

## Influence of Demonstration Method, Cooperative Learning Method and Motivation Against Student Results

Priyono<sup>1</sup>, Yoyok Soesatyo<sup>2</sup>, Dewie Tri Wijayati<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Bina Darma, Palembang, Indonesia

<sup>2,3</sup>State University Surabaya

*Email : priyono.unu\_sidoarjo@yahoo.com*

### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine and test the difference between learning outcomes and interaction between test results by using demonstration learning to the students who use cooperative learning, have high motivation to learning and have low motivation to learning.

Data collection techniques used questionnaires and test method and the sampling technique using random sampling. While the data analysis used is a two-way variance analysis used normality and homogeneity before knowing the data of normal distribution and data homogeneity.

Based on calculations made that cooperative learning proved to give a positive influence and improve student learning outcomes.

*Keywords: demonstration method, cooperative learning, motivation, learning*

### Introduction

Currently the department of education and culture were tidying about teaching methods and learning at high school level. In addition, the motivation needs to be improved to encourage someone to do something, thus causing a change in the behavior of the student, where it is strongly associated with psychiatric and emotional.

Around the world, issues of social justice and justice are an important part of everyday discourse in education. Teaching for social justice is defined differently in various social contexts because changes in society affect the ways that need to be prioritized (Grant & Agosto, 2008). In the United States, teaching for social justice has been labeled, such as social justice pedagogy, social reconstruction teacher education, anti-oppressive education and social justice teacher education (Cochran-Smith, 2009; Giroux, 1992; Kumashiro, 2002; McDonald & Zeichner, 2009). However, apart from these various associations with teaching for social justice, there is agreement among educators about their goals or objectives, namely to eliminate educational inequalities between the poor, middle and rich economy classes; majority and minority ethnic groups; and privileges and powerlessness, as well as eradicating the forms of accountability responsibility of the school (Kvietok, 2014).

This is why creativity is part of life itself and not something destined for unique individuals. Thus, creativity is a necessary part of thought and action in a new way in the world that requires us to act. Good for continue to live, disrupt the status quo or to rebuild order, and human creativity does this work because

manuscripts of how to do this are not written before (Brinkmann, 2009). This requires acting.

In relation to the above, the main point is that schools and education play a major role in relation to fostering the ability of students and students to understand the world as a change and the need for this capacity is underscored in the accelerated, postmodern and global world where the labor market is facing major changes, and where we face increasingly complex economic, climate and ethnic challenges. In this situation, it is very important that students and students learn to recognize and see their own possibilities for action and literally manipulate their world (Brinkmann & Bedsard, 2010). Such investigative action is required as well to change the current state or to stabilize everyday life in a new way. Let me make this more concrete.

In recent years, "active learning" in the classroom has been driven by the Ministry of Religious Affairs, Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology in Japan, and the focus on cooperative learning is increasingly important. In cooperative learning, students work together to maximize their own learning and each in small groups (Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, 1991). Many researchers have examined the cooperative learning process in Japan (Machi & Nakaya, 2014). To examine the process of cooperative learning, it is important to take into account "how learners think of cooperation". For example, there may be students who consider cooperative learning as positive to show better performance than students who consider it negative. Nagahama, Yasunaga, Sekita, and Kouhara (2009) developed a scale measuring the confidence of Japanese undergraduates in cooperation in cooperative learning and revealed a scale with three subscale factors. First, the use of cooperation represents the belief of the usefulness of cooperation in cooperative learning. Second, individual orientation describes beliefs about the tendency to learn individually and avoid learning with friends. Third, injustice represents the belief that the benefits of cooperative learning vary from person to person. While it is necessary to examine how this belief influences cooperative learning in order to promote it effectively in the classroom, little research has examined the effect of trust in cooperation in learning behavior in cooperative learning.

In cooperative learning are taught specific skills to be able to work well together in the group, such as being a good listener, students are given an activity sheet with questions or tasks that are planned to be taught. During group work, task group members are reaching completeness (Slavin, 1995).

Achievement motivation is considered as one of the determinants of student achievement and academic success (Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H., 2013). Studies in public schools show that motivation predicts students' choice of duties and activities, persistence in performance situations, and attitudes toward the subject to a high level (Wigfield & Cambria, 2010). People who have successful motivation (people with higher levels of high school) want to improve themselves ability, acquire new skills, and improve their skills in the task. They attribute success to insufficient effort and talent and business failure (Weiner, 1974). Even in failure, their personal skills are never questioned. Success triggers the excitement and pride of achievement and recognition of their own abilities. People who have

successful motivation do not let their reviews and feelings of pride in success outweigh the feeling of shame for failure. Effects in the form of self-assess emotions improve performance motivated behavior (Heckhausen, J., & Heckhausen, H, 2010). However, the whole directive is reinforced, not just one individual element.

This behavior seems to be a functional and understandable way to maintain one's self-esteem. However, some authors argue that the avoidance of school is unfavorable for improving competence because it demonstrates overall defensive and sporadic efficiency (Brunstein & Heckhausen 2010; Covington, 1999, 2000; Martin & Marsh, 2003; De Castella, Don Byrne, & Covington, 2013).

Based on the variety of opinions expressed about the motivation above, this suggests that in general the motivation comes from within the individual itself, be regarded as intrinsic motivation, and while the motivation in the form of stimulation, the driving force or the driving force that comes from outside, called with extrinsic motivation. Both forms of motivation are interrelated, meaning that intrinsic motivation will be more meaningful or meaningless unless reinforced by extrinsic motivation.

Results of learning can not be separated from the act of learning, because learning is a process, while learning achievement is the result of the learning process. For a student to learn is a liability. Success or failure of a student in education depends on the learning process experienced by these students.

Furthermore, assessment of student learning outcomes to determine the extent to which he has achieved the goal of learning is what is called learning achievement. As said by Winkel (1997: 168) that the learning process experienced by students resulted in changes in the field of knowledge and understanding, in the field of values, attitudes and skills. These changes appear in the learning achievement produced by the students of the questions, problems or tasks assigned by the teacher. Through student achievement can know the progress that has been achieved in the study.

Involvement refers to the quality of student connections or involvement with schoolwork (Christenson, Reschly, & Wylie, 2012; Fredricks, Blumenfeld, & Paris, 2004). Since emotional aspects of learning have received attention in recent years (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014), we measure emotional involvement in addition to behavioral engagement. Behavioral involvement refers to on-task behavior, academic behavior and class participation, while emotional engagement reflects emotional states of energy, such as enthusiasm, interest and enjoyment (Skinner, Kindermann, & Furrer, 2009).

While the above concept of learning and creativity lies in social practices mainly inspired by Lave and Wenger (1991), my distinctive creativity conception also involves the main ideas formulated by the German order Hans Joas, among others, in the book 'The Creativity of Action' 1996, originally published in 1992 as *Die Kreativität des Handelns*). According to Joas, a pragmatic perspective implies that human cognition and learning are not understood as isolated mental processes. Cognition and learning must be understood as part of life itself. From this perspective, cognition is a creative human life practice, and human action is seen as a creative act. Joas's conceptualization of creativity is inspired by George Herbert Mead and John Dewey, among others, and he intends to eliminate the model of the

rationality of human action. According to Joas, it is a mistake to assume that humans first plan their actions (in the mental realm) to be able to take action afterwards by following the plan (on a practical plane). Instead, 'actors find themselves faced with new situations that force them to emerge creative solutions - a process that can not simply be captured by functional logic' (Joas & Knöbl, 2009, p. 522). This implies that the concept of the situation supersedes the logic of the end-means, because in concrete situations, where people take action that perception and cognition take place and where plans are formulated and all this requires human creativity: 'This situational challenge thus requires new and creative solutions rather than search unshakable goals and plans are formulated at a particular point in time' (Joas & Knöbl, 2009, p. 518).

## **Research Methods**

### ***Research design***

This research uses experimental design methods to provide different treatment on two groups of samples, her condition homogeneous. One group of samples were treated in the form of learning methods of demonstration. Another group treated cooperative learning methods. 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.

At the end of the lesson or the end of the administration of treatment, each group both groups with learning demonstration methods and treatment methods of cooperative groups were given tests to determine learning outcomes. From the collection of test results of each group were then analyzed by Anova 2 lines.

### ***Population and Sample Research***

Hadi (1987, 220) provide limits on the study population is a population or an individual who at least has the same properties. While Suharsimi (1989: 102) provide limits on the overall study population is the subject of research. As for the population in this study were students of class X in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 academic year 2009/2010.

### ***Research samples***

The sample is a population that's less than the population. (Hadi, 1987, p.221). Noting in this study that the research sample was all students of class X, then a sample of this population is 160 students, which consists of two classes at each study site.

### ***Method of collecting data***

In this study, the data collection methods used are: the questionnaire method, are a number of written questions and used to obtain information from respondents in terms of personal or reports about the things he knew. (Suharsimi Arikunto, 1989: p.124). Questionnaires were administered in the form of multiple choice closed, meaning questionnaire given to respondents provided alternative answers that respondents lived choose the answer among the answers that are given. These questionnaires method used to obtain data on students' motivation in class X public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the academic year 2009/2010.

**Method Tests,**

Tests are a series of questions or exercises and other tools used to measure the skills, knowledge, intelligence, ability or talent possessed by individuals or groups (Suharsimi, 2002, p. 127). While tests of achievement or achievement test is a test used to measure the achievement of someone having learned something (Suharsimi, 2002, p. 128). The test was given in order to measure and determine student learning outcomes in the form of student scores on test day. The test conducted was to determine the learning outcomes of students Entrepreneurship.

**Data analysis technique**

Analysis of the data used in this research is to use the technique of analysis of variance of two paths. Test requirements analysis:

(A) Test Normality

(B) Test the homogeneity of variance

**Hypothesis testing**

After the prerequisite test, further testing Anava two lanes. As to facilitate the calculation of the above analysis, it will use a computer-based statistical program, SPSS version 15.

**Results and Discussion****Normality test**

Table 1. Normality Test Results Method Demonstration

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test			Demonstration
N			60
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean		73.9000
	Std. Deviation		9.80609
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute		.145
	Positive		.135
	Negative		-.145
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z			1.121
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)			.162

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Grades K-S for demonstration learning data values obtained 1.121 with significance probability value is above 0.162 and  $\alpha = 0.05$  this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcomes data using for classroom demonstrations normally distributed learning.

Table 2. Normality Test Results Cooperative Method

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Cooperative
N		60
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Mean	79.4667
	Std. Deviation	10.04645
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.122
	Positive	.122
	Negative	-.095
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.943
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.337

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Grades K-S for learning data values obtained demonstrations .943 with significance probability value is above 0.337 and  $\alpha = 0.05$  this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcome data with the use of cooperative learning classes are normally distributed.

**Homogeneity test**

Homogeneity calculation results can be seen from the following table.

Table 3. Homogeneity Calculation Results Pretest

**Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variance<sup>s</sup>**

Dependent Variable: learning outcomes

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.482	3	116	.223

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

a. Design: Intercept+Factor\_A+Factor\_B+Factor\_A \* Factor\_B

Decision-making:

- If the probability of  $<0.05$  was not homogeneous
- If the probability  $>0.05$  homogenous

Based on the above table it can be seen that the probability of the above data is 0.223, meaning that the probability of  $>0.05$ , it gives the sense that the data class for demosntrasi method and cooperative method is homogeneous.

From the foregoing it can be seen that from both a research site has the same ability to learn Entrepreneurship, which both samples have the same properties or homogeneous.

Table 4. Descriptive Results Achievement Entrepreneurship

**Descriptive Statistics**

Dependent Variable: learning outcomes

Factor_A	Factor_B	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
cooperative	High motivation	86.7667	7.12782	30
	Low motivation	72.1667	6.65444	30
	Total	79.4667	10.04645	60
Demonstration	High motivation	77.3333	8.68345	30
	Low motivation	70.4667	9.78998	30
	Total	73.9000	9.80609	60
general	High motivation	82.0500	9.20100	60
	Low motivation	71.3167	8.34325	60
	Total	76.6833	10.27274	120

From the table above it can be seen that there are differences in the average results of learning achievement Entrepreneurship in each class cooperative and demonstrations in students with high motivation and low motivation, further to test the significance level of the average yield is used t test, with results as follows.

Table 5. Different Test average of cooperative learning and demonstration

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Learning outcomes	Equal variances assumed	.051	.822	3.071	118	.003	5.56667	1.81241	1.97760	9.15574
	Equal variances not assumed			3.071	117.931	.003	5.56667	1.81241	1.97757	9.15576

From the table above obtained significant value under 0.05 ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ), so it can be explained that there are differences in achievement Entrepreneurship in class X in public vocational secondary schools 1, public vocational secondary schools 2 using learning methods demonstration and cooperative learning.

Furthermore, to test the significance of the average difference between students with high motivation and low motivation obtained the following results. Table 6. Different test average student with high motivation and low motivation cooperative learning.

**Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Learning Outcomes	Equal variances assumed	.244	.623	8.201	58	.000	14.60000	1.78033	11.03628	18.16372
	Equal variances not assumed			8.201	57.728	.000	14.60000	1.78033	11.03592	18.16408

From the table above obtained significance value below 0.05 ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ), so it can be explained that there are differences in achievement Entrepreneurship in class X in public vocational secondary schools 1, public vocational secondary schools who have high achievement motivation with who have low achievement

motivation in cooperative learning. While the demonstration learning model was presented as follows.

Table 7. Different test average student with high motivation and low motivation in learning Demonstration.

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
Learning outcomes	Equal variances assumed	.235	.630	2.874	58	.006	6.86667	2.38918	2.08420	11.64914
	Equal variances not assumed			2.874	57.185	.006	6.86667	2.38918	2.08274	11.65059

From the table above obtained significant value under 0.05 ( $\alpha < 0.05$ ), so it can be explained that there are differences in achievement Entrepreneurship in class X in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 who have high achievement motivation with who have low achievement motivation on learning demonstrations.

After the prerequisite test, Anova test is then performed two lanes, to understand the interaction of learning methods and the motivation of the students.

The results of the test Anova two paths, as follows.

Table 8. Anava 2 Line Test Results.

#### Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4834.300 <sup>a</sup>	3	1611.433	24.202	.000
Intercept	705640.033	1	705640.033	10597.848	.000
Factor_A	929.633	1	929.633	13.962	.000
Factor_B	3456.133	1	3456.133	51.907	.000
Factor_A * Faktor_B	448.533	1	448.533	6.736	.011
Error	7723.667	116	66.583		
general	718198.000	120			
Corrected Total	12557.967	119			

a. R Squared = .385 (Adjusted R Squared = .369)

According to the table above can be explained that

- 1) The ratio FA ( $F$ -count on methods of learning) = 11.045 with a significance value smaller than  $\alpha < 0.05$  is 0.000, with DF1 = 1 and DF2 = 116 obtained value of  $F$ -table = 3.94 so that it can be explained that the  $F$ -count  $>$   $F$ -table, meaning that there is influence between the learning outcomes of cooperative learning model and demonstration applied to the class X on the subjects of entrepreneurship in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 Academic Year 2009/2010
- 2) Ratio FB ( $F$ -count on the level of student motivation) = 51.907, with significant value smaller than  $\alpha < 0.05$  is 0.001, with DF1 = 1 and DF2 = 116 obtained value of  $F$ -table = 3.94 so that it can be explained that  $F$ -count  $>$   $F$ -table, meaning that

there is influence learning outcomes among students who have learning high motivation and students who have low motivation in class X on the subjects of entrepreneurship public vocational secondary schools and public vocational secondary schools 2 Academic Year 2009/2010.

- 3) The value of the significance of the interaction between factor A (Method of cooperative learning and demonstration) and factor B (students' motivation high and low learning motivation) obtained calculated F value of 6.736 with a significant level of 0.011, a comparison with the F table and significant level  $\alpha = 0.05$ , ( $6.736 > 3.94$ ), so it can be explained that the factor A (cooperative learning methods and demonstrations) and factor B (learning motivation high and low learning motivation) has an influence on the result of learning on the subjects of entrepreneurship. This means that there is an interaction between cooperative learning methods, demonstration and motivation to learn the results of class X student on the subjects of entrepreneurship in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 Academic Year 2009/2010

Based on the calculation and the results of tests conducted on each class can be explained that the learning outcomes Enterprise Class X public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the academic year 2009/2010, at the beginning of learning has the same ability, where the average results of the same study. After treatment by using cooperative learning there are significant differences in the results, there was an increase learning outcomes Entrepreneurship in class X public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the school year 2009/2010. It illustrates that by using cooperative learning to motivate students to learn and improve learning outcomes. While the students using demonstration method also has an average significant study results, after the demonstration of learning methods.

This can be explained that the students had also a learning experience and see first hand what has been practiced so that the material can be absorbed well. In line with the cooperative learning, 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 classes with cooperative learning with instructional demonstrations have significant differences, as shown by the average value of learning results obtained by each class, where by using cooperative learning method has an average value higher than the values using the method of demonstration. Statistically this is indicated by the value of t is greater 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 teaching model demonstration) showed greater than *F-table*, it means there is a difference and influence the learning outcomes of cooperative learning model and demonstration as applied to student class X on the subjects of entrepreneurship in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the school year 2009/2010.

The result of this calculation indicates that the hypothesis can be accepted, where there are differences in learning outcomes Entrepreneurship class X students

at public vocational secondary schools and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the school year 2009/2010 among which are taught using cooperative learning model and the taught using learning model demonstration.

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 Entrepreneurship students. 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, cooperative and demonstrations obtained different results between students who have high motivation and low both in method cooperative learning or demonstration shown by the value  $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$ , respectively for cooperative learning and demonstrations are 8.201 and 2.874.

In addition, by using analysis of variance 2 lines get value FB ( $F\text{-count}$  to the level of student motivation high and motivation is low) showed that the FB is greater  $F\text{-table}$ , 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 class X on the subjects of entrepreneurship in public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 in the school year 2009/2010.

This indicates that the second hypothesis can be accepted, meaning that there are differences in learning outcomes Entrepreneurship class X students at public vocational secondary schools 1 and public vocational secondary schools 2 Academic Year 2009/2010 between that which motivated high learning and motivation low learning.

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

Based on the calculation of the interaction between the two, cooperative learning

### **Findings**

Based on the results of calculations and test results conducted on each class can be explained that, at the beginning of learning students have the same ability, Average learning outcomes are the same. Having been treated using demonstration methods and discussion methods there were significant differences in outcomes.

This illustrates that learning by using demonstration methods gives students the motivation to learn and improve their learning outcomes. Similarly, students using discussion methods also have a significant average of learning outcomes.

### **Implications**

From the previous research and theory presented above, and thereafter Conducted research found that the implications of using demonstration methods gave students the motivation to learn and improve their learning outcomes. Similarly, students using discussion methods also have a significant average of learning outcomes.

***Practical Implications***

After conducting research in Class XI vocational high School Muhammadiyah 1 and vocational high School Karya Dharma 2 Lesson 2009/2010, can be seen using demonstration methods to give students the motivation to learn and improve their better learning outcomes.

***Social Implications***

From the results of research in Class XI vocational high School Muhammadiyah 1 and vocational high School Karya Dharma 2 Lesson 2009/2010, then this can be applied in other school places.

***Orisinality / Value***

From the design of this study, the originality or value of research is to learn by using demonstration methods to motivate students to learn and improve their learning outcomes. Similarly, students using discussion methods also have a significant average of learning outcomes

## Bibliography

- Arikunto, Suharsimi. 1989. *Research procedure*. Bandung: Bina Aksara.
- Anderman, E. M., & Anderman, L. H. (2013). *Classroom motivation* (2nd ed.). Columbus: Pearson <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/program/Anderman-Classroom-Motivation-2nd-Edition/PGM157822.html>
- Brinkmann, S. (2009). Social kreativitet: at skabe det sociale i en verden uden manuskript. I L. Tanggaard, & S. Brinkmann (red.), *Kreativitetsfremmende læringsmiljøer i skolen* (s. 75-93). Frederikshavn: Dafolo Forlag A/S. <http://www.tangora.dafolo.dk/filer/onlineshop/pdf/6255%20-%20indhold%20og%20forord.pdf>
- Brinkmann, S. & Tanggaard, L. (2010) Toward an Epistemology of the Hand, *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 29(3), 243-257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11217-009-9164-0>
- Brunstein, J. C., & Heckhausen, H. (2010). Leistungs motivation [Achievement motivation]. In H. Heckhausen & J. Heckhausen (Eds.), *Motivation und Handeln [Motivation and action]*. (4th ed.). Berlin: Springer.
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326993es3803_9)
- Cochran-Smith M. (2010) Toward a Theory of Teacher Education for Social Justice. In: Hargreaves A., Lieberman A., Fullan M., Hopkins D. (eds) Second International Handbook of Educational Change. Springer International Handbooks of Education, vol 23. Springer, Dordrecht [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6\\_27/fulltext.html](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-90-481-2660-6_27/fulltext.html)
- Christenson, S. L., Reschly, A. L., & Wylie, C. (2012). Handbook of Research on Student Engagement. New York: Springer. <http://www.springer.com/us/book/9781461420170>
- Covington, M. V. (1999). Caring about learning: The nature and nurturing of subject-matter appreciation. *Educational Psychologist*, 34(2), 127–136. [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3402\\_5](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326985ep3402_5)
- Covington, M. V. (2000). Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: an integrative review. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 171–200. <http://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.psych.51.1.171>
- De Castella, K., Byrne, D., & Covington, M. (2013). Unmotivated or motivated to fail? A cross-cultural study of achievement motivation, fear of failure, and student disengagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105, 861–880. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/servlet/articulo?codigo=5884437>
- Fredricks, J. A., Blumenfeld, P. C., & Paris, A. H. (2004). School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 59-109. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/00346543074001059>
- Giroux, H. A. (1992). *Border crossings: Cultural workers and the politics of education*. New York: Routledge. <http://www.worldcat.org/title/border-crossings-cultural-workers-and-the-politics-of-education/oclc/23941253>

- Grant, C. A., & Agosto, V. (2008). Teacher capacity and social justice in teacher education. In M. Cochran-Smith, S. Feiman-Nemeser, D. J. McLntyre, & K.E. Demers (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (pp. 175-200). New York, NY: Routledge.  
[http://api.ning.com/files/sMx9jEUNmKLDqQaLZZfaSGOQKzTpqkR0hQ\\*eZSRJBN5TBcMx2J2qVzojuWeH1eV89C6i-GOLxe-KsnvvWoniVHpLj-ITjt/GrantyAgostoteachercapacity.pdf](http://api.ning.com/files/sMx9jEUNmKLDqQaLZZfaSGOQKzTpqkR0hQ*eZSRJBN5TBcMx2J2qVzojuWeH1eV89C6i-GOLxe-KsnvvWoniVHpLj-ITjt/GrantyAgostoteachercapacity.pdf)
- Hadi Sutrisno. 1987, Statistics Volume 2. Yogyakarta: YPPF. UGM.
- Heckhausen, J., & Heckhausen, H. (2010). *Motivation und Handeln [Motivation and action]*. (4th ed.). Berlin: Springer.  
<http://www.springer.com/us/book/9783642759635>
- Joas, H. & Knöbl, W. (2009) *Social Theory: twenty introductory lectures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
<https://books.google.co.id/books?id=QI7SAAAACAAJ>
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (1991). Cooperative Learning: Increasing College Faculty Instructional Productivity . ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, No.4. Washington DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University. From  
<https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED347871.pdf>
- Kumashiro, K. K. (2002). *Troubling education: Queer activism and anti-oppressive pedagogy*. New York, NY: Routledge Flamer  
[https://books.google.co.id/books?id=aouDWdKA\\_b0C&hl=en](https://books.google.co.id/books?id=aouDWdKA_b0C&hl=en)
- Kvietok, F. (2014), *Social Justice Language Teacher Education edited by Margaret R. Hawkins , ed. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters, 2011. 178 pp..* Anthropology & Education Quarterly, 45: 126–127. doi:10.1111/aeq.12053
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- Machi, T., & Nakaya, M. (2014). Reciprocal Teaching Intervention in Elementary Mathematics Classrooms: Children's Social Goals, Interactive Processes, and Academic Achievement. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology*, 62 , 322-335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5926/jjep.62.322>
- Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2003). Fear of failure: Friend or foe? *Australian Psychologist*, 38, 31–38.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1080/00050060310001706997/abstract>
- McDonald, M., & Zeichner, K. ( 2009). Social justice teacher education. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn , & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 595-610). New York, NY : Routledge. [Google Scholar](#)
- Nagahama, F., Yasunaga, S., Sekita, K., & Kouhara, S. (2009). Development of a Scale to Measure Belief in Cooperation. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology* , 57 , 24-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5926/jjep.57.24>
- Pekrun, R., Elliot, A. J., & Maier, M. A. (2009). Achievement Goals and Achievement Emotions: Testing a Model of Their Joint Relations with Academic Performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101, 115-135.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013383>

- Pekrun, R., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2014). *International Handbook of Emotion in Education*. New York: Routledge.  
<https://www.routledge.com/International-Handbook-of-Emotions-in-Education/Pekrun-Linnenbrink-Garcia/p/book/9780415895026>
- Skinner, E. A., Kindermann, T. A., & Furrer, C. J. (2009). A Motivational Perspective on Engagement and Disaffection: Conceptualization and Assessment of Children's Behavioral and Emotional Participation in Academic Activities in the Classroom. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 69, 493-525. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013164408323233>
- Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory research and practice*. 2nd edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon..  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9781118133880.hop207008/abstract>
- Weiner, B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory*. Morristown: General Learning. [Google Scholar](#)
- Wigfield, A., & Cambria, J. (2010). Students' achievement values, goal orientations, and interest: Definitions, development, and relations to achievement outcomes. *Developmental Review*, 30, 1-35.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2009.12.001>
- Winkel, WS (1997). *Evaluation of Educational Psychology and Learning*. Jakarta: Gramedia.