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ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was to find out whether there is significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery, especially in present continuous tense. The research method of this study was experimental research in quantitative approach. The population of this research was the whole students of the eleventh grade students of SMA Prayatna Medan that consists of 188 students that divided into two class, experimental and control class as the samples that consisted of 30 students each class. Both classes were given pre-test that consisted of 20 questions in multiple choices form. After that, experimental class was treated by using jigsaw cooperative learning, while control class was treated by using conventional way. After given the treatment, both classes were given post-test that also consisted of 20 questions in multiple choices form. To analyze the data, the researcher used t-test. According to the result of statistical calculation by using SPSS 2018 showed that Sig. (2-tailed) was lower than significant level (0.004 < 0.05). And then t_{obs} was higher than t_{table}; 5.764 > 2.002. It means that there is a significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery. Then, H_{a} was accepted and H_{o} was rejected.
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INTRODUCTION

English is a language that has been agreed by many countries as a mean of communication, so that it can facilitate communication between countries. English also takes important role as
communication language in various sectors in life, such as technology, politic, bilateral relationship, and others. But, in learning English is not our mother tongue and as our foreign language, so many problems that we face to master that language. The problems like the absence of interlocutors to communicate in using English, and lack of self-confidence in speaking English because they do not master grammar. Sentence structure is one of language segments that assumes significant job in getting English. By acing sentence structure, at that point the understudies will have the option to build up different aptitudes of language, such as tuning in, perusing, talking, and composing. Meanwhile, most Indonesian students face difficulties in learning and mastering grammatical rules of English. It can be caused by the lack of interest in the teaching methods conveyed by the teacher so make students bored with the lessons taught. Therefore, the teacher must use effective strategies in teaching English so the students will enjoy and can understand the lesson given by the teacher. One of the strategies that can make students motivated to learn English is using suitable strategy such as jigsaw cooperative learning. Jigsaw agreeable learning can assist understudies with understanding the learning material is given by the educator. Since the understudies have the fundamental job in jigsaw process, understudies ought to get included well all the while. In this manner, the air of learning process gives the chances to the understudies to work and to share thoughts in gatherings will prone to be viable. The understudies who experience issues understanding the exercises given by the instructor will have the option to comprehend.

Based on the background of the research above, the problem of the research was “is there any significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery?” The objectives of the research was to find out whether there is significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery. And the researcher limited the research on the eleventh grade students of Senior High School in SMA Prayatna Medan. The research focused on examining the effect of jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery on present continuous tense.

The Concept of Cooperative Learning

According to Sanjaya (2006) in Rusman (2012 : 3), cooperative learning is learning activity carried out in a group. It completed by understudies in specific gatherings to accomplish learning destinations that have been detailed. And Tom V. Savage (1987) in Rusman (2012 : 203) said that cooperative learning is an approach that emphasizes collaboration in a group. Artzt & Newman (1990) in Trianto (2018 : 56) stated that in cooperative learning, students learn together as a team in completing tasks to achieve common goals. So, each group member has same responsibility for the success of the group. Eggen and Kauchak (1996) in Trianto (2018 : 58) said that cooperative learning is a gathering of instructing procedures that include understudies working cooperatively to accomplish shared objectives. In the agreeable class, students learn together in the little gathering that comprise of 4-6 understudies that are equivalent however heterogeneous, capacity, gender, and ethnicity/race and help one another. The reason for framing the gathering is to give the chances to all understudies to be effectively associated with procedure of reasoning and learning exercises. While working in gatherings, the errand of gathering individuals is to accomplish the fulfillment of the material displayed by educator, and help each other to accomplish dominance learning. (Trianto, 2018 : 56). Based on the explanations, cooperative learning is learning activity consisting of several small groups to help each other that are formed to achieve common goals in the group so that students become easier to understand the material given by the teacher. So, each group member has same responsibility for the success of the group. There are many techniques in cooperative learning that can be applied by teachers in learning activities, such as Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD), Jigsaw, Teams Games Tournaments (TGT), Think Pair Share (TPS), and Numbered Head Together (THT). (Trianto, 2018 : 67). The researcher limited this research only use jigsaw technique to be applied.

The Objectives of Cooperative Learning

The main idea of cooperative learning is that students work together to learn and responsible for their friends’ learning progress. (Trianto, 2018 : 57). Slavin (1995) in Trianto (2018 : 57) said
that cooperative learning emphasizes group goals and success, which can only be achieved if all group members achieve mastery and material goals. And Johnson & Johnson (1994) in Trianto (2018: 57) said that the principle reason for agreeable learning is to augment understudies figuring out how to improving scholarly accomplishment and understanding both independently and in gatherings. Then, Louisell & Descamps (1992) in Trianto (2018: 57) said that since students work in a group, it can normally improve relations between students of different ethnic foundations and capacities, create bunch process abilities and critical thinking. Besides that, cooperative learning can develop social solidarity among students. By cooperative learning, it is hoped that in the future, a new generation of brilliant academic achievements and strong social solidarity will emerge. Cooperative learning is organized with an end goal to build understudies’ support, encourage understudies with understanding of authority dispositions and settle on choices in gatherings, and give the chances to understudies to associate and learn with different understudies of various foundations. So in helpful learning, understudies assume a double job to be specific as an understudy or as an instructor. By working cooperatively to accomplish a shared objective, understudies will create aptitudes identified with individual people that will be gainful for life outside of school. What's more, the analyst inferred that the goal of helpful learning is to improve the understudies' relations to accomplish shared objectives in their gatherings.

The Concept of Jigsaw

Jigsaw takes an example of how to function a saw (crisscross), that is, understudies do a learning movement by working with different understudies to accomplish a shared objective (Rusman, 2012: 217). It was developed and tested by Elliot Aroson and friends from the Texas University, and was adopted by Slavin and friends at Johns Hopkins University (Trianto, 2018: 73). Jigsaw centers around bunch work as little gatherings. It is a helpful learning model by methods for understudies learning in little gatherings comprises of four to six heterogeneous understudies. (Aris Shoimin, 2016: 90). Lei (1994) in Rusman (2012: 218) stated that jigsaw is an adaptable learning model. A ton of research has been finished concerning jigsaw agreeable learning. The exploration reliably shows that understudies associated with this learning model improve accomplishments, have better and progressively uplifting frames of mind towards learning. Jasa Ungguh Muliawan (2016: 150) in his book “45 Model Pembelajaran Spektakuler” stated that jigsaw or called the master group model is a learning strategy that spotlights on the particular authority of topic. From the clarification above, jigsaw is agreeable learning model in which understudies learn in a little gathering which utilizes an example "cause gathering" and "jigsaw gathering" and each gathering part have an obligation in their gatherings to comprehend the learning material is given.

The Learning Steps of Jigsaw

1. The students are divided into some groups.
2. Learning materials are given to the students in the form of text that has been divided into several sub chapters.
3. Each group member reads the sub chapter that is assigned and is responsible for learning it.
4. Members from other groups who have studied other sub chapters meet in the expert group (jigsaw group) to discuss it.
5. The expert group members return to their original group.
6. Each group member should teach the other friends in original group.
7. Each group presented the results of the discussion to the other groups.

The Advantages of Jigsaw

According to Carolyn Kessler (1992) in Annisa Ulfah (2014) stated some the advantages of jigsaw, are:

1. Providing some opportunities for students in working both in racially and culturally mixed groupings.
2. Providing an amazing learning condition for the securing of language through pertinent substance.
3. Supporting the open methodology in instructing of language.
4. Developing students’ skills of analysis, evaluation, comparison, and synthesis of information.

**The Disadvantages of Jigsaw**

According to Elliot Aronson in Annisa Ulfah (2014) mentioned some the disadvantages of jigsaw, are:
1. The problem of the dominant student, self-interest of the group that reduces the problem of dominance.
2. The issue of the moderate student, instructor must ensure that the student who has poor examination aptitudes doesn't present a second rate report to jigsaw gathering.
3. The issue of the keen student that getting exhausted, fatigue can be an issue in the class paying little mind to the method of discovering that utilized.
4. The issue of the student that has been prepared to contend, it can happen when that student has encountered the agreeable learning previously.

**The Definition of Grammar**

Grammar is one of language components in English. Umi Habibah (2010 : 24-25) said that syntax of any language is ordinarily drawn nearer in two distinct manners: an engaging, generally dependent on an efficient investigation of a huge book corpus and portraying syntactic structures immediately; and a prescriptive, which endeavors to utilize the distinguished principles of a given language as a device to oversee the etymological conduct of speakers. According to Gerot and Wignel (1994) in Dyah Saraswati (2015 : 29), grammar is a theory of language, of how languages is put together and how it works. In linguistics, grammar is the set of structural rules that govern the composition of sentences, phrases, and words n any given natural language (Umi Habibah : 2010). And then, the researcher concluded that grammar is a set of rules of words combined and forming sentences in a language.

**The Kinds of Grammar**

Pardiyono (2007) in Dyah Saraswati (2015 : 30 – 31) stated that there are so many types of English grammar that should be known, but the most basic of English grammar is tenses. In learning English, one of the general and base problems that are usually faced is tenses problem. Most of students do not understand what is spoken in tenses problem.

**Tenses**

Tense is gathered into two sorts – unadulterated tense and modular tense. Unadulterated tense alludes to articulations of present, past, and future tenses in which auxiliary worldly reference (Time of Assertion, Time of Completion, or Time of Evaluation) is known or saw to be completely sure. At the end of the day, unadulterated tense alludes to articulations in which the validation is known or thought to be valid. Modular tense then again, alludes to articulations of present, past, or future in which the sureness of the validation isn't completely sure. (Umi Habibah, 2010 : 49 – 50).

**Present Continuous Tense**

According to Umi Habibah (2010 : 58), present progressive or present continuous is utilized to portray occasions happening now. This strained is framed by consolidating the present type of the action word "to be" with a present participle. Present continuous tense is also called present progressive tense because it can use to explain an action that may or can be done in the future. Present continuous tense shows an event or condition that is happening now, often occurs, and can be carried out or continues into the future. This tense can also use to describe an event that occurs briefly and / or that has occurred in a long time.

**2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

**Research Design**

The plan of this examination was exploratory research in quantitative methodology. The examples were arranged into two gatherings, the trial gathering and the benchmark group. Both of
the gatherings were given various medicines. The exploratory gathering was instructed by utilizing jigsaw helpful learning in educating and learning present constant tense, while the benchmark group was instructed by regular way. Both of the gatherings were given pre-trial of present ceaseless tense before the treatment and post-test after the treatment. Research design can be seen in table 1 below.

Table 1. Research Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Conventional Way</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>Jigsaw Cooperative Learning</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In which:
S : Sample
C : The Control Group
E : The Experimental Group
01 : The Students’ Pre-Test Score
02 : The Students’ Post-Test Score

Population and Sample
The population of the research was the whole students of the eleventh grade students of SMA Prayatna Medan that consists of 188 students divided into 6 classes. And the researcher took 2 classes as samples, experimental and control class by using purposive sampling. Both of classes consisted of 30 students.

Treatment
The treatment was given to the students after pre-test. The treatment was given to both of the classes, experimental and control class. The experimental class was given the learning material about present continuous tense by using jigsaw cooperative learning. Meanwhile, the control class was given the learning material about present continuous tense by using conventional way. The different treatments were used to find out the effect of jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery on present continuous tense.

Research Instruments
This research used test to collect the data. The test was used to find out whether there is an effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery on present continuous tense. The tests were given at the beginning and at the end of treatment. The tests consisted of 20 questions in the multiple choices form.

Technique of Data Collection
The instruments that used by the researcher in collecting the data were

a. Pre-Test
The researcher gave pre-test to both classes; experimental and control class. The purpose in conducting pre-test was to find out the students’ achievement before treatment was given. The students were given some questions in the form of multiple choices. The students chose the best answer from the optional answers provided. There were 20 numbers of the questions.

b. Post-Test
Post-test was used to find out whether jigsaw cooperative learning is effective on students’ grammar mastery in present continuous tense. The purpose in conducting post-test was to find out the result of students’ achievement after the students were given treatment in learning. The questions of post-test also consisted of 20 numbers of questions.

Technique of Data Analysis
To discover the distinction of students’ score by utilizing the distinction strategy, the procedure of information examination utilized right now measurable investigation by utilizing t-
It was utilized to test the hugeness of the mean picked up the score of the test gathering and control gathering.

3. RESEARCH FINDING AND DISCUSSION

Result

Based on the analysis, the description of the data were divided into four groups, they were as follow:

a. The data of grammar pre-test of the students for the group taught by using jigsaw (pre-test experiment).

b. The data of grammar pre-test of the students for the group taught by using conventional way (pre-test control).

c. The data of grammar post-test of the students for the group taught by using jigsaw (post-test experiment).

d. The data of grammar post-test of the students for the group taught by using conventional way (post-test control).

The information demonstrated were gathered from the students’ score in pre-test and post-trial of both exploratory and control class. The information was depicted into two tables. Table 2 indicated the students' scores and accomplishments in test class and table 3 demonstrated the student' scores and accomplishments in control class.

Table 2. Students’ Score of Experimental Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X (Students)</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gained Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data showed the score in experimental class from 30 students, the mean of pre-test gained was 64.83 and the mean of post-test was 79.83. The mean of gained score was 15.00 and standard deviation was 6.63. The lowest score in the pre-test was 50, the highest score was 75 and standard deviation was 6.63. After the application of jigsaw cooperative learning as a treatment in teaching grammar, the students took the post-test. The data showed in post-test that the lowest score was 55, the highest score was 90 and standard deviation was 9.14. And then, the score of control class can be seen in table 3 below.

Table 3. Students’ Score of Control Class

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X (Students)</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
<th>Gained Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data showed the score in control class from 30 students in the class, the mean of pre-test gained was 61.33 and the mean post-test was 72.83. The mean of gained score was 11.50 and standard deviation was 6.97. The lowest score in pre-test was 45, the highest score was 85 and standard deviation was 7.98. After the application of conventional way as a treatment given in teaching grammar, the students took the post-test. The data showed in post-test that the lowest was 55, the highest was 85 and standard deviation was 8.58.

**Hypotheses Testing**

After testing normality and homogeneity of the data, then the researcher analyzed the hypotheses. The hypotheses testing is aimed to find whether there is a significant effect between the students who are taught by using jigsaw cooperative learning and the students who are taught without it. The researcher stated the hypotheses as follows:

- **Hₐ**: There is a significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery.
- **Hₒ**: There is no significant effect of using jigsaw cooperative learning on students’ grammar mastery.

The researcher analyzed them by using statistic calculation by *SPSS 2018*. The result as follows:

**Table 4. T-Test**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>7.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>5.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data showed the score in control class from 30 students in the class, the mean of pre-test gained was 61.33 and the mean post-test was 72.83. The mean of gained score was 11.50 and standard deviation was 6.97. The lowest score in pre-test was 45, the highest score was 85 and standard deviation was 7.98. After the application of conventional way as a treatment given in teaching grammar, the students took the post-test. The data showed in post-test that the lowest was 55, the highest was 85 and standard deviation was 8.58.
The statistic hypotheses states:
- If probability > 0.05, then $H_0$ was accepted; $t_{obs} < t_{table}$, then $H_0$ was accepted
- If probability < 0.05, then $H_0$ was rejected; $t_{obs} > t_{table}$, then $H_0$ was rejected

From the table above, it can be seen that the Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.004. The value of Sig. (2-tailed) was lower than significant level (0.004 < 0.05). And then, it showed that $t_{obs} = 5.764$ and the degree of freedom (df) was 58. Based on the significance, it can be seen on df = 58 in significance 5%, the value of the degree significance was 2.002. By comparing the result of $t_{table}$ and $t_{obs}$ that in significance 5% $t_{obs} : t_{table} = 5.764 > 2.002$. And the value of probability is less than 0.05 (0.004 < 0.05). Then, Null Hypothesis ($H_0$) was rejected.

Research Finding
Based on the tests have done, it showed that the students in the experimental class, both pre-test and post-test were better than students in control class. It can be seen from the score average of experimental and control students, and the result of statistical calculation. The gain score average of experimental students was higher than the gain score average of control class (15.00 > 11.50). From the result of statistical calculation, it was obtained the Sig. (2-tailed) was lower than the critical level; 0.004 < 0.05, and $t_{obs}$ was higher than $t_{table}$; 5.764 > 2.002. According to those results, it can be concluded that Null Hypothesis ($H_0$) was rejected and Alternative Hypothesis ($H_a$) was accepted.

Discussion
In light of the clarification above, jigsaw helpful learning is viable in learning language structure, particularly right now. Jigsaw helpful learning caused the understudies to be increasingly dynamic in their gathering, and be mindful in their undertakings given by the instructor. As indicated by the consequence of theories testing, it demonstrated that jigsaw agreeable learning was huge in showing language structure, particularly right now. It very well may be seen from the score of the Sig. (2-tailed) was lower than the critical level. Furthermore, $t_{obs} > t_{table}; 5.764 > 2.002$, it implies that jigsaw helpful learning is more successful than regular way.

4. CONCLUSIONS
The consequence of the examination indicated that jigsaw is viable in understudies' sentence structure dominance. It appeared from the understudies' scores of present consistent tense instructed utilizing jigsaw agreeable learning were higher than the understudies' scores of present persistent tense showed utilizing customary way. It implies that jigsaw is viable in showing punctuation, particularly present nonstop tense. In light of the examination and test had be done, the aftereffect of this exploration indicated that the estimation of Sig. (2-followed) was lower than critical level; 0.004 < 0.05. At that point tobs was 5.764, and the estimation of table from df (58) on level of criticalness of 5% was 2.002. It implies that tobs was higher than table; 5.764 > 2.002. In this way, the invalid theory (Ho) was dismissed and elective speculation (Ha) was acknowledged. The analyst reasoned that the utilization of jigsaw agreeable learning is compelling to improve understudies' language structure dominance.

5. SUGGESTIONS
Based on the conclusion, the researcher would like to give some suggestions in applying jigsaw cooperative learning. The suggestions are:
1. For Other Researchers
In this research, jigsaw cooperative learning is effective in teaching grammar of present continuous tense. Therefore, the other researchers can do further research by applying jigsaw cooperative learning in teaching English. This study can be used as an additional reference for a similar research with difference variables and research design.

2. For English Teachers
English teachers should use jigsaw cooperative learning especially in teaching grammar because it has been proven that jigsaw is effective in teaching grammar.

3. For Students
Students should be responsible of material is given. They should use time wisely in discussing it.

4. For School
School should provide supporting facilities so that teachers can teach well and effective, such as projector and learning sources.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This research was financially supported by University of Potensi Utama. And also thanks to my advisor, Mr. Ashari P. Swondo, S.Pd., M.Hum. for giving the guidance, encouragement, suggestions, and comments until this research has been completed.

REFERENCES

[1] Al-Salkhi, Mahmoud Jamal. 2015. The Effectiveness of Jigsaw Strategy on the Achievement and Learning Motivation of the 7th Primary Grade Students in Islamic Education. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, (Vol. 5, No. 4) 111-118.


