother.”

The synonym of spoiled in the text is spoon-fed.
It showed that if the students were expected to comprehend a text well, they had to pay attention to those aspects of reading, there are main idea, specific information, reference, inference and vocabulary.

2.2. Teaching Reading Comprehension

Teaching is a complex process, it does not only give the information from the teacher to the students. There are many activities that can be doing especially when the process of teaching and learning in the classroom. The aim of teaching reading is to make students become an effective and efficient reader.

According to Alyousef (2005 : 143) in teaching reading, contemporary reading tasks, unlike the traditional materials, involve three-phase procedures: pre-while-, and last-reading stages.

- The pre-reading stage helps in activating the background knowledge.
- Then, the aim of while-reading stage (or interactive process) is to develop students’ ability in tackling text by developing their linguistic and schematic knowledge.
- At last, last-reading includes activities, which enhance learning comprehension using exercises, close exercises, cut-up sentences, comprehension questions or the teacher can ask students to identify and integrate the most important information by using summarizing.

Reading comprehension is you teach a student to read by helping him or her to learn the relationship between the printed words and their meaning. In teaching reading, the teacher presents and explains new material in order to make it clear, comprehensible and available for learning, gives practice to consolidate knowledge, and test.

In short, teaching reading is not a simple activity, the teachers should transfer, explain and present the materials to the students. Then, they also have to help their
students to achieve the goals by doing something that can elaborate students’ knowledge and ability in reading activity.

2.3. Jigsaw Technique

Teachers are suggested to use a good technique in teaching reading. One of them is jigsaw technique. It is initially introduced by Elliot Aronson in 1971 in Austin, Texas. This jigsaw structure is meant to provide students with the chance to learn a material from their peers. According to Richards, Platt and Platt (1992:87) "jigsaw is a type of cooperative or collaborative learning which each member of group has a piece of information needed to complete a group task".

Jigsaw learning is based on the perspective that each student will first become “an expert” in a small part of the whole learning material, and then teach other students in his group this part of the material. In this technique, the students will be divided into some groups, they will get the material and then it will be divided into some parts. At last, each student has to master the each part of the material and share it to the other members in a group.

Jigsaw activity has been a teaching activity that can be used by teachers of all grades in their classrooms. It happens because jigsaw model is an effective approach to develop dependency and cooperation. Perkins and Tagle, (2011) also states that using jigsaw technique increases the variety of learning experiences, and teaches learners course content and cooperative social skills. In addition, Brown (2001: 185) defines that jigsaw strategy is a special form of information gap in which each member of a group is given some specific information and the goal is to pool all information to achieve some objective. Jigsaw technique is expected to help the students in improving their reading achievement through ten steps (Aronson, 2008).
1. Divide students into 5 or 6 person jigsaw groups.
2. Appoint one student from each group as the leader.
3. Divide the day’s lesson into 5-6 segments.
4. Assign each student to learn one segment.
5. Give students time to read over their segment at least twice and become familiar with it.
6. From temporary “expert groups” by having one student from each jigsaw group join other students to the assigned same segment.
7. Bring the students back into jigsaw groups.
8. Ask each student to present her or his segment to the group.
9. Float from group to group, observing the process.
10. At the end of the session, give a quiz on the material.

It can be concluded that jigsaw technique is a cooperative technique for the students to work in a group. It is a suitable technique to apply in teaching reading narrative text. Because students can share the different part of a story of narrative text to others. So, they can comprehend the text well and effectively.

2.4. Think-Pair-Share Technique
Think-pair-share is a student-centered technique which means students will get most of the information in learning process from other students. Think-pair-share is a summarization strategy that can be used in any content area before, during, and after a lesson. The activity involves three basic steps, which is, thinking, pairing, and sharing, Lyman (1981). Think-Pair-Share is a technique where teacher poses a question, students think of a response. Students discuss their responses with a partner. Students share their partner’s response with the class Aronson and Patnoe, (2011:126). This technique was developed by Prof. Frank Lyman in 1981 in Maryland. There are three procedures of this technique:
1. Thinking
First, teacher will divide a text into two parts before distributing to the students. After that, students have to think and comprehend the text individually.

2. Pairing
In this step, students have to find their pair who has different part of text. Each of them has to talk about their thinking of the text before. And then, they should gather the idea of the two different parts of text in order to get the whole idea.

3. Sharing
In the last step, students have to find another pair to share the information which they have discussed in pairing step.

This technique can be used to increase the students’ participation in learning process, either work individually or work in pair.

2.5. Previous Research of Jigsaw Technique in Teaching of Reading
There are some previous researches which are done by the researchers in conducting jigsaw technique in learning reading. The first, Inayati (2011) concludes that jigsaw technique is effective in teaching English reading comprehension of the eight grade students.

The second, According to Arini (2013) jigsaw technique can improve the students’ reading comprehension of narrative text at the second grade students in junior high school level. It can be seen from students’ score, and students’ participation in group or class.

The third, Ameiratrini (2017) states that jigsaw strategy can increase students’ reading comprehension in recount text. It is proven, since there is an increase of students’ reading score after being taught through jigsaw strategy at the first grade
student of SMAN 1 Abung Selatan. Then, identifying details information becomes the most improved aspect after the implementation of jigsaw strategy.

Based on previous researches above, it has been approved that jigsaw technique can be implemented successfully to teach reading skill.

2.6. Previous Research of Think-Pair-Share in Teaching of Reading

There are several previous researches which are done by some researchers in conducting think-pair-share in learning reading. The first, Sugiarto and Sumarsono (2014) conclude that there is a significant improvement in term of students’ ability in reading English narrative text after they were treated using think-pair-share.

The Second, according to Bastian (2018) states that there is a significant improvement of students’ reading comprehension after being taught through Think-Pair-Share technique in reading text, especially in analytical exposition text.

The third is a research from Mulia (2010), her finding shows that there is significant difference of students’ achievement in reading descriptive text between those who are taught by using think-pair-share strategy in reading descriptive text between those who are taught by using conventional method for the grade seven students of junior high school.

Based on the previous researches above, it can be concluded that think-pair-share is a technique that can be conducted in learning reading. Then, the results show that there is a significant difference of the students’ reading achievement in learning reading after they are treated by think-pair-share technique.
2.7. Advantages and Disadvantages

In this part, there are some advantages and disadvantages of each technique. Advantage is the benefit of the technique, while disadvantage is the opposite of advantage. Here are some advantages and disadvantages of Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique according to some experts.

2.7.1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Jigsaw Technique

According to Arronson and Patnoe (2011) the advantages of Jigsaw Method are:

1. Jigsaw promotes student learning and academic achievement. It may happen, because every student is actively involved in both expert group and home group. They are fully responsibility to master their segment of text, and this situation indirectly increases students’ academic achievement through total responsibility they own during the activity.

2. Jigsaw increases students‘ retention. Jigsaw offers the puzzle activity which means the students try to memorize paragraph and interpret it to the members of the group.

3. Jigsaw enhances students‘ satisfaction with their learning experience. The satisfaction will appear as the expert fully understands about their own part text and deliver it to the others.

4. Jigsaw strategy helps students to develop skills in oral communication. Not only in reading by understanding, while explaining to their home group it surely helps the students to have more practice on speaking activity.

5. Jigsaw develops students‘ social skill. They are required to move to different group, and they need to discuss, good social skill must be developed in this stage.
6. Jigsaw promotes students' self esteem. A good self esteem is develop when the students are insisted to be an expert means that they must pretend to really know, and the only way to know everything is understand the text well.

7. Jigsaw helps to promote race relation. Jigsaw makes the students help one another and if many races in the class exist, it means that the students will break the gap and unconsciously build warm relations with each others.

There are some disadvantages of using Jigsaw strategy based on Johnson & Jhonson in Septiyana (2012:29). They are:

1. Require some time to prepare students to learn how to work in groups

2. Require some time to make groups that each group has heterogeneity in their member ability

3. It forces teacher to make a special preparation for teaching in the class because teacher needs to prepare kinds of media

The explanation above shows that jigsaw technique can make the students think creatively and can be cooperative while they are working in group, but it will be difficult for the teachers to manage the classroom.

2.7.2. Advantages and Disadvantages of Think-Pair-Share Technique

There are some advantages of traditional method based on explanation above are as follows:

Allen (2007:17) states some benefits of Think-Pair-Share (TPS) as a technique:

1. It provides students time to think to prepare their own information into the discussion with their pair.

2. It allows both independent and collaborative learning. The students have their own time to work by themselves and together with their partner(s).
3. It gives students opportunities to collaborate the refining definition. While they are in the stage of sharing process, they have opportunities to exchange information with their pair.

4. It invites equal participation. Each of students will tell the information that she/he has to their pair.

5. It engages students into active learning. This technique can force the students who are passive to be active because in pairing and sharing step, each of them should join and invite their friends to discuss.

6. It invites students to share their understanding in both kinesthetic and visual modes. While the student is explaining in sharing step, they usually use body language and face-to-face interaction to send their information to their friends.

Besides having some advantages, think-pair-share according to Lyman (1981) also has disadvantages as follow:

A. **Time Consuming**

Applying think-pair-share will be time consuming if the process does not run well. The teacher should be able to create an amusing atmosphere and give some rules for prevention.

B. **Odd number of students**

Problem may appear when the number of students is odd, for example 27. In such case, the teacher may let one a group with odd number, i.e. three students, for the pairing stage (leaving one students alone in pairing process is not preferable and inconsistent with the procedure of TPS).

C. **Domination of Certain Students**

Students who are in upper level of knowledge usually have many opportunities to share their idea because they have more ideas in their mind than the lower
students. It can create a situation where the upper students try to dominate the process of learning (especially in sharing stage). Therefore, the teacher should always check and monitor the entire process to ensure that such thing does not happen. Students should also be provided an understanding about equal opportunity and participation in classroom learning.

D. Assigning the member of the Groups

Think-pair-share technique allows all of the students to share their ideas one by one. It makes the teacher should assigned every students in order to monitor their participation. It will be hard because the teacher will work harder to remember and recognize the students who are good or not in the process of learning in the classroom.

E. Limited Information

The information received by the students is limited to what their friends know. The ideas that come up from the students’ mind usually appear from their previous knowledge and acquired knowledge from the text given. The information can be limited if the students are not able to elaborate their ideas, so the information given only rotate in the same place or not elaborate well and not so many information that students get from their friends.

So, choosing Think-Pair-Share (TPS) as a technique in teaching reading can solve students’ reading problems but every teaching-learning technique has its own.

2.8. Procedure

Procedure is the steps or process of conducting Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique in teaching reading. Here are the procedure of conducting the two techniques.
2.8.1. Procedure of Using Jigsaw Technique in Teaching of Reading

Procedure of applying jigsaw technique is used to make sure that the research is systematically arranged and to avoid confusion. There are the procedures of teaching narrative text through jigsaw technique:

1. Pre-Reading
   - Teacher divided the students into some groups, each group consisted of 5 people.
   - Then, researcher divided a text into five parts.
   - The teacher gave different parts of a text to each student in a group.

2. While-Reading
   - Teacher asked the students to gather with other students from different groups which had the same part (expert group).
   - Teacher asked them to read their part of text first.
   - And then, teacher asked them to analyze and discuss the part of text.
   - After the discussion in expert group had finished, teacher asked the students to come back to their group (home group).
   - Each member had to tell or present the result of the discussion in expert group to other members in the home group one by one.
   - All members in a group had to gather the information of the text, so it would be a complete story.

3. Last-Reading
   - Each group had to present or tell the complete story to other students.
   - At last, students had to do the assignment which was given by the teacher.

Time allocation for reading narrative text for grade X was 8x45 minutes.

In this procedure there were ten steps that teachers and students had to do in applying this technique. It started from making a group, dividing the parts of a
topic, comprehending the parts of the topic and sharing the content of the parts to other members in a group.

2.8.2. Procedure of Using Think-Pair-Share Technique in Teaching of Reading

Procedure of applying think-pair-share technique is used to make sure that the research is systematically arranged and to avoid confusion. There are the procedures of learning narrative text through think-pair-share technique:

1. Pre-Reading
   - Teacher divided a text into two different parts.
   - Teacher divided the students into some pairs. Each student in a pair got a different part of text.

2. While-Reading
   - Each member in a pair should read the part of text first individually.
   - Then they had to understand and analyze their part of text.
   - Each member shared the idea of their part of text to their partner in pair.
   - Then, each pair gathered the information that they got into a short and complete story.

3. Last-Reading
   - After getting the idea of the whole text, each pair presented the result of their discussion with their pair to other students in front of the class.
   - At last, students had to do the assignment which was given by the teacher.

Time allocation for reading narrative text for grade X is 8x45 minutes.

From those steps of applying think-pair-share technique, it could be concluded that there were eight steps which should be done by teachers and students.
2.9. Narrative Text

Narrative text was used in this current research in teaching reading through jigsaw technique and traditional method in different classes. According to Bushel (2011: 10) a narrative paragraph describes an event, feeling or experience in story from or in the order the details of the event happened. Its aim is to amuse or entertain the readers.

Narrative text generally has generic structure which consists of (1) Orientation: introducing the characters, setting, time of the story, (2) Complication: the characters face the problem, (3) Resolution: the complication needs resolution. It may be resolved for happily or unhappily. Then, there are many types of narrative text, here are the explanation and example:

1. **Folktale** is very old tradition story from particular place that is originally passed on people spoken from, e.g. *Roro Jonggrang*.
2. **Fairytale** is an old story about magic things happened intended for amusing and giving lessons, meanings, and moral values, e.g. *Cinderella*.
3. **Fable** is traditional short story that teaches moral lesson, especially one with the animals as characters, e.g. *The Smart Parrot*.
4. **Myth** is a story from ancient times, especially one that is told to explain about natural events or to describe the early history of place or people, e.g. *The Legend of Thor*

In this research, folktale or legend story is conducted in line with the syllabus in 2013 Curriculum for the first grade of senior high school. The example of folktale can be seen in Appendix 2.

2.10. Theoretical Assumption

Based on the literature review, it can be assumed that reading is the extremely complex skill of learning a language. The researcher assumed that jigsaw and
Think-Pair-Share techniques are included in cooperative techniques. Because of the procedure of the techniques, the students may be active in learning process. By using this technique, the students are also helped to keep a good relationship with other members by giving the information. So, the researcher believed there would be a significant difference of students’ reading achievement after the students were taught through Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) techniques and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) is better than jigsaw technique because the procedures in think-pair-share is more simple than jigsaw. Then, it is also believed that there are aspects of reading comprehension which improved significant after conduction the two techniques, especially determining main idea and finding specific information because in the procedures of both techniques students are asked to share the information of the text. But, the students will faced some problem in the learning process because of the procedures too. In jigsaw class the problems might be affected from the complicated procedures which the students had to do because they had to work in home group and expert group. On the other hand, in Think-Pair-Share class the students faced the problem because of the limitation of sharing the idea because in this technique the students just can work in pairs to comprehend and sharing the idea.

2.11. Hypothesis

Based on the theoretical assumption, the researcher formulates hypothesis as follows:

1. There is a significant difference of student’s reading achievement between those who are taught through jigsaw technique and those who are taught by think-pair-share technique.

2. There are aspects of reading that improves significant after the students are taught through jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique.
These are the explanation about some theories related to the research. The theories will be used as references to conduct the research.

This chapter has explained about the definition of reading, aspects of reading, teaching of reading, jigsaw technique, think-pair-share technique, jigsaw technique in teaching of reading, think-pair-share technique in teaching of reading, advantages and disadvantages of jigsaw technique, advantages and disadvantages of think-pair-share technique, procedure of teaching through jigsaw technique, procedure of teaching through think-pair-share technique, narrative text, theoretical assumption, and hypothesis.
III. METHODS

This chapter discusses about the research method which consists of design, variable, data sources, instruments, validity and reliability, data collecting procedure, data analysis, data treatment, and hypothesis testing. These topics are explained as follows:

3.1. Design

In this research, the researcher conducted quantitative research. This study applied two groups pretest-post-test design of pre-experimental design. This research compared students’ reading achievement between jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique. The researcher used one class for administering try-out test and two classes for conducting the research. The first class was X IPS I, in this class try-out test was conducted. The second class was X MIPA II, in this class Jigsaw technique was conducted in teaching reading. The third class was X MIPA IV, in this class Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique was conducted in teaching reading. Before conducting the research, researcher applied pre-test to the students, then after giving treatments, the students were given a post test for both classes. The research design could be illustrated as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
G1 & T1 & X1 & T2 \\
G2 & T1 & X2 & T2 \\
\end{array}
\]

(Setiyadi, 2006:135)
In which,

T1 : Pre-test for students’ reading achievement before the treatment is given.
T2 : Post-test for students’ reading achievement after the treatment is given.
X1 : Treatment using jigsaw technique.
X2 : Treatment using think-pair-share technique.
G1 : The class will be taught using jigsaw technique.
G2 : The class will be taught using think-pair-share technique.

The research conducted this research in four meetings. Each meeting took two lesson hours (2x45minutes). The first meeting was pre-test session, then the next day was the treatments for the students which would be conducted two times and the last day was post-test session. In order to find out the significant difference of the students’ reading achievement after they were taught trough jigsaw and think-pair-share techniques, the gain score of the pre-test and the-post test from jigsaw and think-pair-share classes were compared.

3.2. Variable

This research consisted of two independent variables :

1. Students’ reading achievement which were taught by jigsaw technique as independent variable (X).

2. Students’ reading achievement which were taught by think-pair-share technique as independent variable (X).

So, in this researcher, there were two independent variables, students’ reading achievement which were taught by jigsaw technique and students’ reading achievement which were taught by think-pair-share technique.
3.3. Data Sources
The population of this research was the tenth grade students of SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung. In relation to the design, the researcher took two classes in that school for conducting the research. The first class was X MIPA II which consisted of 25 students, in this class Jigsaw technique was conducted in teaching reading. The second class was X MIPA IV which consisted of 26, in this class Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique was conducted in teaching reading.

3.4. Data Collecting Technique
In this research, researcher used some instruments for collecting the data. The data of this research were in forms of quantitative and qualitative data. To figure out whether the objective of the research was achieved or not, the researcher used research instrument. The instruments of this research were tests, questionnaire and interview. In detail, the techniques of collecting data were as follows:

3.4.1. Quantitative Data
The quantitative data were collected through a reading test. It was a technique to find out the significant difference of the students’ reading achievement in learning narrative text by using jigsaw and think-pair-share technique, which techniques was more effective between jigsaw and think-pair-share, and what aspects of reading that improved more significant after implementing jigsaw and think-pair-share techniques. The tests which were given were in multiple choice forms. There are three types of tests which were administered; pre-test and post-test.

1) Pre-Test
The pre-test was given to the students before applying the treatments to find out the students’ reading achievement before implementing jigsaw and think-pair-share technique to the students. It consisted of 30 items, and it was conducted in 90 minutes.
2) Post-Test
The post-test was given to the students after applying the treatments to find out students’ reading achievement after implementing jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique to the students. It consisted of 30 items, and it was conducted in 90 minutes.

3.4.2. Qualitative Data
The qualitative data was collected through administering a questionnaire. It was applied to identify the students’ problems in comprehending the aspects of reading during the implementation of jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique. Then, the researcher administered interview to some students in order to check the reliability of the questionnaire.

3.4.2.1. Questionnaire
It was given to all students in the class after the post-test. Students had to answer the questions according to their personal estimation of each question to find out the students’ problems in comprehending five aspects of reading comprehension through jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique. There were 5 items and the time allocation was 10 minutes.

3.4.2.2. Interview
Interview was given to three students in jigsaw class and three students in think-pair-share class. Students were asked to answer five questions which were same as the questions in questionnaire. Interview was administered to check the consistency of the questionnaire.

The researcher used five kinds of instrument in collecting the data, they were a try out test, pre-test, post-test, questionnaire and interview.
3.5. An Analysis of Research’s Instrument

In this research there were two instruments, reading test was used in pre-test and post-test as the instrument of the quantitative data, meanwhile questionnaire was the instrument of the qualitative one.

3.5.1. Quantitative Data

There were some ways in analyzing the quantitative instrument, they were validity, reliability, level of difficulty and discrimination power.

3.5.1.1. Validity

A test can be said valid if the test measures the object to be measured and suitable with the criteria (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:250). There are several types of validity according to the different purpose of the test. In this research content validity and construct validity were used.

3.5.1.1. Content Validity

Content validity is concerned with whether the test is sufficiently representative and comprehensive for the test. It is also the extent to which a test measures a representative sample of the subject meter content, the focus of content validity is the adequacy of the sample and simply on the appearance of the test (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:251). This study used narrative text reading test which is supposed to be comprehended by the first year of senior high school students. The researcher made the tests based on the English Curriculum (2013 Curriculum) for senior high school and measured the validity by using interrater. The use of interrater was to measure the agreement of the test which has been developed. Syllabus based on the 2013 Curriculum refers to basic competence point 4.8 about catching the meaning of the social function, generic structure, language features of oral and written folktale.
3.5.1.1.2. Construct Validity

Construct validity is concerned with whether the test is actually in line with the theory of what it means to know the language (Shohamy, 1985:74) It means that, the test items should really test the students or really measures the students’ ability in reading comprehension. Regarding the construct validity, it measures whether the construction has already referred to the theories, meaning that the test construction has already in line with the objectives of learning (Hatch and Farhady, 1982 : 251). In construct validity, the researcher used a theory of aspects of reading from Nuttal. According to Nuttal (1985) there are five aspects of reading comprehension :1. Determining main idea, 2. Finding the specific information, 3. Finding reference, 4. Finding inference, 5. Understanding vocabulary To construct the validity, the researcher used interrater, to check whether the test has been consisted of the aspects of reading based on theory from Nuttal. In this research, there were two ratters who were the English teachers in SMA YP Unila Bandar Lampung.

Table 3.1. Table of specification of a try out test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Numbers of Items</th>
<th>Item Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Main Idea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,6,12,18,21,28,34,36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Specific Information</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2, 8, 11, 17, 24, 27, 31, 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3, 7, 15, 19, 22, 26, 33, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Inference</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4, 10, 14, 20, 25, 29, 35, 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5, 9, 13, 16, 23, 30, 32, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5.1.2. Reliability of the test

Reliability can be defined as the extent to which a test produce consistent results when administered under similar condition (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:244). In this research, the researcher used split half method to estimate the reliability of the
test. The test and the students were divided into 2 categories, based on odd and even numbers. Then, the test was distributed to the students based on the categories. To measure the coefficient of the reliability of half test the researcher used the following formula:

\[ rl = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{(\sum x^2)(\sum y^2)}} \]

Where:

- \( rl \): coefficient of reliability between the first half and the second half items
- \( X \): total number of odd numbers items
- \( Y \): total number of even numbers items
- \( X^2 \): square of \( X \)
- \( Y^2 \): square of \( Y \)

(Lado 1997)

After getting the reliable of the half test, the researcher used Spearman Browns Prophecy formula (Hatch and Farhady, 1982:247) to determine the reliability of the whole test, as follows:

\[ rk = \frac{2rl}{1 + rl} \]

Where:

- \( rk \): the reliability of the test
- \( rl \): coefficient of reliability between the first half and the second half items

The criteria of reliability as follows:

- \( 0.90 - 1.00 \) = high
- \( 0.50 - 0.89 \) = moderate
- \( 0.0 - 0.49 \) = low
3.5.1.3. Level of Difficulty

Level of difficulty relates to how easy or difficult the item taken from the point of view of the students who do the test. It is important since the test items which are too easy (that all students get right) can tell us nothing about differences within the test population (Shohamy, 1985:79).

It was calculated by the following formula:

$$LD = \frac{U + L}{N}$$

(Shohamy, 1985:79).

Where:

- LD : level of difficulty
- U : the proportion of upper group students who answer correctly
- L : the proportion of lower group students who answer correctly
- N : total number of students

The criteria are as follows:

- < 0.30 = difficult
- 0.30-0.70 = average
- >0.70 = easy

3.5.1.4. Discrimination Power

Discrimination power refers to the extent to which items are able to differentiate between high and low students on that test. The discrimination power was calculated by this following formula:

$$DP = \frac{U-L}{\frac{1}{2}N}$$

(Heaton, 1975 : 180)
Where:

DP : discrimination power
U : the number of students from the upper who answer correctly
L : the number of students from the lower who answer correctly
N : the number of students

The criteria are as follows:

DP : 0.00-0.19 = Poor items
DP : 0.20-0.39 = Satisfactory items
DP : 0.40-0.69 = Good items
DP : 0.70-1.00 = Excellent items
DP : - (Negative) = Bad items, should be omitted

3.5.2. Qualitative Data

In qualitative data, questionnaire was administered. In analyzing the data of qualitative instrument, the researcher checked the validity and the consistency of the questionnaire.

3.5.2.1. Questionnaire

The researcher administered questionnaire to answer the forth research question of this research. Questionnaire was administered to find out the students’ in comprehending aspects of reading comprehension through Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) techniques. The form of the questionnaire was open-ended questionnaire.

3.5.2.1.1. Validity

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982), there are least two types of validity should be fulfilled; they are content and construct validity. The content validity of the instrument which was used by the researcher was the content of the
questionnaire itself. It was already achieved at the table of specification. According to Nuttal (1985) there are five aspects of reading comprehension:

1. Determining main idea
2. Finding the specific information
3. Finding reference
4. Finding inference
5. Understanding vocabulary

3.5.2.1.2. Consistency of the Questionnaire

To find out the consistency of the questionnaire, the researcher conducted triangulation. Its aim was to make sure the data which was collected by the researcher to identify the problems which occur during implementing jigsaw and think-pair-share technique was consistence. Triangulation is an attempt to check the correctness of the data or information obtained by researchers from different angles by reducing as many errors as possible at the time of collecting and analyzing the data. In this research, the researcher used methods triangulation. The researcher used this type of triangulation to test the credibility of the data by checking the data to the same source but using different methods. In this research, the data was collected by questionnaire, then it was checked by interview. If they produced different results, it had to be checked again to produce valid and consistence data. The researcher did the interview to the subject of this research. During the interview, the researcher wrote the result of the interview to avoid the errors in collecting the data.
3.6. Research Procedure
The procedures of the research were as follows:

1. **Determining the population and samples**
The researcher chose tenth grade students of SMA YP Unila as the population and sample of this research. The researcher took two classes as the sample of the research.

2. **Deciding the materials to be taught and tested**
The materials were based on 2013 Curriculum for the first year students in senior high school. The researcher selected some samples of narrative text from English books and internet.

3. **Administering a try out test**
The try out test was administered in another class. Students were given the reading texts with 40 items of multiple choice test in 90 minutes.

4. **Conducting pre-test to the students**
The researcher prepared a text about narrative text. Then, the researcher asked the students to do the test by crossing the correct answers in the students’ worksheet. There were 30 items and the time was 90 minutes for this test.

5. **Giving treatments**
In giving treatments, the researcher gave the different treatments in two classes. One class was given treatment by using jigsaw technique as the experimental class one and other class was taught by using think-pair-share technique as the experimental class 2. The researcher gave two times of treatments in two meetings in each class, which took 90 minutes in every meeting.
6. Administering questionnaire

To find out the students’ problem in applying jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique in the two different classes, the researcher prepared a questionnaire which consisted of 5 questions. The researcher asked the students to fill the appropriate answer based on their feeling while the researcher was implementing the technique. The time to fulfill the questionnaire was 10 minutes.

7. Conducting post-test to the students

In order to see the significant difference of the students’ reading achievement, which method was better and what aspect of reading which increased the most, the post-test was conducted in the two classes after having the treatments. The test was in form of reading. The researcher prepared some texts of narrative text and 30 questions about the text and asked the students to choose the correct answer by crossing the correct option. The post test was conducted in 90 minutes.

8. Conducting Interview

In order to collect the detail information about the students’ problems in applying jigsaw technique and think-pair-share technique and check the consistency of the questionnaire, the researcher used interview as the data collecting technique. In this step, the researcher interviewed six students from those two experimental classes.

9. Analyzing the result of the test

In scoring the student’s work, the researcher used Arikunto’s formula (2005: 236). The highest score was 100. The score of pre-test and post-test were calculated by using the following formula:

\[ S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100 \]
The formula above could accordingly be illustrated as follows:

\[ S = \frac{R}{N} \times 100 \]

3.7. Scoring System

In scoring the students’ results in pre-test and post-test, the researcher used the formula by Arikunto (2005:236):

3.8. Data Analysis

There were two kinds of data in this research, quantitative and qualitative, so that the steps of analyzing the quantitative data was different from analyzing the qualitative data.

3.8.1. Quantitative Data

In order to find out the students’ progress in comprehending the text, the researcher analyzed the data using some steps as follows:

1. Scoring the pre-test and post-test.
2. Tabulating the result of the tests and calculating the scores of the pre-test and post-test.
3. Drawing conclusion from the tabulated results of the pre-test and post-test by comparing the gain score from the two classes which was statistically analyzed using independent sample t-test computed through SPSS 16.0.
4. Making a conclusion from the tabulated results of the aspects of reading in pre-test and post-test which was statistically analyzed using one way anova through SPSS 16.0.

In analyzing the data, the researcher did four steps, started from scoring the pre-test and post-test until making the conclusion.

3.8.2. Qualitative Data
First, the researcher analyzed the result of the questionnaire which was administered to all students in two different classes. Then, the researcher analyzed the result of the interview and described it in descriptive form in order to makes the readers were easy to comprehend the data. Then, the descriptive data was arranged in specific and systematically.

3.9. Data Treatment of Quantitative Data
In this part there were some steps before answering the hypothesis testing, the researcher did a random test, normality test and homogeneity test.

3.9.1. Quantitative Data
According to Setiyadi (2006: 168-169), using the t-test for the hypothesis testing has three underlying assumptions, namely :

1. The data are in interval ratio.
2. The data are taken from a random sample in population.
3. The data are distributed normal.

Therefore, the researcher used the following procedure to treat the data treatment:

3.9.1.1. Random Test
Random test is used to make sure whether the data is random or not (Hatch and Farhady is quoted by Setiyadi, 2006: 168-169). The researcher used the SPSS
program to analyze the data in order to find out the value. The hypotheses for the random test were as follow:

\( H_0 \) : The data is not random.
\( H_1 \) : The data is normal.

The level of the significance used was 0.05. \( H_1 \) is accepted if the result of the random test is higher than 0.05 (p>q).

### 3.9.1.2. Normality Test

The aim of composing the normality test is to find out whether the data is normally distributed or not. The researcher used SPSS program to analyze the data in order to find the value. The hypotheses of the normality test as follows:

\( H_0 \) : The distribution of the data is not normal.
\( H_1 \) : The distribution of the data is normal.

The level of the significance used was 0.05. \( H_1 \) is accepted if the result of the normality test is higher than 0.05 (p>q).

### 3.9.1.3. Homogenity Test

According to Hatch and Farhady (1982: 57-59), homogenity of items test are measured to test whether the data of post-test from the experimental class and from the control class have a homogenous variance or not. This test is analyzed by independent t-test. The hypothesis for the homogenity test is as follows:

\( H_0 \) : There is no significant difference in the level of ability (equal)
\( H_1 \) : There is a significant difference in the level of ability ( not equal)

In data treatment, there were three tests which were used, the first was random test, the second was normality test, and the last was homogeneity test.

### 3.10. Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is used to prove the hypothesis in this research is accepted or not. The researcher used SPSS 16.0 to find out the significance improvement of treatment affect. The hypothesis is approved if t-value > t-table.
In this case, paired sample t-test was used in this research. The formulation of the hypothesis could be seen as follows:

\[ H_0 = \text{There is no significant difference of student’s reading achievement among those who are taught through Jigsaw Technique and those who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share Technique.} \]

\[ H_1 = \text{There is a significant difference of student’s reading achievement among those who are taught through Jigsaw Technique and those who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share Technique.} \]

The researcher also analyzed what aspect of reading skill that improved the most after being taught using Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique in learning reading comprehension. The researcher used one way anova and it was calculated by using SPSS 16.0.

\[ H_0 = \text{There are aspects of reading which improves more significant after the students are taught through Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique.} \]

\[ H_1 = \text{There is no aspect of reading which improves more significant after the students are taught through Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique.} \]

The criteria of accepting the hypotheses are as follows:

The first hypothesis testing:

1. \( H_0 \) is accepted if the t-value is lower than T-table.

   If \( H_0 \) is accepted and the t-value is lower than T-table, it means that there is no significant difference of student’s reading achievement among those who are taught through Jigsaw Technique and those who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share Technique.
2. H₁ is accepted if Ho is rejected.

H₁ is accepted, that means there is a significant difference of student’s reading achievement among those who are taught through Jigsaw Technique and those who are taught by using Think-Pair-Share Technique.

The second hypothesis testing:

1. Ho is accepted if the significance > 0.05.

If Ho is accepted and the significance > 0.05, it means that there is no aspect of reading which improves significantly after the students are taught through Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique.

2. H₁ is accepted if the significance < 0.05.

If H₁ is accepted and the significance < 0.05, it means that there are aspects of reading which improve significant after the students are taught through Jigsaw Technique and Think-Pair-Share Technique.

This chapter has discussed the design, variable, data source, data collecting technique, an analysis of research’s instrument, research procedure, scoring system, data analysis, data treatment of quantitative data and hypothesis testing.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

5.1. Conclusions

With reference to the previous chapters, it can be summarized that the results of the implementation of Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) techniques enabled the students to increase their ability in reading comprehension. The conclusions can be drawn as follows:

1. There is a significant difference of students’ reading achievement after being taught through Jigsaw technique and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) Technique. It showed that the t-value was higher than t-table (1.852 > 1.677). It means that there was an improvement of the students’ reading achievement in learning English, especially narrative text. Then, Think-Pair-Share (TPS) technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique to help students to increase their reading achievement. That can be identified from gain in Think-Pair-Share (TPS) class is 18.83 and in Jigsaw class is 15.05. It means that the gain in Think-Pair-Share (TPS) class is higher than Jigsaw class.

2. In order to answer the second research question the researcher also analyzed the improvement of reading aspects in pre-test and post-test. The aspect of reading that improved significant in Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) classes are main idea and specific information because the significant level is higher than 0.05. In jigsaw class, main idea was the
aspect of reading which improved significantly because in jigsaw technique students could gather all information of the text and determine the main idea by discussing it with their pair or members in a group. In Think-Pair-Share class, main idea and specific information were the aspects of reading which improved significantly because students could get more complete specific information than in Jigsaw class and it could help the students to determine main idea easily. Then, the aspect of reading that had lowest improvement in both classes was vocabulary because the students were lack of vocabulary.

3. There were some problems faced by the students in comprehending five aspects of reading through Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share techniques. The problems that the students faced in both classes are almost same. The difference of the problems was affected by the procedure of implementing the technique itself. Based on the data, some students got more difficulties in understanding vocabulary because they were very lack of vocabulary to comprehend the text whether they worked in groups or in pairs. Meanwhile, some students did not really get difficulty in determining main idea. In addition, the number of the students which got difficulties in comprehending aspects of reading in Jigsaw class is higher than in Think-Pair-Share class.

5.2. Suggestions

Based on the discussion and conclusion above, the researcher recommends some suggestion as follows:

1. For teachers
   - In order to improve the students’ reading achievement, the teacher should try and use other types of cooperative learning in teaching reading.
- The lowest improvement in aspect of reading was vocabulary. The teacher should provide certain media or activities to enrich students’ vocabulary.

- Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) techniques are part of cooperative learning, which means that a technique that can make the students more active in a class. So, teachers should create conducive situation so that the students can absorb the materials effectively.

- The procedures of Jigsaw techniques are complicated, there are many steps that the students have to do, so that the teachers should make sure that all students understand the procedures of implementing jigsaw technique well.

- Time management is needed in teaching reading by using those techniques. So, teachers should be careful in managing time so students could finish the assignment well.

2. For other researchers

- Jigsaw and Think-Pair-Share (TPS) techniques are good to increase the ability of the students especially in reading comprehension. Therefore, other researchers should try to implement those techniques to students from different departments or level.

- In qualitative research, the researcher asked the students problems in comprehending aspects of reading trough jigsaw and think-pair-share techniques, for other researchers who want to apply the same research should use the different form of questions, such as asking the students response of using the two techniques.

- In this research, the researcher used methodological triangulation in the consistency of the data in qualitative research, other researchers are suggested to use other types of triangulation.
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