Al-Ishlah: Jurnal Pendidikan
Vol.14, 4 (December, 2022), pp. 4939-4946
ISSN: 2087-9490 EISSN: 2597-940X, DOI: 10.35445/alishlah.v14i4.1667

Teachers' Constraints in Organizing Learning Process for High School Students in Jambi

Harbeng Masni[1], Zuhri Saputra Hutabarat[2], Herman Budiyono[3]

[1] Universitas Batanghari Jambi, Indonesia; harbeng.masni@unbari.ac.id
[2] Universitas Batanghari Jambi, Indonesia; zuhri2saputra1hutabarat9@gmail.com
[4] Universitas Jambi, Indonesia; hermanbudiyono61@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

teacher constraints; organizing learning
process;
high school students

Article history:

Received 2021-12-14
Revised 2022-05-12
Accepted 2022-11-15

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to describe the constraints faced by high school teachers in Jambi in the students learning process. Those constrains are ranging from planning, implementing, to evaluating learning outcomes. The study was conducted in public high school in Jambi for 8 months. Subjects in this study are subject teachers, principals, supervisors, and supervisors. While the object of this research includes teacher learning documents and infrastructure facilities. This research uses qualitative approach and based on field study. It belongs to phenomenological research and includes descriptive research type. The data were collected using questionnaires, interview guides, observation guides, documentation, and portfolios. The result of the research reveals that public high school teachers in Jambi are experiencing difficulties in planning process of learning. Some hindrances found in the process of implementing student learning in the classroom are the large number of students in each class and the lack of supporting facilities and infrastructure. Whereas the hindrance in the process of evaluating student learning outcomes came from ineffective design qualities.

Corresponding Author:
Harbeng Masni
Universitas Batanghari Jambi, Indonesia; harbeng.masni@unbari.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Learning is a process marked by a change of behavior in a person. Learning is also an activity consisting of student activities as a personal learning and teacher activity as a teacher. Learning activities are the change that occured in a person as a result of experience. Changes as a result of learning activities can include changes in knowledge, skills and abilities, reactive ability, receptive ability and so forth. Similarly, teaching is basically a process, which includes the process of organizing and organizing students learning environment of which purpose is to raise and motivate students in learning.

According to Reigeluth and Chellman (2009), "This definition emphasizes three things, namely methods, conditions, and learning objectives. When learning theories used should be able to identify appropriate methods to create learning conditions that are enjoyable to achieve learning objectives.

Meanwhile Gagne, Briggs, and Wager (2005) stated that instruction is a set of external events that is organized and deliberately designed to support the internal learning process. Referring to the opinion, learning activities need to consider the number of learning stages (events of learning) that must be passed in order to achieve certain learning objectives. In general, they share learning on several stages: (1) attracting students' attention through certain stimuli; (2) inform learning objectives; (3) recall the material already learned; (4) presents the material clearly; (5) provide study guides; (6) requesting performance; (7) provide feedback on performance appropriateness; (8) assessing learning performance; And (9) increase retention and transfer.

Smith and Ragan (in Tornei, 2008), reveals the student's position in the learning process, as stated "The learner is viewed as constructing meaning from instruction, rather than being a recipient of meaning residing alone within instruction." In the meantime, Miarso (2011) discovered learning as a deliberate attempt to manage the environment in order for a person to establish himself in a certain positive under certain conditions. This means that learning is actually more related to the empowerment of the learning environment in such a way as to enable students to learn. This opinion suggests that learning is an activity that is more motivational toward student individually.

Learning as a science has three main components in learning theory that is method, condition, and result (Reigeluth, 2009). Learning methods are different ways of achieving different outcomes under different conditions. Learning conditions are factors that affect the effects of methods to achieve learning outcomes. Conditions are variables that interact with methods to influence their relative effectiveness and can not be manipulated in a given situation. While out-comes learning is a variety of effects that become a measure of the value or benefits of alternative methods under different conditions. Learning outcomes can be actual or expected. It can be concluded that learning is a planned and intentional activity that is done by manipulating the environment and learning resources to help students achieve predetermined learning objectives.

The essence of learning is a systematic and planned process. According to Subroto (2002: 19) "teaching and learning process includes activities undertaken by teachers ranging from planning, implementation of activities, to evaluation and follow-up programs that take place in an educational atmosphere." Namus (2003: 30) explains that the learning process is the core of the formal education process, in which the interaction of various components (elements of instruction) is called educational interaction.

2. METHODS

The purpose of this study is to describe the constraints faced by public high school teachers in Jambi in the process of student learning, which are ranging from the process of planning, implementing, to evaluating learning outcomes. Research activities conducted in public high schools in Jambi for 8 months consecutively. Subjects in this study are the subject teachers, principals, and supervisors, while the object of this study includes teacher learning documents and infrastructure facilities.

This research includes descriptive research type using qualitative approach and based on field study. This research is considered as qualitative phenomenological, with the basic assumption that the object of science is not limited to the empirical, but includes the phenomenon that is nothing but perception, thought, will, and belief, subject of something outside the subject, the transcendent as well as the a posteriori (Muhadjir, 1996).

To explore the data in this study, the instruments that are used are questionnaires, interview guides, observation guides, documentation, and portfolio. For the validity of the questionnaire, the researcher used a logical validity or so-called construct validity. Logical validity is the validity assessed from each aspect to be expressed in its predefined definition as a measure of whether this material is

actually included in it. Therefore, if the data collection tool aspect is considered to have accommodated all the symptoms included in a particular definition, it means the data collection tool is valid (Hadari, 1995: 137).

The analysis of research data refers to the Miles and Huberman analysis model (1994). Data analysis techniques were began from data collection, data reduction, data presentation, conclusions and verification are done collectively and integratively.

Data analysis procedure using triangulation technique. The triangulation technique used in this study refers to the type of triangulation as described by Denscombe (2007), i.e 1) source triangulation; 2) methodological triangulation; And 3) theory triangulation. The analyzed data will be tabulated and presented qualitatively and quantitatively. Qualitative data will be considered to describe the information based on theoretical foundations and the foundation of legality. Quantitative data using a simple statistical analysis of the average value or percentage used to be seen the trend data. The concluded data will be informed as a consideration of decision-making for program improvement.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Findings

Respondents in this study amounted to 109 people (14.99%) who came from the existing state Senior High School in Jambi. Of that number, there are 102 people (93,58%) with civil servant status and only 7 people (6.42%) who have non-PNS employment status. In addition to teachers, data were also collected through 5 principals, 5 supervisors. Of the total respondents there were 85 teachers (77.98%) already certified educators, and there were 24 teachers (22.02%) who had not been certified.

The majority of respondents, on the figure of 51 (46.79%) have a working period over 20 years. There are 28 (25.69%) have a working period of 11 - 20 years, 23 (21.10%) have a working period of 5 - 1 10 years, and only 7 (6.42%) have less than 5 years . This figure assumed that ideally a teacher with a relatively long working period has a higher or better competence than other teachers. In addition, teachers should also be able to solve problems and learning constraints independently and better than teachers who have relatively new working lives. Those teachers should also have a level of innovation and creativity better than other teachers who work younger. Therefore, the number of teachers with longer tenure in the study is quite dominant.

The education level of the public high school teachers in Jambi meets the requirements as required by the Ministry of Education and Culture. Data from the research revealed that there is no longer a public high school teacher in Jambi with D3 education background. Teachers with S1 education background amounted to 93 (85.32%), while teachers with S2 education background amounted to 16 (14.68%). Judging from the educational background, the public senior high school teacher in Jambi has fulfilled the academic qualification, also describes that it has met the minimum requirement to become an educator, namely undergraduate degree (S1). It should also attract attention, there are numbers above 10% of teachers who already have S2 education level. Although this figure is still in the range of 10% - 20%, but this figure is potential to see the improvement of teacher competence improvement through education.

There are 4 (3.67%) of teachers in rank III / A, 14 (12,84%) of teachers with rank III / B, 10 (9,17%) teachers with rank III / C, 11 (10.09%) teachers with rank III / D, and 7 (6.42%) non-civil servant teachers. Meanwhile, teachers with rank IV / A group amounted to 63 (57.79%). If seen from this number, then most public high school teachers in the city of Jambi most have a high class of space, namely IV / A. This is directly proportional to the working period of teachers who are mostly over 20 years of service.

In terms of understanding of the learning design, there are 99 (90.83%) of the teachers understood the design of the lesson, but there are still 8 (9,17%) teachers who do not understand yet. This number should be relatively small but it is sufficient to illustrate that there are still teachers who have not understood the design of learning. Teachers who understand learning design components there are 101 (92.66%). Teachers who have made the design of learning recorded 99 (90.83%). Meanwhile, teachers who made different designs for each recorded topic only reached 83 (76.15%). This figure is sufficient

to illustrate, that there are still teachers who have not designed learning and teachers who design the learning is not differentiated for each different topic. So reasonable, if in the implementation of learning found a variety of obstacles because it is still found teachers who have not designed learning, and do not create different designs for different topics.

In the guidance indicators in the design of learning there are 40 (36,69%) of teachers who design their learning independently and 69 (63.31%) of teachers designed learning with the guidance of colleagues. In terms of the implementation of learning there were 91 (83.49%) teachers received guidance from colleagues, 65 (59.63%) teachers received guidance from supervisors, 52 (47.71%) people received guidance from principals, and 81 (74, 31%) people get guidance from colleagues / senior teachers. In terms of supervision, there are 28 (25.68%) teachers alone who are often supervised by colleagues. This figure illustrates that the guidance pattern carried out by supervisors and principals is still below 60%. Teachers are still more often guided by colleagues or senior teachers. Meanwhile, the culture of teachers to present other teachers in the classroom as an observer or supervisor is still very small, that is only 28 teachers.

In regard of ownership of learning resources in the form of books, there are 100 (91.74%) of teachers declared already has a guide book for designing learning. However, when asked more about the title of the book owned no one wrote the title of the book. When observations are made to some teachers at the school, no one can show the book they have. There are 67 (61.47%) teachers who exhibit books that have nothing to do with the way of learning. Whereas teachers who were asked about the purchase of books from certification funds were 82 (75.23%) of teachers declared to buy books. But that teachers do not all mention the title of the book ever purchased.

The activity of teachers in the training obtained 101 (92.66%) of the teachers had attended the training in designing the lesson. However, teachers who participated in similar training during the last 2 years recorded 90 (82.57%) of teachers. While stating that the training resources in accordance with what they want, that is delivering training materials according to new desires to reach 79 (72.48%) only. This shows that not all informants when training convey material with the methods, strategies, and models desired by the teachers. Thus, some teachers still have not understand how to design learning as desired.

An important aspect in learning design is to conduct analysis. Of the 109 new respondents, 63 (57.79%) teachers who analyze the characteristics of students in designing learning. In fact, the analysis of student characteristics is the first component of teacher pedagogic competence and in each model of designing learning. Teachers who write the specific purpose of learning (ICT) is only 70 (64.22%) people only. This illustrates that not all teachers organize learning-oriented achievement of learning objectives. Meanwhile, most 104 teachers (95.41%) have followed the curriculum or standard of content. While teachers who pay attention to student differences when designing learning there are 90 (82.57%) teachers.

Another important component of learning is the assessment of learning outcomes. There are 103 (94.49%) teachers have lattice and evaluation result instrument. However, of these there are only 9 (8.74%) who design the grid and evaluation instruments before designing the lesson plan (RPP), the remaining 94 (91.26%) design the grid after making the RPP.

Teachers also have not fully devised a variety of learning evaluation tools. Of the total respondents, there were 77 (70.64%) teachers making variations in designing test kits. However, when observations on the design of the test equipment there were only 31 (40.26%) teachers who could demonstrate variations of the evaluation tool, while 46 (59.74%) were unable to show the type of variation of the designed test kit. The facts illustrated about the grid and the variety of evaluation tools prove that the teacher still has problems in designing the learning result evaluation tool. This is derived from teachers' lack of understanding about when and where to initially devise evaluation tools.

In terms of implementation of development of teaching materials, strategies and learning models there are facts 95 (87.16%) teachers choose and develop their own teaching materials. However, when traced from that number there are only 31 (32.63%) that can show the development of self-generated

materials, the rest 64 (67.37%) can not show it. Another fact is there are 56 (51.38%) teachers develop their own learning model. However, during the deepening of the teacher can not explain the foundation of thinking and the syntax of the developed model. Meanwhile, for the use of learning media obtained data 87 (79.82%) teachers have used the media during the learning process.

One component of pedagogic competence is the ability of teachers to integrate multimedia learning. Of the respondents studied, there are 107 (98.17%) teachers need learning media. Of these figures recorded 102 (93.58%) have been able to master the computer, the mastery of microsoft word applications, microsoft excel, microsoft power point, simple video movie, and internet. The number of teachers who have been able to use internet recorded 99 (90.83%). Of the 90.83% of teachers who are able to use the internet, recorded 84 (84.85%) teachers often use the Internet as a source of learning. In terms of accessing the internet, recorded 79 (79.79%) teachers already have their own modem, and 98 (89.91%) teachers learn to access the internet from colleagues.

Indicators that often appear as obstacles in learning faced by public high school teachers in the city of Jambi is a matter of teaching hours and facilities infrastructure. The results revealed there were 45 (41.28%) teachers stated, that 24 hours face to face is quite difficult. This figure is quite large considering some teachers have to add face-to-face hours at different schools. The number of 24 hours face to face is considered not ideal for effective learning. In terms of classroom conditions recorded 66 (60.55%) states, that the available classrooms are ideal. However, on the contrary, the number which states the class condition is not ideal is still quite big, namely 43 (39.45%). Of course this number affects the way the teacher organizes the classroom during the lesson. Not to mention the opinion of teachers who stated that the infrastructure facilities that meet new requirements 21 (19.27%) only. While the facilities and infrastructure that support the new learning activities, 40 teachers responded (36.69%). The facts of this respondent's answer means that the availability of facilities and infrastructure of learning is still a constraint, because it has not met the minimum service standards, both in terms of quantity and quality.

The interesting topic that questioned in the research is about new student acceptance system (PPDB) in Jambi. The results revealed only 20 (18.35%) teachers stated that this year's PPDB system meets the standards. The remaining 89 (81.65%) teachers stated that the PPDB system did not meet the standards and tended to violate the Regulation of the Minister of National Education on Standard Processes and Minimum Service Standards.

3.2 Discussion

Education is an instrument of economic and social development. In the broader context education is the main basis for overall implementation efforts of the highest priority of human resource development policies within a comprehensive national development framework. Therefore, the implementation of national education services needs to be done with a comprehensive approach, holistic, and put forward the way students view as a whole person. The fulfillment of the right to education and learning for the community needs to be continuously improved. Minimum Service Standards (SPM) of the last elementary and secondary education is regulated by the Regulation of the Minister of National Education No. 15 of 2010 is a benchmark of the performance of education services through formal education channels held by the region.

It can not be denied that the constraints in learning come from the way many teachers design learning. In essence, teachers have realized that the learning process that runs effectively if started with an effective learning design. As expressed by Jones and Davis (2011: 101), that "Effective teaching begins with effective planning of instruction." This opinion wants to emphasize how important the role of a design in learning. Another opinion expressed by Morrison, et.al. (2007: 2), "This notion indicates that learning must be effective and efficient, but more importantly, how a learning design in its implementation should be able to prevent students from learning difficulties. It is in this context that the role of the teacher becomes very important in designing a lesson. Teachers must have a clear vision and a sharp analytical analysis of the design they will make. In the end, the resulting designs really

meet the desired expectations. The problem is based on the findings of research not all teachers designing learning well. There are still many learning components that are not well designed. Such as paying attention to the characteristics and differences of students, ignoring the purpose of learning, the design of learning is only duplication, assessment of learning outcomes that are not goal-oriented, and other issues.

The quality and the success of a lesson basically depends on the quality of the teacher's lesson design. The role of teachers in designing learning is a major and important factor. Teachers are the agents in designing the learning that will be done. As an agent, the teacher must be able to adapt and make changes. As De Cues says in Fullan (2000: 43), "To cope with a changing world, any entity must develop the capability of shifting and changing - in developing, the capability of learning." In this opinion each unit or entity must develop the ability to move and make changes, develop new skills and attitudes: in short, each unit must develop learning skills. Responding to the opinion, what happens if the learning process is done without a clear design teacher or even without a design at all. The emphasis of that opinion is every unit or entity. That is, in the process of designing and learning activities teachers not only rely on self-ability alone. As a process that will have far-reaching impacts, the teacher's design activities must involve other units. Like students, colleagues, leaders, or experts who can be consulted. This is important because the design of learning is the first and main element that must exist in the learning that comes from the learning needs.

Learning is a process that originally comes from goals designed to solve existing problems. Learning is also true must be able to make the subject learn to construct or build new knowledge not just get the transfer of knowledge from educators. Gagne and Briggs (1978: 1), define, "Instruction is a human undertaking whose purpose is to help people learn." This view emphasizes, that the learning process essentially helps others to learn. In relation to the activity of facilitating others to learn, a learning plan is required. The design is necessary because it contains a series of activities to be directed towards achieving the expected behavioral changes (Suparman, 2012: 10). On that basis, the teacher's role really becomes the main actor to the success of learning in the classroom. Learning is not an instructional activity. But learning is a process that involves various components to the success of goal achievement.

Through this study, it is still found some teachers who have not done student behavior analysis and analysis of learning well. This may be due to teachers who do not have complete curriculum and content standards that serve as lesson guidance or a minimal understanding of the importance of learning analysis, which resulted in teachers still unable to design a good learning. Though doing the analysis of subordinate ability of students and important learning analysis done considering the ability and ability of students to absorb the different learning.

Ausubel (in Uno, 2008: 59) argues that to optimize the acquisition, organizing, and disclosure of new knowledge can be done by making new knowledge meaningful to students, and widely accepted by education theorists, that this can be done by linking knowledge that students have. Differences in the characteristics of students as a result of the analysis also have an impact on the ability of teachers to plan learning strategies that will be implemented. Thus, each learning will produce a different strategy according to the characteristics of the students. The teacher's understanding of the design of the learning impact on the learning pattern becomes chaotic (distracted). Teachers still do not understand correctly the views of learning theories such as behaviorism and constructivism. Ausubel (in Uno, 2008: 59) states that behavior must be explained through observable experience, not by mental processes. Behavior is everything that is done and can be seen directly

4. CONCLUSION

The suppositions that can be drawn from the facts of research conducted are: 1) High school teachers in Jambi still experiencing difficulties in the planning learning process. 2) The constraints faced by high school teachers in Jambi in the process of implementing student learning in the classroom is the large number of students in each class and the lack of supporting facilities and infrastructure. 3)

The constraints faced by high school teachers in Jambi in the process of evaluating student learning outcomes started from an ineffective design quality. Teachers have not analyzed and designed better evaluations. 4) The teacher constraints in learning are caused by several factors, such as (A) the desire to be better than the teachers in implementing the learning is still relatively low; (B) fulfillment of the standard of facilities and infrastructure in public senior high schools in Jambi is still not fulfilled; (C) the system of acceptance and placement of students in one study group still does not follow the rules (process standard); And (D) lack of opportunities for teachers to have access to learning development training.

REFERENCES

Alfian, Eli Suraya, & Yusraini. (2011). "Dampak Sertifikasi Guru terhadap Peningkatan Mutu Proses Pembelajaran: Studi Kasus di MAN Model Jambi." *Jurnal.* Jambi: Fakultas Tarbiyah IAIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin.

Arikunto, S. dan Cepi SAJ. (2004) .*Evaluasi Program Pendidikan Pedoman Teoritis Praktis Bagi Praktisi Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Brown, D. (2007). *Prinsip Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran Bahasa Edisi Kelima, terj*. Noor Cholis dan Yusi Avianto Pareanom. Boston: Paearson Education. h. 8.

Carey, Walter, D. and Lou C. (1994). *The Systematic Design of Instructional 3rd Edition* . Glenview: Scot, Foresman and Company. hh. 15-27.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denscombe, M. (2007). *The Good Research Guide for small-scale social research projects* Third Edition. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill Education, Open University Press.

Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y.S. (2005a) 'Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research', in N. Denzin and Y.S. Lincoln (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dewantara, KH. 2004. *Pendidikan*, Cetakan Ketiga. Yogyakarta: Majelis Luhur Persatuan Taman Siswa. h. 25.

Fullan, M. (2000). *Change Forces the Sequel*. Philadelphia: *George* Muchamm. h. 43, 267, 268.

Gagne, RM., dan Leslie J. Briggs. (1978). *Principles of Instructional Design Second Edition.* New York, USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston. h. 1, 123, 133.

Guba, EG. and Yvonna SL. (1983). *Effective Evaluation, Improving the usefulness of Evaluation Results Through Responsive and Naturalistic Approaches.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher.

Hadjar, (1999). *Dasar-dasar Metodelogi Penelitian Kuantitatif dalam Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Huda, M. K. (2011). "Peranan sertifikasi Guru terhadap Peningkatan Etos Kerja Guru PAI (Studi kasus terhadap guru PAI MTs N Yogyakarta 1)." *Tesis.* Yogyakarta: UIN Sunan kalijaga.

Jogiyanto. (2005). *Sistem Teknologi Informasi Pendekatan Terintegrasi: Konsep Dasar, Teknologi, Aplikasi, Pengembangan, dan Pengelolaan* Edisi II. Yogyakarta: Andi. h. 34.

Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, (1994). *The Program Evaluation Standard.* California: Sage Publication.

Jones, P., dan Rita D. (2011). "*Instructional Design Methods Integrating Instructional Technology,"* dalam *Instructional Design: Concept, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications, ed.* Mehdi Khosrow. New York, Hershey: Information Science Reference. h. 101.

Kahan, Barbara dan Kael Consulting, (2008). *Review of Evaluation Frameworks.* Saskatchewan: Ministry of Education.

Keller, J.M. (2010). *Motivational Design for Learning and Performance The ARCS Model Approach.* New York: Springer.

Marquardt, Michael J. (2002). *Building the Learning Organization Mastering the 5 Elements for Corporate Learning.* Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black Publishing, Inc.

Miarso, Yusufhadi. (2011). *Menyemai Benih Teknologi Pendidikan.* Jakarta: Kencana dan Pustekom Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.

Muhadjir, Noeng. (1996). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*, Yogyakarta: Rake Sarasin.
Mujid, Abdul. (2013). *Strategi Pembelajaran*.Bandung: PT Rosdakarya.
Mark, Melvin M. dan Debra JR. (2010). *The 2010 User-Friendly Handbook for Project Evaluation.* Program Officer and COTR Division of Research and Learning in Formal and Informal Settings National Science Foundation.
Marynowski, S. (2006). *Best Practices Guide to Program Evaluation For Aquatic Educators.* Florida: Pandion Systems, Inc.
Madaus, GF., Michael SS, and Daniel LS. (1985). *Evaluation Model, Viewpoints on Educational and Human Services Evaluation.* Boston : Kluwer Nijhoff Publishing.
Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data Analysis: An expanded sourcebook.* San Francisco, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
Moleong, LJ. (2007). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*: Bandung: Rosdakarya.
Moore, KD. (2005). *Effective Instructional Strategies from Theori to Practice.* California: Sage Publication. h. 8.
Morrison, G.R., *at.al.* (2007). *Designing Effective Instruction Fifth Edition*. New Jersey, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. h. 2.
Muslich, M. (2007). Kurikulum Tingkat satuan Pendidikan, Dasar Pemahaman dan Pengembangan. Jakarta. Bumi Aksara.
Nuh, M. (2012). "Kurikulum Disesuaikan dengan Zaman," *Kompas*: Rabu, 5 September 2012.
Peraturan Pemerintah Nomor 19 Tahun 2005 Tentang Standar Nasional Pendidikan, Pasal 19, Ayat 3, h. 11.
Pritchard, A. and John W. (2010). *Psychology for The Classroom: Constructivism and Social Learning.* London & New York: RoutledgeTaylor & Francis Group. h. 6, 239.
Reigeluth, Charles M. and Chellman. (2009). *Instructional Design Theories and Models*, dikutip tidak langsung oleh Marcy P. Driscoll, *Psychology of Leaming for lnstruction*, Second Edition. Massachusetts: Pearson Education Company.
Rothwell, W.J. dan H.C. Kazanas, (2004). *Mastering The Instructional Design Process* Third Edition. San Francisco: Pfeiffer.
Santrock, JW. (2007). *Psikologi Pendidikan*. Jakarta:Kencana Prenada Media. h. 266.
Sanjaya, W. (2009). *Perencanaan dan Desain Sistem Pembelajaran* (Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group. h. 121.
Suparman, M. A. (2012). *Desain Instruksional Modern*. Jakarta: Erlangga. h. 119.
Strauss, Anselm dan Juliet Corbin. (2003). *Dasar-dasar Penelitian Kualitatif*. Yogjakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
Stufflebeam, Daniel L. and Anthony J. Shinkfield, (2007). *Evaluation Theory, Models, & Applications.* San Francisco : Jossey-Bass.
Tomei, Lawrence A. (2008). *Encyclopedia of Information Technology Curriculum Integration.* New York: Hersey, Information Science Reference, 2008.
Yamin, M. (2011). *Paradigma Baru Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Gaung Persada Press.