

**THE EFFECTS OF “ONE STAYS THE REST STRAY” AND “LOCKSTEP”  
TECHNIQUES ON THE ENHANCEMENT OF STUDENTS’ READING  
ACHIEVEMENTS**

**Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno<sup>1</sup>**

*Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia*

email: mariasurjosuseno@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** This research was based on students’ need in preliminary research which stated that most students (87%) need a new strategy in teaching and not all students have good achievements in reading texts (37.14%) in EFL classes. The writer was using two-group, quasi-experimental, post test only design to investigate two techniques, i.e. “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” technique, to increase students’ achievements in EFL reading. Participants in this study included 61 college students who were taken as two intact groups. The result of statistical computations showed that the reading achievements of the experimental group increased and was significantly different from those of the control group. These students were able to have various competencies which might help keep students work on task, speak orally, recall the knowledge, summarize the passage, and comprehend the text well and happily.

**Keywords:** one stays the rest stray technique, lockstep technique, reading achievements, positive interdependence, individual accountability and interpersonal skills.

In Indonesia, many institutions of Teacher Training and Education are now developing competence-based curricula which are suited to the needs of the institutions. These institution-based curricula are locally called “*Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan*” and abbreviated as the KTSP. These curricula are aimed at equipping graduates with sufficient knowledge, skills in listening, speaking, reading, writing, and life skills, so that they can become competent English teachers (Agustien, 2007). The achievement of the aim of KTSP has been endorsed by the Indonesian Government’s Decree No. 19/2005 (Depdiknas, 2005) which states that students graduating from English language Education should be able to communicate orally, listen to speakers of English, and have the capabilities in reading and writing in English to face the globalization era (Depdiknas, 2004, p.15). One of the English Education in Indonesia which has been trying to develop its KTSP is used as sample. It is located in Surabaya, the second largest city in Indonesia. The English Education Department of this university is responsible for the production of English language teachers who are competent in their English language skills. This research project focuses on one of the English language skills that is reading, and investigated how the reading achievements can be improved by the use of “one stays the rest stray” technique. Reading skill has been chosen as the focus of this

---

<sup>1</sup> **Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno** earned her doctoral degree of education from CQU-Australia. She is a lecturer in the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at Widya Mandala Catholic University Surabaya, Indonesia. Her research interests include language skills, TEFL, as well as Curriculum and Material Development.

## **Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno**

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

research because the reading skill can be a stepping stone to the development of students’ knowledge in any subject matters they want.

In this university, reading is given as a series of courses. However, in preliminary research the fact pointed out that not all of the students could read well. Based on the preliminary study conducted by the researcher in the Department, it was known that students attending the reading courses were not all good at reading. Here was the evidence, in the academic year of 2009/2010: the average of students’ scores in Reading II class in the Department was only 65.34 and the percentage of students who failed (with marks less than 60 out of 100) was 37.14% of 91 students. From the data, the researcher suspected that there might be something wrong in the process of the learning-teaching of reading. The questionnaire given to the students in the preliminary study also revealed that 87% of the students wanted to have new strategies for the teaching of reading since most of the students had got bored of the lockstep technique (a traditional teaching situation where the lecturer controlled the session) which caused them to lose their interests.

In the previous curriculum Reading II classes were usually conducted through teacher-centered learning activities, named “lockstep” technique. In a classroom a teacher was very active. The teacher usually asked students to read one paragraph loudly, and then asked some questions about the paragraph. Further, the students were asked to identify problems, to fix the problems, to picture the text, to predict what would happen next, to make comparisons and comments, right after they had read the passage. Thus, the students were supposed to think hard to answer the teacher’s questions right away after they had finished reading the passage.

In the new curriculum of the English Teacher Training and Education Department, Reading II classes use “one stays the rest stray” in which students work in groups. Each group has different paragraphs and tasks. First, each student reads the paragraphs and does the tasks given silently, and then they (all members of the group) discuss them together. After finishing the discussion, one student stays in their group while others stray to other groups to find out what other groups have done. Then, the strayers return to their base group and one by one, the member of the group, tells what he/she has observed and listened. At last the whole members of each group discuss and write a report of the whole story and tasks.

In this research, the writer compares the two techniques since “one stays the rest stray” technique has the same materials, the same lecturer and the same evaluation rubrics, as the “lockstep” technique. That is the reason why the two techniques are compatible, but the researcher wonders which technique is good on the enhancement of students’ reading achievement; “lockstep” technique or “one stays the rest stray” technique? This question becomes the problem of this research. Thus, in this research, the researcher wants to investigate whether or not students who are taught using “one stays the rest stray” technique have a better result of Reading II achievement than those who are taught using the “lockstep” technique.

There are four theories used here: Theory of reading in general and reading comprehension in particular, Collaborative Learning, “One stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques. Below these theories, the researcher also describes the relation among the four theories for this research. Fisher, Dennis and Charles (1981, pp. 40-41) stated that

reading is a term that can be defined in a variety of ways such as: reading is a complex thing, mental activity, discourse and a meaningful interaction. Reading is a complex thing since it involves various processes; perceptions, recognitions, and interpretations. Reading is a mental activity, since it occurs in the mind. As a result, reading cannot be directly observed. All that can be seen are the product as competence of the reading acts, e.g. answering questions, making questions, making word recognition, using new ideas and application of ideas by dramatizing or summarizing the text presented. Consequently, the process used during reading can be identified only by using questions (oral or written). Reading occurs only when a reader interacts with discourse. Reading is more than acquiring information from the printed words. The reader's background knowledge, purpose, perspective, and skills are brought to the text. It is the authors' task to make the interacting meaningful by addressing the correct or appropriate audience. Yet, it is the reader's task to make the interaction meaningful by purposely employing knowledge and skills. In the era of globalization, interaction is needed to read and communicate for the sake of a real life exchange. Brown (2001) states that an interaction is a collaborative exchange of thought, feeling and ideas of two or more persons, resulting in a reciprocal effect on each other.

Paul (1993, p. 461) defines reading as an active intellectually engaged process in which the reader participates in an inner dialogue with the writer. Here, Paul (1993) considers that reading is a process by which the reader relates the author's ideas or information to their own experience or problems using a process which includes thinking, analyzing, synthesizing, evaluating information and working in groups which actively debate and exchange ideas.

According to Linse and Nunan (2006, p. 86), reading is "a set of skills that involves making sense and deriving meaning from the printed words". In order to read, we must be able to make out the printed words and also comprehend what we read. For second language learners, there are three different elements which affect reading: "the students' background knowledge, the students' linguistic knowledge of the target language, and the strategies or techniques the students uses to tackle the text" (Peregoy & Boyle, 2004, p. 266).

Smith, Banton and Robinson (1980, p. 205) state that reading comprehension means the understanding, evaluating, and utilizing of information gained through an interaction between the reader and the author. Further, Shepherd (1973, p. 79) confirms that "reading comprehension is the ability of the student to think about the information presented by the author." Reading is a mental process. According to Nuttal (1983, p.5), it means that we can find out the writer's message by reading their text.

Below the writer has a summary of some reading's definitions to facilitate a consideration of the similarities and differences. Table 1 summarizes the main definitions of reading.

TABLE 1: Summary of Reading Definitions

Summary of reading definitions	
Author	Definitions
Fisher, Dennis F. and Charles W.,P., (1981, pp. 40-41).	Reading is a term that can be defined in a variety of ways such as: reading is complex, mental activity, discourse and meaningful interaction.
Paul (1993, p. 461).	Reading as an active intellectually engaged process in which the reader participates in an inner dialogue with the writer.

## Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

Linse and Nunan (2006, p. 86)	Reading is a set of skills that involves making sense and deriving meaning from the printed text. In order to read, we must be able to make out the printed words and also comprehend what we read.
Peregoy & Boyle (2004, p. 266)	Reading needs the students’ background knowledge, the students’ linguistic knowledge of the target language, and the strategies or techniques the students use to tackle the text.
Smith, Banton and Robinson (1980, p. 205).	Reading comprehension means the understanding, evaluating, and utilizing of information gained through an interaction between the reader and the author.
Shepherd (1973, p. 79).	Reading comprehension is the ability of the student to think about the information presented by the author.
Nuttal (1983, p. 5).	Reading is a mental process.

Synthesizing the above definitions, the present study claims that reading causes readers to participate with the writer and comes as close as possible to the writer’s point of view by looking at the key words, main ideas, supporting details and details of the written text. Readers might also able to draw conclusion, give evidence, analyze the passage, make prediction, solve problems encountered, give opinion and evaluate the value of the material. These ideas are in line with Fisher et al. (1981)’s definition of reading which is really a complex thing, mental activities, discourse and meaningful interaction

Another theory used in this research is a collaborative teaching. It is a way of transferring knowledge to others. In which students work together in groups on a structured activity and students become the centre of the learning activities. In collaborative teaching students are guided by clear objectives so that they can engage in numerous activities that improve their understanding of the subjects explored. Students and teacher may reflect and learn about improving lessons. They work by considering problems encountered and resolved.

Johnson (2003) stated that over 600 studies had been conducted on increasing students’ achievement in college using various techniques of collaborative teaching. There are various popular techniques of collaborative teaching such as Jigsaw, Summer, Round-table, Round Robin, Write-Pair-Share, Think-Pair-Share, Folded Value Lines, Talking Chip, Inside-Outside Circle and Student Team Learning (STAD) techniques, technique of questionings, one stays two stray and the most innovative one is “one stays the rest stray” techniques. It is interesting to discuss the similarities and the differences between the last two techniques.

The similarities of the two techniques, “one stays two stray” and “one stays the rest stray” techniques give the members of the team an opportunity to find out what other groups have done. Besides, only one of the members remains staying in their base group and hold up his/her sign, both techniques kept the name of each group in collaborative skills. The differences between the two techniques are stated below:

In “one stays two stray”, which was proposed by Jacobs et al. (1996), they stated that in “one stays two stray” the group only consists of three, six or nine students and there are three, six or nine paragraphs in one passage. On the contrary in “one stays the rest stray”, the

members are not limited such as in “one stays two stray”. The members of the group can be the same as the amount of the paragraphs in a text. After their 10 minutes discussion, each group only one member stays in their based group. He/she holds up their sign. He/she will welcome the strayers from other groups and share his/her discussion. He/she will also listen to other strayers (from other groups) who share their group discussions. This will be carried out for 5 minutes. Meanwhile, the other two members (if one group consists of three) stray or leave their group individually, not in pair, to other groups they like. These strayers look at the sign of other groups or find out what other groups have done. These strayers also explain what their base groups have discussed. Other members of another groups may ask questions or give suggestions or comments on the explanation of strayers. This is carried out in 5 minutes (the time limit should be mentioned: otherwise they will talk about other things). Then, after 5 minutes the two strayers of each group return to their base group, discuss and make a report for their group.

Regardless of the variety, all techniques in collaborative teaching, based on Johnson et al. (2003), have stated five competent characteristics in common as they required: (a) positive interdependence, (b) individual accountability, (c) interpersonal skills, (d) face to face interaction, and (e) group processing. To be collaborative, the groups must have clear positive interdependence. This means that each team members are obliged to rely on one another to achieve the goal. If any of the members fail to do their parts, everyone in that team will suffer. Each group member receives the same reward when the group achieves its goal.

The second characteristic is individual accountability/personal responsibility, meaning that everyone has to do his/her fair share of the work. Each student needs responsibility by group members for contributing his/her fair share for the group success. The third characteristic is developing interpersonal skills, meaning that the members of the groups (students) should get to know and trust each other, to communicate accurately, to accept and support each other, and to resolve conflict. This third characteristic is very difficult especially for the members who do not have social skills. The third characteristic needs students with high social skills so that they can enhance their achievements easily. The fourth characteristic is face to face interaction in which no room exists for stars in each team. Each team needs talented people and each member of the team cannot reach the goal alone, so he/she has to get help. Even though some of the group-work will be done individually, some must be done interactively providing one another with a conclusion and reasoning and perhaps with a feedback.

The last characteristic is the group processing where the teacher should periodically assess what they are doing as a team. The teacher might also identify changes the students will make, to reach the goal and function more effectively in the future. Success in face to face interactions usually means success in interpersonal skills and in group processing Johnson et al. (2000, p. 2). Each member might have a sense of sink and swim together in learning. He has to contribute something in discussions, and to learn something from others. Besides, he has to communicate, to trust, to lead and to do the conflict resolutions with members in his group.

These five essential components of a collaborative technique must be present for a group learning to be truly cooperative and it is used in this research using the propose technique. As Panitz (2005) believes, working in groups help keeps students on task and helps them speak orally, recall the knowledge, and comprehend the texts well and happily.

## **Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno**

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

In this occasion the researcher created something new for this research since using “one stays the rest stray” the class might be small or big groups and the passage might be three, four paragraphs or more, besides using “one stays the rest stray”, one group might consist of more than three students. This technique needs less time than Zig Saw since the members pursue the content of paragraphs faster than in Zig Saw. When each group does his/her task from the teacher, each member does a different task or the same task, it does not make any different. Then, they (all members of each group) discuss the task and take a conclusion to put it into one idea as the answer to the teacher’s task. Furthermore, Johnson et al. (2000) suggests teachers to use collaborative learning techniques in different style.

The teacher in this research (using “one stays the rest stray”) is only functioning as a facilitator and as a motivator. As a facilitator, the teacher should facilitate students to read various types of texts such as hands out, journals, compulsory and suggested books before the class. As a motivator the teacher might motivate students by giving attention to students when they study, giving relevant material, supporting them to study hard checking the students’ work before they submit to the teacher or present it in front of the class, building students’ confidence to reach the highest marks, and giving reward.

Further, Jacobs et al. (1996) confirm that using collaborative learning techniques will cause students to continue using good strategies of answering questions, making questions, and summarizing when the students read alone later on, after they graduate. “One stays, the rest stray” technique is completely students’ centered since the students may change the teacher’s roles to suit their particular situation. Here, not only the teacher/lecturer can speak and explain in front of students, but the students have opportunities to speak and explain in front of their friends, too. This means that each student has the chance to contribute and to learn something which causes each student develops his/her accountability. Meanwhile, engaging students in competency based class need employing “one stays the rest stray” technique since using this technique students will have a chance to answer, ask questions, apply the knowledge they have acquired and gain feedback from group members while they are socializing in groups. Learning in such instances will build students’ self esteem as they gain confidence in them and lead to additional enjoyment of the learning process. The teacher does not always work with the students and he/she doesn’t control all students’ activities such as in lockstep. In summary the writer thinks that this suggested technique, one stays the rest stray, is worth considering to be used in experiment group and hopefully, using quantitative research it can improve the students’ achievement in reading

In reading comprehension using lockstep technique, the students are working together tightly with the teacher and following the teacher instruction. Here, the students are asked to read the text, stop at the stop points and answer questions from their teacher right away, immediately after he/she stops reading as a part of the text. This enables the teacher to see the first-hand process of task completion. The teacher is able to detect objectively what the students say/respond to those questions. This technique is really a teacher centered technique since the questions come from the teacher or friends. The students compete each other when they are doing their tasks or answering the teacher/lecturer’s questions. The teacher may take notes of everything that the students say and correct the students’ mistakes by asking other

students to correct the mistakes. Then, the teacher might be able to deliver other good questions for the students. The success of this technique lies on how the teacher uses this technique which means choosing appropriate texts and questions, listening carefully to students' answers, determining students' abilities and adapting the technique to the students' needs and abilities in order to be successful.

The process of how to score students in lockstep technique is the same as in the collaborative techniques (the evaluation ranges from 1-100); 15% of students' daily activities in the class-room and 15 % is the attendance lists. 20 % of students' last project and 50% will be taken from the midterm and final test. Both techniques, lockstep and one stays the rest stray, will use the same materials and the same teacher. That is the reason why the two techniques are comparable to be used for this research.

In this research this lockstep technique causes the teacher controls the students' activities as in the traditional technique. This technique uses teacher-centre. The teacher thinks all of the activities, while the students work together with the teacher, so all students are "locked up" the same activity, rhythm and pace with the teacher. In using this technique, the teacher doesn't think that the students as the centre of the learning but he/she instead (Harmer, 2007, p.161).

The relation of the three theories above in this research pointed out that Reading is more than acquiring information from the printed words. Reading is a complex thing, mental activity, discourse and meaningful interaction. The reader's background knowledge, purpose, perspective, and skills are brought to the text. It is the authors' task to make the interacting meaningful by addressing the correct/appropriate audience. Yet, it is the reader's task to make the interaction meaningful by purposely employing knowledge and skills. In collaborative technique, the readers are groups of students who become the center of the learning activities. The students will perceive positive interdependence, individual accountability, face to face interaction, interpersonal and group processing. By using "one stays the rest stray" technique, each member of the group has his/her own share/ individual accountability; he/she becomes stronger individual in his/her own right. Students will develop their positive interdependence. They easily sink and swim together to reach the goal or they have positive interdependence, each member of the groups will receive the same reward when the groups achieve the goal, perceive different portion of resources/materials necessary for the task to be completed, be assigned complementary and interconnected roles that specify responsibilities that the groups need in order to complete the joint task, have a personal responsibility, have the ability to deal with people, have the ability to take care of each other, and never feel alone to get the job done.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The design of this study was a quantitative research using two groups (control and experiment). It is a quasi-experimental research employing the post-test only design. It was categorized as a quantitative research as it was based on testing a theory composed of variables, measured with numbers, and analyzed using statistical techniques; the goal of which is to determine whether the predictive generalizations of a theory holds true. The type of study was a quasi-experimental, since the researcher only used the real situation of the classrooms without arranging them: the researcher did not randomize the samples but used the existing classes as they were.

## Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

There were two types of variables examined in this study. Those variables were independent and dependent variables. The independent variables were the “lockstep” and the “one stays the rest stray” techniques. The dependent variable was the students’ reading achievement which includes these following areas: main idea, supporting details, factual information and inference information (see Table 2 below).

TABLE 2: Two Groups, Quasi-Experiment, Post Test Only Design

Group	Independent variable	Post test/dependent variable
Experiment	X1	Y2
Control	X2	Y2

Before the research study the writer used 92 students of the third semester students to see whether the instrument is good or not and to see whether the students of the two classes (experiment and control classes) statistically have more or less the same competence. Since quasi experiment was conducted so the classes were used as they were. Randomization was conducted to determine which of the classes would be the pilot group, the control group, and the experimental group. The subjects before the experiment are: Class A as the pilot group (31 students), Class B as the control group (30 students) and Class C as the experiment group (31 students). The average scores of the “Reading I” summative tests in class A, B and C were as follows: 68.71 (Class A, that was used as the pilot group), 70.87 (Class B, as the control group), and 73.16 (Class C, as the experimental group). The conclusion of the similarity of the three classes was based on the result of comparison of their mean scores on the Reading I summative test conducted in the previous semester (see Table 3 below). The writer determined 5% or 0.05 as the level of the significance of the test. It meant that the chance of making a wrong decision was maximally 5%. The comparison using ANOVA showed that f value (0.05) was less than the f table (0.94542), or f table >0.05. Accordingly, Ho was accepted, meaning that there was no significant difference between the three groups. This meant that at the beginning of the experiment (before the treatment), the reading achievement of the three groups was statistically equal since the result of statistical counting of the three classes (pilot, control and experiment) using ANOVA test with 0.05 as the level of significant pointed out that post test only design was applied since there were no significant differences among the three classes, and the pre test was not necessary to be used.

TABLE 3: Comparison of Mean Scores of Summative Reading Tests Prior to Treatment

Group	Mean	Variance	F
Class A (the pilot group)	68,7097	138,6504	0,94542
Class B (the control group)	70,8667	164,1109	
Class C (the experimental group)	73,1613	184,7856	

An instrument of this study which consists of 30 objectives test (close ended type test items) could be used in this research if the instrument was a good instrument (Cohen, Lawrence and Keith, 2000). This meant that the instrument should have been practical, valid and reliable prior to the treatment. The instrument is practical when it is (a) economical, (b) easy to administer (c) easy to score, and (d) easy to interpret. This instrument was economical since it had only one page of multiple choice test with answer keys for the teacher. It would take a few minutes to check. Besides, it was also easy to administer as the divisions of each passage were clearly indicate. The instrument began with general instructions, then each passage began with a roman number followed by specific instruction which was typed in capital letters e.g.; READ THE PASSAGE CAREFULLY!. The directions or instructions of the test were clear and they were written using simple English. This instrument was also easy to score as it was provided with answer keys and a clear direction for scoring so that the teacher could score the test easily and objectively without requiring any judgment on every item. The result of using this instrument test was easy to interpret so that different scorers would produce the same mark to the same responses.

Validity is only concerned with what a test measures and how it is supposed to measure. Since the test developed for this study was used to determine students' reading achievement at the end of the course, content validity was commonly used, Content validity is defined as the extent to which a test measures a representative sample of domain task under consideration (Cohen et al, 2000, p, 105). This meant that the items in the instrument should be representative samples of the course given. After the researcher discussed with other Reading II lecturers in that university, it turned out that this instrument had suited the curriculum used there. It contained a representative sample of the course and there was a relationship between the test items and the course objectives. The form of questions in this instrument was 30 objective questions. The researcher determined that the items should have content validity in order to accomplish the purpose of learning. The items should coincide with the level of reading comprehension ability of Reading II since the teacher is a reading expert and she has been teaching reading for more than twenty years; therefore, the questions should be appropriate for them, and suit their curriculum. In this study, the validity of test items was considered valid. It was because the test items were suitable with the curriculum used and they also suited students' reading comprehension achievement. Thus, the researcher concluded that the validity of the instrument is valid.

Meanwhile, reliability refers to the consistency of test scores; that is, how consistent they are from one measurement to another (Cohen et al., 2000, p. 117). For estimating the reliability of this study, Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 was used (Gronlund, 1981, p. 100, Arikunto, 1983, pp. 157-167), with interpretation of reliability varying from very low (< 0.2), low (0.2-0.399), moderate (0.4-0.599), high (0.6- 0.799), to very high (0.8-1). This study found that the reliability for the instrument test was 0,7330. It meant that the reliability for the post-test was high or it was able to achieve a high degree of consistency or reliability. Hence, the data expected would be accurate for a post test.

To complete the evaluation of the reliability of the instrument, the researcher investigated the level of difficulty and the level of discrimination power. The level of difficulties was used to express the percentage of test to answer each item correctly. It also showed how easy or difficult a particular item was in the test. Based on the table of the item

## **Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno**

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

difficulty, it could be concluded that this try out had easy, moderate and good items, 15 items were easy, 13 items were moderate, meanwhile 2 items were good.

The item discrimination indicated whether a particular item had the power of discriminating good students from poor students. An item is good if the good students tend to do well on a test as a whole, and the poor students tend to do badly on a test as a whole. The criteria for discriminating power vary from poor means (0-0.20), satisfactory means (0.2–2.4), and good means (0.4– 0.7). Based on the analysis of the item difficulty the researcher found that 5 items were poor, 22 items were satisfactory and 3 items were good. From the analysis of the reliability the researcher also confirmed that the instrument had a high reliability of 0.73; the items consisted of 15 easy items, 13 moderate items, and 2 good items. Moreover the items difficulty stated that there were 5 poor items for the poor students, 22 satisfactory items for the average students and 3 good items for the smart students. Thus, the researcher concluded that this instrument which consists of a reading text with 30 objectives type test was good since it was practical, valid and reliable. And then, the researcher used the instrument as a post test after the treatment was carried out.

For the treatment, the researcher only examined the teaching learning activities of English for fourteen sessions of 100 minutes and discussed the kinds of language teaching techniques applied by the reading teacher. Since the writer taught the two classes in Reading II of the third semester, the researcher then decided to take the two classes as a classroom research in English Department of the university as the samples under her research project. They are expert in teaching reading with more than twenty years of experience. Only Reading II class was discussed in this research project, other Reading classes were not discussed and the researcher compared students taught in classes using “lockstep” and “one stays the rest stray” techniques from the same reading material.

The treatment of Students in the experiment group had the same amount of teaching periods as the control group (14 sessions of 100 minutes). Meanwhile, the language instruction was the same in the experiment and control group. The material was assumed to be well selected to suit the basic need of both groups since the materials had been available and stated in the Reading II curriculum. The amount of the passages was the same in both groups. The teacher and the rubric were the same. Only the techniques of both groups were different. The participants of this study were 61 students of the third semester students of the English study programmed who were enrolled Reading II in the academic year of 2009/2010.

The treatments were divided into two parts, the treatments for the experimental group and treatments for the control group. The treatments were fully conducted by one expert of reading teacher who had been teaching reading for more than 20 years at the university in Surabaya- Indonesia. She carried out the treatment for the experiment group and the same teacher from this university taught in control group. The treatment was carried out for fourteen times @ 100 minutes. Each treatment was conducted using the ways below.(see Table 3 below).

Table 3: Treatments for the Experiment and Control Groups.

Activities	Experimental group		Control group	
	Lecturer	Students	Lecturer	Students
Pre-Reading Activities (5minutes)	-Explained the Purpose of the division into groups to the students.	-Listened to the explanation of the purpose of the division of the students into groups.	-Explained the Instruction of the passage and asked if they had ever come across the same problems as the main characters in the story.	-Listened to the explanation of the instruction, answered the questions and asked the teacher if they didn't understand.
	-Gave the triggering questions	-Answered the triggering questions	Gave the triggering questions	Answered the triggering questions
Whilst-Activities (45 minutes)	-Discussed the content of the reading passage briefly (through question - answer)	-Listened to the explanation of the reading passage briefly and participated in the discussion.	Explained the reading passage thoroughly	Listened to the explanation of the reading passage thoroughly
	-Explained the key vocabulary in the Passage	-Listened and jotted down the explanation of the key vocabulary briefly.	Explained the key vocabulary in the passage	Listened to the explanation of the key vocabulary and jotted them down briefly
	-Asked students of each group to discuss their tasks. Each group discussed different paragraphs.	-Each group discussed different paragraphs about the reading passage in English using question and answer.	Asked each student to answer the questions about the paragraph right away after he/she had read the passage.	Answered the questions orally about the paragraph right away after they read the passage.
	-Walked in each group and helped them in case they found difficulties (as a facilitator).	-Had discussion together with their friends and the teacher (whenever it's necessary) in each group	Explained the answer and gave corrections of their mistakes.	Listened and gave response to the explanation.

## Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno

*The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

Activities	Experimental group		Control group	
	Lecturer	Students	Lecturer	Students
	<p>-Asked each group to discuss different paragraphs.</p> <p>-Asked one of the members to stay in their group while the rests strayed to other groups to ask the information about other paragraphs.</p>	<p>-Discussed their tasks in each group. After that one of the members stayed in their group while the rests strayed in other groups to ask the information about other paragraphs.</p>	<p>-Asked some students to read different paragraphs and right after they finished reading it, the teacher would ask students some questions orally.</p> <p>If the students could not answer it orally, the teacher would give the turn to other students.</p>	<p>-Read different paragraphs at different times and after they finished reading them, the students would answer the questions given orally. If the students could not answer them the teacher would give the turn to other students.</p>
	<p>-Asked students to return to their base group or to their previous group, after they had already got the information from other groups about the content of other paragraphs.</p>	<p>-Returned to their previous group/ based group after they had already got the information from other groups about the content of other paragraphs.</p>	<p>-Asked students to answer questions orally right away after they finished reading one paragraph.</p>	<p>-Answered questions right away after they finished reading one paragraph.</p>
	<p>-Asked students to discuss the results of their strayers to other groups and to wrap up the content of the passage.</p>	<p>-Returned to their base group and discussed the results of their strayers to other groups. (each student had a chance to speak in front of his</p>	<p>-Gave the assessment related to the passage to the whole class while the teacher was moving around the class and helping students</p>	<p>-Did the assessment, if they were not able to do it they would ask the teacher’ suggestion.</p>

		friends in his/her group).	who were not able to do it well	
	-Listened to the report of each group about the content of the passage.	-Made a report of their discussion on the passage.	-Checked the students' work together by asking each student to read the answer orally.	-Listened to their friends reading the answer of the assessment.
<b>Activities</b>	<b>Experimental group</b>		<b>Control group</b>	
	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Lecturer</b>	<b>Students</b>
	-Gave some assessments (could be to summarize, dramatize the passage or do similar comprehension questions) to all the groups. The teacher asked students who knew the answers to share them with the other members of the group.	-Shared the answers with the other members of the group.	-Asked each student to write the answer on the board. Meanwhile, the teacher checked the students' work on the board and explained it when their work was not correct.	-Answered the questions by writing the answer on the board .
(10 minutes)	-Reviewed on the material by giving summary of the lesson and asked the difficult words through questions and answers.	-Listened to the teacher's review through questions and answers .	-Reviewed the material given by giving Summary of the lesson and asked the difficult words through questions and answers.	-Listened to the teacher's review through questions and answers .
Post-Reading Activities (40 minutes)	-Asked each student to find a text of the same genre and created various questions for the text given. Then, he/she presented in a class	-Searched a text of the same genre which was explained by the teacher in a class. Created questions for the text	-Asked students to do some assignments individually.	Each student did the assessment individually and submitted it to the teacher after doing it.

**Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno**

*The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’reading achievements*

	<p>/submitted to the teacher.</p> <p><b>Sometimes the</b> Activities vary: (usually in post test the students perform individually) -Asked students to work in groups to find out a text of the same genre text and created various questions for the text given, performed a drama, summarized a text or dialogue and created questions for the text given. -Asked students to have a discussion in groups and performed it in a class-room or in an open air. Evaluated the learning process and gave comment on it.</p>	<p>given and presented them in a class/submitted to the teacher</p> <p>-In each group presented his group discussion (in the form of a drama, dialogue, summary or making questions). in front of their friends to obtain comments from their teacher.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

After the treatment, the researcher gave post test to the two classes using a good reading instrument which had been practical, valid and reliable. The researcher calculated students’ post test scores of both classes (control and experiment classes) using independent T test to know whether there was a significant difference between the two groups. The test scores were analyzed using a statistical calculation. Since this study compared two means, the statistical tool used in this study was the independent t-test.

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

During the treatments, the researcher taught the topics of the study in the first to the fourteenth meeting. Then, she determined the level of the significance of the test. It is 5% or 0.05. It meant that the chance of making a wrong decision was maximally 5%. It was used for

measuring the *t*. obtained whether *H*<sub>0</sub> was accepted or rejected. *H*<sub>0</sub> was accepted if the value of *t*. obtained was less than the *t*. table at the 0.05 level. After that, the researcher calculated the students' scores from the post-test in order to get the mean scores, the standard deviations, and the *t*. observed. From the *t*. observed, the researcher determined whether *H*<sub>0</sub> was accepted or rejected. This study showed that the difference between groups was significant, and that the experimental group was greater.

After the treatment to both groups, group A and group B, the students were given the post-test. The data showed that the mean of the experimental group was 22,93 and the mean of the control group was 19,67. The *t* obtained was 3,3 and *t*. table at level of significance was 2,660. The result indicated that the *t*. obtained was greater than the *t*. table. Since  $3.3 > 2.66$ , thus *H*<sub>0</sub> was rejected means that *H*<sub>a</sub> was accepted. Hence the researcher concluded that there was a significant difference in the reading achievement of the students who were taught by means of "one stays the rest stray"- technique and those who were taught using lockstep technique.

**Table 4: The Post-test Score**

<b>Group</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SD</b>	<b>Df</b>	<b>t-obtained</b>	<b>Σ-table (0.05)</b>
Experimental group	22,93	3,973	58	3,3	2,660
Control group	19,67	3,689			

Since the value of the *t*. obtained was greater than the value of *t* table at 0.05 levels of significance, the alternative hypothesis was accepted or the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, this study proved that teaching reading by means of "one stays the rest stray" technique was more effective than teaching reading using "lockstep" technique. In addition, the teaching reading by means of "one stays the rest stray" technique, almost all students followed the lesson with full enthusiasm, and spirit, and they found that the lesson was interesting and fun. They did not find difficulties when they did the post-test after they had got the treatment with the comfortable and relaxing situation of learning in which they could learn in a small group, and consequently they got higher scores than the control group.

Johnson et al. (2000) stated that by using collaborative technique ("one stays and the rests stray"), the students' positive interdependence, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, face to face interaction and group processing aroused which may help students keep on task, speak orally, recall the knowledge, and comprehend the text well and happily. It can also cheer up and brighten up the classroom and bring more variety and interest into language lesson such as giving students opportunity to answer questions, making dialogue, summarizing and dramatizing the material given. From the findings, the researcher is able to draw a conclusion that the use of "one stays the rest stray" technique in teaching reading to the third semester students has a significant effect on the students' achievement in mastering English reading.

## **CONCLUSION**

This research issue was made to determine whether the use of "one stays the rest stray" technique to teach reading to the third semester students of one of the universities in Surabaya, Indonesia, was more effective than the use of "lockstep" technique. The result of

## **Tjahjaning Tingastuti Surjosuseno**

### *The effects of “one stays the rest stray” and “lockstep” techniques on the enhancement of students’ reading achievements*

this research pointed out that the students who were taught using “one stays the rest stray” technique have higher reading achievements than those taught using “lockstep” technique since  $t$ . obtained (3.3) >  $t$ .table (2.66); thus  $H_0$  was rejected, meaning that the experiment plays a significant role in improving the students’ achievement. The researcher believes that her research would give some contributions to the teaching of EFL reading, especially the usefulness of “one stays the rest stray” as a new technique in collaborative learning for EFL readers to be used in fun reading classes to increase students’ reading achievement.

Based on the result of the study, reading teachers became creative and innovative in varying their teaching so that students would not easily get bored with the lessons in class and their reading achievements would increase. “One stays the rest stray” technique is very compatible to enhance students’ reading achievement. Students are able to enhance their interdependence, individual accountability, interpersonal skills, face to face interaction and their group processing when they work in group. Using “one stays the rest stray” the researcher hopes that the result of this research will give some contribution in teaching Reading to the tertiary education. Further more, using this technique might help keep students working on task, speaking orally, recalling the knowledge, and comprehending the text well and happily. Implementing “one stays the rest stray” technique could also give students opportunities to answer and raise questions, to dramatize and to summarize the materials given during the teaching- learning process of reading. It is expected that reading teachers can apply this technique in their reading courses since they are happy doing their tasks and comprehend the text well.

It is important to note that in this study, only 61 students were involved and the treatments were given only 14 times to both of the groups. For better results, future researchers might involve more students and classroom meetings. Having these limitations, the researcher realizes that this research is far from being perfect, but the readers will know a new technique in collaborative learning which can be used to enhance the students’ reading achievement. It is more practical, takes less time to enhance their knowledge in acquiring the content of the texts. The researcher also hopes that other researchers who are interested in this topic will do the same research in longer time for treatments, hold in many universities in Indonesia and use many teachers which have the same competence statistically..

## **REFERENCES**

- Agustien, H.I.R. (2007). ‘*Widya Mandala Syllabus Design*’. Proceedings of the A2 Seminar on Syllabus Design, University of “Unika Widya Mandala, Surabaya”, Indonesia
- Arikunto, S. (1983). “*Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*”. pp. 157-167. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Brown, D.H. (2001). *An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. San Fransisco: Wesley Longman.
- Cohen, L., Lawrence, M., and Keith, M., 2000. *Research Methods in Education*. p.117. London: Routledge Falmer

- Depdiknas.(2004). *Kurikulum 2004. "Pedoman Umum Pengembangan Sillabus Berbasis Kompetensi SMA"*. Jakarta: Department Pendidikan Nasional.
- Depdiknas (2005). *"Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomer 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standart Nasional"*. Jakarta: Department Pendidikan Nasional
- Fisher, Dennis, F., and Charles W.,P., (1981). *Comprehension and the Competent Reader: Inter-Specialty*, New York: Praeger Publisher.
- Gronlund, N.E. (1981). *Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching*. p. 100. New York: Mac Millan.
- Harmer, Jeremy (2007). *Grouping Students in the Practice of English Language Teaching* (Fourth Eds), pp. 161-174. Cambridge: Pearson Longman.
- Jacobs, G.M., Gan, S.L., & Ball, J. (1996). *Learning Cooperative Learning Via Cooperative Learning: A Sourcebook of Lesson Plans for Teacher Education on Cooperative Learning*. Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Johnson, D.W. (2003). *Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity*. Minnesota: James Rhem & Associates, LLC.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T. and Stanne, M.B.(2000). *Cooperative Learning Methods: A Meta-Analysis*. Minnesota: University of Minnesota.
- Linse, Caroline and David, Nunan (2006).*Young Learners (Practical English Language Teaching Series) (ELT PELTS)* [Paperback]. Cambridge: McGraw-Hill Higher Education
- Nuttal, Christine. (1986). *Teaching Reading Skills in a Foreign Language*, London: The Chaucer.
- Panitz, T. (2005). *Cooperative Learning Saves the Day One Teacher's Story*. Minnesota: Bafile Education World.
- Paul, R.(1993). *Critical Thinking: What Every Person Needs to Survive in a Rapidly Changing World*. Rohnert Park., CA: Sonoma State University Press.
- Peragoy and Boyle. (2005). *Reading, Writing and Learning in ESL*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Shepherd, David. (1973). *Comprehensive High School Reading Methods*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles, E.,Merrill publishing company.
- Smith, Nila Banton and Alan Robinson. 1980. *Reading Instruction for Today's Children*, 2nd ed. Prentice- Hall, Inc.