

EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE TYPE MODEL *STAD* AND STUDENT LEARNING MOTIVATION ON LEARNING OUTCOMES OF INTEGRATED THEMATIC LEARNING IN CLASS IV ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

***Resca Corrina Sarie¹ and Farida Mayar²**

¹ Graduate Program of Elementary Education, Universitas Negeri Padang

² Lecturers of Basic Education-FIP Universitas Negeri Padang

E-mail: rescacsarie@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author, Received: March 10, 2019, Revised: April 15, 2019, Accepted: May 10, 2019

ABSTRACT

This research originated from the problem of low student learning outcomes in the elementary school of Padang. This is due, among other things, to learning that is still dominated by teachers. Students are still focused on the ways taught by the teacher and have not been able to cooperate in groups well. To overcome this problem, the *STAD* type cooperative learning model is used. This study aims to determine the effect of the *STAD* type cooperative model and student learning motivation on integrated thematic learning outcomes. The type of research used is quasi experiment. The study population was all fourth grade students of SDN 20 Indarung Padang who were enrolled in semester 2 of the 2018/2019 school year with a total of 43 students. The sample selection was done by random sampling. The experimental class is class IVA students of SDN 20 Indarung Padang and as a control class is grade IVB of SDN 20 Indarung Padang. The research instruments were learning motivation questionnaires and written tests. Data analysis was performed using the t test and two-way ANAVA for interaction. The results of the analysis show that: (1) Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 using the *STAD* type cooperative model are better than conventional methods. (2) Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have High Learning Motivation using the *STAD* type cooperative model are better than conventional methods. (3) Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have low learning motivation using the *STAD* type cooperative model are better than conventional methods. (4) There is an interaction between the cooperative type *STAD* model and conventional methods and learning motivation towards student learning outcomes.

Keywords: *STAD* Type Cooperative Model, Learning Motivation, Learning Outcomes, Integrated Thematic Learning

INTRODUCTION

The more advanced a nation is, the more advanced knowledge will be. Therefore education is now needed with a curriculum that is able to produce the next generation of people who are knowledgeable, skilled, and knowledgeable in order to be able to compete internationally. The basic thing about the 2013 curriculum is the problem of the learning approach. So far, the approach used is material. So the material is given to students as much as possible so that they master the material to the fullest. Even for the mastery of the material, drilling has been given from the start, long before students face national examinations. In learning like this, the learning objectives - learning objectives achieved are more to the cognitive aspects by denying psychomotor and affective aspects. The 2013 curriculum emphasizes the three domains: knowledge, attitudes and skills.

Motivation has an important role in the teaching and learning process for both teachers and students. For teachers to know the motivation to learn from students is very necessary to maintain and improve students' enthusiasm. For students the motivation to learn can foster a spirit of learning so students are encouraged to do learning actions. Students carry out learning activities with pleasure because they are motivated. But in the field, there are still various problems. Based on the author's observations conducted at SDN 20 Indarung Padang on Wednesday and Thursday on 11 and 12 July 2018 on theme 1 The beauty of diversity of sub-themes 2 Togetherness in Diversity conducted with IVA class teachers. Problems found in students in integrated thematic learning are First students are less motivated to find new information. This can be seen in the learning process when students are less eager to finish training at school. Some students choose to model the practice of their friends and don't want to find new information. In addition, students also tend to want to go home quickly and want to end learning.

Second, students are less responsible for the assignments given. This can be seen in the assignment given that it has not been carried out according to the instructions on the exercise. Some students are still reluctant to complete training and prefer to talk with other friends. Students also tend to look for answers from their friends so that the exercises they answer are not based on their own abilities. Third,

limited students to express their ideas and thoughts. This can be seen in the learning process of students found only to hear an explanation from the teacher. Not many students express their ideas and thoughts when an integrated thematic learning process takes place. Students lack opportunities to express opinions. Fourth, students' academic and social abilities decline so that the impact on student learning outcomes and achievements is less optimal and still below the learning completeness value set by the school, which is 75.

To overcome the above problems, the teacher can apply a cooperative learning model that can help students to solve problems in their assignments. One type of cooperative learning model that is suitable for use in accordance with the problems described earlier is the cooperative learning model type STAD (Student Teams Achievement Divisions). The STAD type learning model is a learning which students are divided into small groups of four or five heterogeneous students. This is consistent with the statement of Slavin (2005) STAD type cooperative learning, students are grouped in small groups of four or five people who are a mixture of different academic abilities, so that each group has high, medium, and low achievers. Students are divided into groups whose members consist of students who have different abilities, gender and ethnic background. In accordance with Slavin (2005) statement in STAD, students are divided into learning teams consisting of four people who have different levels of ability, gender, and ethnic background.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative approach in the form of Quasi Expansion Design. This design was chosen because it was not possible to control the research variables in full. The study was conducted in the fourth grade of SDN 09 Indarung Padang. In this study, the design that will be used is factorial design 2x2. According to Sugiyono (2012) factorial design is a design that pays attention to the possibility of a moderator influencing treatment (independent variable) on the outcome (dependent variable). This study is an experimental study to determine the effect of the STAD type cooperative model on the results and student learning motivation in integrated

thematic learning. The instrument that will be used to collect data in this study is a motivational questionnaire and integrated thematic learning learning written test. To measure student learning outcomes carried out with performance. The steps to be taken in compiling a written test instrument are as follows. First, make assessment grids based on integrated thematic learning learning indicators. Second, validate the validator learning indicators for integrated thematic learning. Systematic procedures can be used to achieve research objectives. In general, the research procedure is divided into three stages, namely the preparation, implementation, and assessment stages. The research data was collected using a learning motivation questionnaire and integrated thematic learning learning written test. Data analysis was performed to test the hypothesis, the statistical test used was the t-test and ANOVA test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The average score of the experimental class student learning outcomes is 21 before being given high treatment than the control class which amounts to 22. The average pretest score of the experimental class student learning outcomes is 41.11 and the average pretest score of the learning outcomes of the control class is 33 , 63. While the average posttest score of the experimental class student learning outcomes, namely: 86.82 is higher than the average posttest score of the learning outcomes of the control class, namely: 83.18. The average N-Gain of the experimental class, which is: 0.77 is also higher than the control class, namely: 0.74. The score for improving student learning outcomes in the experimental class and the control class is categorized as high.

Student learning outcomes test scores on Theme 8 which had high experimental class learning motivation which swore 21 students and controls with 22 students in the high category. The difference in average student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which has high learning motivation in the experimental and control classes conducted on Wednesday March 20 2019 until Tuesday April 9 2019.

Student learning outcomes test scores on Theme 8 which have low learning motivation experiment class which amounted to 21 students and control which amounted to 22 students were in the medium category. The difference in the average

student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which has low learning motivation is the experimental class and the control class conducted on Wednesday March 20 2019 until Tuesday April 9 2019.

The first hypothesis proposed in this study was used to see the effect of the STAD type cooperative model and student learning motivation on student learning outcomes. The following are the results of the first hypothesis test as in Table 1.

Table 1. Results of the First Hypothesis Calculation

Class	N	S_{gab}	A	Dk	T_{count}	t_{table}	conclusion
Experiment	21	0,008195	0,05	41	9,59	2,079614	H_1 be accepted
Control	22						

In table 1, it can be seen that the results of the t-test of the N_{gain} calculation in the experimental and control classes obtained t_{count} of 9.59, while $t_{(table)}$ of 2.079614 means that H_0 was rejected and H_1 was accepted because $t_{count} > t_{(table)}$ that there are differences in student learning outcomes at Theme 8 after treatment in the experimental class and the control class. So, it can be concluded that the learning outcomes of students who use the STAD type cooperative model in the experimental class are better than using conventional methods in the dick class.

The second hypothesis proposed in this study was used to see differences in student learning outcomes on theme 8 which had high learning motivation using the cooperative model STAD type in the experimental class with conventional methods in the control class. The following are the results of the second hypothesis test as in.

Table 2. Results of the Second Hypothesis Calculation

Class	N	S_{gab}	α	Dk	t_{count}	t_{table}	conclusion
Experiment	12	0,006101	0,05	20	89,65	2,178813	H_1 be accepted
Control	10						

In Table 2, it can be seen that the results of the N_{gain} calculation t-test in the experimental and control classes obtained a t-count value of 89.65, while $t_{(table)}$ of 2.178813 means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted because $t_{count} >$ Student learning in Theme 8 which has high learning motivation after treatment in the

experimental class and the control class. So, it can be concluded that student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have high learning motivation using the cooperative model STAD type in the experimental class is better than the conventional method in the control class.

The third hypothesis proposed in this study was used to see the effect of student learning outcomes on 8 who had low learning motivation using the cooperative type STAD model in the experimental class with conventional methods in the control class. The following are the results of the second hypothesis test as in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Third Hypothesis Calculation

Class	N	S_{gab}	α	Dk	t_{count}	t_{table}	Conclusion
Experiment	9	0,009363	0,05	19	11,65	2,262157	1 be accepted
Control	12						

In table 3, it can be seen that the results of the t-test on the N-gain calculation in the experimental class and control obtained the t-count value of 11.65, while the t-table of 2.262157 means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted because $t_{count} > t_{table}$. Thus it is known that there are differences in student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have low learning motivation after treatment in the experimental class and the control class. So, it can be concluded that student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have low learning motivation using the cooperative type STAD model in the experimental class are better than using conventional methods in the control class.

The fourth hypothesis is used to determine the interaction between the STAD type cooperative model with conventional methods and learning motivation in influencing student learning outcomes in Theme 8. In the fourth hypothesis to see whether there is interaction or not by using the Two-Way Anova test. The calculation results can be seen in table 4.

Table 4 Two-way Anova Test Results for Interactions between STAD type Cooperative Model with Conventional Methods and Learning Motivation Towards Student Learning Outcomes.

Source of Variance	JK	Dk	RJK	F _{count}	F _{table}
Delivery A	0,01	1	0,01	1	4,09
Delivery B	0,01	1	0,01	1	
Interaction A x B	7,35	1	7,35	735	
In	0,34	39	0,01		
Total	7,71	42	-		

Based on the summary results of the two-way Anova calculation above, it can be stated that: In line (A) $F_{count} > F_{table}$, then H_0 is rejected so that it can be concluded that at the 95% confidence level there is an influence between student learning outcomes using the STAD type cooperative model with conventional methods. In line (B) $F_{count} < F_{table}$, then H_0 is rejected so that it can be concluded that at the 95% level of confidence there is an influence between student learning outcomes that have high learning motivation and low learning motivation. In line (AB) $F_{count} < F_{table}$, then H_0 is rejected so that it can be concluded that at the 95% confidence level there is an interaction between cooperative type STAD model and conventional method with Motivation to learn towards student learning outcomes. The results of these calculations indicate that the influence of the STAD type cooperative model with conventional methods on learning outcomes depends on learning motivation.

CONCLUSION

Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 using the STAD type cooperative model are better than conventional methods. Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have High Learning Motivation using the STAD type cooperative model are better than conventional methods. Student learning outcomes in Theme 8 which have low learning motivation using the cooperative type STAD model are better than conventional methods. There is an interaction between the STAD type cooperative model with conventional methods and learning motivation towards student learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Abdul, M. 2015. Learning Strategy. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Abdurrahman. 2003. Evaluation of Indonesian Language Learning. Padang: UNP Press.
- Rusman. 2012. Learning Models. Depok: PT Rajagrafindo.
- Slavin, R. 2005. Cooperative Learning, Theory, Research, and Practice. Bandung: Nusa Media.
- Sugiyono. 2012. Qualitative Quantitative Research Methods and R & D. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sukadi. 2013. Learning and Learning Integrated SD thematic learning as Yadnya in the Framework of the Realization of the Dharma of Religion and the Constructivism-Based State Dharma. Bali: Educational Horizon.