THE EFFECT OF JIGSAW AND PAIR SWITCH PATRNER PRESENT ON THE HIGH AND LOW MOTIVATED STUDENTS' VOCABULARY MASTERY

Afief Fakhruddin ✉ Issy Yuliasri, Dwi Anggani Linggar Bharati

Prodi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris, Program Pascasarjana, Universitas Negeri Semarang, Indonesia

Abstract
_____

This study is investigated the effect of jigsaw and pair switch partner present on the high and low motivated students' vocabulary mastery. The statement of problems were (1) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if high motivated students were treated with jigsaw, (2) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if high motivated students were treated with pair switch partner presents, (3) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if low motivated students were treated with jigsaw, (4) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if low motivated students were treated with pair switch partner presents, (5) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if high and low motivated students were treated with jigsaw, (6) How significant is the vocabulary mastery if high and low motivated students were tratedwith pair switch partner presents, (7) Is there any interaction between vocabulary mastery, strategy, and students motivation. This study was exprimental factorial design. This study used test, questionnaire and observation. The result showed that all results were not significants, and only pair switch partner present gave effect to the high motivated students and there was not interaction between vocabulary mastery, strategy, and students motivation. It can be concluded that the strategy were not effective.

✉ Alamat korespondensi:
  Kampus Unnes Bendan Ngisor, Semarang, 50233
  E-mail: pps@unnes.ac.id

INTRODUCTION

Some students have low motivation in learning vocabulary; when a teacher explains the material some students just focused on their own activity, thus this makes them have unconfident in learning English as a target language. This will even make them gradually give up studying English. On the other hand, the good mastery of vocabulary will help students understand English. In addition, their English skills will gradually improve. Therefore, teachers should design various teaching activities in class to make students not feel bored to learn vocabulary. The teacher is one of the key factors of the success in teaching and learning a second language besides the students themselves. This is usually happen when the students do not have any motivation to learn English, especially vocabulary. In this case, the teacher has to motivate students to learn more about vocabulary.

In a teaching learning process, the teacher has to apply appropriate techniques concerning with the way the teacher organizes subject matter, teaching tools and teaching materials. Vocabulary sessions can be uninteresting when students have to memorize lists of words and do completion exercises only. Students sometimes have to learn definitions of words by looking up the words in a glossary or a dictionary. One way to enliven the lessons is using cooperative learning. Mastering English vocabulary is important for the students who learn English as a foreign language. The understanding towards the content of a certain English text will decrease if the students do not have sufficient mastery of vocabulary. Therefore, the students have to enrich their vocabulary and to improve their English skill.

Teachers can use the approach above to stimulate students acquiring the knowledge as well as creating interpersonal and team skills. Traditionally, classes always consist of good students and weak students. In learning English, the weak students sit in isolation as they lack of confidence. Working in groups, therefore, is believed as a good alternative approach to help solving students' problems. Learning is the primary activity of students in the classroom involving some important elements. Harris (1979:9) suggests that there are two very important elements in language: grammatical structure and vocabulary. From this statement, vocabulary is one of the important elements in language that should be mastered by students.

Learning in a group enables each member to improve their individual ability. In class, each student has a different background and ability. Such conditions can also happen in teaching and learning of English vocabulary. For example, one student might have good English vocabulary mastery, while others do not. This kind of condition will bring benefits for the students with poor vocabulary through the interaction in group. It means that cooperative learning models especially jigsaw and pair switch partner presents are among the strategy where students learn in a small group divided into 4 or 6 heterogeneous students.

As has been mentioned in the background of the study, vocabulary is an important part in English as well as a basic factor in language mastery. In this study, the researcher tried to investigate the effective way in teaching vocabulary and also to investigate how the students' motivation in learning vocabulary, and also how to make students motivated in mastering vocabulary. The researcher summarizes several problems; How significant is the vocabulary mastery if the high motivated students are treated with jigsaw strategy, How significant is the vocabulary mastery if the high motivated students are treated with pair switch partner present, How significant is the vocabulary mastery if the low motivated students are treated with jigsaw technique, How significant is the vocabulary mastery if the low motivated students are treated with pair switch partner present, How significant is the vovabulary mastery if the high and low motivated students are treated with jigsaw technique, How significant is the vovabulary mastery if the high and low motivated students are treated with pair switch partner presents

technique, Is there any interaction between vocabulary, strategy, and student's motivation.

The objectives of the study are as follows; to describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the high motivated students are treated with jigsaw strategy, to describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the high motivated students are treated with pair switch partner present, to describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the low motivated students are treated with jigsaw technique, to describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the low motivated students are treated with pair switch partner present, to describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the high and low motivated students are treated with jigsaw technique, To describe how significant of the vocabulary mastery if the high and low motivation students are treated with pair switch partner presents technique, to see the interation between vocabulary, strategy, and student's motivation.

According to Brown (2001:47), cooperative learning is a kind of activity where students work together in pairs and groups; they share information and come to help each other. There should be a team whose players must work together in order to achieve goals successfully. Slavin in Isjoni (2009:15) also notes that 'in cooperative learning, students work together in a group which consists of four members to master the material given by the teacher. It means that cooperative learning technique consists of members of group that will make students more active in the learning process.

Johnson and Johnson (1991: 40) state that four members are the ideal numbers of the group as they set up natural pairs work. Edward (cited in Isjoni, 2009:55) also states that four members of each group are effective. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that cooperative learning is a learning model in which the groups consist of four members, working together towards a group task to master material initially presented by the teacher.

According to Lie (2008:29), cooperative learning is not only about learning in a group work, but also dividing the members of group. The implementation of cooperative learning procedures in the right way gives effective impact for the teachers in managing the classes. It means that if the cooperative learning technique is used in group work, the students will be focused on student activity in discussing the material. Cooperative learning typically begins with the selection of group members based upon predetermined criteria design to create positive effect in small group learning. Cuseo (1992: 50) states that this criterion includes: group formatting, learning styles, and gender. Johnson and Johnson (1993: 61) also state that there are some considerations in formatting a small group in cooperative learning. They are as follows; Heterogeneous teams. Groups should contain both males and females and students of different ability levels. If possible, different ethnic backgrounds and social classes should be represented as well, One class is divided into some small groups. Each group consists of four members. Instructor as Facilitator, Cooperative learning involves the instructor as a facilitator and consultant in the group learning process. The instructor does not sit in on group discussions; instead, he/she circulates among the groups offering support. The instructor is not dominant at all; instead, he/she acts as a learners' peer. This allows the instructor to interact with the students in more personal, informal and collaborative manner than would be possible with a traditional learning. From the explanations above, it can be concluded that each group of cooperative learning has four or six members from different ability and also different social background, so it can affect mainly the student's motivation in learning a new material. In the cooperative learning, the teacher's position is as a facilitator and consultant in a teaching learning process. She/ he can explain and answer the material in the last of discussion.

RESEARCH METHOD

According to Nunan (1992:2-3) research is a process of formulating question, problems, or hypotheses; collecting data or evidence relevant to the questions/ problems/ hypotheses; and analyzing or interpreting the data. Research is carried out in order to prove or disapprove, show up, carried out what is planned, to support the point of view, to find out unknown things, to discover the cause of problem, and to find the solution or to get a result with scientific methods objectively.

In this study, the researcher used a quantitative research method the researcher used Factorial design. According to Mc Kay (2006:6) quantitative research method is a research study that is used to analyze population or sample. Quantitative method begins with a research question or hypotheses. Quantitative method can be used to verify which of such hypotheses are true. This research is aimed to analyze the hypothesis. The participants of this study were 40 students of Language and Culture Centre. A population is any group of individuals that have one or more characteristics in common that are interesting (Best, 1998). According to Best (1998:13). "A sample is a small proportion of population selected for observation or analysis." Approximately 40 students of IAIN SYEKH NURJATI from the fourth semester will take part of this study. Thus, the researcher is relatively confident in choosing them as the participants of the study. In this study, the researcher used anova (analysis of variance). Anova is used to test the hypothesis that the means among two or more groups are equal, under the assumption that the sampled populatios are normally distributed.

RESEARCH FINDING

The researcher have collecting the data in systematic way to find the effect of jigsaw and pair switch partner present on highly and lowly motivated students in mastering vocabulary. The researcher took observation in Language Culture Centre and has some findings as follows:

The researcher classified them by using try out, and quitionaire. In the questionnaire, there were some question about motivation in learning english. In the questionaire some lowly motivated students were bored when the techniques were treated to the students, and in othe other hand highly motivated students, less of them were motivated and active when the teacher used jigsaw and pair switch partner in the classroom.

After the students had answered, the researcher divided students into two kind of motivation; highly motivated and lowly motivated students. And, the next step was doing pre test before the researcher gave the treatment and make students group. And the last step was give the post test. There were 40 students for ech classes. 20 students forexperimental class one and 20 students for experimental class two. The researcher used normality test to findout whether the sample belongs to the normal distribution or not.

Based on the kolmogrove result, it can be seen that the data on pretest in experimental one (0.835 and 0.984 >0.294) at the level significant α 0.05, and on the other hand the data in the pretest from experimental two is (0.963 and 0.973 >0.294) at the level significant α 0.05 it indicates that Ho is accepted. Based on the result above, it can be concluded that the data on pre test in both of experimental class were accounted as normal distributional data, and the null hyphotesis is accepeted.

In the second result, it can be seen that the data on the post test (0.877 and 0.711 > 0.294) in level significant 0.05. And from experimental class two (0.707, and 0.757 > 0.294) in level significant 0.05. This was indicates that Ho was accepted. From the result above, it can be concluded that the data in both of the post test is accounted as normal distribution.

From the result on the both of table above shows that all the data has normal distribution. The data analysisi is done by using ANOVA (analysis of variance comparing more than 2 variables) was able to be done. After calculating

data with normality test, the researcher used homogenity test. Homogenity test was used to make sure the homogeneity of variants. Based on the table above, it can be seen that levante statisyic score is 0.065 and sig. 0.800. Based on sig. scores, Sig. α > 0.065, 0.0.65 > (0.05). it can be concluded that the data were homogeny.

From the result of levene statistic, it can be shows that Levene Statistic is 0.232 and sig score is 0.633. The sig score was Sig. α > 0.232 (0.633 > 0.05), it can be concluded that the data in post test were homogeny. From the both of the table above, it can be that that the varience of data have characteristic of homogency. It is because pre test and post test data P value >0.05. Those data was taken from pre test and post test score. From explanation above, it can be concluded that variances of two groups have characteristic of homogeny.

To learn English vocabulary is not as easy as people imagine. Students will face some difficulties in enriching their vocabulary. Improving their own language was easier than that of English as it is not their native language. The researcher saw that students find it difficult in improving their English vocabulary. As said before, that the use of jigsaw technique here was to evaluate the students' vocabulary mastery after the treatment given. The activity in jigsaw technique was emphasized on recognizing and understanding English vocabulary so students were able to put these cognitive codes into spoken and written symbols.

Table 1. Result for High Students Treated With Jigsaw

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test 1st Experiment High Motivated	70.00	10	9.718	3.073
	Post-test 1st Experiment High Motivated	71.50	10	8.182	2.587

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the means score for students who learn with jigsaw technique are 70.00 and, on the other side the means score in post test is 71.50. from the result above, it means that the students did the test seriously and effectively, because the means score range was not too far. On the other Resultcan be shows that the t-table in the pre test and post test is -0.439, on the other hand t-table is 2.262, at significant level α = 0.05, and in level of significance 0.671. Based on the reseult above, it means that jigsaw technique did not give an effect to the high motivated students in their vocabulary mastery the data were not significant. It can be seen from the tcounts is lowest than t-table, so Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the data was not significant.

Table 2. Result for High Students Treated With Pair Switch Partner Presents

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test 2nd Experiment High Motivated	59.00	10	9.661	3.055
	Post-test 2nd Experiment High Motivated	74.70	10	8.994	2.844

It can be seen from mean score 59.00 and in the other post test score in high motivated students means score is 74.70 From the result above, it means that some students were enthusiastic in doing the test and excercises in the classroom, because the means score in post test was better than pre test result. it can be seen that tcounts score was -4.700 and the t-table score was 2.262 at significant level α = 0.05, based on the result above, it can be seen that t-count scores was higher than t-table at significant level α = 0.05. So, Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected. Based on the result above, the result of this study supports the study hypothesis that there was a significant result after the high motivated students were treated with pair switch partners. It means that the pair switch partner present gave an effect to the high motivated students in their vocabulary mastery. It Indicated that the students in the experimental class two really showed excitement with pair switch partner presents as a medium to teach vocabulary.

Table 3. Result For Low Students treated With Jigsaw

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test 1st Experiment Low Motivated	62.10	10	7.781	2.461
	Post-test 1st Experiment Low Motivated	66.00	10	10.220	3.232

From the rseult above, it can be seen that, the mean of low motivated students was 62.10 and the mean of post test score was 66.00. It means that most of low motivated students in learnt English vocabulary using jigsaw technique got low scores after getting the treatment. It means that jigsaw technique did not have effect to make the students active in learning vocabulary at the experimental class one. In the other rseult, it can be summarize that t counts score is -0.784, and on the other result t tables score is 2.262 at significance level α = 0.05 *(sig.2 tailed)*, from the result above, it can be concluded that the jigsaw technique was not approriate to give effect for low motivated students in mastery vocabulary. This is because tcounts is lower than t-table, so Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. From the result above, it can be concluded that the data was not significant.

Table 4. Result For High Students Treated with Pair Switch Partner Presents

Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Pre-test 2nd Experiment Low Motivated	64.80	10	9.705	3.069
	Post-test 2nd Experiment Low Motivated	69.10	10	8.386	2.652

From the result above, it can be seen that the mean of pre test was 64.80 and the mean of post test was 69.10. from the data above, it can be seen that the means range between pre test and post test were not too far. It means that pair switch partner gave less effect to the students in learning vocabulary. Tcounts score -1.314, and t table is 2.262. based on the explanation above it can be concluded that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. It was because t-counts score was lower than t tabel at significant level α = 0,05 in (*Sig.2-tailed*).

Table 5. Result of High and Low Motivated Students Treated With Jigsaw

Group Statistics					
	Gain	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Jig Saw	High Motivated	10	1.50	10.814	3.420
	Low Motivated	10	3.90	15.730	4.974

Based on the correlation result, it can be seen that the means score between high motivated students and low motivated students are 1.50 and 3.90. it means that the means scores' range was not too high. From explanation above, it can be concluded that jigsaw did not improve students vocabulary mastery. it can be seen that t counts score is -

0.398, and on the other hand t table score is 2.100 at significance level α = 0.05 Sig (2-tailed). It means that Ho was accepted and Ha was rejected. Based on the research findings, it can be concluded that there was not significant result for students who treated with jigsaw technique for high and low motivated students.

Table 6. result of High and low Motivated Students treated With pair Switch Partner presents

Group Statistics					
	Gain	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
PSP	High Motivated	10	15.70	10.563	3.340
	Low Motivated	10	4.30	10.350	3.273

From the correlation table above, it can be seen that high motivated students means score is 15.70, and low motivated means score is 4.30. Based on the result, it can be summarize that all of high motivated students get a high means score, and the differences beetween high and low motivated students was high. it can be seen thatthe t counts is 2.438 and the t tavle is 2.100, at significance level α = 0.05 Sig (2-tailed)   It means that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. In the learning process some of students faced difficulty. Basically, the entry level of the ability of experimental class was good.

In the last calculating data, the result showed that f counts result for each source. The first data was strategy, and the result of f-counts strategy was 3.656. On the other hand, f counts motivated was 1.389. And the last f counts of Strategy* Motivated was 3.266. on the other hand, the f table was 4.091. It means that f-counts for each source is lower than f-table (4.091). So, it can be concluded that there were not significant result between strategy and

students motivation in mastery vocabulary, and there was not interaction between vocabulary, strategy and students' motivation.

CONCLUSION

After conducting research, the researcher found that not all of students were undersatand how to learn English with jigsaw and pair switch partner presents. It can be seen from the result of research. The researcher found that only pair switch partner present   treated for highly motivated students was significant. On the other hand, there was not significant result for each experimental classes, and also there was not relationship between vocabulray, strategy and students motivation.

REFRENCES

Brown, H. D. (2001). *Principle of Language Learning and Teaching*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Best, J. W., & Kahn, J. V. (1998). *Research in Education: Eight Editions*. Chicago: A Viacom Company.

Cuseo JB. (1992). "Cooperative learning vs. small-group discussions and group projects: the critical differences. Cooperative Learning and College Teaching".*http://www.bu.ac.th/knowledgecenter/ epaper/july_dec2005/saovapa.pdf*. Retrieved on oct,10th 2012

Harris, D. P. (1979). *Testing English as a Second Language*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Isjoni. (2009). *Cooperative Learning Mengembangkan Kemampuan Belajar Berkelompok*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Johnson &Johnson. (1994). "Creativity and Collaborative Learning"; J. Thousand, A. Villa and A. Nevin (Eds); Brookes Press. *http//www.co-operation.org/pages/overviewpaper.html*. Retrieved on oct,10th 2012.

Lie, Anita. (2008). *Cooperative Learning: Mempraktikan Cooperative Learning di Ruang Kelas*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.

McKay, S. Lee. (2006). *Researching Second Language Classrooms*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Nunan, D.(1992).*Research Method in Language Learning*. New York; Cambridege University Press.