THE ACADEMIC
Journal of English Language Education Volume 7 No. 2 December 2022
ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

IMPLEMENTATION OF PROBLEM SOLVING APPROACH CAN IMPROVE ENGLISH THE LEARNING OUTCOMES AT CLASS IV SD NEGERI 7 KUTAMAKMUR KABUPATEN ACEH UTARA

Nuraini
SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara, Indonesia

ABSTRACT
This research is class action research (Classroom Action Research) which consists of two cycles, each cycle is held in three meetings. This research was conducted in 2022. The research procedures included planning, implementing actions, observing, and reflecting. The subjects in this study were students of Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara. Based on the results of the analysis of the data obtained in this study, it can be concluded as follows: Learning using a problem solving approach can improve learning outcomes for class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara. This is indicated by the increase in the completeness of student learning outcomes at Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara. Of the 13 students (61.90%) who were in the complete category in cycle I increased to 19 students (90.50%) in cycle II. The application of the problem-solving approach in learning can increase student activity, this can be seen from the observation sheet of student activity in the positive response of students in learning.

Keywords: Problem Solving and Learning Outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Learning is an activity for everyone. One's knowledge and skills are acquired through learning. The success of learning processes and outcomes is influenced by two factors, namely external factors, and internal factors within the individual. External factors are factors that come from outside the child/individual, such as the family environment, school environment, children's play environment. While internal factors are factors that come from within the child itself, consisting of physiological and psychological factors.

is one of the important lessons for students, because subjects' function to develop knowledge about the natural surroundings and cannot be separated from everyday life. The method used by the teacher in learning activities is very influential for students in the process of absorbing subject matter.

Learning activities carried out by the teacher only by explaining and not involving students in the learning process will make students feel bored and bored to understand the lesson. The data obtained from observations at the Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara shows the way of teaching the teacher who only explains in a monotone so that it makes students less active and will have an impact on student learning outcomes.

ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Based on the results of a direct interview with the teacher on March 6, 2021 in class IV, it showed that UPT SPF students at Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara were still not motivated enough to learn. As a result, in terms of learning outcomes, students of class Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara in the first semester were not satisfactory and there were still many students who had not reached the Minimum Completeness Criteria standard (KKM). From the list of acquisition values, it shows that the ability to solve questions in class Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara is still low. Of the 21 students, only about 9 children have completed their studies with a minimum KKM of 65 and above. So, there are still 12 children who have not finished studying.

The solution that is used to assist students in improving learning outcomes is through the application of a problem-solving approach. In problem solving students are faced with situations that require them to understand the problem (identify known and asked elements), create a natural model, choose a solution strategy, carry out the completion of the natural model and draw conclusions.

METHODS

The learning process occurs when a person interacts with the environment (natural, social, and cultural) which causes relatively permanent changes in behavior (cognitive, affective and psychomotor) while learning is any effort made to help a person or group of people in such a way that the learning process is become efficient and effective which is relatively constant due to the influence of experience and human effort itself. Learning is something that must be done and experienced alone and cannot be left to someone else to do it. Therefore, learning events always contain an activity with different levels, starting from low activity to high activity. According to the traditional view, learning is simply interpreted as an effort to acquire and collect a few knowledge or learning is an attempt to gain knowledge through the experience of Bower and Hilgard (1981: 2). So learning is solely interpreted as an intellectual endeavor. The function of this research is to provide feedback to improve the teaching and learning process and implement remedial programs for students who have not been successful Djamarah (2006). Learning achievement tests usually consist of a few questions that have a certain level of difficulty. The students who were tested were given the opportunity to solve all the questions in the allotted time. The learning outcomes test is a type of activity that intends to measure the ability of students being tested to solve questions or problems related to the things or subject matter that has been studied. In other words, the learning achievement test intends to measure the extent to which students have mastered or achieved the teaching goals set by Anomm (2002). This research is a type of class action research (Classroom Action Research) with stages of implementation which include 4 stages, namely: planning, action, observation/evaluation and reflection

which aims to improve learning outcomes for Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara through Problem Solving Approach. The subjects of this study were 21 students of class Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara who were active during the 2022/2023 school year, consisting of 10 boys and 11 girls. The factors that will be investigated in this study are: Process factors, namely the implementation of learning through the application of a problem-solving approach, specifically covering student activities, student activity in answering questions posed by the teacher and by their own friends, student activity in asking about material and student skills in solving story problems. and the outcome factor, which is looking at the completeness of student learning in learning through the application of a problem-solving approach and student responses to learning.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Findings

1. Cycle I
   a. Student Activity

To find out student activity during the learning process, it can be seen from the results of observations recorded by colleagues as observers at each meeting, using student activity observation sheets. The results of observing student activity during the teaching and learning process can be seen in the following table:

Table 1. Student Observatio Results in Cycle I

No	Activity Observed Cycle	Confluence				Percentage (%)
		1	2	3	4	
1.	Students present at the time of learning	18	19	20	Cycle I test	90.47
2.	Students who actively ask questions about material they have not understood	3	3	4		55.52
3.	Students asking for teacher guidance	12	12	10		15.87

4.	Students guiding group mates who don't understand in Group	1	1	4		9.52
5	Students who study according to applied learning	15	16	18		77.76
6	Students presenting the results of discussions in front of class	1	3	4		12.66
7	Students who actively answer questions	2	3	2		11.09
8	Students who make summaries/conclusions of subject matter	19	20	19		92.06
9	Students who actively complete homework assignments	15	17	18		12.66
10	Students who do other activities during learning activities	3	4	1		12.66

At the first meeting the students' enthusiasm for learning was still lacking, only 18 of the 21 students attended. There were only 3 students who asked questions about learning material that had not been understood during the teaching and learning process. There were 12 students who asked for teacher guidance, and 1 student who guided their friends. There were 19 students who made summaries/concluded the subject matter, 3 students who actively completed homework and students who carried out other activities while learning activities take place as many as 3 people. Furthermore, to find out students' understanding of the lesson, they are directed to work on LKM related to the material being studied.

At the second meeting, the results were slightly better. However, only 19 students attended. Only 3 students asked questions about the material being taught which they did not understand. Students who ask for guidance 13 people, students who guide their friends only 1 person. Students who study according to the learning that is applied are 16 people. There were 3 students who presented the results of the discussion and 3 students who actively answered. There were 20 students who made conclusions/summaries and students who actively made homework as many as 17 people. And students who do other activities as many as 4 people.

At the third meeting, 20 students attended the lesson. There were 4 students who asked questions about learning material that had not been understood during the learning process, 10 students who asked the teacher's

guidance on material that had not been understood and 4 students who guided their friends. Students who take part in learning according to learning are 18 people, the percentage is 4 people and students who actively answer questions are 3 people and students who make summaries are 17 people, then students who do other activities are 1 person.

b. Learning Outcomes Cycle I

From the descriptive analysis of learning outcomes scores in cycle I, we can see in the table below:

Table 2 Statistics of Learning Outcomes Cycle I

Statistics	Value Statistics
Subject	21
Ideal Score	100
Highest Score	85
Lowest Score	40
Score Range	45
Average Score	64,76

Based on the table above, it can be seen that the average score of Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara students through a problem solving approach in cycle I was 64.76. Meanwhile individually, the score achieved by respondents with the lowest score was 40 and the highest score was 85 with a score range of 45. This shows that the level of ability or learning achievement in cycle I was still very low. If the student learning achievement test scores are grouped into five categories, the frequency and percentage distributions are obtained as follows:

Table 3. Distribution of Frequency and Percentage of Students' Learning Outcomes Scores in Cycle I

Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage
00-54	Very Low	6	28,57
55-64	Low	2	9,52
65-79	Currently	9	42,90
80-89	Tall	4	19,00
90-100	Very high	0	0
Total		21	100

Based on the table above shows that 28.57% of students are in the very low category, 9.52% of students are in the low category, 42.9% are in the medium category 19% are in the high category and no students are in very high category.

Then to see the percentage of students' natural learning completeness, the problem solving approach has been determined in cycle I, which can be seen in the following table:

Table 4. Frequency and percentage of Completeness of Student Learning Outcomes in Cycle I

No.	Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	00-64	Not Finished	8	38,10
2.	65-100	Complete	13	61,90
	Total		21	100

In the table above it can be seen that of the 21 students, 38.10% of the students had not finished studying and 61.90% of the students had finished studying. This means mastery learning at cycle I has not been achieved classically because the number of students who complete has not reached 85%.

2. Cycle II

a. Student Activity

To find out student activity during the learning process, it can be seen from the results of observations recorded by colleagues as observers at each meeting, using student activity observation sheets. The results of observing student activity during the teaching and learning process can be seen in the following table:

Table 5. Student Observation Results in Cycle II

No	Activity Observed Cycle	Confluence				Percentage (%)
		1	2	3	4	
1.	Students present at the time of learning	20	21	21	. . Cycle II	98,34

2.	Students who actively ask questions about material they have not understood	8	10	10		44.42
3.	Students asking for teacher guidance	4	4	1		14.28
4.	Students guiding group mates who don't understand in Group	5	6	11		34.90
5	Students who study according to applied learning	20	20	21		96,80
6	Students presenting the results of discussions in front of class	5	5	6		25.38
7	Students who actively answer questions	5	6	10		33.33
8	Students who make summaries/conclusions of subject matter	20	20	21		96.80
9	Students who actively complete homework assignments	20	20	21		96.80
10	Students who do other activities during learning activities	2	1	1		6.33

At the fifth meeting it was noted that the results of the observation were increasing, although there were still students who were not present in the learning process. There were 8 students who asked about the material, students who guided their friends before understanding in groups of 5 people, students who studied according to the lesson determined by 20 people, students who study according 20 people learning, 5 students presenting their group results, 5 students actively answering questions, and 20 students making summaries/conclusions of material, 20 students completing assignments/homework, and students doing activities while the learning activity took place there were 2 people.

At the sixth meeting it was noted that there were 21 students present in the learning process. There were 10 students who asked about material that they did not understand, 4 students who asked for guidance, 5 students who guided group friends who did not understand the material, 20 students who studied in accordance with the applied learning, students who presented the results of discussions in There are 6 people in front of the class, 20 students who make learning summaries/conclusions, 20 students who actively complete assignments/homework, 2 students who carry out other activities during learning activities.

At the seventh meeting, it was noted that all students were present at the lesson, namely 21 people. There were 10 students who asked about material that had not been understood, 1 student who asked for guidance, 11 students who guided their group mates, 21 students who studied according to the lessons learned, 6 students who presented their group results, 10 students who actively answered questions, 21 students who actively made summaries/conclusions, 21 students who actively completed assignments/homework, and 1 student who did other activities during the lesson.

b. Learning Outcomes Cycle II

From the descriptive analysis of learning outcomes scores in cycle II, we can see in the table below:

Table 6 Statistics of Learning Outcomes Cycle II

Statistics	Value Statistics
Subject	21
Ideal Score	100
Highest Score	100
Lowest Score	50
Score Range	50
Average Score	82,85

Based on Table 6 above, it shows that student learning outcomes through the problem solving approach in cycle II amounted to 82.85. Meanwhile individually, the score achieved by the respondent with the lowest score was 50 and the highest score was 100 with a score range of 50. This indicates that the level of student learning ability or achievement in cycle II has increased.

If the average scores of students are grouped into five categories, the frequency and percentage distributions are obtained as follows:

ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

Table 7. Distribution of Frequency and Percentage of Students' Learning Outcomes Scores in Cycle II

Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage
00-54	Very Low	1	4,80
55-64	Low	1	4,80
65-79	Currently	3	14,30
80-89	Tall	8	38,10
90-100	Very high	8	38,10
Total		21	100

From Table 4.7 above it can be seen from the 21 students who are in the very low category 4.8% of students are in the low category 4.8% of students are, 14.3% of students are in the medium category, 38.1% of students are in the high category and 38.1% for the very high category. To see the completeness of students' learning after the problem solving approach was applied in cycle II can be seen in the table below:

Table 8. Frequency and percentage of Completeness of Student Learning Outcomes in Cycle II

No.	Score	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1.	00-64	Not Finished	2	9,50
2.	65-100	Complete	19	90,50
	Total		21	100

The table above shows that out of 21 students there were 2 students who did not complete their studies, meaning that 19 students were included in the 90.5% complete category, thus from cycle I to cycle II there has been an increase in classical completeness. This is because because of this second cycle, the students have started to be serious in learning and the students have also started to pay attention to the assignments given to be completed and after making improvements regarding things that are considered lacking in the cycle I. This shows that learning outcomes with a problem solving approach can improve learning outcomes.

From all the results of the descriptive analysis above, it shows that the learning outcomes of fifth grade students after the application of the problem-solving approach have increased.

This discussion will describe the results of the research which consists of observations of student activity and learning outcomes of class Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara. In this study, a problem-solving approach was applied which was carried out in two cycles. This research yielded significant results, namely increased learning outcomes.

In cycle I, it has not achieved the expected results, because it is not in accordance with the set targets. At the beginning of the meeting there were many obstacles faced by students in the learning process, including students who were still confused in solving story problems given by the teacher. The problem-solving approach is intended so that students can solve word problems because this approach is in accordance with the material characteristics of word problems that are often found in students' daily life environments.

After reflecting on cycle, I, activities that are deemed necessary to improve learning outcomes in cycle II must be carried out. As stated by Soedijarto (Purwanto 2008:46) learning outcomes are changes in student behavior study result. Changes in behavior are caused because he achieves mastery over a number of materials provided in the teaching and learning process.

The comparison of statistical values in cycles I and II can be seen in table 9 below:

Statistics	Cycles I	Cycles II
Subject	21	21
Ideal Score	100	100
Highest Score	85	100
Lowest Score	40	50
Score Range	45	50
Average Score	64,76	82,85

The comparison of the frequency and percentage of student learning outcomes in cycles I and II can be seen in table 10 below:

No	Score	Category	Frequency		Percentage	
			Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	0 – 54	Very Low	6	1	28,57	4,80

2	55 – 64	Low	2	1	9,52	4,80
3	65– 79	Currently	9	3	42,90	14,30
4	80 – 89	Tall	4	8	19,00	38,10
5	90 – 100	Very High	0	8	0	38,10
	Jumlah		21	21	100	100

The comparison of the completeness of the learning outcomes of students in cycles I and II can be seen in table 11 below:

No	Score	Category	Frequency		Percentage	
			Cycle I	Cycle II	Cycle I	Cycle II
1	0-64	Not Finished	8	2	38,10	9,50
2	65-100	Completed	13	19	61,90	90,50
	Jumlah		21	21	100	100

CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the analysis of the data obtained in this study, it can be concluded as follows: Learning using a problem-solving approach can improve learning outcomes for students of class Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara. This is indicated by the increase in the completeness of the learning outcomes of Class IV SD Negeri 7 Kutamakmur Kabupaten Aceh Utara students. Of the 13 students (61.90%) who were in the complete category in cycle I increased to 19 students (90.47%) in cycle II. The application of the problem-solving approach in learning can increase student activity, this can be seen from the observation sheet of student activity in the positive response of students in learning.

ISSN: 2528-3677; E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX

REFERENCES

Aisha, Nyimas. 2007. SD Learning Development. Jakarta: Directorate General of Higher Education Ministry of National Education.

Compilation Team, 1989. Big Indonesian Dictionary. Jakarta: Earth Script

Ministry of National Education. 2003. Basic Education Curriculum. Jakarta:Ministry of National Education.

Mulyasa. 2008. Become a Professional Teacher. Bandung: Youth Rosda Karya.

Nasution, S. 2008. Various Approaches to Learning and Teaching. Jakarta: The Literary Earth.

Purwanto, 2008. Evaluation of Learning Outcomes. Yogyakarta: Student Library Publisher.

Riyanto, Orphan. 2009. New Paradigm of Learning. Jakarta: Kencana Publisher.

Saryulis, 2011. www.google.com//http://education-all.blogspot.com. Problem Solving Method. (online), (accessed January 2, 2013).

Satria, 2009. Improving Learning Outcomes Through Problem Solving Methods for Class VI Students of SDN Sudirman II Makassar. Unpublished Thesis. PGSD S1 FIP UNM Department.

Wina Sanjaya. 2006. Learning Strategies. Jakarta: Prenada Media