

USAGE MODEL COOPERATIVE LEARNING AND LEARNING MODEL JUMP IN INCREASED MOTIVATION AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

Priyono

Universitas Bina Darma, Palembang, Indonesia

Email : priyono.unu_sidoarjo@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to know the results of different studies and the significant interaction between student learning outcomes that use cooperative learning and directed learning as well as high motivation and low motivation. By using random sampling obtained data 160 samples. While the data analysis technique is a two-way variance of the analysis by means of questionnaires and test methods.

Based on the results of calculations and tests conducted on each class can be explained that there are differences in research results between the two models of learning, but there is no interaction between learning methods and motivation to learn, meaning cooperative learning proved effective to improve student learning outcomes.

Keywords: Cooperative Learning, Learning Direct, motivation to learn, study findings

INTRODUCTION

Cooperative learning is a form of learning approaches in which there is a process of togetherness. Kagan (2001) placed the cooperative learning among "the strongest of all methods to improve student achievement .He confirmed" students learn best when it can encourage and teach each other. "(P31)

Kagan (2010) defines cooperative learning as "teaching setting that refers to, small heterogeneous groups of students work together to reach a common goal of students work together to learn and be responsible for the team 's learning as well as their own" (p 0.85) . Kagan cooperative learning models, based on the concept and use of "structure" is an innovative approach to instructions .This class structures such as "numbered heads together"

Slavin (1996) recorded more than 90 experimental studies. He concluded that the reason for successful cooperative learning as an educational methodology is the use of convergent task: the group's goals by individual responsibility of all group members leads to increased learning achievement, regardless of the subject or skill level of the students involved

Some characteristics of cooperative learning is; (A) each member has a role, (b) there is connection direct interaction between students, (c) each member of the group responsible for learning and also friends group of their, (d) the teacher helps develop interpersonal skills group, (e) interacting with a group of teachers only when needed (Carin, 1993). Although the basic principles of cooperative learning has not changed, there are several variations of the model. There are four cooperative learning approach (Arends, 2001).

Selection of the learning model used by teachers strongly influenced by the nature of the material to be taught, is also influenced by the goals to be achieved in the teaching and the level of ability of learners. At the same each learning model always has stages (syntax) conducted by students with the guidance of teachers. Between syntax with each other have different syntax.

Therefore, teachers need to master and can apply a variety of learning models, in order to achieve the learning objectives to be achieved after the learning process so that it can be completed as specified. The experts found no teaching model is better than other teaching models. (Kardi and Nur, 2000b: 13). Direct

Model instruction is an approach to teaching that helps students to learn the basic skills and obtain information that can be taught step by step. This teaching approach is often called Direct Teaching Model (Kardi and Nur, 2000a: 2). Arends (2001: 264) also says the same thing, namely: "A model of teaching that is Aimed at helping the student learn basic skills and knowledge that can be taught in a step-by-step fashion. For our purposes here, the models is labeled the direct instruction model ". If the teacher uses a model of direct teaching this, teachers have a responsibility to identify learning objectives and a great responsibility towards the structuring of the content / materials or skills, explain to students, modeling / demonstrating combined with exercise, providing the opportunity for students to practice applying the concepts or skills that have been learned and provide feedback.

Pasaribu and Simanjuntak (1984: 49) argues that every activity undertaken by a person driven by something force, the driving force is called the motive. Furthermore, based on this expression can be stated that a person's activities or certain activities because there is a power boost that pushed him.

The driving force or power that is active is called motivation. Motivation can be divided into two: the motivation can come from within the individual (intrinsic motivation) and can also arise from outside himself (extrinsic motivation). (Usman, 1996: 29). Intrinsic motivation is the driving force or power that comes from within the individual himself, while extrinsic motivation is the driving force or the driving force that comes from outside oneself. The same opinion was stated the Ministry of Education and Culture, according to its ranks motiv

RESEARCH METHODS

Research design

This research uses experimental design methods to provide different treatment on two groups of samples, its homogeneous condition. One sample group was treated in the form of cooperative learning model. Another group was treated direct instructional 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

Winarsunu (2002: 12) says that the population is all individuals are intended 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).

table 3 Total Population Research

No	School name	Amount
1.	public junior high school 4 Trenggalek	240
2.	public junior high school5 Trenggalek	242
the total population		482

Source: School Profile

Research samples

The sample is a population that's less than the population. (Hadi, 1987: 221). Noting in this study that the research sample was all students of class VII, then a sample of this population is as follows.

table 4 Total Sample Research

No	School name	Amount
1.	public junior high school4 Trenggalek	80
2.	public junior high school5 Trenggalek	80
the total population		160

Source: School Profile

Data Collection Methods, In this research, data collection methods used are: 1) The questionnaire method and 2) Test Method

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. This study was conducted at two different locations, public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010.

table 5 Normality Test Results cooperative learning model

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test		
		learning cooperative
N		80
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	80.6625
	Std. Deviation	9.45468
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.115
	Positive	.115
	Negative	-.110
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.032
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.237

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Grades K-S for cooperative learning data values obtained 1,031 with significance probability value is above 0237 and $\alpha = 0:05$ this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcomes data using cooperative learning model class is normally distributed.

table 6 Normality test results direct instructional model

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		learning directly
N		80
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	73.5250
	Std. Deviation	9.18994
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.148
	Positive	.148
	Negative	-.139
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.326
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.060

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Grades K-S for demonstration learning data values obtained 1,326 with significance probability value is above 0.060 and $\alpha = 0:05$ this means that the null hypothesis is accepted or learning outcomes data using direct learning model for the class are normally distributed.

table 7 Homogeneity calculation

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent Variable: Indonesian Learning Outcomes:

F	df1	df2	Sig.
.868	3	156	.459

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

Based on the above table it can be seen that the probability of the above data is 0459, meaning that the probability of > 0.05 , it gives the sense that the data class for cooperative learning and direct learning model is homogeneous.

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

After learning in each class, where a class is treated with cooperative learning model, one class given direct instructional model. Of the learning process on 160 samples of this will be seen some students who like cooperative learning called with highly motivated, and less like the cooperative learning or have low motivation, as well as on direct instructional model would seem that excited or motivated to keep learning is said to be high motivation group, and the remaining low motivation. After the implementation of learning at their respective predetermined learning, where one class is given a cooperative learning model, while another class with direct instructional model.

table 8 Descriptive Results Achievement Indonesian

Descriptive Statistics

Dependent Variable: Indonesian Learning Outcomes

Factor_A	Factor_B	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Cooperative learning	High motivation	83.0750	9.49868	40
	Low motivation	78.2500	8.88314	40
	General	80.6625	9.45468	80
direct learning	High motivation	75.7500	9.84170	40
	Low motivation	71.3000	8.00385	40
	General	73.5250	9.18994	80
General	High motivation	79.4125	10.29279	80
	Low motivation	74.7750	9.09997	80
	General	77.0938	9.95954	160

From the table above it can be seen that there are differences in the average Indonesian learning outcomes for each class of cooperative and direct learning in 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 direct instructional model with high motivation have better learning results than the direct learning model with low motivation. As well as cooperative learning model has better learning outcomes or higher than the direct learning model.

table 9 Different Test average of cooperative learning model and direct instructional model

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 Indonesian	Equal variances assumed	.015	.902	4.842	15	.000	7.13750	1.47414	4.22595 10.04905
	Equal variances not assumed			4.842	157.873	.000	7.13750	1.47414	4.22593 10.04907

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 Indonesian students of class VII in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010 using cooperative learning model and direct instructional model.

table 10 Different test average student with high motivation and low motivation in cooperative learning model

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 Indonesian	Equal variances assumed	.176	.676	2.346	78	.021	4.82500	2.05630	.73122 8.91878
	Equal variances not assumed			2.346	77.652	.022	4.82500	2.05630	.73093 8.91907

From the table above obtained significant value under 0:05 ($\alpha < 0.05$), so it can be explained that there are differences in student learning outcomes in subjects Indonesian students of class VII in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010 which have a high motivation to learn with those having low learning motivation in cooperative learning model.

table 11 Different test average student with high motivation and low motivation on direct instructional model

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 Indonesian	Equal variances assumed	2.341	.130	2.219	78	.029	4.45000	2.00574	.45687 8.44313
	Equal variances not assumed			2.219	74.889	.030	4.45000	2.00574	.45425 8.44575

From the table above obtained significant value over 0:05 ($\alpha < 0.05$), so it can be explained that there are differences in learning outcomes Indonesian students of class VII in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010 who have learning motivation high with those having low learning motivation in direct instructional model.

table 12 Anava 2 Line Test Results

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable Indonesian Learning Outcomes:

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2899.419 ^a	3	966.473	11.713	.000
Intercept	950951.406	1	950951.406	11524.736	.000
Factor_A	2037.756	1	2037.756	24.696	.000
Factor_B	860.256	1	860.256	10.426	.002
Fakcor_A * Factor_B	1.406	1	1.406	.017	.896
Error	12872.175	156	82.514		
Total	966723.000	160			
Corrected Total	15771.594	159			

a. R Squared = .184 (Adjusted R Squared = .168)

DISCUSSION

Differences in Learning Outcomes Using cooperative learning and direct learning model Based on the calculation and the results of tests conducted on each class can be explained that the learning outcomes Indonesian Seventh Grade Students in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010, at the beginning of learning have the same ability, where the mean average results of the same study. After treatment with the use of cooperative learning and direct instructional model there is a difference in student learning outcomes, which is quite significantly different, it means an increase learning outcomes Indonesian students of class VII in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 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 direct instructional model also has an average significant study results. This can be explained that students receive guidance directly from the teacher so the teacher's attention is focused on the students.

While the cooperative learning model, most 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 the class of cooperative learning model with direct instructional model has 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 compared to the value that using direct learning model. 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 F_A (F count to factors cooperative learning and direct instructional model) showed greater than F table, meaning that there is influence learning outcomes between cooperative learning and direct instructional model as applied to student class VII in Indonesian subjects in public junior high school and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010.

Based on the above can be explained that this shows the hypothesis can be accepted, where there are differences in learning outcomes Indonesian seventh grade students at public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010 between classes are taught using cooperative learning model and the taught using direct learning model.

Differences Learning Outcomes Students Who Have Learning Motivation Motivation High and Low

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 Indonesian 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, 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, as well as on the direct instructional model shows the value t count $> t$ table, so it can be explained there are significant differences of class VII student learning outcomes in subjects Indonesian who has high motivation with students who have low motivation.

In addition, by using analysis of variance 2 lines get value F_B (F count to the level of student motivation high and motivation is low) showed that the F_B 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 class VII in Indonesian subjects in public junior high school 4 and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010.

It gives the sense that the second hypothesis can be accepted, that there are differences in learning outcomes Indonesian students of class VII in public junior high school and public junior high school 5 academic year 2009/2010 among the ones that have a high motivation to learn and who have low learning motivation.

The interaction between the Model of Learning and Student Motivation Levels As for the interaction between factor A (cooperative learning and direct instructional model) by a factor B (students with mot

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 doing research in Scholl Gandusari and Kampak, can be seen using the demonstration method to give students the motivation to learn and improve their learning result better.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

From the results of research in Scholl Gandusari and Kampak, 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.

References

- Arends, R. I. 1997. Classroom Instruction and Management. New York: McGraw Hill Companies.
- Arends, R. I. 2001. Learning to Teach. New York: McGraw Hill Companies
- Arends, R.I. 2001. Learning to Teach. New York: Mc Graw Hill Companies, Inc.
- Carin, A. 1993. Teaching Modern Science. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Kagan, M (2005). Classroom management: classroom signals smart card. San clemente, ca: kagan publishing 2005
- Kagan, s. (2010). Cooperative learning. San clemente, ca: kagan publishing.
- Kagan, s. (2001). Brain -based learning smart card. San Clemente, ca: kagan publishing, 2001.
- Kagan's (1995). "Group grades miss the mark." Educational leadership, 52 (8): 68-71
- Kardi, S. and Nur M. 2000a. Direct Teaching. Surabaya: Universitas Negeri Surabaya University Press.
- Pasaribu and B. Simanjuntak. 1973. Theory of Personality. Tarsito: Bandung
- Slavin, R. 1995. Cooperative Learning, Allyn and Bacon Publisher.
- Sutrisno, Hadi. 1987. Statistics Volume 2. Yogyakarta: YFPF. UGM
- Usman, Uzer, Mohammad. Become a Professional Teacher Teens Rosdakarya: Bandung.