

Enhancing Primary Students' Achivement in Civic Education with Talking Stick Approach

Eddy Noviana^{1*}, Cindy TriwulanDesta¹
¹Program Studi PGSD, Universitas Riau, Indonesia
*eddy.noviana@lecturer.unri.ac.id

Abstract

This study aims to determine differences in student learning outcomes learned through cooperative learning model type of talking stick with students who are taught conventional learning model. This research uses quasi experimental method with nonequivalent control group design. This research was conducted at 62 students in third class elementary school. The result of the research is before implemntation cooperative type learning model talking stick type in the experimental class and conventional model learning in the control class is obtained $t_{count} < t_{tabel}$ that is $-0.430 < 2.000$ which means there is no significant difference civic education learning outcome. In the experimental class and control class after treatment obtained $t_{count} < t_{tabel}$ is $0.676 < 2.000$ which also means there is no difference civic education learning outcome. Thus, it can be conclude that cooperative learning model with talking stick can enhance elementary students' achivement in civic education.

Keyword :Talking Stick, primary students' achivement, civic education.

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is an important role for every human being. Education has always been a foundation of hope to develop qualified individuals intellectually achieve maximum success in the learning process. To determine the success of education, the role of teachers as direct executors in the field in the learning process. In the teaching and learning process, teachers are face students who need guidance and coaching to mature students after undergoing the learning process. One of the subjects that have a very important role in guiding and nurturing students to maturity is Citizenship Education. This is because civic education is able to instill moral values

to the students in accordance with the demands of national education that is developing the ability and develop character and civilization of a dignified nation in order to educate the life of the nation, aims to develop students potential become human beings who believe and devoted to God Almighty, having noble character, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent and become citizen of democratic and responsible.

Achieving national education demands, it is necessary to have planned and concrete efforts in the form of innovative learning activities for students. Teachers should be able to choose a model of learning in accordance with the standards of

competence to be achieved and create a fun learning to enhance student learning outcomes. The low level of student learning outcomes can be seen from students' pretest scores in two classes that share a low average. Therefore, it should be supported by the use of appropriate learning model. The use of Talking Stick learning model is expected to help the effectiveness of the learning process to delivery concept and the lesson content delivered and improve student learning outcomes. Talking Stick learning model is a model of cooperative learning with the help of a stick with the stipulation, who holds the baton must answer questions from the teacher after learning the subject matter. The talking stick learning model provides a fun learning experience, increasing motivation, confidence and life skill in which the model is aimed at generating positive emotions and attitudes learned in the teaching and learning process that affects the improvement of brain intelligence (Istarani, 2015). Implementation cooperative learning model talking stick type which has the potential to influence student's learning outcome because this model is more to play while learning that can make the students motivated in learning. Interesting activities in learning in this research a talking stick game is assumed to affect student learning outcomes.

Talking Stick is a method used by Native Americans to invite everyone

to speak or express opinions in a forum (inter-ethnic meetings) and now that method has been used as a classroom learning method (Huda, 2015). As the name suggests, Talking Stick is a group learning method with the help of a stick. The group holding the stick must answer the teacher's question after they have learned the subject matter. This activity is repeated until all groups have a turn to answer the teacher's questions. This learning model provides a fun learning experience, increased motivation, confidence and life skill in which the model is intended to generate positive emotions and attitudes learned in the learning process that affects the improvement of intelligence of the brain. This study aims to examine cooperative learning model talking stick to enhance primary students' achievement in civic education.

2. METHOD

Method this research is a quasi experiment method with nonequivalent control groups design and randomly class (Sugiyono, 2013). In this design there are two classes, one experimental class is a class that is treated cooperative learning model type talking stick, and one class for the control class is conventional learning. Thus, the research design used is quasi experiments that can be illustrated in table 1 below.

Table 1. Research Design

Group	<i>Pretest</i>	<i>Treatment</i>	<i>Posttest</i>
Eksperimen	O1	X	O2
Kontrol	O3	-	O4

Note:

O1, O3 = Data angketawal (*pretest*)

O2, O4 = Data angketakhir (*posttest*)

X = class given treatment cooperative learning model with talking stick

- = class given conventional learning model

The sample conducted in this research purposive sampling in which the sample is selected based on certain considerations with a particular purpose as well (Triyono, 2012). of data retrieval using test result of learning which given before (*pretest*) and after (*posttest*) implementation cooperative learning model of talking stick type in experiment class and conventional learning model at control class. The data collected in this research is the test score of the students' learning outcome before (*pretest*) and after (*posttest*) implementation cooperative learning model of talking stick type in the experimental class and the lecture method on the control class. The test instrument must fulfill the validity requirement; therefore validation needs to be done. Validation of test instruments is done by expert judgment.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

a. Result

The result of the research is the *pretest* of the experimental and control class, the final data score (*posttest*) of the experimental class and control class, and the difference of students' learning outcomes between the

experimental class and the cooperative learning model of talking stick type and control class with conventional learning model.

b. Pretest Data

Pre-treatment test was done to find out how far the students early learning result in the experimental class and control class in this study the *pretest* score was only used to test the sample homogeneity between the experimental group and the control group students only. This *Pretest* is usually to measure the equivalence or group equalization (Pranyandari, Negara, & Suardika, 2014).

c. Normality test of pretest data in control and experiment

The normality test is performed to see the normality of the *pretest* score data between the experimental class and the control class. Normality test using static test with lilliefors test commonly used in discrete data that is spreading data or not presented in interval form (Sundayana, 2014). The results of the normality test calculation of the initial test of the experimental class and control class can be seen in table 2 below.

Table 2. Data of learning outcome normality test

Class	Normality			Categorize
	Dk	L_{count}	L_{table}	
Experiment	30	0.149	0,161	Normal
Control	30	0.157		Normal

Based on Table 2, it shown that L_{count} students' initial ability of the experimental class and control class meets the criteria $L_{count} < L_{table}$, for experimental class $0.149 < 0.161$ and control class $0.157 < 0.161$. This indicates that the pretest score of the experimental class and the control class is normally distributed.

d. Homogeinitytest ofpretest data in experiment and control class

After the pretest score of the experimental class students and the

control class is normally distributed, the next step is to test the homogeneity of the variance of the pretest grade of the experimental and control classes. Homogeneity test of pretest data is statistically tested using the largest data variance comparison method compared to the smallest variance using F_{table} . The result of calculating homogeneity of variance of pretest grade of experiment and control class is shown in table 3 below.

Tabel 3. Data of homogeinity

Class	Homogenitas			Categorize
	Varians	F_{count}	F_{table}	
Experimen	346.667	1.14	184	Homogen
Control	302.796			

Based on Table 3 it is known that the pretest of the experimental class and the control class at the significant level $\alpha = 0.05$ meets the criterion $F_{count} < F_{table}$ or $1.14 < 1.84$. This means that the experimental class and control class variables are homogeneous and continuous with t test.

e. t-test pretestin experiment and control class

After the normality and homogeneity test of the pretest score,

it is found that the students' understanding ability in both experiment and control classes is normal and homogeneous distributed. Furthermore, to know whether there is difference of mean score of pretest of experiment class with significant control class or not, then test score continued by using difference test of two mean (t test) Result of t test processing at pretest data can be seen in table 4 below.

Table 4. t Test of Pretest Learning Outcomes

Class	Uji t					Decision
	\bar{x}	S	$S_{combine}$	T_{count}	t_{table}	
Experiment	40.00	18.619	18.020	-0,430	2.000	There is no significant difference
Control	41.935	17.401				

Note:

\bar{x} : Score average *pretest*

S: Standard deviasi

Based on table 4 it is known that $t_{hitung} < t_{tabel}$ is $-0.430 < 2.000$. In other words, the two average pretest score of learning outcomes are not significantly different and the students' ability in both classes.

f. Post test data

Posttest is a test given to students after they allowed learning in control and experiment class. The action or treatment in the experimental class is to apply the cooperative type of learning model while the treatment in the control class is learning by the lecture method. The purpose of posttest is to see whether or not the influence of the learning model given to the students by knowing the difference

between the average score of posttest of the experimental class and control class, then the score is tested by using two mean differences (t test).

g. Normality test of posttest data in control and experiment

Similar to pretest, a normality test is performed to see if the posttest score between the experimental class and the control class is normally distributed. Normality test using static test with lilliefors test commonly used in discrete data that is spreading data or not presented in interval form (Sundayana, 2014). As a result of calculation of normality test to final test of experiment class and control class can be seen in table 5 below.

Table 5. Normality test posttest data

Class	Normalitas			Decision
	Dk	L_{count}	L_{table}	
Experiment	30	0.157	0.161	Normal
Control	30	0.145		Normal

Based on Table 5 it is found that the Lhitung score of students' ability after the teaching and learning process of the experimental and control class meets the criteria $L_{hitung} < L_{tabel}$, for experimental class $0.157 < 0.161$ and control class $0.145 < 0.161$. This indicates that the posttest scores of experimental class students and control classes are normally distributed.

h. Homogeneity test of posttest data in experiment and control class

After the posttest score of the experimental students and the control class is normally distributed, the next step is to test the homogeneity of variance of posttest scores of the experimental class and control class. The results of the homogeneity of

variance of the posttest score of the experimental class and the control class are shown in table 6 below.

Tabel 6. Homogeneity test of posttest data

Class	Homogenitas			Decision
	Varians	F_{count}	F_{table}	
Experiment	344.946	1.11	1.84	Homogen
Control	382.796			

Based on table 6, it is known that the learning result of the students after the learning process (posttest) of the experimental class is a significant difference between $\alpha = 0,05$. If $F_{count} > F_{table}$, $1,11 < 1,84$ this means that a variance classes experiments of clear controls and the community and text and controls.

After the test of normality and homogeneity to the posttest score, it is obtained that the students' ability of the experimental class and the control class are normal and homogeneous distributed. Furthermore, to determine whether the difference between the average score of post-grade experiments with the control class is significant or not, the test score is continued by using t-test. Results of t test processing on posttest data can be seen in table 7 below.

i. Uji t Skor Posttest

Tabel 7. T-test post test data

Kelas	Uji t					Desicion
	\bar{x}	S	S_{total}	T_{count}	t_{table}	
Experiment	81.290	18.573	19.075	0.676	2.000	No Significant differences
Control	78.065	19.565				

Note:

\bar{x} : Score average *posttest*
 S: Standard deviasi

Based on the above table, it can be seen that $t_{hitung} < t_{tabel}$ is $0,676 < 2,000$. So H_0 accepted and H_a rejected. In other words, the two posttest score scores do not differ significantly and the students' ability in both classes is the same.

processing, the researcher will discuss the results of the formulation of the problem in the following description.

The difference civic education learning outcomes in experimental class and control class can be seen from comparative test or t test. Based on the experimental and control class experimental results, prior to the application of cooperative learning type of talking stick type in the experimental class and the lecture method in the

j. Discussion

Based on the results of data analysis of pretest and posttest score through several stages of value

control class obtained by $t_{count} < t_{table}$ is $-0.430 < 2,000$ which means there is no significant difference. After two treatments in the experimental class and two control classes, the experimental class and control class were then given a posttest in the same questionnaire as the initial test. The purpose of giving the final test (posttest) is to know the effect of cooperative learning model type of talking stick to student's learning motivation. Based on the result of the final test (posttest) of the experimental class and control class, the difference test is t test. From the t test calculation, the final score of the experimental class and the control class meets the criteria t_{count} that is $0.676 < 2,000$, which means there is no difference in learning outcomes. However, there is still an improvement in civic education learning outcomes before treatment and after treatment in the experimental class and control class. This can be seen from the average value of the class before treatment (pretest) that is 40.00 in the experimental class and 41.94 in the control class, while the mean grade after treatment (posttest) is 81.29 in the experimental class and 78.07 on the control class.

The absence of differences in experimental class learning results and control classes means that cooperative learning model of speaking stick type is less effective when used in learning because the results of research indicate that student learning outcomes increase not only because implementation cooperative learning model of talking stick type in the experimental class but also influenced by factors other factors such as a good level of intelligence, a conducive

learning environment and many other things that affect student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are not only influenced by a single factor, but are influenced by many factors. The factors that affect learning outcomes are divided into 2 groups, namely: internal factors (health, intelligence, talent, interest, motivation, and learning) and external factors (family, school, community, and environment). These factors will be interconnected in the achievement of learning results either directly or indirectly (Putri & Isnani, 2015). So motivation does not directly affect other factors, such as health, intelligence, talent, learning style, and society.

4. COCLUSSION AND RECOMENDATION

Based on data analysis, it can be concluded that there is no difference students' motivation Civics education learning in the experimental class and control class after treatment which means cooperative learning model type talking stick does not affect students' learning outcomes in civic education. Based on the experimental and control class experimental test, before implementation cooperative type learning model talking stick type in the experimental class and conventional model learning in the control class is obtained $t_{count} < t_{tabel}$ that is $-0.430 < 2,000$ which means there is no significant difference civic education learning outcome. In the experimental class and control class after treatment obtained $t_{count} < t_{tabel}$ is $0.676 < 2,000$ which also means there is no difference civic education learning outcome. Based on the research conclusions, the

researcher would like to convey some suggestions. The suggestion is that is expected for classroom teachers who apply cooperative learning model type talking stick is to further optimize the time for student learning outcomes will enhance more leverage and to further researchers to examine more deeply about the differences that occur between the experimental class and class control and the influence of cooperative learning model type talking stick to student learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- Alim, J. A. (2015). *Modul Statistik Pendidikan*. Pekanbaru: FKIP Universitas Riau.
- Huda, M. (2015). *Model-model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Istarani. (2015). *58 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Media Persada: Medan.
- Pranyandari, N. M., Negara, I. G., & Suardika, I. W. (2014). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Talking Stick Berbasis Concept Mapping Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPA Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar Gugus IV Kuta Utara Tahun Ajaran 2013/2014. *Jurnal Mimbar Pgsd Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha (9)1. Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*.
- Putri, D. T., & Isnani, G. (2015). Pengaruh Minat Dan Motivasi Terhadap Hasil Belajar Pada Mata Pelajaran Pengantar Administrasi Perkantoran. *Jurnal Pendidikan Bisnis Dan Manajemen (1).2 Program Studi* *Pend. Adp Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Negeri Malang*.
- Sugiyono. (2013). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan (Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D)*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sundayana, R. (2014). *Statistika Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Triyono. (2012). *Metedologi Penelitian Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Ikapi.