

Improving History Learning Outcomes Class XE students at SMA Negeri 1 Kaliwungu, Kendal Regency through the Talking Stick Learning Model 2011/2012 Academic Year

Dony Dwi Ermiyanto¹

Abstract

This research is a classroom action research (CAR). Classroom action research (CAR) is a form of reflective investigation that is participatory and collaborative and has a goal to make system improvements, working methods, processes, content, competence, and a situation that begins with planning (planning), action (action), observation (observation), and reflection (reflecting) until repair or improvement is achieved. The subjects in this study were students of SMA Negeri 1 Kaliwungu XE—still a need for classroom learning outcomes standard of 6.50. Based on the results of this study, it was concluded that learning talking stick models of learning outcomes are 63.625 to 64.50. It can be said to be increased by 0.875. Of the average value of the first and second cycles, 64.50 to 73.625.

Keywords: *Learning Outcomes, Talking Stick Learning Models*

Introduction

Education is an essential aspect of human resource development. With education, humans will find it easier to develop and even become backward (Maunah, 2009). Without education, a country or nation will not progress. With education, humans or a nation can be free from ignorance, poverty, and backwardness because education is a vehicle for learning new knowledge and skills. Education is formally, informally, or non-formally (Sudiapermana, 2009). Education is directed at forming quality humans who can compete with other humans. This means that humans have an advanced mindset because, with education, they will have more resources from within themselves, raising their standard of living. In contrast, the definition of competing with other humans means that humans have a mindset. Different individuals who have higher education It will produce more advanced thinking patterns and lift that position more from other individuals, resulting in competition between fellow humans to achieve a better standard of living.

¹ History Teacher, SMA Negeri 1 Kaliwungu, Donydwi@gmail.com

It will produce more advanced thinking patterns and lift that position more from other individuals, resulting in competition between fellow humans to achieve a better standard of living. History is a subject that studies the past, present, and future (Abdullah, 2009, p. 3). History learning in schools, one of which is carried out in high school, is usually considered trivial; teachers only use the lecture method in presenting material or information to students, so learning tends to be uninteresting and makes students feel bored quickly (Makdalina, 2003). The teacher is the central figure in every history lesson without involving the students. This makes students feel ignored and unnoticed, so students become passive individuals. Things like this result in grades or test results in history subjects being wrong, or you could say they are still below average and not by the KKM or Minimum Completeness Criteria set by the school, namely 6.5. Class XE students also experienced this reality at SMA N 1 Kaliwungu, Kendal Regency. Initial research was conducted, and a score of 4 was obtained. The score is based on the last test in history subjects held on March 3, 2012. Apart from that, based on the 2011/2012 even mid-semester score, the class average is still below the standard, namely 6.50.

Based on these facts, it can be concluded that students' understanding and deepening of history subjects is still low. The low level of understanding and deepening is caused by two factors, namely, teacher and student factors. In this case, it is a lesson history, or it could be said that teachers only have limited teaching materials. Other failures are also caused by the use of monotonous learning methods or models; for example, the teacher only uses the lecture method so that it does not involve students' activeness in learning because they are only passive, that is, they only listen to the teacher's explanation, so they quickly get bored and even talk to their friends alone (Saiman, 2009). Learning using the talking stick model allows students to work independently and optimize student participation with a learning model that allows students to advance to answer questions provided by the teacher. Talking stick learning allows each student to be recognized and show their participation to others. So that students are more active in learning, this learning model needs to be applied in the world of education so that it can be conducive to the process of maturation and development for students.

Method

Classroom action research is research conducted by teachers in the classroom or at the school where they teach, emphasizing perfecting or improving learning processes and practices (Ghony, 2009). This research is a problem-solving activity with four main components: 1).

planning; 2). Action; 3). Observation (observation) and 4). Reflection. The relationship between these four components shows repeated continuous activities (cycles). The research design that researchers will use is the Kemmis and McTaggart model. The research was carried out at SMA N 1 Kaliwungu, which is located at Jalan Pangeran Djuminah, Kaliwungu, Kendal Regency, which has nineteen classrooms at level X are divided into seven classes, namely XA, XB, XC, XD, XE, XF and XG. Of the seven classes, student learning outcomes are relatively lacking in class .0, and four students got a score of 4.0.

Results and Discussion

The description of the discussion in this research is based on the results of observations during the research process in Cycle I and Cycle II. In cycles I and II, the teacher uses the talking stick learning model, namely, learning using a stick as a medium to explain the material. Since the teacher entered the class, students have joyfully welcomed the learning process. It is hoped that talking stick learning can improve students' history learning outcomes.

In cycle I, students still felt unfamiliar with the talking stick learning model. This is because the talking stick learning model requires teachers to act as facilitators and motivators who emphasize learning on student activities to be more active in learning activities so that students will more easily understand the material. Meanwhile, in the learning that the teacher usually carries out, the teacher is the main character; the teacher often uses a lecture model in the learning that is carried out so that students feel bored and less enthusiastic about the material taught by the teacher. So, teaching and learning practices using the talking stick learning model have not run optimally.

Based on the observations in cycle I, the teacher carried out the learning process according to the plan, namely an opening filled with presence and apperception, and continued with the core activities, namely explaining the material and learning, ending with an evaluation test. However, the teacher's lack of attention reaches all students, resulting in students becoming less active in learning; some students are still busy alone. Teachers are good at providing opportunities for students to ask and answer questions from the teacher. However, many students still do not dare to ask or answer questions because they still feel embarrassed, awkward, and afraid. Apart from that, teachers can also not create a familiar atmosphere with students in learning.

Cycle II was carried out based on the reflection results of cycle I, where there were still shortcomings and mistakes in cycle I. The primary material in Cycle II is Ancient European

Civilization. In this second cycle of learning, changes occurred as expected. In the second cycle of action, it was seen that there was a change in the learning atmosphere, namely that learning activities were going well according to the plan, the atmosphere and situation in the class were more lively than in the first cycle, student activity was also visible in participating in learning activities in class. Changes can also be seen in students who have become active and no longer feel awkward in asking and answering questions or expressing opinions. The collaboration has also gone well in cycle II, making students look more prepared and unified. In cycle II, the teacher's mastery of the class was perfect, so students' attention to the material being explained increased; no students were busy alone, and all students looked concentrated and serious in learning. The teacher can explain the use of the talking stick learning model to students well and clearly; the motivation to ask and answer questions and express opinions is excellent and appropriate. Teachers are also good at giving appreciation to students by using the words sound, correct, and very precise, and teachers even give thumbs up to students who try to ask and answer questions or express their opinions.

Conclusion

Based on the research results, it can be concluded that learning history using the talking stick learning model can improve the learning outcomes of class XE students at SMA Negeri 1 Kaliwungu Kendal Regency in the 2011/2012 academic year. The increase and completion of student learning outcomes proves this. In cycle I, the average test result was 64.59, with a classical completeness of 42.50%. From the data, the student learning test results in cycle I did not meet the indicators. This is shown by the average score of 64.50 with completeness of 42.50%, with the lowest score of 50 obtained by two students and the highest score of 75 obtained by eight students. In cycle II, the average test result score increased to 73.62, with a classical completeness of 80%. Data from the second cycle of student learning tests shows that the class average score reached 73.62 with a classical completeness of 80%. The average score of students has increased from the previous cycle, which obtained an average score of 64.50 with classical completeness of 42.50% from the results of the second cycle learning mastery test, so it can be said that teaching and learning activities use the talking stick learning model in this second cycle. Has met the indicators desired by teachers and researchers. Apart from learning outcomes, student activity and responses to the talking stick learning model that has been implemented have also increased.

References

- Abdullah, S. H., & Hassan, A. (2007). Empati sejarah dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran Sejarah. *The Asia Pacific Journal of Educators and Education (formerly Journal of Educators and Education)*, 22(1), 1-14.
- Abdullah, T. (2007). *Sejarah Pemikiran, Rekonstruksi, Persepsi, Media Komunikasi Profesi Masyarakat Sejarawan Indonesia*. Jakarta. ISBN
- Anni, Catharina Tri. (2004). *Psikologi Belajar*. Semarang: UPT MKK UNNES.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2002). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Azizah, U. (2008). *Efektivitas Metode Quantum Learning dengan Menggunakan Teknik Peta Pikiran terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia).
- Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (1990). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta. Balai Pustaka
- Dimiyati dan Mudjiono, (1999). *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Rineka Cipta. Jakarta
- Ghony, M. D. (2008). Penelitian tindakan kelas.
- Hamalik, Oemar. (2006). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung. Bumi Aksara
- Makdalina, P. (2003). Perbedaan efektifitas metode diskusi dan metode ceramah dalam pembelajaran sejarah di MAN 3 Malang oleh Peptina Makdalina.
- Maunah, B. (2009). Ilmu pendidikan.
- Mulyasa, E. (2010). Penelitian tindakan kelas. *Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya*.
- Nasution, S. (2008). *Asas-asas Kurikulum*. Jakarta. Bumi Aksara
- Nurbani, Y. (2004). Efektivitasmetode ceramah dengan metode diskusi kelompok sebagai metode pembelajaran sejarah: suatu eksperimen di kelas II SLTP Negeri12 Balikpapan tahun ajaran 2002/2003 oleh Yulita Nurbani.
- Soewarso, H. (2000). *Cara Peyampaian Pendidikan Sejarah Untuk Membangkitkan Minat Peserta Didik Mempelajari Sejarah Bangsaanya*. Jakarta. DEPDIKNAS
- Sudiapermana, E. (2009). Pendidikan informal. *Jurnal Pendidikan Luar Sekolah*, 4(2).

- Sudjana, Nana. (2001). *Penelitian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Bandung. Remaja Rosdakarya
- Suhardjo, (2003). *Berbagai Cara Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
- Suyitno, H. (2006). *Hubungan Antara Logika Proposisi Dengan Logika Predikat (Suatu Kajian Epistemologis)*. Semarang. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro
- Tim Penyusun Kamus Pusat Bahasa. (1995). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta. Balai Pustaka
- Tim Penyusun Kamus Pusat Bahasa. (2000). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta. Balai Pustaka
- Trianto. (2007). *Model-Model Pembelajaran Inovatif Berorientasi Konstruktivistik (Konsep, Landasan Teoritis-Praktis dan Implementasinya)*. Jakarta : Prestasi Pustaka.
- Universitas Negeri Semarang. (2008). *Panduan Penulisan Karya Ilmiah*. UNNES
- Widja, I Gde. (1989). *Dasar-Dasar Pengembangan Strategi Serta Metode Pengajaran Sejarah*. Jakarta. DEPDIKBUD