



THE INFLUENCE OF INQUIRY LEARNING MODEL, DISCOVERY LEARNING MODEL AND LEARNING STYLE ON THE POETRY LEARNING OUTCOME ON JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL IN PASURUAN INDONESIA

Rumus Achliono¹, Iskandar Wiryokusumo², IbutPriono Leksono²

¹Magister Degree Program, ²Lecturer of Magister Program of Education Technology, PGRI ADI BUANA University, Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This research aims to: (1) See whether there is a difference between poetry learning outcome who is using inquiry and discovery learning model of 7th grade student Junior High School in Pasuruan Indonesia; (2) See whether there is a difference between poetry learning outcome who is using visual learning style, auditorial learning style, or kinesthetic learning style of 7th grade student Junior High School in Pasuruan Indonesia; (3) See whether there is an interaction influence between learning model and learning style of 7th grade student Junior High School 1 in Pasuruan Indonesia. Population in this research is 7th grade student Junior High School in Pasuruan Indonesia. Data collected from 186 students as chosen samples using random sampling method. Data analyzed with descriptive analysis and regressive analysis. Research result shows: (1) There are 109 students who have visual learning style obtain learning outcome with average 64,32 and deviation standard 9,596. While there are 37 students who have auditorial learning style obtain result with average 65,0 and deviation standard 11,316; (2) There are 73 students who have inquiry learning model obtain learning outcome with average 67,40 and deviation standard 9,96. While there are 73 students who have discovery learning model obtain learning outcome with average 61,21 and deviation standard 9,302; (3) Hypothesis test about the difference of poetry learning outcomes between students who treated with inquiry learning model and discovery learning model obtains result that there is difference of poetry learning outcome between students who were treated with inquiry learning model with discovery learning model; (4) Hypothesis test about the difference of poetry learning outcomes between students who have visual learning style and auditorial learning style obtains result that there is no difference of poetry learning outcomes between students who have visual learning style and auditorial learning style; (5) Based on the results of F test calculation to determine the effect of independent variables on dependent variables obtained the significance level of 0,002 (on corrected model) means that the learning model, learning style and interaction between the learning model and learning style have an effect on the learning outcome.

Keywords : Inquiry learning model, Discovery learning model, Visual learning style, Auditorial learning style, Learning outcome.

INTRODUCTION

Based on various studies conducted by international organizations, such as the study conducted by TIMSS most of Indonesian students (95%) are only able to answer the problem to the middle level. That means, 5% of Indonesian students are only able to solve problems that require thinking. The problem is why Indonesian lessons have not been able to build students intellection, whereas the main function of language other than as a means of communication is also a means of mind-forming.

According to Government Regulation, Education and Culture 65/2013 about Procedural Standard, provides that the suggested learning approach are scientific-based learning. Those are discovery or inquiry learning, and learning that results in project-based learning. In line with the policy, the Directorate of Junior Secondary Education provides guidance on learning models that are in line with the implementation of the 2013 curriculum, namely Scientific approach, Contextual approach, Problem Based approach, Project Based approach, and Communicative approach.

Each student has different way of receiving an information submitted by the teacher, that causes the results of each student's learning are different. Ways to learn a lesson are often referred to learning styles. According to Gunawan (in Ghufon, 2014) learning styles are the ways we prefer to do activities of thinking, processing and understanding an information.

The curriculum, especially for learning materials in Indonesia is more emphasized on text-based learning. Language units contain meaning, thoughts, and complete ideas are called text. Text does not always have form of written language, as is commonly understood, for example Pancasila text which is often read at the flag ceremony. Text can be either written text or oral text. The text itself has two main elements that must be had. First, context of the use of language situations in which there are registers behind the birth of the text, such as the existence of something (messages, thoughts, ideas, ideas) to be conveyed (field), target or to whom the message, thoughts, ideas, or ideas are conveyed (tenor), and in a language format how messages, thoughts, ideas, or ideas are merged (mode).

Poetry is a form of rhythmic language pronunciation which is expressing intellectual experience that is imaginative and emotional (Purba, 2010). Poetry is an expression of the poet's inner experience of human life, nature, and God through an aesthetic language media that is coherent and fully solidified in textual form (Zulfahuret al., 1996).

A learned person aims to achieve good learning outcomes. Learning outcomes are related to learning activities, because learning is a process, while learning outcomes are an achievement that student obtains in the learning process. That achievement is not only about the knowledge of student only, but also related to the attitude and skill of student. This is supported by the opinion of Sudjana (2014) which tells that the results of student learning is essentially a change of behavior.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Research Location and Time

Research is conducted in Sukorejo1 Junior High School and Gempol 2 Junior High School in Pasuruan District, and conducted from September 2017 to February 2018 or year 2017/2018.

Population and Sample

Populations in this research are nine classes consist of students in Sukorejo 1 Junior High School and eight classes consist of students in Gempol 2 Junior High School, Pasuruan District, year

2017/2018.

Samples in this research are taken randomly as many as four classes include two classes from Sukorejo 1 Junior High School, those are VIIB and VIID, and two classes from Gempol 2 Junior High School, those are VIIA and VIIC.

Research Variable

Independent variable : Learning model which consists of inquiry and discovery

Moderator variable : Learning style which consists of visual and auditorial

Control variable : Poetry learning outcome in the form of daily exam grade

Data Collecting Methods

Learning style questionnaire

Data Analysis

The data obtained from the questionnaire of student learning style and student learning outcome in the form of daily examination results are analyzed by using T test to determine differences in student learning outcomes based on differences in learning model and learning style and F test to examine the influence of interaction between learning model with learning style on learning outcome with the help of SPSS version 16.0.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Learning Style

Learning style data indicate that students who used as sample research almost three quarters of samples have visual learning style while a quarter of samples have auditorial learning style and none of students have kinesthetic learning style. Based on questionnaire, obtained data (Table 1) as follows:

Table 1. Learning style based on questionnaire

No.	Learning Style	Students Number	Percentage
1	Visual	109	74,66%
2	Auditorial	37	25,34%
3	Kinesthetic	0	0%
Total		146	100%

Table 2. Learning Outcome According to Visual Learning Style Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
DE Grade	109	44	92	64.31	9.596
Visual	109	1	1	1.00	.000
Valid N (listwise)	109				

Based on Table 2, data shows maximum daily examination grade is 92, minimum daily examination grade is 44, and mean is 64,31 with deviation standard is 9,596.

Table 3. Learning Outcome According to Auditorial Learning Style

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
DE Grade	37	44	84	65.30	11.316
Auditorial	37	2	2	2.00	.000
Valid N (listwise)	37				

Based on Table 3, data shows there are 37 students having auditorial learning style and maximum daily examination grade is 84, minimum daily examination grade is 44, and mean is 65,30 with deviation standard is 11,316.

Table 4. Learning Outcome According to Inquiry Learning Model

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
--	---	---------	---------	------	----------------

DE Grade	73	44	92	67.40	9.926
Learning Model	73	2	2	2.00	.000
Valid N (listwise)	73				

Based on Table 4, data shows there are 73 students having inquiry learning model and maximum daily examination grade is 92, minimum daily examination grade is 44, and mean is 67,40 with deviation standard is 9,926.

Table 5. Learning Outcome According to Discovery Learning Model

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
DE Grade	73	44	84	61.21	9.302
Learning Model	73	1	1	1.00	.000
Valid N (listwise)	73				

Based on Table 5, data shows there are 73 students having discovery learning model and maximum daily examination grade is 84, minimum daily examination grade is 44, and mean is 61,21 with deviation standard is 9,302.

Learning Outcome to Learning Style Difference Test

F test is used to determine whether the variant of the two samples is same or different. Both data samples are said to be equal if the probability count or $P > 0,05$. Based on data analysis results using SPSS version 16.0 obtained results in table 6 obtained results $F = 5,055$ with $P_{\text{count}} = 0,026$. Since $P_{\text{count}} < 0,05$, then this case indicates that the sample comes from a different variant.

Difference test is using criteria:

H_0 accepted if $T_{\text{count}} < T_{\text{table}}$, calculating result in Table 6 obtains $T = -0,475$, while with $df = 144$ and significant level 0,05 amount $\pm 1,976575$.

Under the terms of acceptance or rejection of the null hypothesis (H_0), then the null hypothesis (H_0) is accepted. This means that there is no difference in the results of poetry learning between students who have a visual learning style with students who have an auditorial learning style although there is a difference in average value of 0,985.

Learning Outcome to Learning Model Difference Test

Based on calculating result in table above, P_{count} in F test amount 0,624, shows $P_{\text{count}} > 0,05$ thus null

hypothesis (H_0) rejected, means two samples are from same variant.

Based on T test obtained number -3,889 while based on table with $df=144$, significant level 0,05 amount $\pm 1,976575$ thus $-T_{\text{count}} < -T_{\text{table}}$ thus null hypothesis (H_0) rejected. It means there is difference between student using inquiry and discovery learning model with mean difference 6,192.

Interaction between Learning Style and Learning Model to Learning Outcome Test

Before testing the influence of learning style interaction and learning model to the learning result, basic assumption test includes normality test, homogeneity test, and linearity test as a requirement of parametric method research.

Based on the calculation, Kosmogorov-Smirnov shows that the value of significance for daily re-examination on the discovery learning model is 0,071 and for daily re-examination on inquiry learning model of 0,052. Because the significance value for the two daily values in the two learning models is more than 0,05 thus the sample data is normally distributed.

Linearity Test

Linearity test aims to find out whether the two variables that are variables of learning outcome with variable learning model have a linear relationship. Testing by using SPSS program version 16.0 by using Test for Linearity with significance level 0,05. Two variables are said to have a linear correlation if the significance is less than 0,05.

Based on the result, obtained significant level 0,000. Based on the note contained below table 10 which states that linearity can not be computed. This happens because the data on the variable learning model and learning style is the nominal data so that can not be determined its linearity with learning outcome.

After testing the basic assumptions include normality test, homogeneity test and linearity test as requirements of parametric method research have been fulfilled, the influence of interaction test between the learning style and the learning model on the learning result can be continued.

Two-way anova test is used to determine the effect of learning style, learning model and interaction between learning style and learning model on learning outcome. In this research, the two-way anova test using SPSS program version 16.0 and the result in table 11. Based on the results obtained: In the Corrected model results obtained significance level 0,002, meaning that the learning model, learning style, and interaction between learning model and learning style affect the learning outcome.

In the Intercept results obtained 0,000 significance level, meaning without the influence of independent variables, learning outcome will change.

In the Model obtained the significance level 0,001, meaning that the learning model affects the results of learning.

In the Style result obtained a significance level 0,979, meaning that learning styles have no effect on learning outcome.

In the model style obtained a significance level 0,672, meaning that the interaction between learning model with learning style has no effect on learning outcome.

On the results of R Squared obtained results 0,98, meaning that the correlation between independent variables with very strong dependent variable

CONCLUSION

According to data and data analysis can be concluded that:

1) Students used as research samples nearly three quarters of the samples had visual learning style whereas a quarter of the samples had auditorial learning style and none of the students had a kinesthetic learning style.

There is no difference in the result of poetry learning between students who have visual learning style with students who have auditorial learning style although there is an average difference of 0,985.

There are differences in the results of poetry learning between students who were treated with inquiry learning model with discovery learning model with an average difference of 6,192.

Learning model, learning style as well as interaction between learning model and learning style have an effect on to learning result.

SUGGESTION

After doing research, processing data and testing the hypothesis to produce conclusions, the authors provide advice to researchers and observers of education as follows:

- 1) Preparation before conducting the research is essential for the continuity of the research.
- 2) Research tools include questionnaires, learning outcomes and learning tools are well prepared.
- 3) Learning methods and models should be adapted to the learning styles of students and subject matter presented by teachers in order to improve student learning outcomes.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Al Tabany, TriantoIbnu. **2014**. Mendesain Model Pembelajaran Inovatif, Progresif, dan Kontekstual. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group
- [2]. Arikunto, Suharsimi. **2010**. Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik .Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [3]. Bintarini, Ni Kade, A.A.I.N. Marhaeni, I WayanLasmayan. **2013**. Determinasi Pemanfaatan Lingkungan Sekitar Sekolah Sebagai Sumber Belajar Terhadap Gaya Belajardan Pemahaman Konsep IPS pada Siswa Kelas IVSDN Gugus Yudhistira Kecamatan Nagara. *e-Journal Program Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha*, Vol. 3, Hal. 1-11.
- [4]. Bungin, Burhan. **2014**. Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif Edisi Kedua. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- [5]. Dimyatidan Mudjiono. **2009**. Belajardan Pembelajaran. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.Djaali. **2014**. Psikologi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- [6]. Djamarah, Syaiful Bahridan Aswan Zain. 2011. Strategi Belajar Mengajar. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta
- [7]. Ghufiron, M. Nurdan Rini Risnawita. **2014**. Gaya Belajar Kajian Teoritik.Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [8]. Basiran, Mokh. **1999**. *Apakah yang Dituntut GBPP Bahasa Indonesia Kurikulum 1994*.

Yogyakarta: Depdikbud

- [9]. Darjowidjojo, Soenjono. **1994**. *Butir-butir Renungan Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Bahasa Asing*. Makalah disaji kandalam Konferensi Internasional Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Bahasa Asing. Salatiga: Univeristas Kristen SatyaWacana
- [10]. Kosiyah. **2012**. Pengaruh Strategi Pembelajaran dan Gaya Belajar terhadap Hasil Belajar Pendidikan Agama Islam Siswa SD Inti No. 060873 Medan. *Jurnal Tabularasa PPS UNIMED*, No. 1, Hal.63-80.
- [11]. Lestari, NurOktavianti. 2015. Analisis terhadap Pola Asuh dan Gaya Belajar Siswa Berprestasi. *Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan PEDAGOGIA*, Volume 7, Nomor 2, Hal. 291-295.
- [12]. Machfudz, Imam. **2000**. *Metode Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia Komunikatif*. Jurnal Bahasan SastraUM
- [13]. Moeleong, Lexy J. **2000**. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosyda Karya
- [14]. Saksomo, Dwi. **1983**. *Strategi Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia*. Malang: IKIP Malang
- [15]. Subyakto, Sri Utari. **1988**. *Metodologi Pengajaran Bahasa*. Jakarta: Dirjen Dikti Depdikbud
- [16]. Suarsani, Gusti Ayu. **2011**. Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Inkuiri Terbimbing Terhadap Hasil Belajar Kimia Siswa Kelas XI IPA SMA PGRI Gianyar 3Ubud. Tesis (tidak diterbitkan). Singaraja: Undiksha.
- [17]. Sugiono, S. **1993**. *Pengajaran Bahasa Indonesia sebagai Bahasa Asing*. Makalah disajikan dalam Konferensi Bahasa Indonesia; VI. Jakarta: 28 Oktober—2 Nopember **1993** Suharsimi
- [18]. Arikunto. (2002). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara