

Influence of Cooperative Learning Model, Individual Learning and Motivation to Student Results

Priyono & Sunda Ariana

Bina Darma University, Palembang, Indonesia

Abstract

. The purpose of this study was to examine the Influence of Cooperative Learning Model, Individual Learning and Motivation Study Learning Outcomes graders.

This research uses experimental design methods to provide different treatment on two groups of samples, homogeneous condition. One group was treated sample in the form of cooperative learning model. The other group was treated individual learning model. Then each group was divided into two, namely a control group and an experimental group with high motivation and the control group and experiment with low motivation.

Based on the calculation result and test result may be concluded that Ho is accepted and H1 is rejected, it means there are not different of study result and significant interaction among study result who use cooperative learning method and individual learning along with students who have high motivation and student who have low motivation to Social Science of VII Grade in two junior high schools and two junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek Regency in 2009/ 2010

KEYWORDS: cooperative, individual, learning motivation, learning outcomes

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, studies on cooperative learning have been rife discussed, one type of student-centered approach has emerged in the international community among researchers (Slavin, 2011).

A series of studies have found an association between higher cognitive and affective outcomes, from the approach to cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 2005; Tran & Lewis, 2012a; Tran & Lewis, 2012b). In the setting of education in Indonesia that lecture-based teaching, one of the traditional approach most commonly used while the instructional approach (Harman & Nguyen, 2010). Compared with cooperative learning techniques, this study has been reported to be less effective with the demands of the high level of cognitive and affective outcomes (Slavin, 2011). lecture-based teaching In order to improve cognitive outcomes of students, alternatives to be part of cooperative learning (Tran & Lewis, 2012a & b). This approach has been reported to improve student achievement and retention of their knowledge (Johnson & Johnson, 2009).

Jolliffe (2007: 3) states that Cooperative learning is a teaching that emphasizes the collaborative efforts of students in small groups to support each other in order to improve their own learning and others. Terwel (Gillies & Ashman, 2003: 54) states that the cooperative learning are designed and implemented to develop social strategies and social attitudes that can be accepted by the students.

Felder and Brent offer the following definition for CL: "The term *cooperative learning* (CL) refers to students working in teams on an assignment or project under conditions in which certain criteria are satisfied, including that the team members be

held individually accountable for the complete content of the assignment or project” (2007, p. 34). Therefore, cooperative learning implies the organization of group work in the classroom in order to achieve academic, affective and social goals at the same time. It also promotes the development of both social and thinking skills.

Motivation refers to "the reasons underlying behavior" (Guay et al., 2010, p. 712). Paraphrasing Gredler, Broussard and Garrison (2004) broadly defines motivation as "an attribute that drives us to do or not do something" (p. 106). Intrinsic motivation is motivation that is driven by personal enjoyment, interest, or pleasure. As Deci et al. (1999) observed, "intrinsic motivation to energize and sustain the activity through the satisfaction of spontaneous inherent in the act of will be effective. This is manifested in behaviors such as play, exploration, and the challenge of looking that people often do for external rewards" (p. 658) , Researchers often contrasted with extrinsic motivation intrinsic motivation, the motivation governed by the contingencies of reinforcement. Traditionally, educators consider the intrinsic motivation to be more desirable and produce better learning outcomes than extrinsic motivation (Deci et al., 1999). Many researchers confirm the effectiveness of cooperative learning (Felder & Brent, 2007; Johnson, Johnson, Stanne, 2000). In this case, the results show that the Learning Together and Group Investigation Cooperation promotes higher achievement than competitive or individualistic efforts.

Therefore Van Wyk (2010) in his study seeks to improve the existing STAD practices and look into how the achievement scores associated with the practice of modified, selected as the fourth part of the study due to adopt different relative quantitative approach to the accumulated use of questionnaires. The latter is of Gillies (2004) in Australia who adopt triangulative method to investigate group differences STAD structured and unstructured.

Motivation to learn, motivation is an important quality that affect student success in learning and performance (Popovich&Wongwiwatthanannukit, 2000). Students are motivated to have extra energy to learn. low motivation and unstable causing minimal effort to learn. This affects the performance of students in class and achievement (Pintrich& Groot, 1990; Hamzah& Ismail, 2009; Thosalis&Nakkula, 2012).

Interaction within the group provides the possibility for students to adapt and accept different abilities and backgrounds of other students (Wyk, 2012). In addition, peer relationships are very important and can not be underestimated. Fellow drive to achieve better academic achievement is not only also foster student motivation but also make students ready for work, and concern for learning and improving thinking skills (Hamid, Zakaria, and Islam, 2012).

RESEARCH METHODS

Research design

This research uses experimental design methods to provide different treatment on two groups of samples, her condition homogeneous. One sample group was treated in the form of cooperative learning model. Another group was treated individual learning model. Then each group was divided into two, namely a control group and an experimental group with high motivation and the control group and experiment with low motivation.

Population and Sample Research

1. Population Research

Winarsunu (2002: 12) states that the population is all individuals who are meant to be studied, and which will be subject to generalization. Hadi provide limits

on the study population is a population or an individual who at least has the same properties (1987: 220).

While the sample is a population that's less than the population. (Hadi, 1987: 221). Darmawan provide understanding the sample is an interesting process most of the study subjects, symptoms or objects that exist in the population. (2006: 63).

Furthermore, the population and the sample can be seen in the following Method of collecting data. In this study, the data collection methods used were:

1) Methods The questionnaire or questionnaires and 2) Test Method Data analysis technique. Analysis of the data used in this research is to use the technique of analysis of variance of two lines that were previously done prerequisite test that consists of tests of normality and homogeneity test.

RESULTS

In the report the results of this study will be explained about the findings in the field at the time the researchers conducting the study. Research conducted on two different research sites, namely 1) second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek 2) second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek Psychology.

Grades K-S for demonstration learning data values obtained 1,031 with significance probability value is above 0.237 and $\alpha = 0:05$ this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcome data with the use of cooperative learning model class is normally distributed.

Grades K-S for learning data values obtained demonstrations .931 with significance probability value is above 0.334 and $\alpha = 0:05$ this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcome data with the use of individual learning model class is normally distributed.

Test the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups

a. Design : Intercept +A_Factor+B_Factor+A_Factor*B_Factor

Based on the above table it can be seen that the probability of the above data is 0.851, meaning that the probability of > 0.05 , it gives the sense that the data class for cooperative learning and individual learning model is homogeneous.

From the foregoing it can be seen that from both a research site has the ability to learn the same of Social Sciences, where the two samples have the same properties or homogeneous.

From the table above it can be seen that there are differences in the average Social Sciences learning outcomes in each cooperative and individual classes to students with high motivation and low motivation.

Based on the above table it can be seen that the model of cooperative learning with highly motivated, have a greater learning outcomes when compared with the model of cooperative learning in students with low motivation. Similarly, in the individual learning model with high motivation have learning outcomes g

\kreater than the individual learning model with low motivate mo. As well as c\kooperative learning model is greater than the individual learning model.

From the table above obtained significant value under 0:05 ($\alpha < 0.05$), so it can be explained that there are differences in learning outcomes Social Sciences students of class VII in two junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and two junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010 using cooperative learning and individual learning model.

From the table above obtained significant value under 0:05 ($\alpha < 0.05$), so it can be

explained that there are differences in learning outcomes of students in the subjects of Social Sciences students of class VII in two junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and two junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek year lessons 2009/2010 which has a high motivation to learn with those having low learning motivation in cooperative learning model.

From the table above obtained significant value over 0:05 ($\alpha > 0.05$), so it can be explained that there are no differences in learning outcomes Social Sciences students of seventh grade primary school or second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009 / 2010, which has a high motivation to learn with those having low learning motivation on individual learning model.

Test of between-subjects Effects

Dependent Variable : Learning Outcomes of Social Science

- a. R Square = 149 (Adjusted R Square = 133) t_{3} rt 0890

DISCUSSION

Differences Learning Outcomes On Learning Model Cooperative Learning and Individual

Based on the calculation and the results of tests conducted on each class can be explained that the learning outcomes of Social Sciences Seventh Grade Primary School Students or two grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and two grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek the academic year 2009/2010, at the beginning of learning has the ability Similarly, where the average results of the same study. After treatment with the use of cooperative learning and individual learning model there are significant differences in the results, there was an increase learning outcomes for Social Sciences in seventh grade or two grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and two grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010.

This suggests that learning by using cooperative learning model to motivate students to learn and improve learning outcomes. Similarly, students who use individual learning model also has an average significant study results. This can be explained that students receive individual guidance from the teacher so the teacher's attention is focused on the students.

In line with the cooperative learning model, where almost all of the material can be absorbed by the students, because students are directly involved in a given problem, when students learn, do chores and interpret them, so that more students master the material. The average difference between classroom learning model, cooperative learning model and individuals have significant differences, as shown by the average value of learning results obtained by each class, which by using cooperative learning model has an average value higher when compared with the use of individual learning model. Statistically this is indicated by the use values greater than $t > t_{table}$ and the value of learning a second significant difference under 0:05.

In addition, the calculation by using analysis of variance 2 lines get value FA (F count to factors cooperative learning and learning model people) showed greater than F_{table} , meaning that there is influence learning outcomes between cooperative learning and learning model individuals who applied to students of seventh grade on the subjects of Social Sciences in second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek in the academic year 2009/2010.

The result of this calculation indicates that the hypothesis can be accepted, where there are differences in learning outcomes Social Sciences seventh grade students at second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010 between classes are taught using cooperative learning model and are taught using individual learning model.

Learning Outcomes Students with Learning Motivation Level High and Low Motivation

The motivation of the students in the learning process is probably different, where students have high motivation to learn and others have a low learning motivation, differences in the motivation of these students provides its own influence on learning outcomes of students of Social Sciences. This is also shown by the different test average, in which the achievements of both (students with high motivation and students with low motivation) with the learning method is different, the cooperative learning model obtained significantly different results between students who have high motivation and low indicated with the value of $t > t_{table}$ as well as the significance value less than 0.05, whereas the individual learning model shows the value $t < t_{table}$, it means that there was significant difference in student learning outcomes that have a high motivation to the students who have low motivation.

In addition, by using analysis of variance 2 lines get value FB (F count to the level of student motivation high and motivation is low) showed that the FB is greater than F_{table} , so it gives the sense that there is influence learning outcomes among students who have learning motivation high and students who have low motivation in seventh grade primary school on the subjects of Social Sciences in second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010.

It gives the sense that the second hypothesis can be accepted, that there are differences in learning outcomes Social Sciences students of seventh grade primary school or second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade junior high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010 among the ones that have the motivation to learn is high and who have the motivation to learn low.

Interaction Model of Learning and Student Motivation Levels

Calculations using 2-way analysis of variance also used to determine the interaction between factor A (cooperative learning and individual learning model) by a factor B (students with high motivation and students with low motivation).

Based on calculations performed to determine the interaction between the two, cooperative learning model and the model of individual learning with students who have learning motivation high and low learning motivation can be explained that there was no significant interaction between the learning model (model of individual learning and cooperative learning model) and motivation learning students towards learning results. This is indicated by the value of F arithmetic $< F_{table}$ and significant level greater than 0.05 (5%), so it can be explained that there is no interaction between the learning method with the motivation of the students. It gives the sense that there is no interaction between cooperative learning model, a model of individual learning and learning motivation toward learning outcomes of seventh grade students on the subjects of Social Sciences in second grade junior high schools Pogalan Trenggalek and second grade high schools Gandusari Trenggalek academic year 2009/2010.

It explains that students with high learning motivation by using cooperative learning model of education outcomes of Social Sciences were high compared with the

learning outcomes of students who have low motivation. Students with high learning motivation using individual learning model has the same learning outcomes with the learning outcomes of students who have low motivation.

Bibliography

1. Slavin, R. E. (2011). Instruction Based on Cooperative Learning. In R. E.
2. Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (2009). An Educational Psychology Success Story: Social Interdependence Theory and Cooperative Learning. *Educational Researcher*, 38(5), 365-379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189X09339057>
3. Tran, V. D., & Lewis, R. (2012a). Effects of Cooperative Learning on Students at An Giang University in Vietnam. *International Education Studies*, 5(1), 86-99. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v5n1p86>
4. Tran, V.D., & Lewis, R. (2012b). The effects of Jigsaw Learning on Students' Attitudes in a Vietnamese Higher Education Classroom. *International Journal of Higher Education*, 1(2), 1-13. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v1n2p9>
5. Harman, G., & Nguyen, T. N. (2010). Reforming teaching and learning in Vietnam's higher education system. In G. Haaland, M. Hayden & T. Nghi (Eds.), *Reforming Higher Education in Vietnam: Challenges and Priorities* (pp. 65-86). London: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3694-0_5
6. Jolliffe, Wendy. 2007. Cooperative learning in the classroom. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
7. Gillies, Robyn.M. & Ashman, Adrian F. 2003. Co-operative learning. London: RoutledgeFalmer.
8. Harman, G., & Nguyen, T. N. (2010). Reforming teaching and learning in Vietnam's higher education system. In G. Haaland, M. Hayden & T. Nghi (Eds.), *Reforming Higher Education in Vietnam: Challenges and Priorities* (pp. 65-86). London: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3694-0_5
9. Felder, R. M.; Brent, R. Learning by Doing. *Chem. Engr. Education* **2003**, 37, 282–283, <http://www.ncsu.edu/felder-public/Columns/Active.pdf> (accessed October 6, 2006).
10. Felder, R. M.; Brent, R. Navigating The Bumpy Road to Student-Centered Instruction. *College Teaching* **1996**, 44 (2), 43–47, <http://www.ncsu.edu/felder-public/Papers/Resist.html> (accessed October 6, 2006).
11. B van Wyk & D Adeniji-Neill 2014. Introduction. In: Indigenous Concepts of Education: Toward Elevating Humanity for All Learners. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 1-14
12. Guay, F., Chanal, J., Ratelle, C. F., Marsh, H. W., Larose, S., & Boivin, M. (2010). Intrinsic, identified, and controlled types of motivation for school subjects in young elementary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80(4), 711–735.
13. Broussard SC & Garrison MEB. 2004. The Relationship Between Classroom Motivation and Academic Achievement in Elementary-School-Aged Children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 2004; 33; 106
14. Deci, E. L., Koestner, R., & Ryan, R. M. (1999). A meta-analytic review of experiments examining the effects of extrinsic rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125(6), 627–668.
15. Pintrich, P. R. & Groot, E. V. D. (1990). Motivational and Self-regulated Learning Components of Classroom Academic Performance. *Journal of*

- Educational Psychology*, 82(1): 33-40.
16. Wyk, M. M. (2012). The Effects of the STAD-Cooperative Learning Method on Student Achievement, Attitude and Motivation in Economics Education. *Journal of Social Science, Vol 33 No 2* , 261-270.
 17. Hamid, D. T., Zakaria, N., & Islam, M. R. (2012). Implementation of an Online Collaborative Learning through Grid Portal Technology. *3rd International Conference on e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning* (pp. 35-42). Singapore: IPEDR vol.27, IACSIT Press
 18. Hamzah, M. & Ismail. (2009). The Influence of Environment and Students' Learning Motivation on the Achievement in Mathematics Subject in KejarPaket C PKBM Sultan AgungKesambi Cirebon. *EduMa*, 1(2): 101 - 112
 19. Toshalis, E. &Nakkula, M. J. (2012). *Motivation, Engagement, and Student Voice: The Students at the Center Series*. Boston, US: Jobs for the Future and the Nellie Mae Education Foundation
 20. Hamid, D. T., Zakaria, N., & Islam, M. R. (2012). Implementation of an Online Collaborative Learning through Grid Portal Technology. *3rd International Conference on e-Education, e-Business, e-Management and e-Learning* (pp. 35-42). Singapore: IPEDR vol.27, IACSIT Press
 21. Mayer & P. A. Alexander (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Learning and Instruction* (pp. 344-360). New York: Taylor & Francis.
 22. Winarsunu, Tulus. 2002. *The statistics in the study of psychology and education*, Malang: UMM Press
 23. SutrisnoHadi. *Statistics 1987. Volume 2*. Yogyakarta: YPFP. UGM