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#### Abstract

Hasnawati, 2019. Increasing Students’ Speaking Skill By Using Jigsaw Technique At The Eleventh Grade Students Of Senior High School 4 Palopo. Thesis, English Study Program Tarbiyah and Teachers Training Faculty State Islamic Institute of Palopo.Supervised by: (1) Dr. Muhaemin, M.A. and (2) Dewi Furwana, S.Pd.I,M.Pd.
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This thesis dealt with Increasing Students' Speaking Skill By Using Jigsaw Tekhnique At The Eleventh Grade Students of Senior High School 4 Palopo. The problem statement of the reserach can the jigsaw technique able to increase student's speaking skill at the eleventh grade students of senior high school 4 Palopo. The objective of the reasearch was to find out whether or not jigsaw technique increase student's speaking skill at the eleventh grade student's of senior high school 4 Palopo.

This research applied quasi experimental. The population of this research was the eleventh grade students of senior high school 4 palopo. The number of population was 200 students. The samples were class XI IPA 1 consisted of 20 students as experimental group and class XI IPA 4 consisted of 20 students as control group.The sampling technique in this research was purposive sampling. The instrument of the research was speaking test. The researcher gave pretest and posttest to the students.

The result showed that the mean score of posttest in experimental qroup was higher than the mean score of posttest ( $63.60>39.25$ ). While the mean score of posttest in control group was 39.25 and the mean score of pretest was 36.65 . The result of statistical analysis the experimental group for level of significance 0.05 with degree of freedom (df) $=19$; the probability value was smaller than $\alpha$ $0.00<0.5$ and the result of statistical analysis the control class in which the probability value was lower than $\alpha .0 .00>0.05$. As a result, there is a significant difference in speaking increase between the students who are taught by using jigsaw tekhnique and those who are taught by non-using jigsaw tekhnique. Based on the result of this research, the researcher concluded that jigsaw techhnique can increase the students' speaking skill.

## CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

## A. Background

English Language is very important to be learned because English Language is internasional language, it means by knowing English well you be also to communicate will the foreigners with different language and culture. In Indonesia English is the first foreign language that taught at school and it is considered as an important subject to acquire the knowledge, and to develop technology, art, and culture. English is one of object which is taught from kindergarten school until university. Based on the school curriculum for English, teaching English is a subject that is consist of four skills such as listening, speaking, reading and writing. Moreover, there are some elements of language that should be taught to develop there three component they are : Accuracy, Fluncy, and Comprehensibility.

How to communicate with people to inform the speaker idea to the listener or the other person. Often people help someone from the skill to speak. However, students often feel anxious to practice speaking in class. This can be modified by internal problems such as low help and ability. An external problem arises teachers are limited on innovative and usable strategies Speaking. The lessons that have been so often used are the lessons that only accept what the teacher is saying and do whatever is used to learn. Then of the learning techniques should be developed because the current eye English lessons especially the skill to speak need teachers to understand how to teach smoothness and accuracy; how
to use transactional text; and how to increase students' motivation to speak English into a habit. ${ }^{1}$

To overcome this ther a teachers should think creatively so that students no longer feel the things that reduce the interest of students to learn better, for example by changing the way students learn in the beginning. Students learn individually and then teach lecturers to students study group (cooperative learning) or commonly called jigsaw technique.
"cooperative learning teachers should be available to the student team, but students must also learn to rely on individual students besides their teachers ".

According to Arends (1997) cooperative learning or commonly called jigsaw technique should consist of groups and students more active role than the teacher. Learning process by using jigsaw can help students in understanding the material facilitate students in solving problems together with other students who joined in one group. In this case the teacher can use jigsaw technique. In cooperative learning type jigsaw activities there are groups of origin and group of experts. Each member of the expert group is in charge of explaining the discussion material to the group origin. This is what encourages students to participate actively. Cooperative advantages of the jigsaw type are to enhance students' sense of responsibility for their own learning as well as the learning of others.

The jigsaw structure promotes positive interdependence and also provides a simple method to ensure individual accountability. First introduced by Aronson, et
al. (1978) the basic premis of jigsaw is to divide a problem into sections, one for each group member. Each student receives resources to complete only his/her part. The students who are responsible for the same section join together and form a new, temporary focus group whose purpose is for the students to master the concepts in their section, and to develop a strategy for teaching what they have learned to the other students in their original collaborative learning group. ${ }^{2}$

The ability to speak English is very important because by having the skill to speak English well can help us in communicating with strangers from anywhere because English is a language that is widely used or learned in all countries so that's why English is called the language of the world so very it is important for a teacher to be able to teach or better to mention the ability to speak to his students because we already know together that English is the world language (international) used in all countries but there are still some of the teachers who just just teach but do not pay attention to whether the students has been able to use or speak English well or not and based on the results of research at the location of researchers to get results that the existing constraints that occur is the lack of interest of students in English subjects du e to one factor lack of ino vative of the teacher when teaching the English language lack of techniques or methods that teachers use so that students sometimes feel bored and in the ability to speak the lack of time students are given so that students are less able to feel the skill speech.

[^0]
## B. Problem Statement

Based on the background above the research questions is formulated as follow can the jigsaw technique increase students speaking skill at the eleventh grade studemts of senior high school 4 palopo?

## C. Objective of the Research

Based on the problems statement above the objective of the research is focus as follow to find out whether or not the use of jigsaw technique can improve student's speaking skill?

## D. Significance of the Research

The results of this study are expected to provide many benefits for various parties, both practical and theoretical.

1. Theoretically: Theoretically, this research is expected to know the principle of improving students' speaking skill with the application of jigsaw technique in learning
2. Practically : The results of this research are expected to provide benefits as follows:
a). For students:

Application of cooperative method of Jigsaw model in teaching speaking skills can increase students' interest and activity so that their speaking abilities can increase.
b). For teachers / collaborators:

The results of this study can me provide direct experience to teachers to develop less innovative and process-oriented learning methods so that their learning quality can increase.
c). For school :

The results of this study can be used as a reference in the effort to procure innovation learning for other teachers and also motivating them to always innovate to find the most appropriate and effective learning method.
d). For researchers :

For researchers it becomes an effort to examine the scholarship related to students' speaking skills, especially the students of the School.

## E. Scope of the Research

By discipline, this research under applied English Language Teaching, by activity, this research used jigsaw technique in teaching speaking, by content, this research focused on speaking skill which consist of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility.

## F. Definition of the Term

Based on the tittles is Increasing students'speaking skill by using jigsaw technique at the eleventh grade students of senior high school number 4 palopo The researcher gives the definition as follow:

## 1. Speaking Skill

Speaking is a process where by we can interact with others and produce an appropriate outcome in want of a good talking impact as well as we will be good
example of someone asking us by using language and a clear and clear way of speaking so that we will communicate or interact accordingly with what we expect with others that is discussed discussions will be able to connect.

## 2. Jigsaw Technique

Jigsaw is a learning technique that is used in the learning process the learning process takes place students are divided into groups where one group consists of $4-5$ people whose groups are 5 and each a method of organizing classroom activity that makes students dependent on each other to succed. It breaks classes into groups and breaks assigmments into peaces that the groups assembles to complete the jigsaw (Puzzle). group has different material to be discussed in the classroom according to what the teacher has given and said.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

## A. Some Previous Related Research Findings

Nina Puspitaloka (2014) Based on the results of the research, the overall results of this study can be concluded as follows: from computed t-Test comparable with t-Table, it can be concluded that jigsaw activity technique can improve academic ability of student of study program of UNSIKA. In other words, teaching with jigsaw activity techniques will be more effective than using conventional learning. ${ }^{3}$

Gatot Suherman (2010) Based on the results of classroom action research conducted in two cycles, it can be concluded that learning to speak by using jigsaw type cooperative learning techniques can improve speaking skills in fourth grade students of SDN Sriwedari, Surakarta. The level of speaking can be proved by the value of talk machine in each cycle. Before the action average score of students skills 63,15 with $36,84 \%$ classical completeness. In the first cycle of average scholarship 68.21 with classical completeness $63.15 \%$. In the second cycle the average score of students' skills is 77.89 with classical completeness level of $78.94 \%{ }^{4}$

Sri Handayani (2008) The result of this research is the application of problem based learning model and cooperative learning (effective cooperative

[^1]learning) type jigsaw to improve student learning, student learning outcomes from cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects, and student response in subjects. economy. Suggestions in the study include: (1) for each level of educational unit and economic subject teachers that can be conditioned in the use of this learning model, (2) the application of PBL model and cooperative learning type Jigsaw wants to adjust to the lesson material, 3) for the MGM P to learn effective learning methods for economic subjects, including the PBL method and Jigsaw type cooperative learning, (4) for subsequent researchers to enable measurement of learning objectives to measure effectiveness.

From the statement above the researcher conclude that used jigsaw techniques in the teaching and learning process that jigsaw techniques have been proven able to increase students' skill in increase learning abilities expected by researchers and including speaking skills. The similarities of the three research and the results of the research of the three researchers above explain that the use of jigsaw techniques in the classroom as a technique to improve students 'ability in teaching and learning process has the same result that jigsaw technique proved capable and successful in improving students' learning ability and the difference from the results the above study is only in terms of the level of education and material used when using jigsaw techniques.

## B. Speaking

## 1. Definition Speaking

An act of communication through speaking is commonly performed in face to face intraction and occurs as a part of a dialogue or other form or verbal
exchange. ${ }^{5}$ It means that when people communicate or speak to the other people, there must be intraction among them. Language is means of communication for human beings that consists of four skills, they are listening, speaking, reading, and writing. ${ }^{6}$ Speaking a language is especially difficult for a language learnes because effective oral communication require the ability to use the Language appropriately in social intraction.

## 2. Component of Speaking

There are at least 3 components of speaking skill compherension, Accuracy and fluency.
a. Compherension is very important for oral communication to get good respond of speech, so, doesn't misunderstanding.
b. Fluence can be conveyed as the skill to speak fluently and accurately fluency in speaking is the aim of many students.
c. Accuracy is the state of being correct or exact and without error especially as result of careful effect.

## 3. The Teaching of Speaking

The mastery of speaking skill in English is apriority for many second language or foreign-language learners. ${ }^{7}$ Consequently, learners often evaluate

[^2]Their success in language learning as well as the effectiveness of their English course on the basis of how much they feel they have improved in their spoken language proficiency. ${ }^{8}$

Oral skills have hardly been neglected in EFL/ESL courses (witness the huge number of conversation and other speaking course books in the market), though how best to approach the teaching of oral skills has long been the focus of methodological debate. Teachers and textbooks make use of a variety of approaches, ranging from direct approaches focusing on specific features of oral interaction (e.g., turn-taking, topic management, and questioning strategies) to indicet approaches that create conditions for oral interaction trought group work, task work, and other strategies. Advances In discourse analysis, conversational analysis, and corpus analysis in recent years have revealated a great deal about the nature of spoken discourse and how it.

## 4. Types of Speaking

a. Monologue

In monologue, when one speaker uses spoken language for any length of time, as in speeches, lectures, reading, and hearers must process long stretches of speech without interruption the stream of speech will go on whether or monologue and unplanned monologue. The planned monologues differ considerably in their discourse structures. The unplanned monologue such as in speeches and other

[^3]prewriting material usually manifest little redundancy and are therefore relatively difficult to comprehend. ${ }^{9}$

## b. Dialogue

Dialogue involves two or more speakers can be subdivided into those exchanges that promote social relationship (interpersonal) and those for which the purpose is to convey proportional of factual information (transactional). In the dialogue, there are familiarity and unfamiliarity of interlocutors. If it is familiar, it will produce conversation with more assumption and implication. In addition, if it is unfamiliar the reference and meaning have to be made more explicit.

## C. Theories of Jigsaw

## 1. The Origin of Jigsaw

The jigsaw classroom was first used in 1971 in Austin, Texas. My graduate students and I had invented the jigsaw technique, as a matter of absolute necessity to help defuse an explosive situation. The city's schools had recently been desegregated, and because Austin had always been racially segregated, white youngsters, African-American youngsters, and Hispanic youngsters found themselves in the same class rooms for the first time. Within a few weeks, longstanding suspicion, fear, and distrust between groups produced an atmosphere of turmoil and hostility. Fist-fights erupted in corridors and schoolyards across the city. The school superintendent called me in to see if we could do anything to help students get along with one another. After observing what was going on in

[^4]classrooms for a few days, my students and I concluded that inter-group hostility was being fueled by the competitive environment of the classroom." ${ }^{10}$

## 2. Definition of Technique Jigsaw

Jigsaw is one cooperative learning in which students learn together in a group and responsible in understanding the materials for each other. According to spencer (1944), jigsaw is groups with five students are set up. Each group member is assigned some unique material to learn and then to teach his group members. To help in the learning, students across the class work on the same subsection get together to decide what is important and how to teach it. After practicing in these "expect" groups the original reform and students teach each other.

The purpose of jigsaw is to develop team work and cooperative learning skills within all students. Jigsaw helps to develop a depth of knowledge not possible if the students were tried and learnd the material on their own, because students are required to present their finding to home group. This technique will often disclose student's own understanding of a concept as well as reveal any misunderstanding.

## 3. The Steps of Jigsaw

a. Students form groups of 1-5 people
b. Everyone in the team, get different material
c. Members of other teams that have the same sub-material form a new group (expert group)

[^5]d. After the discussion is over the students go back to the original group and take turns teaching the teammates
e. Group representatives report on the work

## 4. The Benefit of Using Jigsaw

a. Positive interdependence, positive mutual respect with group members.
b. Face-to-face promotive interaction, must face each other as an interaction.
c. Individual and group accountability, sometimes working individually and also working for groups.
d. Interpersonal and small group skills, using interpersonal skills and small group skills.
e. Group processing, the occurrence of group processor at the time of discussion.

## D. Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of this research can be illustrared diagrammatically as follow:


## E. Hypotheses

Based on the literature that has been explained before, the researcher put
forward the hypotheses of the research as follows :

1. Null Hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$ : There is no a significant difference between the students' speaking skill who are taught through jigsaw technique and the students' speaking skill who are not taught through jigsaw technique
2. Alternative Hypothesis ( $\mathrm{HI}_{1}$ ): There is a significant difference between the students' speaking skill who are taught through jigsaw technique and the students' speaking skill who are not taught through jigsaw technique.

## F. Teaching Speaking Through Narrative Text

in this study researchers used a jigsaw technique where the jigsaw technique is a technique used by researchers who aim to be able to improve students' speaking skills at SMAN 4 Palopo where SMAN 4 Palopo is a place where researchers conduct the research process and in this study researchers take material to be tested or given to students is material about narrative text where from the material the researcher wants to see whether students' speaking skill can increase or not by using the jigsaw technique which is in line with one of the previous researchers who said because with the factors that influence speaking, storytelling is applied to teach narrative speaking in class to encourage students to talk.

As stated by Davis (2007: 4) telling stories grows from the playful element of human nature and satisfies the need for self-entertainment. In addition, students have become accustomed to storytelling because it has existed in culture since time immemorial, notes in storytelling have been found in many ancient cultures and languages, including Sanskrit, Old German, Latin, Chinese, Greek, Icelandic, and Old Slavonic (Davis, 2007: 3). That is why using storytelling is an effective way to teach narrative texts.

## CHAPTER III

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

## A. Research Design

This research would apply a quasi experimental research method. It will involve two group of students with pretest and posttest design. Quasiexperimental methods that involved the creation of a comparison group are most often used when it is not possible to randomize individuals or groups to treatment and control groups. This is always the case for ex-post impact evaluation designs. It may also be necessary to use quasi-experimental designs for ex-ante impact evaluations, for example, where ethical, political or logistical constraints, like the need for a phased geographical roll-out, rule out randomization. ${ }^{11}$

This research would apply quasi experimental method, whether the jigsaw technique can increase speaking skill students of the eleventh grade students in SMAN 4 PalopoThe formula as follow:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{E}=\mathrm{O}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{O}_{2} \\
& \mathrm{C}=\mathrm{O}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{O}_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{O}_{1} & =\text { Pre-test } \\
\mathrm{O}_{2} & =\text { Post-test }
\end{array}
$$

${ }^{11}$ Novia, Quasi Experimental Design and Methods, file:///C:/Users/NOVIA/Documents/New\%20folder/Downloads/QuasiExperimental Design_and Methods ENG.pdf. Accessed on $1{ }^{\text {th }}$ May 2018.

| E | $=$ Experimental class |
| :--- | :--- |
| C | $=$ Control class |
| X 1 | $=$ Treatment for experimental class |
| $\mathrm{X}_{2}$ | $=$ Treatment for control class |

## B. Variables

There two variables in this research namely independent variable and dependent variable. The independent variable the use of jigsaw technique and the dependent variable is the students' increase in speaking skill.

## C. Operational Definition of Variables

To make clear the variables in this research, the research describe the operational definition as follows :

1. Jigsaw technique is the technique that teacher use in the teaching in order to build up students speaking skill
2. The speaking skill is the students increase to speak accurate, fluent, and comprehensible.

## D. Population and Sample

1. Population

The population of the this research was the 20 students at the Eleventh grade students of SMAN 4 Palopo
2. Sample

In this research, the researcher applyed purposive sampling technique. The sample in this research was Eleventh grade students of SMAN 4 Palopo an object of this research. There was 20 students as sample.

## E. Instrument of the Research

The researcher conducted a speaking test. In conducting the test, the researcher gived a test to explain about the interesting experiences that have been passed by the students.

## F. Procedure in Collecting Data

This research activity begined with pre-test and ends with post-test. This research activity planned through several treatments. Any treatment conducted by researchers in learning can be described as follows:

1. Pre-test

At this stage, The teacher asked about the material to be taught, to test the extent to which students understand the material to be taught, as well as monitoring of students' circumstance will be examined and prepare all instruments.

## 2. Treatment

a. The first preparation to open the lesson, by greeting and praying together
b. Teacher checking student attendance and after that entering the material
c. After the teacher has finished explaining the teacher gives the students to ask what if there is from the material that has not been understood
d. After all students understand the teacher prepares the material ,.,according to what has been discussed previously
e. After that the teacher give instruction about the next learning that is by using technique that have prepared teacher that is jigsaw technique
f. The stages of the process of using jigsaw technique

1. Teachers instructed students to create groups of 1-5 people
2. Each people in the team get different material
3. Members from other teams that have the same sub-material form a new group (expert group) and discuss
4. After the discussion is finished the students return to the original group and alternate teammates from the origin
5. Group representatives report the results of their discussion.
g. The final stage the teacher again took over the class and again concluded from all the results discussed by the student earlier.

## 3. Post-test

The end of the treatments, both Experimental and Control group were given a post-test to check the influence of the treatments. In the posttest, the researcher used speaking test which supplied the same test in the pretest.

## G. Technique of Data Analysis

In speaking test, the researcher used the recorded data for tabulating and scoring the students' ability in speaking English during improvisation process.

## 1. Scoring and Tabulating Students' Speaking Test Result

The students' score described separately into the value of speaking accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. In measuring the students' speaking ability of accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility, the researcher used levels of classification scores as follows:

Table 3.1 Level of Classification Score of Accuracy
a. Accuracy

| Classification | Score | Criteria |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Excellent | 6 | Pronunciation only very slightly influence by the mother <br> tongue, two or three grammatical errors |
| Very good | 5 | Pronunciation is slightly influence by the mother tongue. <br> A few minor grammatical and lexical errors but most <br> utterance is correct. |
| Good | 4 | Pronunciation is still moderately influenced by the mother <br> tongue but no serious phonological errors. A few <br> grammatical and lexical errors some of which cause <br> confusing. |
| Average | 3 | Pronunciation seriously influenced by mother tongue. <br> Only a few serious phonological errors, and several <br> grammatical and lexical errors some of which cause <br> confusing. |
| Poor | 2 | Pronunciation seriously influenced by mother tongue with <br> errors causing a breakdown in communication many <br> "basic" grammatical and lexical errors. |
| Very poor mas pronunciation errors as well as many "basic" |  |  |

Table 3.2 Level of Classification Score of Fluency
b. Fluency

| Classification | Score | Criteria |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | Speak without too great an effort with a fairly wide range of expression. Search for word occasionally by only one or two unnatural pauses. |
| Very good | 5 | Has to make an effort at times to search for words. Nevertheless, smooth delivery on the whole and only a few unnatural pauses. |
| Good | 4 | Although he has to make an effort and search for words, there are not many unnatural pauses. Fairly smooth. Delivery mostly. Occasionally fragmentary but succeeds in conveying the general meaning. Fair range expression. |
| Average | 3 | Has to make an effort for much of time. Often has to search for desired meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost give up making the effort at times. Limited range of expression. |
| Poor | 2 | Long pauses while he searches for desire meaning. Frequently fragmentary and halting delivery. Almost give up making the effort at times. Limited range of expression. |
| Very poor | 1 | Full of long and unnatural pauses. Very halting and fragmentary delivery. At time gives up making the effort. Very limited range of expression. |

Table 3.3 Level of Classification Score of Comprehensibility
c. Comprehensibility

| Classification | Score |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Excellent 6 | Easy for the listener to understand the speaker, attention <br> and general meaning. Very few interruptions and <br> classification required. |
| Very good 50 | The speakers' intention and general meaning are fairly <br> clear. A few interruptions by listeners for sake of <br> clarification are necessary |
| Good | Most of what the speaker says is easy to follow. His <br> intention is always clear but several interruptions are |
| necessary to help him to convey massage or to seek |  |
| clarification. |  |

To find the subject mean score, the quantitative evaluation above were converted into nominal.

|  | SCORE |
| :--- | :--- |
| $81-100$ | CLASSIFICATION |
| $61-80$ | Very good |
| $41-60$ | Gaod |
| $21-40$ | Foor |
| $0-20$ | Very poor |

## H. Data Analysis

The students' English proficiency data were analyzed by tabulation, appraisal, calculating frequency and percentage of student scores, calculating average scores, finding standard deviations to measure improvements between pre-test and post-test, finding out significant differences between means of two group on some independent variables, and test the data normality by calculating the t -test value that will apply the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS).

## CHAPTER IV

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter deals with the research findings and the discussion. The findings in this part consists of the data obtained through the test in order to know the effect of teaching English Increasing students' speaking skill by using jigsaw technique. The findings that the researcher reported in this chapter are based on the analysis of data collected. The discussion deals with the description, arguments and further interpretation of the findings in the research.

## A. Findings

As the researcher explained in the previous chapter that to collect the quantitative data in this research, the researcher used pre-test and post-test to collect data of the students' English speaking ability. The components of students' speaking skill consisted of three parts: Accuracy, fluency, and Comprehensibility to analyze the data obtained from the test, the researcher used the t-test (test of difference)

## 1. Test Analysis

## a. Class Experimental Pre-test

In this section the researcher showed the complete score of students in speaking skill (accuracy, fluently, and comprehensibility) in pre-test, the mean score and standard deviation of students, and the rate percentage of students' speaking score in pre-test. It was tabulate by following table:

Table 4.1
The Scores of Students' Speaking Skill in Class Experimental Pre-test

| Respondent | The Aspect of Speaking Skill |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accuracy | Fluency | Comprehensibility |  |
| R1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| R2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| R3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| R5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| R6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| R7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| R8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| R9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| R11 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R12 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 7 |
| R13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| R14 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| R15 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| R16 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| R17 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| R18 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| R19 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| R20 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{R}=20$ |  |  |  | $\sum \mathrm{Y}=96$ |

Speaking skill consisted of three aspects; they are accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. In this section, the researcher would present and tabulate the
mean score of the students' speaking skill one by one. All of those would explain for more clearly by following tables:

1) Accuracy

## Table 4.2

The Score of Students' Speaking in Class Experimental Pre-test
Respondents
R1 1
R2 1
R3 1
R4 2
R5 2
R6 3
R7 2
R8 1
R9 1
R10 3
R11 1
R12 3
R13 2
R14 1
R15 2
R16 1
R17 2
R18 3
R19 2
R20 1
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' accuracy in pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.3
The Mean Score of Students' Accuracy in Class Experiment Pre-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accuracy | 20 | 1 | 3 | 1.75 | .786 |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.3, it showed that the highest score of students' were 3 and the lowest score was 1 . Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' accuracy in class experimental pre-test was 1.75 and the standard deviation was 0.786.

In other side, the researcher also had written the students' score of accuracy before giving treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presents through the rate percentage score. The table score as follows:

Table 4.4
The Rate Percentage Score of the Students' Accuracy in Pre-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 4 | $45 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 7 | $35 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 9 | $20 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.4 indicatesd that students' score in accuracy of pre-test.
It showed that there is none of students got excellent ( $0 \%$ ), very good $(0 \%)$, and good ( $0 \%$ ). Besides, there were 9 students ( $20 \%$ ) who got very poor, there were 7 students (35\%) who get poor and there were 4 students ( $45 \%$ ) who got average.
2) Fluency

## Table 4.5

The Score of Students' Fluency in Pre-test
Respondents
Fluency
R1 2
R2 2

R3 1
R4 1
R5 1
R6 2
R7 3
R8 1
R9 1
R10 3
R11 1
R12 3
R13 2
R14 2
R15 2
R16 1
R17 2
R18 2
R19 1
R20 1
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' fluency in pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result can be present in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.6
The Mean Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Pre-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fluency | 20 | 1 | 3 | 1.70 | .733 |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.6, it showed that the highest score of students was 3 and the lowest score was 1 . Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' fluency in class experiment pre-test was 1.70 and the standard deviation was 0.733 .

In other side, the researcher also had written score of the students' fluency before giving treatment by using jigsaw technique and it present through the rate percentage score. The table showed as follows:

Table 4.7
The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Pre-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |


| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Average | 3 | 3 | $15 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 8 | $40 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 9 | $45 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.7 indicated that students' score in fluency of pre-test. It shows that there is none of students got excellent $(0 \%)$, very good $(0 \%)$, and good $(0 \%)$. Besides, there were 9 students (45\%) who got very poor, there were 8 students (40\%) who get poor and there were 3 students ( $15 \%$ ) who got average.
3) Comprehensibility

## Table 4.8

The Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Experimental Pre-test
Respondents
Comprehensibility
R1 1
R2 1
R3 1
R4 1
R5 2
R6 2
R7 2
R8 2
R9 1
R10 2

| R11 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R12 | 1 |
| R13 | 1 |
| R14 | 1 |
| R15 | 1 |
| R16 | 2 |
| R17 | 2 |
| R18 | 2 |
| R19 | 1 |
| R20 | 1 |
| N=20 | 1 |

For looking the mean score of students' comprehensibility in class experimental pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be present in to table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.9
The Mean Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Experimental Pretest
Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fluency | 25 | 1 | 2 | 1.35 | .489 |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 25 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.9, it showed that the highest score of students was 2 and the lowest score was 1 . Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in pre-test is 1.35 and the standard deviation was 0.489 .

In other side, the researcher also had written score of the students' comprehensibility before giving treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presents through the rate percentage scores. The table shows as follows:

Table 4.10
The Rate Percentages Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Pre-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 7 | $65 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 13 | $35 \%$ |
| Total |  | 25 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.10 indicated that students' score in comprehensibility of pretest. The table shows that there was none of students ( $0 \%$ ) who got excellent, very good $(0 \%)$, good $(0 \%)$, and average ( $0 \%$ ). In other that, there were 13 students ( $35 \%$ ) who got very poor and there were 7 students ( $65 \%$ ) who got poor.

## b. Post-test

In this section, the researcher made the rate percentage of students' score speaking ability in post-test. The results of the students' score in post-test were presents in the tables. The complete of the students' score speaking ability of accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility in post-test are tabulate as follows:

Table 4.11
The Scores of Students' Speaking Ability in Class Experiment Post-test
Respondents
The Aspect of Speaking Skill
Total
Accuracy Fluency Comprehensibility

| R1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 13 |
| R3 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 12 |
| R4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 |
| R5 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 14 |
| R6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 15 |
| R7 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 13 |
| R8 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| R9 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 12 |
| R10 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| R11 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 14 |
| R12 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 15 |
| R13 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 16 |
| R14 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 16 |
| R15 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 15 |
| R16 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 11 |
| R17 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| R18 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| R19 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 13 |
| R20 | 4 | 4 | 4 |  |

$$
\mathrm{N}=20
$$

$\sum \mathrm{Y}=259$

In other side, the researcher had classified based on English speaking assessments that consisted of accuracy, fluency, comprehensibility and it was presented through the table distribution frequency and percentage. It could be shown as follows:

1) Accuracy

Table 4.12
The Score of Students' Accuracy in class experiment post-test
Respondents
R1
R2
R3
R4
Accuracy
4
R2 4
4
3
R5
5
R6 5
R7 5

R8 3
R9 3
R10 4
R11 5
R12 5
R13 6
R14 6
R15 5
R16 4

| R17 | 4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R18 | 5 |
| R19 | 5 |
| R20 | 4 |
| R=20 |  |

To calculate the mean score of students' accuracy in class experiment post-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.13


From the table 4.13, it showed that the highest score of students were 6 and the lowest score was 3. Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' accuracy in post-test 4.45 and the standard deviation was 0.887 .

In other side, the writed also has written score of the students' accuracy who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presents through the rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

## Table 4.14

## The Rate Percentages Score of Students` Accuracy in Class Experiment Posttest

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | 2 | $10 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | 8 | $40 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | 7 | $35 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 3 | $15 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

Based on table 4.14, the percentage of the students' accuracy score in post=test indicated that there was 2 of students (10\%) who got excellent, and very good (40\%). Besides, it also showed that there was 7 students (35\%) who got good and average (15\%).

1) Fluency

Table 4.15
The Score of Students' in Class Experiment Post-test
Respondents Fluency
R1 4

R2 5
R3 5
R4 4
R5 4
R6 5
R7 5
R8 4
R9 4
R10 3
R11 5
R12 5
R13 6
R14 6
R15 5
R16 4
R17 3
R18 3
R19 4
R20 4
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' fluency in class experiment post-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.16
The Mean Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Post-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fluency | 20 | 3 | 6 | 4.40 | .883 |
| Valid N | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| (listwise) |  |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.16, it showed that the highest score of students were 6 and the lowest score were 3 . Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' fluency in class experiment post-test was 4.40 and the standard deviation was 0.883 .

In other side, the researcher also had writed score of the students' fluency who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presented through the table rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.17
The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Post-
test
Classification $\quad$ Rating $\quad$ Frequency $\quad$ Percentage

| Excellent | 6 | 2 | $10 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very good | 5 | 7 | $35 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | 8 | $40 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 3 | $15 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | 100 |

Based on the table 4.17, the percentage of students' fluency score in posttest indicates that there was 2 of the students ( $10 \%$ ) who got excellent, very good (35\%), good (40\%) and average ( $15 \%$ ).
3) Comprehensibility

Table 4.18
The Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Experiment Post-test
Respondents
Comprehensibility

| R1 | 4 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 4 |
| R3 | 3 |
| R4 | 5 |
| R5 | 5 |
| R6 | 5 |
| R7 | 3 |
| R8 | 3 |
| R9 | 5 |
| R10 | 4 |
| R11 | 4 |
| R12 | 5 |
| R13 | 4 |
| R14 | 4 |
| R15 | 5 |
| R16 | 3 |
| R17 | 5 |
| R18 | 4 |
| R19 | 4 |
| R20 | 3 |
| N=20 |  |

For looking the mean score of students' comprehensibility in post-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.19

## The Mean Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Experiment Posttest

## Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 5 | 4.10 | .788 |
| Comprehensibility | 20 | 3 | 5 |  |  |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.19 it showed that the highest score of students were 5 and the lowest score were 3. Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in post-test is 4.10 and the standard deviation was 0.788 .

In other side, the researcher also had written score of the students' comprehensibility who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presented through the table rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.20
The Rate Percentages Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Post-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | 7 | $35 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | 8 | $40 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 5 | $25 \%$ |


| Poor | 2 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very Poor | 1 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.20 indicated the percentage of students' comprehensibility score in post-test. The table shows that there was none of students $(0 \%)$ who got excellent, very good (35\%), good (40\%) and average (25\%). Besides showed about the mean score in each subject of speaking skill (accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility) one by one, this research also would present the total mean score and standard deviation of in pre-test and post-test, and then compare both of them. The result would be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

## Table 4.21

The Mean Scores and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Pots-test Descriptive Statistics
N Minimum Maximum Mean Std. deviation

| Pre-test | 20 | 3 | 8 | 4.8 | .1 .439 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Post-test | 20 | 9 | 17 | 12,95 | 2.558 |

Valid N 20
(listwise)
From the table 4.21, it indicated that the standard deviation in pre-test was 1.439 and in post-test were 2.558 . It also showed that mean score of the students in pre-test were 4.8 and the mean score of the students in post-test were 12.95 . the result of the table above showed that the mean score of students in post-test was higher than the mean score of students in pre-test. It concluded that using English jigsaw technique was effective in increasing students speaking ability.

To know whether the pre-test and post-test were significantly different and also to know acceptability of the hypothesis of this research, the researcher used ttestanalysis and calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be shown in the table of paired samples statistics, paired samples correlation and paired samples test. It was presented in the following tables:

Table 4.22
The Paired Samples of Pre-test and Post-test Paired Samples Statistics

|  | Mean | N | Std. deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 Pre-test | 4.8 | 20 | 2.008 | .162 |
| Post-test | 12,95 | 20 | 2.558 |  |
|  |  |  | .277 |  |

The table paired samples statistics of pre-test and post-test above indicates that the value of standard deviation in pre-test was 2.008 and 2.558 in post-test. Besides, the standard deviation error in pre-test was 0.810 and in post-test was 1.384. The table above also showed that mean score in pre-test was 4.36 and in post-test was 7.20 . It could be concluded that the students' score increase from 4.36 to 7.20 .

## 2. Test Analysis

## a. Class Control Pre-test

In this section the researcher showed the complete score of students in speaking ability (accuracy, fluently, and comprehensibility) in pre-test, the mean
score and standard deviation of students, and the rate percentage of students' speaking score in pre-test. It was tabulate by following table:

Table 4.23
The Scores of Students' Speaking Skill in Class Control Pre-test
Respondent
The Aspect of Speaking Skill
Total
Accuracy Fluency Comprehensibility

| R1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| R6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| R7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| R8 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| R9 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| R10 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| R12 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| R13 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 |
| R14 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| R15 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| R16 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| R17 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| R18 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 |
| R19 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| R20 | 1 | 1 |  | 3 |

$\mathrm{R}=20$
$\sum \mathrm{Y}=81$

Speaking skill consisted of three aspects; they are accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility. In this section, the researcher would present and tabulate the mean score of the students' speaking ability one by one. All of those would explain for more clearly by following tables:

1) Accuracy

Table 4.24 The Score of Students' Speaking in Class Control Pre-test
Respondents Accuracy

| R1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 1 |

R3 1
R4 1
R5 1
R6 1
R7 2
R8 2
R9 1
R10 1
R11 3
R12 2
R13 2
R14 1
R15 1
R16 2
R17 3
R18 1
R19 1
R20 1
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' accuracy in pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result coulded presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.25
The Mean Score of Students' Accuracy in Class Control Pre-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Accuracy | 20 | 1 | 3 | 1.45 | .686 |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.3, it showed that the highest score of students' were 3 and the lowest score was 1 . Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' accuracy in class control pre-test was 1.45 and the standard deviation was 0 . . 686 .

In other side, the researcher also had writed the students' score of accuracy before giving treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presents through the rate percentage score. The table score as follows:

Table 4.26
The Rate Percentage Score of the Students' Accuracy in Pre-test
Classification Rating Frequency Percentage

| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 2 | $10 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 5 | $25 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 13 | $65 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.4 indicated that students' score in accuracy of pre-test.
It shows that there none of students got excellent (0\%), very good (0\%), and good (0\%). Besides, there were 13 students (65\%) who got very poor, there were 5 students ( $25 \%$ ) who get poor and there were 2 students ( $10 \%$ ) who got average.
2) Fluency

Table 4.27

## The Score of Students' Fluency in Class Control Pre-test

Respondents Fluency
R1 ..... 1
R2 ..... 1
R3 ..... 1
R4 ..... 1
R5 ..... 2
R6 ..... 2
R7 ..... 2
R8 ..... 1
R9 ..... 2
R10 ..... 1
R11 ..... 1
R12 ..... 1
R13 ..... 2
R14 ..... 2
R15 ..... 2
R16 ..... 1
R17 ..... 1
R18 ..... 1
R19 ..... 1
R20 ..... 1
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' fluency in pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result can be present in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.28
The Mean Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Pre-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fluency | 20 | 1 | 2 | 1.35 | .489 |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.6, it showed that the highest score of students was 2 and the lowest score was 1 . Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' fluency in class control pre-test was 1.35 and the standard deviation was 0.489 .

In other side, the researcher also writed score of the students' fluency before giving treatment by using jigsaw technique and it present through the rate percentage score. The table showed as follows:

Table 4.29
The Rate Percentage Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Pre-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percenta |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |


| Average | 3 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Poor | 2 | 7 | $35 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 13 | $65 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.7 indicated that students' score in fluency of pre-test. It shows that there none of students got excellent (0\%), very good (0\%), and good ( $0 \%$ ). Besides, there were 13 students ( $65 \%$ ) who got very poor, there were 7 students (35\%) who get poor and note students ( $0 \%$ ) who got average.
3) Comprehensibility

Table 4.30
The Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class ControlPret-test
Respondents
Comprehensibility

| R1 | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 1 |
| R3 | 1 |
| R4 | 1 |
| R5 | 1 |
| R6 | 1 |
| R7 | 1 |
| R8 | 2 |
| R9 | 2 |
| R10 | 1 |
| R11 | 1 |
| R12 | 1 |


| R13 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R14 | 1 |
| R15 | 2 |
| R16 | 1 |
| R17 | 1 |
| R18 | 2 |
| R19 | 1 |
| R20 | 1 |

$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' comprehensibility in pre-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPS. The result coulded presented in the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.31

|  | Descriptive Statistics |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. deviation |
| Comprehensibility | 20 | 1 | 2 | 1.25 | . 444 |
| Valid N | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| (listwise) |  |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.19 it showed that the highest score of students were 2 and the lowest score were 1 . Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in post-test is 1.25 and the standard deviation was $0 . .444$.

In other side, the researcher also had written score of the students' comprehensibility who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it
presented through the table rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.32
The Rate Percentages Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Post-test

| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 5 | $25 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | 15 | $75 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.20 indicated the percentage of students' comprehensibility score in pre-test. The table shows that there was none of students ( $0 \%$ ) who got excellent, very good ( $0 \%$ ), good ( $0 \%$ ), average ( $0 \%$ ), Poor ( $25 \%$ ) and Very Poor (15\%).
b. Post-test

In this section, the researcher made the rate percentage of students' score speaking ability in post-test. The results of the students' score in post-test
were presents in the tables. The complete of the students' score speaking ability of accuracy, fluency and comprehensibility in post-test are tabulate as follows:

Table 4.33
The Scores of Students' Speaking Skill in Class Experiment Post-test

| Respondents | The Aspect of Speaking Skill |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Accuracy | Fluency | Comprehensibility |  |
| R1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| R2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 7 |
| R3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| R4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| R5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| R6 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| R7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |
| R8 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| R9 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 10 |
| R10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 |
| R11 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| R12 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 |
| R13 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 9 |
| R14 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 12 |
| R15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 10 |
| R16 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 11 |
| R17 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| R18 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 |
| R19 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 |
| R20 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 11 |
| $\mathrm{N}=20$ |  |  |  | $\sum \mathrm{Y}=178$ |

In other side, the researcher had classified based on English speaking assessments that consisted of accuracy, fluency, comprehensibility and it was presented through the table distribution frequency and percentage. It coulded shown as follows:
2) Accuracy

Table 4.34
The Score of Students' Accuracy in class experiment post-test

Respondents

R1 Accuracy

R2
3
R3
2
R4
2
R5 2
R6
3

## R7

3

## R8

 4R9 ..... 2
R10 ..... 2
R11 ..... 4
R12 ..... 3
R13 ..... 3
R14 ..... 4
R15 ..... 3
R16 ..... 4
R17 ..... 4
R18 ..... 3
R19 ..... 2
R20 ..... 3

$$
\mathrm{R}=20
$$

To calculate the mean score of students' accuracy in class control posttest, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.35
The Mean Score of Students' Accuracy in Class Control Post-test
Descriptive Statistics

From the table 4.13, it showed that the highest score of students were 4 and the lowest score was 2 . Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' accuracy in post-test 2.95 and the standard deviation was 0.759 .

In other side, the writed also has writed score of the students' accuracy who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presents through the rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.36

## The Rate Percentages Score of Students` Accuracy in Class Experiment Posttest <br> Classification Rating Frequency Percentage

Excellent $6 \quad 0 \%$

| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Good | 4 | 5 | $25 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Average | 3 | 9 | $45 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| Poor | 2 | 6 | $30 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Total
20
100\%

Based on table 4.14, the percentage of the students' accuracy score in posttest indicated that there was none students ( $0 \%$ ) who got excellent, and very good ( $0 \%$ ). Besides, it also showed that there was 5 students ( $25 \%$ ) who got good, average (45\%) and poor (30\%).
2) Fluency

Table 4.37
The Score of Students' in Class Control Post-test
Respondents
Fluency
R1 2
R2 2
R3 3
R4 3
R5 3
R6 4
R7 3
R8 4
R9 4
R10 1
R11 2
R12 3
R13 4
R14 4
R15 3
R16 4
R17 3
R18 2
R19 3
R20 3
$\mathrm{N}=20$

For looking the mean score of students' fluency in class experiment posttest, the researcher calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

## Table 4.38

The Mean Score of Students' Fluency in Class Experiment Post-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fluency | 20 | 2 | 4 | 3.05 | .170 |
| Valid N | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| (listwise) |  |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.16, it showed that the highest score of students were 4 and the lowest score were 2 . Besides, it also indicates that the mean score of students' fluency in class control post-test was 3.05 and the standard deviation was 0.170 .

In other side, the researcher also had writed score of the students' fluency who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presented through the table rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.39

| The Rate Percentage Score of Students' | Fluency in Class Control Post-test |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | Rating | Frequency | Percentage |


| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | 6 | $25 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 9 | $45 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 5 | $30 \%$ |
| Very Poor | 1 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Total |  | 20 | 100 |

Based on the table 4.17, the percentage of students' fluency score in posttest indicates that there was none of the students ( $0 \%$ ) who got excellent, very good ( $0 \%$ ), good ( $25 \%$ ), average ( $45 \%$ ) and poor (30\%).
3) Comprehensibility

Table 4.40
The Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Control Post-test
Respondents Comprehensibility

| R1 | 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| R2 | 2 |
| R3 | 2 |
| R4 | 2 |
| R5 | 2 |
| R6 | 3 |
| R7 | 3 |
| R8 | 4 |
| R9 | 4 |
| R10 | 3 |
| R11 | 2 |
| R12 | 2 |
| R13 | 2 |
| R14 | 4 |
| R15 | 4 |
| R16 | 3 |
| R17 | 4 |
| R18 | 3 |
| R19 | 3 |
| R20 | 4 |
| N=20 |  |

For looking the mean score of students' comprehensibility in post-test, the researcher calculated it by using SPS. The result could be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.41
The Mean Score of Students' Comprehensibility in Class Control Post-test Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. <br> deviation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | 4 | 2.90 | .852 |
| Comprehensibility | 20 | 2 | 4 |  |  |
| Valid N <br> (listwise) | 20 |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.19 it showed that the highest score of students were 4 and the lowest score were 2. Besides, it also indicated that the mean score of students' comprehensibility in post-test is 2.90 and the standard deviation was 0.852 .

In other side, the researcher also had writed score of the students' comprehensibility who had been given treatment by using jigsaw technique and it presented through the table rate percentage scores. The table was showed as follows:

Table 4.42

## The Rate Percentages Score of Students' Comprehensibility in class Post-test

Classification Rating Frequency Percentage

| Excellent | 6 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Very good | 5 | - | $0 \%$ |
| Good | 4 | 9 | $30 \%$ |
| Average | 3 | 6 | $30 \%$ |
| Poor | 2 | 8 | $40 \%$ |


| Very Poor | 1 | - | $0 \%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  | 20 | $100 \%$ |

The table 4.20 indicates the percentage of students' comprehensibility score in post-test. The table shows that there was none of students $(0 \%)$ who got excellent, very good $(0 \%)$, good ( $30 \%$ ) and average ( $30 \%$ ) and poor ( $40 \%$ ). Besides showing about the mean score in each subject of speaking skill (accuracy, fluency, and comprehensibility) one by one, this research also would present the total mean score and standard deviation of in pre-test and post-test, and then compare both of them. The result would be presented in to the table descriptive statistic as follows:

Table 4.43
The Mean Scores and Standard Deviation of Pre-test and Pots-test

## Descriptive Statistics

|  | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pre-test | 20 | 3 | 7 | 4.05 | .1 .619 |
| Post-test | 20 | 6 | 12 | 8.9 | 2.370 |
| Valid N | 20 |  |  |  |  |
| (listwise) |  |  |  |  |  |

From the table 4.21, it indicated that the standard deviation in pre-test was 1.619 and in post-test were 2.370. It also shows that mean score of the students in pre-test were 4.05 and the mean score of the students in post-test were 8.9 the result of the table above showed that the mean score of students in post-test was
higher than the mean score of students in pre-test. It concludes that using English jigsaw technique was effective in increasing students speaking ability.

To know whether the pre-test and post-test were significantly different and also to know acceptability of the hypothesis of this research, the researcher used ttestanalysis and calculated it by using SPSS. The result could be shown in the table of paired samples statistics, paired samples correlation and paired samples test. It was presented in the following tables:

Table 4.44

|  | Mean | N | Std. deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Pair 1 Pre-test | 4.8 | 20 | 2.008 | .162 |
| Post-test | 12,95 | 20 | 2.558 | .277 |

## B. Discussion

The discussion deals with argument and further interpretation of the research findings in students` score both pretest and posttest results of experimental and control class. There are three items Researcher Analyze namely, Accuracy, fluency and comperhensibility. Student A in pre test got Poor in content component, in post test student A got Good in the content. Student B in Pre test fair in content component, in post test student B got Good in the content. Student C in Pre test Poor in content component, in post test student C got Good in the content. Student D in Pre test Poor in content component, in post test student D got Good in the content. Student E in Pre test fair in content component, in post test student E got Good in the content. Based on explanation above, the researcher concluded the use jigsaw technique helped the students to increase their ability in speaking skill. There are three results of the first previous research Nina Puspitaloka, who used a jigsaw technique where the results of using the jigsaw technique have proven capable increasing student learning skills at the UNISKA campus and likewise by Gatot Suherman and Sri Handayani who use the jigsaw technique in the learning process can increase student's learning abilities which where the jigsaw technique can not only be used for high school students but can also be used at the research SDN level by Gatot Suherman and the lecture level by Nina Puspitaloka and Sri Handayani In line with Professor Aronson found that jigsaw tekhnique. The comparison of the students` score of both groups could be supported by analyzing the result of posttest. In pretest result, no one of 20 students either experimental group or control class was classified excellent classification (Table 4.10). After giving treatments in experimental group with jigsaw technique, the result of postest were 5 students $(25 \%)$ got good classification, none of them was very poor, three were in poor and two were in fair classification, twelve students or $60 \%$ got good classification (Table 4.8). Otherwise, six students got good in result of posttest in control class. Most of them were classified at fair classification (twostudentor 10\%). Based on the result of data analysis, researcher concluded that jigsaw tekhnique is strongly recommended as one strategy in upgrading students` speaking skill because in teaching speaking jigsaw tekhnique has great benefits that may serve a variety of
learning purpose. It may provide students with a systematic means to integrate their new knowledge and stimulate them to use that knowledge to interact with the text and it can also provide students with clear understanding about the definition of the words.In the line with Professor Aronson .

## CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This chapter deals with the conclusion of the research finding as well as some suggestions regarding for the increase of the teaching English speaking in the eleventh grade students of senior high school 4 palopo

## A. Conclusion

Based on the findings and discussion, the researcher concluded that the use of Jigsaw technique can increase students speaking skill.

## B. Suggestions

Considering the conclusion above, the researcher gives some suggestions as follows:

1. English teachers should be creative to manage the material and the classroom for teaching speaking, so it is advisable to the teachers to use jigsaw technique as one of alternative tekhnique in teaching speaking in order to build up students' speaking ability.
2. English teacher should give opportunities and motivations to the students to build up their speaking ability such as using jigsaw technique that was proved to be an increase and applicable in learning English.
3. It is strongly suggested that the teaching of speaking skill through jigsaw technique should be continually implemented to the eleventh grade students of senior high school 4 palopo. The teacher also
suggested to give more attention to the students' speaking through jigsaw tekhnique, so that the students can compose and organize their speaking perfectly.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aronson, E., Blaney, N., Stephan, C., Sikes, J., and Snapp, M. (1978). The jigsaw classroom., Sage Publications.

Aronson, E., (2000), The Jigsaw Clasroom: A cooperative Lerning Technique (online) tersedia di http://www.jigsaw.org/steps.htm diakses pada 9 juli2018

Group.Herbert,Speaking Skill, (New York : Oxford University, New Edition 1997),p. 223

Gatot Suherman, "Peningkatan keterampilan berbicara menggunakan model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe jigsaw pada siswa IV SDN SRIWEDARI Surakarta (https://eprints.uns.ac.id/9692/1/unlock-b_(10).pdf, Diakses pada 19 Juli 2018)
H.Dogles Brown. Priciple of Language Learning and Teaching. (New York ; Prentice Hall,1980),p. 210

Herliana, The Effectiveness of Problem Based Learning Strategy in Improving Students Skill at The Sevent Year Students of Mts.BoneLemo Kec.Bajo Barat, A thesis S1, Unpublished, (Palopo : Perpustakaan IAIN Palopo),p.15-16
H. Douglas. 2001. Teaching by Principles: an Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy. San Francisco: State University.

Ismail, The Effectiveness of Using Role Play In Teaching Speaking Skill At The Second Year Students of SMA PMDS (PUTRI) Palopo,p. 5

Melfin L, Silberman, Active Learning, Yogyakarta : Pustaka Insan Madani, 2017
Novia, Quasi Experimental Design and Methods, file:///C:/Users/NOVIA/Documents/New\%20folder/Downloads/QuasiExp erimental_Design_and_Methods_ENG.pdf. Accessed on $19^{\text {th }}$ May 2018.

Nina Puspitaloka, "Pengaruh Teknik Jisaw Activities terhadap hasil kemampuan berbicara Akademik mahasiswa prodi B.INGGRIS UNSIKA", Edisi 19 Juli 2018, hal.67.

[^6]Sugiyono, Metode Penelitian Pendidikan, (cet.XVIII; Bandung: Alfabeta, 2015), p.111.

Zubaedi. 2011. Desain Pendidikan berkarakter Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media.

## Appendix 1

## Instrument of the Research Pretest Experimental class \& Control class INSTRUMENT <br> PRE TEST

## Goldiloks and Three Bears

Once upon a time there was a little girl called Goldilocks. She went for a walk in the woods. She was lost.

Suddenly, she saw a cottage. She knocked on the door but when no one answered. Goldilocks walked right in!

She saw the table with three bowls. On it. She was very hungry so she tasted the porridge the big bowl." Ooh this porridge is too hot!" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the medium bowl. " Yuk! This porridge is too cold" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the little bowl. "Mmm! This porridge is just right! It is not to hot and it is not too cold," said Goldilocks.

She went into living room and she saw three chairs.
Goldilocks sat on the big chair." Ouch!" she said. It was too hard.
Goldilocks sat on the medium sized chair. "oops! She said. It was too soft.
Goldilocks sat on the little chair . "Ahh! This chair is just right. It's not to hard and it's not too soft" said Goldilocks. But then the chair broke!

Goldilocks ran into the bedroom and she saw three beds.

Goldilocks sat on the big bed. " Huh! This bed is too lumpy" said Goldilocks.
Goldilocks sat on medium bed. "Eek! This bed is too spongy" said Goldilocks.
Goldilocks sat on the little bed."Oooh! This bed is just right. It's not too lumpy and it's no too spongy " said Goldilocks. Then she went to sleep.

The three bears went back home.
They found Goldilocks asleep in the little bed. Just then Goldilocks woke up and saw the three bears. "Help!" screamed Goldilocks,

Goldilocks ran all the way home and never went back to the house of the three bears.

Questions :

1. How did goldilocks find the bear's house ?
2. What did she find in the bear's house ?
3. What did she do there?
4. What happend to the small chair?
5. Why were the tree bears surprised?

# Posttest Experimental class \& Control class <br> INSTRUMENT <br> POST TEST 

## 1. True Friends

Once upon a time, there were two close friends who were walking through the forest together. They knew that anything dangerous can happen any time in the forest. So they promised each other that they would always be together in any case of danger.

Suddenly, they saw a large bear getting closer toward them. One of them climbed a nearby tree at once. But unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. So being led by his common sense, he lay down on the ground breathless and pretended to be a dead man.

The bear came near the one who was lying on the ground. It smelt in his ears, and slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead creatures. After that, the friend on the tree came down and asked his friend that was on the ground, "Friend, what did the bear whisper into your ears?" The other friend replied, "Just now the bear advised me not to believe a false friend."
2. Fox and A Cat

One day a cat and a fox were having a conversation. The fox, who was a conceited creature, boasted how clever she was. 'Why, I know at least a hundred tricks to get away from our mutual enemies, the dogs,' she said.
'I know only one trick to get away from dogs,' said the cat. 'You should teach me some of yours!'
'Well, maybe some day, when I have the time, I may teach you a few of the simpler ones,' replied the fox airily.

Just then they heard the barking of a pack of dogs in the distance. The barking grew louder and louder - the dogs were coming in their direction! At once the cat ran to the nearest tree and climbed into its branches, well out of reach of any dog. 'This is the trick I told you about, the only one I know,' said the cat. 'Which one of your hundred tricks are you going to use?'

The fox sat silently under the tree, wondering which trick she should use. Before she could make up her mind, the dogs arrived. They fell upon the fox and tore her to pieces.
3. The Ant and the Dove

One hot day, an ant was seeking for some water. After walking around for a moment, she came to a spring. To reach the spring, she had to climb up a blade of grass. While making her way up, she slipped and fell unintentionally into the water.

She could have sunk if a dove up a nearby tree had not seen her. Seeing that the ant was in trouble, the dove quickly put off a leaf from a tree and dropped it immediately into the water near the struggling ant. Then the ant moved towards the leaf and climbed up there. Soon it carried her safely to dry ground.

Not long after at that, there was a hunter nearby who was throwing out his net towards the dove, hoping to trap it in this way.

Guessing what he should do, the ant quickly bit him on the heel. Feeling the pain, the hunter dropped his net and the dove flew away quickly from this net. The morality: One good turn deserves another.

## 4. The Fox and the Grapes

One afternoon there was a fox that was walking through the forest and spotted a bunch of grapes hanging from over a lofty branch. "Just the thing to quench my thirst," quoted the fox. Taking a few steps backward, the fox jumped but unfortunately he missed the hanging grapes. Again the fox took a few paces backward, ran, and tried to reach them but he still failed.

Finally, giving up, the fox turned up his nose and said, "They're probably sour anyway," and proceeded to walk away.

## Task

After students are given narrative texts, groups of students are told to know what moral messages are in the contents of the text after which the researchers call one by one students to speak to convey what moral messages can be taken from the text

# Appendix 2 : Lesson Plan <br> Class Experiment (Pre-test) <br> RENCANA PELAKSAAN PEMBELAJARAN 

(RPP)
Satuan Pendidikan : SMANegeri 4 Palopo
Kelas/Semester : XI / Semester Ganjil
Mata Pelajaran : Bahasa Inggris
Materi Pokok : Narative Text (Teks Narasi)
Alokasi Waktu : 2x40 menit

## A. Kompetensi Inti :

KI 1: Menghargai dan menghayati ajaran agama yang dianutnya
KI 2: Menghargai dan menghayati perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (toleransi, gotong royong), santun, percaya diri, dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam dalam jangkauan pergaulan dan keberadaannya.

KI 3: Memahami pengetahuan (faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural) berdasarkan rasa ingin tahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya terkait fenomena dan kejadian tampak mata.

KI 4: Mencoba, mengolah, dan menyaji dalam ranah konkret (menggunakan, mengurai, merangkai, memodifikasi, dan membuat) dan ranah abstrak (menulis, membaca, menghitung, menggambar, dan mengarang) sesuai dengan yang dipelajari di sekolah dan sumber lain yang sama dalam sudut pandang/teori.

## B. Kompetensi Dasar dan Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi

No. Kompetensi Dasar

1. 1.1 Mensyukuri kesempatan dapat mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar komunikasi internasional yang diwujudkan dalam semangat belajar
2. 2.1 Menunjukkan perilaku santun dan peduli dalam melaksanakan komunikasi interpersonal dengan guru dan teman.
3. 3.2 Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks dan unsure karakter yang ada dalam suatu cerita kebahasaan pada teks narrative rakyat sederhana berbentuk legenda rakyat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.

Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi
1.1.1. Mengucapkan hamdalah ketika menyelesaikan tugas.
1.1.2. Menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam kegiatan pembelajaran.
2.1.1 Memulai pertanyaan dgn 'excuse me'.
2.1.2. Mengucapkan 'sorry' ktk melakukan kesalahan
2.1.3. Mengucapkan "what is wrong?" untuk mengetahui kondisi orang lain
3.1.1 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi
3.1.2 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsure sosial cerita rakyat
3.1.3 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi nilai moral yang ada dalam cerita
3.1.4 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsur kebahasaan dalam cerita rakyat
4. 4.1 menamgkap makna teks 4.1.1 siswa dapat menjawab narrative lisan dan tulisan pertanyaan terkait dengan teks cerita berbentuk legenda, sederhana.
rakyat yang dibaca

> 4.1.2 siswa dapat menceritakan kembali suatu cerita rakyat yang di baca baik secara lisan.

## C. Tujuan Pembelajaran

Pada akhir kegiatan pembelajaran siswa diharapkan dapat:

- Menunjukkan kesungguhan belajar bahasa inggris terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Menunjukkan perilaku peduli, percaya diri dan tanggung jawab dalam melaksanakan komunikasi terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Mengidentifikasi fungsi social, struktur teks, dan unsure kebahasaan dari teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat
- Merespon makna teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.


## D. Materi Pembelajaran

## Konsep

## Narative Text

## Goldiloks and Three Bears

Once upon a time there was a little girl called Goldilocks. She went for a walk in the woods. She was lost.

Suddenly, she saw a cottage. She knocked on the door but when no one answered. Goldilocks walked right in!

She saw the table with three bowls. On it. She was very hungry so she tasted the porridge the big bowl." Ooh this porridge is too hot!" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the medium bowl. "Yuk! This porridge is too cold" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the little bowl. "Mmm! This porridge is just right! It is not to hot and it is not too cold," said Goldilocks.

She went into living room and she saw three chairs.

Goldilocks sat on the big chair." Ouch!" she said. It was too hard.
Goldilocks sat on the medium sized chair. "oops! She said. It was too soft.
Goldilocks sat on the little chair . "Ahh! This chair is just right. It's not to hard and it's not too soft" said Goldilocks. But then the chair broke!

Goldilocks ran into the bedroom and she saw three beds.
Goldilocks sat on the big bed. "Huh! This bed is too lumpy" said Goldilocks.

Goldilocks sat on medium bed. "Eek! This bed is too spongy" said Goldilocks.

Goldilocks sat on the little bed."Oooh! This bed is just right. It's not too lumpy and it's no too spongy " said Goldilocks. Then she went to sleep.

The three bears went back home.
They found Goldilocks asleep in the little bed. Just then Goldilocks woke up and saw the three bears. " Help!" screamed Goldilocks,

Goldilocks ran all the way home and never went back to the house of the three bears.

## E. Metode Pembelajaran

Metode/Technique : jigsaw technique

## F. Sumber Belajar

Internet : http://www.britishcourse.com/narrativetext
Alat :Tanya jawab siswa dan guru

## G. Media Pembelajaran

Media : Buku panduan bahasa Inggris

## H. Langkah-langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

a. Pendahuluan (10 menit)

## -Persiapan /orientasi

1. Berdoa sebelum mengajar
2. Mengecek kehadiran siswa
3. Menyapa dengan memperkenalkan diri dengan menggunakan sapaan yang akan dipelajari,
4. Menyampaikan tujuan dan skenario pembelajaran
-Aperespsi : Tanya jawab mengenai ungkapan-ungkapan kepemilikan
-Motivasi : Menjelaskan pentingnya materi yang akan dipelajari berikut kompetensi yang harus dikuasai siswa.
b. Kegiatan inti ( 60 menit)
5. Guru mengelompokkan siswa menjadi 5 kelompok yang dinamakan kelompok asal
6. Tiap anggota dalam kelompok diberi materi dan tugas yang berbeda dengan penguasaan/tema yang sama membentuk kelompok baru (kelompok ahli)
7. Setelah kelompok ahli berdiskusi atau menjelaskan masingmasing materi yang dikuasai kelompok ahli kembali pada kelempok asal untuk menjelaskan materi yang dikuasai
8. Siswa secara bergantian mempresentasikan hasil diskusi dan memberikan kesempatan pada kelompok lain memberikan tanggapan
c. Penutup (10 menit)
9. Siswa dan guru membuat resume pelajaran
10. Tugas/PR :
d. Penilaian

SCORE

| $81-100$ | Very good | $81-100$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $61-80$ | Good | $61-80$ |
| $41-60$ | Fair | $41-60$ |
| $21-40$ | Poor | $21-40$ |
| $0-20$ | Very poor | $0-20$ |
| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |

Palopo 6 November 2018

Mengetahui<br>Kepala SMA Negeri 4 Palopo<br>Mahasiswa<br>Drs. H. Esman, M.Pd<br>NIP. 196412311989031242<br>Hasnawati<br>NIM. 14.16.3.0044

# Class Experiment (Post-test) RENCANA PELAKSAAN PEMBELAJARAN 

## (RPP)

| Satuan Pendidikan | $:$ SMANegeri 4 Palopo |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kelas/Semester | $:$ XI / Semester Ganjil |
| Mata Pelajaran | $:$ Bahasa Inggris |
| Materi Pokok | $:$ Narative Text (Teks Narasi) |
| Alokasi Waktu | $: 2 \times 40$ menit |

## I. Kompetensi Inti :

KI 1: Menghargai dan menghayati ajaran agama yang dianutnya
KI 2: Menghargai dan menghayati perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (toleransi, gotong royong), santun, percaya diri, dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam dalam jangkauan pergaulan dan keberadaannya.

KI 3: Memahami pengetahuan (faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural) berdasarkan rasa ingin tahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya terkait fenomena dan kejadian tampak mata.

KI 4: Mencoba, mengolah, dan menyaji dalam ranah konkret (menggunakan, mengurai, merangkai, memodifikasi, dan membuat) dan ranah abstrak (menulis, membaca, menghitung, menggambar, dan mengarang) sesuai dengan yang dipelajari di sekolah dan sumber lain yang sama dalam sudut pandang/teori.

## J. Kompetensi Dasar dan Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi

No. Kompetensi Dasar

1. 1.1 Mensyukuri kesempatan dapat mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar komunikasi internasional yang diwujudkan dalam semangat belajar
2. 2.1 Menunjukkan perilaku santun dan peduli dalam melaksanakan komunikasi interpersonal dengan guru dan teman.
3. 3.2 Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks dan unsure karakter yang ada dalam suatu cerita kebahasaan pada teks narrative rakyat sederhana berbentuk legenda rakyat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.

Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi
1.1.3. Mengucapkan hamdalah ketika menyelesaikan tugas.
1.1.4. Menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam kegiatan pembelajaran.
2.1.2 Memulai pertanyaan dgn 'excuse me'.
2.1.4. Mengucapkan 'sorry' ktk melakukan kesalahan
2.1.5. Mengucapkan "what is wrong?" untuk mengetahui kondisi orang lain
3.1.1 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi
3.1.2 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsure sosial cerita rakyat
3.1.3 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi nilai moral yang ada dalam cerita
3.1.4 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsur kebahasaan dalam cerita rakyat
4. 4.1 menamgkap makna teks 4.1.1 siswa dapat menjawab narrative lisan dan tulisan pertanyaan terkait dengan teks cerita berbentuk legenda, sederhana. rakyat yang dibaca

> 4.1.2 siswa dapat menceritakan kembali suatu cerita rakyat yang di baca baik secara lisan.

## K. Tujuan Pembelajaran

Pada akhir kegiatan pembelajaran siswa diharapkan dapat:

- Menunjukkan kesungguhan belajar bahasa inggris terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Menunjukkan perilaku peduli, percaya diri dan tanggung jawab dalam melaksanakan komunikasi terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Mengidentifikasi fungsi social, struktur teks, dan unsure kebahasaan dari teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat
- Merespon makna teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.


## L. Materi Pembelajaran

## Konsep

## Narative Text

1. True Friends (kelompok 1)

Once upon a time, there were two close friends who were walking through the forest together. They knew that anything dangerous can happen any time in the forest. So they promised each other that they would always be together in any case of danger.

Suddenly, they saw a large bear getting closer toward them. One of them climbed a nearby tree at once. But unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. So being led by his common sense, he lay down on the ground breathless and pretended to be a dead man.

The bear came near the one who was lying on the ground. It smelt in his ears, and slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead creatures. After that, the friend on the tree came down and asked his friend that
was on the ground, "Friend, what did the bear whisper into your ears?" The other friend replied, "Just now the bear advised me not to believe a false friend."

## 2. Fox and A Cat (kelompok 2)

One day a cat and a fox were having a conversation. The fox, who was a conceited creature, boasted how clever she was. 'Why, I know at least a hundred tricks to get away from our mutual enemies, the dogs,' she said.
'I know only one trick to get away from dogs,' said the cat. 'You should teach me some of yours!'
'Well, maybe some day, when I have the time, I may teach you a few of the simpler ones,' replied the fox airily.

Just then they heard the barking of a pack of dogs in the distance. The barking grew louder and louder - the dogs were coming in their direction! At once the cat ran to the nearest tree and climbed into its branches, well out of reach of any dog. 'This is the trick I told you about, the only one I know,' said the cat. 'Which one of your hundred tricks are you going to use?'

The fox sat silently under the tree, wondering which trick she should use. Before she could make up her mind, the dogs arrived. They fell upon the fox and tore her to pieces.
3. The Ant and the Dove (kelompok 3)

One hot day, an ant was seeking for some water. After walking around for a moment, she came to a spring. To reach the spring, she had to climb up a blade of grass. While making her way up, she slipped and fell unintentionally into the water.

She could have sunk if a dove up a nearby tree had not seen her. Seeing that the ant was in trouble, the dove quickly put off a leaf from a tree and dropped it immediately into the water near the struggling ant. Then the ant moved towards the leaf and climbed up there. Soon it carried her safely to dry ground.

Not long after at that, there was a hunter nearby who was throwing out his net towards the dove, hoping to trap it in this way.

Guessing what he should do, the ant quickly bit him on the heel. Feeling the pain, the hunter dropped his net and the dove flew away quickly from this net. The morality: One good turn deserves another.

## 4. The Fox and the Grapes (kelompok 4)

One afternoon there was a fox that was walking through the forest and spotted a bunch of grapes hanging from over a lofty branch. "Just the thing to quench my thirst," quoted the fox. Taking a few steps backward, the fox jumped but
unfortunately he missed the hanging grapes. Again the fox took a few paces backward, ran, and tried to reach them but he still failed.

Finally, giving up, the fox turned up his nose and said, "They're probably sour anyway," and proceeded to walk away.

## M. Metode Pembelajaran

Metode/Technique : jigsaw technique

## N. Sumber Belajar

Internet : http://www.britishcourse.com/narrativetext
Alat :Tanya jawab siswa dan guru

## O. Media Pembelajaran

Media : Buku panduan bahasa Inggris

## P. Langkah-langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

$e$. Pendahuluan (10 menit)
-Persiapan /orientasi
5. Berdoa sebelum mengajar
6. Mengecek kehadiran siswa
7. Menyapa dengan memperkenalkan diri dengan menggunakan sapaan yang akan dipelajari,
8. Menyampaikan tujuan dan skenario pembelajaran
-Aperespsi : Tanya jawab mengenai ungkapan-ungkapan kepemilikan
-Motivasi : Menjelaskan pentingnya materi yang akan dipelajari berikut kompetensi yang harus dikuasai siswa.
f. Kegiatan inti ( 60 menit)
5. Guru mengelompokkan siswa menjadi 5 kelompok yang dinamakan kelompok asal
6. Tiap anggota dalam kelompok diberi materi dan tugas yang berbeda dengan penguasaan/tema yang sama membentuk kelompok baru (kelompok ahli)
7. Setelah kelompok ahli berdiskusi atau menjelaskan masingmasing materi yang dikuasai kelompok ahli kembali pada kelempok asal untuk menjelaskan materi yang dikuasai
8. Siswa secara bergantian mempresentasikan hasil diskusi dan memberikan kesempatan pada kelompok lain memberikan tanggapan
g. Penutup (10 menit)
3. Siswa dan guru membuat resume pelajaran
4. Tugas/PR :
h. Penilaian

| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $81-100$ | Very good | $81-100$ |
| $61-80$ | Good | $61-80$ |
| $41-60$ | Fair | $41-60$ |
| $21-40$ | Poor | $21-40$ |
| $0-20$ | Very poor | $0-20$ |
| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |

Palopo 6 November 2018

Mengetahui
Kepala SMA Negeri 4 Palopo
Mahasiswa

Drs. H. Esman, M.Pd
Hasnawati NIM. 14.16.3.0044

# Class Control (Pre-test) RENCANA PELAKSAAN PEMBELAJARAN 

## (RPP)

| Satuan Pendidikan | $:$ SMANegeri 4 Palopo |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kelas/Semester | $:$ XI / Semester Ganjil |
| Mata Pelajaran | $:$ Bahasa Inggris |
| Materi Pokok | $:$ Narative Text (Teks Narasi) |
| Alokasi Waktu | $: 2 \times 40$ menit |

## A. Kompetensi Inti :

KI 1: Menghargai dan menghayati ajaran agama yang dianutnya
KI 2: Menghargai dan menghayati perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (toleransi, gotong royong), santun, percaya diri, dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam dalam jangkauan pergaulan dan keberadaannya.

KI 3: Memahami pengetahuan (faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural) berdasarkan rasa ingin tahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya terkait fenomena dan kejadian tampak mata.

KI 4: Mencoba, mengolah, dan menyaji dalam ranah konkret (menggunakan, mengurai, merangkai, memodifikasi, dan membuat) dan ranah abstrak (menulis, membaca, menghitung, menggambar, dan mengarang) sesuai dengan yang dipelajari di sekolah dan sumber lain yang sama dalam sudut pandang/teori.

## B. Kompetensi Dasar dan Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi

No. Kompetensi Dasar

1. 1.1 Mensyukuri kesempatan dapat mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar komunikasi internasional yang diwujudkan dalam semangat belajar
2. 2.1 Menunjukkan perilaku santun dan peduli dalam melaksanakan komunikasi interpersonal dengan guru dan teman.
3. 3.2 Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks dan unsure kebahasaan pada teks narrative sederhana berbentuk legenda rakyat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.

Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi
1.1.5. Mengucapkan hamdalah ketika menyelesaikan tugas.
1.1.6. Menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam kegiatan pembelajaran.
2.1.3 Memulai pertanyaan dgn 'excuse me'.
2.1.6. Mengucapkan 'sorry' ktk melakukan kesalahan
2.1.7. Mengucapkan "what is wrong?" untuk mengetahui kondisi orang lain
3.1.1 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi karakter yang ada dalam suatu cerita rakyat
3.1.2 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsure sosial cerita rakyat
3.1.3 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi nilai moral yang ada dalam cerita
3.1.4 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsur kebahasaan dalam cerita rakyat
4. 4.1 menamgkap makna teks 4.1.1 siswa dapat menjawab narrative lisan dan tulisan pertanyaan terkait dengan teks cerita berbentuk legenda, sederhana.
rakyat yang dibaca

> 4.1.2 siswa dapat menceritakan kembali suatu cerita rakyat yang di baca baik secara lisan.

## C. Tujuan Pembelajaran

Pada akhir kegiatan pembelajaran siswa diharapkan dapat:

- Menunjukkan kesungguhan belajar bahasa inggris terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Menunjukkan perilaku peduli, percaya diri dan tanggung jawab dalam melaksanakan komunikasi terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Mengidentifikasi fungsi social, struktur teks, dan unsure kebahasaan dari teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat
- Merespon makna teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.


## D. Materi Pembelajaran

## Konsep

## Narative Text

## Goldiloks and Three Bears

Once upon a time there was a little girl called Goldilocks. She went for a walk in the woods. She was lost.

Suddenly, she saw a cottage. She knocked on the door but when no one answered. Goldilocks walked right in!

She saw the table with three bowls. On it. She was very hungry so she tasted the porridge the big bowl." Ooh this porridge is too hot!" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the medium bowl. " Yuk! This porridge is too cold" said Goldilocks.

She tasted the porridge in the little bowl. "Mmm! This porridge is just right! It is not to hot and it is not too cold," said Goldilocks.

She went into living room and she saw three chairs.
Goldilocks sat on the big chair." Ouch!" she said. It was too hard.
Goldilocks sat on the medium sized chair. "oops! She said. It was too soft.
Goldilocks sat on the little chair . "Ahh! This chair is just right. It's not to hard and it's not too soft" said Goldilocks. But then the chair broke!

Goldilocks ran into the bedroom and she saw three beds.
Goldilocks sat on the big bed. " Huh! This bed is too lumpy" said Goldilocks.

Goldilocks sat on medium bed. "Eek! This bed is too spongy" said Goldilocks.

Goldilocks sat on the little bed."Oooh! This bed is just right. It's not too lumpy and it's no too spongy " said Goldilocks. Then she went to sleep.

The three bears went back home.
They found Goldilocks asleep in the little bed. Just then Goldilocks woke up and saw the three bears. "Help!" screamed Goldilocks,

Goldilocks ran all the way home and never went back to the house of the three bears.

## E. Metode Pembelajaran

Metode/Technique : jigsaw technique

## F. Sumber Belajar

Internet : http://www.britishcourse.com/narrativetext
Alat :Tanya jawab siswa dan guru

## G. Media Pembelajaran

Media : Buku panduan bahasa Inggris

## H. Langkah-langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

i. Pendahuluan (10 menit)
-Persiapan /orientasi
9. Berdoa sebelum mengajar
10. Mengecek kehadiran siswa
11. Menyapa dengan memperkenalkan diri dengan menggunakan sapaan yang akan dipelajari,
12. Menyampaikan tujuan dan skenario pembelajaran
-Aperespsi : Tanya jawab mengenai ungkapan-ungkapan kepemilikan
-Motivasi : Menjelaskan pentingnya materi yang akan dipelajari berikut kompetensi yang harus dikuasai siswa.
j. Kegiatan inti ( 60 menit)
9. Guru mengelompokkan siswa menjadi 5 kelompok yang dinamakan kelompok asal
10. Tiap anggota dalam kelompok diberi materi dan tugas yang berbeda dengan penguasaan/tema yang sama membentuk kelompok baru (kelompok ahli)
11. Setelah kelompok ahli berdiskusi atau menjelaskan masingmasing materi yang dikuasai kelompok ahli kembali pada kelempok asal untuk menjelaskan materi yang dikuasai
12. Siswa secara bergantian mempresentasikan hasil diskusi dan memberikan kesempatan pada kelompok lain memberikan tanggapan
k. Penutup (10 menit)
5. Siswa dan guru membuat resume pelajaran
6. Tugas/PR :

1. Penilaian

| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $81-100$ | Very good | $81-100$ |
| $61-80$ | Good | $61-80$ |
| $41-60$ | Fair | $41-60$ |
| $21-40$ | Poor | $21-40$ |
| $0-20$ | Very poor | $0-20$ |
| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |

Palopo 6 November 2018

Mengetahui
Kepala SMA Negeri 4 Palopo
Mahasiswa

Drs. H. Esman, M.Pd

# Class Control (Post-test) RENCANA PELAKSAAN PEMBELAJARAN 

## (RPP)

| Satuan Pendidikan | : SMANegeri 4 Palopo |
| :--- | :--- |
| Kelas/Semester | $:$ XI / Semester Ganjil |
| Mata Pelajaran | $:$ Bahasa Inggris |
| Materi Pokok | $:$ Narative Text (Teks Narasi) |
| Alokasi Waktu | $: 2 \times 40$ menit |

## A. Kompetensi Inti :

KI 1: Menghargai dan menghayati ajaran agama yang dianutnya
KI 2: Menghargai dan menghayati perilaku jujur, disiplin, tanggungjawab, peduli (toleransi, gotong royong), santun, percaya diri, dalam berinteraksi secara efektif dengan lingkungan sosial dan alam dalam jangkauan pergaulan dan keberadaannya.

KI 3: Memahami pengetahuan (faktual, konseptual, dan prosedural) berdasarkan rasa ingin tahunya tentang ilmu pengetahuan, teknologi, seni, budaya terkait fenomena dan kejadian tampak mata.

KI 4: Mencoba, mengolah, dan menyaji dalam ranah konkret (menggunakan, mengurai, merangkai, memodifikasi, dan membuat) dan ranah abstrak (menulis, membaca, menghitung, menggambar, dan mengarang) sesuai dengan yang dipelajari di sekolah dan sumber lain yang sama dalam sudut pandang/teori.

## B. Kompetensi Dasar dan Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi

No. Kompetensi Dasar

1. 1.1 Mensyukuri kesempatan dapat mempelajari bahasa Inggris sebagai bahasa pengantar komunikasi internasional yang diwujudkan dalam semangat belajar
2. 2.1 Menunjukkan perilaku santun dan peduli dalam melaksanakan komunikasi interpersonal dengan guru dan teman.
3. 3.2 Menganalisis fungsi sosial, struktur teks dan unsure karakter yang ada dalam suatu cerita kebahasaan pada teks narrative rakyat sederhana berbentuk legenda rakyat sesuai dengan konteks penggunaannya.

Indikator Pencapaian Kompetensi
1.1.7. Mengucapkan hamdalah ketika menyelesaikan tugas.
1.1.8. Menggunakan bahasa Inggris dalam kegiatan pembelajaran.
2.1.4 Memulai pertanyaan dgn 'excuse me'.
2.1.8. Mengucapkan 'sorry' ktk melakukan kesalahan
2.1.9. Mengucapkan "what is wrong?" untuk mengetahui kondisi orang lain
3.1.1 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi
3.1.2 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsure sosial cerita rakyat
3.1.3 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi nilai moral yang ada dalam cerita
3.1.4 siswa dapat mengidentifikasi unsur kebahasaan dalam cerita rakyat
4. 4.1 menamgkap makna teks 4.1.1 siswa dapat menjawab narrative lisan dan tulisan pertanyaan terkait dengan teks cerita berbentuk legenda, sederhana.
rakyat yang dibaca

> 4.1.2 siswa dapat menceritakan kembali suatu cerita rakyat yang di baca baik secara lisan.

## C. Tujuan Pembelajaran

Pada akhir kegiatan pembelajaran siswa diharapkan dapat:

- Menunjukkan kesungguhan belajar bahasa inggris terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Menunjukkan perilaku peduli, percaya diri dan tanggung jawab dalam melaksanakan komunikasi terkait teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.
- Mengidentifikasi fungsi social, struktur teks, dan unsure kebahasaan dari teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat
- Merespon makna teks narrative sederhana berbentuk cerita rakyat.


## D. Materi Pembelajaran

## Konsep

## Narative Text

## 1. True Friends (kelompok 1)

Once upon a time, there were two close friends who were walking through the forest together. They knew that anything dangerous can happen any time in the forest. So they promised each other that they would always be together in any case of danger.

Suddenly, they saw a large bear getting closer toward them. One of them climbed a nearby tree at once. But unfortunately the other one did not know how to climb up the tree. So being led by his common sense, he lay down on the ground breathless and pretended to be a dead man.

The bear came near the one who was lying on the ground. It smelt in his ears, and slowly left the place because the bears do not want to touch the dead
creatures. After that, the friend on the tree came down and asked his friend that was on the ground, "Friend, what did the bear whisper into your ears?" The other friend replied, "Just now the bear advised me not to believe a false friend."

## 2. Fox and A Cat (kelompok 2)

One day a cat and a fox were having a conversation. The fox, who was a conceited creature, boasted how clever she was. 'Why, I know at least a hundred tricks to get away from our mutual enemies, the dogs,' she said.
'I know only one trick to get away from dogs,' said the cat. 'You should teach me some of yours!'
'Well, maybe some day, when I have the time, I may teach you a few of the simpler ones,' replied the fox airily.

Just then they heard the barking of a pack of dogs in the distance. The barking grew louder and louder - the dogs were coming in their direction! At once the cat ran to the nearest tree and climbed into its branches, well out of reach of any dog. 'This is the trick I told you about, the only one I know,' said the cat. 'Which one of your hundred tricks are you going to use?'

The fox sat silently under the tree, wondering which trick she should use. Before she could make up her mind, the dogs arrived. They fell upon the fox and tore her to pieces.
3. The Ant and the Dove (kelompok 3)

One hot day, an ant was seeking for some water. After walking around for a moment, she came to a spring. To reach the spring, she had to climb up a blade of grass. While making her way up, she slipped and fell unintentionally into the water.

She could have sunk if a dove up a nearby tree had not seen her. Seeing that the ant was in trouble, the dove quickly put off a leaf from a tree and dropped it immediately into the water near the struggling ant. Then the ant moved towards the leaf and climbed up there. Soon it carried her safely to dry ground.

Not long after at that, there was a hunter nearby who was throwing out his net towards the dove, hoping to trap it in this way.

Guessing what he should do, the ant quickly bit him on the heel. Feeling the pain, the hunter dropped his net and the dove flew away quickly from this net. The morality: One good turn deserves another.
4. The Fox and the Grapes (kelompok 4)

One afternoon there was a fox that was walking through the forest and spotted a bunch of grapes hanging from over a lofty branch. "Just the thing to quench my thirst," quoted the fox. Taking a few steps backward, the fox jumped but
unfortunately he missed the hanging grapes. Again the fox took a few paces backward, ran, and tried to reach them but he still failed.

Finally, giving up, the fox turned up his nose and said, "They're probably sour anyway," and proceeded to walk away.

## E. Metode Pembelajaran

Metode/Technique : jigsaw technique

## F. Sumber Belajar

Internet : http://www.britishcourse.com/narrativetext
Alat :Tanya jawab siswa dan guru

## G. Media Pembelajaran

Media : Buku panduan bahasa Inggris

## H. Langkah-langkah Kegiatan Pembelajaran

$m$. Pendahuluan (10 menit)
-Persiapan /orientasi
13. Berdoa sebelum mengajar
14. Mengecek kehadiran siswa
15. Menyapa dengan memperkenalkan diri dengan menggunakan sapaan yang akan dipelajari,
16. Menyampaikan tujuan dan skenario pembelajaran
-Aperespsi : Tanya jawab mengenai ungkapan-ungkapan kepemilikan
-Motivasi : Menjelaskan pentingnya materi yang akan dipelajari berikut kompetensi yang harus dikuasai siswa.
n. Kegiatan inti ( 60 menit)
13. Guru mengelompokkan siswa menjadi 5 kelompok yang dinamakan kelompok asal
14. Tiap anggota dalam kelompok diberi materi dan tugas yang berbeda dengan penguasaan/tema yang sama membentuk kelompok baru (kelompok ahli)
15. Setelah kelompok ahli berdiskusi atau menjelaskan masingmasing materi yang dikuasai kelompok ahli kembali pada kelempok asal untuk menjelaskan materi yang dikuasai
16. Siswa secara bergantian mempresentasikan hasil diskusi dan memberikan kesempatan pada kelompok lain memberikan tanggapan
o. Penutup (10 menit)
7. Siswa dan guru membuat resume pelajaran
8. Tugas/PR :
p. Penilaian

| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $81-100$ | Very good | $81-100$ |
| $61-80$ | Good | $61-80$ |
| $41-60$ | Fair | $41-60$ |
| $21-40$ | Poor | $21-40$ |
| $0-20$ | Very poor | $0-20$ |
| SCORE | CLASSIFICATION | SCORE |
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## Appendix 3

## Frequencies result for students' speaking skill in pretest and posttest for Experimental group

Pre-test

1. Accuracy

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid | 1 | 9 | 45.0 | 45.0 |

2. Fluency

|  | Frequenc <br> $y$ | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 9 | 45.0 | 45.0 | 45.0 |
|  | 2 | 8 | 40.0 | 40.0 |

3. Comprehensibility

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 13 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 |
|  | 2 | 7 | 35.0 | 35.0 |

## Post-test

1. Accuracy

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 3 | 3 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
| 4 | 7 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 50.0 |
| 5 | 8 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 90.0 |
| 6 | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

2. Fluency

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 3 | 3 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 15.0 |
|  | 4 | 8 | 40.0 | 40.0 |

3.Comprehensibility

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 3 | 5 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 25.0 |
| 4 | 8 | 40.0 | 40.0 | 65.0 |
| 5 | 7 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

## Appendix 4

Frequencies result for students' speaking skill in pretest and posttest for Control class
Pre-test

1. Accuracy

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 13 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 |
|  | 2 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 90.0 |
|  | 2 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 100.0 |
|  | Total | 20 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

2. Fluency

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 13 | 65.0 | 65.0 | 65.0 |
|  | 2 | 7 | 35.0 | 35.0 |

3.Comprehensibility

|  | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative <br> Percent |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Valid 1 | 15 | 75.0 | 75.0 | 75.0 |
|  | 2 | 25.0 | 25.0 | 100.0 |



## Appendix 5

## Documentation

1. Student Activities in the Class Experiment When Working (Pre-test)


Student Activities in the Class Experiment When Working (Post-

2. Student Activities in the Class Control When Working (Pretest)


Student Activities in the Class Control When Working (Post-test)


## Appendix 6

## Transkip

## Class Experiment (Pre-test)

1. Students A : If talk a lot use the word 'e' in every talk and pause too long
2. StudentS B : Serious pronunciation errors and many "basic" grammatical and lexical errors.
3. Students C : Full length pauses and obscure pronunciation
4. Students D : If talk a lot use the word 'e' in every talk and pause too long
5. Students E : think too much when you want to say a word

## Post-test

1. Students A : Have tried sometimes to look for words and the word 'e' that has been used has begun to decrease
2. StudentS B : the way of pronunciation has begun to improve
3. Students C : the break in speaking starts to decrease slightly
4. Students D : Have tried sometimes to look for words and the word 'e' that has been used has begun to decrease
5. Students E : have begun to be able to speak without thinking for a long time Class Control (pre-test)
6. Students A : If talk a lot use the word 'e' in every talk and pause too long
7. StudentS B : Serious pronunciation errors and many "basic" grammatical and lexical errors.
8. Students C : Full length pauses and obscure pronunciation
9. Students D : If talk a lot use the word 'e' in every talk and pause too long
10. Students E : think too much when you want to say a word

## Post-test

1. Students A : Have tried sometimes to look for words and the word 'e' that has been used has begun to decrease
2. StudentS B : the way of pronunciation has begun to improve
3. Students C : the break in speaking starts to decrease slightly
4. Students D : Have tried sometimes to look for words and the word 'e' that has been used has begun to decrease
5. Students E : have begun to be able to speak without thinking for a long time
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