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**ABSTRACT**

This study illustrates how a group of students are taught with cooperative learning models to understand the inner structure and physical structure of poetry. Researchers try to teach students by applying the principles of cooperative learning type Student Team Achievement and Division (STAD) and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) according to Robert E. Slavin's theory. In addition to applying cooperative models, literary reading interest is also a consideration in the process of learning to understand poetry. Therefore, 63 out of 124 students were randomly assigned in two experimental groups. The experimental group I with a total of 33 participants was given treatment with the STAD model and the experimental group II with a total of 30 participants were given treatment with the CIRC model. At the end of the treatment period, an independent sample t-test was performed to compare the post-test average values ​​of the two experimental groups. The results of the analysis show that there is no significant difference from the application of the two cooperative models in learning to understand poetry. The cooperative learning model of Student Team Achievement and Division (STAD) and Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) can help students to improve students' performance in understanding the inner structure and physical structure of poetry, whether students with high literary reading interest and low literary reading interest.
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**MEMAHAMI PUISI MENGGUNAKAN MODEL PEMBELAJARAN KOOPERATIF DITINJAU DARI MINAT BACA SASTRA**

**ABSTRAK**

Penelitian ini menggambarkan bagaimana sekelompok mahasiswa diajarkan dengan model pembelajaran kooperatif untuk memahami struktur batin dan struktur fisik puisi. Peneliti mencoba mengajarkan mahasiswa dengan menerapkan prinsip-prinsip pembelajaran kooperatif tipe *Student Team Achievement and Division* (STAD) dan *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition* (CIRC) menurut teori Robert E. Slavin. Selain menerapkan model kooperatif, minat baca sastra juga menjadi pertimbangan dalam proses pembelajaran memahami puisi. Oleh karena itu, 63 dari 124 mahasiswa secara acak ditugaskan dalam dua kelompok eksperimen. Kelompok eksperimen I dengan jumlah partisipan 33 orang diberikan perlakuan dengan model STAD dan kelompok eksperimen II dengan jumlah partisipan 30 orang diberikan perlakuan dengan model CIRC. Pada akhir periode perlakuan, sampel independen t-test dilakukan untuk membandingkan nilai rata-rata post-test dari dua kelompok eksperimen. Hasil analisis menunjukkan bahwa tidak terdapat perbedaan yang signifikan dari penerapan kedua model kooperatif dalam pembelajaran memahami puisi. Model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe *Student Team Achievement and Division* (STAD) dan *Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition* (CIRC) dapat membantu mahasiswa meningkatkan tingkat kinerja mahasiswa dalam memahami struktur batin dan struktur fisik puisi, baik mahasiswa dengan minat baca sastra tinggi maupun minat baca sastra rendah.

**Kata Kunci: memahami puisi, pembelajaran kooperatif, minat baca sastra**

**INTRODUCTION**

High-level thinking processes, communication skills, and social relationships (Bromley & Modlo, 1997) are an important issue and become the capital to build a better life in the 21st century. Cooperative learning becomes the solution used in the learning process in accordance with the demands of the century 21. Cooperative learning is a group learning that gives students more responsibility for their own learning and teams resulting in an interdependence relationship that promotes positive social relationships in the classroom and builds a classroom climate that aids in the learning process (Stevens, 2008:105). Cooperative learning can improve learning achievement (Tiantong & Teemuangsai, 2013); ((Durukan, 2011); (Adesoji & Ibraheem, 2009) through the interaction of the social environment and change the objective structure in the classroom to focus on improving learning outcomes and positive motivation for all students.

Children view cooperative learning as a way to help them become more successful, especially in order to prepare for social life by building collaboration and collectivity. Cooperative learning has an effect on the relationships among students in groups, mutual acceptance, and improvement of students' self-esteem. In other words, cooperative learning will help students improve literacy skills, improve metacognitive strategies for thinking and learning awareness, build effective communication skills, improve language skills, and improve social skills (Bromley & Modlo, 1997). In addition, the more students work together in collaborative groups, the more they understand, retain, and feel better about themselves and their peers in the team. Collaborative group collaboration encourages student responsibility to improve learning achievement and social skills (Tiantong & Teemuangsai, 2013).

The Student Team Achievement Team and Division (STAD) model is a model of cooperative learning that can help develop students' positive attitudes toward themselves, peers, adults, and learning in general (Adesoji & Ibraheem, 2009). STAD is conducted with the teacher presenting the subject matter, the students in the heterogeneous group are involved cooperatively according to the material being studied, the teacher gives the question according to the subject matter to the student in the form of quiz, the students answer the question individually without help from their teammate, each team member is calculated to find the team score, the teacher rewards the best three teams (Slavin, 1994); (Adesoji & Ibraheem, 2009), (Tiantong & Teemuangsai, 2013).

The Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) model is also a cooperative learning model based on teamwork designed to develop reading and writing skills. CIRC is implemented with students prepared in heterogeneous reading groups, students are paired in reading groups by conducting feedback learning to develop basic skills, such as: oral reading, contextual guessing, asking questions, summarizing, and composing writing, then assessing (Slavin, 1994). The CIRC model can improve the achievement and retention of reading and writing (Durukan, 2011).

Cooperative learning with STAD and CIRC models is applied in language classes for learning to understand poetry. Cooperative learning in language classes can have a positive effect on student learning outcomes, a key factor affecting student feedback in the learning process, and making students comfortable in learning, freer in the classroom, motivated, and more active in communicating, which is high for learning (Sachs, Shum, Bureau, Kong, & Christopher, 2003). For learning to understand poetry, students are required to understand the physical structure and inner structures of poetry. The inner structure consists of: theme, felling, tone, and itention. The inner structure consists of: typography, imagery, concrete words, figurative language, and verification (Ramadhanti & Diyan, 2017). The theme is the subject of a poem. Feeling is the poet's appreciation, attitude, or emotion for the subject of the poem he wrote, such as a feeling of wonder, sadness, joy, anger, surprise, joy, disbelief, counsel, and so on. Tone refers to the poet's attitude to the issues discussed in his work, such as patronizing, berating, wooing, whining, inviting, sarcastic, and so on. Itention is a message the poet wants to convey, for example expecting the reader to be angry, hateful, like something, and rebel against something. Typography is the appearance of a poem as one of the creative arts. The appearance of the poem can be observed in various forms, such as language structuring, the use of signs or symbols, setting the spacing of lines, setting letters, words, lines, or stanzas. Imagery is a word or composition of words that can express one's sensory experiences, such as the image of a vision, hearing, smell, and feeling. A concrete word is a word that a poet explicitly uses in conveying the issues he conveys. These concrete words are the words that the senses can sense to allow for the appearance of images. Figurative language is a language full of allegories, such languages ​​can turn on, alert effects, and cause certain connotations. Verification concerns the issue of rhyme, rhythm, rhythm, and metrum.

The implementation of cooperative learning in the classroom is influenced by certain variables, such as: gender, level of proficiency, time, patterns of class interaction, and attitudes toward others. In addition, interest in literary reading is also a variable that also influences the learning process. Students with low reading interest will be motivated in the learning process. Social skills created through cooperative learning help students improve their vocabulary and reading skills (Shaaban, Al-Badawi, & Ghaith, 2007). Furthermore, the interest in reading someone is known through three aspects, namely attention, feelings and responses to what is read. Attention includes the frequency, amount, and time spent in reading. Feelings include a feeling of joy to the reading material and the interest and satisfaction after reading. Responses include reading comprehension, finding problems and taking solutions, and benefiting after reading (Slameto, 2010).

The research was conducted to prove the hypothesis about the influence of cooperative learning model in learning to understand poetry by considering literary reading interest, both high and low. Hypothesis tested, namely: there is a significant difference between the results of learning to understand the poetry of students who have high literary reading interest in learning with cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC, there is a significant difference between the results of learning to understand poetry students who have low literary reading interest in learning with STAD and CIRC cooperative learning model, and there is interaction between the use of cooperative learning model and literary reading interest in influencing the learning result of understanding poetry.

**METHOD**

**Participants**

Participants in this study were students who studied at the Indonesian language and literature education courses STKIP PGRI West Sumatra. Participants are male and female students who take the Poetry Appreciation course. This course is studied in the third semester during their studies. Initial tests were given to 124 students to determine the homogenization of study participants. Then 63 of the 124 participants with a score of one standard deviation above and below the mean were randomly assigned to two experimental groups, 33 partisans in the experimental class I and 30 participants in the experimental class II.

**Instruments**

Instruments used as a data collection tool in this study, namely: questionnaire interest in reading literature and multiple choice test questions.

1. Literary Reading Interest Questionnaire

Literary reading interest questionnaire are structured according to the three main aspects of reading interest, namely: attention to reading, feelings of reading, response after reading. Questionnaire consisting of 70 items statement. Prior to use in the study, each item of statement in the questionnaire was given to the expert to be validated.

1. Multiple Choice Test Questions

The multiple choice test is structured according to the physical structure and inner structure of the poem consisting of 50 items of statement. Prior to use in the study, expert validation for each item was tested and tested to determine the validity and reliability of the test.

To facilitate the treatment process with STAD and CIRC model prepared by the lecture unit which contains steps of applying STAD and CIRC model in learning process to understand poetry. To make it easier for participants to understand poetry, they are given the book "Understanding Poetry." The book contains poetry recognition materials, understanding the elements of form and content of poetry, understanding the elements of sound in poetry, understanding the elements of language in poetry, understanding the elements of imagery in poetry, understanding aspects of figurative language in poetry (Ramadhanti & Diyan, 2017)

**Procedure**

1. **Filling Literary Reading Interest Questionnaires**

Samples in both experiment classes fill out a literary reading interest questionnaire for high literary reading interest and low literary reading interest.

1. **Provide Treatment**

In the experimental class I implemented learning by applying STAD type cooperative learning model. STAD is implemented by applying five main components: class presentations, group work, quiz assignments, individual progress scores, and team recognition.  
Class presentation: The class presentation is led by the teacher. The issues discussed are subject matter activities during STAD implementation. This activity makes it easier for participants to do quizzes, quiz score scores, and their team scores. (a) Group work: group work is carried out to prepare each individual in the quiz work. The material understands poetry and analyzes understanding the inner structure and physical structure of poetry understood in group work. They work together so that each individual understands the subject matter. (b) Quiz giving: the teacher presents additional material related to understanding poetry, then the participants working on the individual quiz understand the poetry. (c) Individual progress score: each partispan earns an initial score based on the results of the quiz. The participants then collected points for their team based on the level of quiz score increase compared to their initial score. (d) Group recognition: teams will be rewarded if their score reaches certain criteria related to the purpose of learning to understand poetry.

In the experimental class II, learning is done by applying cooperative learning model of CIRC type. CIRC is implemented by applying three main components, namely: basic activities related to cooperative learning, reading comprehension, and integrated writing activities. (a) Basic activities related to cooperative learning: basic activities undertaken are group divisions and the provision of materials and poems for analysis of poetical understanding in the learning process. Participants work in pairs in groups. (b) Understanding the reading: Participants are given a given poem, identifying key ideas related to the inner structure and physical structure of poetry, understanding the relationships between elements in the poem, and making conclusions about the inner structure and physical structure of poetry. (c) Integrated writing activity: Participants write out the results of an understanding of the inner structure and structure of poetry in the form of short essay. The essay contains an explanation of the meaning contained in the poem.

1. **Doing Tests to Understanding Poetry**

The test of understanding poetry in the form of multiple choice tests is given after the treatment with STAD and CIRC models is carried out in the experimental class.

**Data Analysis**

To test the hypothesis of the difference of learning result to understand poetry (hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 2) is done by using t test and for the third hypothesis test which aims to know the interaction of using cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC and literary reading interest to result learn to understand poetry used formula anava 2 direction with the method of unweighted means (Ferguson, 1976: 258-260).

**RESULT**

1. **Learning Outcomes Understanding Poetry in Experimental Class I and II**

The results of the first hypothesis testing show that there is no significant difference in learning outcomes to understand poetry using cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC. This is evidenced by the results of data analysis obtained t-test = 0.678 and t table value = 1.67. This means t-test < t table, so H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted. In addition, the acquisition of the average score of the learning outcomes to understand poetry was not much different after being taught by STAD type cooperative learning model in experimental class I and CIRC cooperative learning model in Experiment II class. The average score of students studying with STAD type cooperative learning model is 75.48. The average score of students studying with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 73.50. The average difference between the two experimental classes is 1.98. The result of learning to understand poetry using STAD type cooperative learning model is 1.98 is superior compared with the result of learning to understand poetry using cooperative learning model of CIRC type. Differences in learning outcomes to understand the poetry with both types of cooperative learning model is not too large. This proves that the two types of cooperative learning model are equally effective to be used in the process of learning to understand poetry.

In addition, when compared with test results before students studying with cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC, student learning outcomes change. Student learning outcomes have increased. The average score of students before learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 39.6 and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 75,48. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 38.88. The average value of students before learning with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 38.85 and after learning with cooperative learning model CIRC type is 73.50. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with cooperative learning model CIRC type is 34.65.

The application of cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC give positive influence to the result of learning to understand poetry. Learning outcomes after using both models are not much different because they are both effective use in the learning process. Students are more motivated in the learning process, students who initially have difficulty understanding the inner structure and physical structure of poetry become more familiar with the concepts.

1. **Learning Outcomes Understanding Poetry with High Literary Reading Interest in Experimental I and II classes**

The result of the second hypothesis test shows that there is no significant difference in the result of learning to understand the poetry of students with the high literary reading interest learning by using STAD type cooperative learning model and students with high literaty reading interest learning with cooperative learning model of CIRC type. This is evidenced by the results of data analysis obtained t-test = 0.039 and t table value = 1.71. This means t-test < t table, so H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted. In addition, the acquisition of the average score of the learning outcomes to understand student poems was not much different after being taught by STAD type cooperative learning model in experimental class I and CIRC cooperative learning model in experiment II class.

The average score of students with high literary reading interest in learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 75.65. The average score of students with high literary reading interest in learning with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 75.05. The average difference between the two experimental classes is 0.6. The results of learning to understand the poetry of students with high literary reading interest learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 0.6 is superior compared with the results of learning to understand the poetry of students with high litetary reading interest learning model with cooperative learning type CIRC. Differences in learning outcomes to understand the poetry of students with high literary readng interest in learning with both types of cooperative learning model is not too large. This proves that both types of cooperative learning model are equally effective in using learning process to understand poetry of students with high literary reading interest.

In addition, when compared with test results before students with high literacy reading interest with cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC student learning outcomes changed. Student learning outcomes have increased. The average score of students with high literacy interest before learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 39.39 and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 75,65. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 36.26. The average score of students with high literacy interest before learning with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 39.5 and after learning with cooperative learning model CIRC type is 75,5. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with cooperative learning model CIRC type is 36.

1. **Learning Outcomes Understanding Poetry with Low Literary Reading Interest in Experimental I and II classes**

The result of the third hypothesis testing shows that there is no significant difference in the result of learning to understand the poetry of the students with low literary reading interest that learn by using STAD type cooperative learning model and the students studying with low literary reading interest that learn by using CIRC type cooperative learning model. This is evidenced by the results of data analysis obtained t-test = 0.723 and t table value = 1.70. This means t-test < t table, so H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted. In addition, the acquisition of the average score of the learning outcomes to understand student poems was not much different after being taught by STAD type cooperative learning model in experimental class I and CIRC cooperative learning model in experiment II class.

The average scores of students with low literary reading interest in learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 75.95. The average scores of students with low literary reading interest in learning with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 73.05. The average difference between the two experimental classes is 2.9. The results of learning to understand the poetry of students with low literary reading interest in learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 2.9 superior compared with the results of learning to understand the poetry of students with low literary reading interest learning with cooperative learning model type CIRC. Differences in learning outcomes to understand the poetry of students with low literary reading interest who learn with both types of cooperative learning model is not too large. This proves that both types of cooperative learning model are equally effective to be used in learning process to understand poetry of students with low literacy interest.

In addition, when compared with the results of tests before students with low literary reading interests learnng with cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC student learning outcomes changed. Student learning outcomes have increased. The average score of students with low literary reading interest before learning with STAD type cooperative learning model was 39.54 and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model was 75.95. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with STAD type cooperative learning model is 36.41. The average score of students with low literary reading interest before learning with CIRC type cooperative learning model is 38.89 and after learning with cooperative learning model CIRC type is 73,05. Differences in student learning outcomes before and after learning with cooperative learning model type CIRC is 34.16.

1. **Interaction between Cooperative Learning Model Type STAD and CIRC with Literary Reading Interest in Influencing Learning Outcomes Understanding Poetry**

An interaction occurs when the effects of one factor depend on another factor in influencing something. The result of the fourth hypothesis test shows that there is no interaction between STAD and CIRC learning model with literary reading interest in influencing the result of learning to understand poetry. This is evidenced by the results of hypothesis test obtained F-test = 0.203 and F table = 4.02. This means F-test <F table, so H1 is rejected and H0 is accepted. This means there is no interaction between the learning model with literary interest in influencing the learning outcomes to understand poetry.

STAD and CIRC cooperative learning models are not dependent on one another with literary reading interest in influencing learning outcomes to understand poetry. This means that without the literary reading interest, cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC will still affect the results of learning to understand poetry. Conversely, without the cooperative learning model of STAD and CIRC type, literary reading interest will still influence the learning outcomes of understanding poetry. Furthermore, students who have high literary reading interest and low literary reading interest can learn by using cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC.

**DISCUSSION**

The results showed that cooperative learning model type STAD and CIRC can be used in learning process to understand poetry. Learning can be implemented without considering the interest of literature reading because cooperative learning can improve reading motivation (Shaaban et al., 2007). Lessons learned in cooperative groups are the main factors in increasing the learning outcomes of understanding poetry. Student interactions in groups are also influenced by group composition and student personalities (Webb, 1984). In addition, in the process of doing the test, the group learning experience becomes the motivation for students to understand poetry. this shows that individual accountability is enhanced by teamwork (Slavin & Tanner, 1979). In addition, teachers become the determinant of the implementation of cooperative learning in the classroom. The experience of teachers in implementing previous learning and the context of learning in the form of groups requires teachers to continue to guide students in the process of solving problems in accordance with the material being studied (Siegel, 2005).

Teachers who apply cooperative learning in the classroom make learning more mediated. With teachers implementing group work to make the class more disciplined, students also showed a positive interaction in their group (R. M. Gillies, 2006). Teachings mediated by teacher interaction have sparked hope in students who are sensitive to their need to provide more detailed explanations and responses to others. The interaction between teachers and students in cooperative groups occurs because students understand how to negotiate group tasks. When teachers build cooperative learning in the classroom, they create well-structured groups and influence the way they interact in groups (Gillies, 2008). Student verbal behavior in groups helps and supports group work. Students listen earnestly what the teacher says and do the job well. Student verbal behavior arises because they are challenged to think deeper and clearer about the issues being discussed. Students are required to reflect on the implications of each poem he read and conclude the physical structure and inner structure of poetry.

**CONCLUTION**

Cooperative learning is the way to improve the high-level thinking skills needed in the 21st century. Students who are able to develop teamwork in study groups will be increasingly encouraged in the process of thinking in solving problems in accordance with the subject matter. Student interaction in groups affected by group composition strongly affects the accountability of each individual in performing the task, especially understanding poetry. STAD and CIRC's cooperative learning enhances students' understanding of the physical structure and inner structures of poetry requiring critical reading skills. Students with low reading interest are motivated in learning because cooperative learning can encourage students to think and read.
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