Effect of cooperative learning model type of talking stick against student learning

Lidia Wijayanti*, Imam Sukwatus Sujai, and Dian Septi Nur Afifah

STKIP PGRI Tulungagung, Tulungagung, Indonesia

*lidiawijayanti91@gmail.com

Abstract. This experimental research aimed to know the influence and difference of learning talk stick. The research design used is posttest-Only Control Group design. The population in this study were 348 students. Sampling technique using cluster Random Sampling. This study uses two class samples. Methods of data collection using tests and documentation. Data analysis using simple regression test and Independent Sample Ttest Test using SPSS 21.0. The result of simple regression test data analysis is $t_{\text{hitung}} > t_{\text{table}}$, so $H_0$ rejected and $H_a$ accepted which means there is influence of using cooperative learning type of talking stick to result of study of IPS student of class VIII SMPN 1 Karangrejo indicated by acquisition of $t_{\text{hitung}} = 4.448 > t_{\text{table}} = 2.042$. The result of test data analysis of independent sample T test is $t_{\text{hitung}} > t_{\text{table}}$, so $H_0$ rejected and $H_a$ accepted which means there is difference of using cooperative learning type talking stick model to result of study of IPS student of class VIII SMPN 1 Karangrejoshown from the acquisition of $t_{\text{hitung}} = 2.363 > t_{\text{table}} = 1.990$.

1. Introduction

One effort to improve the quality of education in schools is by improving the learning process. In the implementation of learning the teacher's abilities needed are the ability to manage teaching materials and the ability to choose approaches, strategies, models, methods, media and learning resources. A teacher can achieve optimal results in the learning process, if he is able to use the method and the selection of the right learning model [1].

However, based on a preliminary study conducted by researchers at Karangrejo 1 Public Middle School when the learning activities took place the students seemed to be not in a position to accept the subject matter, as evidenced by their lack of standing and even leaning their heads on the table or on the wall, chatting with friends some are even busy copying other subjects or doing homework. Learning is delivered by using the lecture method so that students feel bored quickly [2]. From some of the facts above, it is suspected that the KKM (Minimum Completion Criteria), especially in social studies, is charged to students being less able to be achieved.

By looking at these facts it is necessary to choose a learning model that can reduce student saturation in accepting lessons and can improve students' ability to interact socially. One alternative learning model that can be used is the Trianto Cooperative Learning learning model. Cooperative learning is a learning model where students are grouped into small groups consisting of 4-6 students to solve a problem, complete a task to achieve a common goal [3], [4].

According to Fathurrohman, there are several types in cooperative learning including, (1) Number Head (2) Cooperative Scripts, (3) Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD), (4) Team Games Tournament (TGT) (5) Snowball Throwing (6) Jigsaw, and (7) Talking Stick [4]. From these models, the researcher chooses the type of Talking stick cooperative model in this learning students are required to be able to work together with the group, and be able to answer questions about the material being studied so as to improve learning outcomes. The selection of this learning model is based on several considerations, namely the learning model is easy to do, according to the subjects and characteristics of junior high school students.
According to Suprijono, Shoimin, the talking stick learning model is one of the cooperative learning models that can encourage students to dare to express their opinions [5], [6]. This learning strategy is carried out with the help of sticks, whoever holds the stick must answer questions from the teacher after students learn the subject matter. Talking stick is very suitable for elementary, middle and high school / vocational students. In addition to practicing speaking, this learning will create a pleasant atmosphere and make students active. Supported by the benefits of the Talking Stick learning model according to Huda states that this model is useful because it is able to test children's readiness, in training to understand subject matter quickly, and inviting them to be prepared in any situation [7].

Based on the description above, the purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the Effect of Cooperative Learning Model Type Talking Stick on Social Studies Learning Outcomes of Class VIII students of SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo [8]. The talking stick type cooperative learning model is expected to be able to overcome shortcomings and constraints in the social studies learning process so that student learning outcomes in social studies lessons increase and learning objectives can be achieved. Learning outcomes according to Dimyanti & Mudjiono are the results of an interaction between learning and teaching [9]. From the teacher's side, teaching action ended with the evaluation process of learning outcomes.

2. Research method

The research method used in this study is the experimental research method. This research is the only type of research that directly tries to influence a particular variable, and when it is properly applied. The research design used in this study was true experimental design using the Postest Only Control Design design. So after following the subject matter, the researcher gave the posttest question. Posttest is given two times in two meetings [10].

The population in this study were all eighth grade students at SMPN 1 Karangrejo consisting of 11 classes ranging from class VIII-A to class VIII-K with a total of 348 students, both male and female students. 200 male students and 148 female students. The samples were determined using probability sampling. The sampling technique that the researchers used in this study was cluster random sampling. Sampling in this study was conducted randomly. The researcher made small pieces of paper that were given the letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, and K. Then 2 papers were randomly taken as samples. The samples taken in this study were students of class VIII-H and class VIII E. This study was conducted at SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo class VIII semester 2 of the school year 2017/2018.

3. Results and discussion

Social studies learning outcomes data obtained were then analyzed, but before the preliminary test was conducted, namely the normality test and homogeneity test. In this study using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test by looking at the significance value and comparing with the significance level in the study which is 0.05 .

Following is the table of normality test results:

| Tests of Normality | Kolmogorov-Smirnov | Shapiro-Wilk |
|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|
|                    | Statistic | df  | Sig.  | Statistic | df  | Sig.  |
| Experiment         | .149      | 32  | .068  | .936      | 32  | .056  |
| Control            | .147      | 32  | .076  | .921      | 32  | .022  |
| a. Lilliefors Significance Correction |

Based on the output results in table 1 above in the Kolmogorov-Smirmov column, it can be seen that the significance value for the control class is 0.068 and the experimental class uses the talking stick learning model of 0.068 greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the data is distributed normal.

The homogeneity test results of the two classes namely the experimental class and the control class are used as the basis for testing the hypothesis. The homogeneity test of the post test value between the experimental class and the control class using SPSS 2.1 with the following results:

| Table 2. Test of Homogeneity of Variances |
|------------------------------------------|
| Test of Homogeneity of Variances          |
|                                          |
|                                          |
|                                          | .evene Statistic | df  | df2 | Sig |
|                                          | .631            | 2   | 23  | .541|
|                                          | .222            | 3   | 26  | .321|

As shown in table 2, the results of the homogeneity test can be seen from the output of the test of homogeneity of variances. It can be seen that the significance values in the experimental class are 0.541 and the
control class is 321. Thus the significance of the two classes is greater than 0.05, it can be concluded that the two classes have the same variant. Therefore hypothesis testing is independent sample t test using Equal Variance Assumed test.

Based on the results of data analysis, then get the following results: (1). There is a significant effect between cooperative learning Type Talking Stick to students' learning outcomes in class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo. Shown from the acquisition of t count> t table (4.448> 2.042). (2). There is a significant difference between traditional learning with cooperative learning type Talking Stick in class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo, indicated by the acquisition of t count> t table (2.363> 1.990).

This research has also been carried out by another researcher, Ni Made Firma Janayanti, Desak Putu Parmiti, I Ketut Gading. 2017. Effect of Cooperative Learning Model of Talking Stick Type and Achievement Motivation on Learning Outcomes Ips Students in Grade V Elementary School. That the cooperative learning model of the Talking Stick and Motivation type of achievement has an effect on the learning outcomes of Social Studies. The value of Fcount = 12.603 with sig = 0.002, while the significance level (a) applied is 5% (0.05), so α> sig (0.05> 0.000).

Referring to the explanation above, it can be interpreted that there are significant influences and differences in learning outcomes on social studies subjects between groups of students who use the talking stick learning model and groups of students using traditional learning.

The results of the data analysis the magnitude of the influence of the Talking Stick learning model on learning outcomes are, 397 and differences in learning outcomes using the talking stick learning model is greater than traditional learning indicated by an average value of 83.8281> 80.9375.

The results of this study are in line with the opinion of Shoimin stating that the talking stick learning model is one of the cooperative learning models [6]. This learning strategy is carried out with the help of sticks, whoever holds the stick must answer questions from the teacher after students learn the subject matter. Supported by the benefits of the Talking Stick learning model according to Huda states, "this model is useful because it is able to test children's readiness, in training to understand subject matter quickly, and inviting them to continue to be prepared in any situation" [7]. So that through this will affect the student learning outcomes.

4. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study is that there is a significant effect between cooperative learning Talking Stick type on social studies learning outcomes of students in class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo indicated by the acquisition of t count> t table (4.448> 2.042), and significant differences between traditional learning and learning Cooperative Talking Stick type in class VIII of SMP Negeri 1 Karangrejo indicated by the acquisition of t count 2.363> t table 1.990.

Regarding the research results obtained, the researcher suggests that the Talking Stick learning model is very effective if applied in learning so the teacher in the learning process is expected to use the talking stick type cooperative model or other cooperative models to help students understand and explore social studies material deep with fun learning methods that affect student learning outcomes [11].
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