

THE EFFECT OF THINK PAIR SHARE (TPS) LEARNING MODEL ON LEARNING THEME OF INDAHNYA KEBERSAMAAN SUBTEMA 2 TOGETHER IN DIVERSITY LEARNING LESSONS 1 CLASS IV STUDENTS IN 54 STATE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS 54 LUBUKLINGGAU

Lestari^{1*}, Rudi Erwandi¹, Tio Gusti Satria¹

^{1*} Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, STKIP PGRI Lubuklinggau, Indonesia

^{1}lestari07071998@gmail.com*

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21107/literasinusantara.v1n3.1111232>

Received: December 01, 2020

Revised: January 02, 2021

Accepted: February 06, 2021

Abstract

This study aims to determine the effect of Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model on the Learning of the Beautiful Theme of Subtema 2 Together in Diversity Learning Lessons 1 Grade IV Students at SD Negeri 54 Lubuklinggau. The research method used is a pure experiment that there are two classes one class as an experimental class and the other class as a control class. Data collection techniques in this study used a test which provided as many as 20 test instruments and tested them so that they got valid questions that would be used as tests for students in the control class or in the experimental class. Data analysis techniques with steps, namely: after getting the scores of students in the control class and the experimental class then the next step to look for, on average, standard deviations, conduct normality test, homogeneity test and average test of two groups. The results showed that there was a significant influence on Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model on the Learning of the Beautiful Theme of Subtema 2 Together in Diversity Learning Lessons 1 Students in Class IV of SD Negeri 54 Lubuklinggau.

Keywords– Influence, Think Pair Share (TPS) Learning Model, Learning Theme.

1. Introduction

Education is an indicator of the progress of a country and what can support future development is education that is able to develop students so that they are able to face and solve the problems of life they face. Education must touch the potential that is owned and the potential competence of students. The concept of education is increasingly important when a person enters a higher life, because he / she must be able to apply what is learned in elementary school to deal with daily problems today and in the future. As for the opinion of Salamah, et al. (2017: 3) education is a process of changing thought patterns, attitude patterns, and action patterns in the desired direction. It can be said that education is very necessary for children and the public to be able to shape the morale, behavior, and mindset of students that must be formed since they were young.

The implementation of the 2013 curriculum is expected to be able to produce competent and competitive graduates so that the goals of national education can be achieved optimally. Through this curriculum, it is hoped that it can improve student learning outcomes both in terms of cognitive, affective and psychomotor. The learning process in the 2013 curriculum is carried out thematically and students are required to be active, creative, and independent in the learning process so that educators only act as facilitators and student-centered learning, not teacher-centered. The most continuous problem with many things is the lack of educators' understanding of thematic learning which results in many components that should be implemented not being implemented because of the lack of understanding of educators about curriculum development, especially in the 2013 curriculum. Not a few educators have experienced difficulties in implementing the 2013 curriculum so that teaching occurs. only limited to the educator's knowledge. Thus it causes material lags, learning objectives are not achieved.

Primary school learning has characteristics, namely in elementary schools an educator has a role in learning how to make learning more effective through methods and scientific thinking. There are several demands of educators in implementing the 2013 curriculum, such as: (1) Educators as learning designs,

(2) Educators as learning artists, (3) As motivators, (4) Inspirators of learning, (5) Educators must be more creative and innovative, and finally 6) Educators as learning mediators. Educators are also required to use a theme-based learning approach, which is then known as thematic. The meaning of the word "thematic" itself is related to theme. This thematic learning is in accordance with the stages of child development, the characteristics of children's learning methods, the concept of learning and meaningful learning, namely by building integrated subjects that unite various subjects.

The application of an effective learning model is intended to make the learning process more active and memorable so that it can improve student learning outcomes in thematic learning. An educator must be able to master the model that will be applied in learning, because this is one of the determining factors for the success of a thematic learning. The success of students' thematic learning can be seen from the learning outcomes of students during the thematic learning process in class. The learning outcomes of students can be used as a parameter to assess the success of the learning process in schools and can also measure the performance of educators in carrying out the learning process.

Based on the results of preliminary research observations that the author has conducted on January 9 - January 16 2020 at the Lubuklinggau Public Elementary School 54 (Model), information was obtained, one of which was that the curriculum in effect at the school was used in the learning process at SDN 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau. using the 2013 Curriculum. The author also obtained information that when the learning process took place educators still used a conventional learning process, which made students motivated to educate so that it caused students to experience boredom that's when there were students who were not focused on educators, but in In the field, students do not participate and are not directly involved in learning, so the learning process is still centered on the educator.

During the learning process there are problems in the classroom, namely:
(1) Students pay less attention to the material presented because of the emergence of boredom with the monotonous learning model, which is more dominated by

educators and smart students, while less intelligent students tend to be passive, (2) Educators provide less variety in using learning models, in the end it has an impact on the low learning achievement of students. In order for learning in class to be more active, educators should be able to choose a learning model that is in accordance with the learning and classroom conditions, according to the characteristics of students, and use a learning model that is able to make students interested in participating in the learning process.

An educator can choose a creative and varied learning model to be applied in the learning process, one of which is by applying the Think Pair Share (TPS) Type of Cooperative learning model. TPS is cooperative learning designed to influence the patterns of students and an effective way to create variations in class discussion patterns, assuming that all learning and discussion activities require arrangements to control the class as a whole. The learning process with the TPS model students are able to independently think and solve problems with their partners (other students), students can work together and issue opinions or ideas to share with other students so that they can improve learning outcomes in the cognitive realm of students because one of the characteristics of students is playing so that the TPS model is suitable for use in learning.

Based on this background, as a writer I am interested in carrying out experimental research with the title "The Effect of the Application of the Think Pair Share (TPS) Learning Model on Theme 1 The Beauty of Togetherness, Subtema 2 Togetherness in Learning Diversity 1 Grade IV Students of State Elementary School 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau.

2. Method

This research is a quantitative research with experimental research methods using True Experimental Design. The form of True Experimental Design used in this study was the pretest-posttest control group design. The subjects in this study were fourth grade students of SD N 54 Lubuklinggau Academic Year 2020/2021. The samples of this study were class IV.B as the control class with 29 students and class IV.C as the experimental class with 28 students.

The instrument used in this study was a Likert scale model with a scale of six. The research instrument used in this study is a test that can be tested with multiple choice test questions with a total of 15 test items. In determining validity, the technique used to measure the validity of the question is the series point product correlation technique. The formula is (Arikunto, 2013: 326).

$$r_{xy} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{\{N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2\}\{N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2\}}}$$

The research instrument shows the level of reliability with the K-R20 formula coefficient of 0.74. This means that the test item has a high degree of reliability and can be trusted as a measuring tool. As well as the data that has been collected is analyzed by calculating the average score, standard deviation, normality test, homogeneity and average acidity test.

3. Result and Discussion

In accordance with the purpose of doing the pretest, which is to know the initial description of student learning outcomes in learning before being given treatment. Based on the pretest results, the experimental class got an average value of 54.04 and a standard deviation of 10.9, while the control class got an average score of 53.57 and a standard deviation of 15.08. Based on these data it can be concluded that the learning outcomes of the theme 1 The Beauty of Togetherness, Sub-theme 2 togetherness in the diversity of learning 1 are in the low category with an average score that is still below the KKM.

Based on the posttest results from the experimental class and control class in the high category. Based on the data, the experimental class got an average value of 79.07 and a standard deviation of 13.15, while the control class got an average value of 71.79 and a standard deviation of 12.47. Based on the data obtained in Figure 2, it can be concluded that the learning outcomes of students are in the high category with the average score significantly passing the KKM. The pretest and posttest results in the experimental class showed that there was an increase in the score with an average difference of 25.05. Based on these

results, it can be concluded that the Think Pair Share learning model in the experimental class has an effect on student learning outcomes. Research data obtained both before giving treatment (pretest) and after treatment (posttest). There are differences in learning outcomes, here will be presented a comparative analysis of learning outcomes for each experimental class and control class before and after treatment.

Table 1. Analysis of the pretest and posttest values

No	Name of Class	Standard Deviation	Mean	Completed	Not Completed
<i>Pretest</i>					
1	Experiment	10,90	53,57	3	25
2	Control	15,08	54,04	3	26
<i>Posttest</i>					
1	Experiment	13,15	79,07	22	6
2	Control	12,47	71,79	15	14

Based on the table above, it is clear that learning outcomes have increased after being given treatment. It can be seen in table 1 that there is a difference in the average value in the high category. Based on table 1 above, it can be seen that there are differences in student learning outcomes before and after treatment. The findings of this study are significant differences in student learning outcomes in learning before and after being given treatment using the Think Pair Share learning model. Furthermore, in order to be implemented conceptually, the research results will be discussed in depth.

Think Pair Share (TPS) Learning Model, the results showed that the learning outcomes of students in thematic learning were in the high category with an average value of 79.07. Based on the results of these data it can be concluded that in general students have difficulty learning with conventional models. This problem is an indication of the low learning outcomes of students.

Arki, et al. (2017: 73) cooperative learning type TPS is a cooperative learning model that places students in pairs to complete academic tasks through three stages, namely: Think (think), Pair (pair), and Share (share). Shoimin

(2015: 208) has an opinion that "Think Pair Share (TPS) is a cooperative learning model that gives students time to think and respond and help each other.

Think Pair Share (TPS) is a simple cooperative learning model. This technique uses the pair discussion method followed by plenary discussion. With this learning model students are trained how to express opinions and students also learn to respect the opinions of others by still referring to the material / learning objectives. The TPS type of cooperative learning model contains responses from all students in the class, where each student is actively involved in each group. The implementation of this learning model is relatively simple and does not take a long time to arrange seats or group students, because groups can be formed based on the serial number that students get when counting. This model is expected to be effective in improving student learning outcomes.

Pre-Test Learning Outcomes, to find out the initial abilities of students in the experimental class and control class as well as before the Think Pair Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model was applied, besides we conducted interviews with the experimental class and control class teachers, what the researcher did was conducting a pre-test which aimed to find out The students' initial abilities regarding the theme of Theme 1 Beautiful Togetherness Sub-theme 2 Togetherness in Learning Diversity 1 about hearing organs, how to respond to religious, ethnic and cultural diversity as well as material about main ideas and explanatory ideas. The pre-test in the experimental class and control class was held on Saturday 24 April 2020. The number of students for the experimental class was 28 students consisting of 17 girls and 11 boys while for the control class there were 29 students consisting of 15 female and 14 male.

Table 2. Spread of Pre-test Research

Pre-test	Conventional	<i>Think Pair Share</i>	Total
High	6	5	11
Moderate	13	14	27
Low	10	9	19
Total	29	28	57

The pre-test questions used were in the form of instruments that had been tested on students who had studied the material from the instrument test conducted by the researcher so that 15 multiple choice questions were obtained to test the learning outcomes of students in the control class and the experimental class. The results of pre-test data processing of students in the experimental class and control class. The following is an analysis of the pre-test results in the study in table 2. After processing the pretest data obtained from students in the experimental class and control class, the various values that can be used as significant calculations are obtained from the average value of each class, the highest score, the lowest score, and the standard deviation of each. -Each class. To see the initial abilities of students in the experimental class and the initial abilities of students in the control class.

Based on the results of the calculation, it can be seen that the highest and lowest pre-test scores of students in the experimental class and control class have differences. The pre-test mean value of students in the experimental class was 52.70 with a standard deviation of 10.9, while the pre-test mean value of students in the control class was 54.03 with a standard deviation of 15.08. This shows that the initial ability of students in the experimental class and control class is different by a difference of 0.83. Thus, the pre-test average value of students in the experimental class was smaller than the pre-test average value of students in the control class however, this was not enough to determine the significance of the comparison of the pre-test scores on students between experimental class and control class. Therefore, the normality test, homogeneity test and average difference test must be carried out.

Based on the results of research conducted on April 14 to May 14 2020 at SD Negeri 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau, the use of the Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model in thematic learning greatly helps students to understand the subject matter given, because by using Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model creates active, creative, and fun teaching and learning conditions.

The success or failure of students or educators in learning can be seen in the results of the final test (post-test) which is carried out after learning is complete.

However, the learning outcomes achieved by students are sometimes not in accordance with what the students themselves and the educators expect, this is because there are factors that affect the learning outcomes. According to Jamal, F. (2014: 20) as follows, learning difficulties experienced by students can be caused by internal and external factors. Internal factors are factors that come from within students, for example, talent, interest, health, intelligence and so on. While external factors are factors that come from outside the students, for example from the school environment, family environment and community environment.

Post-test data analysis shows differences in learning outcomes between the control class and the experimental class. This is because the learning treatment given is different. In the control class using the conventional learning model an average value of 71.79 and a standard deviation of 12.47 was obtained, while the experimental class was given treatment using the Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model and obtained an average value of 79.07 and a standard deviation of 13, 15. Thus than that the post-test average score of the experimental class is greater than the post-test average score of the control class.

By using the t-test, the obtained $t_{count} = 5.69$. Degrees of freedom $dk = n_1 + n_2 - 2 = 29 + 28 - 2 = 55$ and $\alpha = 0.05$. The value of t table with $dk = 55$. So, the value of t table = $t(1-\alpha) = t(0.95) = 1.671$. So it can be concluded that $t = 5.69 < t_{table} = 1.671$, because $t_{count} > t_{table}$ then H_0 is rejected and H_a is accepted. Thus there is an effect of the use of the Think Pair Share (TPS) model on the learning outcomes of students with material on theme 1, the beauty of togetherness, sub-theme 2, togetherness in learning diversity 1 with several indicators which contain the material about hearing organs, explanatory sentences along with main ideas and addressing religious, ethnic differences, cultures and customs that exist from different areas in SD Negeri 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau. This is evidenced by the final test average score of the control class with the conventional model of 71.79 with a standard KKM score of 70 and only 15 students out of 29 students achieved the KKM. Whereas in the post-test the experimental class using the Think Pair Share (TPS) learning model obtained an

average of 79.07 with 22 students who succeeded in achieving the KKM from 28 students. In addition, the results of this research are also supported by one of the previous studies conducted by Randi, SDPP, et al (2015) which states that there is a significant effect on learning using the Think Pair Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model on mathematics learning outcomes. the material energy of mixed count operations for fourth grade students of SDN Babatan 1 Surabaya. What researchers did in class IVB SDN Babatan 1 Surabaya as an experimental class showed that the students' posttest mean scores were higher than the pretest scores. This is evidenced by the pre-test score of 1185 with a class average of 51.52 and the posttest score of 2026 with a class average of 89.65. Then from the results above, the data analysis process is then carried out. From the results of the above calculations, it can be consulted with the t value table for $db = N - 2$ is $N = 46 - 2 = 44$. It is known that the t table for the 5% significance level is 2.02 and it is known that the tcount is 8.17. From these results it is known that t count is greater than t table price ($8.17 > 2.02$).

4. Conclusion

The conclusions that the researcher can put forward based on data analysis and discussion of the research results that have been described can be concluded that the learning outcomes of students who feel 28 students in class IV.C SD Negeri 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau who use the Think Pair Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model in the material Theme 1 The Beauty of Togetherness Subtema 2 Togetherness in Learning Diversity 1 is included in the category well, students are able to achieve learning goals. Thematic learning outcomes of students who feel 29 students in class VI.B SD Negeri 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau who use conventional learning on the subject matter of Theme 1 The Beauty of Togetherness, Sub-Theme 2 Togetherness in Learning Diversity 1 falls into the sufficient category, and students are already able or achieve learning goals.

The influence of the influence of the Think Pair Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model on student learning outcomes in the subject matter of Theme 1 The Beauty of Togetherness Sub-Theme 2 Togetherness in Learning

Diversity 1 in class VI SD Negeri 54 (Model) Lubuklinggau Academic Year 2020/2021, where the average value is The average learning outcomes of students taught by the Think Pair Share (TPS) type of cooperative learning model are greater.

References

- Arikunto. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian: Satuan Pendekatan Praktik*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Astuti, D. (2017). *Model Pembelajaran Think Pair Share (TPS) Untuk Meningkatkan Prestasi Belajar Mata Pelajaran IPS Kelas I. Pogalan Trenggalek. Jurnal Riset dan Konseptual*, Vol.2, No.3, Hal.328-334.
- Buku Panduan Penulisan Skripsi*. (2018). Lubuklinggau, Palembang: STKIP-PGRI Lubuklinggau.
- Elhefni. (2011). *Model pembelajaran Kooperatif tipe Think Pair Share dan Hasil Belajar di Sekolah. Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN Raden Fatah Palembang*, Vol. XVI, No. 02, Hal.303-319.
- Fathurrohman, M. (2015). *Model-Model pembelajaran Inovatif*. Depok, Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Handayani, R. D. & Yanti. Y. (2017). *Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif tipe Think Pair Share Terhadap Hasil Belajar PKn Siswa Di Kelas IV MI Terpadu Muhammadiyah Sukarame Bandar Lampung. UIN Raden Intan Lampung. Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Dasar* 4, (2), Hal.107-123.
- Helmiati. (2016). *Model pembelajaran*. Sleman Yogyakarta: Aswaja Pressindo.
- Huda, M. (2017). *Model-Model Pengajaran dan Pembelajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Jakni. (2016). *Metodologi Penelitian Eksperimen Bidang Pendidikan*. Bandung: Alfabeta, CV.
- Jamal, F. (2014). *Analisis Kesulitan Belajar Siswa dalam Mata Pelajaran Matematika pada Materi Peluang Kelas XI IPA SMA Muhammadiyah Meulaboh Johan Pahlawan. Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*, 01, (01), Hal: 18-36.
- Kasimuddin. (2016). *Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Think Pair Share (TPS) Untuk Meningkatkan Aktivitas Dan Hasil Belajar Fisika Peserta Didik Kelas XI IPA 2 SMA Negeri 9 Makassar. JPF*, 04, (1), Hal.54-72.
- Prastowo, A. (2013). *Pengembangan Bahan Ajar Tematik*. Wonosari, Jogyakarta: DIVA Press.

- Rofiq, M, N. (2010). *Pembelajaran Kooperatif (Cooperative Learning) dalam Pengajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam. Jurnal Falasifa*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Hal.1-14.
- Salamah, U., dkk. (2017). *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan untuk Perguruan Tinggi*. Malang, Jatim: Madani.
- Setiawan, D. (2017). *Pendekatan saintifik dan penilaian autentik untuk meningkatkan mutu pembelajaran pendidikan agama islam. Journal of basic education*, 01, (02), Hal.34-46.
- Shoimin, A. (2017). *68 Model pembelajaran inovatif dalam Kurikulum 2013*. Depok, Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Sugiyono. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: Alfabeta, Cv.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: Alfabeta, Cv.
- Wafiqni, N. & Nurani, S. (2018). *Model Pembelajaran tematik berbasis Kearifan Lokal. Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Negeri 1 Tangerang Selatan*, 10, (02) Hal.95-110.

