

# STUDENTS' LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING ANALYTICAL EXPOSITION TEXT: A STUDY IN JIGSAW COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL

Herni Hafsa<sup>1</sup>, Iskandar<sup>2</sup>, Elly Fatmasari<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> SMA Negeri 4 Sungai Raya, Kalimantan Barat, Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>1</sup> SMKN 10 Makassar, Indonesia

## Article Info

### Article history:

Received January 25, 2022

Revised July 15, 2022

Accepted December 10, 2022

### Keywords:

Cooperative Learning Model;

Exposition Text;

Jigsaw;

Learning Achievement;

Writing

## ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to improve students' learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts using the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model strategy. The research method used was classroom action research, which was carried out in two cycles. Data collection techniques used are observation, interview, test, and documentation. The observation was done by the real teacher and collaborator in observing the teacher's (writer's) performance. The result showed that there were significant improvements in students' learning outcomes. It can be seen in the mean score and percentage of the test from cycle 1 until cycle 2. The students' percentage who passed the criteria for success in cycle 1 is 67.7%. And cycle 2 is 90%. It can be concluded that the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model can improve the student's learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts.

Copyright © 2022 ETDCI.  
All rights reserved.

## Corresponding Author:

Herni Hafsa

SMA Negeri 4 Sungai Raya, Kalimantan Barat, Indonesia

Email: [hafsahherni84@gmail.com](mailto:hafsahherni84@gmail.com)

## 1. INTRODUCTION

English has been used almost everywhere in the world, both as a second language and as a foreign language (Cook, 2016; Rao, 2019). In Indonesia, English is taught as a foreign language, and English is taught as a compulsory lesson from elementary to university level. English has different characteristics than other subjects (Trudgill & Hannah, 2013; McDonough & McDonough, 2014; Wolfram & Schilling, 2015). The different situations affect the function of language as a means of communication. In mastering language skills, some important aspects of language should be mastered by the students. They include vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, and spelling (Rivers, 2018; Taslim et al., 2019). It also requires skill in applying them to both oral and written communication activities. At the learning competence or writing aspect, where writing ends up producing functional text and monologue based on the genre or type of text, students are expected to understand the language features of a text and to express themselves with a grammatical vocabulary.

At Public High School 4 Sungai Raya, many of the students in grade XI, especially in XI IPA, have found difficulties in joining English classes, especially in the writing aspect. For example, when they studied analytical exposure Most of the students did not immediately do it in the right way, and the students didn't feel confident when they wanted to write their idea. The example of analytical exposition text has already been given, and all students have discussed the structure and language features.

That may have been the case, but most students considered English a difficult and uninteresting subject (Panggabean, 2015; Songbatumis, 2017; Budiharto & Amalia, 2019; Sultra & Baharudin, 2020). Because of the difficulties and uninterest, students feel stuck and want to avoid the task that has been given by their teacher. The students had a shortcut to do the task by seeing the example text from the internet, but the students didn't understand the content of the text when their teacher wanted them to forward it.

When the teacher asked them to create an analytical exposition for several meetings in writing class, most of the students stopped when they wanted to forward their ideas or opinions, even though they knew about the structure and language features, and that was the problem for students in writing analytical exposition. The problem seems to be that most of the students in XI IPA Public High School 4 Sungai Raya face fairly complex learning aspects.

Based on the writer's preliminary research, the writer found a problem in the teaching and learning process in writing class. The writer will be trying the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model to solve the problem. The jigsaw cooperative learning model is one type of cooperative learning that focuses on collaboration in small groups to help each other learn the subject matter (Slavin, 2011; Karacop & Doymus, 2013; Slavin, 2013). In this technique, students work with the same group members but with different backgrounds. Moreover, the jigsaw cooperative learning model focuses on teamwork or small groups that provide information to each other in the team or group (Mengduo & Xiaoling, Orprayoon, 2014; 2010; Susanti & Subekti, 2020).

The cooperative learning jigsaw learning model can help students create a new atmosphere in writing class (Gillies, 2007; Sajin, 2010; Mahfuroh et al., 2018). By using the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model, learning activities will be more interesting for students. It can eliminate students's boredom because they can collaborate and share ideas or opinions with their friends. This strategy can make students more active during class and improve their ability to write analytical exposition texts. Based on these facts, the purpose of this study is to improve student's learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts using the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model strategy.

## 2. METHOD

This research was conducted as action research, in which the writer paid more attention to the teaching and learning process and the real problems. Classroom Action Research is practical research intended to improve classroom learning. This research is one of the efforts of teachers or practitioners in the form of various activities carried out

to improve and/or increase the quality of learning in the classroom (Koshy, 2005; McNiff, 2013). Therefore, appropriate action should be taken to solve such a problem. To evaluate the changes in the action taken or treatment, the writer reflected on her teaching after she made a note during the process of teaching and learning in the classroom.

This study was conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consisted of several stages of the classroom action research procedure, namely, planning, acting, observing, and reflecting. In planning, the researcher prepared lesson plans, teaching materials, and teaching media to be taught to the students. In acting, the researcher implemented the lesson plans using a cooperative jigsaw learning model in writing class. In observing, the writer implemented the lesson plans using the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model with a collaborator. In the last step of reflection, the researcher evaluated the use of the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model in writing class to improve students' analytical exposition texts. The writer uses quantitative data, which is a test used to find out whether or not the use of a cooperative learning model strategy can improve students' learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts, and qualitative data, which is an observation of the teaching and learning process by using a cooperative learning jigsaw learning model.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Results

Research findings discuss the findings of a preliminary study, which includes observation and a pre-test. Besides, the writer describes two cycles of implementation and presents students' scores in tests 1 and 2. In interpretation, the writer explains the data from an interview, observation, and test.

The result of writing analytical exposition texts was evaluated by considering five components, namely content, organization, vocabulary, language use, and mechanics, where each component had its score.

This research was conducted in two cycles. Each cycle consists of four steps: planning, implementation, action, and reflection. Well, the implementations of each cycle were as follows:

**Table 1.** The Students' Average Scores of the Pre-test

Pre-test	The evaluated components of writing					ΣScore
	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	
Average	16.19	10.94	10.39	11.90	2.58	52.00

The table above shows us the average scores of five aspects of writing tested in the pre-test. The scores of the five aspects are content 16.19, organization 10.94, vocabulary 10.39, language use 11.90, and mechanics 2.58, while the mean of the pre-test is 52.00, and there were only 3 or 9,67% of students who passed the criteria for success in research, while the other 28 students were below the criterion. It means that they are still fair in their ability to write analytical exposition texts.

**Table 2.** The Students' Average Scores of the Test on Cycle 1

Pre-test	The evaluated components of writing					$\Sigma$ Score
	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	
Average	22.55	14.84	14.77	17.97	3.29	72.00

The table above shows us the average scores of the five aspects of writing tested in the test on cycle 1. The scores of the five aspects are: content 22.19, organization 14.45, vocabulary 14.10, language use 17.97, and mechanics 3.29, while the mean of the test is 72.00. The result of that calculation shows that 67.74% of the class passed the criteria for success in research. Twenty-one students passed the criteria for success, while ten students did not. It means that the cycle of research still needs to be continued because it could not reach 90% as a criterion for success in research.

After the whole activity had finished, the researcher assessed the students' writing results. From the result, he could calculate the mean of the student's writing results.

**Table 3.** The Students' Average Scores of the Test on Cycle 2

Pre-test	The evaluated components of writing					$\Sigma$ Score
	Content	Organization	Vocabulary	Language Use	Mechanic	
Average	23.23	16.00	15.65	18.65	3.65	77.16

The table above shows us the average scores of five aspects of writing tested in the post-test on cycle 2. The scores of the five aspects are: content 23.23, organization 16.00, vocabulary 15.65, language use 18.65, and mechanics 3.65, while the mean of the pre-test is 77.16. The result of that calculation shows that 90% of the class passed the criteria for success in research. Twenty-eight students passed the criteria for success, while three students did not. It means that the student's writing value was good, and it reached the criteria of success in research. It was better than the previous one. There was an improvement in this cycle. The researcher concluded that the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model strategy can improve students's learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts.

**Table 4.** The comparison of students' learning outcomes in Cycle 1 and Cycle 2

Criteria	Cycle I test	Cycle 2 test	Increase
Mean Score	72,00	77,16	6
Percentage	67,74%	90%	23%

**Table 5.** The comparison of students' learning outcomes on pre-cycle, cycle 1 and cycle 2

Criteria	Pre-Cycle	Cycle I	Increase	Cycle 2	Increase
Mean Score	52,00	72,00	20	77,16	6
Percentage	9,67%	67,74%	58%	90%	23%

Based on the Table of Comparison Student's learning outcomes in pre-cycle and cycle 1 are increasing in each criterion; namely, the mean score is 20 and the percentage is 58%. Meanwhile, in cycles 1 and 2, there is an increase in each criterion, namely: the mean score is 6, and the percentage is 23%.

### 3.2 Discussion

The students' percentage who passed the criteria for success in pre-cycle is 9,67%, which means a mean score of 52.00. in cycle 1 is 67,74%, which is an average score of 73,42. And cycle 2 is 90%, whose average score is 77.16. It indicated that 3 students passed criteria in pre-cycle, 21 students who passed criteria success in cycle 1, and 28 students who passed criteria success in cycle 2.

It means that the percentage score in learning outcomes of students in writing descriptive text is progress and suitable with the criteria of success of research that is  $\geq 70$  from 90% subject of research.

It showed that there was a significant improvement in students' learning outcomes. Furthermore, there was also improvement from cycle 1 until cycle 2.

## 4. CONCLUSION

In this research, classroom action research was used to improve students' learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts. The result shows that the mean score of the pre-test is 52.00, and there were 3 students, or 9.67% of the class, who passed the criteria for success. In test 1, the main score is 72.00, with 21 students, or 67.74% of the class, passing the criteria for success in research. In test 2, the mean score is 77.16, and there are 28 students, or 90% of the class, who passed the criteria for success in research. Based on the criteria of success, the cycle will be stopped when the percentage of students who pass the criteria of success is 90%. Thus, in this research, the action was stopped in cycle 2 because it had already passed the criterion of success. It showed that there was a significant improvement in students' learning outcomes. Furthermore, there was also improvement from cycle 1 until cycle 2.

Therefore, it can be concluded that the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model can improve the student's learning outcomes in writing analytical exposition texts. In addition, the students became more interested and creative in exploring the ideas through the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model, where they could share their ideas and make the learning process more interactive. In summary, the cooperative learning jigsaw learning model helps the students gain a better score in writing.

## REFERENCES

- Budiharto, R. A., & Amalia, L. (2019). Motivation behind Indonesian undergraduates learning English as a target language. *IDEAS: Journal on English Language Teaching and Learning, Linguistics and Literature*, 7(1).
- Cook, V. (2016). *Second language learning and language teaching*. Routledge.
- Gillies, R. M. (2007). *Cooperative learning: Integrating theory and practice*. Sage.

- Karacop, A., & Doymus, K. (2013). Effects of jigsaw cooperative learning and animation techniques on students' understanding of chemical bonding and their conceptions of the particulate nature of matter. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 22, 186-203.
- Koshy, V. (2005). *Action research for improving practice: A practical guide*. Sage.
- Mahfuroh, M., Emzir, E., & Fahrurrozi, F. (2018). Developing the Skills of Writing German Paragraph Through the Model of Cooperative Learning with Jigsaw Tehnique (Action Research in Man 2 Kota Serang). *Bahtera: Jurnal Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra*, 17(1), 30-54.
- McNiff, J. (2013). *Action research: Principles and practice*. Routledge.
- McDonough, J., & McDonough, S. (2014). *Research methods for English language teachers*. Routledge.
- Mengduo, Q., & Xiaoling, J. (2010). Jigsaw Strategy as a Cooperative Learning Technique: Focusing on Language Learners. *Chinese Journal of Applied Linguistics (Foreign Language Teaching & Research Press)*, 33(4).
- Panggabean, H. (2015). Problematic Approach to English Learning and Teaching: A Case in Indonesia. *English language teaching*, 8(3), 35-45.
- Orprayoon, S. (2014). Effects of Cooperative Learning on Learning Achievement and Group Working Behavior of Junior Students in Modern French Literature Course. *Journal of Effective Teaching*, 14(1), 80-98.
- Rao, P. S. (2019). The role of English as a global language. *Research Journal of English*, 4(1), 65-79.
- Rivers, W. M. (2018). *Teaching foreign language skills*. University of Chicago Press.
- Slavin, R. E. (2011). Instruction based on cooperative learning. *Handbook of research on learning and instruction*, 4(2), 12-23.
- Slavin, R. E. (2013). Cooperative learning and student achievement. *School and classroom organization*, 129-156.
- Songbatumis, A. M. (2017). Challenges in teaching English faced by English teachers at MTsN Taliwang, Indonesia. *Journal of foreign language teaching and learning*, 2(2), 54-67.
- Sultra, E. D., & Baharudin, B. (2020). Analysis of student's difficulties in learning English at SMA Negeri 1 Batauga. *English Education Journal*, 65-75.
- Susanti, Y. P., & Subekti, A. S. (2020). Jigsaw strategy for cooperative learning in an English reading class: teacher's and students' beliefs. *Pedagogy: Journal of English Language Teaching*, 8(2), 102-114.
- Taslim, T., Asrifan, A., Chen, Y., & Nurdania, N. R. (2019). Correlation Between Student's Vocabulary Mastery and Speaking Skill. *Journal of Advanced English Studies*, 2(2), 65-76.
- Trudgill, P., & Hannah, J. (2013). *International English: A guide to the varieties of standard English*. Routledge.
- Wolfram, W., & Schilling, N. (2015). *American English: dialects and variation*. John Wiley & Sons.