

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF GEOGRAPHY LEARNING THROUGH LEARNING MODELS STUDENT FACILITATOR AND EXPLAINING

Adhitya Prihadi¹

¹Geography Education Study Program, Faculty of IPPS,
IKIP PGRI Pontianak
E-mail: aditlaa929@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The learning model can be used as an innovation to improve student learning outcomes, especially Paloh city is a border area that is included in the disadvantaged, frontier, and outermost (3T) areas. The purpose of this study is to 1) determine the needs of students towards the learning model of student facilitator and explaining in SMP Negeri 1 Paloh 2) determine the effectiveness of the use of learning models for student facilitators and explaining in SMP Negeri 1 Paloh. The method used was an experiment with a quasi-experimental form and the design of the Two Group Post Test Only, 3) whether the effective use of student facilitator and explaining learning models in SMP Negeri 1 Paloh. The results showed: 1) Students need the student facilitator and explaining learning model based on the results of the questionnaire calculation of 66% which shows a strong category 2) The results of the study show the learning group without the student facilitator and explaining model and the learning group student facilitator and explaining model with U test mann whitney there is Asymp sig (2 tailed) of $0.381 > 0.05$. These results indicate the learning model of student facilitator and explaining has no difference with other learning. Effect size to see the effectiveness of student learning facilitators and explaining with 0.1 results that are classified as low, these results can also be influenced by various other types of factors.

Keywords: *Student Facilitator and Explaining, Learning Outcomes, Effectiveness.*

A. INTRODUCTION

Education is one of the most fundamental factors in human life (Widayani et al., 2014). Education is a conscious effort to make a change from unknown to known. Education can be obtained through experience outside of school, but formal education experience can also influence the students to achieve their goals which are in line with the goals of Indonesia's national education, namely the welfare of

people who are faithful, creative, capable, independent and knowledgeable. By the goal of the state of Indonesia is to educate the life of the nation, therefore education is the most appropriate means to achieve these goals, both urban areas and 3T areas (disadvantaged, frontier, and outermost). Formal experience can be through school learning, learning is an action or process of delivering a material to an object or student, such as in

geography learning. Geography learning is the science that describes the landscape both inside and outside the earth. The process of learning geography is inseparable from the role in its delivery, both the delivery of media assisted learning, learning methods, and learning models. This learning is successful if learning by applying and applying it can help the learning process that is following the sub discussion or the appropriate material because not all geography materials can be used with the same learning model. In the process of delivering learning normally

experiences deficiencies and constraints such as SMP Negeri 1 Paloh where belong to 3T area (disadvantaged, frontier and outermost) directly adjacent to eastern Malaysia and occupies the most northwestern region for the Indonesian Borneo region, in this case, being a place of observation and research. The learning outcomes of Grade VII students of SMP Negeri 1 Paloh on daily scores obtained are still relatively low compared to conditions in the subdistricts of their cities, the results are as the table below:

Table 1 Average Values

Class	VII A	VII B	VII C	VII D
Average value	78	81	76	82

Source: SMPN 1 Paloh administration

Based on the data in table 1 above, the data is the result of daily repetition learning with a learning model that may be subject to misdirected and inaccurate even in the way of delivering sub-topics that do not fit the material being taught. Some problems that often arise in the inadequate use of inappropriate models are: 1) in the process of learning less reactive; 2) reduce learning interest; 3) students tend to

be passive with learning conditions; 4) student learning independence is low (Mulyono et al., 2018).

From the explanation above, the researcher offers a learning model in which the model focuses on how to deliver while learning is the process of interacting objects and subjects in the scope of learning. Therefore, the learning model is a technique in the delivery of material so that the

material can be accepted and absorbed by students or students. Learning is focused on student learning activities seriously involving aspects of intelligence, feeling, and social (Zainal Arifin, 2012). Learning according to (Daryanto & Rachmawati, 2015) is a social process of students with teachers and learning resources in the scope of learning. One of the learning processes involves the interaction of students and teachers is a cooperative learning model. This learning forms a learning group that will be able to help interaction learning through various types and types. Like the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining* is a learning model that demands students to be active in learning in class. This learning model is student-centered learning so that students share information with students the opportunity to explain the material being learned to other students, strategies suitable for training students to be directly involved, and active in the learning process (Zain

The advantages of cooperative learning models of *student facilitator and explaining* types are that they can allow students to present their

& Joko, 2012). This learning can also trigger the mental ability to speak in front of other people or students (Widyawati, 2016). The learning model that will be offered to overcome the shortcomings and errors above is the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining* which is thought to have a supporting factor in improving learning outcomes in this school in the social studies learning process in class VII of SMP Negeri 1 Paloh. According to Suyatno (2009) in (Widayani et al., 2014), the steps that must be taken in applying the *Student facilitator and explaining* learning model are "(1) the teacher conveys the competencies to be achieved; (2) the teacher demonstrates/presents the material; (3) provide the opportunity for students/participants to explain to other participants both through charts/concept maps and others; (4) the teacher concludes the ideas/opinions of students; (5) the teacher explains all the material presented at that time; (6) cover.

opinions or ideas from each group representative. Another advantage is to train the effectiveness of students in expressing opinions and then involve a group of friends to

exchange ideas (Astiani et al., 2019), this learning activity can also gain knowledge while playing (Nur et al., 2017), students and teachers can collaborate in designing material to be presented (Muslim, 2014), it can also motivate students by giving opinions to other students (Setiawan, 2017), can increase and encourage interest in learning if appropriate and

The use of student learning facilitator and explaining learning has taken and used in this study has several factors of excellence as above which can provide the impetus for learning that will be presented in the application of student learning facilitator and explaining. Student facilitator learning and explaining in geography learning at a junior high level can also have a better impact than learning with other cooperative models (Yuswar et al., 2017), this is in tune with the opinions (Sari et al., 2019) namely learning of student

B. MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study uses quantitative research that is data that can be measured using numerical calculations. The research method used is experimental research, an experiment

appropriate with the material taught (Alti & Hasan, 2020), can arouse the arguments of students in the submission of opinions by attaching valid and accountable evidence (Aztry, 2020) and other advantages of this learning can provide and increase student activity to produce better achievement by expectations and goals (Saifuddin et al., 2015).

facilitators and explaining can also have a better impact than other learning. In the study (Situmorang et al., 2019) he stated the learning of student facilitators and explaining can provide variations on learning outcomes. Then research by (Widayati, 2018) states the use of student learning facilitator and explaining can improve learning outcomes even though on different materials, such opinions form the basis of this research conducted at the junior high level but the results obtained are in line with expectations.

is a research used to look for the effect of certain treatments on others under controlled conditions (Sugiyono, 2017). The form used is quasi-experimental which is an actual

treatment which means that the pseudo-treatment, which will be compared to the process skills (Arikunto, 2013), with the design of

two groups of post-test only that uses two groups of samples and then look for differences between the two groups (Mulyatiningsih, 2011).

Table 2 Two Group Post-Test Only Design

CLASS	TREATMENT	TEST
Experiment	X ₁	O ₁
Control	X ₂	O ₂

Information :
 X1 : Treatment
 X2 : No treatment
 O1 : Posttest
 O2 : Posttest

This study used population data of 130 students consisting of 4 classes and a sample of 2 classes with a total of 64 students, divided into 1

experimental class and 1 control class. The sampling technique is cluster random sampling with the provisions of homogeneous class data.

Table 3 Total Population

No.	Class	Amount
1.	Xa	33
2.	Xb	33
3.	Xc	32
4.	Xd	32
Total		130

Source: SMPN 1 Paloh administration

Meanwhile, the analysis of the learning needs of the facilitator and explaining student learning models uses percentages, with the following criteria:

Table 4 Percentage of Requirements Analysis Criteria

Percentage	Criteria
Figures 0% - 20%	Very weak
Figures 21% - 40%	Weak
Figures 41% - 60%	Enough
Figures 61% - 80%	Strong
Figures 81% - 100%	Very strong

(Riduwan, 2010)

To find out how big is the difference between *student facilitator and explaining* learning models with other models, use the Mann Whitney U test or T-test depending on the results of the normality test, then proceed with the hypothesis test to see how much influence the effective use of the facilitator and explaining student learning model uses the *efecct formula*

size. Cohen (1998) (Purnamawati et al., 2017) provides an assessment rubric for calculations using *effect size*. It states that the effect size results are 0.20, which means little effect, then 0.50, which means medium effect, while 0.80, which means high influence. In detail, the indicator of the *effect size* value can be seen from the table below:

Table 5 Indicator Value Effect Size

Effect Size	Level
$d < 0,2$	Low
$0,2 < d < 0,8$	Medium
$d > 0,8$	High

(Purnamawati et al., 2017)

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

From the results of the analysis of student needs an analysis on the learning facilitator and explaining

student learning using the percentage formula as below:

$$P = f / n \times 100\%$$

Where:

P = Percentage

f = answer frequency YES

n = number of respondents x number of questions

The results of the questionnaire calculation of 66% which states the amount is classified as strong. This means the need for a learning model is needed at SMP Negeri 1 Paloh.

Mann Whitney U Test or T-Test to see the difference then have to go

through several steps first with the assumption of a normality test. First, the normality test of learning outcomes data is carried out normally beforehand including learning outcomes using the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining* as follows:

Table 5 Normality Test

Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.037
------------------------	------

From the table above, the analysis of normality test with SPSS learning outcomes with the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining* is not normal because of Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) <0.05 i.e. 0.037 <0.05 then all the data of this study came from abnormal populations.

Both variance homogeneity tests were carried out with the Bartlett test model which served to show that the populations of the study sample were homogeneous or varied equally. Homogeneity test results with Bartlett with SPSS are as follows:

Table 6 Homogeneity

Result			
<i>Levene Statistic</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
12.777	1	62	.001

From the list of tables above the homogeneous test analysis with SPSS is not homogeneous because sig <0.05, which is 0.001 <0.05, it can be concluded that the population of the study sample is not homogeneous.

which is not normal then the Mann Whitney U test is performed to see how much difference in learning outcomes using the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining* and without the learning model of *student facilitator and explaining*, the data can be seen as follows:

Hypothesis analysis from the normality test data analysis above

Table 7 Hasil U Mann Whitney

Result	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.381

From the analysis table data above, it can be concluded that the use of non-parametric U Mann Whitney test with SPSS produces asymp sig (2 tailed) of 0.381 > 0.05, then the result is no difference between *student facilitator and explaining* learning models without student learning model

facilitator and explaining applied in junior high based on several external factors that support the failure of this learning theory.

Furthermore, to see the effectiveness of student learning *facilitator and explaining* can be seen using the effect size formula to see

how much influence this learning has on students who have applied it. With

the following formula:

$$Es = \frac{X_e - X_k}{S_c} = \frac{62 - 61}{9,75} = 0.1$$

Information

Es = Effect Size

Xe = the average of experimental class Xk = average of control class

Sc = standard deviation of control class

From the results of calculations using the formula above get 0.1 results than the assessment rubric according to Cohen is classified as low, so the effectiveness of student learning facilitator and explaining in class VII SMP N 1 Paloh is less effective. Such results are not pure results from the

application of the *student facilitator and explaining* learning model, but can also be influenced by other factors, such as classroom conditions, social conditions of students in the 3T regions (lagging, outermost, outermost), supporting facilities and targets as well as factors other factors.

D. CONCLUSIONS

The results of the research and discussion above, it can be concluded that the need for good learning models of learning that have been offered such as learning models of student facilitators and explaining is needed with a percentage of 66%. After doing and implementing student learning facilitator and explaining learning and without learning student facilitator and explaining, the results are lacking with the nonparametric test calculation value of U Mann Whitney with SPSS producing asymp sig

(2tailed) of $0.381 > 0.05$, i.e. there is no difference significant between the two models, so they do not get results that are less in line with expectations. Whereas to measure how effective the facilitator and explaining student learning model is using the effect size formula with the results obtained 0.1 which is classified as low according to the Cohen rubric, which means that the learning model of facilitator and explaining student learning is less effective. The novelty of this study in the learning of student facilitators and

explaining at the junior high school level is not suitable, especially in the 3T areas (lagging, outermost,

outermost) which lacks several aspects, but such results can also be influenced by other factors.

E. REFERENCES

- Alti, W., & Hasan, H. (2020). Pengaruh Penggunaan Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining dan Minat terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa. *JRTI (Jurnal Riset Tindakan Indonesia)*, 4, 48–52.
- Arikunto, S. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian: Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*. Rineka Cipta.
- Astiani, F., Bahar, A., & Amir, H. (2019). Perbandingan Pembelajaran Sainifik Menggunakan Model Kooperatif Tipe Student Fasilitator and Explaining (SFE) dan Student Teams Achievement Division (STAD). *ALOTROP, Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Kimia*, 3(1), 25–33.
- Aztry, A. (2020). Model Student Facilitator and Explaining dalam Kemampuan Menulis Argumentatif. *BAHTERASIA*, 1(3), 7–14.
- Daryanto, & Rachmawati, T. (2015). *Teori Belajar dan Proses Pembelajaran yang Mendidik*. Gava Media.
- Mulyatiningsih, E. (2011). *Riset terapan bidang pendidikan dan teknik* (A. Nuryanto (ed.); 1st ed.). UNY Pres.
- Mulyono, D., Asmawi, M., & Nuriah, T. (2018). The Effect of Reciprocal Teaching, Student Facilitator and Explaining and Learning Independence on Mathematical Learning Results by Controlling the Initial Ability of Students. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 13(3), 199–205.
<https://doi.org/10.12973/iejme/3838>
- Muslim, S. (2014). Pengaruh Penggunaan Metode Student Facilitator And Explaining dalam Pembelajaran Kooperatif terhadap Kemampuan Pemecahan Masalah Matematik dan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Matematik Siswa SMK di Kota Tasikmalaya. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Keguruan*, 1(1), 209680.
- Nur, F., Sumarti, S. S., & Wardani, S. (2017). Pengaruh Student Facilitator and Explaining dengan Roda Impian Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa. *Chemistry in Education*, 6(2), 8–14.
- Purnamawati, D., Ertikanto, C., & Suyatna, A. (2017). Keefektifan Lembar Kerja Siswa Berbasis Inkuiri untuk Menumbuhkan Keterampilan Berpikir Tingkat Tinggi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Fisika Al-Biruni*, 6(2), 209.
<https://doi.org/10.24042/jipfalbiruni.v6i2.2070>
- Riduwan. (2010). *Skala Pengukuran Variabel-Variabel Penelitian* (Warsiman (ed.)). Alfabeta.
- Saifuddin, A., Nasikh, & Utomo, S. H. (2015). Penerapan Model Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFE) Dengan Menggunakan Peta Konsep Untuk Meningkatkan Keaktifan dan Prestasi Belajar Siswa Pada Mata Pelajaran Ekonomi Kelas X Lintas Minat Ekonomi Di SMA Negeri 02 Batu. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 8(1), 36–47.

- Sari, M. N., Hasmunir, & Kamaruddin, T. (2019). Perbandingan Hasil Belajar Siswa Menggunakan Model Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining dengan Model Pembelajaran Belajar Everyone is a Teacher Here Pelajaran IPS Terpadu Kelas VII SMP Negeri 10 Banda Aceh. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Geografi FKIP Unsyiah*, 4(1), 82–88.
- Setiawan, M. A. (2017). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Problem Based Learning Dipadu Student Facilitator and Explaining Terhadap Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Siswa Kelas X Sman 6 Kediri Pada Pokok Bahasan Fungi. *Florea: Jurnal Biologi Dan Pembelajarannya*, 4(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.25273/florea.v4i1.1167>
- Situmorang, E., Hutasuhut, S., & Maipita, I. (2019). The Effect of E-Learning, Student Facilitator and Explaining Model Learning and Self-Regulated Learning on 11th Grade Students Learning Outcomes of Economic Subject in Senior High School 1 Perbaungan School Year 2019/2020. *Budapest International Research and Critics in Linguistics and Education (BirLE) Journal*, 2(4), 461–469. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birle.v2i4.537>
- Sugiyono. (2017). *metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung, Alfabeta.
- Widayani, P. Y., Putra, I. M., & Ganing, N. N. (2014). Pengaruh Student Facilitator and Explaining Berbantuan Peta Konsep terhadap Hasil Belajar PKN Kelas V SD Gugus I Gusti Ngurah Rai. *Jurnal Mimbar PGSD Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, 2(1).
- Widayati, R. A. (2018). The Implementation of Cooperative Learning Strategy of Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFE) Type to Improve Activity and Learning Result. *Classroom Action Research Journal*, 2(1), 13–23. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um013v2i12018p13>
- Widyawati, S. (2016). Eksperimentasi Model Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFE) Terhadap Hasil Belajar Ditinjau Dari Kecerdasan Linguistik. *Al-Jabar: Jurnal Pendidikan Matematika*, 7(2), 267–274.
- Yuswar, E., Taher, A., & Kamaruddin, T. (2017). Perbandingan Hasil Belajar Siswa Menggunakan Model Pembelajaran Student Facilitator and Explaining dengan Model Pembelajaran Think Talk Write pada Mata Pelajaran IPS Terpadu Kelas VIII SMP Negeri 1 Ingin Jaya. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pendidikan Geografi FKIP Unsyiah*, 2(November), 43–50.
- Zain, A. R., & Joko. (2012). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe. Student Facilitator and Explaining (SFAE) Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Teknik Elektro*, 1, 37–39.
- Zainal Arifin. (2012). *Evaluasi Pembelajaran*. Bandung. Remaja Rosdakarya Offset.