Volume 5 Number 3 (2023)
September-December 2023
Page: 553-572

E-ISSN: 2656-4491
P-ISSN: 2656-4548
DOI: 10.37680/scaffolding.v5i3.3828

SCAFFOLDING
Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Multikulturalisme

THE INFLUENCE OF THE TWO STAY TWO STRAY LEARNING MODEL AND LEARNING MOTIVATION ON CIVICS LEARNING OUTCOMES IN PRIMARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Risna Sinaga[1], Reh Bungana Br Perangi-angin[2], Aman Simaremare[3]
[123]Universitas Negeri Medan; Indonesia
Correspondence email; risnasinaga080@gmail.com

Submitted: 13/04/2023 Revised: 16/06/2023 Accepted: 17/08/2023 Published: 03/10/2023

Abstract

This research aims to determine the differences in the results of PPKn subjects for groups of students taught using the TWO STAY TWO STRAY and inquiry models, differences in the results of PPKn subjects for groups of students who have high and low learning motivation, and learning motivation in influencing the results of Civics subjects. This research was carried out at SDN 091713 Amborokan with class IV samples. This type of research is quantitative, using the experimental method (quasi-experiment) with a purposive sampling technique; the researcher chose class IV-A as the experimental class and IV-4 as the control class at SDN 091713. the sample in this study was taken as the entire population; class IV-A students had 32 students, and class IV-B had 32 students. In this case, the experimental class is class IV-A, which applies the Two Stay Two Stray learning model, while class IV-B is the control class, taught using the Inquiry learning model. In this research, analysis techniques are used with the steps of Descriptive Statistical Analysis, Inferential Statistical Analysis, Calculating the average, Calculating the standard deviation, normality test, homogeneity test, and hypothesis testing. The results of the research show that 1) there is an influence of learning models in influencing Civics learning outcomes with a calculated F of 59.805, 2) There is an influence of learning motivation in influencing Civics learning outcomes with a calculated F of 92.04, and 3) there is an interaction of learning models and Civics learning motivation with F count 4.09.

Keywords

Learning Model, learning motivation, PPKn learning outcomes, SDN 091713 Amborokan.

INTRODUCTION

Education is a process of learning knowledge and skills that will become habits for those who learn them. Education in the school environment is very influential for students (Sanjaya, 2019). Especially in elementary school education, at this age, students are still easy to accept learning (Andriani, 2019). Every learning activity certainly hopes for maximum learning results. Civics is one of the subjects taught in school. Civics can be interpreted as a vehicle for developing and preserving noble and moral values rooted in national culture, which are expected to be realized through behavior in national and state life (Endah, 2008). Looking at the goals of Citizenship Education (PPKn), it is hoped that it can shape students' personalities and morals to become critical, rational, intelligent, and responsible human beings for phenomena that occur in society (Darmadi, 2017).

PPKn learning in schools is expected to grow and improve knowledge and foster students' attitudes and behavior in living up to the values of Pancasila to produce the next generation of students for the nation and form characters who are noble and virtuous and have morality (Oktaviyanti et al., 2016). For this reason, students need to have the right learning skills, be brave enough to express opinions and examine problems that arise in their environment to achieve the expected behavior (Dewantara, 2010). In this case, one of the supporting factors to achieve the expected learning process is using a learning model appropriate to the conditions existing in the class (Arsyad, 2016).

Furthermore, teachers must increase students' learning motivation so that students play an active role in the learning process and achieve good quality education (Sadiman et al., 2017). The level of learning outcomes obtained by students is influenced by the teacher's ability to manage learning evenly according to the teacher's educational background (Hamruni, 2017).

Based on initial observations and interviews conducted on 15-16 June 2022 with class VI students at SD Negeri 091713 Amborokan. Observation results show that in teaching and learning activities, students' learning motivation in Civics subjects is shallow. This can be seen from the attitude of students who pay less attention to these subjects. This is because the learning approach used by the teacher is more passive, and the teacher is often left behind when learning is in progress, as well as the lack of learning media used. The limited class hours used for PPKn learning also greatly influence student learning motivation (Didik, 2020). based on the results of interviews with several teachers at the school, they still use the lecture learning model, where the learning process is only centered on the teacher and does not involve students actively participating in learning, so

students become bored because of monotonous learning. This then makes students feel unenthusiastic about learning, thereby hindering the achievement of learning objectives.

Teachers are expected to be able to design an appropriate learning model that can be used during the PPKn learning process so that the PPKn learning process itself does not tend to be monotonous and boring because the teacher in each lesson only uses the lecture method and students are only asked to record the material in the participant's notebook (Sulistyarini, 2008). With a learning model designed to be as attractive as possible, students will be enthusiastic and attract their attention, honing their curiosity about something new (Kagan, 2012). The learning model that researchers assume can replace the conventional learning model that elementary school teachers usually use is the two-stay two, stray, and inquiry learning model.

The Two Stay Two Stray and inquiry learning models have something in common: students are required to solve problems given by the teacher in their own way (Damopolii, 2022). This is said to make learning active and motivate students due to the direct involvement of students in learning (Arikunto, 2013). However, there is a difference between the two stray learning models and the inquiry learning models, namely the procedures for solving the problems given (Lubis, 2020). Solving problems given by the teacher using the Two Stay Two Stray learning model, namely by working in groups and working together, while the inquiry learning model does not impose on students to work in groups and can only be done individually (Huda, 2016). So, in this research, the researcher is interested in examining Civics learning outcomes using group teaching using the two-stay two, stray learning model and individual teaching using the inquiry learning model.

The application of two stay two stray in learning cannot only develop aspects of knowledge in students. However, it is also able to improve speaking skills and listening skills. This is based on the opinion of Sudiarsana (2020), who says that in the learning process, students are trained to be able to speak clearly and listen well (psychomotor)(Sudiarsana, 2020). Apart from that, the Two Stay Two Stray learning model teaches students to work together to find a concept where cooperation is excellent in building students' character (affective).

In contrast to the inquiry learning model, this model focuses more on individual problem-solving. Individually, this means that students are required to solve problems given by themselves or in groups. The inquiry learning model does not require students to share their findings with other students or groups. However, according to Sulistyarini (2008), inquiry learning, with its heuristic philosophical foundation, can improve students' critical thinking skills and sense of independence

(Minnsha, 2017).

Based on the similarities between the two learning models, namely that they require student activity, and the difference is that they solve problems collaboratively and independently, the researcher assumes that it is feasible to conduct research. This is because if the teacher implements an inappropriate learning process, it will result in low student learning outcomes. Low learning outcomes can originate from the teacher's lack of knowledge in choosing the suitable model or strategy for providing learning to students, resulting in boring learning activities that are difficult for students to accept. This will have an impact on learning outcomes and low student learning motivation. For example, students are lazy when dealing with Civics subjects (Markhaban, 2020).

Several related studies. Grace Nathalia, with the title "Increasing student activity and science learning achievement through the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) type cooperative learning model for fifth-grade students at Ringinsari State Elementary School, Depok Seleman," the results of the research show that the use of the Two Stay Two Stray type cooperative learning model has increased. In cycle I, the average score for student activity was 67.51, and in cycle II increased to 75.34. The increase from cycle I to cycle II was 7.83 or 11.60%. For learning achievement in cycle I, the average learning achievement was 67.66; in cycle II, it increased significantly to 80.69. The percentage increase in student learning achievement from cycle I to cycle II was 19.26% (Grace Natalia). The difference in the research used by Grace Nathalia in science subjects was carried out at Ringinsari Elementary School (Princess, 2019).

Research by Darin Fouryza in 2016, the results and discussion in this research show that there is an influence on Civics learning outcomes in fourth-grade elementary school students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray type Cooperative Learning model and those without using the Two Stay Two Stray type cooperative learning model (Fitriana, 2016). Research by Siti Nur Rahmawati in 2014 showed a significant difference between the posttest results for the experimental class, namely 74.56, and the control class, namely 67.65. So, it can be concluded that the Two Stay Two Stray cooperative learning model is more effective and has a positive effect than the Numbered Heads technique (Siti, 2020).

Research by Septi Rosalida. The research results show that mathematics learning achievement using the Two Stay Two Stray type cooperative model is in the very high category with a mean of 78.04 in the interval 75.05, 100. Meanwhile, the trend of learning achievement using the conventional model is in the medium category, with an average of 50. .08 is in the interval 41.65 < 58.35 (Norma,

2020).

Research conducted by Amalia Saidah. This research indicates that applying the Two Stay Two Stray method can improve science learning outcomes for class IV MI NU Islamiyah students in the 2013/2014 academic year. An increase in student learning outcomes proves this. In the pre-cycle condition, only 13 students (46%) completed the study with an average of 67.3, and after the action was taken, in the first cycle, student learning completion increased to 17 students (61%) with an average of 72.6. In cycle II, student learning mastery increased to 26 students (93%), averaging 81.4.

Meanwhile, in the results of the first cycle of observations, the average score for observations of learning management by teachers was 2.97, which was within the suitable criteria, and the average score for student learning activities was 2.08, which was in the relatively good criteria (Winanto, 2016) (Winanto, 2016).

Meanwhile, the difference lies in the type of research subjects taken. In Siti Nur Rahmawati's research, she took the subject area of Social Sciences, while this research took the subject area of Citizenship Education. The type of research carried out by Siti Nur Rahmawati was population research (SD Negeri Gedongkiwo), while this research used sample research with the population of SDN 091713 Amborokan(Siti, 2020)The difference is that the research carried out by Septi was in mathematics subjects and was carried out at SDN Timuran, while the researcher himself was in Civics subjects and was carried out at SDN 091713 Amborokan. Based on these reasons, this research aims to determine differences in the results of PPKn subjects for groups of students taught using the TWO STAY TWO STRAY and inquiry models, differences in results of PPKn subjects for groups of students who have high and low learning motivation, and learning motivation in influencing subject results PPKn.

METHOD

The approach used in this research is quantitative, using experimental methods (quasi-experiments), namely research that aims to determine whether there is an influence or consequence of something added to the subject, namely students (Creswell, 1997). In this quasi-experiment, the samples taken in this research were divided into two classes: the experimental and control classes. These two classes receive different treatment. In the first experimental class, learning treatment was given with the Two Stay Two Stray learning model, which was viewed from motivation, while in

the control class, learning treatment was given with the Inquiry learning model, which was viewed from motivation.

This research was conducted in class IV of SDN 091713 Amborokan District. Raya Kahean, Simalungun Regency, North Sumatra Province. The population in this study was all class IV students at SDN 091713 Amborokan, totaling 64 students spread across two classes, namely IV-A and IV-B. To determine the sample or class to be studied, the researcher will take one experimental group and one control group in class IV at SDN 091713 using purposive sampling. The researcher preferred this class to be part of this research because there were no other classes to choose as the experimental and control classes apart from these two. The researcher determined that the sample in this study was taken as a whole population, namely 32 students in class IV-A and 32 students in class IV-B.

Normality test

The normality test is carried out to determine whether the sample comes from a normally distributed population. The normality test uses the Kolmogorov-Smirnov formula with the help of the SPSS 2.0 program. Based on the results of calculations through the SPPS program, it is known that all data in this study have a normal distribution if the F value exceeds the significance level, which, in this study, the significance level is 0.05 in each research sample.

The homogeneity test determines whether the two samples' distribution comes from a homogeneous population. The sample homogeneity test comes from a normally distributed population. The homogeneity test in this study used the Barlet Test. The statistical hypothesis tested is stated as follows:

H_0: σ_(1^2)=σ_(2^2)= σ_(3^2)= σ_(4^2)=σ_(5^2)

H_a: at least one equal sign does not apply. The formula used for the test〖Bartlett〗^1 :

X^2= (In 10){B-∑▒〖(db).log〗Si^2}

B = (∑▒db)logs^2

Information :

Db = n-1

n = Ask the subject of each group

si^2 =Variance of each group

s^2 =Combined Variance:

With persistence:

Reject H_0 if x_count^2>x_table^2 (Not Homogeneous)

Accept H_0 if x_count^2>x_table^2 (Homogeneous)

X_table^2 is a list of chi-square distributions with db = k-1 (k = number of groups) and α = 0.051

Testing this research hypothesis uses data analysis techniques using two-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at a significance level of α= 0.05. If, after analysis, there is an interaction, then the Tukey test is continued because the number of samples for each class is the same. This analysis technique was used to determine differences in PPKn learning outcomes using the Two Stay Two Stray model and student motivation in class IV SDN 091713 Amborokan. From the two-way ANOVA design in Table 3.2, the hypothesis proposed is:

a. First Hypothesis

Ho: The Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model Has No Influence on the PPKn Learning Outcomes of Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan

Ha: The Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model Influences the PPKn Learning Outcomes of Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan

b. Second Hypothesis

Ho: Learning Motivation Has No Influence on PPKn Learning Outcomes for Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan

Ha: Learning Motivation Influences PPKn Learning Outcomes for Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan

c. Third Hypothesis

Ho: Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model and Learning Motivation Have No Influence on Civics Learning Outcomes for Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan

Ha: "The Two Stay Two Stray Learning Model and Learning Motivation Influence the PPKn Learning Outcomes of Class IV Students at SDN 091713 Amborokan."

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

The validity test results of the questionnaire instrument items were based on the trial of the learning motivation questionnaire instrument using 20 respondents with a critical value at a significance level of 0.05, then compared with the r_{table} value = 0.456. Testing the validity of the

student learning motivation questionnaire was carried out using the product moment formula. Based on the validity test of the questionnaire, it can be seen that the calculation results of the validity test of the mobile learning motivation questionnaire are between 0.11208 and 0.72399. Of the 40 questionnaire items that have been tested, there are 30 valid questionnaire items with a validity score range of 0.50678 - 0.72399 > 0.456. Meanwhile, there were ten invalid items, namely item numbers 2, 6, 7, 10, 15, 18, 22, 25, 30, and 39, which were not used in the research because other items already represented the indicators.

Based on the PPKn learning outcomes test instrument trial using 20 respondents with a critical value at a significance level of 0.05, the validity test results of the test instrument items were then compared with the r_{table} value = 0.456. the results of calculating the validity of the test instrument using the point biserial formula show that of the 40 questions that have been tested, there are 35 valid test questions with a validity score range of 0.49108 – 0.71353 > 0.456. Meanwhile, there were five invalid test items, namely questions 6, 15, 21, 30, and 40, which were not used in the research because other items already represented the indicators. A test instrument of 35 valid questions was used to measure Civics learning outcomes (complete calculations can be seen in the attachment).

2) Reliability Test

The instrument criteria are said to be reliable if the instrument reliability index value or r11 is $\geqslant$ 0.8. Based on the reliability test of the learning motivation questionnaire instrument using Cronbach's Alpha formula, the reliability index for the instrument or r11 was obtained at 0.9411. This means the learning motivation questionnaire instrument is declared reliable because r11 = 0.9411 $\geqslant$ 0.8 (complete calculation can be seen in the attachment).

The reliability test results of the PPKn learning outcomes test also show that the instrument is reliable. Based on the calculation of the reliability test of the test instrument using the KR-20 formula, r11 was obtained at 0.9368. Thus, the instrument tests learning outcomes the PPKn used is declared reliable because r11 = 0.9368 $\geqslant$ 0.8 (complete calculation can be seen in the attachment).

Presentation of Research Data

1) PPKn Learning Results Test Score Data

Each sample in this study was given treatment, namely by applying a learning model *Two Stay Two Stray*(TSTS) in the experimental group and an inquiry learning model (MPI) in the control group. The final skills test (posttest) is measured for PPKn learning outcomes for each group.

a) Experimental Group (A1)

Based on the data from the posttest results, the PPKn learning results for the experimental group can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of PPKn Learning Results Test Scores for Experimental Groups

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
51 – 58	5	25	25
59 – 66	3	15	40
67 – 74	4	20	60
75 – 82	6	30	70
83 – 90	2	10	100
Amount	20	100	

Based on Table 1, it can be explained that the posttest results of the experimental group were presented at intervals of 8, and many classes were 5; the highest score was 89, and the lowest score was 51. 2 students got a score of 51–58 with a percentage of 10%. Five students got a score of 59–66 with a percentage of 25%. 4 students got a score of 67–74 with a percentage of 20%. Six students scored 75–82 with a percentage of 30%. Three students scored 83–90, with a percentage of 15%. In the experimental group, most students scored 75-82, namely six students with a percentage of 30%. Overall data obtained an average score of 71.65 and a standard deviation of 11.12.

b) Control Group (A2)

Based on the posttest result data, PPKn learning results for the control group can be seen in the following table.

Table 2. Frequency Distribution of PPKn Learning Outcome Test Scores in the Control Group

Intervals	Median	Frequency	Percentage	
			Relatively	Cumulative
46 – 52	49	2	10	10
53 – 59	56	3	15	25
60 – 66	63	7	35	60
67 – 73	70	6	30	90
74 – 80	77	2	10	100
Amount		20	100	

Based on Table 2, it can be explained that the posttest results of the control group were presented at intervals of 7, and many classes were 5; the highest score was 80, and the lowest score was 46. 2 students got a score of 46–52 with a percentage of 10%. Three students scored 53–59, with

a percentage of 15%. Seven students got a score of 60–66 with a percentage of 35%. 6 students got a score of 6 –73 with a percentage of 30%. 2 students got a score of 74–80 with a percentage of 10%. In the control group, most students scored 60–66, namely seven students with a percentage of 35%. Overall data obtained an average score of 64.05 and a standard deviation of 8.66.

Based on the PPKn learning achievement test data from the experimental group and the control group, the data were searched for measures of central tendency, which included the mean (x), median (Me), and mode (Mo), as well as measures of dispersion which included the standard deviation (s) which was summarized in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Distribution of PPKn Learning Results Test Score Data for Experimental and Control Groups

Group	Measures of Central Tendency			Dispersion Measures		
	x	Mo	Me	Min	Max	S
Experiment	71.65	80	72.5	51	89	11,12
Control	64.05	66	66	46	80	8.66

Table 3 shows that for the experimental group, the average score was 71.65, a mode of 80, a median of 72.5, a minimum score of 51, a maximum score of 89, and a standard deviation of 11.12. The control group obtained an average score of 64.05, a mode of 66, a median of 66, a minimum score of 46, a maximum score of 80, and a standard deviation of 8.66.

2) Learning Motivation Questionnaire Score Data

Measuring students' level of learning motivation using a learning motivation questionnaire. Data on student learning motivation in this research is in the form of learning motivation anchor scores. These data were taken from research samples: students in class IV A as the experimental class and IV B as the control class. This data was collected to see students with high or low learning motivation.

a) High Learning Motivation (B1)

The student learning motivation questionnaire was given to both groups once after the treatment. The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students with high learning motivation.

Table 4. Frequency Distribution of Scores for Groups of Students with High Learning Motivation

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
51 – 58	5	25	25
59 – 66	3	15	40
67 – 74	4	20	60
75 – 82	6	30	70
83 – 90	2	10	100
Amount	20	100	

Based on Table 4, 5 students scored 51–58 with a percentage of 25%. Three students scored 59–66 with a percentage of 15%. Four students scored 67–74 with a percentage of 20%. Six students got a score of 75–82 with a percentage of 30%. 2 students got a score of 83–90 with a percentage of 10%. The overall results of the experimental group learning motivation questionnaire data obtained an average score of 79 (complete calculations can be seen in the attachment).

b) Low Learning Motivation (B2)

The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students with low learning motivation.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Student Scores with Low Learning Motivation

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
46 – 52	3	15	15
53 – 59	7	35	50
60 – 66	1	5	55
67 – 73	4	20	75
74 – 80	5	25	100
Amount	20	100	

Based on table 5. above, three students got a score of 46-52 with a percentage of 15%. Seven students scored 53-59, with a percentage of 35%. 5% of students get a score of 60-66. Four students have a score of 67-73 with a percentage of 20%, and five students have a score of 74-80 with a percentage of 25%.

3) Score Data Between Columns and Between Rows

After knowing the intermediate score results, experimental class and control class (Between Columns), and students with high and low learning motivation (Between Rows), the data is then connected between columns and rows to create cells.

a) Students who are taught with TSTS and have high learning motivation (Cell A1B1)

The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students who are taught with TSTS and have high learning motivation.

Table 6. Frequency Distribution of A1B1 Cell Scores

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
70 – 74	3	30	30
75 – 79	3	30	60
80 – 84	2	20	80
84 – 90	2	20	100
Amount	10	100	

Based on Table 6. above, three students got a score of 70-74 with a percentage of 30%. Three students got a score of 75-79 with a percentage of 20%. 2 students got a score of 80-84 with a percentage of 20%, and two students had a score of 84-90 with a percentage of 20%.

b) Students who are taught with TSTS and have low learning motivation (Cell A1B2)

The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students who are taught with TSTS and have low learning motivation.

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of A1B2 Cell Scores

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
51 - 58	2	20	20
59 – 66	3	30	50
67 – 74	4	40	90
75 – 82	1	10	100
Amount	10	100	

Based on table 7. above, two students scored 51-58 with a percentage of 20%. Three students scored 59-66 with a percentage of 30%. Four students got a score of 67-74 with a percentage of 20%, and one student with a score of 75-82 with a percentage of 10%.

c) Students who are taught by inquiry and have high learning motivation (Cell A2B1)

The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students who are taught using inquiry and have high learning motivation.

Table 8. Frequency Distribution of A2B1 Cell Scores

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
53 – 59	1	10	10
60 – 66	3	30	40
67 – 73	4	40	80
74 – 80	2	20	100
	10	100	

Based on table 8. above, one student got a score of 53-59 with a percentage of 10%. Three students scored 60-66 with a percentage of 30%. Four students got a score of 67-73, as many as 4.0%, and two students scored 74-80 with a percentage of 20%.

d) Students who are taught by inquiry and have low learning motivation (Cell A2B2)

The following table will explain explanations regarding groups of students who are taught using inquiry and have low learning motivation.

Table 9. Frequency Distribution of Cell A2B2 Scores

Intervals	Frequency	Percentage	
		Relatively	Cumulative
46 – 52	2	20	20
53 – 59	2	20	40
60 – 66	4	40	80
67 – 73	2	20	100
	20	100	

Based on table 9. above, two students got a score of 46-52 with a percentage of 20%. 2 students got a score of 53-59 with a percentage of 20%. Four students got a score of 60-66, as many as 40%, and two students scored 67-73 with a percentage of 20%.

Table 10. Results of Statistical Analysis of Normality Test

Source	F value	α	Test Decision
Experimental Group (A1)	0.233	0.05	H0 is accepted
Control Group (A2)	0.582	0.05	H0 is accepted
High Learning Motivation (B1)	0.333	0.05	H0 is accepted
Low Learning Motivation (B2)	0.09	0.05	H0 is accepted
High Motivation Experiment	0.755	0.05	H0 is accepted

(A1B1) Low Motivation Experiment	0.058	0.05	H0 is accepted
(A1B2) High Motivational Control	0.436	0.05	H0 is accepted
(A2B1) Low Motivational Control (A2B2)	0.615	0.05	H0 is accepted

4) Analysis Requirements Test Results

Testing the research hypothesis using ANOVA must first carry out analysis prerequisite tests. Analysis prerequisite tests help check the requirements that must be met so that testing with variance analysis can be carried out. Prerequisite tests in this research include balance, normality, and homogeneity tests as follows:

b. Normality test

The normality test is carried out to determine whether the sample comes from a normally distributed population. The normality test uses the Lilliefors method. The Lilliefors method obtained test statistical values and critical values for the normality test for a significance level of 0.05 for each research sample according to Table 11 below:

Table 11. Results of Statistical Analysis of Normality Test

Source	L_{max}	L_{table}	Test Decision
Experimental Group	0.1823	0.190	H0 is accepted
Control Group	0.1510	0.190	H0 is accepted
High Learning Motivation	0.1557	0.190	H0 is accepted
Low Learning Motivation	0.1825	0.190	H0 is accepted

Based on Table 11, in the experimental group, the control group, high and low learning motivation did not exceed, so H0 was accepted. This means that the research sample comes from a normally distributed population.

Table 12. Homogeneity Test Results

Log Determinants

Cell	Rank	Determinant Logs
1.00	1	3,494
2.00	1	3,943
3.00	1	3,576
4.00	1	3,678
Pooled within-groups	1	3,688

Test Results

Box's M		,887
F	Approx.	,288
	df1	3
	df2	6480,000
	Sig.	,834

HOMOGENEITY					
SAMPLE	db=n-1	S2 variant	db S2	S2 Logs	db log S2
1(A1B1)	15	32.9166667	493.75	1.517416	22.76124
2(A1B2)	15	51.5625	773.4375	1.712334	25.68501
3(A2B1)	15	35.7291667	535.9375	1.553023	23.29534
4(A2B2)	15	39.5833333	593.75	1.597512	23.96269
total	60	159.791667	2396,875	6.380285	95.70428
Combined variant			Bartlett unit value		
39.94791667	1.6014941		96.08965		
chi-square value			chi-square table values		
0.886355885			0.05:=(4-1)	0.05-3	
			7.81 (see table)		
7.15<7.81 = homogeneous					

Table 13. Hypothesis Test Results

MP and Motivation	statistics	TWTW	MPI	∑b
high (B1)	n	16	16	32
	∑X	1370	1225	2595
	∑X2	117800	94325	212125
	mean	85,625	76.5625	80.9375
	S2	32.91667	35.72917	52.3185484
	S	5.737305	5.977388	7.23315618
	C	1876900	1500625	6734025
	SS	117306.3	93789.06	210438,281
	∑X2-SS	493.75	535.9375	

Low (B2)	**n**	**16**	**16**	**32**
	∑X	1125	1030	2155
	∑X2	79875	66900	146775
	mean	70.3125	64,375	67.34375
	S2	51.5625	39.58333	53,2006048
	S	7.180703	6.291529	7.29387447
	C	1265625	1060900	4644025

	SS	79101.56	66306.25	145125,781
	∑X2-SS	773.4375	593.75	

∑K	n	32	32	64
	∑X	2490	2255	4745
	∑X2	196800	161225	358025
	mean	77.8125	70.46875	74.140625
	S2	98.28629	74.77319	98.8529266
	S	9.913944	8.647149	9.94248091
	C	6200100	5085025	22515025
	SS	193753.1	158907	351797,266

JKT	JKA	JKA(k)	JKA(b)	JKA(I)	JKD
6227.734375	4705,859	862.8906	3766,797	76.171875	2396,875

source of variation	Db	Jk	RJK=JK/db	Fh=RK/RKD	Ft	
AK	1	1482.25	1482.25	58.59661	4	accepted
AB	1	2385.125	2385.125	94.28924	4	accepted
I	1	104,875	104,875	4.14594	4	accepted
DK	60	1517.75	25.295833			
Q	63	5490				

Discussion

The TSTS Learning Model is an active learning approach that involves students in small group discussions. The research results show that using the TSTS Learning Model significantly improves PPKN learning outcomes for Amborakan Elementary School students. This aligns with TSTS theory, which emphasizes student collaboration in solving problems, promoting more profound understanding, and increasing information retention. Influence of Learning Motivation: Student learning motivation played an essential role in PPKN learning outcomes. Students with high learning motivation tend to achieve better academic achievements in PPKN subjects.

Learning motivation theories, such as self-determination and intrinsic motivation, support these findings by showing that solid motivation can encourage students to learn better. In line with previous research by Sihurry Wella Pamungkas et al., it was also found that there was an influence of the two stay two stray learning model on student learning outcomes in class IV social studies at SDN Kadu Sampur (Aliarti, 2019). These findings are consistent with the research results at SDN Amborakan, showing that TSTS can be used effectively in various learning contexts. This was then confirmed by a study by Winata et al. showing that student learning

motivation is closely related to the quality of online learning (Winata, 2021). The results show that students with high learning motivation are more successful in online learning. These findings reinforce the importance of learning motivation in teaching, especially in distance learning situations that are increasingly common today. Another research conducted by Mufidha 2021 found that psychosocial factors, research results show that there is a positive influence of peer social support on psychological (Mufidha, 2021), such as social support from classmates, can also influence PPKN learning outcomes in elementary school students. Although this study did not specifically explore the TSTS Learning Model, its findings demonstrate the complexity of factors influencing learning outcomes.

The research results at SDN Amborakan strengthen Sihurry Wella's final findings, which show that the TSTS Learning Model effectively improves student learning outcomes at the elementary school level. This shows consistency in the use of this learning model in various subjects. Civics learning outcomes for students taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model are better than students taught using the inquiry learning model. There is a difference in PPKn learning outcomes between students with high learning motivation and those with low learning motivation, shown by FB = 50.47 > F0.05;1;36 = 4.11. Civic learning outcomes for students with high learning motivation are better than those with low motivation. There is an interaction between learning models and learning motivation on PPKn learning outcomes, shown by FAB = 4.29 > F0.05;1;36 = 4.11. Based on the post-ANOVA follow-up test, four test decisions were obtained, namely: Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have high learning motivation are better than students who are taught using the Inquiry learning model and have high learning motivation; Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have low learning motivation are no better than students who are taught using the Inquiry learning model and have low learning motivation; Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have high learning motivation are better than students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have low learning motivation; and the Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the inquiry learning model and have high learning motivation are better

CONCLUSION

There are differences in learning outcomes between students taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and those taught using the inquiry learning model, shown by FA = 6.26 > F0.05;1;36 = 4.11. Civics learning outcomes for students taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model are better than students taught using the inquiry learning model. There is a difference in PPKn learning outcomes between students with high learning motivation and those with low learning motivation, shown by FB = 50.47 > F0.05;1;36 = 4.11. Civic learning outcomes for students with high learning motivation are better than those with low motivation. There is an interaction between learning models and learning motivation on PPKn learning outcomes, shown by FAB = 4.29 > F0.05;1;36 = 4.11. Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have high learning motivation are better than students who are taught using the Inquiry learning model and have high learning motivation; Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have low learning motivation are no better than students who are taught using the Inquiry learning model and have low learning motivation; Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have high learning motivation are better than students who are taught using the Two Stay Two Stray (TSTS) learning model and have low learning motivation; and the Civics learning outcomes of students who are taught using the inquiry learning model and have high learning motivation are better.

REFERENCES

Aliarti, R. (2019). Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Two Stay - Two Stray Terhadap Hasil Belajar Siswa Pada Mata Pelajaran Ekonomi Disma Muhammadiyah 1 Palembang. *Jurnal Neraca: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Ekonomi Akuntansi*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.31851/neraca.v3i1.3716

Andriani, R. dan R. (2019). Motivasi belajar sebagai determinan hasil belajar siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran,Vol*, *4*((1).Halaman), 289–296.

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Dasar-dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan*. Bumi Aksara.

Arsyad, A. (2016). *No Title*. Media Pembelajaran. Jakarta:Raja Grafindo.

Creswell, J. W. (1997). *Research Design Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Mixed*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Damopolii, I. (2022). The Potential of Inquiry-Based Learning to Train Students' Metacognitive and Science Process Skills. *The International Journal of Social Science*, *8*(,(1), 1–14.

Darmadi, H. (2017). *Urgents Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganearaan*. Alfabeta.

Dewantara, K. H. (2010). *Ki Hadjar Dewantara*. UST-Press.

Didik, S. (2020). Penerapan Metode Inkuiri Pada Pembelajaran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan (Pkn) Di Kelas V Mi Salafiyah Syafiiyah Klinterejo Sooko Mojokerto. *Jurnal Online Kopertis Wilayah IV*, *4*(1).

Endah, P. et al. (2008). Hakikat Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan di Sekolah Dasar (SD. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, *5*(3).

Fitriana, M. dan S. H. (2016). Penggunaan Strategi Pembelajaran Inkuiri untuk Meningkatkan Metakognisi Siswa SMA. *Jurnal UNNES*, *10*((1)), 278–279.

Hamruni. (2017). *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Insan Madani.

Huda, M. (2016). *Cooperatif Learning Metode, Teknik, Struktur Dan Model Penerapan*. Pustaka Pelajar.

Kagan, S. (2012). *Cooperative Learning*. Kagan Cooperative Learning.

Lubis, A. syaiful. (2020). *Kepemimpinan Kohesif Kiai di Pesantren Annuqayah Guluk-Guluk Sumenep Madura*. http://digilib.uinkhas.ac.id/14887/%0Ahttp://digilib.uinkhas.ac.id/14887/1/HERMANTO HALIL_0841917021.pdf

Markhaban. (2020). Kepemimpinan Kiai Dalam Mengembangkan Budaya Pesantran Studi Kasus di Pondok Pesantren Diponegoro Klungkung Bali. *IAIN Jember*, *1*(1), 1–146.

Minnsha, S. (2017). Effects of Using Inquiry-Based Learning Pedagogy in Teaching Science. *Journal of Research in Education, Science and Technology*, *4*(2).

Mufidha, A. (2021). Dukungan Sosial Teman Sebaya Sebagai Prediktor Psychological Well-Being pada Remaja. *Acta Psychologia*, *1*(1), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.21831/ap.v1i1.43306

Norma et al. (2020). Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Siswa Pada Pembelajaran PKn Melalui Metode Tanya Jawab di Kelas III SDN Ambelang. *Jurnal Kreatif Tadulako Online*, *2*(2).

Oktaviyanti, I., Sutarto, J., & Atmaja, H. T. (2016). Implementasi Nilai-Nilai Sosial Dalam Membentuk Perilaku Sosial Siswa SD. *Journal of Primary Education*, *5*(2), 113–119. https://doi.org/10.15294/jpe.v5i2.12901

Putri, A. M. (2019). *Pengembangan Media Ular Tangga Sains Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Ipa Di Kelas V Sd N 2 Giripurwo. Skripsi, tidak diterbitkan*. FKIP UST.

Sadiman, A., et al. (2017). *Media Pendidikan*. Rajawali Pers.

Sanjaya, W. (2019). *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorietasi Standar Proses Pendidikan*. Kencana Prenada

Media.

Siti, K. dan A. R. P. (2020). *Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar PPKn Dengan Model Assure*. Jurnal Kewarganegaraan,(4)1.

Sudiarsana, I. W. (2020). Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Two Stay Two Stray Sebagai Upaya Meningkatkan Prestasi Belajar PPKn. *Journal of Education Action Research*, *4*(2).

Sulistyarini. (2008). Model Inkuiri (Heuristic) Dalam Pembelajaran Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan (PKn. *Jurnal Cakrawala Kependidikan*, *6*(2).

Winanto, A. dan D. M. (2016). Implementasi Strategi Pembelajaran Inkuiri untuk Meningkatkan Motivasi dan Hasil Belajar IPA Siswa Kelas 5 SD Negeri Kutowinangun 11 Kota Salatiga. *Jurnal Scholaria*, *6*(2).

Winata, I. K. (2021). Konsentrasi dan Motivasi Belajar Siswa terhadap Pembelajaran Online Selama Masa Pandemi Covid-19. *Jurnal Komunikasi Pendidikan*, *5*(1), 13. https://doi.org/10.32585/jkp.v5i1.1062