

THE USE OF JIGSAW III METHOD TO IMPROVE THE ABILITY OF THE SECOND YEAR STUDENTS OF SMPN 20 PEKANBARU IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXTS

Eldinanda Mula Nuwary

Student of English Language Education Department
Faculty of Teacher's Training and Education
Riau University

Abstract

This study aimed to explore whether Jigsaw III method could improve the ability of the second year students of SMPN 20 Pekanbaru in writing descriptive text. The subjects were 40 students from class VIII.6 at SMPN 20 Pekanbaru selected through the result of small survey. This study was classroom action research which was divided into two cycles, in which every cycle consisted of four stages which were planning, action, observation and reflection. In this research 'pre-test and post-test were given including a set of observation sheets and field notes used to gain the record of the classroom activity during doing the treatments. Treatments were designed for three meetings in each cycle. The findings of the study indicated that a cooperative learning that focused on Jigsaw III method had improvement to the students' ability in which there were 20 students or 50% of the students could achieve the standard minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) with average was about 70.36. In addition, the percentage of students' activities was also improved from the first to the last meetings. Moreover, the result of observation sheets and field notes showed a positive behaviour in a process of learning and it also helped students improve their writing ability and more active in learning process.

Keyword : *Jigsaw III method, Ability, Descriptive Text*

INTRODUCTION

English is a language which is most widely used in the world. We have to be able to communicate in English not only by spoken but also by written. Writing is one of productive skills. The writers can pour their ideas, feelings, and opinions freely. But, to make the good writing, the writers have to pass through some processes such as, prewriting, drafting, and revising. Bambang (1997) says that writing is the most complicated one among other language skills because learners are expected to be able to master the component of writing and express their ideas clearly and efficiently in writing form.

According to Department of National Education, School in Indonesia has applied school based curriculum (KTSP) since 2007. Based on this curriculum the purpose of writing in Junior High School is to express the meaning of various interactional and monolog written texts based on the genre. The text types which are introduced at junior high school are descriptive, narrative, spoof/recount, procedure, report, and anecdote.

Unfortunately, the goal of teaching writing cannot be reached as well as the other skills. Based on syllabus the time duration of teaching writing is not as much as others. It means that students have short time to be able to write the texts. Therefore, teachers are expected to choose the best strategy in teaching and learning process to reach all competence. Teacher are also suggested to create enjoyable teaching and learning process to make students can be active and do not feel boring so they can receive the lesson well.

Here, writer chooses students of class VIII-6 of SMPN 20 Pekanbaru as the participants. Based on observation that writer has done, English teacher at SMPN 20 Pekanbaru teaches writing by using traditional way. She uses the lecturing method. She only explains the materials in front of the class and asks the students to do the exercises. She also tends to focus on finishing the materials and does not give the feedback for the students. She doesn't comment what the weakness of the students' written works. Besides, the teacher doesn't use supported media to engage students in learning. She usually takes the materials from one text book only. She rarely uses any kind of other resources.

In teaching and learning process, the teacher also rarely uses any kinds of strategies that can make an enjoyable class activity. So, it makes the situation in the class goes on passively. For most of second year students in SMPN 20 Pekanbaru, learning writing is more difficult than learning other skills. Usually, they face difficulties to begin the writing. They are confused to develop their thoughts or ideas especially in writing text. As the result, most of the students cannot reach the standard minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) of English subject.

However, the ability of the students in writing the text need to be improved in order to enable them to get use to the writing process and to give them enough time to develop their ability. Here, the writer assumes that Jigsaw III method is the best one to improve students' writing ability especially in writing descriptive text.

Jigsaw is a cooperative learning technique which includes two different practices realized by small group was first used in 1978 by Elliot Aronson. The method essentially consists of breaking down a large topic into a number of small topics, with the production of an 'expert sheet' prepared by the teacher. The students each are assigned to read an expert sheet, and then those who have the same expert sheet move from the home group to a

separate expert group in which they then discuss their topic in detail. Once the discussion in the new group is complete, they return to their home group, and teach all their home group members about the topic that they are now expert in. Finally the groups are assessed, and individual grades are given.

Then, Slavin in 1986 modified Jigsaw II from the original method. This revised version of the method involves using computed team scores as for the STAD method. In addition Stahl developed Jigsaw III by adding the cooperative test review process in procedures of Jigsaw.

Some of advantages of jigsaw are as follows:

1. it is less threatening for many students,
2. it increases the amount of student participation in the classroom,
3. it reduces the teacher's dominance in the classroom,
4. it can successfully reduce students' reluctance to participate in the classroom activities and help create an active learner-centered atmosphere.

METHODOLOGY

The writer had gathered data and information about the students' problem in writing descriptive text through the small survey, and planned to solve the difficulties faced by the students in writing by using Jigsaw III method. This research contained of 2 cycles to see any the improvement of students' writing ability in writing descriptive text during the implementation of Jigsaw III method.

Before conducting the treatment in cycle I, the writer had given a pre-test to the students. It was done to know the ability of the students in writing descriptive text before implementing the method.

Then, to know the students' proficiency, the writer gave them treatments in writing descriptive text by using Jigsaw III method. The steps of the method were drawn as follows:

1. Formation of home group and pre-work.
2. Expert sheet assigned to expert group.
3. Answer expert questions prior to returning to home group. The students are asked questions based on their expert sheet to check their understanding prior to returning to their home group.
4. Return to home groups to share their information with their group. The students return to their home group to teach their group, and to share information with each other in their home group.
5. Review process. The teacher reviews and clarifies any concepts which it appears the students did not understand.
6. Individual assessment and grade. Each student is reassessed using a post-test.

The implementation of the action was followed also by the observation process of which the result was delivered into observation sheet. The students' and the teacher's activities were recorded by the collaborator in the observation sheets, and the situation in the class was recorded in the field notes during the treatment.

After conducting the treatment and recording the activities during the treatment in the observation sheets, then the result was collected as raw data of the research and was analyzed to find out whether the students showed a good progress in writing a descriptive text or not. Both researcher and observer analyzed the activity in cycle 1 through the observation sheets and field notes. The observer gave comments about the teacher's performance and added any other improvement in using Jigsaw III method in the classroom.

The writer decided to continue to the cycle 2 if the result of the quantitative and qualitative data in the cycle 1 did not show a significant improvement yet. In this cycle 2, the writer still used Jigsaw III method by rearranged the planning to improve the ability of students in writing skill.

In addition to this, the quantitative data of this study was collected through the writing test (Pre-Test, Post-Test I, and Post-Test II), and the qualitative data was collected by the recording of activity during the treatment by using the observation sheets and field notes. For the rating scales, the three assigned raters had used the scoring from Hughes (1989), in which the holistic scoring rubrics are used to assess the students' competency in certain features of writing: grammar, vocabulary, mechanics, form/organization, and fluency of communication.

FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Pre-test was given before Jigsaw III method used by the writer. The purpose was to know the students' base score in writing descriptive text. The quantitative data of the pre-test can be seen as the following table:

No	Score	Ability Level	F	P
1	80-100	Good to excellent	-	-
2	60-79	Average to good	-	-
3	50-59	Poor to average	2	5%
4	0-49	Poor	38	95%
Total			40	100%

From the table above, we could say that almost all of the students had poor ability in writing descriptive text before implementing Jigsaw II method. The result of pre-test which they had done before doing the treatments showed that only two students almost reached the average level of ability. Here, the mean of students' score was about 31.75 and there was no student achieved the standard minimum criteria of achievement (KKM) which was about ≥ 70 .

In this discussion the writer began to apply Jigsaw III method in order to increase the students' writing ability. There were three meetings in each cycle. Every meeting had 90 minutes. The writer was observed the students' activity. The observation result can be seen as the following table:

No	Activities	The Activeness					
		1st Meeting		2nd Meeting		3rd Meeting	
		F	P	F	P	F	P
1.	Identifying the topic and organize to sit in group (pre writing –brainstorming)	34	85%	36	90%	35	87.5
2.	Expert group discussion (sharing)	32	80%	34	85%	33	82.5%
3.	Home group reporting (sharing and editing)	33	82.5%	34	85%	35	87.5%
4.	Testing (write descriptive text)	40	100%	40	100%	40	100%
Average		34,75	86.88 %	36	90 %	35,75	89.38 %
Total		88.75%					

Based on the data above, it could be concluded that there were 88.75% of the students did the stages well. Few students didn't do discussion in both home and expert group. They just submitted their testing.

During a process of treatment in cycle 1, the writer needed to ask a collaborator to fill in Field Note sheets for each meeting. It was used to observe and to cross check the atmosphere in the classroom activities. The collaborator was an English teacher in class of VIII.6. The result for classroom activities can be seen as follow:

At the first meeting, the observer noted that there were only several students who was getting involved in the process of learning. Some students were still confuse about the method. Besides, the teacher could not handle the students well so many students making noise in the class.

At the second meeting, the teacher began to be more confident during explaining the material and the method. Then, the students looked like interested to their own groups. But there were several students who couldn't cooperative well with their partner. Then at the third meeting, the students were able to do all the procedures of method well.

The students were also assigned to do the exercises given by the writer. The exercises were collected and the writer and English teacher calculated the students' worksheet. The average result of students' score during treatments in cycle one could be seen as the following table:

No	Score	Ability Level	F	P
1	80-100	Good to excellent	-	-
2	60-79	Average to good	1	2.5%
3	50-59	Poor to average	10	25%
4	0-49	Poor	29	72,5%

Total	40	100%
-------	----	------

Note:

F= Frequency

P= Percentage

Here, the mean of students' summative score during treatments in cycle one was about 46.25. The students who had the level ability average to good was about 25%.

After doing this research from pre-test to three times of treatment in cycle one, the writer found that the students' score for each treatment and students' writing ability by using Jigsaw III Method was still not good enough, or need an improvement. Therefore, based on the result of observation above, it was needed to rearrange the planning of the implementation the method for the next cycle. So, it was hoped that the students could reached better result and motovation in order to have a significant improvement.

In order to get the better result, here were the several things that would be applied in the second cycle:

- a. Jigsaw III method was still used in the second cycle but on different topics around descriptive texts.
- b. The topic should be given at one day before doing the meeting. So, the students was able to find the information that was related to the topic.
- c. Teacher should more confident in the process of learning, and needed more interesting explanation for the students. She should control the classroom activities more well and engage more the students' motivation.

For the result of observation sheet and field note in cycle two, it was found that the teacher's and students' activities in teaching and learning process was obviously better than cycle one. The progression could be seen on observation sheets and field notes that collaborator made during the class activities for the fourth to the sixth meeting.

The observation result can be seen as the following table:

No	Activities	The Activeness					
		4th Meeting		5th Meeting		6th Meeting	
		F	P	F	P	F	P
1.	Identifying the topic and organize to sit in group (pre writing-brainstorming)	38	95%	38	95%	38	95%
2.	Expert group discussion (sharing)	33	82.5%	35	87.5%	37	92.5%
3.	Home group reporting (sharing-editing)	35	87.5%	36	90%	38	95%
4.	Testing (write descriptive text)	40	100%	40	100%	40	100%
Average		36.5	91.25%	37.25	93.13%	38.25	95.63%
Total		93.34%					

From the data above, there were 93.34% of the students did the stages well. It showed that the students' participation in doing the treatments in cycle two was increasing compared with students' participation in cycle one, even still was found the few of students did not do the activities in both home and expert group.

Then, the process and result of field notes in cycle two could be interpreted as follows:

At the fourth meeting, teacher performance during teaching was more getting better in giving materials. There were almost a lot of students paid attentions to the teacher's lecture. Because of the topic was given a day before continuing to the next meeting, Students were able to get information which was related to the topic easily. The lack of teacher in this meeting was he didn't explained students about the difficult words, he also let students' did the Jigsaw by themselves. It was proved the students couldn't cooperative well with their group.

During the fifth treatment, the teacher seemed more confident and attractive. The students still found the information that was related to the topic at home. They also could cooperative well with their friends in the both home and expert group. The teacher controlled well the students and helped the students to find the difficult words.

At the last treatment, Students were accustomed to use Jigsaw method. It would not take a long time for the teacher to explain what they should do. They didn't spent a lot of time to start the composition and wrote it down into several systematically ideas. Then the teacher could handle the students very well.

In short, the students were interested more to the lesson and the topic that teacher gave. They also could cooperative well in their group. Then, the teacher was able to handle the class well.

The students' progress could be seen from the result of average score during doing treatments in cycle two as the following table:

No	Score	Ability Level	F	P
1	80-100	Good to excellent	-	-
2	60-79	Average to good	13	32.5%
3	50-59	Poor to average	23	57,5%
4	0-49	Poor	4	10%
Total			40	100%

Then, in cycle two, the writer decided to give the students post-test in order to look the students' improvement during did the treatments in two cycle and to compare the achievement with the result of pre-test. The result of post-test could be interpreted in the table as below:

No	Score	Ability Level	F	P
a1	80-100	Good to excellent	-	-
2	60-79	Average to good	40	100%
3	50-59	Poor to average	-	-
4	0-49	Poor	-	-
Total			40	100%

Note:

F= Frequency

P= Percentage

From the table above, we could see that 100% of the students achieved average to good level with score 60-79 for their writing ability. Here, the mean of post-test was about 70.36. Then, there were 20 students or about 50% of students could achieve the standard minimum criteria of achievement (KKM). So, Jigsaw III method was able and suitable to be used in increasing the writing ability of the second grade of SMPN 20 Pekanbaru in writing descriptive text.

The writer analyzed the data based by comparing the result of pre-test and post-test . The comparison of average score between both of tests can be seen in table below.

Pre-test Average Score	Post-test Average Score
31.75	70.36

The different mean both of scores is 38.61. Here the writer decided to stop her observation in cycle two.

CONCLUSION

After conducting this classroom action research, writer concludes that the use of Jigsaw III method in writing descriptive text can improve the students' ability. It was clearly proven by the improvement in average score of the student from 31.75 (Pre-test) up to 70.36(Post – test 2).

This method helps students to find a lot of ideas by sharing with their friend in both home and expert group. Then, it also helps the student be more active and make the students are able to cooperative well with their friends.

IMPLICATION

Based on the findings and conclusion above, the writer implicated that Jigsaw III Method can be used to improve the writing ability of the second year students of SMPN 20 Pekanbaru in writing Descriptive text.

SUGGESTION

The writer would like to deliver some suggestions as follows:

1. It is suggested that in teaching writing, the English teachers should use the appropriate method for teaching in order to make the lesson more interesting. The teachers may consider using Jigsaw III as one of the alternative methods since the result can improve the writing ability of students by its steps that require students to be involved in learning process.
2. In applying Jigsaw III, the teacher should tell the students about the steps that they are going to do so that they are not confused. Then, the English teachers need to control and help the group discussion in order that this method runs well.
3. The English teacher should be able to create interesting and active classroom situation for the students in order to make the students enjoyable studying English.
4. Here, the writer also suggests the English teacher to provide more time for the students to learn and practice the writing skill. The English teacher should manage the time provided based on the need of the students. On the other words, English teacher can set the time for four skills of English based on the understanding of the students. It's better to provide more time for students in writing since it seems more difficult for the students rather than other skills.

REFERENCES

- Angel, Heny. 2011. http://www.jigsaw/advantages_and_disadvantages/advantages-and-disadvantages-of-jigsaw.htm
- Aronson, Elliot. 2010. *Jigsaw Classroom*. <http://www.jigsaw.org/>
- Barbara, Tewksbury. *The Jigsaw Technique*. <http://serc.carleton.edu/NAGTWorkshops/coursedesign/tutorial/jigsaw.html>
- Broward. 2010. *Jigsaw*. <http://rshackelford.iweb.bsu.edu/ITEDU691/jigsaw.pdf>
- Ferrance, Eileen. 2000. *Action Research*. Providence: LAB at Brown University.
- Guy, L.R, and Arasian, P. 2000. *Educational Research Competence for Analysis and Application*. New Jersey: Meril Publishing Company.
- Harris, David. 1974. *Teaching English as a Second Language*. New York: Mc. GrawHill Book Company.

- Hartono, Rudi. 2005. *Genres of Text*. Semarang: Semarang State University.
- Heaton, J.B. 1975. *Writing English Language Test*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornby, A.S. 2002. *Oxford Advanced Learner' Dictionary of Current English Sixth Edition*. New York: Oxford university press.
- Huda, Miftahul. M.Pd. 2011. *Cooperative Learning Metode, Teknik, Struktur dan Model Penap Penerapan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Hughes, Arthur. 1989. *Testing for Language Teacher*. Cambridge: University press
- Jansoon, Ninna et al .2008. [www.recsam.edu.my/R&D_Journals/.../jigsaw\(178-200\).pdf](http://www.recsam.edu.my/R&D_Journals/.../jigsaw(178-200).pdf)
- Kemmis, Stephen, Robin McTaggart. 1988. *The Action Research Planner*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- Orlich, Donald C et al. 2010. *Teaching Strategies: A Guide to Effective Instruction*. United States of America: Wadsworth
- Ozbourne, Erwan. 2012. [http://www.jigsaw/related_theory/Applying the Jigsaw Method in Teaching Writing of Descriptive Texts in 7 State Senior High School of Depok.htm](http://www.jigsaw/related_theory/Applying_the_Jigsaw_Method_in_Teaching_Writing_of_Descriptive_Texts_in_7_State_Senior_High_School_of_Depok.htm)
- Raimes, A. 1983. *Technique in Teaching Writing*. New York: Oxford University Press. Kristono (1996:15)
- Sahin, Abdullah. 2010. www.academicjournals.org/ERR/PDF/Pdf%202010/.../Sahin.p
- Salvin, Robert E. 1995. *Cooperative learning Theory, Research and Practice*. Second Edition. London: The Johns Hopkins University.
- Smalley, Regina L. 2001. *Refining Composition Skills Rhetoric and Grammar*. United States of America: Heinle & Heinle Publisher.
- Spancer, Kagan. 1992. *Cooperative Learning*. http://mlab.taik.fi/polut/Yhteisollinen/tyokalu_jigsaw.html
- Sudijono, Anas. 2010, *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Susan, 2010. *Version of Jigsaw*. <http://www.public.asu.edu/~ledlow/sledlow/jigsaw.htm>
- Petty, T. Walner and M. Jensen, Julie. 1980. *Ways of Writing*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon. Inc.
- Yudi, Bambang C. 2010. *The Teaching of English Language Skills and English Language Components*. Malang: State University of Malang Press.

Yudi, Bambang C. 1997. *Pengajaran Bahasa Inggris, Stratefy dan Hasil Penelitian*. Malang: IKIP.

Zahrah, Raudhatuz. 2009. <http://www.jigsaw/related%20theory/1030.htm>

<http://understandingtext.blogspot.com/2010/08/example-of-short-descriptive-text-about.html>

<http://www.celea.org.cn/teic/92/10120608.pdf>