IMPROVING STUDENTS' SPEAKING SKILL THROUGH JIGSAW TECHNIQUE OF THE FIRST GRADE STUDENTS AT SMAN 11 BANDAR LAMPUNG

Naafi Pratama, Basturi Hasan, Mahpul
English Education Study Program
Lampung University
Email: (naafipratama5522@gmail.com)

Abstrak. Tentunya, belajar keterampilan berbicara dalam bahasa inggris merupakan hal yang kompleks. Oleh karena itu, tujuan penelitian ini adalah untuk mengetahui apakah ada perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik pada kemampuan berbicara siswa antara *pre-test* dan *post-test* setelah diajar melalui jigsaw teknik pada cerita naratif dan untuk mengetahui aspek berbicara apa yang meningkat secara statistik. Populasi penelitian ini adalah 15 siswa SMA Negeri 11 Bandar Lampung. Hasil penelitian menunjukan bahwa adanya perbedaan yang signifikan secara statistik antara *pre-test* dan *post-test,* dengan nilai signifikan kurang dari 0.05. Ini membuktikan bahwa tehnik Jigsaw mampu memfasilitasi siswa untuk meningkatkan kemampuan berbicara mereka.

Abstract. For Indonesian learners, learning to speak English appropriately is naturally a complex matter. Therefore, the objective of this research was to find out whether there is a statistically significant difference of the students' speaking performance between the pretest and the postest in the implementation of the jigsaw technique on a narrative story and to find out what aspect of speaking statistically improve. The subjects were 15 students of Senior High School 11 Bandar Lampung. The results showed that there was a statistically significant difference between the pre-test and the post-test, the significant value was less than 0.05. This research suggests that the Jigsaw technique facilitates the students to improve their speaking.

Keywords: improvement, jigsaw technique, speaking performance, narrative story

INTRODUCTION

Naturally, speaking is an interactive process of constructing meaning which involves producing, receiving and processing information (Burns & Joyce, 1997 : 1-2). To put it in another way, speaking is an ability in making vocal sounds which we known as language, then it gives students the ability to communicate effectively. However, speaking is the ability to express ideas, feelings, thoughts, and emotions and to respond others. Hence, when we are speaking, we interact and use the language to express our ideas, feeling and thought. Specifically, Lawtie (1992:2) says that speaking is a fundamental ability of human communication, in an attempt to express human ideas through well-constructed language systems.

With regard to the previous explanation, Brown (2004: 142-143) pointed out that speaking skill naturally has many crucial aspects, they are; (1) grammar denoting of a system of rules and principles for speaking and writing language. (2) vocabulary concerned mainly with the collection of words, which is used in communication. (3) pronunciation refering to the way in which the words of a language are made to sound when speaking. (4) comprehension represent of someone's ability in undertanding the meaning conveyed. (5) fluency refers to the ability defined as the speed of speaking with a small number of pauses. Moreover, Brown (1994:40) states that speaking is also considered as the most difficult and challenging skill to be mastered. For this reasons, it is not uncommon that the students are still not able to appropriately use the spoken skill form after they graduated from the school. This evidence is understandable because English particularly, spoken term (oral ability) is considered quite difficult to master. Reasonably,

Consecuently, the students of SMAN 11 Bandar Lampung experienced crucial problems in speaking practice, such such as the students were not able to speak fluently, they often speak English with pause, added some fillers in their words, such as "ums" or "a". In addition, the students were lack in choosing the proper vocabulary or even pronouncing the words. Commonly, this evidence can be seen

from their daily activities that they rarely use their English to make a simple conversation with other students either inside or outside the class room.

In line with the previous notion, Alexander (1998) states that the teaching qualities, particularly the techniques used in teaching are very essential factor in achieving the target of learning English. In point of fact, there are various kinds of techniques used in teaching and learning process, among others is jigsaw technique. This typical sort of the jigsaw technique is considered an effective technique to improve students speaking skills because the jigsaw tchnique offers comunity learning which consist of enjoyable and valueable learning process.

As for the reason for choosing Jigsaw as a teaching technique according to Aronson (2008:1), believe that Jigsaw strategy places great emphasis on cooperation and sharing within groups. The success of each group depends on the participation of each individual in completing their task. This also means the jigsaw strategy effectively increases the involvement of each student in the activity. The writer assummed the activitiy that can develop and stimulate the speaking skills of the student is through group discussion. Thus, through this activity, students are practicing in communicating and interacting with different social contexts and different social roles.

Based on the previous studies described above, this research is intended to implement jigsaw technique on narrative story to improve students speaking ability, especially in macro skill.

METHODS OF THE RESEARCH

This research was a quantitative research. The research intended to find out whether there was any improvement of students speaking achievement after the implementation of technique and to find out what aspect will improve the most after being taught by jigsaw technique. To answer this question, the speaking-aspects scores will be compared (from the pretest and the posttest).

This research used one group pretest-posttest design which represented as follows:

```
T1   X   T2
```

The formula can be further explained as follows:

T1 refers to pretest

X is concerned with Treatments

T2 refers to posttest

(Hatch and Farhady, 1982:20)

The population was taken in SMAN 11 Bandar Lampung and the sample of the research was 15 first grade students of regular class. There were the speaking pretest and the speaking posttest. The pretest was administrated to see students speaking ability before the treatment (jigsaw implementation). The posttest was administrated to see students speaking after the treatment (jigsaw implementation).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section discusses the results of the students' speaking performance and the improvement of speaking aspects in pretest and posttes. Here are the results of students speaking performance include all aspects of speaking skill.

A speaking pre-test and speaking post-test were administered during the research in order to obtain the data. The treatments were focused on implementing jigsaw technique in which the materials were narrative story with 3 different themes. During the treatments administered, the students were asked to have discussion

towards one story in each of treatments. The following table shows the results of both pre-test and post-test.

Table 1. Students' Speaking Performance in Speaking Pretest

No.	Students' Interval Score	Pre-test		The Lowest Score	The Highest Score	Mean Score
		Freq.	%			
1.	30 – 39	2	13%	32	72	57.5
2.	40 – 49	1	7%			
3.	50 – 59	3	20%			
4.	60 – 69	7	47%			
5.	70 – 79	2	13%			
6	80 – 89	0	0%			
Total		**15**	**100 %**	**32**	**72**	**57.5**

Table 1 shows students' scores in the speaking pretest. The lowest score in the pretest was 32 and this score only gained by one student. Furthermore, only one student who achieved a high score. With regards to the interval of the pretest, there were six intervals which represent the appearance of the students' level in speaking performance. For the first interval, two students gained a score between 30 and 39. For the second interval, between 40 and 49, there was a student who achieved the score. Next, in the score between 50 and 59, three students gained these score. Moreover, seven students gained the score ranges between 60 and 69. On the next ranges between 70 and 79, two students gained these score. Yet, in the top interval of the class, there were no students who gained the score ranges between 80 and 89.

Table 2. Students Speaking Performance in Speaking Posttest

No	Students' Interval Score	Post-test		The Lowest Score	The Highest Score	Mean Score
		Freq	%			
1.	30 – 39	0	0%	52	89	72.1
2.	40 – 49	0	0%			
3.	50 – 59	1	7%			
4.	60 – 69	3	20%			
5.	70 – 79	8	53%			
6	80 – 89	3	20%			
Total		**15**	**100 %**	**52**	**89**	**72.1**

In the result of the students' speaking posttest, table 2 shows that there was a student who achieved 52 as the lowest score in this test. Moreover, a student gained 89 points as the highest score. The first and second score ranges are around 30 and 49, there were no students who gained these scores. Next, a student was available in the third score ranges between 50 and 59. Moreover, for the fourth interval score between 60 and 69, three students were able to achieve these scores. On the next interval score between 70 and 79, eight students gained this level. Yet, in the top interval of the class, three students gained score ranges between 80 and 89.

As it is already explained before, both table 1 and 2 indicates the students' speaking performance. It can be concluded that there was a statistically significant difference in the students' speaking performance between the pretest and the posttest. The students who were in the lowest interval of pretest with the score 32 was improved to the third interval ranged 50 – 59. Next, the students who were in the second and third interval improved to the range 60 – 69 and 70 - 79. Thus, the majority of the students who were in the fourth range improved to the largest frequencies with 53% in the fifth interval. One of the seven students improved to the highest interval in the speaking posttest. Last, the two students in the fifth range were improved to the highest interval ranged 80 – 89.

In order too answer whether there is a statistically significant difference in the students' speaking performance between the pretest and the posttest after the implementation of the jigsaw technique, the data are statistically analyzed using paired t-test in SPSS. Yet, before analyzing the data using T-test, the data should be analyzed the normality of the data itself. This research use normality test to know whether the data are normally distributed or not. The data are tested by using Shapiro-Wilk (SPSS 16) to test the normality of the data. This research concluded that the data of this research are normally distributed. The results of the normality data test show that the speaking pretest result is 0.063 and the speaking posttest result is 0.898. Since the marks of the two terms are bigger than 0.05, it can be assumed that the data are normally distributed. Table 3 below shows the case of the testing data normality by using Shapiro-Wilk (SPSS 16).

Table 2. Tests of Normality

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Kelompok	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Nilai	Pre Test	.185	15	.179	.888	15	.063
	Post Test	.164	15	.200[*]	.973	15	.898

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.

After the data was analyzed by using the normality test, the hypothesis testing is administered to find out whether the hypothesis proposed in this research is accepted. This research hypothesizes that there is a statistically significant difference in the students' speaking performance between the pretest and the posttest after the implementation of the jigsaw technique. The analysis data from SPSS showed that there are significant differences between the students' speaking performance before the implementation of the Jigsaw technique and after the implementation of the jigsaw technique. The results indicated that the p level is lower than the alpha level (0.000<0.05). Besides, students' speaking performance improved statistically significant after the implementation of the jigsaw technique.

This fact can be seen from the t-value is bigger than the t-table (13.131>2.145). The result of t-test shows in the following table.

Table 3. Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences							
		Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean			Lower	Upper	T	Df	
Pair 1 Post – Pre Test	14.600	4.306	1.112	12.215	16.985	13.131	14	.000

As can be noticed that there are several aspects considered in this research, they are; (1) pronunciation, (2) grammar, (3) comprehensibility, (4) vocabulary, (5) fluency. To examine the speaking aspects, a scoring rubric has been implemented. Specifically, the rubric is divided into five scales, very poor, bad, average, good, excellent. The following table shows the result of speaking aspects both pre-test and post-test.

Table 4. Paired Samples Test of Speaking Aspects

Aspects	Pre-test	Post-test	Gain	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pronunciation	2,4	2.9	0.5	.000
Grammar	3.0	4.0	1.0	.000
Comprehensibility	3.1	3,9	0.8	.000
Vocabulary	3.2	3.9	0.7	.000
Fluency	2.7	3.3	0.6	.000

Table 4 shows that the improvement of the speaking aspects after the implementation of jigsaw technique. In the speaking pretest, the highest point is vocabulary aspect, 3.2 points, followed by comprehensibility is 3.1 points,

grammar and fluency are 3.0 and 2.7 points. Based on table 4, there are gaps between the speaking pre-test and the speaking post-test. The highest gain is from grammar aspect which increases with ten points. In addition, the aspect which has the lowest gain in speaking aspect is pronunciation, which increases five points. In short, the speaking aspects improved after the implementation of the jigsaw technique.

The results of the students' speaking ability increases due to the implementation of the jigsaw technique. This can be viewed from the comparison between the students' score before and after the treatments. It is proven that the lowest score of the students in pretest is 32 and it has an improvement about 20 points (from 32 in the pre-test to 52 in the posttest) in posttest after the implementation of the jigsaw technique. Furthermore, the students highest score in pretest is 72 and it also has an improvement about 16 points (in the pre-test 72 to 88 in the posttest) in posttest. Hence, it can be confirmed that there is a significant improvement of students' speaking skill after the students are taught by using the jigsaw technique.

In conclusion, the statistical data analysis and the comparing means of each the speaking pretest and the speaking posttest, it can be inferred that the majority of the students' speaking achievements improved after being treated of the jigsaw technique.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In line with the results and the discussion of the findings, the writer draws the conclusions as follows:

1. There is a significant difference of students' speaking skill after being taught by using jigsaw technique. It can be seen from the average of students score, which is from 57.5 in pre-test to 72.2 in post-test. It can be conclude that the students' speaking skill improved. It happens becau jigsaw technique involves students into situations where they need to be active and work together as a team to complete their task.

2. The aspect of speaking improves the most after being taught through jigsaw technique in terms of macro skills at the first grade students of SMAN 11 Bandar Lampung is grammar.

This technique also improved all aspects of speaking ranging from the higher to the lower improvement, they are:

1. Grammar improved from 3.0 to 4.0. It proved that this aspect of speaking skill improved 1.0 because most of the students are able to use phrase, clause, tense and sentence very well.

2. Comprehensibility improved from 3.1 to 3.9. Evidently, this aspect of speaking skill improved 0.8 because the students understand and able to tell their story well and correctly.

3. Vocabulary improved from 3.2 to 3.9. It shows that this aspect of speaking skill improved 0.7 because the students are able to use the appropriate nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs.

4. Fluency improved from 2.7 to 3.3. This aspect of speaking skill improved 0.6 because the students are able to tell their story with the proper intonation, speed and no filler.

5. Pronunciation improved from 2.4 to 2.9. This aspect of speaking skill improved 0.5 because the students are able to pronounce the word well.

Considering the result of the research and the conclusion, the writer would lie to propose some suggestion as follows:

a. Pronunciation is the lowest achievement among the other elements of speaking skills. For this reason, it is necessary to consider the students' pronunciation in applying jigsaw technique. The english teacher should apply effective strategies for improving this speaking element. For example, the English teacher should give more affected exercises/drills such as: listening and repeat, record and replay, etc.

b. The English teacher are suggested to use jigsaw technique as one of the alternative techniques to improve the students' speaking

skill. This because the technique can help to create the communication environment where the students are active in learning process by asking and giving their opinion.

REFERENCES

Alexander, R. J. (1998). *Still no pedagogy? principle, pragmatism and compliance in primary education*. Retrieved October 21, 2018, from http://www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu

Aronson, E. (2008). *Jigsaw classroom*. Retrieved October 21, 2018, from http://www.jigsaw.org.

Brown, H. D. (2004). *Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Brown, H. D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching.* New Jersey: Practice Hall.

Burns, A., & Joyce, H. (1997). *Focus on speaking.* Sydney: National Center for English Language Teaching and Research.

Hatch, E., & Farhady. (1982). Research design and statistic for applied linguistics. Tokyo: Newbury House of Publisher.

Lawtie, F. (1992). *Teaching speaking skills: 2-overcoming classroom problems*. Retrieved November 21, 2018, from https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/