



Classroom Action Research Journal 2 (2) (2018) 55-63

Classroom Action Research Journal

<http://journal2.um.ac.id/index.php/carjo>



Combining Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) and Talking Stick on Learning Achievement of Senior High School

Diah Ayu Febri Anggraini, Sapir

DOI: 10.17977/um013v2i22018p55

Economic Education Program, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Negeri Malang

History Article

Received 18 April 2018

Approved 28 May 2018

Published 7 June 2018

Keywords

*STAD, Talking Stick,
Learning Results,
Learning Achievement*

Abstract

The purpose of this study aims to understand the application of cooperative learning techniques STAD method in collaboration with Talking Stick to improving student learning result of an economics class in Senior High School. This type of research is Classroom Action Research with a qualitative approach. This research consists of two cycles, each cycle consists of four stages of action planning, implementation, observation and reflection. The results showed that the application of cooperative learning techniques STAD method in collaboration with Talking Stick on economic subjects can improve student learning results in economics class. In more detail, in the first cycle, the average pre-test score was about 43.63 and post-test 79.37 with the completeness percentage 56.25 percent. Meanwhile, in the second cycle, the average value of pre-test value 52.72 with the completeness percentage approximately 6.06% and the post-test score was 84.24 with a completion percentage of 81.81%.

How to Cite

Anggraini, D. A. F., & Sapir. (2018). Combining Student Teams Achievement Divisions (STAD) and Talking Stick on Learning Achievement of Senior High School. *Classroom Action Research Journal*, 2(2), 55-63.

Correspondent email:
diahayu252@gmail.com

e-ISSN 2598-4195

INTRODUCTION

Education is learning the knowledge, skills and habits of people from generation to generation through training or research. Education is an effort to develop human potential and improve the quality of human resources. The learning process can also use formal or informal education. Education in practice cannot be ignored by learning activities, especially formal education. Formal education, schools, teachers, students and the government is one unit in an effort to improve the quality of education. The learning process is done better, both in terms of and students. According to Slameto (2013) learning is a process and effort that is done by someone to encourage new behavior as a whole, as a result of his own experience in interaction with his environment.

The many changes in the education system in Indonesia, whether in the form of policies or curricula require teachers to be more innovative in developing learning models that are used during the learning process. Learning objectives can be achieved if the teacher can create effective and efficient teaching and learning activities. It is intended that students are better able to absorb the material taught and encourage students to always involve themselves in the learning process in the classroom. Learning models that are less effective and efficient, cause an imbalance of cognitive, affective and psychomotor abilities, for example, a monotone learning model from time to time, so students feel bored and tend to not pay attention to the teacher during the learning process takes place Wulandari & Narmaditya, (2017). In addition, the selection of learning methods must also be with the right technique, because the learning method is a method used in the learning process to achieve the expected goals. This study aims to determine the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick in class XI IPS-F and to improve learning outcomes of students of class XI IPS-F at SMAN 10 after the application of cooperative learning techniques STAD techniques collaborated with Talking Stick.

Based on preliminary observations made in the XI IPS-F class of SMAN 10 Malang, the learning process in the classroom is still not effective, because not all students are able to follow the learning process well. When the teacher delivers the material, there are still many students who lack concentration and pay less attention. Many students are busy themselves like working on other subject assignments while the learning process is taking place, as well as talking about things outside of learning material with their peers. Most students are also reluctant to record material that has been delivered. Whereas during group discussions, cooperation between students seemed to be lacking and there were still many students who did not have responsibility for their groups. In addition, group formation is not heterogeneous based on the level of ability and gender, so the use of group discussion methods does not always make students fully involved in the learning process.

This is because in the application of group discussion methods, in one group sometimes only one or two students are working on a given assignment, while other students are just waiting for answers from their friends who are then copied, besides not all students feel they have responsibility for the work the group. So that the group discussion process is not carried out by all group members and the group discussion process is not optimal, besides that sometimes students who are dominant in the learning process are also reluctant to share

information with other members, so there is still individualism. Besides that the learning outcomes of XI IPS-F students are also not maximal, as evidenced by the results of the daily XI IPS-F class scores which are still low, the percentage of students' learning completeness is only 30.30% in other words from 33 students there are only 10 students who complete or able to reach the minimum completeness criteria.

So the way to overcome this problem is by applying cooperative learning methods with the STAD technique in collaboration with Talking Stick. This is because the cooperative learning method is done by forming heterogeneous groups based on the level of ability, so students who have high academic abilities can work together and share information with students who have moderate and low academic abilities. This is in accordance with the opinion expressed by Trianto (2010) that in cooperative classes students learn together in small groups consisting of 4-6 students who are equal but heterogeneous, what is meant is heterogeneous here based on ability, gender, ethnicity, and each other help each other. In addition, the background chooses to collaborate the STAD learning technique with Talking Stick because the learning technique can make each group member have the same responsibility, student responsibility not only in the group but also in themselves. The existence of the same responsibilities in each group member, will make each group member involved in the group work process. This happens because they are required to master the material which later the assessment is not only taken in groups but also individually, so it also encourages students to pay attention to the teacher when delivering learning material.

According to Isjoni (2010) STAD developed by Slavin is one of cooperative learning that emphasizes the existence of activities and interactions between students to motivate each other and help each other in mastering subject matter in order to achieve maximum achievement. Sapir (2013) also states that STAD has the advantage of being able to make students have two forms of learning responsibilities, namely learning for themselves and helping fellow group members to learn. Whereas according to Suprijono (2013) Talking Stick learning can encourage students to dare to express opinions, this learning begins with an explanation of the material by the teacher, then the students are asked to close the book, the teacher takes the stick which is then given to students, students who accepting sticks is required to answer questions from such teachers etc, when the sticks roll from students to other students, it should be accompanied by music. And according to Huda (2013) Talking Stick has the advantage of being able to test the readiness of students, train skills in reading and understanding material quickly and make students more prepared in any situation. So if this learning technique has collaborated it will be able to encourage all students to follow the learning process and group work in the classroom to the maximum, because students have their respective responsibilities and all students are required to have readiness to answer questions from the teacher, with maximum student involvement in the learning process certainly will have an impact on the learning outcomes. Regarding learning outcomes Dimayanti & Mudjiono (2013) explain that learning outcomes are the result of the interaction of the actions of learning and teaching, from the teacher's side the teaching action ends with the evaluation process of learning outcomes, while in terms of students the learning outcomes are the culmination of the learning process. Whereas according to Sudjana (2010)

"process is an activity carried out by students in achieving teaching goals, while learning outcomes are abilities possessed by students after he receives his learning experience".

This study aims to find out how the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick on economic subjects with the subject of international trade in class XI IPS-F of SMAN 10 Malang and the learning outcomes of XI IPS-F students at SMAN 10 Malang after its implementation STAD cooperative learning techniques has collaborated with Talking Stick on economic subjects with the subject of international trade.

METHOD

This type of research is classroom action research (CAR) using a qualitative approach. This study aims to improve the learning process in the classroom so that it can achieve the expected learning goals and improve student learning outcomes. The study was conducted in 2 cycles, each cycle consisting of 3 meetings. This study consists of four stages in each cycle. The stages of classroom action research, namely: planning (planning), action (action), observation (observation), and reflection (reflection).

The subjects of this study were students of class XI IPS-F at SMAN 10 Malang in the odd semester of the 2017/2018 academic year with 33 students, 14 students and 19 students. Data collection techniques used are test techniques, observation techniques and documentation techniques.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Research cycles I and II consist of 3 meetings with an allocation of time for each meeting which is 2 x 45 minutes (2 hours of study). This research was conducted on economic subjects with the subject of International Trade, which consists of 8 learning indicators. In the first and second cycles the researchers were assisted by 4 observers, namely one economics teacher and 3 colleagues. The task of the observer is to assess the success of the actions of the researcher as a model teacher in applying the cooperative learning method STAD techniques collaborated with the Talking Stick and observe the attitudes of students during the learning process and class conditions during the learning process takes place. In this study the pre-test questions were given at the first meeting and the post-test (final test) was given at the third meeting in each cycle, with the form of multiple choice questions totaling 10 items.

The results of this study indicate that the application of the cooperative learning method STAD technique collaborated with the Talking Stick can be applied well and can improve the learning outcomes of students of class XI-IPS F SMAN 10. Based on research conducted in the first cycle, the application of cooperative learning methods STAD collaborated with Talking Stick has not gone well. At the first meeting students still seemed confused by the application of collaboration learning techniques, this was because students were only for the first time familiar with cooperative learning methods STAD techniques collaborated with Talking Stick, but in the second and third meetings students had better understood the learning steps. The class conditions at the first and second meetings of the first cycle were still not conducive, but at the third meeting the class conditions were quite conducive, so the learning process could run well. In

cycle I there are still many students who pay less attention to researchers when delivering material, because many students are busy themselves or discuss things outside of learning material with their peers, besides there are only a few students who answer questions during the question and answer process. When implementing the STAD technique, collaboration between students is still lacking, this can be seen when the discussion process there are some students who seem to dominate, students who have high ability levels seem reluctant to work with students who have low ability when the group work process and tend to do individual group work questions, so that several other members only wait for the results of group work from their friends and do not follow the group work process. This was very evident in the first and second meetings, during the third meeting the collaboration between students was better. The division of groups determined by researchers heterogeneously based on the level of students' abilities and gender.

Huda (2013) that STAD is one of the cooperative learning strategies in which several small groups of students with different levels of academic ability work together to complete learning objectives. The purpose of researchers to form heterogeneous groups is so that when the group work process students are able to work together and smart students can help students who are lacking, and students who are less able to ask smart students and increase the responsibility of each student towards the group. In the first and second meetings, it was seen that students' responsibility towards the group was still lacking, many students were still dependent on their friends, and did not want to be involved maximally during the group work process, but at the third meeting most students had begun to look responsible for the group. Students were also enthusiastic during the implementation of the Talking stick technique, although when group representatives made presentations many students were less attentive and tended to be passive. This is because the way students present the results of group work seems to only read and is less communicative. Only a few asked questions but at the third meeting the number of students who asked more questions than the previous meeting.

Whereas based on the research carried out in the second cycle, after the existence of corrective actions from the deficiencies in the first cycle, the application of the STAD cooperative learning technique collaborated with the Talking Stick has gone well. In the second cycle the application of the cooperative learning method of the STAD technique with Talking Stick showed an increase compared to the first cycle. The condition of the class from the first meeting to the third meeting was more conducive, almost all students could follow the learning process well. At the first meeting, there were still a few students who paid less attention but were easier to a condition. In the second and third meeting, the number of students who paid less attention was reduced and the class conditions were conducive. In the second, cycle the response of students is also faster when the researcher conducts questions and answers to students. When implementing STAD techniques collaboration between students is also good, almost all students are able to cooperate well when doing group work. In accordance with the opinion expressed by Isjoni (2010) that the main purpose of cooperative learning is that students can learn in groups by respecting opinions and providing opportunities for other students to express their opinions in groups. At the first meeting there

were still students who dominated but in the second and third meetings all students could cooperate well, students seemed more enthusiastic to do group work and students had no one to dominate. Students who have high abilities help students who have a low level of ability, as well as students who are not less embarrassed to betray their friends when there is material that has not been understood. Almost all students already have responsibility for their groups, students share information so that all groups participate in completing group work questions and truly understand the material.

Sutirman (2013) cooperative learning is indeed designed to build a cooperative attitude of students and a series of learning activities carried out by students by forming certain groups to achieve predetermined goals. During the Talking Stick technique, in cycle II students looked more enthusiastic, when one group representative presented the results of his group work, almost all students noticed and students were better when presenting the results of their group work than in cycle I. So many students wanted to ask , students also have the courage to respond to their friends' answers, express opinions and argue with other students. This is in accordance with the benefits of cooperative learning expressed by Sutirman (2013), which can foster an attitude of cooperation, courage, openness, honesty, discipline, communication skills, critical attitudes and so forth. When answering questions many students can answer correct and complete questions compared to students who answer incorrectly. Each group seems to compete to get the highest score.

Regarding the learning outcomes of class XI IPS-F students, the results of this study indicate that the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick can improve cognitive and affective learning outcomes of XI IPS-F students in odd semester 2017/2018 academic year. This is evidenced by the results of the pre-test and post-test scores as well as the results of student attitudes during the learning process. The following are the results of research on student learning outcomes in class XI IPS-F in cycle I and cycle II:

Table 1: Comparison of Learning Outcomes in the Cognitive Realm of Class XI IPS-F Cycle I and Cycle II Students

	<i>Pre Test</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Information</i>	<i>Post Test</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Information</i>
Cycle I	43.63	Poor	Increase	79.37	Average	Increase
Cycle II	52.72	Poor	9.09	84.24	Good	4.87

Source: Authors (2018)

Based on table 1 above it can be stated that in the cognitive learning outcomes of students in the first cycle and second cycle there was an increase, for the pre test improvement of 9.09 and post test of 4.87. In the first cycle the average pre test was 43.63 with less criteria, then the pre test cycle II increased to 52.72 with less criteria. Whereas for the average post test score in the first cycle was 79.37 with sufficient criteria, then in the second cycle the post test average increased to 84.24 with good criteria. Based on the above data it can be concluded that the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick can improve the cognitive learning outcomes of students in class XI IPS-F. This is evidenced by the increase in the average value of the post test from

cycle I to cycle II, which is used as a benchmark in determining student learning outcomes after the application of collaboration learning techniques.

Table 2 Comparison of Percentage of Learning Completeness in the Cognitive Realm of Class Students XI IPS-F Cycle I and Cycle II

<i>Pre Test</i>				<i>Post Test</i>				
	Complete	Percentage	Criteria	Information	Complete	Percentage	Criteria	Information
Cycle I	0	0%	Very Poor	Increase	18	56.25%	Poor	Increase
Cycle II	2	6.06%	Very Poor	6.06%	27	81.81%	Good	25.56%

Source: Author (2018)

Furthermore, seen from the percentage of students 'learning completeness in table 2 above, it can be stated that the percentage of students' learning completeness in the cognitive realm of the first cycle and second cycle also increased, for the pre test the increase was 6.06% and the post test was 25.56%. In the first cycle, the completeness percentage of learning the pre test value was 0% with the criteria less once and no students were completed, then the pre test value of the second cycle increased to 6.06% with the criteria less once and the number of students who completed were 2 students. Whereas the percentage of completeness in learning the post-test value in the first cycle was 56.25% with fewer criteria and there were 18 students who completed, then in the second cycle the percentage of learning completeness in the post-test value increased to 81.81% with good criteria and 27 students completed. Based on the above data it can be concluded that the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick can also increase the completeness percentage of cognitive learning in students of class XI IPS-F. This is evidenced by the increase in the percentage of completeness in learning the post-test value from the first cycle to the second cycle, which is used as a benchmark in determining the percentage of students' mastery learning after the collaboration learning model has been applied.

Table 3 Comparison of Learning Outcomes & Percentage of Learning Completeness in Affective Fields of Students Class XI IPS-F Cycle I and Cycle II

Cycle I						
Meeting	Final Score	Average Learning Outcomes of Affective Areas	Criteria	Percentage Completeness	Average Perceived Learning Percentage	Criteria
Meeting-1	79.09			48.48%		
Meeting-2	80.04	80.24	Good	59.37%	56.78%	Poor
Meeting-3	81.60			62.50%		

Cycle II						
Meeting	Final Score	Average Learning Outcomes of Affective Areas	Criteria	Percentage Completeness	Average Perceived Learning Percentage	Criteria
Meeting-1	83.21			72.72%		
Meeting-2	84.50	84.60	Good	81.25%	80.61%	Good
Meeting-3	86.10			87.87%		

Source: Authors (2018)

Based on table 3, it can be stated that the affective average value of class XI IPS-F students increases for each meeting both in cycle I and cycle II. The average affective learning outcomes from cycle I to cycle II increased by 4.36. This can be proven on the average of the first cycle of affective learning outcomes of 80.24 with good criteria, then in the second cycle increased to 84.60 with good criteria. Based on table 3 above, it can also be stated that the percentage of affective learning completeness in class XI IPS-F students increases for each meeting both in cycle I and cycle II. The average percentage of mastery learning affective domains from cycle I to cycle II increased by 23.83%. This can be proven on the average percentage of completeness of the first cycle of affective learning at 56.78% with less criteria, then in the second cycle it increased to 80.61% well. Based on the above data it can be concluded that the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick can improve learning outcomes and the percentage of affective learning completeness in the XI IPS-F class.

Based on the learning outcomes data of cycle I and cycle II which have been described above, it can be concluded that the application of cooperative learning methods STAD techniques collaborated with Talking Stick can improve student learning outcomes in cognitive and affective domains. Cognitive domain learning outcomes are evidenced by an increase in the average grade of the pre-test and post test and the increasing number of students who complete or reach the minimum completeness criteria from cycle I to cycle II. Whereas for affective domain learning outcomes is evidenced by an increase or change in attitudes of students who start active in the class, are involved during the group work process, can cooperate well, do not make noise or disturb their friends during the learning process and have responsibility for the group. This is in line with the results of previous studies conducted by Sinaga (2016) which stated that there was an increase in economic learning outcomes and creativity by implementing the STAD learning model. Besides that, it is also in line with the results of research conducted by Rahsyahputra (2015) which shows that the application of the Talking stick type cooperative learning model can improve student learning outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results and discussion that has been described, it can be concluded the application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick on economic subjects in the XI IPS-F class of SMAN 10 Malang has increased from cycle I to cycle II. In the first cycle the

implementation was still not maximal but after corrective actions were taken, in the second cycle the implementation of the learning model could be implemented properly and maximally. Application of STAD cooperative learning techniques collaborated with Talking Stick on economic subjects in the XI IPS-F class of SMAN 10 Malang can improve student learning outcomes in cognitive and affective domains. This is evidenced by the cognitive and affective learning outcomes of students who experience an increase from cycle I to cycle II.

REFERENCES

- Dimayanti & Mudjiono. (2013). *Belajar dan pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- Huda, Miftahul. 2013. *Model-Model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Isjoni. (2010). *Cooperative Learning (Efektivitas Pembelajaran Kelompok)*. Bandung: Alabeta.
- Rahsyaputra, D. J. (2015). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif
- Editorial: "Tipe Talking Stick Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Mata Pelajaran Sosiologi Kelas XI IIS 2 SMA Negeri 1 Boyolali Tahun Pelajaran 2014/2015. [Editorial]. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Sosiologi Antropologi*. 7 (2).
- Sapir. (2013). *Model-Model Pembelajaran (Strategi, Pendekatan, Metode dan Teknik)*. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- Sinaga, Dearlina. (2016). Penerapan Model Student Teams Achievement Division Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Kreativitas Belajar Ekonomi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan*, (3), 357 – 364
- Slameto. (2013). *Belajar dan Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sudjana, N. (2010). *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Suprijono, A. (2013). *Cooperative Learning*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Sutirman. (2013). *Media dan Model-model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Yogyakarta: Graha Ilmu.
- Trianto. (2010). *Model Pembelajaran Inovatif-Progresif*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group
- Wulandari, D., & Narmaditya, B. S. (2017). Readers Theater as a Tool to Understand Difficult Concept in Economics. *International Education Studies*, 10(5), 144.