

Three Methods of Online Learning in Studying Law for Students' Critical Thinking: Which One is More Effective?

Agustinus Tampubolon^{1*}, Margi Wahono², Pat Kurniati³, Matang Matang⁴,
Wachid P⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: Agustinustampubolon83@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The pandemic condition for online learning of Civics Education created not only a challenge for students but also for teachers, material dealing with law for students in Senior High School was considered difficult because it contained only theory and concepts. This caused students to tend to be less skilled in critical thinking. Therefore, teachers must look for effective learning methods and then the characteristics must be tailored to the needs of students. This study aimed to determine the difference in effectiveness and which method was more effective between courtroom methods, debate and law comparison between countries. The research design was quantitative with an experimental approach. The comparison of the three methods was a novelty apart from the online method, the three of them were considered to be effective with a significance of 0.081 (Sig.> 0.05) and the learning method using the courtroom was more effective than the debate method and law comparison.

Keywords: *Critical Thinking, Effectiveness, Law Learning Methods.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The pandemic condition has had a major impact on various aspects of life, including education. (Onyema, EM, et, al, 2020; DeMatthews, D., Knight, D., Reyes, P., Benedict, A., & Callahan, R, 2020; Daniel, S. J, 2020 & Joshi, A. , Vinay, M. and Bhaskar, P, 2021) [1] [2] [3] [4]. This requires teachers to innovate more than before the pandemic. (Ellis, V., Steadman, S., & Mao, Q, 2020) [5]. Including by utilizing pedagogic capabilities and alternative technologies (Kidd, W., & Murray, J, 2020) [6]. Even in pedagogy, teachers have their challenges (Oliver, M, Gistered M, Liberty, M, 2020) [7]. Various ways are done so that learning is not boring or boring but also so that students are able to be actively and critically involved as is the goal of Pancasila education and Citizenship Education (PPKn), especially in legal evaluation materials.

The law, as it contains the concept of rights and obligations, is the goal of how Civics aims to make students aware of being part of the state. Comber (2005) emphasizes the relationship of civic education with skills to participate in government which is very necessary in learning [8]. Chong, E. K., Sant, E., &

Davies, I added that civic education is related to political education [9]. Because essentially through civic education, students learn to be involved and aware of themselves in the country. Even by Kennedy (2019) Civic education should be to solve society's problems [10]. Because basically, citizens in the 21st century should contribute to the democracy of the future. (Wolff-Roth, M, 2018) [11].

Efforts to encourage students' critical thinking skills must be supported by an experience-based approach directly through experience or known as experiential learning methods. Sholihah, M. A., Utaya, S., & Susilo, S. (2016) explained that this method can improve students' critical thinking skills [12]. In line with that, Astutik, H. Y. (2009) added experiential learning as a learning model that activates students in the teaching and learning process to build knowledge and skills through direct experience [13]. Therefore, the authors propose three methods based on experience, namely the courtroom method, debate and comparative study of law between countries.

1.1 Critical Thinking Skills

Critical education is known through Paulo Freire who is famous for his critical pedagogic theory that liberates students in learning. The meaning of liberating here is liberation by providing a critical awareness space for students as human beings who cannot be filled like a 'bank' which is then called bank-style education.

Agus and Roizah (2019, p. 31) explain that critical awareness has three meanings, namely: 1. understanding or knowing a level of observation or controlled thinking; 2. able through thought, ability, design, or perception; 3. act through critical understanding. Critical awareness in humans is at the sub-conscious layer, the sub-conscious layer is the conscious human layer which can be known if someone tries to focus the mind to explore it [14]. Critical thinking in educational practice involves dialogue and lectures (Kuhn, D, 2019) [15]. Critical thinking is a reflective process that is important for the development of students' thinking (Mahanal, S, Zubaidah, S, Sumiati, I.D, Sari, T.M, Ismirawati, N, 2019) [16].

1.2 Courtroom Method

The courtroom is a learning method by involving students' active role in court situations and experiencing how the trial process occurs. The courtroom has a design to develop critical skills because students learn to experience events in a court firsthand and try to dig up information from various legal case investigation efforts. Students not only convey but experience situations that are not just learning content but play a role according to their needs. Chan (2012) revealed that learning strategies involving roles need to be accommodated in problem-based learning to be more effective [17].

The problem is related to the needs that students will face in their experience. Cherif and Somervil (1995) have used role playing as a learning strategy in the classroom because students learn to play conflicts so that they are directly involved in their roles and are able to motivate them to learn to resolve them [18].

1.3 Debate Method

Debate is a learning method that can improve students' critical thinking skills by dealing with tensions between pros and cons. The goal is that students are able to develop their skills in dealing with a consequence from various perspectives. Mumtaz and Latif (2017) explain that debate can improve students' skills in analytical decision making, communication, and critical thinking skills [19]. However, for McAvoy, P., & McAvoy, G. E. (2021) debate brings less participation than deliberation [20]. Therefore, according to Omelicheva, M. Y. & Avdeyeva, O. (2008), debate cannot stand alone as an effective learning if it is not

accommodated by traditional learning [21]. This means that debate cannot forget class activities with lectures because there is a basic process to understand basic concepts. Therefore, debate is not the only strategy in active learning.

Pezhman Zare, P. & Othman, M. (2013) added that debate has the potential to maintain active student engagement which includes improving critical thinking skills, mastering lesson content and improving speaking skills [22]. So Moore, J. (2020) proposes the importance of teaching healthy ways in participatory debate without indoctrination [23]. These opinions explain that debate is a method that can be used to improve students' critical reasoning, but it should be realized that this activity cannot stand alone without supporting factors from other strategies in the form of basic concepts so that the direction of the debate can achieve the objectives of the learning itself.

1.4 Comparative Methods of Legal Studies

Jessop & Maleckar (2014) explain that comparative studies can encourage deep learning by investigating alternative and authentic real-world examinations [10]. The purpose of this statement is focused on trying to compare the real conditions in the situation with various alternatives that occur. Sacco (1991) adds that a comparative study of law presupposes the existence of a plurality of legal rules and institutions [11]. Therefore, to study them requires an effort to find out how to determine the extent to which they are identical or different. These two opinions explain that comparative studies in law are an attempt to find comparisons about rules and legal institutions to the extent that they are identical or different through various real conditions in society.

2. METHOD

The research design is a quantitative study with an experimental approach that is used to find out whether there are differences in the effect of the effectiveness of certain treatments on others. Sampling in this study uses a proportional sampling technique (proportional sampling), which is proportional sampling so that all members in the population have the same probability or opportunity to be selected as samples if they have predetermined criteria. The research sample used 45 students and was divided into 3 groups using courtroom, debate and comparative law studies methods. The data analysis technique used was descriptive statistics, hypothesis testing (One Way ANOVA), and further testing using the Tukey test to see significant differences between each learning method.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Results

Based on the results of data analysis using SPSS, it can be explained as follows:

One Path Anova Test

To find out the effectiveness of learning with courtroom methods, debates and comparative studies of law between countries on students' thinking abilities, the study used the one-way ANOVA test.

Score_KBK

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	642.133	2	321.067	2.675	.081
Within Groups	5041.067	42	120.025		
Total	5683.200	44			

Table 3.1. Path ANOVA Test Results (1st Hypothesis Test)

Based on the calculations that have been done, the results of the analysis in table 1. show that the F value for data sources between learning methods is 2.675 with a significance of 0.081 (Sig. > 0.05). This means that H0 is accepted, or H1 is rejected. In other words, it can be concluded that there is no difference between the method of courtroom, debate and comparative study of law between countries on students' thinking ability.

Descriptives

score_KBK

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Min	Mx
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
RS	15	82.93	9.617	2.483	77.61	88.26	64	92
DB	15	76.80	9.704	2.506	71.43	82.17	52	88
PN	15	73.87	13.169	3.400	66.57	81.16	52	92
Total	45	77.87	11.365	1.694	74.45	81.28	52	92

Table 3.2. Descriptive Results of Students' Critical Thinking Ability Score

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: skor_KBK

Tukey HSD

(I) Metode	(J) Metode	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound

RS	DB	6.133	4.000	.286	-3.59	15.85
	PN	9.067	4.000	.072	-.65	18.79
DB	RS	-6.133	4.000	.286	-15.85	3.59
	PN	2.933	4.000	.745	-6.79	12.65
PN	RS	-9.067	4.000	.072	-18.79	.65
	DB	-2.933	4.000	.745	-12.65	6.79

Table 3.3. Results of Hypothesis 2 Testing with Tukey

Based on the table above, it can be explained that:

1. Because the difference between RS (Trial Room) and DB (Debate) is 6,133 with a significant value of 0.286 (Sig. > 0.05), there is a significant difference in the average critical thinking ability of students between students who study with the RS and DB methods. . Because the average of those who study with RS is greater (82.93) than DB (76, 80), then the effect of the RS method is higher than DB.
2. Because the difference between RS (Trial Room) and PN (State Comparison) is 9,067 with a significant value of 0.072 (Sig. > 0.05), then there is a significant difference in the average critical thinking ability of students between the rest who study with the RS method and PN. Because the average who studied with RS was greater (82.93) than PN (73, 87), the effect of the RS method was higher than that of PN.
3. Because the difference between DB (Debate) and PN (Country Comparison) is 2,933 with a significant value of 0.745 (Sig. > 0.05), then there is a significant difference in the average critical thinking ability of students between students who study with the DB method and PN. Because the average learner with DB is greater (76.80) than PN (73, 87), then the effect of the DB method is higher than that of PN.

3.2 Discussion

In this study, the courtroom (RS), Debate (DB) and Comparative Study of the State of Law (PN) learning methods were applied to the evaluation of legal cases as an effort to critically involve students in legal issues in class XII students of SMAK 1 BPK Penabur Bandung. Some of the things studied in this study include knowing the differences in the effectiveness of the three learning methods in improving students' critical reasoning and describing the effectiveness of the three learning models in the formation of students' critical reasoning abilities. The results are as follows.

First, it discusses the differences in the effectiveness of the three teaching methods for RS, DB and PN. The background of the research is that students have difficulty understanding solid legal material and seem boring or boring so that critical thinking skills which are one of the urgencies of Civics need to be improved. This

effort is also driven by the not yet maximal learning innovation specifically in Civics learning, especially in the pandemic and digital era. Therefore, the teacher tries to use various methods to improve students' critical thinking skills using the Courtroom (RS), DB (Debate) and PN (State of Law Comparison) models. The three methods have learning styles whose characteristics are felt to be able to improve students' critical thinking skills. This is what researchers want to know whether there are differences in the effectiveness of the three methods.

The application of the three methods was carried out to class XII students and to determine the difference in effectiveness, statistical tests were carried out with the One Way Anova test of the three learning methods. The three groups are samples that are tested so that through the one-way ANOVA test according to its purpose to test the effectiveness of these three media.

Based on the results of hypothesis testing with one way ANOVA, the probability value is greater than the significant level of 0.081 (Sig. > 0.05). Thus, the research hypothesis H₀ that there is a difference in effectiveness between courtroom methods, debates and comparative studies of law between countries on students' thinking skills is rejected. Thus, it can be said that there is no difference in the effectiveness of learning with the Courtroom, Debate and Comparative Study of the Rule of Law learning method on students' critical thinking skills.

Second, it discusses the differences in the learning effectiveness of students who study with the RS, DB and PN methods. From the results of the literature review, it was found that the three methods have characteristics that are similar to those based on problems, students' real experiences and contextual learning resources. Therefore, because of this similarity, the researcher wants to know which method is more effective in implementing law learning in the classroom. From the results of statistical tests with the ANOVA test, it was found that the Courtroom Method has a greater probability value than the Debate and Comparative Legal Studies method. This can be seen from the significant difference between RS and DB, which is 0.286 (Sig. > 0.05), RS and PN are 0.072 (Sig. > 0.05), DB and PN are 0.745 (Sig. > 0.05).

Thus, it means that the research hypothesis (H₀) that the learning method of courtroom, debate and comparative law studies is effective in improving the critical thinking ability of students in class XII SMAK 1 BPK Penabur Bandung is rejected. The results of the study show that the Courtroom method is more effective than studying the debate method and comparative study of state law.

4. CONCLUSION

The results of the research on the three learning methods on students' critical thinking skills in law learning explain that there is no difference in the effectiveness of learning with the Courtroom, Debate and Comparative Study of the State of Law learning method on students' critical thinking skills. However, the courtroom learning method is more effective than the debate method and comparative law study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Onyema, E.M, et.al. Impact of Coronavirus Pandemic on Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11 (13), 108-121. 2020
- [2] DeMatthews, D., Knight, D., Reyes, P., Benedict, A., & Callahan, R. From the Field: Education Research During a Pandemic. *Educational Researcher*, XX (X), 1–5. 2020.
- [3] Daniel, S. J. Education and the COVID-19 pandemic. *PROSPECTS*, 2-6. 2020.
- [4] Joshi, A., Vinay, M. and Bhaskar, P. "Impact of coronavirus pandemic on the Indian education sector: perspectives of teachers on online teaching and assessments", *Interactive Technology and Smart Education*, Vol. 18 No. 2, pp. 205-226.2021.
- [5] Ellis, V., Steadman, S., & Mao, Q. "Come to a screeching halt": Can change in teacher education during the COVID-19 pandemic be seen as innovation? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1–14. 2020.
- [6] Kidd, W., & Murray, J. The Covid-19 pandemic and its effects on teacher education in England: how teacher educators moved practicum learning online. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 1–17. 2020.
- [7] Oliver, M, Gistered M, & Liberty, M. Pedagogical Challenges in Teaching Civic Education in Secondary Schools in Zambia. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 9 (3), 1483-1488. 2020
- [8] Comber, M.K. *Civic Skills and Civic Education: an Empirical Assessment*. Washington: University of Maryland. 2005.
- [9] Chong, E. K., Sant, E., & Davies, I. Civic education guidelines in Hong Kong 1985–2012: Striving for normative stability in turbulent social and political contexts. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, 48(2), 285–306. 2019.
- [10] Kennedy, K. J. *Civic and Citizenship Education in Volatile Times: preparing students for citizenship in the 21st century*. Singapore: Springer. 2019.

- [11] Wolff-Roth, M. Heterogeneity, Diversity, Change: new goal posts or rethinking science education and citizenship in the 21st century. Dalam Kane, L.T & Powell, M.R (Penyunting). *Citizenship in the 21st Century* (93-125). New York: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.2018.
- [12] Sholihah, M. A., Utaya, S., & Susilo, S. Pengaruh Model Experiential Learning terhadap Kemampuan Berpikir Siswa SMA. *Jurnal Pendidikan: Teori, Penelitian, dan Pengembangan*, 1(11), 2096-2100.2016.
- [13] Astutik, H. Y. Penerapan experiential learning pada mata diklat kewirausahaan untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa (studi pada siswa kelas XB Penjualan SMK Islam Donomulyo Kab. Malang). 2009.
- [14] Agus, A. H., & Roizah, Z. Konstruktivitas Kesadaran Kritis, Pendidikan Dan Tanggung Jawab Dalam Mengatasi Perilaku Literasi Di Perguruan Tinggi. *Edureligia: Jurnal Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 3(1), 25-40. 2019.
- [15] Kuhn, D. Critical Thinking as Discourse. *Human Development*, 62(3), 146–164. 2019.
- [16] Mahanal, S, Zubaidah, S, Sumiati, I.D, Sari, T.M, Ismirawati, N. 2019. RICOSRE: A Learning Model to Develop Critical Thinking Skills for Students with Different Academic Abilities. *International Journal of Instruction*, 12 (2), 147-434. 2019.
- [17] Chan, Z.C.Y. Role-playing in the problem-based learning class. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 12 (1), 21-27. Doi.10.1016/j.nepr.2011.04.008. 2012.
- [18] Cherif, A.H & Somervill, C. H. Maximizing Learning: Using Role Playing in the Classroom. *The American Biology Teacher*, 57 (1), hlm. 28-33. 1995.
- [19] Mumtaz, S dan Latif, R. Learning through debate during problem-based learning: an active learning strategy. *Adv Physiol Educ*, 41, 390–394. doi:10.1152/advan.00157.2016. 2017.
- [20] McAvoy, P., & McAvoy, G. E. Can Debate and Deliberation Reduce Partisan Divisions? Evidence from a Study of High School Students. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 96(3), 275–284. 2021.
- [21] Omelicheva, M. Y. & Avdeyeva, O. Teaching with Lecture or Debate? Testing the Effectiveness of Traditional versus Active Learning Methods of Instruction. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 41(03), 603–607. 2008.
- [22] Pezhman Zare, P. & Othman, M. Classroom Debate as a Systematic Teaching/Learning Approach. *World Applied Sciences Journal*, 28 (11), 1506-1513. 2013.
- [23] Moore, J. And Justice for All! Teaching the Reparations Debate. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 11(2), 27-60. 2020.
- [24] Jessop, T., & Maleckar, B. The influence of disciplinary assessment patterns on student learning: a comparative study. *Studies in Higher Education*, 41(4), 696–711. doi:10.1080/03075079.2014.943170. 2014.
- [25] Sacco, R. Legal Formants: A Dynamic Approach to Comparative Law (Installment I of II). *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 39(1), 1-34. 1991.