Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics and Literature

Journal homepage: journal.iainlhokseumawe.ac.id

Improving Students' Learning Outcomes through Jigsaw Method: A Classroom Action Research at SMPN 8 Satap Woja

Saidatul Kainati[1*]

[1*]*SMP N 8 Satap Woja, Dompu, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia, 84251.*

ARTICEL INFO

Keywords:
Jigsaw Method
Junior High School
Classroom Action Research
Students' Lerning Outcomes

History:
Received (17 September 2022)
Revised (8 January 2023)
Accepted (11 January 2023)

ABSTRACT

This research is prompted by the issues that arise at SMPN 8 Satap Woja, specifically the fact that after the teacher integrates English learning on the teacher-suggested materials, student learning outcomes remain low. That is evident from both the teacher's observations and the students' learning outcomes that merely a small number of students are engaged in class. Student activity is important to the learning process because it influences learning outcomes. In addition, student interest and response have a significant impact on the achievement of learning outcomes during the learning process. As a result of being aware of the aforementioned issues, a teacher feels compelled to improve lessons by conducting research. This study is a classroom action research utilizing the Jigsaw method to enhance student learning outcomes for at SMPN 8 Satap Woja. This study has been conducted in two cycles. Based on the analysis of data in this study, Jigsaw research could indeed improve student learning outcomes. The implementation of the Jigsaw method model can increase student participation. The Jigsaw learning model can enhance student learning outcomes, as evidenced by the pre-test average of 47%, cycle 1: 58%, and cycle 2: 70.5%.

INTRODUCTION

As teachers, educators, and instructors are agents of societal change, within the realm of education, the function that instructors play is one that is both significant and purposeful (Bautista, 2019). According to Kostoulas et al., (2019) and Rahmah & Ilham (2022), teachers have the power to alter the mentalities, attitudes, thus, educational institution nowdays and age ought to have undergone some sort of revitalization or innovation in order to train students to become valuable human resources. This may get started in the classroom by introducing new ideas and activities that are creative and innovative for both teaching and learning (Seechaliao, 2017; Yusridawati, 2022; Sari et al., 2022). Teachers are not required to keep to a single method in the course of teaching and learning activities; rather, they should use a variety of ways to ensure that the learning process is not monotonous (Van Alten et al., 2019).

One of the most essential factors that contributes to the success of the teaching and learning process is the pleasant connection that exists between instructors and pupils (Rahman & Yuzar, 2020). The interaction process that is in question is not simply a relationship between teachers and students and the delivery of subject matter; rather, it takes the form of educative interactions (e.g. question-answer, turn-taking, negotiation and feedback) that aim to cultivate an attitude of confidence in students, respect the learning process, and be meaningful in day-to-day life (Lian et al., 2020; Yuliza, 2022; Muntasir et al., 2022). One of the reasons for the poor quality of learning outcomes is because teachers are unable to examine teaching materials and apply appropriate learning models that are in accordance with teaching materials (Van Alten et al., 2019; Khamroev, 2021; Saputra & Muntasir, 2021). Thus, this is one of the causes of the low quality of learning outcomes.

Jigsaw cooperative learning was chosen as the learning approach to apply in this investigation. The Jigsaw approach was invented by Elliot Aronson and adopted by Slavin and colleagues (Nalls & Wickerd, 2022). Many experts provided the useful suggestions in using Jogsaw technique, as a teaching strategy, the Jigsaw method begins with the pupils being split up into heterogeneously diverse little groups of five to six individuals each (Aronson, 1978; Ab Murat, 2008; Blajvaz et al., 2022). Students receive their assigned reading material in the form of a text that has been broken up into multiple sub-chapters for easier comprehension. Every member of the group has been tasked with reading the sub-chapters and is accountable for studying the various sections that have been provided to them. Participants from various groups take part in the activity. In addition, every member of the group who is accountable for the same sub-chapter participates in a meeting of an expert group (Aronson, 2022). They have a conversation on the information that has been read and falls under their duty. Following completion of their deliberations on the topic at hand within the expert group, members of the group revert back to the initial group. In addition, the outcomes of the conversation held inside each expert group are relayed by every member of the group.

Learning outcomes, in accordance with Adam's (2004) definition, are the manifestation of change in a person's behavior that is observable and measurable in terms of their knowledge, attitudes, and abilities. These shifts have the potential to be understood as an improvement and progression that is superior to what existed previously; however, there are some who do not recognize this. The term "learning outcomes" refers to the maximum results that a student has attained after going through the teaching and learning process in the process of studying a specific subject matter (Hussey & Smith, 2003). These results can be understood as "learning outcomes." Learning outcomes are not absolute in the form of values; rather, they might take the form of changes, reasoning, self-discipline, abilities, and so on that lead to positive improvements in one's life (Erikson & Erikson, 2019).

The process of determining the worth of student learning through assessment activities or measurement of learning outcomes is referred to as understanding learning outcomes (or simply learning outcomes). On the basis of the prior knowledge, learning outcomes can shed light on the primary objective, which is to ascertain the level of success achieved by students after participating in a learning activity (Falchikov & Goldfinch, 2000), with the success rate being then marked by a value scale in the form of letters, words, or symbols (Al-Thani et al., 2014; Premalatha, 2019; Yuzar, 2022). The learning outcomes that an individual is able to accomplish are the product of the interaction of a number of different elements that have an effect on them from within (internal factors) as well as from without (external factors). Aspects of the pupils themselves, most notably their skills and capacities. The factor of the student's ability has a significant impact on the learning results that are accomplished.

METHODS

This study is an illustration of classroom action research, famously known as CAR. CAR is characterized by the fact that it is conducted multiple times in order to obtain the desired educational objectives. The cyclical action stage will serve as the blueprint for the implementation of this classroom action study. The spiral modification described by Kemmis and McTaggart is the one that this study model is referring to (Altrichter et al., 2002). Each cycle is completed by working through a number of steps, the first of which is the planning stage, the second is an action phase, the third one is observing and concluded by the reflection stage. This study was carried out within one classroom, with twenty students junior high school students at SMPN 8 Satap Woja. There were eight female students and twelve male students participated in the study. All of these students are currently enrolled in the 2022/2023 academic year. This particular class has been selected as the

: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v3i1.671

focus of research due to the fact that the level of activity and the low learning outcomes in general have not yet achieved the Minimum Standard Score.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The activities of cycle I and cycle II are described in this part of the paper. At the planning stage, researcher created learning tools such as lesson plans, test questions, and supporting teaching materials. Then, it was followed by the activity and implementation phase.

Cycle I

The teaching and learning activities were implemented in class VIII with 20 students on August 23, 2022. In this case, the researcher takes on the role of a teacher. The lesson plans that have been prepared are referred to as the teaching and learning process. Concurrently with teaching and learning activities, observations are conducted. Further, students were given a formative test 1 at the end of the teaching and learning process to assess and determine their level of success in the teaching and learning process that has been carried out.

According to the percentage of students who have completed their learning out of a total of 20, barely half of the students have completed the teaching-learning process. Moreover, in the teaching and learning process, information is derived from observations. It has been discovered that students are less committed to the teaching and learning process, resulting in a decrease in the teacher's motivation to deliver the learning objectives. In addition, it has been determined that the teacher is poor at time management, and as a consequence, some of the students are less enthusiastic to follow the learning process. Because the implementation of teaching and learning activities in Cycle 1 is still inadequate, improvements will be required in the subsequent cycle. As a result, it is hoped that teacher would improve her ability to motivate pupils and provide clearer explanations of learning objectives. The instructor is then responsible for time management by incorporating essential information and providing notes. Equally important is that teachers improve their capacity to motivate themselves and their degree of enthusiasm.

Table 1. The Result from Cycle I and II.

NO	Students	Score			Description
		Preliminary	Cycle 1	Cycle 2	
1	AI	20	25	45	incomplete
2	AM	30	40	65	complete
3	AS	20	30	45	Incomplete
4	AU	20	35	60	Incomplete
5	AM	25	40	60	incomplete
6	AR	35	50	75	complete
7	FZ	50	70	80	complete
8	FD	50	70	80	complete
9	IN	80	86	95	complete
10	IR	20	40	50	incomplete
11	MA	80	85	95	complete
12	MU	85	90	95	complete
13	MWR	40	60	70	complete
14	NBO	85	90	95	complete
15	SKN	80	85	90	complete
16	SS	75	80	85	complete
17	SN	20	30	60	complete
18	SU	50	70	80	complete
19	YUD	75	80	85	complete
20	YUN	-	-	-	incomplete

: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v3i1.671

Cycle II

A total of twenty students participated in the second cycle, which began on August 24, 2022 at SMPN 8 Satap Woja and was conducted in class VIII. During this stage of the process, the researcher develops learning resources such as lesson plans, exam questions, and other supplementary instructional resources. The teaching and learning process makes reference to the modified lesson plans from cycle I, with the goal of ensuring that the problems that were present in cycle I do not appear in cycle II. Concurrently with the delivery of instruction and the acquisition of knowledge, observations and observations are carried out. According to the degree to which students in a group of 20 have mastered the material, 14 of the students, or 70 percent, have done so, while 6 of the students, or 30 percent, have not completed their learning process. The following is an explanation of how the results of the second cycle came out: the maximum score possible was 95, the lowest score possible was 45, and the average grade was 70.5%.

CONCLUSION

It is possible to draw the following conclusion based on the findings of classroom action research that was carried out in two cycles at SMPN 8 Satap Woja that the Jigsaw cooperative learning model has the potential to improve the learning outcomes of students in class VIII at SMPN 8 Satap Woja. The average score on the pre-test was 47%, in the cycle I was 58% and in the cycle II was 70.5% respectively. In addition, there were 10 students who finished the teaching-learning process in Cycle I, making up 50% of the total number of students. In Cycle II, however, there were 14 students who finished the teaching-learning process, making up 70% of the total number of students.

REFERENCES

Ab Murat, N. B. (2008). Learning through teaching and sharing in the jigsaw classroom. *Annals of Dentistry University of Malaya*, *15*(2), 71-76.

Adam, S. (2004). Using learning outcomes. In *Report for United Kingdom Bologna Seminar* (pp. 1-2). Edinburgh, UK: Heriot-Watt University (Edinburgh Conference Centre).

Al-Thani, S. J., Abdelmoneim, A., Daoud, K., Cherif, A., & Moukarzel, D. (2014). A perspective on student learning outcome assessment at Qatar University. *Quality in Higher Education*, *20*(3), 255-271. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13538322.2014.964079

Altrichter, H., Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Zuber-Skerritt, O. (2002). The concept of action research. *The learning organization*. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/09696470210428840

Aronson, E. (1978). *The jigsaw classroom*. SAGE.

Aronson, E. (2002). Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the jigsaw classroom. In *Improving academic achievement* (pp. 209-225). Academic Press. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012064455-1/50013-0

Ayunigtyas, D.I. (2012). Politeness Strategy in Request: Does It Always Work Well? *Prosodi: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa dan Sastra*, 6(2), 1-10. DOI: https://doi.org/10.21107/prosodi.v6i2.54

Bautista, A., Habib, M., Eng, A., & Bull, R. (2019). Purposeful play during learning centre time: From curriculum to practice. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *51*(5), 715-736. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00220272.2019.1611928

: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v3i1.671

Blajvaz, B. K., Bogdanović, I. Z., Jovanović, T. S., Stanisavljević, J. D., & Pavkov-Hrvojević, M. V. (2022). The Jigsaw Technique in Lower Secondary Physics Education: Students' Achievement, Metacognition and Motivation. *Journal of Baltic Science Education*, *21*(4), 545-557.

Erikson, M. G., & Erikson, M. (2019). Learning outcomes and critical thinking–good intentions in conflict. *Studies in Higher Education*, *44*(12), 2293-2303. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2018.1486813

Falchikov, N., & Goldfinch, J. (2000). Student peer assessment in higher education: A meta-analysis comparing peer and teacher marks. *Review of educational research*, *70*(3), 287-322. DOI: https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070003287

Hussey, T., & Smith, P. (2003). The uses of learning outcomes. *Teaching in higher education*, *8*(3), 357-368. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510309399

Khamroev, A. (2021). Quality and effectiveness for design of learning outcomes in the language teaching. *Academicia: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *11*(1), 549-558. DOI: 10.5958/2249-7137.2021.00085.9

Kostoulas, A., Babić, S., Glettler, C., Karner, A., Mercer, S., & Seidl, E. (2019). Lost in research: educators' attitudes towards research and professional development. *Teacher Development*, *23*(3), 307-324. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13664530.2019.1614655

Lian, B., Kristiawan, M., Primasari, D. A. G., & Prasetyo, M. A. M. (2020). Teachers' model in building students' character. *Journal of Critical Reviews*, *7*(14), 927-932. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.31838/jcr.07.14.165

Muntasir, M., Rahman, F., & Haekal, M. (2022). THE EFFECTS OF CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK ON FLUENCY AND ACCURACY IN 4/3/2 ACTIVITY: A CASE OF STUDENTS AT ELTO SPELL-OUT PROGRAM. *Elite: English and Literature Journal*, *9*(1), 42-54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.24252/elite.v9i1.26526

Nalls, A. J., & Wickerd, G. (2022). The Jigsaw Method: Reviving a Powerful Positive Intervention. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 1-17. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/15377903.2022.2124570

Premalatha, K. (2019). Course and program outcomes assessment methods in outcome-based education: A review. *Journal of Education*, *199*(3), 111-127. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0022057419854351

Rahmah, S., & Ilham, M. (2022). Management of Students' Religious Culture. *Development: Studies in Educational Management and Leadership*, *1*(1), 39–54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47766/development.v1i1.644

Rahman, F., & Yuzar, E. (2020). Students' Perception towards NNESTs & NESTs' Teaching Styles: A Study at State Islamic University of Ar-Raniry. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, *4*(2), 321-335. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.21093/ijeltal/v4i2.516

Saputra, N., & Muntasir, M. (2021). The Integration of Mind Mapping Technique in Storytelling to Assist EFL students in Mastering Speaking Skill. *International Journal of Education, Language, and Religion*, *3*(2), 49-54. DOI: https://doi.org/10.35308/ijelr.v3i2.4460

Sari, M. P., Putri, N. H., Zahriana, E., & Safwan, M. (2022). Picture and Picture Learning Model to Improve Students' Achievement in Writing Recount Text. *JETLEE: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, *2*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v2i1.251

Seechaliao, T. (2017). Instructional strategies to support creativity and innovation in education. *Journal of education and learning*, *6*(4), 201-208. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v6n4p201

: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v3i1.671

Van Alten, D. C., Phielix, C., Janssen, J., & Kester, L. (2019). Effects of flipping the classroom on learning outcomes and satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Educational Research Review*, *28*, 100281. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2019.05.003

Yuliza, Y. (2022). Education Planning Curriculum Based on Technology: Impact Evaluation. *Development: Studies in Educational Management and Leadership*, *1*(1), 55–74. DOI: https://doi.org/10.47766/development.v1i1.642

Yusridawati, Y. (2022). Improving Students' Speaking Ability Through Demonstration Method:(A Case Study of Junior High School Students). *JETLEE: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, *2*(1). DOI: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v2i1.211

Yuzar, E. (2022). Classroom Evaluation: Learners' Perspectives on The Teaching Approach in A Second Language Writing Course. *JETLEE: Journal of English Language Teaching, Linguistics, and Literature*, *2*(2). DOI: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v2i2.484

: https://doi.org/10.47766/jetlee.v3i1.671