

## The Effect of Using Talking Stick Learning Model on Student Learning Outcomes in Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair, Ciledug Tangerang

Saihu

Program Pascasarjana, Institut PTIQ Jakarta  
e-mail: madesaihu@ptiq.ac.id


Submitted: 02-12-2019

Revised: 20-04-2020

Accepted: 13-05-2020

**ABSTRACT.** This study aims to determine the effect of using a Talking Stick model on learning outcomes of Fiqh. The research method used was a quasi-experimental study with a non-equivalent control group design. The population in this study was all students at the Fourth Grade of Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug-Tangerang, Sampling was drawn by using a saturated sampling technique in which all populations were used as samples consist of the control class and the experimental class. The instrument of this was a multiple-choice test that has four options. Moreover, the data analysis technique utilized the t-test. The results of the study showed that the mean score of the posttest for the control class was 69.8. Meanwhile, the mean score of the posttest for the experimental class was 77.76 with the standard deviations were 8.55 and 10.02 respectively. Furthermore, the result of the t-test showed that t-count (3,021) > t-table (2,011). This means that the t-count is bigger than the t-table. In other words, we can conclude that there is a significant difference between students who have studied by using the Talking Stick model and students who used conventional techniques.

**Keywords:** *Talking Stick, Learning Outcomes, Fiqh.*

 <https://dx.doi.org/10.32678/tarbawi.v6i01.2325>

**How to Cite** Saihu, S. (2020). The Effect of Using Talking Stick Learning Model on Student Learning Outcomes in Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair, Ciledug Tangerang. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 6(01), 61-68. doi:10.32678/tarbawi.v6i01.2325

## INTRODUCTION

Education is a conscious effort based on developing human personality and abilities and is carried out inside and outside of school and lasts for life (Usiono, 2012) Education in essence takes place in a process. The process is in the form of transformation of the values of knowledge, technology and skills. The recipient of the process is students who are growing and developing towards the maturation of personality and mastery of knowledge. Education is also one of the main instruments of human resource development, educators in this case the teacher as one of the elements that play an important role in it, has the responsibility to develop tasks and overcome all problems that arise.

Unavoidably, the teacher is a crucial component in implementing the learning process in the classroom as a micro element of an educational success. The successful implementation of a learning strategy in the classroom depends on the expertise of the teacher in using the learning methods, techniques, and strategies (Susanto, 2018). Meanwhile, the school is a place or institution where children begin the process of learning and character building after family and playmates. The school also functions to provide, education, knowledge, experience and also

develop children's creativity to form young people who are creative, active and independent. This is in line with Ahmad's (2008) opinion who expresses that school is a body that is trusted by the community to carry out the education of young people.

Generally, in the process of education at schools, learning activities are the most basic activities. The success or failure of achieving educational goals depends on how the learning process experienced by students. In teacher learning activities as the center of education, it means that teachers are required to be able to transfer their knowledge to students through learning activities (Supriyanto, 2019). Some efforts in improving learning are in line with the times that require students to be broad-minded. Teaching in the context of standard education processes is not just about delivering learning material, but it is also interpreted as a process of regulating the environment so that students learn. In other sense, the process of teaching always corresponds to learning activities. This indicates that in the process of teaching and learning students must be made as the center of activities (Sanjaya, 2009).

But unfortunately, until now there are still many learning activities that are less varied, conventional or boring, and do not pay attention to the level of students' understanding of the information conveyed. Students are less active in the learning process; students listen more and write, causing the content of the lesson as memorization so that students do not understand the actual concept. So far education is still dominated by the view that knowledge as a set of facts must be memorized. Classes are still focused on the teacher as the main source of knowledge (Surani, 2018) Based on the description above, this study aims: first describe the results of pretest fiqh learning in the dick class and experimental class; Second, describe the results of posttest fiqh learning in the control class and experimental class; Third, analyze the effect of the talking stick learning model on learning outcomes.

Actually, the learning process is not only dominated by the teacher, which in turn causes students to be less developed in their thinking abilities. By changing the conventional learning model, which is only focused on the teacher and monotonous, to a dynamic learning model, more meaningful, which gives students the opportunity to generate critical thinking with better learning outcomes. "In the learning process, teachers are required to be active so that interactions and harmonious communication occur in order to achieve the expected learning goals" (Hamalik, 2001).

Practically, a teacher is strongly demanded to carry out their duties and responsibilities, not only limited to teaching, but also demanded to be able to find new alternatives in carrying out their learning tasks. Because a learning or education is a continuous process. The learning process is not limited to the delivery of material in the classroom, but more important is how to make the subject matter acceptable to students in the classroom and can be applied and practiced in daily life. "The learning process does not only stop at the process of intelligence and intellectual development that is based on aspects of cognition, but rather is the growth and development of children's talent comprehensively" (Djamarah, 2004).

Student learning outcomes are one of the benchmarks of success in the world of education. Learning outcomes can be interpreted as the results that obtained because of the activities which carried out. Learning outcomes are things that cannot be separated from learning activities, learning outcomes achieved by students have different levels and to achieve student learning outcomes as expected, then need to be considered appropriate learning models so that the expected learning objectives can be achieved.

Learning outcomes are one that you want to achieve in the learning process. Student learning outcomes in Islamic primary schools of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug are still relatively low, especially in the subject of Fiqh. This reflects on the results of student reports which mean score was 7.58. The low student learning outcomes are due to the inability of students to participate in

learning and the learning model used by teachers is not appropriate in the learning process so that the learning outcomes of students are not optimal.

In the learning process, it is very necessary to vary the learning model in order to be able to activate students in the learning process, as well as the learning model used to make students are not bored in the learning process and this learning model is expected to affect the learning outcomes of students. One learning model that is able to activate students in the learning process is the Talking Stick Cooperative learning model.

Cooperative Learning is generally defined as a learning system that gives students the opportunity to work together with fellow students on structural tasks. Cooperative learning is known as group learning, but cooperative learning is more than just group learning or group work because in cooperative learning there is a structure of encouragement or task that is effective interdependence among group members. Such work relationships allow for positive perceptions about what students can do achieving learning success based on their abilities and the contribution of other group members during group learning (Almaida, 2019).

Cooperative Learning prioritizes cooperation in solving problems to apply knowledge and skills in order to achieve learning objectives. The task structure, goal structure and reward structure in the Cooperative learning model are different from the task structure, goal structure and other learning model reward structures. Practically, in the learning process with the Cooperative learning model students are encouraged to work together on a joint assignment and they must coordinate their efforts to complete the assignment given by the teacher.

In the practice, this learning model is carried out with the help of a stick, whoever holds the stick must answer questions from the teacher after the student learns the subject matter. Learning with the Talking Stick model encourages students to dare express their opinions. This model begins with the teacher's explanation of the subject matter to be studied. Then with the help of a rolling stick (stick) students are required to reflect or repeat the material that has been learned by answering questions from the teacher. Who is holding the stick, he is the one who must answer questions (Talking) (Suprijono, 2010).

In addition, the talking stick model has clear learning goals as well as the objectives achieved at the outset before conveying subject matter which the learning objectives are also an indicator of learning. This learning model also makes students more enthusiastic in learning because students can discuss with their group friends in solving problems and each student must also prepare himself to answer questions because each group member who gets a stick must answer questions. Besides, the talking stick learning model is also used to review lessons that have been learned, by using this model students are invited to recall the subject matter that has been studied previously. This learning model is considered researchers can influence the learning outcomes of students, especially in Fiqh subjects on the alms material.

To see the effect of student learning outcomes on fiqh at Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug especially on alms material that can use the talking stick learning model because this learning model is able to test students' readiness, improve their skills in reading and understanding subject matter quickly, as well as invite them to continue to be ready in any situation (Huda, 2017).

The importance of this learning model to be implemented is because: 1) When learning takes place in class, students pay less attention to the lesson being taught because the learning model is still monotonous or boring; 2) Student learning outcomes in Fiqh subject do not meet the Minimum Completeness Criteria; 3) Learning model is boring so it does not improve student learning outcomes. And so that the discussion does not widen, the authors limit their focus at the fourth-grade students of Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug.

Technically, the implementation of the talking stick method can be described as follows: 1) The teacher prepares a stick; 2) The teacher conveys the main material to be studied, then gives the opportunity for students to read and study the material; 3) After finishing reading the lesson material, students are instructed to close the book; 4) The teacher takes a stick and gives it to students, after that the teacher gives questions and students who hold the stick must answer it, and so on until all students have a part to answer the questions asked by the teacher; 5) The teacher gives a conclusion; 6) Conduct an evaluation; 7) And closing the lesson (Suprijono, 2010).

The steps of the Talking Stick learning model are as follows: 1) the teacher explains the subject matter to be learned. In the lesson the teacher will explain the first time about the material to be learned starting from the Core Competencies, Basic Competencies to the subject matter; 2) Students are given the opportunity to read and study the material. On this occasion the students will read their respective books and read the material learned and will be given sufficient time for this activity; 3) the teacher then asks the students to close the book. In this step each student must close the book that supports the knowledge of this material and no longer be allowed to see the book; 4) the teacher takes the stick and gives it to one of the students and the stick is rolled from the student to the other students. The stick is intended as a medium or learning aid that will be carried out given to students and when the stick is rolling from students to other students; 5) Teachers provide opportunities for students to reflect on the material learned. The teacher gives an explanation of all the answers given by students and formulates conclusions (Suprijono, 2010).

## METHOD

This study used an experimental model (quasi-experimental) with a non-equivalent control group design (Sugiyono, 2010; Supardi, 2017). In this design, the study was conducted on two groups, namely the experimental group and the control group. The tests were conducted twice that is before and after treatment. The effect of treatment is measured from the difference between the initial measurement and the final measurement. While the research design used is the experimental and control group research designs. In this study, the sample was divided into two groups namely the control class and the experimental class, the control class using the conventional learning model and the experimental class using the talking stick model. These two classes have similarities in relevant aspects and differ only in treatment. With the following research designs:

**Table: 1 Research Design**

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
R	O1	X	O2
R	O1	-	O2

R = Experimental Class; R = Control Class; O1 = Pretest for both classes; X = Treatment by using Talking Stick; O2 = Posttest for both classes

The population in this study was all students of class IV A and IV B. as many as 50 students were involved on this study by using saturated sampling techniques to determine the sampling technique when all members of the population were used as samples. Another term for saturated samples is the census, where all members of the population are sampled (Sugiono, 2007). This is done because the population is relatively small. Thus, the sample in this study was taken as a whole from a population of two classes, as an experimental class that is class IV B, amounting to 25 students and one class as a control class that is class IV A, amounting to 25 students. Furthermore, the test results of the Test Instrument include:

### *Validity and Reliability Test*

Based on the test results of 30 items provided there are 20 valid items, namely numbers 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 26, 27, 29, 30. For invalid numbers, there are 10

items, namely: 1, 2, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, and 28. Based on the calculation results, that the reliability value obtained by the instrument test of 0.96, this score is in the very high category or in other words this instrument is appropriate to use in this study.

In addition, this study involves two variables, namely the talking stick learning model symbolized by the letter X. This variable is positioned as an independent variable, which is the input that will affect student learning outcomes. While the dependent variable (dependent variable) is student learning outcomes with the letter Y. Furthermore, the data used in this study is quantitative data that is data expressed in numbers, about the scores of student learning outcomes before and after using the Talking Stick model of the number of class IV students, number of teachers, geographical location and state of infrastructure.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSIONS

### Result

In this study, class IV an acts as a control class. Meanwhile, class IV B acts as an experimental class. The next step is to analyze and interpret the data obtained. Data from the results of the study consisted of pretest and posttest scores from the control and experimental class involving 50 students, each of 25 students from both classes. The learning outcome score is determined based on the number of correct answers from 20 test questions in the form of multiple choices. Table 2 shows the pretest and posttest values of the control and experiment class.

**Table 2: The Results of Pretest and Posttest**

Data	Pretest		Posttest	
	Control	Experiment	Control	Experiment
Max	75	85	80	100
Min	50	50	55	50
Mean	65.6	64.74	69.8	77.76
Median	65.75	64.50	71.00	77.00
Mode	72.00	53,32	75.75	75.60
SD	8.23	10.32	8,55	10.02

From the above table, it can be seen that the results of the control group pretest obtained the highest value of 75 and the lowest value of 50 with an average value of 65.6 median value of 65.75, mode value of 72.00 and standard deviation of 8.23. While the pretest results for the experimental group obtained the highest value of 85 and the lowest value of 50 with an average value of 64.74, a median value of 64.50, and a mode value of 53.32 and a standard deviation of 10.32. Meanwhile, the control group's posttest results obtained the highest value of 80 and the lowest value of 55 with an average value of 69.8 a median value of 71.00, a mode value of 75.75 and a standard deviation value of 8.55. Meanwhile, the posttest results for the experimental group obtained the highest value of 100 and the lowest value of 50 with an average value of 77.76, a median value of 77.00 mode values of 75.60 and a standard deviation value of 10.02.

Normality test of both classes was carried out by using Chi Square (X<sup>2</sup>). The results of data processing from the experimental class pretest and the control class were obtained as follows:

**Table 2 Normality Test Results**

Group	Pretest			Posttest		
	X <sup>2</sup> count	X <sup>2</sup> table	Distribution	X <sup>2</sup> Count	X <sup>2</sup> table	Distribution
Experiment	8.38	11.07	Normal	4.80	11.07	Normal
Control	5.12	11.07	Normal	7.28	11.07	Normal

Based on the above table, it can be seen that in the experimental class X2 the t-count was smaller than the X2 t-table; this means the data in the experimental class has normal distribution. Moreover, in the control class X2, the t-count is smaller than the X2 table, it means that the data in the control class was also has normally distribution, so that  $H_0$  was accepted and normally distributed. From table 2 it can be seen that in the experimental class X2 the t-count was smaller than the X2 t-table, this means that the experimental class has also normal distribution. Meanwhile, in the control class X2 the t-count was smaller than the table X2; this means that the data in the control class has also normal distribution. Thus,  $H_0$  was accepted and has normal distribution.

Furthermore, the homogeneity test for the two classes was carried out by using the Fisher test. From the calculation results, the degree of freedom of the numerator was 24 and the degree of freedom of the denominator was 24, the F-count was 1.57 and the F-table (0.05; 18; 19) was 1.98. Therefore, it can be concluded that in the two classes have F-count is  $1.57 < 1.98$  from F-table with  $\alpha$  which is 0.05. Thus,  $H_0$  was accepted and the two classes namely the experimental class and the control class are homogeneous. From the calculation results obtained by the degree of freedom of numerator was 24 and the degree of freedom of the denominator was 24, then F-count was 1.37 and F-table (0.05; 19; 18) was 1.98 then it can be concluded that in both classes that F-count was  $1.37 < 1.98$  from F-table with  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Thus,  $H_0$  was accepted and the two classes namely experiment and control class was homogeneous.

Based on the results of testing the requirements of data analysis, it can be concluded that the data of the two samples in this study are normally distributed and homogeneous, then the next hypothesis test the difference between the experimental and control groups using the t-test is as follows:

**Table 3 The Results of t-test from Experiment and Control Class**

Pretest		Posttest	
<i>t-count</i>	<i>t-table</i>	<i>t-count</i>	<i>t-table</i>
-0,325	2,011	3,021	2,011

From the table, it can be seen if the test results of t-count was -0.325 while the table (0.05; N-2) was 2.011. Therefore, it can be concluded if  $t\text{-count} < t\text{-table}$ . Therefore,  $H_0$  was accepted. This means that the mean score of pretest in the experimental group was the same as the control group. Based on these results it turns out there was no significant difference between the experimental group and the control group. From the above table it can also be seen if the test results of t-count was 3.021 while the table (0.05; N-2) was 2.011. Therefore, it can be concluded if  $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$  then  $H_0$  was rejected. This means that learning outcomes by using the Talking Stick learning model in the experimental class were better than the control class which only used conventional techniques in the control class. In short, based on these results it can be concluded that there are differences between the experimental class and the control class.

## Discussions

Based on the analysis results, the mean score of the control class in pretest was 65.6. However, the mean score of pretest in the experimental class was 64.74, with the standard deviation score of the control class pretest was 8.23. Meanwhile, the standard deviation score of the experimental class was 10.31. Then, based on the hypothesis test, the data showed that  $t\text{-count} (-0.325) < t\text{-table} (2.011)$ . This means that the t-count was smaller than t-table which shows that there was no difference between students who are given the Talking Stick learning model and students who use conventional techniques in Fiqh subjects at the fourth grade of Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug Tangerang.

Moreover, based on the results of the analysis, the mean score of posttest for the control class was 69.8. Meanwhile, the mean score of posttest for the experimental class was 77.76, with the standard deviation of the posttest for the control class was 8.55, and the posttest standard deviation for the experimental class was 10.02. Furthermore, based on the hypothesis test data which obtained were  $t\text{-count} (3,021) > t\text{-table} (2,011)$ . This means that  $t\text{-count}$  was greater than  $t\text{-table}$ . In other words, it can be drawn a conclusion that there were differences between students who are given the Talking Stick learning model compared to students who only used conventional techniques in Fiqh subject at the fourth grade of Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug Tangerang.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the study, the researcher can draw conclusions as follows: 1) the results of the study indicate that student learning outcomes after using the cooperative learning model (Talking Stick Type) in Fiqh subjects have a significant effect compared to student learning outcomes that only used conventional technique. This can be seen on the mean scores of student learning outcomes with the Talking Stick learning model; 2) there is a positive effect by using Talking Stick learning model on student learning outcomes in Fiqh subjects. It can be seen from the results of the calculation of the hypothesis test which showed that  $t\text{-count} > t\text{ table}$  or  $3.021 > 2.011$ . This means that the hypothesis is accepted. In other words, we can infer that there is a positive and significant effect of using the Talking Stick learning model on student learning outcomes in Fiqh subjects at the fourth grade of Islamic Primary School of Jamiatul Khair Ciledug Tangerang. Furthermore, this study suggests that: 1) The Talking Stick Type Cooperative learning model can be used to activate and encourage students to express their opinions in the learning process; 2) For teachers, the Talking Stick type of cooperative learning model is expected to be used as an alternative in providing variations in the learning process.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almaida, A. (2019). Pengelolaan Pembelajaran Akidah Akhalk Dengan Media Pembelajaran CD Interaktif. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 5(1), 23–34.
- Aqib, Z. (2013). Model-model dan strategi pembelajaran kontekstual (inovatif). Bandung: Yrama Widya.
- Arikunto, S. (2008). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Arikunto, S. (2008). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Bungin, M. B. (2005). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Djamarah, S. B. (2004). *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Hamalik, O. (2001). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hamalik, O. (2007). *Proses Belajar Mengajar*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- Hengky, L. (2006). *Penerapan model pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Talking Stick untuk Meningkatkan Minat dan Hasil Belajar Biologi Siswa pada Materi Pencemaran Lingkungan XA di SMA Yapis Manokwari*. 1.
- Huda, M. (2017). *Model-model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Isjoni, I. (2010). *cooperative Learning*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Istarani, I (2015). *58 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif*. Medan: Media Persada.
- Adha, M. A., Supriyanto, A. T. (2019). Strategi Peningkatan Mutu Lulusan Madrasah Menggunakan Diagram Fishbone. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 5(1), 12–22.
- Mudjijono, M. (1995). *Tes Hasil Belajar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Sanjaya, W. (2009). *Strategi Pembelajaran Beorientasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media.
- Shoimin, A. (2016). *68 Model Pembelajaran Inovatif Dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.

- Sudijono, A. (2009). *Pengantar Statistik Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Sugiyono, S. (2007). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfa Beta.
- Sugiyono, S (2013). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan R & D*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono, S. (2004). *Analisis Statistik Sosial*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.
- Sugiyono, S. (2010). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan: Pendekatan Kuantitatif, Kualitatif, dan R & D* (11th ed.). Bandung: ALPABETA.
- Supardi, S. (2017). *Statistik Penelitian Pendidikan*. PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Suprijono, A. (2010). *Cooperative Learning Teori dan Aplikasi Paikem*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Suprijono, A. (2010). *Cooperative Learning Teori dan Paikem*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Surani, D. (2018). Kompetensi Guru dan Motivasi Mengajar Guru Berpengaruh Terhadap Efektivitas Pembelajaran di SMK Negeri 3 Kota Serang. *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan*, 4(2), 149–158.
- Susanto, A. (2018). *Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Usiono, U. (2012). *Aliran-aliran Filsafat Pendidikan*. Medan: Perdana Publishing.