

LEARNING INDONESIAN EVALUATION USING COOPERATIVE LEARNING MODEL JIGSAW TYPE THROUGH LESSON STUDY

¹Yeni Rostikawati, ²Wikanengsih

^{1,2}STKIP Siliwangi Bandung

¹yenrostikawati@gmail.com, ²wikanengs@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The problem found in the evaluation course is when developing the student test instrument is difficult to understand in preparing the test tool based on cognitive level that must be adjusted with the indicator, as well as in preparing the skill test. Their difficulty lies in the preparation of rubrics as the translation of learning objectives in the skill domain. Also, arranging non-test tools such as observation sheets, interview guides, and questionnaires also experienced some obstacles. Based on that, efforts to improve the ability of students in the course of Learning Evaluation, especially in preparing test kits and non-test through jigsaw type cooperative learning model. The purpose of this research is 1) describe the implementation of teaching Indonesian Language Evaluation Course using a jigsaw type cooperative learning model; 2) to describe the student's response in the process of teaching implementation. The course of Indonesian Language Evaluation uses a cooperative learning model of jigsaw type: and 3) describes the student's ability in preparing the evaluation tool of test and non-test after implementing the learning using jigsaw type cooperative learning model. The results of the implementation of the lesson study of Evaluation learning using a jigsaw type cooperative learning model through Lesson Study for Learning Community can improve the collaborative, communication, critical thinking, and creative ability of the students. Therefore, the results of this study can be used as a reference for teachers to enrich references on learning models that can be used in the learning process.

Keywords: *Learning Indonesian Evaluation, Cooperative Model, Jigsaw Type, Lesson Study for Learning Community*

INTRODUCING

According to Law no. 14 of 2005 on Teachers and Lecturers article 10 paragraph (1) teacher competence includes pedagogic competence, personality competence, social competence, and professional competence obtained through professional education. One of the competencies that must be owned by a teacher as has been mandated in Law no. 14 of 2005 is pedagogic competence. In this case, pedagogic competence is the ability to manage learners. This competence can be seen from the ability to plan the learning program, the ability to implement the learning program, and the ability to evaluate the learning result or assessment.

About the Act, one of the skills that must be owned by STKIP Siliwangi students as a teacher candidate is the skill in developing the evaluation instrument as a measurement of the success of the learning process. Course Evaluation Indonesian language learning is a course that is expected to provide knowledge and skills for students in preparing a valid evaluation tool and reliable. The ability to develop evaluation tools is a vital skill for a prospective teacher. Teachers also must be able to teach is also able to carry out evaluations to measure the achievement of the learning

process. The purpose of research in this course is to optimize the learning process of the Indonesian Language Learning Evaluation Course so that students experience improvement both in terms of cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

Based on the experience of researchers so far, the students of the Indonesian Language Education Study Program have difficulty in the course of learning evaluation, especially in compiling the assessment instruments, both test, and non-test instruments. Preparing the student test instrument is difficult to understand in preparing the test tool based on cognitive level that must be adjusted with the indicators, as well as in preparing the skill test tool. Their difficulty lies in the preparation of rubrics as the translation of learning objectives in the skill domain. Also, arranging non-test tools such as observation sheets, interview guides, and questionnaires also experienced some obstacles. Based on that, this study was conducted with the aim of 1) describe the implementation of teaching Indonesian Language Evaluation Course using jigsaw type cooperative learning model; 2) to describe the student's response in the process of teaching implementation. The course of Indonesian Language Evaluation uses a cooperative learning model of jigsaw type: and 3) describes the student's ability in preparing the evaluation tool of test and non-test after implementing the learning using jigsaw type cooperative learning model.

Understanding the Evaluation of Learning

Evaluation is an assessment (Novia, p 123). The definition developed by Ralph Tyler (1950). This expert says that evaluation is a process of collecting data to determine the extent to which, in what way, and how the educational objectives have been achieved (Arikunto, 2009, p3). Wrightstone and colleagues say the evaluation of education is an assessment of the growth and progress of students towards the goals or values set in the curriculum (Purwanto, 2004, p3).

Evaluation of learning is an evaluation of the teaching and learning process. Systemically, the evaluation of learning is directed to the components of the learning system that includes the raw input component, the student's initial behavior, the instrumental input component, the professional ability of the teacher or the education personnel, the curriculum component (study program, method, media) administrative (tools, time, funds), component of the process is the procedure of learning implementation; the output component is the learning outcome that marks the achievement of the learning objectives (Hamalik, 1995, p 171).

Terms of Evaluation

Requirements to be met by teachers so that an educator can plan and evaluate correctly and appropriately. Evaluations must meet several conditions before being tested against students and performed in daily life. A good evaluation should have requirements, which are valid, reliable, objective, balanced, differentiating, normative, fair, and practical (Sukardi, 2011, pp. 8).

Teacher Competence in Implementation of Learning Evaluation Activities

Competence will be realized in the form of mastering the knowledge of the deed professionally in carrying out the function as a teacher. To obtain a measurable picture of assigning values for each capability, it is necessary to set the performance of each capability. Performance ability/competence seen in the form of indicators. Here is a table of competencies and indicators

that become a reference assessment of students' ability in preparing an evaluation instrument (Arifin, 2009).

Table 1. Component of Evaluation Instrument Compilation Assessment

Competencies	Indicator
Ability to develop evaluation instruments	1. Be able to choose questions based on difficulty level.
	2. Able to choose questions based on differentiation levels.
	3. Able to fix invalid problem
	4. Be able to check answers
	5. Be able to classify the results of the assessment
	6. Able to process and analyze the assessment results
	7. Able to prepare reports on assessment results
	8. Able to make interpretations of the tendency of the results of the assessment
	9. Able to determine inter-regional correlations based on the assessment results
	10. Identify the level of test result variation
	11. Able to conclude from the assessment results clearly and logically

About Jigsaw Cooperative Learning Model

This type of jigsaw is a group of learning. Before the lesson begins, the teacher gives the learning topic first to the students. The activity aims to form a student's schemata to be more ready to carry out the learning.

As for the learning process, this type of jigsaw cooperative model is implemented in several stages, covering the preparation stage, the learning stage, and the evaluation phase.

a. Preparation phase

1) Establish student groups

The student group setting is done by the teacher. Grouping is done based on the acquisition of student scores in the previous semester. The established group consisted of a group of highly capable, moderate, and low-ability students.

2) Material

The material is designed by the teacher before the learning process begins.

b. Stage learning

After students are in groups, each group is given material that must be understood. Then, they understand the material together. Groups that are considered to have mastered the material explain to the group who still do not understand.

c. Evaluation stage

The evaluation process is carried out individually after completion of submitting the material at the end of the learning period.

METHOD

The research method is a method used to obtain the completeness of the data needed for the problem-solving business under study by using certain techniques and tools. The method used in this research is the pre-experimental design method. The research design used was design with class random technique through the Initial Test-End Test in one research group (one group Pretest-Posttest Group Design). In this design, the researcher performs a class random technique because the technique of matching to the subject as proposed in Syamsuddin and Vismaia theory (2007: 163), is not possible to do in the field. 1) Research Technique Data collection techniques used in this experimental study are two test techniques and observation techniques. 1) Test Technique; The test technique is explained by Nurgiyantoro (2009: 58-59) that the test technique is a form of assignment or question that must be done by the student (testi, try) which is being tested. The answers that students give to these questions are regarded as reliable information that reflects their abilities. The information is expressed as an important input to consider students' abilities. The instruments used in this test technique are test questions. The use of test techniques in data collection is intended to determine the level of writing ability that can be measured quantitatively. 2) Observation Technique; Observation technique is an assessment tool used to evaluate the activities of researchers (teachers) and students in the application of the information-oriented model of thinking-critical information in the classroom.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results of the Learning Process and Student Response

1) Results in Cycle 1

Plan:

At this stage, the model lecturer presented the lesson plan in front of the reviewer's lecturers. Then there is the discussion process to provide inputs regarding the implementation of more effective and innovative learning. The material discussed in the first cycle is to develop an evaluation tool for writing skills.

Do:

In the Do process, this learning step can be accomplished according to plan. Students can collaborate and communicate while conducting presentations. Some questions arose about the material they had not understood when the group of students who presented the presentation of his paper. However, learning objectives are not fully achieved. Inadequacies of competence can be observed when the process of exposure done by the presenter group and when the discussion is working on the MFI designed by the previous lecturer. The group of students whose paper presentations were stuck on the KD material presented, the direction of exposure did not deal much with the evaluation of writing but more about the writing theory. However, at the end of the

presentation, the lecturer tries to straighten the understanding to avoid misleading understanding of the students. During group discussions, the majority of students can collaborate and communicate, although not all can play an active role. Although the collaboration that they do only limited collaboration that occurred in the group only. Some groups work dominated by one student because the dominant student is fairly smart so that other group members like relying on the dominant student. In the second stage of the first cycle, to get around the wider collaboration between groups is not just one group, and to avoid domination by one of the students, the lecturer changes the strategy. The changed strategy is to carry out the discussion process in two ways. In the first stage, students discussed completing the MFI with the original group. In the second phase, the student group is broken up and combined with other group members to allow for wider collaboration. The ability to think critically and think creatively has not emerged. For example, the average student only listens to exposure when there is a group of presentations without giving criticism of the error of the concept presented by the presenter group. However, there is one student who is quite critical.

See:

Based on the results see discussed between the model lecturer and 3 observers, the following points are obtained: a. students are less focused when listening to presentations; b. ice-breaking becomes an alternative to break down the saturation of the middle of the learning with a long duration of time; c. slide displayed less legible; d. effectiveness noted less; e. the presentation group presents the material focused on the skills rather than the evaluation material but in phase two has begun to focus on the presentation of the preparation of evaluation tools not only theory; and f. when a group discussion occurs, there are opinions of students who are "misleading". In conclusion, in the cycle, one of the discussions conducted by the students is still less directional caused by the student's lack of understanding of the learning objectives with the presentation method. Therefore, there are still groups of students who incorrectly convey the concept of the material in the process of discussion. Then, there are still groups who do not understand when to develop an evaluation tool by following language skills. The ability of collaboration and student activeness has been seen but for the ability of critical thinking, creativity, and innovation not so emerged. Thus, the input for lecturers from the evaluation of the implementation of open lessons in cycle I am to be able to create a learning process that is better able to stimulate students to be critical, creative, and innovative.

2) Results in Cycle II

Plan:

The model lecturer presented the lesson plan for the implementation of cycle II. The material to be taught is the material of composing the evaluation tool of test and nontes.

Do:

In cycle II, the learning process is still using cooperative learning model of jigsaw type. Before starting the lesson, lecturers more clarify the purpose of learning so that students understand the direction of lectures and more understand when doing the task. Implementation of learning as well as in cycle I begin with the implementation of the presentation by a group of students who are assigned to perform. The direction of the presentation has already started according to the

instruction of the lecturer. The student group presented a paper containing the concept and at the end presented an example of an evaluation instrument format by following the language skills discussed by the group. The learning strategy in cycle II is slightly updated, ie after the group conducts the presentation, each member is distributed to each other group. Group members whose presentations are considered as a group of experts so that when discussions come back in doing the MFI there may be one member who acts as a peer tutor.

See:

In this second cycle, there is one group that is beginning to appear to have the ability to think critically. The students' critical thinking skills arise when group discussions even though from several groups in the classroom only one group emerges. Student's critical thinking ability is enhanced through MFI's stimulus. The MFI contains some questions that the student should distinguish, whether the questions in the MFI belong to the type of test or non-test. Then they explain the reason for the answer. The dominance of work by one student in one group can also be minimized because the two-stage discussion is held by exchanging group members. Thus, the ability of collaboration and liveliness is increasing. In this second cycle, student creativity appears in the presentation group. They present examples of test and non-test evaluation tools taken from the thesis. This they do as an alternative to overcome their lack of understanding in preparing the evaluation tool tests and non-test own.

3) Results in Cycle III

Plan:

Lecturer re-present the model results of the plan about learning materials in the third cycle of preparing the evaluation tool reading skills.

Do:

The learning process begins with a presentation of the student group on the preparation of reading skill evaluation tools. In the group discussion session, the learning model used is still cooperative learning, but using the technique "Teach Praise". The type of learning still uses the jigsaw, only during the crossing session, the members of the presenter team who go into each group discuss and guide the MFI from the lecturers after which they teach the understanding to their colleagues, the other companions give praise. This technique of "praise" is used as a way to respect each other's opinions in the learning process. Praise is also expected to increase students' confidence while passing on their understanding to other colleagues.

See:

Observations on students can be concluded several points are as follows: a. Collaborative ability: there is a collaboration between students, not only within the scope of one group but also between groups. Collaboration between groups is indicated by the activity of each member of the group that helps each other, no members are indifferent, all involved giving opinions. b. Ability to communicate: average communication skills are good, although there are still a small number of students who are still difficult or shy to express opinions. For example, there is one group observed

by one reviewer, one of the students in the group is engrossed in doing the MFI from the lecturers while the other members of the group discuss with each other. Students who are busy themselves trying to do, after finished he seem to deliver the results of his work to colleagues but did not dare. In the end, the friend next to him greets the student and sees the work. Then, the work of the self-employed student is communicated to the other colleagues. The work of a solitary student outcome is what his colleagues use one group. Communication was finally running smoothly among group members. That is, learning with a cooperative style is very effective to stimulate students' communication skills coupled with the presentation in front of the class. c. Critical thinking ability: students' critical thinking skills during the learning process of making the reading skill evaluation instrument less noticeable there is a significant increase. They remain constrained by making the instrument by following the indicator matter. The ability to think creatively: the creativity of students in presenting the presentation or even solve the problem of learning is still not seen maximally.

Outcomes of Student Ability to Formulate Evaluation Instruments

Here the researcher presents the conclusion data of the students' ability to develop the evaluation instrument in the form of presentation at the end of the learning after applying the jigsaw type cooperative model through Lesson Study for Learning Community. The Presentation value refers to the number of student samples of 30 people.

Competence: The ability to develop evaluation instruments

Indicator	Presentation of student skills
1. Be able to choose questions based on difficulty level.	70% from 30
2. Able to choose questions based on differentiation levels.	70% from 30
3. Able to fix invalid problem	50% from 30
4. Be able to check answers	80% from 30
5. Be able to classify the results of the assessment	75% from 30
6. Able to process and analyze the assessment results	65% from 30
7. Able to prepare reports on assessment results	60% from 30
8. Able to make interpretations of the tendency of the results of the assessment	60% from 30
9. Able to determine inter-regional correlations based on the assessment results	50% from 30
10. Identify the level of test result variation	50% from 30
11. Able to conclude from the assessment results clearly and logically	50% from 30

Based on the data, it can be concluded that the students' ability in preparing the evaluation instrument after the learning process average more than 50% able. Although not reaching 100%, but there is an increase in ability than before. Significant improvements will be seen if this LSLC study is continuously implemented. In principle, learning with LSLC should be implemented sustainable and consistent manner.

Discussion

The objective of the jigsaw type cooperative learning model is to train students' schemata through group discussion activities. This can be proven through the results of research that shows that the ability of students in the learning process increases. Improvement of student ability is evidenced by the identification of the ability to develop evaluation instruments. Schematic skills are trained through group discussions consisting of several group members and in which some members act as tutors. The tutors in each group are judged to have the ability above the average peer of the other group members who deliberately spread to each group by the lecturer. Therefore, this type of jigsaw group learning process will be more effective in stimulating each group member to play an active role.

CONCLUSION

The learning process using a jigsaw-type cooperative model through Lesson study conducted for 3 cycles or equal to 6 meetings. Each cycle consists of the plan, do, and see stages. This is by following the implementation phase of Lesson study. The learning activities in the classroom are carried out in groups. Groups formed there are regular groups and tutor groups. This tutor group of which each member is spread to several other groups.

During the learning takes place, it can be observed so that the student response saw some ability among other things, the ability of collaboration, communication, and critical thinking. During the learning process in three cycles, there was a collaboration between students, not only within the scope of the group but also between groups. Collaboration between groups is indicated by the activity of each member of the group that helps each other, no members are indifferent, all involved giving opinions. The average communication ability is good, although there are still a small number of students who are still difficult or shy to express an opinion. Learning with a cooperative style is very effective to stimulate students' communication skills coupled with presentations in front of the classroom. The students' critical thinking skills during the learning process of making the reading skill evaluation instrument less noticeable have a significant improvement. They remain constrained by making the instrument by following the indicator matter. While the creativity of students in presenting the presentation or even solve the problem of learning is still not seen maximally.

The students' ability in preparing the evaluation instrument after the learning process average more than 50% able. Although not reaching 100%, but there is an increase in ability than before.

REFERENCE

- Arikunto, S. (2002). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, S. (2009). *Dasar-dasar evaluasi pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- A.R. Syamsudin dan Vismaia S.D. (2009). *Metode penelitian pendidikan bahasa*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Hamalik, O. (1995). *Kurikulum dan pembelajar*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Nurgiyantoro, B. (2009). *Penilaian dalam pengajaran bahasa dan sastra*. Yogyakarta: BPFE.
- Novia, W. (____). *Kamus lengkap bahasa Indonesia*. Surabaya: Kashiko Press.
- Purwanto, M. N. (2004). *Prinsip-prinsip dan teknik evaluasi pengajaran*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sukardi. (2011). *Evaluasi pendidikan prinsip dan oprasional*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Widodo, L. (2013). *Upaya meningkatkan kompetensi guru dalam menyusun tes hasil belajar melalui workshop penilaian di SMPN 2 Panti Jember*. [online]. Tersedia di: <https://jurnaljp3.files.wordpress.com/2013/09/lulud.pdf>.