THE IMPLEMENTATION OF JIGSAW TECHNIQUE IN IMPROVING THE STUDENTS’ ORAL PRODUCTION OF RECOUNT TEXT

Mega Ayu Desiana, Hery Yufrizal, Rosita Simbolon
Email: meghaayudesiana@gmail.com

Abstract: The objectives of the research are to investigate (1) whether there is any significant difference between the scores of the students’ oral production in recount text before and after being taught through jigsaw technique; (2) which topic get the highest gain from the learning among the three different topics of recount; (3) which aspect of oral production is the most improved. This research was applied one group time series design. The results show that: (1) there is a significant difference between the scores of the students’ oral production in recount text before and after being taught through jigsaw technique; (2) the first topic of recount gets the highest gain from the learning; (3) vocabulary is the most improved aspect in the students’ oral production. The significant (2-tailed) value was (p=0.000, p<0.05), it showed that the hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, jigsaw can be applied as a material to improve the students’ English in oral production class.
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Abstrak: Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk meneliti (1) apakah terdapat perubahan yang signifikan antara nilai-nilai pada hasil lisan siswa dalam teks recount sebelum dan setelah pengajaran melalui teknik jigsaw; (2) topik manakah yang mendapatkan tambahan paling tinggi di antara ketiga topik recount yang berbeda; (3) aspek manakah yang paling meningkat didalam kemampuan berbicara siswa. Penelitian ini menggunakan one group time series design. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa: (1) Terdapat perubahan yang signifikan antara nilai-nilai pada hasil lisan siswa dalam teks recount sebelum dan sesudah pengajaran melalui teknik jigsaw; (2) topik pertama mendapatkan tambahan paling tinggi di antara ketiga topik recount yang berbeda; (3) kosakata adalah aspek yang paling meningkat didalam kemampuan berbicara siswa. Nilai signifikan (2-tailed) adalah (p=0.000, p<0.05), menunjukkan bahwa hipotesa diterima. Oleh karena itu, jigsaw dapat diaplikasikan sebagai materi untuk meningkatkan bahasa Inggris siswa dalam kelas lisan.
INTRODUCTION

Speaking has important role in social life which it is used for communication among people in society in order to keep the relationship. By speaking which is categorized as an active process, the students are able to create a communication each other. Moreover, speaking in English is a crucial skill to function in any aspects of global transformation. Therefore, it is a communicative activity that can encourage people to speak and to interact with each other (Tarigan, 1985).

In general, the researcher found that almost students still had low ability in speaking. They still got difficulty to speak in English. They could not do oral production like using and making simple expression in English. They tended to keep silent when they were asked to speak in front of the class. Besides, they were also not actively involved in the learning process. It was because they were afraid of making mistakes and failed to find a suitable words and correct grammar to express themselves well. Referring to the description of the problems above, it was assumed that jigsaw technique was an appropriate technique to solve the problems and to improve the students’ oral production ability.

Bryne (1984) says that speaking or oral communication is a two-way process between speaker and listener involves productive and receptive skills of understanding. It means that speaker and listener try to communicate with each other and use our language to send our message to others (listeners). Therefore, it can be concluded that speaking is two way process between speaker and listener in which it involves both encoding and decoding process.
According to Harris (1974) the teacher must involves some aspects that are really essential in speaking skill in order to know the students’ oral production ability. They are pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

According to Lawrence (1988) defines that cooperative learning is a teaching activity involving children’s participation in small group learning activities that promote positive interaction. It is any kinds of teaching methods in which the students work together in small groups for helping each others in learning a lesson material. During teaching learning process by using CL, the students will interact with other students to share their knowledge and understanding about the material and they also help others who lack of material being learned. The interactions will help the students to strengthen their knowledge about the material and it will make the students to active in using or practicing the language in both oral and written form.

Aronson et al (1997) states that this jigsaw technique structure is meant to provide students with the chance to learn a material from their groups. He also develops jigsaw technique as Cooperative Learning Strategies. Jigsaw is excellent for task that has several distinct aspects or components. Home groups are formed, which each team member is taking responsibility for one aspect of the problem question. Then, expert group is formed of all students who responsible for and plan how to teach it to their home groups. After adequate time has been given, the students return to the home groups and bring their expertise to bear on the assigned task. Positive interdependence is fostered because each student has different information needed to complete the task.
Based on The 2006 School Based Curriculum (KTSP), there are some types of genres includes for Senior High School textbook: (descriptive, procedure, narrative, recount, and report text). The material of first grade students is taught by recount, narrative, and procedure text, where the researcher will focus on recount text. Recount is a text which retells what happened in the past through a sequence of events or experiences to the readers. The purpose of recount text is to tell what happened in the past, to amuse or entertain the reader, and to tell a story. Recount has three major of generic structures, includes orientation, list of events, and re-orientation.

**METHOD**

This research applied one group time series design. The researcher used one class where the students were given three times of pretests, three times of treatments, and three times of posttests. The design of this research can be presented as follows:

$$T_1 \ T_2 \ T_3 \ X \ T_4 \ T_5 \ T_6$$

Where:

- $T_1 \ T_2 \ T_3$ : Pretests
- $X$ : Treatment (using jigsaw technique)
- $T_4 \ T_5 \ T_6$ : Posttests

(Adopted from Setiyadi, 2006: 137)
This research was conducted at the first grade students of SMAN 1 Bandar Sribhawono, in which X1 class consisted of 31 students was chosen as the sample of the research where selected through lottery drawing.

RESULTS

In achieving the reliability of scoring the three pretests and three posttests, inter–rater reliability was applied in this research. It was meant to avoid the subjectively in judging the students’ oral production ability. The students score gained from both raters were analyzed by using the formula proposed by Shohamy, 1985: 213 in order to see the reliability. The final result shows that the reliability’s value of the pretest 1 was 0.90, pretest 2 was 0.93, and pretest 3 was 0.90. Meanwhile posttest 1 was 0.98, posttest 2 was 0.93, and posttest 3 was 0.91. The criteria of reliability in both pretests and posttests show the highest reliability because the score in each reached more than 0.80.

The purpose of conducting pretest was to know how far the students’ ability in their oral production before the treatment. The result shows that the mean score of pretest 1 was 69.61 with the highest score was 82; the lowest score was 56; the median was 70; and the mode was 66. The mean score of pretest 2 was 69.16 with the highest score was 82; the lowest score was 60; the media was 68; and the mode was 74. The mean score of pretest 3 was 72.71 with the highest score was 84; the lowest score was 62; the median was 70; and the mode was 68.

After implementing three times of treatment using jigsaw technique, the posttests were conducted to measure the improvement of the students’ oral production. The
result shows that the mean score of posttest 1 was 84.39 with the highest score was 96; the lowest score was 78; the median was 82; and the mode was 80. The mean score of posttest 2 was 82.65 with the highest score was 96; the lowest score was 76; the median was 82; the mode was 78. The mean score of posttest 3 was 84.58 with the highest score was 94; the lowest score was 76; the median was 84; and the mode was 82.

Mean Scores of Three Pretests and Three Posttests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Pretest 1</th>
<th>Posttest 1</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.61</td>
<td>84.39</td>
<td>14.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Pretest 2</td>
<td>Posttest 2</td>
<td>Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69.16</td>
<td>82.65</td>
<td>14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>Posttest 3</td>
<td>Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.71</td>
<td>84.58</td>
<td>11.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the three different gain of both pretests and posttests, it was found that the first pretest posttest get the highest gain from the learning that was 14.78 point. However, the gain from the first pretest posttest to the second pretest posttest has decreased to 14.49 point, and the gain from the second pretest posttest to the third pretest posttest has decreased to 11.87 point. The researcher assumes that the cause of the descent gain is the topic used by the researcher. In the first treatment, the researcher used *A Study Tour to Bali* as the topic. In this treatment, almost all students have been familiar with the tourism spots of the topic. They are also familiar with the vocabularies used in expressing their ideas. Therefore, their score is good in posttest 1.

In the second treatment, the researcher has used *My Grandpa’s Funeral in Toraja* as the topic. However, the gain in this treatment is not as good as in the first treatment. The students seem unfamiliar with the topic because there are a lot of
vocabularies that they have not known yet. Besides, they also get difficulties in expressing their idea. In the third treatment, the researcher has used *My Holiday ... Unpredictable but Fun* as the topic. In this treatment, the gain is also not as good as in the second treatment. The mean score in posttest 3 is higher than posttest 2, but the gain from posttest 2 to posttest 3 is decreased. In the third treatment, it is assumed that the students get bored with the technique applied by the researcher. May be the time used by the researcher is too close between the second treatment to the third treatment.

According to Harris (1974), the teacher must involves some aspects that are really essential in speaking skill in order to know the students’ speaking ability. They are *pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.*

### The Improvement of the Students’ Score in Five Aspects of Speaking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspects of Oral Production</th>
<th>Pretest 1</th>
<th>Posttest 1</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 2</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>15.87</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>16.39</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 2</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>14.39</td>
<td>17.48</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td>12.52</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest 2</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Gain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 2</td>
<td>13.87</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>Posttest 3</td>
<td>Final Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.45</td>
<td>18.32</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 1</td>
<td>14.52</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 2</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest 3</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Final Gain    |          |            | 3.44       
| Final Gain    |          |            | 1.97       |

From the table above, it can be seen that the highest gain and the most improved is on *vocabulary* aspect, with the final gain of 3.53. According to Harris (1974) states that vocabulary refers to the selection of words that suitable with content. Nobody can communicate efficiently if they do not have sufficient vocabulary. Therefore, vocabulary means the appropriate diction which used in communication. In terms of vocabulary, the students seems more enthusiasm in communicating each other although they are not allowed to open their dictionary. It makes them more cooperative by asking each other for the appropriate diction which finally make the process of each treatment run more cooperatively. Therefore, vocabulary aspect get the highest gain among others.

Besides that, it also shows that *pronunciation* has the lowest gain of all with the final gain of 1.83. According to Harris (1974) states that pronunciation is the intonation patterns, where it is also the ability to produce easily comprehensible articulation. In term of pronunciation, some students are slightly influenced by their mother tongue. They also have made some mispronounce of several words in each treatment. In this aspect, they seems difficult in pronounce some words into the correct articulation because they are rare of practice by using English in communicating each others.
Hypothesis Testing

The hypothesis testing was used to see whether the hypothesis was accepted or not. In testing the hypothesis, \textit{Repeated Measures t-test} was used and was also statistically tested by using statistical computerization of SPSS version 17, in which the significance was determined by \(p=0.000\), \(p=0.05\). The result of hypothesis testing of \(p<0.05\), \(p=0.000\) shows that it was accepted. Thus, there is a significant difference between the students’ oral production ability in recount text by using jigsaw technique. In other word, \(H_0\) was rejected, and \(H_1\) was accepted.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Pair 1} & \textbf{Pretest1} & \textbf{-Posttest1} & \textbf{-14.77419} & \textbf{4.72377} & \textbf{.84841} & \textbf{16.50689} & \textbf{-13.04150} & \textbf{17.414} & \textbf{30} & \textbf{.000} \\
\hline
\textbf{Pair 2} & \textbf{Pretest2} & \textbf{-Posttest2} & \textbf{13.48387} & \textbf{3.93167} & \textbf{.70615} & \textbf{-14.92602} & \textbf{-12.04172} & \textbf{19.095} & \textbf{30} & \textbf{.000} \\
\hline
\textbf{Pair 3} & \textbf{Pretest3} & \textbf{-Posttest3} & \textbf{-11.87097} & \textbf{4.49994} & \textbf{.80821} & \textbf{-13.52156} & \textbf{-10.22038} & \textbf{-14.688} & \textbf{30} & \textbf{.000} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}
DISCUSSIONS

The research was stated by administering pretest, where the researcher conducted three kinds of different topics in each pretest. In the first pretest, the students were asked to tell about their personal experience, telling about their unforgettable experience in the second pretest, and telling about someone’s biography in the third pretest. After administering the pretest, the researcher conducted the treatment by applying jigsaw technique to help the students in improving their oral production ability. After administering treatment, posttest was given by the students in order to know the improvement of the students after given treatment by the researcher. According to Doughty and Pica (1981) states that jigsaw refers to the existence of lack information among participants. Each of whom possesses some piece of information not known to, but needed by all other participants to complete the given task. This technique is suitable for the students. They seemed too enjoy in doing this technique because they could learnt how to study in group working in cooperative situation.

Based on the first, second, and third treatment the researcher found out several problems occured in the learning process of oral production in jigsaw technique. The problems were as follow:

1. Some students still memorized their part of recount when performing their summary in front of the class.

2. Some students still slightly influenced by their mother tongue, whether Indonesian or Javanese in interacting with their pals.
3. Some students still found many difficulties in pronouncing some words in the correct articulation.

From the final result of the improvement scores in pretest and posttest of the students’ oral production that had been explained in the previous pages, the researcher assumed that jigsaw technique through recount text could improve the students’ ability in their oral production. This means that this technique gives a good contribution to the teaching learning of speaking. It helps the English teacher arise the students’ interest and motivation in learning speaking. In other words, the students’ have improved their performance in speaking helped by jigsaw technique through recount text. Therefore, the researcher has concluded that this technique makes the students’ oral production ability improved. This result is proved by the level of significant in both pretest and posttest, where p=0.000 (p<0.005). Besides, jigsaw technique can also improve all aspects of speaking in terms of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Having conducted the research at the first grade of SMAN 1 Bandar Sribhawono and analyzed the data, the researcher would like to state some conclusions as follow:

1. There is a significant difference between the pretest and posttest scores of the students’ oral production ability before and after being taught through jigsaw technique.
2. Regarding the three different topics of recount text given, the first topic *A Study Tour to Bali* get the highest gain from the learning. It can be proved from the findings of the research where the mean score of 1st topic is 84.39 with final gain of 14.78, the 2nd topic is 82.65 with final gain of 14.49, and the 3rd topic is 84.58 with final gain of 11.87.

3. This research has been focused on the five aspects of speaking on Harris (1974). Then, from the calculation of the five aspects of oral production explained in the previous chapter, it can be seen that the most improved is on *vocabulary* aspect with the final gain of 3.58.

4. Jigsaw technique can be used to improve the students’ ability in their oral production because the students could discuss and work together to carry out their learning task, and enables the students to learn a lot of material quickly and easier through group work, where the lowe achievers could learn from the faster ones.

Regarding the conclusions states previously, the researcher would like to recommend some suggestions as follow:

1. Since there is an improvement on the students’ ability in their oral production before and after being taught through recount text by using jigsaw technique, English teachers are suggested to use jigsaw in teaching recount text.

2. The students are suggested to practice English in their daily activities. It can make them more familiar with this second language. The teacher should determine an English speaking day where students have to use English in communicating with others.
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