

# **The Effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R Technique in Teaching Reading on the Reading Achievement of Eleventh Grade Students of Senior High School**

**Elvina Ariyanto**

*Abstract. The objective of this study is to find out which techniques affect the students' reading achievement better. The students' reading achievement is also specified in three types of reading questions; factual, inference, and main idea questions. In this study, the writer used two classes of the eleventh grade belonging to the school year of 2005-2006 as the subject of the study. The writer also developed a research instrument which contains 20 objective items in the form of multiple choices. Each item has four options with one correct answer. After three meetings of treatment, the writer administered a post test to both classes. Having collected the data, the writer analyzed the mean scores of post test using t-test for independent samples at .05 level of significance and 75 degrees of freedom. The result showed that the students taught by using translation technique have better reading achievement than those taught by M.U.R.D.E.R technique.*

*Keywords: Reading Comprehension, Cooperative Learning*

## **Introduction**

### **Background**

To be able to read English text comprehensively is very important for senior high school students. By reading a lot the students can broaden their knowledge. The students can get a lot of knowledge which will be beneficial in their life. Doehring et al as quoted by Sannia (1998:1) ensures that reading can add greatly to the quality of students' life.

In line with the language learning, Williamson (1988:7) has the same belief as Doehring. She states that reading is good for language acquisition. Reading promotes better spelling and writing skills. Besides that, it makes our reading ability better and increases person vocabulary mastery.

Furthermore, according to the 2004 English curriculum for SMU, Departemen Pendidikan Nasional states that students in the senior high school are expected to achieve informational level which is having the ability to access knowledge from their language because they are prepared to enter university. The students are expected to be able to read English textbooks mostly used in the university. So, reading ability is very essential for senior high school students.

Until now many of them still have a low ability to read and comprehend the content of a reading passage. Based on the writer's experience during her study at senior high school, the students usually get

bored in the reading class due to the teaching method conducted in the reading class. Sometimes, the method used in the reading class is the grammar translation method which is as the traditional method.

In this method, the reading activity is started by the teacher asking the students to read the reading passage silently. Then, the teacher gives the students opportunities to ask the meaning of some difficult words. After that, the students are asked to translate the reading passage into Indonesian and it is continued by asking the students to answer the questions. The teacher can not give the same personal attention to all of the students since this method is applied in large group of students. And since the characteristic of this method is teacher - centered, the students can not learn actively in class.

On the other hands, there is a method namely cooperative learning consisting of many techniques to raise student interaction in class. One of its techniques is M.U.R.D.E.R technique which is suitable to be applied in reading class. Olsen and Kagan (1992:3) state that by doing cooperative learning, the students' learning can be improved and their academic achievement can also be increased since the students can study actively in class. The students will get knowledge not only from the teacher but also from their friends by doing the consultation.

By considering the students' difficulties in reading comprehension and the condition of teaching reading stated above, the writer conducted a research on the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and M.U.R.D.E.R technique of cooperative learning in teaching reading on the students' reading achievement. This study is in the form of a comparative study.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Based on the background of the study, the writer states the major problem as follows:

“What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school?”

In this study, the students' reading ability includes: (1) identifying the explicitly stated information, (2) identifying the implied information, and (3) identifying the main idea. Thus, the writer also includes the minor problems:

1. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to answer factual question?
2. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to answer inference question?

3. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to answer the main idea question?

### **Research Methodology**

The study is quantitative study. This study is a quasi experimental study applying non equivalent-groups post test - only design (McMillan; 1992:175). The choice of this design is based on the consideration that it is not just possible to randomly assign subjects to the two groups. The writer used two existing parallel classes of the eleventh grade of natural science.

### **Population and Sample**

The population of this study was the eleventh grade of natural science students. The students were registered and admitted as the students of St. Louis I senior high school, belonging to the academic year of 2005 - 2006. The students had studied there for one semester and three months when this study began. The writer considers that the eleventh grade students will represent the effect of the techniques used because they have already got enough practice in reading when they were in the tenth grade.

### **The Treatment**

This study used two techniques of teaching reading. They were: (1) the M.U.R.D.E.R technique of Cooperative Learning Method, and (2) the Translation technique of Grammar Translation Method. Both of the groups got the same material. The materials given for the treatments consisted of reading passages and the comprehension questions. The treatments were done in one week consisting of 4 meeting, three meetings for treatment, and one meeting for post test. One meeting was 45 minutes. And both classes were taught by the writer.

### **Experimental Group**

The students in the experimental group were involved in reading class by using Cooperative Learning Method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique. First, the teacher carried out the pre-instructional activities. The teacher greeted the students and asked some triggering questions based on the topic given.

Then, on the whilst-instructional activities, the students were assigned to work in pairs. The teacher asked the students to greet each other to create a relaxed atmosphere. Next, they were asked to read the passage silently. Instead of reading the passage silently, some students were asked to read the paragraph in the passages for the whole class so that all of the students will have the same information about the passage. After they had read the passage, the students were given opportunities to ask some questions concerning with the passage.

Next, the students were asked to work in pairs. The student, for example student A, closed his or her reading passage and recalled the main idea and some important information of paragraph one. Student A could ask the meaning of some difficult vocabularies in paragraph one that he or she did not know to student B. His or her partner, student B, detected student A's error or omission and corrected it if student A made an error. And student B could give explanation of the meaning of some difficult vocabularies that student A asked. After that, both students would give his or her opinion toward the paragraph related to connection to their own lives.

These steps would be repeated until the entire paragraph in the reading passage was finished. The teacher also let the students in pairs exchange their roles. Then, the students were asked to make a review of the reading passage they had read. If they had finished the summary, the students were asked to answer the reading comprehension question.

After that, the teacher would discuss the answer with the whole class. At the end of the lesson, the teacher gave the students a reading quiz related with the passage. They were asked to do the reading quiz individually. The purposes of giving the quiz were firstly as a reading reinforcement to the students and secondly as reinforcement in answering factual, inference and main idea question.

### **Control Group**

The students in the control group were taught by using translation technique of Grammar Translation Method. First, like the pre-activities in the experimental group, the students in the control group were greeted by the teacher and, asked some triggering questions based on the topic given.

The whilst-instructional activities in the control group were started by asking the students to read the passage in silent. Like in the experimental group, some students were asked to read the paragraph of the passages for the entire class. After reading the passage, they were given chances to ask some questions concerning with the passage. Having finished reading, the students were asked to translate it into Indonesian. Each student translated one sentence. In this case, instead of asking the students to translate the passage based on the order of their seat arrangement, the writer asked them randomly. Then, the teacher asked the students to answer the questions based on the passage and discussed the answer to the whole class.

The last was the post-instructional activity. It was the same as the one in the experimental group. The students had to do the reading quiz individually. The purposes of giving the quiz in the control group were more or less the same as ones in the experimental group.

## Research Instrument

The writer developed a reading comprehension test for this study. The writer constructed the test containing 20 items which consisted of factual, inference, and main idea questions. The test was administered with a time limitation of 45 minutes for the students to finish it. Three passages were selected for this test. One passage was taken from the school textbook (Linked to the World: English for Senior High School grade XI) and the other two were added from different sources (Headlight 2: An extensive Exposure to English Learning for SMA Students, and Read and Think 2: A Reading Strategies Course).

The type of the test is objective test having 4 alternative responses for each item with only one correct answer. The writer used objective test to measure the learning outcomes since objective test was efficient for the students to measure knowledge of facts, understanding, and also thinking skills. It was used because it provided the students with a highly structured task that control the students' response. Gronlund (1981:136) said that this structuring of the problem and restriction on the method of responding contribute to objective scoring that is quick, easy, and accurate. Thus, high reliability is possible to obtain.

## Findings and Discussions

In the fourth chapter, the writer presents two main sub chapters namely the findings of the study and discussion of the study. In the first sub chapter, the writer describes the interpretation of the findings after she calculated the mean scores of post test. And in the second sub chapter, the writer explains the rationale of the findings.

### The Findings of the Study

To answer the major problem that is "What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school?", the writer analyzed the data by using t-test formula for independent sample at 5% level of significance and 75 degrees of freedom (df). Then, the writer compared the means of post test scores in the experimental group and the control group. The calculation of the findings is shown in the following table:

**The Calculation of the Mean Scores of Post test in Total Question**

Group	Technique	Mean	Standard Deviation	$t_{table}$	to	Sig./ not sig.
A (XI IA 1)	Translation (GTM)	65.875	12.55	1.6655	2.048	Sig.
B (XI IA 3)	M.U.R.D.E.R (CLM)	60.1351	11.988			

Based on the above calculation, the writer found out that the mean score of group A (XI IA 1) was 65.875 and the mean score of group B (XI IA 3) was 60.1351. It means that the students' reading achievement score in group A is higher than in group B. With 5% level of significance, the writer discovered that the observed  $t$  ( $t_o$ ) was 2.048, which was higher than the  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). The writer accepts  $H_a$ , which says that "There is a significant difference in the reading achievement between the eleventh grade students of senior high school who get the Grammar Translation Method and those who get M.U.R.D.E.R technique." Therefore, the writer concludes that teaching reading by using grammar translation method through translation technique affects students' reading achievement better than one by using cooperative learning method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique.

The writer also computed the mean scores of post test in three types of reading comprehension questions namely factual, inference, and main idea questions to answer the minor problem namely:

1. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to answer factual question?
2. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to answer inference question?
3. What is the effect of the Grammar Translation Method and the M.U.R.D.E.R technique in teaching reading on the reading achievement of eleventh grade students of senior high school to identify the main idea?

The formula used to calculate it was the same as one used to calculate the mean scores of post test in total question. The result of the calculation is shown as follows:

#### **The Calculation of the Mean Scores of Post test in Three Types of Reading Comprehension Question**

Type of Question	Group	Mean	Standard Deviation	$t_{table}$	$t_o$	Sig./ Not sig.
Factual Question	A (XI IA 1)	26	4.696	1.6655	2.356	Sig.
	B (XI IA 3)	22.97	6.50			
Inference Question	A (XI IA 1)	22.375	5.99	1.6655	1.81	Sig.

	B (XI IA 3)	19.865	6.179			
Main Idea Question	A (XI IA 1)	18.375	5.59	1.6655	0.1	Not sig.
	B (XI IA 3)	18.24	6.37			

The findings of the comparison mean scores in three types of reading comprehension question will be described as follows:

**Factual Question** Derived from the procedure of data analysis depicted in chapter 3, the writer found out that the mean of group A (XI IA 1), which was 26, is higher than the mean score of group B (XI IA 3), 22.97. It means that the students' reading achievement in answering factual question in group A (XI IA 1) is higher than in group B (XI IA 3). The writer rejects  $H_0$  since the observed  $t$  was 2.356, which is higher than the  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). It means that the translation technique of grammar translation method conducted in group A (XI IA1) affects students' reading achievement better than M.U.R.D.E.R technique of cooperative learning method conducted in group B (XI IA 3). **(For complete calculation see APPENDIX 13)**

**Inference Question.** Based on the calculation of the mean scores of post test in inference question, the writer gets the result that the mean score in group A (XI IA 1), 22.375, is higher than those in group B (XI IA 3), 19.865. It means that the students' reading achievement in answering inference question in group A (XI IA 1) is higher than in group B (XI IA 3). In further computation, the writer rejects  $H_0$  since the observed  $t$  (1.81) is higher than the  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). It means that the students have better reading achievement through translation technique than through M.U.R.D.E.R technique. **(For complete calculation see APPENDIX 14)**

**Main Idea Question.** When the writer calculated the mean scores of post test in main idea question, the writer found out that the mean scores of both group were a like. The mean score of group A (XI IA 1) was 18.375 and the mean score of group B (XI IA 3) was 18.24. Furthermore, the writer calculated that the observed  $t$  was only 0.1, which is lower than the  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). Then, the writer concludes to accept  $H_0$ , which means that there is no significant difference in the reading achievement between the students who get the translation technique and those who get M.U.R.D.E.R technique. **(For complete calculation see APPENDIX 15)**

### Discussion of the Findings

Based on the statistical calculation of the mean scores of post test, the result shows that students who had been taught by using the translation technique of Grammar Translation Method have higher reading achievement than students who had been taught by using the

M.U.R.D.E.R technique of Cooperative Learning Method. The mean score of the control group (65.875) is higher than the mean score of the experimental group (60.1351). The calculation of the t-test formula proves that the effect of the two techniques is significantly different since the observed t (2.048) is higher than  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). The reasons why the translation technique of grammar translation method affects students' reading achievement better than M.U.R.D.E.R technique of cooperative learning are as follows:

- The treatments were done only for three meetings in both experimental and control group. This condition made the students get difficulty in adjusting to the new technique, especially in the experimental group taught by M.U.R.D.E.R technique, since the students never experienced this kind of teaching activity.
- The students might also have got used to the teaching technique usually applied by their English teacher. Usually, asking some difficult words that the students do not understand after reading is done by their teacher. And then, their teacher gives the translation or the meaning of the words. This kind of teaching that make the teacher as the source of the student knowledge forms habit in the students' learning whether they realize it or not. Therefore, when the writer switched the technique into the new one, the translation technique is easier to apply in the control group rather than M.U.R.D.E.R technique in the experimental group.
- Since M.U.R.D.E.R technique is new for the students, the writer finds some difficulties in making the students understand what they have to do. When the writer gave the instruction about the steps they perform in pairs, she had to repeat the instruction for two or three times in order to make the students understood. The writer also gave further explanation when she checked the students' work.
- The students in the experimental group have to work in pairs (the M.U.R.D.E.R steps). Working in pairs can also be classified in working in groups even though there are only two students in a group. Working in pairs could lead to some problems. For example, the talkative student might ask his or her partner to chat about something else rather than to work on the task given. It can cause the pair to fail in accomplishing the task because both of the students do not give their contribution for the group success.
- On the other hand, the students in the control group pay attention in receiving the explanation of the teacher. It is because the teacher has control in handling the students when they translate the passage.
- The number of students in a class also gives an affect in the teaching and learning activity. In the control group, the number of students is only 40 students. So, since the teacher can control the situation of the learning activity, it is much easier to apply the



translation technique of grammar translation method which is usually applied in large class.

The findings of the mean score comparison in three types of question results that the observed  $t$  ( $t_o$ ) in the factual question was 2.356 and one in the inference question was 1.81. Both of the result is higher than the  $t_{table}$  (1.6655). It showed that through translation technique, the students can answer the factual and inference question better than those taught by M.U.R.D.E.R technique. This occurs because the students have got used to know the meaning of the words by translation so that the students' adaptation of the translation technique is faster than their adaptation of M.U.R.D.E.R technique. As a result, the students in the control group can get the meaning and information of a passage as a whole part like reading a passage in Indonesian.

After the writer compared the mean scores of post test in main idea question, the calculation shows that the observed  $t$  ( $t_o$ ) was 0.1, which means that there is no significant difference in the reading achievement between the students who get the Grammar Translation Method and those who get M.U.R.D.E.R technique. The finding shows that the students who get translation technique and those who get M.U.R.D.E.R technique have the same ability in answering the main idea question. This happens because the students in both groups often directly quote the main idea from the passage without summarizing the paragraph into their own sentences. The students often get difficulties in making summary of a paragraph. So, the students in the experimental and control group can not perform better.

Based on the theory of grammar translation method, this study proves that this method is much effective in teaching a class consisting with 40 students. Since teacher is the authority, the students can learn what the teacher knows. It means that the students get knowledge as much as that possessed by the teacher. When the teacher supplies correct answer, the students have better understanding of the passage.

Based on the previous study about teaching reading by using cooperative learning method through jigsaw activities, it shows that jigsaw technique affect students' achievement in reading comprehension. But, this study shows different result that cooperative learning method through MURDER technique cannot affect students' reading achievement. This could happen since the subject and the technique are different.

## **Conclusion And Suggestions**

In the fifth chapter, the writer presents the conclusion and suggestions. In the first sub chapter, the writer concludes about what have been discussed in the previous chapters. And in the second sub chapter, the writer gives suggestion for English teaching and further research.

## **Conclusion**

The reading ability is essential because the students can broaden their knowledge through reading. Besides that, being able to read English text comprehensively is very important for senior high school students since some of textbooks used in the university are written in English. 2004 English curriculum states that through communicative reading as one of the integrated skills taught in senior high school, the students are expected to be able to read English textbooks mostly used in the university.

Actually, many of them still have a low ability to read and comprehend the content of a reading passage. This could happen due to the unvaried technique of teaching reading used in the class. When the students get bored in the reading class, they can not comprehend the passage well. As a result, they can not develop their reading proficiency.

Some studies to overcome the problem have been done. Most of them analyzed about implementation of the jigsaw technique of cooperative learning method compared to that of the traditional technique in reading class. The results showed that there is an improvement of students' reading achievement taught by using jigsaw technique. This encouraged the writer to conduct a study about the implementation of the cooperative learning method by using another technique namely M.U.R.D.E.R technique compared to that of the grammar translation method by using the translation technique in the senior high school students.

In brief, the writer conducted a study about the effect of cooperative learning method and grammar translation method in the reading achievement of senior high school students. The objective of this study is to find out whether the Grammar Translation Method or the M.U.R.D.E.R technique can improve the reading ability of eleventh grade students of senior high school better. Besides, the writer also examined the students reading achievement in answering factual, inference, and main idea questions.

The study was included in the quantitative study which was quasi experimental study applying non equivalent – groups post test – only design. The subject used in the study was the eleventh grade of natural science students of St. Louis I Surabaya. The data used in this study were taken from the scores of mid term test and post test of the students. And the writer administered three meetings for treatments.

The analysis of the mid term test scores using One Way ANOVA assisted by SPSS 13 program for Windows showed that the mean scores of the classes used for try out (XI IA 5 AND XI IA 6) and post test (XI IA 1 and XI IA 3) were not significantly different. It means that the used classes had equal reading ability. On the next analysis, the writer used t-test for independent samples in order to know whether there was a significant difference between the post test means of the two groups. The

writer tested the mean scores of post test at 05 level of significance with 75 degrees of freedom.

The result of the t-test formula for the comparison of the mean scores of the post test of the two groups (XI IA 1 and XI IA 3) showed that there was significant difference where grammar translation method through translation technique affects students' reading achievement better than cooperative learning method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique. Besides that, the writer also calculated the effect of the two techniques in the students' reading achievement to answer factual, inference, and main idea questions. The result showed that there was significant difference where translation technique affects the students in answering factual and inference questions better than M.U.R.D.E.R technique. While in answering main idea questions, the result showed that there was not significant difference where grammar translation method through translation technique affects students' reading achievement as well as cooperative learning method through M.U.R.D.E.R technique.

The result obtained proved that the students taught by translation technique of the grammar translation method have better reading achievement than those taught by M.U.R.D.E.R technique of cooperative learning method.

### **Suggestions**

This sub chapter deals with two main points. They are suggestions for English teacher and suggestion for further study.

#### **Suggestions for English Teacher**

This study reveals that the students taught by translation technique have higher reading achievement than those taught by MURDER technique. The writer has some suggestions dealing with the implementation of cooperative learning method through the M.U.R.D.E.R technique to the eleventh grade students:

- Since M.U.R.D.E.R technique is relatively new for the students, the students might get confused with the instructions or the steps they should follow. The writer suggests that the teacher should give clear instructions and check if the students understand the task or not.
- The writer recommends that the treatment should be given more than three meetings so that the students have enough time to adjust their learning.
- In applying cooperative learning by using the M.U.R.D.E.R technique, the teacher should actively supervise the students when they are doing the task since working in a group can lead some problems.
- Sometimes students do not know how to work in a group or how to solve a problem together. So, the writer suggests that the teacher could literally tell the students about the purpose of working

together. When the students do a fair share of the work, they get success in accomplishing the task given.

### **Suggestions for Further Study**

Finally, the writer realizes that this study is still far from being perfect. Nevertheless, she hopes that this study can be used as a reference for other researchers who will carry out further research in improving students' reading achievement through the cooperative learning method and the grammar translation method. By sharing the weaknesses found in this study, the writer expects that the next researcher will get a better and valid result by using a better research design and a wider scope of subjects. Due to the limited time to finish the study, the writer only gave three times treatment since she conducted her experiment one month before the national examination held. The writer suggests that the next researcher will have more time and opportunities to conduct his or her experiment so that the students will have enough time in adjusting new technique.

### **Bibliography**

- Anderson, Richard C. and P. David Pearson. 1988. A Schema – Theoretic View of Basic Processes in Reading Comprehension. Patricia L. Carrell et al (eds) Interactive Approaches to Second Language Reading. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Arcana, Nyoman. 1996. Pengantar Statistika II: untuk Ekonomi bagian inferensial. Faculty of Economy: Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya.
- Bowen, J. Donald et al. 1985. TESOL Techniques and Procedures. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
- Brown, H. Douglas. 1994. Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents
- Carrell, Patricia and Joan C Eisterhold. 1987. Schema Theory and ESL Reading Pedagogy. Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richard (eds). Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings. New York: Newbury House Publisher.
- Clarke, Mark A. and Sandra Silberstein. 1987. Toward a Realization of Psycholinguistic Principles in the ESL Reading Class. Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richard (eds). Methodology in TESOL: A Book of Readings. New York: Newbury House Publisher.
- Coelho, Elizabeth. 1992. Jigsaw: Integrating Language and Content. Carolyn Kessler (eds). Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.

- Depdikbud. 2004. 2004 English Curriculum for SMU. [www.puskur.net](http://www.puskur.net) retrieved at May 15<sup>th</sup>, 2007.
- Dixon, Wilfrid J. and Frank J. Massey, Jr. 1969. Introduction to Statistical Analysis International Student Edition. Tokyo: McGraw-Hill Kogakusha, LTD.
- Ebel, R. L. 1979. Essentials of Educational Measurements 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Eskey, David E. 1983. Learning to read versus Reading to Learn: Resolving the Instructional Paradox. English Teaching Forum, Volume 21, Number 3.
- Evangelidou, Evangelia et al. 1990. Reading Skills. English Teaching Forum, Volume 28, Number 4.
- Fantini, Alvino E. and Timothy G. Reagan. 1992. Language Pedagogy. [www.esperantic.org/esf/f-r3.htm](http://www.esperantic.org/esf/f-r3.htm) retrieved at January 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1982. Constructing Achievement Test 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.
- Gronlund, Norman E. 1981. Measurements and Evaluation in Teaching 4<sup>th</sup> edition. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.
- Holburt, Idell. 1981. How to Improve Your Reading Comprehension Skills. New York: Monarch Press.
- Hornby, A.S. 2000. Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 6<sup>th</sup> edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hythecker, V.I., Dansereau, D.F., and Rocklin, T.R. 1988. An Analysis of the Processes Influencing the Structured Dyadic Learning Environment. Educational Psychologist 23. 23-37.
- Jacobs, George and Stephen Hall. 1994. Implementing Cooperative Learning. English Teaching Forum, Volume 32, Number 4.
- Jacobs, George and Stephen Hall. 2002. Implementing Cooperative Learning. Jack C. Richard and Willy A. Renandya (eds). Methodology in Language Teaching: An Anthology of Current Practice. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, David W, Roger T. Johnson, and Mary Beth Stanne. 2000. Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis. [www.co-operation.org.html](http://www.co-operation.org.html) retrieved at May 18<sup>th</sup>, 2006.
- 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-I Students. Surabaya: unpublished thesis. Widya Mandala.

- Larsen-Freeman, Diane. 1986. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Larsen, Richard J. and Morris L. Marx. 1981. *An Introduction to Mathematical Statistics and Its Application*. USA: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- McMillan, James H. 1992. *Educational Research: Fundamental for the Consumer*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers Inc.
- Olsen, Roger E. W-B, and Spencer Kagan. 1992. *About Cooperative Learning*. Carolyn Kessler (eds). *Cooperative Language Learning: A Teacher's Resource Book*. New Jersey: Prentice Hal, Inc.
- Prapphal, Kanchana. 1993. *Cooperative Learning in a Humanistic Class*. John W. Oller, Jr. (eds). *Methods That Work: Ideas for Literacy and Language Teachers* 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Pratisto, Arif. 2004. *Cara Mudah Mengatasi Masalah Statistik dan Rancangan Percobaan dengan SPSS 12*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Sannia. 1998. *The Effect of Cooperative Learning on the Reading Comprehension Achievement of SMU Kristen Petra 3 Students*. Surabaya: unpublished thesis. Widya Mandala.
- Silberstein, Sandra. 1987. *Let's Take Another Look at Reading: Twenty – Five Years of Reading Instruction*. *English Teaching Forum*, Volume 25, Number 4.
- Slavin, R.E. 1990. *Cooperative Learning: Theory, Research, and Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Vacca, Richard T. 1981. *Content Area Reading*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Williamson, Julia. 1988. *Improving Reading Comprehension: Some Current Strategies*. *English Teaching Forum*, Volume 26, Number 1.
- Yun, Yue Mei. 1989. *Teaching Efficient EFL Reading*. *English Teaching Forum*, Volume 27, Number 2.
- .--. Language Training Methods. [www.altalang.com/training/default.aspx](http://www.altalang.com/training/default.aspx) retrieved at January 29th, 2007.
- . --. The Grammar Translation Method. [www.englishraven.com/method\\_gramtrans.html](http://www.englishraven.com/method_gramtrans.html) retrieved at January 29th, 2007.
- .--. Cooperative Learning. <http://www.co-operation.org/pages/cl-methods.html> retrieved at May 18th, 2007.