

# THE COMPARISON OF USING STAD AND JIGSAW TECHNIQUE OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING METHOD TOWARD STUDENTS' SPEAKING ABILITY OF SMP N 4 METRO ACADEMIC YEAR 2011/2012

By Suko

Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Muhammadiyah University of Metro, Metro Indonesia 34111

**Abstract:** Many techniques presented as a solution in this research to develop speaking ability, they are STAD and Jigsaw technique. In this research, the researcher uses the experiment design. The research is conducted at the eight levels of SMP N 4 Metro in the academic year 2011/ 2012. The researcher takes 46 students as the sample, 23 students are as experiment class and 23 students are as control class that taken based on cluster random sampling. After analyzing the data by using the formula of  $t_{test}$ , the researcher get the result of  $t_{test}$  is 3,95 and  $t_{table}$  is 2,69 (on criterion 1) and 2,01 (on criterion 2). It means that  $t_{hit} > t_{table}$ . And the criterion of  $t_{test}$  is  $H_a$  accepted if  $t_{hit} > t_{table}$ . So, There is significant difference between using STAD and Jigsaw technique toward students' speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMPN 4 Metro and STAD technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique toward students' speaking ability for the eight grade students of SMPN 4 Metro.

**Key Words:** Cooperative Learning Method, STAD, Jigsaw and Students Speaking Ability

Students in junior high school should be able to speak English. In structure and content of education curriculum or KTSP curriculum ( *kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan* ). it is clearly stated that one of the objective of the English subject in junior high school is developing the ability to communicate in English, either in written or oral form (Kistono et al, 2007, iii). Speaking is one of the most difficult aspects for students to master. This is hardly surprising when one considers everything that is involved when speaking: ideas, what to say, language, how to use grammar and vocabulary, pronunciation as well as listening to and reacting to the person you are communicating with. Any learner of a foreign language can confirm how difficult speaking is (Pollard, 2008, 34).

Speaking ability at eight grades of Students in SMP N 4 Metro academic year 2011/2012 is indicated low enough. The teacher says that The students is difficult to speak english by maching among the vocabulary,pronunciation, gramar, fluenty and comprehension well. They often

individually study, so their achievment in speaking ability is not maximal. The Teachers just have not found the right key to solve the problem, and Traditional teaching as doing assigment on handbook is not efektif enough to develop the speaking ability. These statements is set by the result of interview between the researcher and teacher and support by pre-survey data of students class A.

To evaluate the pra-survey deeply, the researcher uses Dirjen Dikti regulation (1985, 5) to support the finding, It says that minimum mastering the material sometime are made basic graduated for the students who learn the material. But then usually up to mastery the moving material between 75 % and 80%. By looking this standard, the teachers should evaluate the next step as rules below:

1. When the students are able to mastery the material more than 75%, the learning process can be continued by discussing next material.
2. When the students just can be mastery the material less than 75%, the next

meeting on learning process is just focusing in remedial program.

In referencing those achievement grades, it is hoped that the students be able to mastery the material more than 75%. So that, it is not needed the remedial program. Bellow is the table of pra survey:

**Table 1.1 Pre-survey data of speaking ability at eight grades of students class A of SMP N 4 Metro academic year 2011**

KKMs' score	Frequency	Category	Percentage	minimum Percentase of material mastering base on Dirjen dikti
≥ 75	9	Pass	37,5%	≥ 75%
< 75	15	Failed	62,5%	< 75%
Total	24		100%	Total

Source: English teacher of SMP N 4 Metro acadademic year 2011/2012

From the table 1.1 above, there are 9 students or 37, 5% who pass in speaking test fulfil KKMs' score  $\geq 75$  and 15 students or 62, 5% who failed do not fulfil KKMs' score.

There are 6 basic problems in this research they are:

1. When researcher compares between the pra-survey data and minimum mastering score of the material by dirjen dikti, it is very clear that 37,5% do not fulfil enough the standard minimum of material mastering namely  $\geq 75\%$  and 62,5% students in class A need to be given remedial program, because it is less than 75%.
2. Researcher finds that only 9 students who fulfil KKMs' score and 15 students do not fulfill KKMs' score.
3. Speaking ability at eight grades of Students in SMP N 4 Metro academic year 2011/2012 is indicated low enough because it is just 37,5 % who pass the test. It does not fulfil enough the would like to make the comparison, namely:

standard minimum of material mastering namely is  $\geq 75\%$ .

4. The students is difficult to speak english by maching among the vocabulary, pronunciation, gramar, fluently and comprehension well. High achievment on those basic aspects as indicators of speaking ability of students.
5. They often individually study so their achievment in speaking ability is not maximal, because the students basicly need partners to practice their speaking ability.
6. The Teachers just have not found the right key to solve the problem and Traditional teaching as doing assignment on handbook is not effectif enough to develop the speaking ability.

Here, the researcher would like to review three reseaches, namely; the first, the research is from Umi Machmudah in 2010 with the title is "Influence of Cooperative Learning Method STAD Model vs. Conventional and Achievement Motivation on Arabic Performance of the Tenth Year Students of SMAN I Malang". The Second, the research is from Eko Yulianto, with the title is Science Learning Using Jigsaw and STAD Method of Cooperative Learning Seen in the studens learning's style in SMP N 1Karang Rejo Magetan academic year 2010/2011". The last reseach is from Shlomo Sharan with the titl. "Group Investigation in the Cooperative Classroom." In Sharan, S. *Handbook of Cooperative Learning Methods*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994.

Base on the previous research overview above, next the researcher

1. The comparison between the first research and the researcher's research :
  - a) The first research does not do try out test for making sure that the items is suitable or valid to be tested, while in the researcher's research will do try out first for making sure that the items is suitable or valid to be tested.
  - b) Base on the researcher's observasion on corelation between variable on first research, The title is confused enough because it should be a comparison than an influence research, "Influence of Cooperative Learning Method STAD Model vs. Conventional and Achievement Motivation on Arabic Performance of the Tenth Year Students of SMAN I Malang". The conjunction "versus (vs)" is not suitable in a influence research, as a comparison While the researcher's title is clearly enough about comparison research with the title and conjunction are right to corelate the variable, "The Comparison of Using Stad and Jigsaw Technique of Cooperative Learning Method Toward Students' Speaking Ability of SMP N 4 Metro Academic Year 2011/2012. Here the conjunction "and" is right to compare the variable.
  - c) The strengthens of the research are she gives kinds of test to get the right data, namely matching, multiple choice, completion, and sentence construction. While, This reseach will use different and specific test because this reseach is speaking research, namely "speaking test (oral test)". The researcher hopes that this research will also measure the right data or be better to get the right data than the first research.
  - d) Both are experimen research but this research will add the essential elements that are not in the first reseach such as try out test and using clear title. So this research will be accurate in test and better in presenting of the title than the first reseach.
2. The comparison between the second research and the researcher's reserch :
  - a) The second research uses Jigsaw and STAD in the research but it is not clear in giving the purpose of using the techniques, comparison or influence between technique. While in this research clearly compares STAD and Jigsaw in the hypothesis.
  - b) The strengthens of the research are he gives kinds of test to get the data, namely test method for cognitive student achievement, documentation method for student prior knowledge, observation sheet for affective student achievement and questionnaire for student learning style. While, This reseach will use different and specific test because this reseach is speaking research, namely "speaking test (oral test)". The researcher hopes that this research will also measure the right data or be better to get the right data than the first research.
  - c) Both are experiment research but this research will clearly eksplain the purpose of operational variables in the hyphotesis. So this research will have clearly purpose of the result. As a conclusion this research will be better than the second research.

3. The comparison between the third research and the researcher's research :
- The research did not explain about the population and sample and then the technique sampling. While in this research, researcher will clearly explain his population and technique sampling. It can be read in chapter 3.
  - The strengths of this research are this research uses detail explanation about cooperative learning in small group. While in this research, the researcher will apply STAD and Jigsaw of cooperative learning method in groups. So it will clearly explain the effectiveness of cooperative learning.

Based on those previous research overview, it is seen that STAD and Jigsaw technique create a positive achievement in learning process. This research will add the missed elements of those previous research overview. Supported by researcher's analyzed on the three previous research overview above, The researcher believes that this research will be better than them.

By evaluation the finding problems on the pre-survey and the previous reviews, cooperative learning method is just solution to solve the problems and the right techniques are by treating STAD and JIGSAW in the class.

One of the indicators of the luck of this research is that this research will find problems solution on the problems identification above.

## METHODOLOGY

The research is Quantitative research with using experimental design. It uses two class in the process of taking the data. They are experimental class and control class. The experimental class gets treatments through STAD Technique and the control

class gets treatment through Jigsaw Technique. Each of classes receives pre-test, treatment and post-test in order to find the progress of students' speaking ability. There are two kinds of tests here used by researcher, they are pre-test and post-test. The Pre-Test will be distributed by the researcher before explaining the materials. Here, The researcher wants to know how far the students' speaking ability before treatment. Then, the Post-Test will be distributed after explaining the materials. The treatment will be conducted for  $\pm$  two weeks. Therefore this research will be modified based on Karwonos' research design. Pre-test, treatment and post-test.

There are three kinds of variables:

- The dependent variable is students' speaking ability (Y).
- The first independent variable of the research is STAD technique of cooperative method (X<sub>1</sub>).
- The second independent variable of the research is Jigsaw technique of Cooperative method (X<sub>2</sub>).

the concept of students' speaking Ability is students should be able to answer questions about the Asking and Giving Opinion if given the right example with the right procedures, orally and correctly.

Research of STAD has also revealed very positive effects on ethnic relations and various types of prosocial development. The use of STAD includes enduring teams (usually lasting about six weeks) and an improvement point scoring system, which provides high motivation for students across the range of ability levels (Spencer and Miguel Kagan, 2009, 60). According to Spencer and Miguel Kagan (2009, 460) the steps of using STAD technique are :

- The first step is grouping the students into groups consist of 4 - 6

- people that are mixed in performance level, gender, and ethnicity.
2. The second, the teacher presents the lesson material.
  3. The third, the teacher gives the task to be done, students work within their teams to make sure that all team members have mastered the lesson.
  4. The fourth, teacher gives a question / quiz and the students answer the questions / quizzes. The fifth is Discussion of quiz and the last is Conclusions.

When students learning speaking by doing easy steps above, researcher believes that students at eight grades of SMP N 4 Metro accademic year 2011/2012 are be able to answer questions about the Asking and Giving Opinion if given the right example with the right procedures, orally and corectly.

Jigsaw can be used in a variety of ways for a variety of goals, including mastery, concept development, discussion, and group projects (Kagan, 1994, 18:3). In Team Jigsaw, each team becomes an expert on a topic, and then individuals from that team each teach another team . Spencer and Miguel Kagan (2009, 443) give description of Jigsaw in steps below:

1. The students are divided into a 5 or 6 person jigsaw group. The group should be diversified in terms of ethnicity, gender, ability, and race.
  2. One student should be appointed as the group leader. This person should initially be the most mature student in the group.
  3. The day's lesson is divided into 5–6 segments (one for each member).
  4. Each student is assigned one segment to learn. Each student should only have direct access to their own segment.
5. The students should be given time to read over their segment at least twice to become familiar with it. Students do not need to memorize it.
  6. Temporary experts groups should be formed in which one student from each jigsaw group joins other students assigned to the same segment. Students in this expert group should be given time to discuss the main points of their segment and rehearse the presentation to their jigsaw group.
  7. The students come back to their jigsaw group.
  8. The students present their segment to the group. Other members are encouraged to ask question for clarifications.
  9. The teacher needs to float from group by group in order to observe the process. Intervene if any group is having trouble such as a member being dominating or disruptive. Teacher can whisper the group leader how to intervene the group until the group leader can effectively do it themselves.
  10. A quiz on the material should be given at the end of the learning activityso students realize that the sessions are not just for fun and games, but that they really count.

When students learning Speaking by doing steps above, researcher believes that students at eight grades of SMP N 4 Metro accademic year 2011/2012 are be able to answer questions about the Asking and Giving Opinion if given the right example with the right procedures, orally and corectly.

The Audio media is used here is sound recorder (iPod Nano 8GB purple 2009). This instrument is to record the result of

the conversation between the researcher and the students.

In this research the researcher uses "Speaking Instrument Content Validity Sheet" to measure that the instrument is valid. The instrument get validation from the expert speaking lectures of university of muhamadiyah Metro, namely Mr. Agus Rianto S.T, S.Pd, M.Pd and Dedi Turmudi S.Pd, MA. TESOL. In this research the researcher uses "speaking instrument construct validity sheet" to measure that the instrument is valid. Get validation from the expert speaking lectures of university of muhamadiyah Metro, namely Mr. Agus Rianto S.T, S.Pd, M.Pd and Dedi Turmudi S.Pd, MA. TESOL.

to have the reliability of the test, this research will be used correlation product moment. The formula is:

$$(1) \quad r_{xy} = \frac{\sum xy}{\sqrt{\sum x^2 \sum y^2}}$$

Note:

$r_{xy}$  : Correlation between x and y

$\sum xy$  : Total x time y

$X^2$  : Deviation x

$Y^2$  : Deviation y

(Arikunto, 1991, 70)

The next formula is sperman brown (spilt half)

$$(2) \quad r_i = \frac{2rb}{1 + rb}$$

Note;

$r_i$  : Realiability instrument

$r_b$  : The coefficient correlation between score test

1 & 2 : Constant number

(sugiyono,2010,190)

In collecting data, the researcher will use test as data collecting technique. The test is covered by:

Pre-test consist of 1 question with 5 topics must be choosen for the students. The students must answer the question from the teacher base on the fact. The student speaking's score depend on the criteria which is provided by the researcher. If the students answer all questions correctly, they will get 100 ( one hundred ).

Treatment is a activity in giving a lesson.The technique will be conducted after pre-test and before post-test to know the students achievement on speaking performance. The treatment here uses STAD and Jigsaw Technique in teaching process.

The post-test consist of 1 question with 5 topics must be choosen for the student. The score depend on the criteria which is provided by the researcher. If the students answer all questions correctly, they will get 100 ( one hundred ). After giving the test and finding the result of the test, student's score pre test and post test will be taken by using normality test and homogeneity test. The procedures to treat the data are as belows:

Normality test, To analyze the normality of distribution of the scores, the researcher uses the square technique.

The criteria of normality test are:

$H_o$  : L-ratio is lower than L-table (the distribution of the data is normal)

$H_a$  : L-ratio is higher than L-table (the distribution of the data is not normal)

Homogeneity, The formula of homogeneity test as follow:

$$(1) \quad F = \frac{\text{Biggest Variance}}{\text{Smallest Variance}}$$

(sugiyono, 2010:276)

The criteria are:

$H_a$  : F-ratio is lower than F-table (the distribution of the data is homogenous)

$H_0$  :  $F_{\text{ratio}}$  is higher than  $F_{\text{table}}$  (the distribution of the data is not homogenous)

Hypothesis Test, This test is used to know whether the hypothesis that is proposed by the researcher accepted. The formula used in this test is  $t$ -test. The formula is:

$$(1) \quad t_{\text{test}} = \frac{X_1 - X_2}{S_{\bar{X}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

In which:

$$(2) \quad S_{\bar{X}} = \frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

#### Notes:

$X_1$  = The arithmetical mean of experimental group

$X_2$  = The arithmetical mean of control group

$n_1$  = Number of students in experimental group

$n_2$  = Number of students in control group

$S_1$  = Standard deviation of experiment group

$S_2$  = Standard deviation of control group (Sugiyono, 2010, 181).

The criteria of the test are:

$H_a$  =  $H_a$  is accepted if  $T_{\text{ratio}}$  is equal or higher than  $t_{\text{table}}$ . (The hypothesis proposed is proved)

$H_0$  =  $H_0$  is accepted if  $t_{\text{ratio}}$  is smaller than  $t_{\text{table}}$ . (The hypothesis proposed is not proved).

(Usman, 1995, 142)

#### FINDING

The result of try out test, After getting the data of test, it is obtained that the highest score is 64 and the lowest score is 48 with the average score is 56,4 students get score 64, 2 students get score 60, 2 students get score 56, 4 students get score 52, and 3 students get score 48.

The Result of reliability test, Reliability of the test is got by counting the result of try out data. In counting of reliability of the test the researcher uses product moment

formula and spearman brown (Split Half) formula. finally, from the calculation, the reliability of the instrument is 0,82. It is very high, So, the test can be tested for the research

**Tabel 4.1 The Criteria of interval coefficient**

Interval coefficient	Correlation
0,80 – 1,00	Very high
0,60 – 0,79	High
0,40 – 0,59	Medium
0,20 – 0,39	Low
0,00 – 0,19	Very Low

(Adopted by Sugiyono, 2006, 257)

Result of pre test, In the result of the calculating data in eksperiment class, it is found that the score of  $X_{\text{hit}}$  is 3,9 And in the control class, it is found that the score of  $X_{\text{hit}}$  is 0,821. From the result score of  $X_{\text{hit}}$  both in eksperiment and control class, it is found that at the significant level of

0.05 and also 0.01,  $X^2_{\text{ratio}} \leq X^2_{\text{df}}$ . So, the hypothesis  $H_a$  is accepted, it means that the samples come from the population that has normal distribution.

The result of treatment, when the result of scores and mean of both are compared, STAD' scores and mean are more higher than Jigsaw. So, it is clearly that There is significant difference between using STAD and Jigsaw technique toward students' speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMPN 4 Metro. When this fact is going to be continue in post test it can be sure that STAD is more effective than Jigsaw Technique.

The result of post test, Although both of STAD and Jigsaw have same score in the highest and lowest score but the mean of

both are different. STAD's mean is higher than Jigsaw' mean. And The result score shows that there are 20 students or 86, 95% who pass in speaking test in eksperiment class and fulfil KKMs' score 75 and the dirjen dikti minimum Persentase of material mastering  $\geq 75\%$ . While in control class The result score shows that there are 15 students or 65, 21% who pass in speaking test in control class fulfil KKMs' score 75 but do not the dirjen dikti minimum Persentase of material mastering  $\geq 75\%$ . So, it is clearly support the hypothesis that There is significant difference between using STAD and Jigsaw technique toward students' speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMPN 4 Metro. Seen from the fact that STAD'score is higher than Jigsaw, it will support that the second hypotess is going to be proven and could be predicted that in the hyphotesis  $t_{test} > t_{table}$  of course STAD is more effective than Jigsaw Technique for the eight grades students of SMP N 4 Metro.

The result of normality test, The data normality of the test is accepted  $H_a$  if  $\chi^2_{ratio} \leq \chi^2_{df}$  for the significance level 5% ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) and also the significance level 1% ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ).

**Table 4.2 The data result of normality distribution test**

Test	Variable (X)	$\chi^2_{ratio} \leq \chi^2_{df}$			Conclu sion
		$\chi^2_{ratio}$	$\chi^2_{df}$		
			Significance Level		
			5% ( $\alpha=0.05$ )	1% ( $\alpha=0.01$ )	
Pre test of STAD	X <sub>1</sub>	3,9	7,81	11,3	Norma l
Pre test of Jigsaw	X <sub>2</sub>	0,821	7,81	11,3	Norma l
Post	X <sub>1</sub>	2,608	7,81	11,3	Norma l

test of STAD					1
Post test of Jigsaw	X <sub>2</sub>	3,14	7,81	11,3	Norma l

Based on the table above, it is obtained that  $\chi^2_{ratio}$  both pre test data and post test are lower than  $\chi^2_{df}$  in the significance level of 5% ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) and also 1% ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ) . So, the hypothesis  $H_a$  is accepted. It means that the both sample in this research come from the population has normality distribution.

The result of homogeneity test, The data homogeneity of the test accepted  $H_a$  if  $F_{ratio} < F_{df}$  in the significance level 5% ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) and also the significance level 1% ( $\alpha = 0.01$ ).

**Table 4.3 The data result of homogeneity test**

Test	$F_{ratio} < F_{df}$			Conclusion
	$F_{ratio}$	$F_{df}$		
		Significance Level		
		5% ( $\alpha=0.05$ )	1% ( $\alpha=0.01$ )	
homogeneity test	1,05	2,05	2,78	Homogenous

From the table above, it is obtained that  $f_{ratio}$  of post test are lowest than  $f_{df}$  in the significance level of 5% ( $\alpha = 0, 05$ ) and 1% ( $\alpha = 0, 01$ ). So that, the hypothesis  $H_a$  is accepted, it means that both samples are in this research come from the populations that have the variance equality.

The result of hypothesis test, The criteria of the hypothesis of  $H_a$  was accepted if the  $t_{hit} \geq t_{table}$ . The computation of the hypothesis testing is shown in table presented below.

**Table 4.4 The Result of Hypothesis Test of Experiment and Control class**

Variable	Post test		S <sub>g</sub>	d f	t <sub>test</sub> > t <sub>table</sub>			conclusion
	mean	S <sup>2</sup>			t <sub>hit</sub>	t <sub>table</sub>		
						5 %	1 %	
STAD (X <sub>1</sub> )	81,21	48,81	7,08	46	3,96	2,01	2,69	hypothesis is accepted
Jigsaw (X <sub>2</sub> )	73,34	51,48						

Based on the explanation above and the result of criteria of the hypothesis on the table above, it is obtained that H<sub>a</sub> is accepted while H<sub>o</sub> is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between STAD and Jigsaw technique in speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMPN 4 Metro and STAD technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique for the eight levels students of SMPN 4 Metro.

## DISCUSSION

In this research, in experiment and control class is treated for three meetings. For the experiment class is taught by STAD technique and control class is by Jigsaw technique. The data which is described in this research are the data of the comparison of STAD technique and Jigsaw technique between experiment class and control class. Based on the result of this research, the researcher finds that students' speaking ability scores in experiment class is better than control class

From the previous calculation, the hypothesis can be accepted because t<sub>hit</sub> is 3,96, and t<sub>table</sub> is 2,69 on the criterion 1 and also t<sub>table</sub> is 2,01 on the criterion 2. It shows that the hypothesis of H<sub>a</sub> is accepted and H<sub>o</sub> is rejected. It means that there is significant difference between STAD and Jigsaw technique in speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMP N 4 Metro and it also conclude that STAD technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique for

the eight levels students of SMPN 4 Metro.

In experiment class, before conducting the research, researcher finds that the students' speaking ability is still low. After giving the treatment by using STAD, for the first meeting, the students are easy to following learning process. This condition is caused because the STAD technique is easy to follow. Although the students' speaking ability is still low or many incorrect answers in answering the questions, in The second meeting, the students are enjoying the lesson and they become active and comfortable to follow the rule of STAD technique. They are happy study in a group but they are still shy to practice their speaking ability in front of their friend. In the third meeting, mostly, the students can answer the question correctly and can express their opinion. From this situation may be caused by the STAD technique. This is suitable by the argument of STAD is made of five interlocking recognition components: Class presentation, teams, quizzes, improvement scores, and team recognition ( Kagan and Miguel Kagan, 2009, 460). And supported by Research of STAD has also revealed very positive effects on ethnic relations and various types of prosocial development (Kagan and Miguel Kagan). This situation happens Because STAD' rules is easy to apply and follow in learning process and make students feel relax, comfortable in learning process.

In control class, the students' speaking ability is still low too. After giving treatment by Jigsaw technique. For the first meeting, the students are very difficult to follow the rule of Jigsaw technique. The second meeting, the students is easy and enjoyed the technique but they are still feel confused

about the rule. In the third meeting, the students is active in learning process especially in giving their opinion. The students can also answer the questions corectly but some students is still calm because they must follow the Jigsaw's rule that is strange, so they are afraid when make a mistakes in folowing the rule. In Jigsaw teqnique, the process of learning from the second until third meeting the students are fun. This situation is suitable with the statement that in education, Jigsaw can be used in a variety of ways for a variety of goals, including mastery, concept development, discussion, and group projects (Kagan, 1994, 18:3).

It means that learning process for the students by using STAD and Jigsaw are different, because they have different type in learning proces and roles. From the discusion above we know that There is significant difference between STAD and Jigsaw technique in speaking ability and STAD technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique.

## CONCLUSION

learning process for the students by using STAD and Jigsaw are different, because they have different type in learning proces and roles. From the discusion above we know that There is significant difference between STAD and Jigsaw technique in speaking ability and STAD technique is more effective than Jigsaw technique. From this ilustration the teachers and students should use STAD technique in the learning proces especially in develop of speaking ability in senior high school.

The result score shows that there are 20 students or 86, 95% who pass in speaking test in eksperiment class and fulfil KKMs' score 75 and the dirjen dikti minimum Percentase of material mastering  $\geq 75\%$ . While in control class The result score shows that there are 15 students or 65, 21%

who pass in speaking test in control class fulfil KKMs' score 75 but do not the dirjen dikti minimum Percentase of material mastering  $\geq 75\%$ . These findings support the hypothesis test.

in the hypthosis test  $t_{test} (3,95) > t_{table} (2,01 \text{ and } 2,69)$ . of course STAD is more effective than Jigsaw Technique for the eight grades students of SMP N 4 Metro. So, it is clearly that There is significant difference between using STAD and Jigsaw technique toward students' speaking ability for the eight grades students of SMPN 4 Metro. From this ilustration the teachers and students should use STAD technique in the learning proces especially in develop of speaking ability in senior high school.

## SUGESTION

Based on the ilustration above, the researcher would like to give some suggestion addressed to readers as follows:

### 1. To the Students

Because speaking ability is main focus in english learning so the students should know the right way to develop their speaking ability. Having a experience in learning proccess through STAD technique become a well starting in developing their speaking ability in the future day so the students should use STAD technique in developing their speaking ability.

### 2. To the Teacher

the english teacher should have enough knowledge to teach english well in developing students' speaking ability. The english teachers should uses the comparison method because this method is a creative method and gives the differences result in the teaching learning proccess. To develop students' speaking ability The english teacher should apply STAD technique in the class because it is a right technique and directly effect the students' speaking ability.

### 3. To the School

The school should provides a english laboratory for the student to develop their speaking ability. The laboratory should acomodates the students aspiration in developing their speaking ability. The school should develop the quality of their english teachers to develop the school in the future day.

### 4. To other Researcher

This research is as a reference for further investigation, and the researcher expects other researchers to develop this research so that they can find a perfect result related to this problem.

### 5. To the Reader

the researcher hopes that the readers should read this research, because this research is made to be a refference that may be usefull for the reader in knowing more about the implementation of comparative method especially in apliying of STAD and Jigsaw technique in the real situation.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad, Jazim (2010). *Metodologi Penelitian*. Metro: Universitas Muhammadiyah Metro.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi (2010). *Prosedur Penelitian, Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Edition Revision VII. Jakarta : PT. Rineka Cipta.
- Bates, Nina (2007). *Real Time : An Intersctive English Course for Junior High School Students Year Viii*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Brown, H. Dowglas ( 2001). *Teaching by Principles : An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. White Plains, Ny: Longman.
- Downshen, Catherine (2002). *Practical Research Methods: A user-friendly guide to mastering research techniques and projects*. New Delhi: UBS Publishers'Distributors.
- Pollard, Lucy (2008). *Lucy Pollard's Guide to Teaching English : A book to help you through your first two years in teaching*.
- Hornby, AS (2000). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. New York : Oxford University Press.
- Karwono, Dwiwogo W.D (1992). *Jurnal Metode Experimen Dalam Penelitian*. Malang: IKIP Malang.
- Karwono (2007). *Pengaruh Pemberian Umpan Balik dan Locus of Control Terhadap Kemampuan Mahasiswa dalam Mengelola Pembelajaran Mikro di FKIP UM Metro*. Jakarta : Universitas Negeri Jakarta.
- Kagan, Spencer, & Miguel Kagan (2009). *Kagan Cooperative Learning*. San Clemente, CA. : Kagan Publising.
- Kagan, Spencer (1994). *Cooperative Learning: Resources for Teacher*. San Clemente, CA. : Kagan Publising.
- Kistono et all (2007). *The Bridge English Competence : for SMP Grade VIII*. Surabaya : yudistira.
- Kuntjojo (2009). *Metodologi Penelitian*. Kediri : Universitas Nusantara PGRI.
- Machmudah, Umi (2010). *The Influence of Cooperative Learning Method STAD Model Vs. Conventional And Achievement Motivation on Arabic Performance of The Tenth Year Students of SMAN I Malang Academic Year 2010*. Malang: State University of Malang press.
- Muawiyah, Tuti (2011). *The Correlation Between Students' pronunciation and Their speaking ability at Tenth Grade of SMA Utama Wacana Metro Academic Year 2011/2012*, Umm
- Nuramalia, Lina ( 2010) *The Correlation Between Students' listening skill and Their speaking performance at the first grade of SMPN 3*

- Terbanggi Besar Academic Year 2009/2010*, Umm.
- Santoso, Retno (2011). *The Influence of Using Paper Conversation Towards Students' Speaking Ability at The First Semester of The Tenth Class at SMAN 1 Seputih Mataram Academic Year 2010/2011*. Metro: Universitas Muhamadiyah Metro.
- Sharan, Shlomo (1994). Group Investigation in the Cooperative Classroom: In Sharan, S. *Handbook of Cooperative Learning Methods*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Sugiyono (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Pendekatan Kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Tim Penyusun Pedoman Penyusunan Skripsi Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris (2012). *Pedoman khusus penyusunan Skripsi Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris*. Metro: Universitas Muhamadiyah Metro.
- Usman, H and Akbar R.P.S (1995). *Pengantar Statistika*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Yulianto, Eko (2010). *Pembelajaran Sains Menggunakan Metode Kooperatif Model Jigsaw and STAD ditinjau dari Kemampuan Awal dan Gaya Belajar, Study Kasus Pada Materi Usaha dan Energi Kelas VIII SMP Negeri 1 Karang Rejo Magetan Tahun Pelajaran 2010/2011*. Magetan.