NOVATEUR PUBLICATIONS
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIONS IN ENGINEERING RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY
[IJIERT] ISSN: 2394-3696 Website: ijiert.org
VOLUME 8, ISSUE 8, Aug. -2021

INCREASING ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION LEARNING OUTCOMES WITH THE STUDENT TEAMS ACHIEVEMENT DIVISION MODEL

Suyono Dude
Gorontalo State University
suyonodude@ung.ac.id

ABSTRACT

From the research that has been done that the application of the STAD type cooperative learning model can improve PAI learning outcomes in students. The average value in the first cycle was 68.82 and increased by 14.75% with an average value of 7 9.00 in the second cycle. In addition, the number of students who have finished studying has increased to 16 students or 94.11%. The application of the STAD type of cooperative learning model in PAI learning can increase student group activities. This can be seen in the achievement of the average value in each cycle. The activity of the student group increased from cycle I with an average value of 2.38 in the poor category to 3.5 in the good category in the second cycle.

Keywords: cooperative learning , learning outcomes.

INTRODUCTION

To support the learning process, the use of approaches, models, strategies, learning methods plays an important role because it can lead to multi-directional interactions between students and teachers and between students and students in the classroom. Thus, it is necessary to pay attention to the accuracy of the teaching model chosen by the teacher according to the purpose, type and nature of the subject matter as well as the teacher's ability to understand and implement the model. The use of approaches, strategies, methods and learning models that are in accordance with the characteristics of the learning materials is one way to improve and enhance student learning activities, including the subject of Islamic Religious Education.

Given that each material has a different level of difficulty, in the learning process there is material that is easy to understand and there is also material that is difficult for students to understand. This requires every teacher to understand that not all students can learn what they want. Generally, the learning process in the classroom still focuses on the teacher which is applied by the lecture method.

One of the efforts that can be done is through improving learning by applying the STAD type cooperative learning model . In this type of cooperative learning , students are required to actively cooperate in groups to discuss and understand the subject matter given by the teacher.

In learning using the STAD type cooperative learning model , it is expected that teachers and students will be more active and cooperative in participating in learning activities so that the implementation of learning does not seem monotonous. Therefore, educators are required to be able to use various learning models so that students can carry out learning activities well . Students must be prepared from the start to be able to socialize with their environment so that various types of learning models can be used by educators.

LITERATURE REVIEW

STAD Type Cooperative Learning Model

" The STAD type was developed by Robert Slavin and his colleagues from Johns Hopkins University". The STAD type cooperative learning method is the most studied variation of cooperative learning. This model is also very easy to adapt and can be used at the elementary school to college level. This type is used to teach students new academic information every week, either through verbal or written presentations. The students in the class are divided into several groups, each consisting of 4 or 5 group members. Each group has

heterogeneous members, both gender, race, ethnicity, and ability. Each group member uses an academic worksheet, then helps each other to master the teaching materials through question and answer or discussion among group members. Individually or in groups, every week or two weeks an evaluation is carried out by the teacher to determine their mastery of the academic material that has been studied. Each student and each group is given a score for their mastery of teaching materials and to students individually or in groups who achieve high results or get perfect scores are given awards.

In line with this opinion, Gusarmin stated that the STAD approach is the simplest cooperative learning. The STAD approach also refers to student group study, presenting students with new academic information each week, using verbal or text presentations.

Rusman revealed that there are six steps of STAD type cooperative learning:

a. Delivery of goals and motivation
b. Group division
c. Presentation from teacher
d. Learning activities in team's / group work
e. Quiz (evaluation)
f. Team achievement award

The steps of the STAD type cooperative learning model are described as follows:

a) Delivery of Goals and Motivation

Delivering the learning objectives to be achieved in the learning and motivating students to learn.

b) Group Division

Students are divided into several groups, where each group consists of 4-5 students. Determining group members is attempted so that the ability of students in groups is heterogeneous and the ability between one group and another is relatively homogeneous. Where possible cooperative groups need to pay attention to race, religion, gender, and social background.

c) Presentation from Teacher

The teacher conveys the subject matter first, explains the learning objectives to be achieved at the meeting, and the importance of the subject being studied.

d) Learning Activities in Teams / Group work

psychodynamic theory, "The group is not just a collection of individuals but is a unit that has its own emotional dynamics." In this case students learn in groups that have been formed. The teacher prepares worksheets as guidelines for group work, so that each member masters and each contributes. During the team work, the teacher makes observations, provides guidance, encouragement and assistance when needed. This teamwork is the most important characteristic of the STAD type cooperative learning model.

e) Quiz (Evaluation)

The teacher evaluates learning outcomes by giving quizzes about the material being studied and also evaluating the presentations of each group. Students are assigned seats individually and collaboration is not allowed. This is done to ensure that students are individually responsible for themselves in understanding the teaching materials.

f) Team Achievement Award

After the quiz, the teacher checks the students' work. Furthermore, giving awards for the success of the group.

LEARNING OUTCOMES OF ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

Learning outcomes are a very important problem in the teaching and learning process. This is because the size of the good or bad of a learning process is largely determined by the achievement of student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are the results achieved by students after participating in the learning process through

learning outcomes tests or evaluations that have been determined by the teacher.

Muhibbin Syah said that in general, the factors that influence student learning outcomes are divided into three types, namely:

a. Internal factors (factors from within students, namely the physical and spiritual state/condition of students.
b. External factors (factors from outside of students), namely environmental conditions around students.
c. The learning approach factor (approach to learning), namely the type of student learning effort which includes the strategies and methods used by students to carry out activities to study learning materials.

The explanation above shows that the factors that hinder the quality of learning do not only come from internal students but also external factors caused by the external environment or the teacher itself. The picture that is wrong One concrete effort to encourage the achievement of maximum learning outcomes is also to foster and develop a good spirit of learning, in addition to improving the education and skills of students so that they are able to develop good learning activities.

Basically every subject or certain scientific field, is limited by its scope knowledge when viewed in terms of the content of the material. In terms of their nature, subjects can be divided into subjects that have conceptual and actual material properties and are abstract. Conceptual means a subject that contains a lot of concepts such as economics, sociology and others. While actual means containing applicable materials that must be practiced, such as fiqhi worship, sports and others. While abstract is material that is difficult to explain physically, such as faith material and so on.

PAI subjects are part of the subjects mandated in the National Education System Education Law, which discusses faith, worship and morals as well as Islamic history. Some of these aspects are taught in stages, especially at high school levels, as a minimum standard for graduates, students who have graduated from high school must be able to understand and implement Islamic teachings, and be able to follow morals in social life. Therefore, as a PAI subject, it is sometimes difficult to fully understand the teaching materials, so teachers must show a more maximal role in learning.

In line with that, basically student learning outcomes in PAI subjects at the cognitive level or knowledge can be measured and observed in the learning process through learning outcomes tests conducted by teachers after the learning process ends.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is included in the type of Classroom Action Research, which is abbreviated as CAR.

The steps in CAR are a cycle or cycle consisting of planning , action , observation , and reflection . In detail, the procedure for classroom action research in each cycle is as follows:

1.Cycle I

a. Planning

As for what is done in this stage are as follows:

1) Create a learning scenario in the form of a learning implementation plan (RPP) with cooperative learning of the STAD type .

2) Making/providing media/tools in the form of observation sheets on the activity and active participation of students in learning activities.

3) Design learning evaluation tools in the form of process and learning outcomes (product) assessments to determine the results achieved by students after participating in learning activities.

b. Action implementation

The activities carried out at this stage are implementing learning scenarios with the cooperative learning model t y pe STAD which has been designed in the form of lesson plans .

c. Observation

Observations were made by observing teachers using observation sheets in the form of student activities and teacher activities during learning activities. Observations on learning outcomes are carried out at the end of learning for each cycle. The tool used is a test instrument that has been validated. This is done to determine the extent to which students understand the material that has been studied.

d. Reflection

Reflection is contemplating or thinking about something or the efforts made related to the classroom action research carried out. Based on this reflection, an action improvement (replanning) is then determined.

The design and steps in this classroom action research use Kurt Lewin's model. This is because:

Kurt Lewin was the first to introduce Action Research or action research. The main concept of action research Kurt Lewin's model consists of four components, namely planning , action , observation and evaluation, and reflection .

2. Cycle II

Cycle II is carried out if the minimum performance indicators in cycle I have not been achieved with the appropriate procedures in cycle I.

RESULTS

1.Cycle 1

a. Observation of student activity in cycle I

The implementation of learning that is intended to be carried out in Islamic Religious Education learning is a type -cooperative model STAD. To find out student activities in learning, the researchers used guidelines for observing student activities during learning through a type cooperative model STAD. The activity in question is student activity when carrying out group dynamics. In this case the researcher divided 17 students into 4 groups. Each group consists of 4 students, except for group IV which consists of 5 students. The results of observations of student group activities during PAI learning through a type cooperative model STAD are as follows:

Table 1. Student Activity Values in Cycle I (Meetings I and II)

No	Student activity unit	Group name				Rt	Note:
		I	II	III	IV		
1	Activeness in the discussion process	2	2	3	3	2.5	Not good
2	Student activity in completing assignments	3	2	3	2	2.5	Not good
3	Participation of each group member	2	3	2	2	2.25	Not good
4	Ability to answer problems/questions	3	3	2	3	2.75	Pretty good
5	Awareness of understanding the tasks of each group member	2	2	3	2	2.25	Not good
6	Summarizing the results of the discussion	2	3	2	2	2.25	Not good
7	Expressing ideas resulting from group discussion understanding.	2	2	3	2	2.25	Not good
8	Reviewing the results of each group discussion	3	2	2	3	2.5	Not good
9	Concluding the results of the discussion which is the concept of understanding of each group.	2	2	2	3	2.25	Not good
	Average student activity	2,3 3	2,3 3	2.4 4	2.4 4	**2, 38**	
	Categories	Not so good	Not so good	Not so good	Not so good	Not so good	Not so good

Category evaluation criteria

0.00 - 1.69 : Not good
1.70 - 2.59 : Not good
2.60 - 3.49 : Pretty good
3.50 - 4.00 : Good

From table 1 above, it illustrates that the activity of children in the group shows the average activity in the poor category, because the average percentage is 2.38. The value is in the interval 1.70 – 2.89 which is in the poor category. . In more detail, group I had an average of 2,3 3 , group II had an average of 2,3 3 , group III had an average of 2.4 4 , while group IV had an average activity of 2.4 4 .

These results show that children's activities are still not maximized by learning to use the STAD type cooperative model . This is because students are still accustomed to conventional learning models. The following are the weaknesses of student activities in cycle I:

1.Lack of participation of each member
2.Lack of awareness to understand each other's duties
3.Have not been able to express ideas from understanding group discussions
4.Haven't been able to summarize the results of the discussion well
5.The lack of activeness of all group members in discussing and completing assignments, and has not been able to review the results of member collaboration discussions.

In general, the activity of children in the group is still not good because of the 4 groups, overall they only have an average value of activity between 2,3 3 – 2.4 4 . The results in the first cycle will, of course, be reviewed for their shortcomings and weaknesses to be improved in the next cycle.

2. Cycle II

Based on the learning outcomes in the first cycle, improvements were made to aspects that were still weak and not running optimally. To implement the learning scenarios that have been prepared, in the form of teaching materials, lesson plans, student worksheets and learning evaluations. To analyze the implementation of learning, the researchers made observations (observations) on students and learning conditions.

a. Observation of student activities in cycle II

The implementation of learning that is intended to be carried out in Islamic Religious Education learning is a cooperative model of the STAD type. To find out student activities in learning, the researchers used guidelines for observing student activities during learning through the STAD type cooperative model. The activity in question is student activity when carrying out group dynamics. In this case the researcher again divided 17 students into 4 groups. Each group consists of 4 students, except for group I which consists of 5 students. The results of observations from student group activities during PAI learning through the STAD type cooperative model in cycle II are as follows:

Table 2. Student Activity Values in Cycle II (Meetings III and IV)

No	Student activity unit	Group name				Rt	Note:
		I	II	III	IV		
1	Activeness in the discussion process	3	3	3.5	3	3.125	Pretty good
2	Student activity in completing assignments	3	4	3	4	3.5	Well
3	Participation of each group member	3	3	3.5	3	3.125	Pretty good
4	Ability to answer problems/questions	3	3.5	3	4	3.375	Pretty good
5	Awareness of understanding the tasks of each group member	4	4	3	4	3.75	Well
6	Summarizing the results of the discussion	4	3	3.5	4	3.625	Well
7	Expressing ideas resulting from group discussion understanding.	4	4	3	4	3.75	Well
8	Reviewing the results of each group discussion	3	4	4	3	3.5	Well
9	Concluding the results of the discussion which is the concept of understanding of each group.	4	4	4	3	3.75	Well
	Amount					**31.5 (87.5%)**	
	Average student activity	**3.4**	**3.6**	**3.3**	**3.5**	**3.5**	
	Category	Not good	Not good	Not good	Not good	**Well**	**Well**

Category assessment criteria

0.00 – 1.69 : Not good
1.70 – 2.59 : Not good
2.60 – 3.49 : Pretty good
3.50 – 4.00 : OK

From table 2 above, it provides an illustration that the activity of children in the group shows the average activity in a good category, because the average value of the activity is 3.5. This value is included in the interval 3.50 – 4.00 which is in the good category. In more detail, group I had an average of 3.4, group II had an average of 3.6, group III had an average of 3.3 while group IV had an average of 3.5.

These results show that children's activities have increased from the previous cycle. Students begin to integrate with the way of learning that uses the STAD type cooperative model . This of course causes students to slowly show positive activities in line with the learning scenario which is directed at increasing student activity. Especially in the process of searching for ideas in the discussion, students are able to show an average activity value of 3.75 as well as during the process of drawing conclusions. But in general, the average student activity is 3.5. This value is included in the good category because it is in the interval value of 3.50 – 4.00. From the total score of student activity (31.5), when multiplied by 100% and divided by the maximum score (36), 87.5% of student activity scenarios have been implemented.

Comparison of observations in cycle I and cycle II of student group activities during PAI learning through a type . cooperative model STAD are as follows:

Table 3. The results of student activities in PAI subjects cycle I and II

No	Student activity unit	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	Activeness in the discussion process	2.5	3.125
2	Student activity in completing assignments	2.5	3.5
No	**Student activity unit**	**Cycle I**	**Cycle II**
3	Participation of each group member	2.25	3.125
4	Ability to answer problems/questions	2.75	3.375
5	Awareness of understanding the tasks of each group member	2.25	3.75
6	Summarizing the results of the discussion	2.25	3.625
7	Expressing ideas resulting from group discussion understanding.	2.25	3.75
8	Reviewing the results of each group discussion	2.5	3.5
9	Concluding the results of the discussion which is the concept of understanding of each group.	2.25	3.75
Average student activity		**2, 38**	**3.5**
Category		**Not good**	**Well**

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES IN PAI SUBJECTS

Based on the evaluation implementation in cycle I and cycle II, it was obtained an overview of student learning outcomes in PAI subjects in class XI 2 The Department of Clothing can be seen in the following table .

Table 4. Student Learning Outcomes of PAI Subjects

KLP	No	Student's name	Cycle I	Cycle II
I	1	S01	75	85
	2	S02	60	68
	3	S03	65	75
	4	S04	60	75
II	5	S05	80	90
	6	S06	75	85
	7	S07	75	80
	8	S08	65	70
III	9	S09	65	75
	10	S10	60	75
	11	S11	60	75
	12	S12	75	80
	13	S13	65	80
IV	14	S14	60	75
	15	S15	75	80
	16	S16	75	85
	17	S17	80	90
	Average		**6 8 , 82**	**79 ,00**
	Minimum value		**60**	**68**
	Maximum value		**80**	**90**
	Number of students who finished studying		**8 people**	**16 people**
	The percentage of students' completeness		**47, 05%**	**94, 11%**

In simple terms, it can be seen that there was a significant increase in student PAI learning outcomes from cycle I and cycle II. This can be seen carefully from the increase in the average value, minimum value and maximum value.

CONCLUSION

The application of the STAD type cooperative learning model can improve PAI learning outcomes. The average value in the first cycle was 68.82 and increased by 14.75% with an average value of 7 9.00 in the second cycle. In addition, the number of students who have finished studying has increased to 16 students or 94.11%.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) Abudinnata, Islamic Education, Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group, Cet. I, 2010
2) AM Sardiman, Teaching and Learning Interaction and Motivation, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2011, CCet. 20th
3) Arikunto, Suharsimi, Research Procedure, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, Cet. XIV, 2010
4) At Vesta and Thomspon, Learning Effectively (Jakarta: Swadaya h, 2000), p. 6
5) Ibrahim, Cooperative Learning (Surabaya: Unesa-University Press, 2000), p. 2.
6) Masitoh and Dewi, Laksmi, Learning Strategy , Jakarta: Directorate General of Islamic Education Ministry of Religion RI, Cet. I, 2009
7) Rusman, Cooperative Learning (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2003) , p. 206.
8) Rusman, Cooperative Learning (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 2003), p. 215.
9) Sudirman, Teaching and Learning Strategies (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1999), p. 22.
10) Sudjana , Assessment of Teaching and Learning Outcomes (Bandung: Tarsito, 2001), p. 56.
11) Syarifudin, Tatang, Foundations of Islamic Education, Jakarta: Directorate General
12) Islamic Religious Education, Ministry of Religion of the Republic of Indonesia, Cet. I, 2009
13) Trianto, Cooperative Learning (Jakarta: Ministry of National Education, 2001), p. 52.
14) Wina Sanjaya, Educational Process Standard Oriented Learning Strategy (Jakarta: Kencana, 2011), p. 241.
15) Zainal Aqib, Teacher professionalism in learning (Surabaya: Insan Cendekia, 2002)