

THE EFFECT OF GIVE THE MONEY LEARNING MODEL COMBINED WITH DIGITAL ANIMATION MEDIA ON STUDENTS' SOCIAL STUDIES LEARNING ACHIEVEMENTS AT SMPN 1 SEUNAGAN

Irwasyah Putra¹, Akmaluddin², Syarfuni³, Zahraini⁴, Irmayani⁵

¹Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

²Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia

* Corresponding email: irwansyahtadu@gmail.com¹*,
akmaluddin@bbg.ac.id², syarfuni@bbg.ac.id³, zahraini@bbg.ac.id⁵,
irmayanisuiya@gmail.com⁵

ABSTRACT

This study is entitled the influence of the use of active learning models with the strategy Give the Money on the social studies learning achievement of SMPN 1 Seunagan students. The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of the use of active learning models with the strategy Give the Money on the social studies learning achievement of SMPN 1 Seunagan students. This study uses a quantitative approach and experimental research type. The population in this study were all grade VII students and the sample consisted of 42 students in the experimental and control classes. The data collection technique in the study was carried out by giving a test. Based on the results of the study, it is known that (1) in terms of homogeneity, the two classes used as samples are homogeneous. This result can be seen from the results of the hypothesis test with the calculation results of F count = 1.01 and F table = 2.12, so the data for both classes is homogeneous or comes from the same population, (2) for the normality test of the experimental class, X² count = 1.05 and X² table = 5.99 were obtained and the normality test of the control class was X² count = 0.09 and x² table = 5.99, so it can be said that the control class data is normally distributed, (3) the results of the hypothesis test using the t-test and obtained t count = 2.70 and the t table value at the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$ (one-sided test) with dk = 40 is 1.68 accept Ha if t count > t table, where t count = 2.70 and t table = 1.68 or 2.70 > 1.68 then Ha is accepted. The research hypothesis stating that the learning outcomes of students taught using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy are better than the learning outcomes of students taught using the conventional learning model can be accepted as true or in other words the research hypothesis is accepted.

Keywords: Active Learning, Give the Money Model, Digital Animation Media, Learning Achievement.

INTRODUCTION

One of the subjects at the Junior High School (SMP) level that is mandatory for students is Social Sciences (IPS). The IPS subject is a combination of social sciences such as Sociology, Geography, History and Economics. The organization of the curriculum in the IPS curriculum in Indonesia uses an integrated approach which is generally used at the Junior High School (SLTP) level (Wahab, 2017: 123).

In order for the delivery of IPS learning for class VII of SMP to be well received and interesting for students, it is not enough to only utilize the sense of hearing, namely delivery with the lecture method or verbal sentences alone, but on the contrary, various active learning models are also utilized with the Give the Money strategy which can involve students directly in the material they are studying (Nanang, 2018: 1).

IPS learning at SMP N 1 Seunagan, if observed so far, is still relatively ineffective and inefficient. This means that teachers still apply a conventional learning system in this case, they tend to deliver learning materials using lecture methods and question and answer discussions. So that many students are overwhelmed in understanding the lesson material presented. Seeing the picture of learning that does not involve student activities, it is necessary to have a way to improve students' understanding of the social studies material of SMP N 1 Seunagan students by implementing a more active learning method. Active learning is any form of learning that allows students to play an active role in the learning process, either in the form of interaction between students or students with teachers in the learning process (Suryadi, 2020: 36). In order to implement active learning in the classroom, a teacher is required to master several models, one of which is the Give the Money model. In this give the money model, students work in pairs and have five minutes to start the concept of an answer to a difficult question on scratch paper or flipchart paper with a marker. After time is up, they give part of the answer to the partner behind them and receive work from the partner in front of them. The newly received answer is continued for another five minutes and so on until the process has achieved its goal. The paper then goes back to the original author, who uses some of these contributions to draft a polished version of the final answer (Ginnis, 2018:157).

Not only is the learning model sufficient, the learning media also greatly determines the success of student learning. One of them is digital animation media packaged in the form of videos so that learning becomes

more interesting. If you pay attention to the description of the active learning steps with the Give the Money model above, it is clear that this learning model prioritizes student activities in completing various material assignments studied in class. Active student involvement in the teaching and learning process will certainly make the level of student understanding more solid than just writing and listening to what the teacher says.

METHODS

This study uses a quantitative approach. According to Sugiyono (2020:16-117) quantitative methods because research data are in the form of numbers and are analyzed using statistics. The type of research used in this study is experimental research. The type of research used in this study is experimental research. Sugiyono (2020:111) suggests a research design that has a control class and an experimental class. In this study, the population was all students of class VII of SMPN 1 Seunagan, totaling 63 male and female students consisting of 3 classes. The sample in this study was students of class VII-1 consisting of 21 students as the experimental class and students of class VII-2 consisting of 21 students as the control class. Data collection techniques used multiple choice tests and documentation. Data analysis techniques consisted of normality tests, homogeneity tests and hypothesis tests.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data collection was carried out by giving a test related to the material taught by giving 20 multiple-choice questions. Based on the results of the test given, the experimental class students' scores increased better and all students achieved the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM) score of 60. The results obtained can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Learning Outcomes of Experimental Class Students

No	Student Name	Student grades	Completed/Not Completed
1	AB	60	Completed
2	AZ	90	Completed
3	AS	50	Not Completed
4	AWK	60	Completed
5	AN	60	Completed
6	CAK	70	Completed
7	CM	60	Completed
8	EDA	80	Completed
9	AHP	70	Completed
10	HD	80	Completed

11	HSS	70	Completed
12	IM	80	Completed
13	AA	70	Completed
14	MFL	70	Completed
15	MM	90	Completed
16	MA	70	Completed
17	MFi	50	Completed
18	NA	60	Completed
19	RA	60	Completed
20	SRS	60	Completed
21	SPS	50	Not Completed

Source: Research Results, 2024

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the lowest post-test score obtained by students in the experimental class was 50, while the highest score obtained by students was 90, while the KKM score was 60. So it can be concluded that there are 2 students in the experimental class who have not completed the learning activities with the Give the Money model assisted by digital animation media. Based on Table 1, the frequency distribution data for the experimental class is then compiled with the steps described as follows:

1. Calculating the Range

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Range} &= \text{Highest Value} - \text{Lowest Value} \\ &= 90 - 50 \\ &= 40 \end{aligned}$$

2. Many Classes

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Many Classes} &= 1 + (3,3) \log n \\ &= 1 + (3,3) \log 21 \\ &= 1 + (3,3) 1,32 \\ &= 1 + 4,36 \\ &= 5,36 \end{aligned}$$

3. Interval class length

$$\begin{aligned} 4. \text{ Interval class length} &= \frac{\text{range}}{\text{many classes}} \\ &= \frac{40}{5} \\ &= 8 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the calculation results above, a frequency distribution table can be made as shown in Table 2.

Tabel 2 : Frequency Distribution List of Experimental Class Post-Test

Test Score	f_i	x_i	X_i^2	$f_i x_i$	$f_i x_i^2$
50-57	3	53.5	2862.25	160.5	8586.75
58-65	7	61.5	3782.25	430.5	26475.75
66-73	6	69.5	4830.25	417	28981.5
74-81	3	77.5	6006.25	232.5	18018.75
82-90	2	85.5	7310.25	171	14620.5
Amount	21	-	-	1411.5	96683.25

Sumber: Hasil Pengolahan, 2024

After the post-test frequency distribution list of the experimental class has been known, the next step is to obtain the average value and variance of the experimental class by referring to Table 2. The results of the average value are 67.21 and the variance of the experimental class is 9.51.

Tabel 3. Learning Outcomes of Control Class Students

No	Student Name	Post Test	Completed/Not Completed
1	Addaiyana	60	Completed
2	Afnandi	50	Not Completed
3	Budi	50	Not Completed
4	Daini Atika	40	Not Completed
5	Elfina Selviani	80	Completed
6	Fahrurozi	60	Completed
7	Habibi Win Mahate	60	Completed
8	Khairunlaili	70	Completed
9	Masni	50	Not Completed
10	M Riyadh Gayo	70	Completed
11	Rahmadhana	70	Completed
12	Ramadi Alfitra	60	Completed
13	Reni Simahbengi	50	Not Completed
14	Ridha Sitiro	50	Not Completed
15	Rizka Ambiya	80	Completed
16	Selvi Fitri Andari	70	Completed
17	Sukami	70	Completed
18	T. Iklas Fauji	40	Not Completed
19	Ulaiya Najwa	50	Not Completed
20	Wijaya	60	Completed
21	Yulianda	70	Completed

Source: Research Results, 2024

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the lowest post-test score obtained by students in the control class was 40, while the highest score obtained by students was 80, while the KKM score was 60. So it can be concluded that there are 8 students in the control class who have not completed the learning activities. The post-test score of the control class taught using conventional learning can be described as follows :

1. Calculating Range

Range = The highest score – Lowest Value

$$= 90 - 40$$

$$= 40$$

2. Many Classes

$$\begin{aligned} 3. \text{ Many Classes} &= 1 + (3,3) \log n \\ &= 1 + (3,3) \log 21 \\ &= 1 + (3,3) 1,32 \\ &= 1 + 4,36 \\ &= 5,36 \end{aligned}$$

4. Interval class length

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Interval class length} &= \frac{\text{range}}{\text{many classes}} \\ &= \frac{40}{5} \\ &= 8 \end{aligned}$$

Based on the results of static data calculations, a frequency distribution table can be made as in Table 4. After the post-test frequency distribution list for the control class has been known, the next step is to obtain the average value and variance of the control class by referring to Table 4.5. The steps for obtaining the average value and variance of the control class are as follows:

Table 4. List of frequency distribution of post-test control class

Test Score	f_i	x_i	X_i^2	$f_i x_i$	$f_i x_i^2$
40-47	2	43.5	1892.25	87	3784.5
48-55	6	51.5	2652.25	309	15913.5
56-63	5	59.5	3540.25	297.5	17701.25
64-71	6	67.5	4556.25	405	27337.5

72-80	2	75.5	5700.25	151	11400.5
Amount	21	-	-	1249.5	76137.25

Source: Processing Results, 2024

After the post-test frequency distribution list of the experimental class has been known, the next step is to obtain the average value and variance of the control class by referring to Table 4. The average value is 59.5 and the variance of the experimental class is 89.6.

The homogeneity test is carried out to determine whether the samples obtained are homogeneous or not. If the conclusion shows a homogeneous data group, then the data is worthy of being tested parametrically. The homogeneity test is carried out using the Fisher formula. To carry out the Fisher statistical test, the variance value of the post-test results of the experimental class and the control class is needed. The variance of the experimental class is 90.51 and the variance of the control class is 89.6.

$$F_{hitung} = \frac{\text{varians terbesar}}{\text{varians terkecil}}$$

$$F_{hitung} = \frac{90,51}{89,6}$$

$$F_{hitung} = 1,01$$

After obtaining the Fcount value = 1.01, it is then confirmed with the Ftable value at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with dk1 = dknumerator = n-1 (for the largest variance), and dk2 = dkdenominator = n-1 (for the smallest variance) referring to the F distribution table. The Ftable value at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with dk1 = 21-1 = 20 and dk2 = 21-1 = 20 is 2.12. The test criteria for the homogeneity test are to accept Ho = if Fcount < Ftable at a significant level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with dk1 = dknumerator = n-1 (for the largest variance), and dk2 = dkdenominator = n-1 (for the smallest variance) referring to the F distribution table. Accept Ha if Fcount \geq Ftable at a significant level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with dk1 = dknumerator = n-1 (for the largest variance), and dk2 = dkdenominator = n-1 (for the smallest variance) referring to the F distribution table.

Ho = experimental class data with control class data is homogeneous

Ha = experimental class data with control class data is not homogeneous

The calculation results show the Fcount value = 1.01 and the Ftable value = 2.12 at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with dk1 = 21-1 = 20 and dk2 = 21-1 = 20. This means that Fcount < Ftable or 1.01 < 2.12. Thus, according to the testing criteria, Ho is accepted. Ho is accepted, meaning that the experimental class data with the control class are homogeneous or the data comes from the same population. The normality test is used to determine whether the data from the sample is normally distributed or not. To obtain

normally distributed data, it is tested using the Chi Square formula (Sudjana, 2015:273).

Tabel 5. Experimental Class Normality Test List

Test Score	Class Limits (X)	Z Score	Area Boundar y	Area of the Region (A)	Expected Frequency (Ei)	Security Frequency (Oi)
50-57	49.5	-1.86	0.4686	0.1225	2.5275	3
	57.5	-0.12	0.3461			
58-65	57.5	-0.12	0.3461	0.2747	5.7687	7
	65.5	-0.18	0.0714			
66-73	65.5	-0.18	0.0714	0.3168	6.6528	6
	73.5	0.66	0.2454			
74-81	73.5	0.66	0.2454	0.1878	3.9438	3
	81.5	1.50	0.4332			
82-90	81.5	1.50	0.4332	0.0597	1.2537	2
	90.5	2.45	0.4929			
Amount						21

Source: Processing Results, 2024

After obtaining the value of χ^2 count = 1.05, it is then confirmed with the value of χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table. The value of χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = 5-3 = 2$ is 5.99.

The testing criteria for the normality test are to accept H_0 if χ^2 count < χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table. Accept H_0 if χ^2 count \geq χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table.

H_0 : experimental class data is normally distributed

H_a : experimental class data is not normally distributed

The calculation results show the value of χ^2 count = 1.05 and χ^2 table = 5.99 at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = 5-3 = 2$. This means that χ^2 count < χ^2 table or $1.05 < 5.99$. Thus, according to the testing criteria, H_0 is accepted. Accepting H_0 means that the experimental class data is normally distributed.

Data tabulation for the normality test of the control class student group can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. List of Control Class Normality Tests

Test Score	Class Limits (X)	Z Score	Area Boundary	Area of the Region (A)	Expected Frequency (Ei)	Security Frequency (Oi)
40-47	39.5	-2.11	0.4826	0.0846	1.7766	2
	47.5	-1.27	0.398			
48-55	47.5	-1.27	0.398	0.2352	4.9392	6
	55.5	-0.42	0.1628			
56-63	55.5	-0.42	0.1628	0.3256	6.8376	5
	63.5	0.42	0.1628			
64-71	63.5	0.42	0.1628	0.2352	4.9392	6
	71.5	1.27	0.398			
72-80	71.5	1.27	0.398	0.0888	1.8648	2
	80.5	2.22	0.4868			
Amount						21

Source: Processing Results, 2024

After obtaining the value of χ^2 count = 0.99, it is then confirmed with the value of χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table. The value of χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3 = 5-3 = 2$ is 5.99.

The testing criteria for the normality test are to accept H_0 if χ^2 count < χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table. Accept H_a if χ^2 count \geq χ^2 table at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = k-3$ referring to the chi square table.

H_0 : control class data is normally distributed

H_a : control class data is not normally distributed

The calculation results show the value of χ^2 count = 0.99 and χ^2 table = 5.99 at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with $dk = 5-3 = 2$. This means that χ^2 count < χ^2 table or $0.99 < 5.99$. Thus, according to the test criteria, H_0 is accepted. Accepting H_0 means that the control class data is normally distributed. After the data has been tested for homogeneity and normality, the test results show the results of the homogeneity test, namely $F_{count} > F_{table}$ or $1.01 > 2.12$, meaning that the experimental class and control class data are

homogeneous or come from the same population. The results of the normality test for the experimental class show the results of the normality test, namely $\chi^2_{count} < \chi^2_{table}$ or $1.05 < 5.99$, so it can be said that the experimental class data is normally distributed, and the results of the normality test for the control class show the results of the normality test, namely $\chi^2_{count} < \chi^2_{table}$ or $1.05 < 5.99$, so it can be said that the control class data is normally distributed.

The data obtained were then processed using a t-test. This hypothesis testing was conducted to determine whether the learning outcomes of students taught using an active learning model with the Give the Money strategy were better than students taught using conventional learning. Where the t-test is a type of parametric statistical hypothesis testing with the condition that the data is normally distributed and homogeneous. The formula used for hypothesis testing according to (Sudjana, 2015:239) is as follows:

$$t_{hitung} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

After the t-count value is obtained, then the t-count value is compared with the t-table value at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with degrees of freedom $dk = n_1 + n_2 - 2$ by referring to the t-table. The test criteria are to accept H_a if $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$ at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with degrees of freedom $dk = n_1 + n_2 - 2$ by referring to the t-table. H_a accepted means that the learning outcomes of students taught using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy are better than the learning outcomes of students taught with conventional learning. If $t\text{-count} \leq t\text{-table}$ at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with degrees of freedom $dk = n_1 + n_2 - 2$ by referring to the t-table, then H_a is rejected and H_o is accepted, if H_o is accepted it means that the learning outcomes of students taught using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy are not better than the learning outcomes of students taught with conventional learning. Before conducting hypothesis testing, first find out the combined standard deviation value, with $s_1^2 = 90.51$ (variance of the experimental class), $s_2^2 = 89.6$ (variance of the control class). Furthermore, the calculation for hypothesis testing can be done by conducting a t-test:

$$t_{hitung} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{s \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{67,21 - 59,5}{9,49 \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{21} + \frac{1}{21}\right)}}$$

$$t = \frac{7,71}{9,49 \sqrt{\frac{2}{21}}}$$
$$t = \frac{7,71}{9,49 \sqrt{0,09}}$$
$$t = \frac{7,71}{9,49 (0,3)}$$
$$t = \frac{7,71}{2,85}$$
$$t = 2,70$$

After the tcount value = 2.70 is obtained, the ttable value is then compared with the ttable value at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with degrees of freedom $dk = n_1 + n_2 - 2$. The ttable value at a significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) with degrees of freedom $dk = 40$ is 1.68. The testing criteria are to accept H_a if $t_{count} > t_{table}$. If it has a different value, H_a is rejected (Sudjana, 2015:243). Accepting H_a means that the learning outcomes of students taught using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy are better than the learning outcomes of students taught using the conventional learning model. Based on the results of the study above, the tcount value = 2.70 was obtained, while $t_{table} = 1.68$. This means that $t_{count} > t_{table}$ or $2.70 > 1.68$. Thus, according to the testing criteria, H_a is accepted. H_a accepted means that the learning outcomes of students who are taught using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy assisted by digital animation media are better than the learning outcomes of students who are taught using the conventional learning model.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the purpose of the study to determine whether the learning outcomes of students presented using the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy are better than the learning outcomes of students presented with the conventional learning model in the social studies subject of SMPN 1 Seunagan students, the results of the research data processing obtained a value at a significance level of 5% and degrees of freedom ($dk = 21 + 21 - 2 = 40$). According to the testing criteria, namely if at a significance level of 5% with a degree of freedom $dk =$ then the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This means that there is a difference in the learning outcomes of students presented with the active learning model with the Give the Money strategy with the learning outcomes of students presented with the conventional method in the social studies subject of SMPN 1 Seunagan.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank SMP Negeri 1 Seunagan who have helped a lot in collecting data during the writing of this paper so that it was completed properly.

REFERENCES

Ginnis, Paul. (2018). *Trik & Teknik Mengajar Startegi Meningkatkan Pencapaian Pengajaran di Kelas*. Jakarta: PT. Indek.

Nanang. (2018). *Media Pembelajaran*. Bandung: UPI.

Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R&D*. Alfabeta.

Sudajana. (2015). *Metode Statistika*. Bandung: PT. Tarsito.

Suryadi. (2020). *Strategi Pembelajaran Pendidikan Karakter*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.

Wahab, A.B. (2017). *Metode dan Model-Model Mengajar*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

DOCUMENTATION

Figure 1. Atmosphere When Researchers Show Digital Animation Videos of Social Studies Material



Source: Personal Collection, 2024

Figure 2. Atmosphere When Researchers Supervise Students Finding Social Studies Reading Materials Using Computer Media



Source: Personal Collection, 2024

Figure 3. Atmosphere When Researchers Present Material Assisted by Digital Animation Videos of Social Studies Material

