DIFFERENCES IN THE EFFECT OF QUANTUM LEARNING METHODS WITH MIND MAPPING AND JIGSAW METHODS ON STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT LEVELS OF CREATIVITY AGAINST

Hariyanto[1], Nasruliyah Hikmatul Maghfiroh[2]
ghost.ary1@gmail.com, nasruliyahhikmatulmaghfiroh85@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study aims to find out the differences in the effect of the quantum learning model with the mind map method and the Jigsaw cooperative learning model on students with various levels of creativity. The subjects of this study were students of class X IPA 1 at SMAN I Subob - Situbondo and class X IPA 1 at SMAN 1 Besuki - Situbondo. This research is an experimental research. Data collection techniques through tests and observations. Data were analyzed using Two Way ANOVA. The results of the data analysis show that: (1) The learning outcomes of students who have high creativity are better than the learning outcomes of students with low creativity, (2) The learning outcomes of students with high creativity are better in quantum teaching learning with the mind mapping method than with the Jigsaw method, (3) There is a positive interaction between student creativity and learning models on student learning outcomes.

Keywords: *Quantum Learning method, mind maps, Jigsaw method, level of student creativity, learning outcomes*

[1] Universitas PGRI Argopuro Jember, Indonesia
[2] Universitas PGRI Argopuro Jember, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

One of the goals of education is to equip students with the knowledge and skills they need to function as adults. With the rapid changes in this world, it is necessary to reassess what students need and learn to balance the global challenges in the future. Schools as social institutions must be conducive and sensitive to the needs of students in the future in order to be able to develop knowledge and develop students' personal skills. As stated in Law Number 20 of 2003 article 1, paragraph 1 concerning SISDIKNAS which states the National Education Goals that:

The problems in Biology learning above also occur in SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki class X IPA 1. This was revealed when the authors conducted pre-research on biology learning in class X IPA 1, found several problems which resulted in the learning process being ineffective including, as follows: first, when the teacher uses the lecture method, the researcher gets an idea that class X IPA 1 is a class that is less active in learning biology when compared to other classes that tend to be active and have an interest in learning biology, as evidenced by the enthusiasm shown students in the form of questions and responses raised by students regarding biology material. The lack of activity of class X IPA 1 students during learning can be seen from the lack of enthusiasm of students in learning activities, such as asking, responding, and answering questions from the teacher. Students tend to be passive, less involved in teaching and learning activities, only listening to explanations from the teacher without being accompanied by the desired response such as responses or questions from students. When the teacher asks students, the students don't give a good response, only one or two people are able to answer questions from the teacher. Second, when the teacher uses the discussion method by giving students the freedom to actively manage the material by inviting students to discuss.

These learning problems have a more direct impact on the lack of student activity in class X IPA 1. Researchers see the problem of lack of student activity is one of the reasons the teacher has not developed learning methods so that students are skilled in solving problems in biology material. One of the skills needed to answer the above problems is to cultivate critical thinking skills. As stated by Ennis someone who has critical thinking skills has tendencies or characteristics, as he stated that (Mudianingsih, 2007):

It is these critical thinking skills that may have to be cultivated to fix problems in class X IPA I. One way that can be done to foster the critical thinking skills of students in class X IPA 1 is by developing learning methods. One of the learning methods that can foster students' critical thinking skills is the Quantum learning method with the mind mapping technique. In the use of the Quantum learning method with mind mapping techniques (Mind mapping) the target is more directed at sharpening understanding, problem solving, and student memory in order to foster academic skills (academic skills), achievement or physical challenges (physical challenges), as well as a learning atmosphere as a a

fun and meaningful learning process, through the stages of TANDUR (instill, experience, name, discuss, repeat, celebrate) by taking into account the principles of the Quantum learning method, so that the skills formed are expected to create conditions that are conducive to the growth of critical thinking skills class X IPA 1 students.

The description above encourages the interest of researchers to conduct research as well as improvement efforts, which are integrated into research entitled The Effect of the Quantum Learning Method with Mind Mapping and Jigsaw Techniques and Student Creativity on Biology Learning Outcomes in Class X IPA 1 at SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki".

Starting from the description above, the research proposes the formulation of the problem (1) Are there differences in the learning outcomes of students with high creativity and low creativity in class X IPA 1 SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki? (2) Is there a difference in student learning outcomes between the quantum learning model with the mind mapping technique and the jigsaw type cooperative learning model in biology class X IPA 1 SMA Negeri I Suboh and SMA Negeri I Besuki? (3) Is there an interaction between learning models and creativity on biology learning outcomes in class X IPA 1 at SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki?

Thus the objectives of this study were (I) to examine the differences in student learning outcomes with high creativity and low creativity in class X IPA 1 SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki. (2) Testing the difference in student learning outcomes between the quantum learning model with the mind mapping technique and the jigsaw type cooperative learning model for class X IPA 1 SMA Negeri 1 Suboh and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki. (3) Testing the existence of interaction between learning models and creativity on the results of learning biology class X IPA 1 at SMAN I Suboh and SMAN I Besuki.

Quantum Learning

Quantum learning is a translation from a foreign language, namely quantum learning. "Quantum Learning is tips, instructions, strategies and the entire learning process that can sharpen understanding and memory, and make learning a fun and rewarding process" (DePorter, et al, 2011).

Additionally, DePorter, et al. states about the environment in the context of the learning stage. "The environment is the way the teacher organizes the classroom, lighting colors, setting tables and chairs, plants, music, and all things that support the learning process" (DePorter, et al., 2004).

So, it can be said that quantum learning is very concerned about the conditioning of a class as a learning environment for students, considering that the quantum learning model is an adaptation of the learning model applied abroad.

Quantum Learning Model Syntax

The syntax or steps of the quantum learning model known as TANDUR are as follows (DePorter, et al, 2004):

1. Grow
   Cultivate interest in fulfilling "Is It Benefit Me" (AMBAK), and make the most of life learning.
2. do
   Create or bring common experiences that all learners can understand.
3. Name
   Provide keywords, concepts, models, formulas, strategies, a "feedback".
4. Demonstrate
   Provide opportunities for students to "demonstrate they know."
5. Repeat
   Show students ways to repeat material and affirm, "I know that I know this."
6. Celebration
   Recognize completion, participation and mastery of skills and knowledge

Mind Mapping Learning Method

The mind mapping learning method is an extraordinary system of storing, retrieving data, and accessing a giant library, which actually exists in the amazing human brain (Buzan, 2010). Besides that, according to Tony Buzan, mind mapping is the easiest way to put information into the brain and take information out of the brain. Mind mapping is a way of recording creatively, effectively and will literally "map" our thoughts. With mind mapping, long lists of information can be turned into colorful, highly organized, and easy to remember diagrams that work in harmony with how the brain works in doing things.

There are several instructions and steps in making a mind mapping learning method, before making a map and colored pencils, brain and imagination. the mind requires several materials, namely blank unlined paper, pens and colored pencils, brain as well as imagination, Buzan suggests there are seven steps to making a mind map, namely as follows (Buzan, 2010):

1. Give blank paper to students.
2. Write the title/theme on the blank paper with the long side placed horizontally.
3. Make the main branches with bold lines with different colors.
4. Students write down the keywords for each branch either in written or symbolic form.
5. Develop main branches with curved lines.
6. Using one keyword for each line.

In making a mind map it also takes courage and high creativity. Variations with capital letters, colors, underscores or symbols that describe the main point or idea. Animating the mind mapping that has been made will be more impressive.

Cooperative Learning Model

Cooperative learning (Cooperative learning) is an educational system that provides students with opportunities to collaborate with other students on structured tasks. Cooperative learning is called group learning. But Cooperative learning is more than just group learning and group work. Because Cooperative

learning has a collaborative structure with encouragement and challenge that allows open interaction and effective interdependence between group members. (Tukiran, 2011)

According to Lie's opinion, the cooperative learning model is not the same as just learning in groups, there are basic elements of cooperative learning that distinguish it from group divisions which are carried out at random. Implementation of cooperative learning model procedures will really enable educators to manage classes more effectively. (Lie, 2008)

The characteristics of the cooperative learning model are; (1) studying together with friends, (2) during the learning process occurs face to face between friends, (3) listening to each other's opinions among group members, (4) learning from friends themselves in groups, (5) studying in small groups, (6) productive speaking or mutually expressing opinions, (7) decisions depend on the students themselves, (8) active students (Stahl, 1994). In line with these characteristics, Johnson and Johnson (1984) and Hilke (1990) suggest the characteristics of cooperative learning are; (1) positive interdependence among group members, (2) ability to think independently, (3) heterogeneity, and (4) sharing of tasks and He proposes that there is unity, (5) the formation of sociality. (6) the teacher's role in observing the student's learning process; and (7) the effectiveness of learning differed by group. The learning process takes place in small groups (3-4 members) and in heterogeneous groups, regardless of differences in academic ability, gender, ethnicity, etc.

Jigsaw Type Cooperative Learning Model

Jigsaw was developed and tested by Elliot Aronson and colleagues at the University of Texas and adopted by Slavin and colleagues (Arends, 2001). With a jigsaw, students are grouped into 5 or 6 heterogeneous members to become learning teams. Material learning is presented to students in the form of text, and each student is responsible for the part of the material that is his responsibility.

Coherently, the steps of jigsaw cooperative learning are as follows (Tukiran, 2011):

1. Students are divided into 5-6 team members
2. Each person on the team receives different materials
3. Members of different teams who have studied the same section/subchapter gather in a new group (expert group) to discuss the subchapter.
4. After the discussion as a team expert, each member returns to the original group and takes turns teaching teammates what sub-chapter they are good at, while the other members listen carefully.
5. Each expert team presents the results of their discussions
6. Teacher grades
7. Closing

In the jigsaw type, the original group is a combination of several experts, the expert group is a group of students who are assigned to study and explore a particular topic and complete tasks related to the topic and then explain it to the members of the original group.

METHOD

This research was conducted at SMA Negeri I Subob and SMA Negeri 1 Besuki, Situbondo Regency, East Java in the even semester of the 2015/2016 academic year using class X IPA 1 SMAN 1 Subob and class X IPA 1 SMAN 1 Besuki, as a sample of 30 students from SMAN 1 Besuki and 32 students from SMAN 1 Subob. The research design used by researchers in implementing biology learning tools that are oriented towards quantum learning with the mind mapping type and the jigsaw type cooperative learning model uses inferential statistics with the two way ANOVA test. namely the two Arabic experimental research used to test the difference in the mean (average) data more from the two research groups (class X IPA 1 SMAN I Suboh and class X IPA 1 SMAN I Besuki) the experiment was divided into 2 groups, namely the group of students with high creativity and groups of students with low creativity and then given an initial test (pretest) and a final test (posttest). The draft can be involved as follows.

Table 1. Research design

Learning model	Student creativity (A)	
	high creativity (A1)	low creativity (A2)
Quantum learning learning model with mind mapping approach (B1)	YA1B1	YA2B1
Jigsaw type cooperative learning model (B2)	YA1B2	YA2B2

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Student Creativity

In this study, the sample consisting of students of class X IPA in two schools, namely SMAN I Suboh and SMAN I Besuki were divided into three groups based on the results of the creativity questionnaire, namely groups of students with high creativity, medium creativity and groups of students with low creativity.

Students' Cognitive Ability

a. Description of Students' Cognitive Ability Data

The value of students' cognitive abilities in learning using the jigsaw cooperative model and the mind mapping approach to describing basic competencies Phylum characteristics in the Animal World and their role in life are known from the scores obtained by students in the Learning Outcomes Test (THB), then the data is processed to calculate learning completeness per student.

Based on student learning outcomes (THB), information was obtained that no students had reached the KKM before being given learning activities. After the learning activities were given to students, in the mind mapping lessons given there were 21 students who completed the completeness criterion of 65.625%. At SMAN I Besuki, which applies the jigsaw type cooperative learning model, it is known that 21 students have passed with a completeness criterion of 70%.

b. Hypothesis testing

Data on the value of increasing (gain) cognitive ability is used to test the hypothesis in this study. Before testing the hypothesis, it is necessary to test the normality and homogeneity of the data first. With the help of SPSS 22.0 Amos, a summary of the normality test with the Kolmogrov Semirnov test is obtained as shown in table 2 as follows

Table 2. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		posstest
N		64
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	78,7378
	Std. Deviation	14,48364
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	,214
	Positive	,108
	Negative	-,214
Test Statistic		,214
symp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,100°

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.
c. Lilliefors Significance Correction.

Meanwhile, a summary of the homogeneity test using the Levene test is shown in Table 3 as follows

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances[a]

Dependent variable : student achievement

F	df1	df2	Sig
.924	5	56	.473

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

a. Design: model_pembelajaran + kreativitas + model_pembelajaran * kreativitas

The rule for determining the data normality test is that if Sig. > 0.05, then the data is declared normal, while the method for determining the homogeneity test of the data is if sig. > 0.05, then the variance of the two data is homogeneous. Based on the normality and homogeneity tests of the data in table 4 and table 5 above, it is found that the requirements for using the parametric statistical test with the

Univariate two way ANOVA is fulfilled, because the data has homogeneous and normal variants. The summary of the univariate two way Anova test with the help of SPSS 22.0 Amos is shown in the following table 4

Tabet 4. Test of Between-Subjects Effects

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	367577,202a	6	61262,867	1256,307	,000
Learning model	92,572	l	92,572	1,898	,038
Creativity	2451,440	2	1225,720	25,136	,000
Learning model * creativity	664,520	2	332,260	6,814	,002
Error	2730,798	56	48,764		
Total	370308,000	62			

With a summary of the results of SPSS 22.0 Amos calculations are as follows
From table 6 above, we get important values which can be concluded as follows:

1. Factor A is the learning model. Because a = 0.05 > Sig. = 0.038 then the hypothesis Ho is rejected, so H1 is accepted. In other words, there is an effect between levels of factor A that is not the same. Because factor A consists of two levels, it can be said that the quantum learning model with the mind mapping approach and the jigsaw type cooperative learning model have a significant effect on student achievement.
2. Factor B, namely student creativity. Because a = 0.05 > Sig. = 0.00, then the hypothesis Ho is rejected, so H1 is accepted. In other words, there is an effect between different levels of factor B, or factor B levels 1, 2, and 3, which have a significant difference on the response variable. It can be said that the creativity factor has a significant effect on student achievement.
3. AB interaction factor. Because a = 0.05 > Sig. = 0.02 then the Ho hypothesis is rejected, so H1 is accepted. In other words, the learning achievement of students who received different model treatments (mind mapping and jigsaw) was significantly different in terms of creativity in the high, medium and low categories. Conversely, students with different creativity (high, medium, and low) also have different achievements when given different treatments (mind mapping and jigsaw).

To find out which model produces the best performance, it can be seen from the average descriptive statistics table 5 as follows:

Learning model	creativity	Mean	Std. deviation	N
Mind mapping	High	87,5000	9,89949	8
	Middle	83,3333	6,99784	12

	Low	65,6667	5,51582	12
	total	77,7500	11,97578	32
Jigsaw	High	84,0000	5,65685	7
	Middle	73,3750	6,56125	16
	Low	71,4286	7,45782	7
	total	75,4000	8,01980	30
Total	High	85,8667	8,12287	15
	Middle	77,6429	8,30981	28
	Low	67,7895	6,72953	19
	total	76,6129	10,24032	62

The descriptive statistics table above shows a description of the achievement data of SMAN I Suboh (mind mapping) and SMAN I Besuki (Jigsaw) students in terms of each category of creativity. It appears that the highest average student achievement is a student with high creativity who is treated with a mind mapping model of 87.5. Conversely, the lowest achievement is low creativity students who receive the same treatment, namely mind mapping. To find out the correlation of learning models and student creativity can be seen in the comparison table as follows:

Tabel 6. Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: student achievement LSD

(I) student creativity	(J) student creativity	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High	Middle	8,2238'	2,23440	,001	3,7478	12,6998
	Low	18,0772*	2,41195	,000	13,2455	22,9089
Middle	High	-8,2238*	2,23440	,001	-12,6998	-3,7478
	Low	9,8534*	2,07560	,000	5,6955	14,0113
Low	High	-18,0772*	2,41195	,000	-22,9089	-13,2455
	Middle	-9,8534*	2,07560	,000	-14,0113	-5,6955

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square(Error) = 48,764.

*. The mean difference is significant at the ,05 level.

From the multiple comparisons table it appears that all Sig. The value is O so that because a = 0.05 > Sig. = 0.00, the high, medium, and low creativity factors have a significant effect on student achievement. Further to find out which category of students with creativity, it can be seen from table 7 as follows:

Table 7. Estimate

Student creativity	Mean	Std. error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High	85.750	1.807	82.130	89.370
Middle	78.354	1.333	75.683	81.025
Low	68.548	1.661	65.221	71.874

From the Estimated Margin Means table, it appears that the highest average student achievement is the student with high creativity (85,750), then the student with medium creativity (78,354) and the lowest achievement appears to be the student with the lowest creativity (68,548)

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, student learning outcomes in both learning models are also influenced by their creativity. In the mind mapping approach, student learning outcomes with high creativity have a high score of 87.50. Whereas for students who have low creativity, the value obtained is even smaller than the value obtained by students with the jigsaw model with the same creativity, namely 65.67, while for the same creativity in the jigsaw model, the value is 71.43, this shows that the mind approach Mapping will be effective if given to students with high creativity. This is in line with what Michael Michalko said that in making a mind map requires a lot of courage and creativity. Variations with capital letters, colors, underscores or symbols that describe the main points or ideas (Buzan, 2010). Creativity is needed to create bolder visuals in order to provoke the brain's interest in capturing the messages conveyed in the map. If someone doesn't have creativity, then the map that is made will feel stiff and boring, and will even create confusion after the map is formed, even by the maker himself. Whereas in the jigsaw type cooperative learning model, a correlation was also found between the model used and the creativity of students, for students with high creativity the scores obtained also showed a higher level of 84 than students with the same model but had more creativity. low with a score of 71. This is not so striking from the results obtained by students using the mind mapping method. Students who have high creativity will have the power of innovation in learning and receive learning from others, in this case from home team friends and from expert team friends. With high creativity they have many ways to convey material obtained from expert team discussions to their friends on the home team so that it will add insight and learning outcomes.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the research results and the results of hypothesis testing, conclusions can be drawn, namely:

1. The learning outcomes of students who have high creativity are better than the learning outcomes of students with low creativity,
2. The learning outcomes of students with high creativity are better in quantum teaching learning with the mind mapping method than with the

Jigsaw method,

3. There is a positive interaction between student creativity and learning models on student learning outcomes

Based on the research that has been done and the results obtained, the following suggestions are suggested.

1. Implementation of learning with a mind mapping approach cannot be implemented 100%. This is because students are less trained in making mind mapping. Intense training is required by the teacher to get optimal results
2. The time needed in this study is still insufficient considering the availability of 45 x 2 hours of lessons is still insufficient to explore students' abilities optimally. It is hoped that there will be more time flexibility for improvising students' abilities
3. In the activity of drawing maps students spend more time than planned, so that in the application of concepts students do not have enough time to practice applying the concepts that have been found. Therefore it is suggested to teachers in applying this device to provide sufficient and varied concept application tasks to be done at home

REFERENCES

Arends, R.I. 2001. *Learning to Teach.* 5th. USA: Mc Graw-Hill Compnies Inc. Buzan, T. 2010. *Buku Pintar Mind map.* Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

DePorter B, Mark R dan Sarah S. 2007. *Quantum Teaching Mempraktekkan Quantum Learning di Ruang-ruang Kelas.* Bandung: Kaifa.

Edward, 2009. *Educational Research. Competencies for Analysis and Application.* Columbus: Merril Publishing Company.

Ibrahim, Muslimin, 2005. *Assesment Berkelanjutan. Konsep Dasar, Tahapn Pengembangan dan Contoh.* Surabaya: UNESA University Press.

Kumiawan Effendi. 2012. Transparancey International (TI). Diakses tanggal 28 September 2016 melalui *http://www.kpk.go.id/modules/news/article.php? st01yid=942*

Lie, Anita. 2002. *Cooperative Learning.* Jakarta: Grasindo.

Mudianingsih, I. 2007. *Pendekatan Kosntruktivisme dalam Pembelajaran Matematika untuk meningkatkan Kemampuan Berpikir Kritis Siswa. Kelas VIII-G SMP Negri 29 Bandung. Suatu Penelitian Tindakan Kelas Pada Pokok Bahasan Persamaan Garis Lurus.* Skripsi. FPMIPA: Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia. Tidak diterbitkan.

Mulyanto, Agus. 1991. *Mengartikulasikan Pendidikan Nilai.* Bandung. Alfbeta.

Nur, M. 2008. *Pembelajaran Kooperatif.* Surabaya: Unesa University Press.

Nur, M. dan Mukhlas. 1996. *Teori Pembelajaran IPA dan Hakikat Pendekatan Keterampilan Proses.* Jakarta. Depdikbud.

Nur, M. 2011. *Madu! Keterampilan-keterampilan Proses Sains.* Surbaya: Unesa University Press.

Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 22 Tahun 2006 Tentang Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.

Slavin, R.E. 1994. *Educational Psychology The01y into Practice.* Fourtf Edition. Boston. Allyn and Bacon Publishing.

Tukiran. 2011. *Pembelajaran kooperatif.* Jakarta. Grasindo.

Undang-undang Republik Indonesia No. 20 tahun 2003 tentang sistem pendidikan nasional, 2003, Jakarta: Depdiknas.