The Influence Contextual of Learning Strategy
Collaborative Type vs Expository and Achievement Motivation on
Learning Outcomes Discourse Deixis

Alex Djawa, I Nyoman Sudana Degeng, Utami Widiati, Anselm J. E. Toenlioe
Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
Eadjawa61@gmail.com.

Abstract. This study used two strategies of learning, which is a collaborative type of contextual learning and expository. This study aims to determine: (1) the differences in learning outcomes between groups of learners who were treated using contextual learning strategies and the type of collaborative learners group treated using expository strategy; (2) the differences in learning outcomes between groups of learners with high achievement motivation and the group of learners with low achievement motivation; (3) the interaction between the learning strategies and achievement motivation on learning outcomes discourse diesis. The instrument used is the instrument tests and questionnaires. From the analysis using Anova found F count of 8367 with significant value probability .004. Significance probability value is below the significance level of 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that Ho is rejected. That is, there is a significant difference between the results of the collaborative type of contextual learning vs expository. The conclusion is ini the application to the learners, the collaborative type is superior compared to expository.

Keywords: contextual learning, collaborative, expository, achievement motivation, learning outcomes, diesis

One subject in the subject matter of discourse analysis is diesis. According to Purwo (1984) diesis word comes from the Greek meaning dictions 'appointments directly' While in the Indonesian Big Dictionary (2003) stated daisies is or function points to something beyond language; a word that refers to the persona, time and place of a speech. A word is said to be diesis when its referent move. Or alternately, depending on who the speaker and depending on the time and place when spoken such as here, now.

Abdulwahid, et al (1994) said that the phenomenon of dicis is to describe the relationship between language and context within the structure of the language itself. Dicis based on prototype is the use of demonstrative pronouns, pronominal persona I, II, and III, when, specifically temporal and location (for example: now, here) and grammatical features that are tied directly in the speech situation. Dicis can be a location (place), identification of persons, objects, events, processes or activities that are being discussed or referenced in our time and space relationships when spoken by a speaker or a friend to talk.

A word that is dicis has references, or referrals. Abdulwahid, et al (1994). said reference is the relationship between words and things, but more broadly regarded as the reference language relations with the world. References in discourse analysis should consider the attitudes or behavior of the speaker or writer. Reference a sentence is determined by the speaker or writer. Reference may be endofora (anaphora and katafora) and exofora. Endofora textual, reference (reference) is in the text; while exofora is situational (reference or references are outside the text). Endofora divided into anaphora and katafora by position (distribution) of a reference point (reference). Anaphora cross reference to the elements contained in the foregoing; katafora cross reference to the elements mentioned later.

One very important element to obtain the results of learning is learning strategy. The strategy used to achieve success or success in achieving the learning objectives. Learning strategy is chosen ways to deliver learning methods in a particular learning environment, including the study of discourse. It is known that learning is learning the language of discourse dicis in the function or use of the language in the act of communication. Meaning of language is determined by the context of the situation and the culture in which that language is used. Meanings are not determined by the structure of the language, but its meaning is determined by the environment where the language was uttered.

Berns and Erickson in Komalasari, (2013) says of contextual learning is a concept of learning that helps learners relate subject matter content to real world situations; and motivate learners make connections between knowledge and its application in their lives as family members, citizens, and workers involved in the hard work that requires learning).

1. Jonhson (2011) identified eight characteristics of contextual teaching and learning, namely: Making meaningful connections (create meaningful relationships).
2. Doing significant work (doing important work).
3. Self-regulated learing (learn to regulate their own)
4. Collaborating (cooperation)
5. Critical and creative thinking (thinking critically and creatively)
6. Nurturing the individual (nurture people)
7. Reaching high standards (achieving a high standard)
8. Using authentic assessment (use of actual votes)
9. Using authentic assessment (conduct authentic assessment)

Collaborative learning or cooperative learning is often called also widely used in constructive approaches to learning.

Perkins in Yamin (2013) said that collaborative learning is learning that carried learners together, then solve the problem together anyway and not learn individually, this study shows the distribution of intelligence between the learners that one to the other leaners or vice versa during the collaborative learning process takes place. In fact, learning is very appropriate for learners to set them outside the classroom leading to shared responsibility, and they can strive together to achieve the learning objectives. While Discroll said learning also allows learners to see things from other people's perspective and not just from the point of view alone.

Constructivist theory says the learners learn by doing and learning is strongly influenced by the collaborative work. (Shelly, Cashman, Gunter & Gunter in Rezaei, 2003). However, true collaboration within schools require learning activities that are designed based on the principles of collaborative learning facilitated by technology where appropriate. The focus in the initial studies was conceptual learning. He observed that cooperation helps learners to think critically challenge each other's ideas and also test their own preconceptions.

Expository strategy is a learning strategy that emphasizes the verbal process of delivering material from a learner to a group of learners with the intention that learners can master the subject matter optimally. Killen in Sanjaya (2010) named this term strategy expository is direct learning strategies (direct instruction). Within this strategy the subject matter was presented directly by the learner. Learners are not required to locate the material. The subject matter seemed to have been so.

The Characteristics of Expository Learning Strategies: (1) expository strategy is done by delivering course material verbally. Verbally spoken means is a key tool in doing this strategy, therefore, often people identify with lectures; (2) usually the subject matter presented is a subject matter that is so, such as data or facts, certain concepts to be memorized so that does not require learners to think again; (3) the main purpose of learning is to master the subject

matter itself. That is, after the learning process ends learners are expected to understand correctly the way back can reveal material that has been described.

Expository strategy is a form of learning-oriented approach to learners (teacher centered approach). Say so, because in this strategy learner plays a very dominant. Through this strategy the learner deliver learning materials are structured in the hope of the subject matter presented it can be controlled with good learners. The main focus of this strategy is the academic skills (academic achievement) learners. The learning method to study was forms of strategy expository (Sanjaya, 2010).

Motivation can affect all phases of learning and learning performance. Theories of behavioral define motivation as an increase in the number or probability of occurrence of the behavior derived from repetition of behaviors as response to stimuli or as a result of strengthening. Behavior is supported and driven by a motivation enhanced by strengthening, or the response generated by the continued strengthening. Learner displays behavior that is supported and driven motivation because they had earlier strengthened to do it and because the amplifier-effective suports available (Schunk, 2012).

RESEARCH METHODS

A. The purpose of this study as follows:
1. Examine the significance of differences in learning outcomes on discourse dicis between groups of learners treated using contextual learning strategies and the type of collaborative learners group treated using expository teaching strategy.
2. To test the significance of differences in learning outcomes on discourse dicis between groups of learners with high achievement motivation and the group of learners with low achievement motivation.
3. Test the significance of the interaction between the learning strategies and achievement motivation on learning outcomes on discourse dicis.

B. Subject Research

This research was conducted in Language Study Program and Literature Indonesia in the first semester (V) Academic Year 2015/2016 which amounted to 76 people.

This research is a study that used a quasi-experimental research design. This study wanted to know and described is "Is there any influence of contextual learning strategy vs. expository type of collaborative and achievement motivation on learning outcomes discourse dicis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the research results obtained, it can be described by using SPSS. The name of two treatment classes was class contextual learning and classroom-type collaborative expository. Hypothesis testing is done using ANOVA (analysis of variance). The results of testing the hypothesis were using Anova, as follows.

Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 Test Hypoteses Strategy Of Learning

Descriptive Statistics					
Dependent Variable: Achievement of learning					
Learning Strategy	groups Pretest and Posttest	Learn Motivation	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
expository	Posttest	High	73.5263	4.76324	38
		Total	73.5263	4.76324	38

61

			Low	31.3810	4.10459	21
		Pretest	High	38.0000	5.53399	17
			Total	34.3421	5.78571	38
			Low	31.3810	4.10459	21
		Total	High	62.5455	17.29571	55
			Total	53.9342	20.41263	76
		Posttest	High	79.3684	5.45954	38
			Total	79.3684	5.45954	38
			Low	31.0000	5.12910	27
Collaborative type		Pretest	High	42.4545	4.84487	11
			Total	34.3158	7.24888	38
			Low	31.0000	5.12910	27
		Total	High	71.0816	16.43274	49
			Total	56.8421	23.55479	76
		Posttest	High	76.4474	5.87740	76
			Total	76.4474	5.87740	76
			Low	31.1667	4.66464	48
Total		Pretest	High	39.7500	5.63471	28
			Total	34.3289	6.51437	76
			Low	31.1667	4.66464	48
		Total	High	66.5673	17.34950	104
			Total	55.3882	22.01506	152

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics Based on the above, the class treated contextual learning collaborative type with low achievement motivation found in the pretest mean value was 31.0000 and 39.7500 high achievement motivation. Meanwhile, after being given a post-test with low achievement motivation and high achievement motivation 31.1667 is 76.4474. From these data, it is after the application of contextual learning strategies on the type of collaborative learners are motivated under achievers is an increase of 66190. While motivated high achievers is 31.3736.

While grade expository treated with low achievement motivation found in the pretest mean value was 31.3810 and 38.0000 high achievement motivation. Meanwhile, after being given a post-test with low achievement motivation and high achievement motivation 31.3810 is 73.5263. From these data, it is after the application of expository strategy on learners who are highly motivated under achievers is an increase of 66 190, while motivated high achievers is 31.3736.

Based on the data and facts mentioned above, it can be said that the achievement motivation (high and low) come to influence learning outcomes on discourse dicis. The data can be seen at table 2 below.

Here is look at the table 2 below!

Tabel 2 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

ANOVA ANALYSIS RESULTS TABLE TWO LINES					
Dependent Variable: Learning Outcomes					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	69486.589[a]	4	17371.647	690.636	.000
Intercept	337565.817	1	337565.817	13420.432	.000
Strategy	210.461	1	210.461	8.367	.004
Motivation	1459.457	1	1459.457	58.023	.000
Strategy * Motivasi	278.037	1	278.037	11.054	.001
Error	3697.510	147	25.153		

62

Total	539497.000	152			
Corrected Total	73184.099	151			
a. R Squared = .949 (Adjusted R Squared = .948)					

Based on Table 2 Tests of Between-Subjects Effects above, it can be stated that the f 8367> 0.5 with a significant level of 0.004 thus, it can be concluded that the type of collaborative learning strategies contextual superior to expository learning strategies.

CLOSING

A. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study is:

1. There is a difference in learning outcomes on discourse dicis between groups of learners who were treated using contextual learning strategy type of collaborative and group learners using expository teaching strategy. Based on the results of learning group of learners treated with collaborative type of contextual learning strategy is better than the group of learners treated expository strategy.

2. There are differences in learning outcomes on discourse dicis between groups of learners who have high achievement motivation and groups of learners who have low achievement motivation. Based on study results, the group of learners who have high achievement motivation is better than a group of learners who have low achievement motivation.

3. The existence of interaction between the learning strategies and achievement motivation on learning outcomes on discourse dicis.

B. Suggestions

The suggestions of this study are:

1. Strategy collaborative type of contextual learning is superior, than expository, it is necessary to pay attention to learners this strategy to improve the quality of the learning process to achieve the learning objectives.

2. Learning needs to continue to motivate learners, so that the energy can perform many unexpected things for learning that is being studied.

3. In a collaborative constructivist learning how teamwork is the best way to solve the problems of learning. In general, learners into learning resource for learners. This must change. Learners should be given the opportunity to seek and find what is to be learned in the environment in which they learn.

REFERENCES

Alwi, H. 2003. Indonesian Dictionary. Jakarta: Balai Library.

Darma, Y.A.D. 2014. Critical Discourse Analysis. in Multiperspective. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya, H. 1992. Language, Context, and Text. Aspects of Language in Social Semiotics Views. (Translation: Asruddin B. Tou. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.

Abdulwahid, et al. 1994. Discourse Understanding and Relationships between Elements. Bandung: PT Eresco.

Johnson, E.B. 2011. Contextual Teaching and Learning. (Translation: Ibnu Setiawan). Bandung: Kaifa.

Kaartinen, S. & Kumpulaien, K. 2002. Collaborative Inquiry and the Construction of Explanations in the Learning of Science. Department of Educational Sciences and Teacher Education, University of Oulu, P.O. Box 2000, Learning and Instruction 12 (2002) 189-212

Karagiorgi, Y., & Symeou, L. 2005. Translating into Constructivism Instructional Design: Potential and Limitations. Educational Technology & Society, 8 (1), 17-27.

Keyser, W.M. 2000. Active Learning and Cooperative Learning: Understanding the Difference and Using both Styles Effectively. James C. Jernigan Library, Texas A & M University-Kingsville, Kingsville; Strategies Research 17 (2000) 35 ± 44

Komalasari, K. 2013. Contextual Learning Concepts and Applications. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Reid, G. 2007. Motivating Learners in the Classroom: Ideas and Strategies. California: Paul Chapman Publishing.

Reigeluth, C.M. 1999. Instruction-Design Theories and Models Volume II. A New Paradigm of Instructional Theory. London: Lowrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Rezaei, A.R. 2003. An Integrated Approach to Collaborative Electronic Learning. JI. of Computers in Mathematics and Science Teaching 22 (1), 57-73

Sanjaya, W. 2010. Learning Strategy Process Oriented Education Standards. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group.

Santrock, J.W. 2013. Educational Psychology. (Translation: Tri Wibowo B.S.). Jakarta: Kencna Prenada Meia group.

Schunk, D.H. 2012. Learning Theoris An Educational Perspective (Theories of Learning, Education Perspective. (Translation: Eva Hamdiah, Rahmat Fajar), Yogyakarta: Student Library.

Slavin, R.E., 2011. Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. (Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice). Volume 1. (Translation: Drs. Marianto Samosir, SH) Jakarta: PT index.

Slavin, R.E. 2011. Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice. (Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice). Volume 2. (Translation: Drs. Marianto Samosir, SH) Jakarta: PT index.

Sugiyono 2013. Educational Research Methods. Quantitative Approach, Qualitative and R & D.Bandung: Alfabeta.

Yamin, M. 2013. A New Paradigm Learning .. Jakarta: Reference.