CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This chapter draws conclusion of the discussion in the previous chapter. This collects the essence of the result analysis and construes them in a concluding remark for further researches concerning with students' response. This section ends with recommendation for future related studies.

5.1 Conclusion

This research is designed to investigate the way college students give respond to *Iggie's House*. Furthermore, the study also seeks to trace the implication behind the response of these students. Several findings have been figured out to answer the questions and the most prominent one is concluded below.

First of all, this research formulates two major groups of readers; they are indiscriminative reader group and discriminative reader group. From the research, it can be concluded that there were quite distinguished ways between the two groups in responding to the novel.

In the indiscriminative group, the respondents were reported to respond in a detail, critical and coherent way. The criticizing level is measured from the respondents' ability to relate the story to the ideas, experiences and real life, while the coherence level is measured from the coherency between paragraphs provided by the respondents. The majority of respondents tend to give a more flowing and sustained response with paragraphs which are well-elaborated and its integration which is well-connected. The idea of respective paragraph was clear and supported with several supporting sentence.

Meanwhile, the respondents of the discriminative group do not have a relatively good criticizing and coherence level. The most striking issue in this group is their low coherence level. Most of the respondents in the group jumped over one idea to another idea and had difficulty to elaborate a more focused idea in the paragraphs. In some cases, the respondents jumped over one idea to another in one single paragraph, consequently it somehow made the disintegration of the paragraphs.

Learning from the analysis of students' responses, the writer sees that there are some reasons that contribute to these circumstances. The reasons are the difference of reading attitude and reading environment.

When it comes to reading attitude, readers in the first group possess open attitude towards reading. As confirmed by questionnaires, they show a positive behavior and strong interest to the activity of reading. The respondents are reported to have a higher reading quantity than the discriminative group.

Meanwhile, the readers in the second group are reported to restrict their reading activity and do not possess an open attitude towards reading. They read limited materials and avoid the activity of reading that consumes more time such as reading fiction and non-fiction. They read only to fulfill the need for information and do not conduct the activity of reading for leisure.

These differences of the critical and coherence level between the groups are mainly due to the difference of their reading frequency. The first group spends more time to read than the second one. Thus, this shows that the frequency of reading influences the level of critical and coherence of the respondents. The study found that the more frequent respondents read the more critical and coherent their response would be.

5.2 Implication

Surprisingly, this research shows that the majority of respondents shows a negative attitude towards reading even though they have a supportive reading environment. It indicates that their environment does not encourage them to read voluntarily, it can be assumed that the environment only pushes them to read for academic purpose such as reading for the exams, reading for good marks and other pragmatic readings that result in their ignorance to reading.

It is unfortunate that the majority of the respondent is reported to have negative attitude to their reading. In other words, they do not prioritize reading as expected even though they have supportive environments. The writer assumes that the existing culture encourages the respondents only to read to get a good mark, to read to prepare before exam, to read to be smart and to read in other pragmatic approaches. This behavior constructs in their mind a negative attitude towards reading because they cannot find amusement, excitement or joy found in reading for leisure. This can also be said demanding because the environment is trying to emphasize the purpose of the reading which is not to get pleasure. The environment constructs the understanding that reading is the door to open good marks in school and a good preparation before exam. In fact, the understanding about reading for leisure has not been fostered by the environment.

5.3 Recommendation

There occur several limitations in this research such as less varied respondents involved in the study, problems of respondents' sentence and grammar structure, and lack support of related research or survey.

For future researches related to students' reading interest, family reading background and especially reader response it is recommended to involve more varied students' background. The primary data corpus of this research lies on responses given by the students. Thus, a

more varied students background concerning with the difference of age, GPA and family background will enrich and expand the data useful for any further researches on this topic.

Sentence and grammatical structures are also big concerns in this research due to the findings of many grammar mistakes traced in students' response who are English Language and Literature students. Therefore, it will be beneficial both for the researcher and university if further studies concerning with reader response can focus on how well English students can write in good sentence and grammatical structures.

The last recommendation is to involve other related parties such as faculties, lecturers and advisors in data collection. Responses from the previous mentioned parties can be precious source for any researches concerning with reader response. Thus, any notions or ideas arouse from students' findings can be balanced by the data provided by another party. It is a good way to avoid any judgmental or biased results due to one-way data collection.

The conclusion and recommendation has been drawn and provided above. Hopefully, this research will give beneficial impacts both for the present writer and future writer interested in related topic. The writer also hopes that any further studies can be conducted to fill in the gaps occurring in this research thus a more real and expanded contribution both for the writer him/herself and university can be achieved.

TAKAP

ERPUS