



APPLICATION OF THE STAD TYPE COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL TO IMPROVE STUDENT LEARNING ON THE INDONESIAN FOREIGN POLITICS TOPIC IN CLASS VI OF SD NEGERI ROTTEUNGOH

Afriansyah¹, Siti Mayang Sari², Akmaluddin³

^{1,2,3}Universitas Bina Bangsa Getsempena, Banda Aceh, Indonesia

* Corresponding email: afriansyah935@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This research aims to analyze the improvement in student learning outcomes after implementing the STAD type cooperative learning model on topic Indonesian Foreign Politics in class VI SD Negeri Rotteungoh. This research was classroom action research consisting of two cycles. Each cycle had four stages, namely: planning, implementation, observation, and reflection. The research was carried out at SD Negeri Rotteungoh, Meukek District, South Aceh Regency for 3 months in the even semester of the 2022/2023 academic year. The subjects of this research were 22 class VI students consisting of 12 male students and 10 female students. The instruments used were formative tests and observation sheets. Data analysis used descriptive statistics based on the results of formative tests and observation sheets for each cycle. The research results showed that student learning outcomes increased from cycle I to cycle II, namely cycle I (68.18%) and cycle II (90.91%). The STAD type cooperative learning model motivates students to convey ideas and questions so that student learning outcomes increase. The STAD type cooperative learning model can be used as an alternative learning material for Indonesian foreign policy topic because it can improve student learning outcomes.

Keywords: *STAD type cooperative learning model, student learning outcomes.*

INTRODUCTION

The government has implemented various programs to improve the quality of education. Quality education will form quality individuals. Students as individuals have different characteristics from each other. For this reason, schools are responsible for meeting students' needs to become quality individuals through learning that accommodates student diversity, namely by implementing the cooperative learning model (Akkus & Doymus, 2022). The cooperative learning model can increase students' motivation and thinking abilities due to interaction during the learning process (Dewi et al., 2023). The cooperative learning model supports diversity and individual differences (Akkus & Doymus, 2022). The STAD (Student Teams Achievement Division) type cooperative learning model is a learning model where students learn and work together in small groups of 4-5 with a heterogeneous member structure (Wulandari, 2022). Heterogeneous grouping of members can increase student motivation because each student competes with other groups to make their group better (Ramdhani et al., 2022).

The syntax of the STAD learning model is: (1) create groups with 4/5 members per group; (2) presentation of material by the teacher; (3) students do assignments from the teacher in groups; (4) students take quizzes; (5) evaluation; (6) conclusion (Wulandari, 2022). The STAD type cooperative learning model is very simple and easy to implement (Elpisah, 2020). Learning with the STAD model is able to create active, innovative, creative and fun learning for students during the learning process (Tamam & Hikmah, 2023). The STAD learning model can increase student motivation and learning outcomes. The stronger a person's motivation for learning, the more optimal their learning activities and results will be (Yulianto et al., 2020). The use of the STAD type cooperative learning model can increase student activity and student learning outcomes (Marwah et al., 2023). The STAD type cooperative learning model can improve student learning outcomes because it encourages student involvement and activeness in discovering concepts from the material being studied (Sudarsana, 2021).

One indicator of achieving educational quality can be seen from student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are the abilities that students have after receiving experience from the learning that has been carried out (Marwah et al., 2023). The learning outcomes of students in class VI SD Negeri Rotteungoh are still low. This is because teachers still teach using conventional methods. Conventional methods make students bored because they do not stimulate student activity and involvement (Elpisah, 2020). Student activity during the learning process is one indicator of student motivation. Increasing motivation

will go hand in hand with improving student learning outcomes (Ramdhani et al., 2022).

Based on the description above, it is necessary to make improvements in learning practices so that they are more effective and can improve student learning outcomes. The STAD type learning model is applied to Indonesian foreign policy material for Civics subjects in class VI. The aim of this research is to analyse the improvement in student learning outcomes after implementing the STAD type cooperative learning model on topic Indonesian foreign policy in class VI SD Negeri Rotteungoh. This research describes the answer to the problem formulation, namely: Can the STAD type cooperative learning model improve student learning outcomes on Indonesian foreign policy material in class VI SD Negeri Rotteungoh?

METHODS

This research was Classroom Action Research (PTK), namely research conducted to solve problems that occur in the classroom in order to improve learning practices to create quality education (Rukminingsih et al., 2020). This research was carried out in 2 cycles referring to continuous learning improvement based on the previous cycle. This research took place at SD Negeri Rotteungoh in the 2022/2023 academic year. The research took place in the even semester for 3 months, namely January to March 2023. The research subjects were 22 students consisting of 12 male students and 10 female students.

The research was conducted on the subject of Indonesian foreign policy in the Civics subject. This research procedure used the action research model from Kemmis and Taggart which is described in Rukminingsih et al. (2020). This action research model took the form of a spiral from one cycle to the next. Each cycle included planning, action, observation and reflection. The steps in the next cycle were revised planning, action, observation and reflection. Before entering cycle I, preliminary action was taken in the form of problem identification.

The research instrument was a formative test to determine students' learning mastery individually and classically. In addition, to find out where the mistakes made by students were so that they could see where their weaknesses were, especially in areas where competencies had not been achieved. To strengthen the data collected, observation sheets were also used as research instruments which were filled in by colleagues to find out and record teacher and student activities in the learning process.

The data analysis technique used was descriptive statistics. This technique was used to describe facts according to the data obtained to determine student learning outcomes and student responses to student activities during the learning process.

There are two categories of learning completeness, namely individual and classical. Based on the instructions for implementing teaching and learning in the 1994 curriculum (Depdikbud, 1994), namely that a student has completed learning if he has achieved a score of 65% or a score of 65, and the class is said to have completed learning, whether in that class there are 85% who have achieved an absorption capacity of more than or equal to with 65%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The implementation of the STAD type cooperative learning model goes through the following stages: (1) implementation of learning; (2) group discussion; (3) test; (4) group awards; (5) determine individual and group values. At the end of the lesson, students were given a formative test to determine the level of student success. The results of the observation sheet on teacher and student activities in cycles I and II can be seen in Table 1 as follows.

Table 1. Results of Learning Management Observations in Cycles I and II

<i>No.</i>	<i>Observed teacher activities</i>	<i>Cycle I Percentage</i>	<i>Cycle II Percentage</i>
1.	Conveying goals	6.7	6.7
2.	Motivate students	6.7	6.7
3.	Linking to previous lessons	6.7	10.7
4.	Delivering material/steps/strategy	11.7	13.3
5.	Explain difficult material	11.7	10
6.	Guiding and observing students in discovering concepts	25.0	22.6
7.	Ask students to present and discuss the results of the activity	8.2	10
8.	Provide feedback	16.6	11.7
9.	Guide students to summarize lessons	6.7	10
<i>No.</i>	<i>Observed student activities</i>	<i>Cycle I Percentage</i>	<i>Cycle II Percentage</i>
1.	Listen/pay attention to the teacher's explanation	17.9	20.8
2.	Read a book	12.1	13.1
3.	Work with fellow group members	21.0	22.1
4.	Discussion between students/between students and teachers	13.8	15.0
5.	Presenting learning results	4.6	2.9
6.	Present/respond to questions/ideas	5.4	4.2
7.	Write that is relevant to the learning process	7.7	6.1
8.	Summarize learning	6.7	7.3
9.	Doing evaluation tests	10.8	8.5

In cycle I, based on the table above, it appears that the teacher's most dominant activity was guiding and observing students in discovering concepts,

namely 25%. Other activities that had quite a large percentage were providing feedback/evaluation, asking questions and explaining difficult material. Meanwhile, the most dominant student activity was working with fellow group members, namely 21.0%. Other activities whose presentations were quite large were listening/paying attention to teacher explanations, discussions between students/between students and teachers, and reading books, namely 17.9%, 13.8 and 12.1% respectively. In cycle II, it appeared that the most dominant teacher activity was guiding and observing students in discovering concepts, namely 22.6%. Meanwhile, the most dominant student activity in cycle II was working with fellow group members, namely (22.1%) and listening to the teacher's explanation (20.8%). Increased teacher and student activity in cycles I and II because of teachers reflect to improve learning. The reflection was that teachers are more optimal in motivating students and conveying learning objectives. Teachers were more skilled at managing time and activating students more during learning.

Next is a recapitulation of students' formative test results in cycles I and II which can be seen in Table 2 as follows.

Table 2. Recapitulation of Student Formative Test Results in Cycles I and II

No.	Description	Cycle I Results	Cycle II Results
1.	Average formative test score	70,91	78,18
2.	Number of students who have completed their studies	15	20
3.	Percentage of learning completeness.	68,18	90,91

In cycle I, based on Table 2 above, it can be explained that by applying the STAD type cooperative learning model, the average student learning outcome score was 70.91 and learning completion reached 68.18%. These results show that in the first cycle classically students were less than the desired percentage of completeness, namely 85%. In cycle II, the average formative test score was 78.18 and of the 22 students who had completed it, 20 students had not yet achieved learning completion. So classically the learning completeness that has been achieved is 90.91% (including the complete category). The results in cycle II improved better than cycle I.

The increase in learning outcomes in cycle II was influenced by the increase in teachers' abilities in implementing the STAD type cooperative learning model so that students became more accustomed to this kind of learning and students understood the material more easily.

In cycle I, the learning process using the STAD type cooperative learning model was not implemented well. Teachers were not yet accustomed to using this learning model so learning is still predominantly teacher-centred. This is in

accordance with the explanation by Akkus & Doymus (2022) that although the cooperative learning model is student centered, the success of the class really depends on the role of the teacher. The success of the cooperative learning model occurs if the elements of cooperative learning (teacher guidance, making students aware of individual responsibility) work as they should. In contrast, in classrooms where the teacher fails to play the role of guide, cooperative groups simply turn into group work where each person is only responsible for his or her own learning (Akkus & Doymus, 2022). Apart from that, students who are used to conventional methods are also the reason for the less than optimal use of the STAD type cooperative learning model. This is in accordance with research by Dewi et al. (2023) where in cycle I, student learning outcomes were still low because students were not used to discussing in groups. The non-homogeneous distribution of group members was also the cause of students not being very united with their group friends.

The implementation of the STAD type cooperative learning model which was less than optimal in cycle I was used as a reflection as an improvement in cycle II. Teachers and students were used to using this learning model so that student activity increases. Even though they were heterogeneous, students worked together and interact positively in discovering concepts. Student learning outcomes were increasing which could be seen from the increase in individual and classical completeness. The results of this study are in accordance with Islami et al. (2021) who researched the effect of the STAD type cooperative learning model on student learning outcomes using a pretest-posttest control group design. As a result, the STAD type cooperative learning model had a positive effect on improving student learning outcomes with an effect size (d) value of 3.52, which means the resulting influence is relatively high.

The STAD Type Cooperative Learning Model can increase cooperation between students, encouraging a sense of responsibility in groups where more capable students teach their less capable friends (Tamam & Hikmah, 2023). STAD gives students the opportunity to work together, discuss, students who are able to help students who are less. Students can also present their work in front of the class to get reinforcement from the teacher and feedback from other students. This process can improve student learning outcomes (Sudarsana, 2021). The STAD type cooperative learning model can improve student learning outcomes, positive attitudes and student activity (Elpisah, 2020).

CONCLUSION

The STAD type cooperative learning model can improve student learning outcomes which are characterized by increasing student learning completeness in each cycle, namely cycle I (68.18%), and cycle II (90.91%). This learning

model can be an alternative in learning. However, it needs to be emphasized that good teacher skills are needed so that this learning model can increase student activity, motivation and learning outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author would like to thank the principal and teachers of SD Negeri Rotteungoh who had helped the author complete this research.

REFERENCES

- Akkus, A., & Doymus, K. (2022). Effect of subject jigsaw and reading writing presentation techniques on academic achievement of 6th grade. *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, 19(2), 496-510. DOI: 10.36681/tused.2022.133.
- Depdikbud (1994). *Pedoman pelaksanaan kurikulum pendidikan dasar sekolah dasar*. Jakarta: BP Dharma Bakti
- Elpisah. (2020). Penerapan model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe student teams achievement division (STAD) untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa. *Uniqbu Journal Of Social Sciences (UJSS)*, 1(1), 45-52.
- Islami, V.H., Soeprianto, H., & Prayitno, S. (2021). Pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe student teams achievement divisions terhadap hasil belajar matematika siswa. *Griya Journal of Mathematics Education and Application*, 1(2), 239-247.
- Dewi, S., Rahayu, P., & Nuraeni, F. (2023). Penerapan model cooperative learning tipe Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD) untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa. *Fondatia Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar*, 7(3), 577-588. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36088/fondatia.v7i3.3723>
- Marwah, D. S., Lestari, W. D., & Misbahussurur. (2023). Implementation of cooperative learning model STAD-type as an effort to improve student activity and outcomes in mathematics on functional limits material. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development (IJED)*, 4(2), 238-246. DOI: 10.59672/ijed.v4i2.3014
- Pardiyana. (2020). The Cooperative Learning Model with STAD Type to Improve Science Learning Outcomes. *BIO-INOVED : Jurnal Biologi-Inovasi Pendidikan*, 2(2), 87-90. DOI: 10.20527/bino.v2i2.9094.
- Ramdhani, F. F., Sukrawan, Y., & Permana, T. (2022). Application of STAD-type cooperative learning model to increase student learning outcomes. *Journal of Mechanical Engineering Education*, 9 (2), 61-72.
- Rukminingsing, Adnan, G., & Latief, M. A. (2020). *Metode penelitian pendidikan penelitian kuantitatif, penelitian kualitatif, penelitian tindakan kelas*. Yogyakarta: Erhaka Utama.

Application Of The Stad Type Cooperative Learning Model To Improve Student Learning On The Indonesian Foreign Politics Topic In Class Vi Of Sd Negeri Rotteungoh, Afriansyah, Siti Mayang Sari, Akmaluddin

- Sudarsana, I.K.G. (2021). Penerapan pembelajaran kooperatif tipe STAD untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar matematika. *Indonesian Journal of Educational Development*, 2(1), 176-186. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4781885
- Tamam, B., & Hikmah, N. (2023). Cooperative learning model type STAD for improving students' skills in determining main ideas of paragraphs. *Jurnal Dieksis*, 3(1), 55-62. DOI: [10.54065/dieksis.3.1.2023.200](https://doi.org/10.54065/dieksis.3.1.2023.200)
- Wulandari, I. (2022). Model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe STAD (Student Teams Achievement Division) dalam pembelajaran MI. *Jurnal PAPEDA*, 4(1), 17-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v2i11.2746>
- Yulianto, I., Warsono, Nasution, & Rendy, D. B.(2020). The Effect of Learning Model STAD (Student Team Achievement Division) Assisted by Media Quizizz on Motivation and Learning Outcomes in Class XI Indonesian History Subjects at SMA Trimurti Surabaya. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies* , 2 (11), 923-927. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v2i11.2746>