

THE EFFECT OF COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODELS OF STUDENT FACILITATOR AND EXPLAINING IN BILINGUAL LEARNING UPON THE THEMATIC LEARNING ACHIEVEMENT OF CLASS V

Diserahkan:
5 Desember 2021

Diterima:
7 Desember 2021

Dipublikasikan:
31 Juli 2022

Maria Desidaria Noge*¹, Yohanes Mite Oli², Maria Patrisia Wau³

ennynoge@gmail.com¹, miteoliyohanes@gmail.com²,
mariapatrisiawau@gmail.com³

PGSD, Citra Bakti College of Teacher Training and
Education^{1,2,3}

*Corresponding Author

Abstract: This research aimed to find out the effect of cooperative learning models of Student Facilitator and Explaining in Bilingual learning on the thematic learning achievement of class V in the cluster VI of Boawae district Nagekeo Regency. This research was experimental research using the research design of quasi-experiments, with the research draft "Posttest Only Control Group Design". The subjects in this study were students of class V in cluster VI, namely SDI Padhapa students as the experimental group with a total of 28 students, and SDK Raja students as a control group totaling 25 students. Test result data were analyzed by statistics descriptive quantitative. From the results of the analysis obtained t-test value of 4.038 is greater than 2.021, with its significance value being 0.000 smaller than 0.05, then the decision was H_0 refused and H_1 accepted. Based on the post-test results the experimental group gained an average of 72.35 while the control group gained an average of 60.64. The hypothesis test results showed that there was a significant influence in the implementation of a cooperative learning model for Student Facilitator And Explaining in Bilingual learning of the thematic learning achievement of the V-class students in Boawae district. Nagekeo Regency.

Keywords: Cooperative Learning Model, Student Facilitator And Explaining Model, bilingual, learning achievement.

PRELIMINARY

Along with changes in the government structure of the Republic of Indonesia, especially the ministry of education, the education curriculum has also changed. To realize the process of developing the potential quality of students. The curriculum is one

element that contributes. Literally, the curriculum is defined as the distance a person to take an education. According to Law no. 20 of 2003 (in Sanjaya, 2011: 8) curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements regarding the content and learning materials and the methods used as guidelines for the implementation of teaching and learning activities. On the other hand, Yamin (in Noge, 20-20) explained that the curriculum determines the direction and progress of educational output and provides the desired quality of education.

The current curriculum in Indonesia is the 2013 curriculum. The 2013 curriculum is a curriculum developed from previous curricula that responds to various internal and external challenges (Rusman, 2015: 85). According to Lawe YU, et al (2021), *in the 2013 curriculum framework, it is stated that in compiling and developing learning activities must pay attention to the principles of preparation and development by the conditions in the education unit both the initial abilities of students, interests, motivation to learn, talents, potential, social skills, emotions, learning styles, special needs, learning speed, cultural background, norms, values, and/or the environment of students.* The challenges referred to the deterioration of attitude and character of Indonesian nation. Therefore, the 2013 curriculum is a curriculum that is expected to be able to revive the character of Indonesian nation. In the process, the 2013 curriculum emphasizes the assessment of attitudes or character.

To support the curriculum mentioned above, bilingual learning is considered important to be applied to children from an early age in education as a provision for the younger generation of Indonesia to compete in work both nationally and internationally. *Bilingual* learning is a learning process in which the teacher always inserts English vocabulary, especially in the keywords of a concept. The teacher presents the material using two languages at once, that is Indonesian and English, so students will easily master English vocabulary. *Bilingual* learning aims to enable students to master two languages, which are Indonesian and English as a provision to face the challenges of rapidly changing times.

Based on the initial observations made, students in Cluster VI, Boawae District, thematic learning outcomes are still low. This is due to the lack of supporting books and teachers still use the old teaching pattern, namely the direct model. In addition, Bilingualism in thematic learning has been used or applied but not yet intensely or

maximally. Therefore, teachers should be more creative in using interesting learning models, and insert English vocabulary into the learning process in class so that the knowledge gained will last a long time and be stored in long-term memory.

Therefore, the solution taken is to use one of the learning models, namely *Student Facilitator And Explaining in Bilingual* learning. According to Arifin (2012), learning emphasizes the learning activities of students seriously involving intellectual, emotional, and social aspects. Therefore, the use of learning models is very important to be implemented in the learning process. According to Shoimin (2016), the learning model of *Student Facilitator And Explaining* is a cooperative learning model that emphasizes a special structure designed to influence student interaction patterns and has the aim of increasing mastery of the material. Through the type of cooperative learning model *Student Facilitator And Explaining*, students are invited to be able to explain to other students, students can issue ideas that are in their minds so that they can better understand mathematical material according to their opinions (Wiradnyana, 2014). It is hoped that the *Bilingual based Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model* can change the old educational concept and have a significant influence through its application in classroom learning activities. With the *Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model*, it can open up as many opportunities as possible for students to be able to learn actively and master English vocabulary.

Bilingual learning is learning that is applied using two languages, in this case, Indonesian and English. English needs to be learned because English is an international language and the language of the world, meaning that English is an international communication tool. So it is hoped that bilingual learning can produce competent and competitive human beings at national and international levels. However, it should also be realized that the mastery of foreign languages for some Indonesian people is still very low, including the low ability to communicate in English both orally and in writing (Noge, 2001).

From the background described above, in this study, the researchers took the title "The Influence of *Student Facilitator And Explaining Learning Models in Bilingual Learning* on Thematic Learning Outcomes in Class V Students, Cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency". The purpose of this study was to determine the difference in thematic learning outcomes for students who learned to use the *Student Facilitator*

And Explaining learning model in Bilingual learning with students who learned to use the *Direct Learning Model* for students in Class V, Cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency, in the 2019/2020 academic year.

METHOD

This type of research is an experiment conducted systematically to determine the effect of application of a model or learning method on the learning outcomes of one subject or several subjects in a particular theme. The design of this study used a quasi-experimental because not all variables were strictly controlled. The research design taken by the researcher is " *Posttest Only Control Group Design* ".

The experimental class was given a different treatment from the control class. The experimental class was given treatment in the form of a *Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model*, while the control class was given treatment in the form of a direct learning model. After the two classes were given different treatments, the next stage was to give posttests to the two classes to measure the extent to which the students had mastered the material. The research design "*Posttest Only Control Group Design*" can be described in the following table.

Table 1.1 Research Design "Posttest Only Control Group Design"

Class	Treatment	Posttest
E	X ₁	Oh ₁
K	X ₂	Oh ₂

This research was conducted in the even semester, in July 2019. This research was carried out in Cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency. The procedure in this study was carried out following the existing problems. This research activity was carried out in several steps, namely as follows. 1) determine the research destination schools, 2) determine the experimental group and control group, 3) design lesson plans according to the syllabus, 4) provide treatment *with the Student Facilitator and Explaining learning model in bilingual learning* in the experimental group and direct or direct learning models directly to the control group, 5) giving posttest to both groups, 6) data analysis.

The population in this study were all fifth grade students in Cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency, with details namely SDI Padhapae, SDK Raja, SDK Dorameli, SDSK Bokogo. While the research samples were the fifth grade students of SDI Padhapae with a total of 28 students and the fifth grade students of SDK Raja with a total of 25 students. Research results or research data include student learning outcomes in thematic learning collected through objective or multiple-choice tests. This test will be given at the end of the 6th lesson. This test consists of 22 objective questions that will test the extent of student mastery of the learning material. The scoring in this objective test is that if the answer is correct, it is given a value of 1, if the answer is incorrect, it is given a value of 0. The composing of this test is adjusted to the Competency Standards (SK), Basic Competencies (KD), and indicators that have been described in the learning syllabus.

After calculating the validity of instrument's item validity on the results of thematic learning outcomes for students of grade VI SDK Raja, totaling 20 students, it showed that of the 22 questions in the test objective form that were tested there were 20 questions that were used (valid) and 2 questions were discarded (fall).

Based on the trial results on grade VI students of SDK Raja and after testing the validity of the test items, it is known that the reliability obtained by using KR – 20 are classified as very high (KR = 0.92) so the test questions are feasible to be given to the experimental group and the control group of students class V SDI Padhapae and SDK Raja. Based on the calculation using the formula for the level of difficulty, the value (p) = 0.81 with the criteria for the level of difficulty (p) is easy. The results of the trial of thematic learning outcomes for the sixth grade students of SDK Raja, totaling 20 respondents and 20 objective test items, obtained a test of different power of test items (dp) = 0.21 with fairly good criteria.

After the data has been analyzed, the next step is to perform an analysis prerequisite test which consists of a normality test, a homogeneity test, and a hypothesis test. The normality test is held to test whether or not the distribution of the data to be analyzed is normal. The most important statistical tool in analyzing group state data is so that data can be analyzed and predicted. The criteria for testing the data have a normal distribution if the resulting significance number is greater than 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) and in other cases, the data is not normally distributed. To calculate the normality test, the

researcher used the SPSS 16.00 application *from windows* using the *Shapiro-Wilk statistic*.

RESULTS

Based on the results of student learning carried out in the experimental group, the post-test data was obtained with the highest score of 95 and the lowest score of 50. Next is to make a frequency distribution table for the posttest results of the experimental group.

The calculation results of Mean (M), Median (Md) and Mode (Mo) *post-test* thematic learning outcomes of experimental group students obtained $Mo = 76.16$, $Md = 73.5$, $M = 72.35$ so that the score becomes $Mo > Md > M$ Because the mode value is greater than the median and mean, it is concluded that most of the thematic learning outcomes in the experimental group tend to be high.

Based on student learning outcomes carried out in the control group, the post-test data was obtained with the highest score of 80 and the lowest score of 40. The calculation results of Mean (M), Median (Md) and Mode (Mo) *post-test* thematic learning outcomes of control group students obtained a score for $Mo = 57$ $Md = 60$ $M = 60.64$ so that the score becomes $Mo < Md < M$. In conclusion, is that some of the *post-test scores* of control group students' learning outcomes tend to be low, this can be described in a positive squint curve. In the conversion table, it can be seen that the highest score obtained at most is 52% with a good/high classification. The result of the post-test mean of the control group was 60.64. When viewed from the range of scores on a scale of five above, they are classified as good/high. This means that the thematic learning outcomes achieved by the control group are good.

After analyzing data from post-test results of the experimental group and the control group, the next step is to test for normality, test homogeneity, and test hypotheses. The normality test was conducted to determine whether or not the distribution of the data analyzed in the study was normal with the assessment criteria H_0 being accepted if the significance value (2 tailed) was $> 5\%$ ($\alpha = 0.05$). The normality test results with the SPSS 16.00 program *from windows* showed that the significant value of thematic learning outcomes was > 0.05 . The experimental group = 0.460 while the control group = 0.262, so the data obtained in this study were normally distributed.

In testing the homogeneity of variance, the researcher used SPSS 16 from windows application. If the calculated F_{value} is $>$ from F_{table} , this means that H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted, so the variance is not homogeneous and vice versa. The results of the homogeneity of variance test can be seen in table 4.7 below.

Table 4.8 Description of Homogeneity Test Results of Thematic Learning Outcomes

Test of Homogeneity of Variances
 THEMATIC LEARNING RESULTS

Levene Statistics	df1	df2	Sig.
.003	1	51	.953

Based on the homogeneity test results through SPSS 16 from windows, it shows that the *Levene Statistic* of 0.003 with a significant number of 0.953 is greater than a significant figure of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$). Thus, it can be concluded that the thematic learning outcomes of the two groups are homogeneous.

Hypothesis testing is used to test the hypotheses that have been put forward in the study, that is there are significant differences between students who take part in learning with a bilingual-based *Student Facilitator and Explaining model* and students who take part in direct learning. To test the hypothesis, the researcher used SPSS 16.00 from windows. Statistical hypothesis testing is as follows.

Table 4.9 Hypothesis Test Results Data
 Independent Samples Test

LEARNING OUTCOMES		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
S	Equal variances assumed	.003	.953	4.038	51	.000	12.057	2.986	6.063	18.052
	Equal variances not assumed			4.053	50.867	.000	12.057	2.975	6.085	18.030

$$H_0 = \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_1 = \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

If $t_{count} > t_{table}$ then H_0 is rejected and H_1 is accepted. Based on the hypothesis testing results using the SPSS 16 from Windows application, in Equal variances assumed column, the t-test value of $4.038 > 2.021$ (with $db\ n_1 + n_2 - 2$ ($28 + 25 - 2 = 51$, level sig. 5%), with a significance value of $0.000 < 0.05$, then the decision is H_0 rejected and H_1 is accepted. With the average thematic learning outcomes in statistical group, the experimental group is greater than the control group ($72.60 > 60.80$) with a mean difference of average value or mean difference is 12.05. Thus, there is a significant difference in learning outcomes between students who take part in learning using the Student Facilitator and Explaining type of cooperative learning model and students who take part in learning using the direct learning model.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that the application of the Cooperative learning model type Student Facilitator And Explaining in Bilingual learning affects the thematic learning outcomes of class V cluster VI students, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency for the 2019/2020 Academic Year.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to determine the difference in thematic learning outcomes between students who learn to use the Student Facilitator And Explaining type of cooperative learning model in Bilingual learning and students who take part in learning using the direct learning model in class V cluster VI students, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency. This type of research is classified as quantitative research with a quasi-experimental design (Quasi Experimental Design), because not all variables are strictly controlled. The design of this study used an experimental design "Posttest Only Control Group Design". Obtained one class as the control group totaling 25 students and one class as the experimental group totaling 28 students. The control group carried out learning using the Direct learning model. While the experimental group carried out learning by using a cooperative learning model type Student Facilitator And Explaining in Bilingual learning. The data collected in this study are thematic learning outcomes data for fifth grade students. In thematic learning, in both the experimental class and the control class, the researchers applied bilingualism in learning process. And this bilingual got a positive response from students, both the experimental group and the control group. Students are so enthusiastic about learning English vocabulary. Although

there are still many ways to pronounce vocabulary that are not appropriate, it is necessary to give appreciation to the enthusiasm of these students in learning English vocabulary.

This can be proven by the results of data analysis and t-test conducted. From the t-test calculation showed that there is a significant difference between students who learn to use the cooperative learning model type Student Facilitator And Explaining in bilingual learning and students who learn to use the direct learning model. This can be seen from t-test analysis test, that is $t_{count} = 4.038 > \text{from } t_{table} 2,021$ ($4,038 > 2,021$). When viewed from the average score of learning outcomes, the experimental group obtained an average score of learning outcomes that was higher than the average score of control group's learning outcomes ($72.35 > 60.64$).

This study is in line with the research results conducted by Muslimah, et al (2021) entitled The Effect of the Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFAE) Learning Model to Improve Students' Mathematical Concept Understanding and Self-Confidence Ability. The results showed that data analysis technique used was the Manova test with a significance level of 0.05 and the conclusions were (1) there was an effect of the Student Facilitator and Explaining learning model on the ability to understand mathematical concepts, (2) there was an effect of the Student Facilitator and Explaining learning model on self-confidence of students, and (3) there is an effect of the Student Facilitator and Explaining learning model on the ability to understand mathematical concepts and students' self-confidence.

Based on the results of data analysis and relevant research studies, it is proved that there are differences in thematic learning outcomes between students who are taught using the Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model and students who are taught using the direct learning model. Because of these differences, it is concluded that the use of Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model is very effective for thematic learning outcomes on the theme of human and animal movement organs in class V Cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency, 2019/2020 Academic Year.

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of data analysis, it was found that there were differences in thematic learning outcomes of students who learned to use the Student Facilitator and

Explaining learning model in Bilingual learning and students who learned to use the direct learning model. So, it can be concluded that the Student Facilitator And Explaining learning model in Bilingual learning affects the thematic learning outcomes of the fifth grade students of cluster VI, Boawae District, Nagekeo Regency. Based on the research results, discussion, and conclusions above, the suggestions put forward as a result of this research is a type of cooperative learning model Student Facilitator and Explaining can be the basis for students to always improve their thinking skills and solve thematic learning problems related to daily life.

REFERENCES

- Arifin, Z. (2012). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.
- Chairunnisa Zahra, Santi Widyawati, Eka Fitria Ningsih. 2017. Eksperimentasi model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFE) berbantuan alat peraga kotak imajinasi ditinjau dari kecerdasan spasial. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Matematika*. Vol. 2 No. 2. hal. 97 – 104
- Hamalik, Oemar. 2015. *Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara
- Hernawan, dkk. 2008. *Model Pembelajaran Terpadu di SD*. Jakarta : Universitas Terbuka.
- Huda, Miftaful. 2014. *Cooperative Learning*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Igo, Valentina. 2015. *Upaya Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar IPA dengan Menerapkan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw pada Siswa Kelas IV SDI Turekisa*. Skripsi. Tidak Diterbitkan
- Ihsan, Fuad. 2011. *Dasar-Dasar Kependidikan*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Jauhar, Muhammad. 2016. *Implementasi Paikem dari Behavioristik sampai Konstruktivistik*. Jakarta : Prestasi Pustaka Karya.
- Lawe, Y.U, Noge, M.D, Rato, K.P.D, Novaliendry, D. 2021. Creation of multilingual teaching materials focused on content and background of ngada culture for primary 1st grade. *Turkish Journal of Computer and Mathematics Education*. Vol. 12 No. 2 pp 3110-3118 available at <https://turcomat.org/index.php/turkbilmat/article/view/2355>
- Majid, Abdul. 2015. *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya
- Muslimah, N., Putra, R.Y.W.

- Noge, M.D. 2019. Penerapan model pembelajaran bilingual preview-review berbasis e-flashcard untuk meningkatkan aktivitas dan prestasi belajar bahasa inggris siswa SMP. *Journal Of Education Technology*. Vol. 2 No. (1) pp 13-19.
- Noge, M., Teguh, Y., & Kaka, P. (2020). Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Inside-Outside Circle dalam Pembelajaran Bilingual Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 6(3), 451-459. doi:<https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v6i3.2640>
- Purwanto. 2013. *Evaluasi Hasil Belajar*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Rusman. 2015. *Pembelajaran tematik terpadu*. Jakarta : PT. Raja Grafindo Persada
- Sada, Maria Goreti. 2018. *Pengaruh Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Jigsaw Berbasis Bilingual terhadap Hasil Belajar IPA pada Siswa Kelas IV SDK Rowa Kecamatan Boawae Kabupaten Nagekeo*. Skripsi. Malanusa : Tidak Diterbitkan
- Sanjaya. 2011. *Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran Terpadu*. Jakarta : PT. Raja Grafindo Persada
- Shoimin, Aris. 2016. *68 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Arr-Ruzz Media.
- Sugiarto, Riris. (2018). Pola-pola pemilihan dan penggunaan bahasa dalam keluarga bilingual. *Jurnal Kependidikan: Jurnal Hasil Penelitian dan Kajian Kepustakaan di Bidang Pendidikan, Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*, 4(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.33394/jk.v4i1.905>
- Wiradnyana, I Gd Ananta. et. al. 2014. Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining terhadap Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematika Siswa Kelas V. *Jurnal Mimbar PGSD Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha* vol.2 no.1. hal 1- 12.