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**Abstract**

The research objective is to determine the effectiveness of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education in primary schools. The focus of this research is based on analysis of participants’ affectivety of learning attitude that values ​​religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility as well as their cognitivity from work group risults and answering questions individually. The method used was survey method with a qualitative approach at the primary school level of 24 learners participated in this study consisting of 14 boys and 10 girls with ranges 11- 12 years. Location of the study was focused in class V primary school in South Sulawesi Indonesia. The developed indicators composed of affective value of religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility and cognitive indicators consisting of group work students and answers to questions of each individual. The research results by using STAD type of cooperative learning model based character education in primary schools showed that in addition to the embedded values ​​of the characters learners are also effective in the implementation of learning.
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**INTRODUCTION**

In general, until now the learning process taking place in school is by transfering knowledge from educators to students in the form of classical learning pattern / lectures which resulting in passive activities of learners in the classroom, so that the learning process does not stimulate learners, is not creative and lead to low ability to work in groups. These educational activities are still far from the expected, therefore it is necessary to create cooperative learning patterns that help students to be active in the learning process, It is time that educators master the learning models that can develop the thinking skills of learners hence the role of a decisive teacher / educator is very important in improving students' learning motivation and competence.

The tendency for authoritarian and instructive teachers create a one-way communication, where the teacher plays a more active role while the students only passively accept the subject matter presented by the teacher. This means less teachers provide opportunities and freedom to students to express their opinions so that students become passive and this situation is contrary to active learning students.

Based on the results of a study conducted on the model of learning, one effective solution is the implementation of a cooperative learning model type called Student Team Achievement Division (STAD) a creative and innovative learning model that allows students to be actively involved in the learning process encouragingt a positive impact on the quality of interaction and communication between students. STAD cooperative learning model is appropriate to apply in primary schools where the learning processes typically require students to do experimental and cooperative learning.

In line with the implementation of cooperative learning model type STAD that emphasizes cooperation, there is also a balancing requirement by the application of the values ​​of character. Character education is a continuous process to foster the mental development of children to function better in civilised society.

The normative vision and mission of character formation is contained in Law No. 20 Year 2003 on National Education System Article 3 stating that "National education serves to develop the ability and form the within a dignified civilization in order to educate the nation aimed at developing the potential of learners in order to become a person of faith, devoted to God Almighty, noble, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, who become responsible and democratis citizens ". Therefore, teachers must think and plan systematically in the implementation of teaching to improve learning opportunities for students and improve the quality of teaching.

This study focused on the analysis of affectiveness attitudes of learners that values ​​religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility with cognitivity of learners from group work and answer questions individually.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

This type of research is a quantitative survey method at primary school level. To gather the necessary data this study used a questionnaire technique, observation and tests. The use of such data collection techniques are as follows.

1. Observation

Observation as data collection techniques has specific characteristics compared to interview techniques and questionnaires. Interviews and questionnaires are communication avenues conducted with people while observation is not limited to people, but can also include objects. Observation sheets were used to collect data on the implementation of the lessons learned from the learners’ Assessment Sheets. Data obtained was on the value or affective character of students, which in turn appears effective or not as a learning model.

2. Test

Test method is used to determine student achievement test during the implementation of learning using learning devices. Preparation of achievement test is intended as a set of test tools that can be used to assess learning outcomes on a learning model.

The research indicators, namely:

a. Affective indicator consists of the value of a religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility: and

b. Cognitive indicator consists of the work of the group of students and individual learners answering a number of questions.
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**Figure 1. Conceptual Framework**

This study originated from the development of a learning model STAD based on character. According to the study, there are three criteria, namely the validity, effectiveness, and practicality. Of the three criteria effectiveness is chosen as the focus of the discussion. There are two research indicators which are affective and cognitive. The affective indicator by using the methods of observation will determine the value of a religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility while the cognitive indicator will determine the value of group work and the value of the individual answers on some questions. The values ​​of affective and cognitive produce learning outcomes of students.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

**Participant**

Detail informasi about research are 24 learners year V of primary school, in south Sulawesi Indonesia. Participants consisted of 14 boys and 10 girls with ranges 11- 12 years.

**Prosedures**

An observation study was carried out in this study to evaluate the effectivity of the STAD based character education. The observation was taken for 70 minutes in the classroom while civil education subject was taught. In the observation activity numbers of character indicators were assessed including religious criteria, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility of the students. Examination of character indicators was undertaken using check-list that was modified from SOP from the national education ministry. Based SOP the national education ministry there are 18 indicators value of nation characters but only 4 characters adapted because attention about time only 70 minutes for one meeting. In indicators of students character are precented in appendix 1.

Students character was assessed by coding based on likert-scale are 0 never, 1 rarely, 2 sometimes, 3 often, and 4 Always. Total individu score was gathered from average of the each indicator score.

Next stage, Group discussion activity consisting of participants were grouped into 4 groups with selective placing of participants between one group to another group. Each group was given worksheet to discuss and every group do 5 items question up to that presentation in front of them friends, then evaluation/marking.

Total score for each student was calculated of character from individu score add group discussion then average to get high score. Participants was categorised have high score if they achieve total score more than 65 CCM score, which is they effectivity of the STAD based character education was evaluated from the percentage of the students who achieve CCM.

1. **Affective Indicators**

**Table 1.**

**Affective Rate Indicators on Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondents** | **Affective Value** | | | | **Amount** | **Average** |
| **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 1 | 50 | 70 | 65 | 75 | 260 | 65 |
| 2 | 80 | 80 | 85 | 65 | 310 | 78 |
| 3 | 85 | 55 | 80 | 70 | 290 | 73 |
| 4 | 70 | 80 | 95 | 55 | 300 | 75 |
| 5 | 80 | 75 | 55 | 80 | 290 | 73 |
| 6 | 75 | 80 | 60 | 80 | 295 | 74 |
| 7 | 85 | 95 | 85 | 90 | 355 | 89 |
| 8 | 65 | 85 | 80 | 85 | 315 | 79 |
| 9 | 60 | 50 | 75 | 70 | 255 | 64 |
| 10 | 90 | 55 | 50 | 95 | 290 | 73 |
| 11 | 75 | 80 | 50 | 75 | 280 | 70 |
| 12 | 95 | 95 | 90 | 95 | 375 | 94 |
| 13 | 70 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 265 | 66 |
| 14 | 80 | 85 | 85 | 90 | 340 | 85 |
| 15 | 50 | 85 | 65 | 95 | 295 | 74 |
| 16 | 90 | 80 | 95 | 85 | 350 | 88 |
| 17 | 75 | 75 | 90 | 75 | 315 | 79 |
| 18 | 85 | 80 | 65 | 70 | 300 | 75 |
| 19 | 80 | 80 | 90 | 70 | 320 | 80 |
| 20 | 80 | 55 | 75 | 55 | 265 | 66 |
| 21 | 70 | 80 | 80 | 80 | 310 | 78 |
| 22 | 85 | 85 | 75 | 80 | 325 | 81 |
| 23 | 65 | 70 | 70 | 75 | 280 | 70 |
| 24 | 80 | 85 | 85 | 80 | 330 | 83 |
| **Total** | **1.820** | **1.825** | **1.810** | **1.855** | **7.310** | **1.832** |
| **Average** | **76** | **76** | **75** | **77** | **304** | **76** |

*Source: observation sheet research results 2015*

*Specification:*

*\*Affective 1 = religious character \*Affective 3= national pride character*

*\*Affective 2 = tolerance character \*Affective 4= responsibility character*

Based on the research data on affective which consists of four components which are religious character, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility, result are depicted in the form of tables, graphs, and descriptive analysis as follows.

**Table 2.**

**The distribution of affective ratings**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range Value** | **Frequency** | **%** |
| 91 – 100 | 1 | 4 |
| 81 – 90 | 5 | 21 |
| 71 – 80 | 12 | 50 |
| 61 – 70 | 6 | 25 |
| 0 – 60 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **24** | **100** |

**Figure 2. Graph affective assessment results**

above table and graph show 24 learners at varying affective values. There are no result on the range of ​​0-60, there are 6 people in the range of 61-70, there are 12 people in the a range of ​​71 -80, there are 5 people in the range of 81-90, and no result on the range of ​​91 - 100. Only one student scored the highest value of 94 and only one student had the lowest value which was 64. If the values ​​are added together the total is 1.832 with an average 76.

1. **Cognitive Indicators**

**Table 3.**

**Rate Cognitive Indicators on Respondents**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondents** | **Cognitive Value** | | **Amount** | | **Average** | |
| **Work in Group** | **Answer Individually** |
| 1 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 75 | |
| 2 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 75 | |
| 3 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 75 | |
| 4 | 75 | 70 | 145 | 73 | |
| 5 | 75 | 80 | 155 | 78 | |
| 6 | 85 | 75 | 160 | 80 | |
| 7 | 85 | 95 | 180 | 90 | |
| 8 | 85 | 70 | 155 | 78 | |
| 9 | 85 | 80 | 165 | 83 | |
| 10 | 85 | 70 | 155 | 78 | |
| 11 | 90 | 85 | 175 | 88 | |
| 12 | 90 | 95 | 185 | 93 | |
| 13 | 90 | 80 | 170 | 85 | |
| 14 | 90 | 75 | 165 | 83 | |
| 15 | 90 | 80 | 170 | 85 | |
| 16 | 80 | 90 | 170 | 85 | |
| 17 | 80 | 70 | 150 | 75 | |
| 18 | 80 | 80 | 160 | 80 | |
| 19 | 80 | 70 | 150 | 75 | |
| 20 | 80 | 65 | 145 | 73 | |
| 21 | 75 | 55 | 130 | 65 | |
| 22 | 75 | 70 | 145 | 73 | |
| 23 | 75 | 65 | 140 | 70 | |
| 24 | 75 | 75 | 150 | 75 | |
| **Total** | **1.950** | **1.820** | **3.770** | **1.885** | |
| **Average** | **81** | **76** | **157** | **79** | |

*Source: Primary Data Processing, 2015*

The results of cognitive research consisting of group work and individual answers to some questions may be described in the form of following tables, graphs, and descriptive analysis.

**Table 4.**

**Distribution of Cognitive Assessment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range Value** | **Frequency** | **%** |
| 91 – 100 | 1 | 4 |
| 81 – 90 | 7 | 29 |
| 71 – 80 | 14 | 59 |
| 61 – 70 | 2 | 8 |
| 0 – 60 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **24** | **100** |

**Figure 3. Graph cognitive assessment results**

Result show the 24 learners at varying cognitive values. There are no results on the range of ​​0-60, there are 2 people in the range 61-70, there are 14 people in the range of ​​71-80, there are 7 people in the range of 81-90, and one person scored on a range of ​​91-100. Only one students received the highest value of 93 and another got the lowest value of 65. If the values ​​are added together the total is 1.885 with an average of 79.

1. **Summary of affective and cognitive assessment results**

**Table 5.**

**Results Data Recapitulation Affective and Cognitive Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Respondents** | **Average value** | | **Amount** | **Average** |
| **affective** | **Cognitive** |  |  |
| 1 | 65 | 75 | 140 | 70 |
| 2 | 78 | 75 | 153 | 77 |
| 3 | 73 | 75 | 148 | 74 |
| 4 | 75 | 73 | 148 | 74 |
| 5 | 73 | 78 | 151 | 76 |
| 6 | 74 | 80 | 154 | 77 |
| 7 | 89 | 90 | 179 | 90 |
| 8 | 79 | 78 | 157 | 79 |
| 9 | 64 | 83 | 147 | 74 |
| 10 | 73 | 78 | 151 | 76 |
| 11 | 70 | 88 | 158 | 79 |
| 12 | 94 | 93 | 187 | 94 |
| 13 | 66 | 85 | 151 | 76 |
| 14 | 85 | 83 | 168 | 84 |
| 15 | 74 | 85 | 159 | 80 |
| 16 | 88 | 85 | 173 | 87 |
| 17 | 79 | 75 | 154 | 77 |
| 18 | 75 | 80 | 155 | 78 |
| 19 | 80 | 75 | 155 | 78 |
| 20 | 66 | 73 | 139 | 70 |
| 21 | 78 | 65 | 143 | 72 |
| 22 | 81 | 73 | 154 | 77 |
| 23 | 70 | 70 | 140 | 70 |
| 24 | 83 | 75 | 158 | 79 |
| **Total** | **1.832** | **1.890** | **3.722** | **1.868** |
| **Average** | **76** | **79** | **155** | **78** |

The recapitulation of affective research results consisting religious, tolerance, national pride, and responsibility values, and the recapitulation of cognitive research results consisting of group work and individual answers to some question, are described in the following tables, graphs, and descriptive analysis.

**Table 6.**

**Distribution Data Recapitulation Affective and Cognitive AssessmentResults**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Range Value** | **Frequency** | **%** |
| 91 – 100 | 1 | 4 |
| 81 – 90 | 3 | 13 |
| 71 – 80 | 17 | 70 |
| 61 – 70 | 3 | 13 |
| 0 – 60 | 0 | 0 |
| **Total** | **24** | **100** |

**Figure 4. Graph recapitulation of affective and cognitive assessment**

Result show the 24 learners at varying affective and cognitive values. There are no result on the a range of ​​0-60, there are 3 people in the range of 61-70, there are 17 people in the range of 71-80, there are 3 people in the range of 81-90. and one person scored on a range of ​​91-100. Only one student received the highest value of ​​94 with 3 learners received the lowest value of 70. If the values are added together the total is1.868 with an average of 78.

**DISCUSSION**

Based on the facts that occurred as the result of a survey on the subject of research in year V of primary school in South Sulawesi in Indonesia, the obtained data provide the following information:

1. There are a number of students began to speak when asked a question by saying hello, This indicates that the value of the religious character is embedded in the implementation of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education
2. There are a number of students showing cooperation and solidarity with the friends group during the discussion group, This indicates that the value of tolerance character has appeared on the implementation of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education
3. There are a number of learners to further highlight or the interests of the group of the opinions peribadinya This indicates that the value of the national spirit character already owned on the implementation of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education
4. There are a number of students have received the results of the discussion and not to blame in their own group if they answer incorrectly, This indicates that the value of the existing character of responsibility in the implementation of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education

STAD learning model based character education is one type of cooperative learning which aims to encourage students to cooperate, help each other complete tasks, and master and apply the skills given that that is the grand theory of this learning model.

Based on the theory that the STAD type of cooperative learning model based character education students may be able to carry out cooperation, mutual help completing tasks, and master and apply the skills given mainly in connection with the planting of character values ​​such as religious tolerance, the spirit of nationalism, and responsibility yet the fact that not all students are able to do so. Of course this affects the assessment of learning outcomes of students. From this base dirumuskanlah a problem that How the effectiveness of cooperative learning model type STAD-based character education in primary schools, with the aim to determine the effectiveness of STAD learning model based character education in primary schools.

Behavioristic theory is a theory of learning that is more emphasis on behavior change as well as a result of the interaction between stimulus and response. Figure is a pioneer of the theory behavioristik Thorndike (1949), Watson (2007), and Skinner (1958). According to this theory human behavior is nothing other than a stimulus-response relationship. Who controls the stimulus-response at the most are those who are good and succeed in learning. The establishment of stimulus-response relationship is done through repetition-repetition. Thus from the activities of the first, second, third and so would allow for the occurrence of a change in behavior better.

Furthermore, Skinner (1958) say that the relationship of stimulus and response that occurs through interksi in the environment, the which then would lead to a change in behavior because basically stimuli given to someone will interact and the interaction between the stimulus will affect the shape of the response given.

Cognitive learning theory regard learning as a process functioning elements of cognition, particularly elements of the mind, to be able to recognize and understand the stimulus that comes from outside. Learning activities in human beings focused on internal processes of thinking, the processing of information. The term cognitive (cognitive) is derived from the equivalent of cognition which he said knowing, means knowing. In a broad sense cognition (cognition) is the acquisition, structuring, and use of knowledge. Figures from kognitifisme theory among others Piaget (1969), Ausebel (1963), and Brunner (1978).

Furthermore, Piaget (1969) builds his theory based on the concept of Scheme ie, mental or cognitive structure that causes a person intellectually adapt and coordinate the surrounding environment (Suparno; 1997). Scheme in principle is not static but always been progressing in line with the human cognitive development

**CONCLUSION**

1. According to the results of data analysis at an average of affective value that consists of four components, namely religious, tolerance, national spirit and responsibility and supported by behavioristic theory that emphasizes the relationship of stimulus and response occur through interksi in the environment, then it will lead to changes in behavior then in terms of value affective learning model STAD-based character education in primary schools has been effective.

2. On the results of data analysis the average value of cognitive consists of two components, namely the work group and the results of the individual answers and supported by kognitifisme theory that emphasizes the process of cognition functioning elements, particularly elements of the mind that causes learning activities on human beings against the processing of the information in terms of cognitive learning model STAD value based character education in primary schools has been effective.

3. Both of the above indicates that the learning model STAD-based character education is effectively implemented in primary schools.
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