



## The Effect of the Cooperative Course Review Hooray Learning Model on Students' Learning Outcomes

Sezh Faheem<sup>1</sup>, Dabuos Uzeir<sup>1</sup>, Baliwal Yacub<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Education, Virtual University of Pakistan, Pakistan

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Education, Punjab University, Pakistan

\*Corresponding Author: Sezh Faheem



### Article Info

Article history:

Received 03 July 2021

Received in revised form 22

July 2021

Accepted 13 August 2021

Keywords:

CRH

Learning Outcome

Learning Model

### Abstract

*This study aims to investigate the effect of Cooperative Course Review Horay learning model on students learning outcome. The study uses true experimental design. Description: This research will use descriptive and inferential statistics to quantitatively analyse learning outcomes, with the latter being the primary method of analysis. To describe the scores of the research sample for each variable, a descriptive statistical analysis was carried out to determine their distribution. The findings indicate that Cooperative Course Review is beneficial. The Horay learning method provides great outcomes in terms of student learning. Despite the fact that the average score for the experimental group is 85.20 points, it is the median score for the experimental group that stands at 90 points. The control class has a standard deviation of 62.80 points and a median of 60.00 points, both of which are positive values.*

### Introduction

One of the ways in which a student's learning outcomes may be measured is by their degree of success in the learning activities that they have done. As a general rule, if students' learning outcomes are positive, it may be assumed that the learning process they are experiencing is positive as well, and vice versa. One factor that may have an impact on the learning outcomes of students in schools is the variety of learning methods used by instructors during classroom learning activities, which can be a source of contention.

Based on the findings of the observations that have been conducted, it is known that student learning outcomes are still seen to be poor in the eyes of the community. There are several factors contributing to this, including things that make it difficult for students to understand the lesson due to a limited understanding of lesson concepts, a decrease in enthusiasm for participating in learning activities, students' intelligence levels being below average, and a lack of variety in school teaching (Mitchell et al., 2020). Class, so that the level of understanding and interest in learning activities increases (Cecchini et al., 2020; Rivera-Pérez et al., 2021).

In most cases, pupils simply pay attention to the information being presented by the instructor, and they have little comprehension of the ideas being taught. This will very definitely have an impact on the pupils' comprehension of the subject that will be covered after that. To cope with these issues, it is necessary to make ongoing efforts to identify and develop learning models that would encourage students to take an active role in their education. It has been shown that cooperative learning is one of the most effective learning methods for motivating students to take an active role in their own learning (Jalilifar, 2010).

Therefore, cooperative learning is considered effective learning for all students and is considered an integrative part of the current school paradigm shift (Herrmann, 2013; John, 2015). It is also considered to be a learning method that is able to encourage healthy interaction and cooperation among teachers who are accustomed to working separately with other people

(Johnson et al., 2014; Bolukbas et al., 2011). The Course Review Horay model of cooperative learning is one of the learning models that may be used (CRH).

Collaboration is a group learning activity based on the concept that learning should be based on socially changing knowledge among groups of learners in which each learner is accountable for his or her own learning and is encouraged to help others learn more effectively (Hurst et al., 2013). Cooperative learning provided a student who is having difficulty understanding the subject matter can benefit from the presence of friends around him, resulting in the concepts learned being more easily accepted between colleagues who are providing information to one another (Levine & Marcus, 2010).

The Course Review Horay (CRH) technique is a learning approach that involves evaluating knowledge by writing down the answer in a box filled with numbers; the person who gets the right answer instantly yells "Horay." Learning Course Review Horay (CRH) is intended to educate students in problem-solving skills via the formation of small groups of students.

Course Review Horay (CRH) is a technique that requires students to participate in additional learning activities. This style of teaching and learning places a greater emphasis on comprehending the information being taught through solving problems rather than on memorizing it. The implementation of Horay's Course Review learning technique not only helps students acquire academic material and abilities, but it also helps them understand how to learn. As one of the stages of knowing, doing, being, and living together, course review Horay may help students create meaningful learning experiences by encouraging them to think critically and creatively about their learning.

Learners who use this approach have a framework of activities, objectives, and incentives that foster a positive attitude of dependency among their peers, as well as acceptance of individual diversity, and they acquire abilities for working together in groups between classes. Information is processed in the mind, and pupils will be able to ask questions after they have grasped the material. Because of this, it is essential to investigate the impact of Horay's Cooperative Course Review learning model on student learning outcomes in order to improve the model

## **Methods**

This kind of study is referred to as True Experimental Design research since it only involves a post-test control design. In this research, two groups were selected at random among the participants. The first group received treatment, while the second group did not get treatment. The experimental group was distinguished from the control group by the fact that it received no treatment whereas the latter did get treatment. An online exam containing globalization material was used to gather data for this research. The test consisted of 10 multiple-choice questions, each of which had a score that was the identical across all questions. It can be shown from the tests that have been conducted in this research that student learning outcomes have been improved. The information gathered will be subjected to quantitative analysis.

In this study, quantitative analysis of learning outcomes will be carried out using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics, respectively. In order to characterize the scores of the study sample for each variable, descriptive statistical analysis was carried out. In this instance, the frequency distribution table of the average score, standard deviation, lowest score, and maximum score is utilized, as well as the frequency distribution table of the standard deviation. Using a two-sample t-test, inferential statistical analysis was performed to examine the study hypothesis. The SPSS version was used to conduct the analysis. However, before verifying the hypothesis, it was necessary to conduct a normalcy test first

## Results and Discussion

### Description of Post Test Learning Outcomes Data

In accordance with the findings of the research, it is known that the calculation results from the post-test procedure in both the experimental and control classes of students are given in the table below.

Table 1. Description of Post Test Result Data

Class	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Experiment	25	60	100	85,2
Control	25	40	90	62,8

Using the Cooperative Course Review Horay (CRH) learning paradigm, the experimental class was able to demonstrate this in the table above. With the greatest score being 100 and the lowest being 60, it was possible to achieve an average learning result of 85.2. While the control class had an average learning result of 62.8, with the best score being 90 and the lowest score being 40, the experimental class achieved an average learning outcome of 62.8.

### Description of Post Test Learning Outcome Data Category

Following the trial, the learning outcomes revealed that 8 percent of students had inadequate learning results, 8 percent received moderate learning results, 20 percent received excellent learning results, and 64% received very good learning results in their respective classes. Consequently, 23 pupils were successful in their exams.

It was found that 8 percent of students had excellent learning outcomes, 8 percent received good learning outcomes, 20 percent received intermediate learning outcomes, 40 percent received moderate learning outcomes, and 24 percent received bad learning outcomes in the control class (see table). As a result, nine pupils were successful in their exams.

### Normality Test

Table 2. Output of Experimental Class Normality Test Results on SPSS

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Experiment	.311	25	.087	.835	25	.0

If the significant values of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk tests are more than 0.05, as shown in the table above, the data is considered to pass the normality test. Furthermore, as shown in the table above, the significance in Kolmogorov-Smirnov is  $0.087 > 0.05$  and the significance in Shapiro-Wilk is  $0.076 > 0.05$ , indicating that this test meets the criterion of normality.

Table 3. Output of Control Class Normality Test Results on SPSS

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Control	.256	25	.006	.825	25	.101

It can be observed in the table above that if the significant values of Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk are more than 0.05, then the data is considered to pass the normality test. In addition, the significance in Kolmogorov-Smirnov is  $0.066 > 0.05$ , and the significance in Shapiro-Wilk is  $0.101 > 0.05$ , as shown in the table above. As a consequence, this study's

findings may be classified as meeting the criterion of normalcy testing and being normally distributed.

### T-Test

Table 4. T-test results

Study Results	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	.447	.439	6.592	48	.000	22.40	3.39	15.56779	29.23221
Equal variances not assumed			6.592	46.416	.000	22.40	3.39	15.56176	29.23824

In the results of the t test, the significance level was calculated as Sig. (2-tailed) or a significance level of 0.01 0.000 0.05. Then, based on the foundation of decision-making in the Independent Sample T-Test, it is possible to infer that Ho is not accepted. While H1 is allowed in cases where it indicates that the implementation of the Cooperative Course Review Horay learning model has an impact on student learning outcomes, H2 is rejected in cases where it indicates that there is no such effect. In this instance, it is possible to infer that the Cooperative Course Review learning model developed by Horay has an impact on student learning outcomes.

There is a statistically significant difference between the learning results achieved by the experimental class and the control class, according to the data (Aşıksoy & Özdamlı, 2016). The Cooperative Course Review Horay learning approach produces excellent student learning results, according to the authors. This may be seen in the average value of the experimental class, which is 85.20 points. However, the median score for the experimental class is 90 points. The experimental class has a standard deviation of 10.85, which is within the range. The variance of the experimental class was 117.67.

From these findings, it can be concluded that the experimental class, which was taught using a Horay learning model based on cooperative course review, had a total of 23 students who were able to achieve scores above the minimum completion criteria and a total of only 2 students who were unable to achieve scores above the minimum completion criteria, indicating that the experimental class was a success.

For the control class, the average value of the control class is 62.80, which is a significant figure. The median for the control class, on the other hand, is 60.00. Among the control classes, the standard deviation is 13,077 points. The variance of the control class is 171.00. Based on these findings, it can also be observed that in the control class, the number of students who are able to obtain scores above the minimum completeness criterion is nine students, while the number of students who do not meet the minimum completeness criteria is sixteen students.

This demonstrates that the Cooperative Course Review Horay (CRH) learning paradigm has an impact on student learning outcomes, indicating that there is a positive relationship. Discussion of the findings of study that was carried out in order to acquire reliable data. Taking

into consideration the calculations of the post-test findings that have been given before, it can be observed that the analysis of the hypothesis requirements test, which is  $t\text{-count } 6.59211 > t\text{-table } 2.01063$ , shows that the hypothesis requirements test is successful. In general, it can be stated that learning through the use of the Cooperative Course Review Horay learning model is more beneficial than learning through the use of traditional techniques. The Cooperative Course Review Horay learning approach has a beneficial impact on student learning outcomes, as shown by these findings.

## Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study and discussion provided, it is possible to infer that learning via the Cooperative Course Review Horay (CRH) model is superior to traditional learning. The Cooperative Course Review Horay (CRH) learning approach has been shown to have a beneficial impact on students' learning results. There are significant differences in learning outcomes between students who learn using the Cooperative Course Review Horay (CRH) learning model and those who learn using conventional learning models. The average value of the experimental class is 85.20, while the average value of the control class is 62.80, indicating that the experimental class outperformed the control class.

## References

- Aşıksoy, G., & Özdamlı, F. (2016). Flipped Classroom adapted to the ARCS Model of Motivation and applied to a Physics Course. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, 12(6), 1589-1603.
- Bolukbas, F., Keskin, F., & Polat, M. (2011). The Effectiveness of Cooperative Learning on the Reading Comprehension Skills in Turkish as a Foreign Language. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 10(4), 330-335.
- Cecchini, J. A., Fernandez-Rio, J., Mendez-Gimenez, A., Gonzalez, C., Sanchez-Martínez, B., & Carriedo, A. (2020). High versus low-structured cooperative learning. Effects on prospective teachers' regulation dominance, motivation, content knowledge and responsibility. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1-16.
- Herrmann, K. J. (2013). The impact of cooperative learning on student engagement: Results from an intervention. *Active learning in higher education*, 14(3), 175-187.
- Hurst, B., Wallace, R. R., & Nixon, S. B. (2013). The impact of social interaction on student learning. *Reading Horizons*.
- Jalilifar, A. (2010). The effect of cooperative learning techniques on college students' reading comprehension. *System*, 38(1), 96-108.
- John, Y. J. (2015). A "New" Thematic, Integrated Curriculum for Primary Schools of Trinidad and Tobago: A Paradigm Shift. *International journal of higher education*, 4(3), 172-187.
- Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Smith, K. A. (2014). Cooperative learning: Improving university instruction by basing practice on validated theory. *Journal on Excellence in University Teaching*, 25(4), 1-26.
- Levine, T. H., & Marcus, A. S. (2010). How the structure and focus of teachers' collaborative activities facilitate and constrain teacher learning. *Teaching and teacher education*, 26(3), 389-398.

- Mitchell, S., Mitchell, S. A., Oslin, J., & Griffin, L. L. (2020). *Teaching sport concepts and skills: A tactical games approach*. Human Kinetics Publishers.
- Rivera-Pérez, S., Fernandez-Rio, J., & Iglesias Gallego, D. (2021). Effects of an 8-Week Cooperative Learning Intervention on Physical Education Students' Task and Self-Approach Goals, and Emotional Intelligence. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(1), 61.