THE INFLUENCE OF THE USING GUIDE NOTE TAKING METHOD TO STUDENTS' LEARNING OUTCOMES ON SOCIAL SCIENCE

Yani Fitriyani

Primary School Teacher Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education,
Universitas Kuningan, Indonesia

yanifitriyani0297@gmail.com

Abstract: This aims of the research is for describes The differences in student learning outcomes. This research uses quantitative method with Quasi Experiment research type. The components of this research is to describe the differences (posttest) and (gain) on the learning outcomes of students who received the Guided Note Taking learning method (experimental class) and students who received the lecture method (control class) on social studies. The research was conducted in SDN Pakembangan. The data sources consist of informants teacher on social studies subjects, documents (syllabus, RPP, and other documents that can support this research), as well as places and events. Data collection techniques used interview techniques, observation, and document analysis. Test instruments use normality, homogeneity, validity, and data reliability tests. Data analysis uses statistical testing. Based on the results of data analysis in this study it can be concluded that there is a positive influence of the class using the Guided Note Taking learning method on student learning outcomes in social studies compared to classroom learning outcomes using the lecture method.)

Keywords: Guided Note Taking, social science, learning outcomes.

1. Introduction

Education has an important and closest role in human life, because with education will create a quality person. In addition, education is a tool to make human beings into civilized beings which distinguishes from other God's creatures. To make a quality person requires an effort through the education process which is one of them through well-planned and implemented learning activities. In accordance with article 1 point 1 UU Number 20 of 2003 National Education System that: Education is a conscious and planned effort to realize a learning atmosphere and learning process so that students actively develop their potential to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, wise character, as well as skills needed by them, society, nation, and state.

Learning activities are the most basic activities of the entire educational process. In addition, the development of potential students are carried out thoroughly which includes cognitive, affective, and psychomotor aspects. Success or failure of achieving educational goals depends a lot on how the process is designed and carried out professionally and optimally. Based on data from grade V teachers through a list of the average Semester end of examination scores, it is known that there are still many students who get scores under the Minimum Completion Criteria which is set at 75. The following are the final score scores. 2017/2018.

Tabel 1

Class VA			**Class VA**		
KKM	**N**	**%**	**KKM**	**N**	**%**
>	9	42%	>	10	45%
=	6	29%	=	7	33%
<	6	29%	<	5	22%
Total	21	100%	Total	22	100%

Based on table above, the social science score data of the fifth grade students of Pakembangan Elementary School in the 2017/2018 school year at the end of the last semester examination showed that the students' learning outcomes in grade V Elementary school were still low. This looks at VA class with 21 students only 42% or 9 students more than Minimum Completion Criteria, as many as 29% or 6 students less than Minimum Completion Criteria, and 29% or 6 students who are at the Minimum Completion Criteria limit while VB class which amounts to 22 students only 45% or 10 students who scored more than the Minimum Completion Criteria and as many as 22% or 5 students who were less than and 33% or 7 students who were at the Minimum Completion Criteria limit and had to be treated.

In order for social science learning in Pakembangan Elementary School to be more active, interesting and student learning outcomes can be increased, it is necessary to variation in active learning methods so that students dominate learning more. The learning method used is the Guided Note Taking method which is a method where the teacher provides a form or sheet that has been prepared to make notes when the teacher teaches. One simple way is to fill in the blanks (Silberman, 2013: p. 123). It was also revealed by Zaini that the guided note method in which the teacher prepares a chart or scheme or else that can help students to make notes when the teacher conveys subject matter (2008: 32). This method is expected to train students' memory so that focus on learning, active presentation in front of the class, and actively expressing opinions. The Guided Note Taking method is expected to improve student learning outcomes. This method is one of the solutions to improve social science learning material for the struggle for the independence period for the fifth grade students of Pakembangan Elementary School.

2. Material & Methodology

In this research, the researcher uses the Quasi Experiment method. According to Sugiyono (2015: p.114) defines that "Quasi Experiment research is a research method that has a control group but cannot fully function to be able to control external variables that influence the implementation of

experiments". Referring to the statement above, this research will use the design of the "non-equivalent group design experiment". In this design, there are two groups that were not randomly selected then given a pretest to find out the differences between the experimental group and the control group. Then, the experimental group was given treatment using the guided note taking method while the control group was not given treatment or learning using conventional method. After learning is completed, posttest scores are taken to measure differences in student learning outcomes.

Data collection techniques was the most important step in the research, because the main purpose of the research is to obtain data (Sugiyono, 2015). In this research, the researcher was a human instruments. The data collection techniques that be used in this research were as follows:

Multiple Choice Test

According to Arifin (2016: p.138) said that multiple choice form tests can be used to measure learning outcomes that are more complex and related to aspects of memory, understanding, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. So that the research instrument used in this study uses twenty multiple-choice written tests.

Documentation

In research other than using tests, the documentation method is used to obtain data about the number of students the names of the research samples of the control group and the experimental group.

Data Analysis Techniques Sugiyono (2015) Data analysis is the process of searching and systematically compiling data obtained from interviews, field notes, and documentation, by organizing data into categories, breaking into units, synthesizing, composing into patterns, choosing which ones are important and will be studied, and make conclusions so easily understood by self or others. According to Sugiyono (2014: p.147), "data analysis is an activity of grouping data, tabulation data, presentation data, calculation to answer the research question, and calculations to test the hypothesis that has been proposed". Because the type of data is quantitative, the data analysis technique in this research uses statistical

3. Results and Discussion

a. Result

Description of Initial Ability (Pretest)

Initial tests were given to two groups of research samples, namely the experimental group and the control group before being given treatment. Before being given treatment with research instruments in the form of objective tests in the form of multiple choice totaling 20 questions with 4 answer choices, obtained the following data:

Table 2

Pretest of data result

Class	N	Score	Min	Max	Average	Standard Deviation
VA	21	920	25	70	44,07	12,87
VB	22	975	25	70	44,23	12,58

The table above shows that the results of the experimental and control pretest classes have an average score that is not much different, it can be seen that the number of experimental class students amounted to 21 students obtained an average score of 44.07 with a maximum score of 70 and a minimum score of 25 and the standard deviation of the data in this control class is 12.87 while for the control class totaling 22 students with an average score of 44.23 with a maximum score of 70 and a minimum score of 25 then the standard deviation is obtained 12.58.

Description of Final Ability (Postest)

The final test is given to students to get teaching using conventional methods and guided note taking methods. This test can illustrate the difference in results between the class given the treatment and those that did not. The following table shows the results of the experimental and control class posttest.

Table 3

Posttest of data result

Class	N	Score	Min	Max	Average	Standard Deviation
VA	21	1770	70	100	84,21	8,58
VB	22	1725	65	95	77,59	7,93

From the table above shows that the experimental class that received treatment using the Guided Note Taking method with the number of students 21 can be seen that the average score is 84.21 with a maximum score of 100 and a minimum score of 70 standard deviation is 8.58. Whereas for the control class that gets treatment using the lecture method totaling 22 students obtain an average score of 77.59 with a maximum score of 95 and a minimum score of 65 then the standard deviation is 7.93. This shows that the posttest results between experimental classes using guided note taking methods and control classes using the lecture method have different average score.

Description of Gain

Increasing students' learning outcomes can be seen through the difference between pretest and posttest scores as well as the maximum score of learning outcomes expressed as a normalized gain or N-gain.

Table 4

The data of N-gain experimental and control class

Class	Total pretest	Total posttest	Total gain	Total N-gain	Explanation
VA	965	1725	695	0.60	Medium
VB	920	1770	790	0.72	High

Based on the score data of pretest and posttest in experimental class, obtained score gain (N-gain), in experimental class as much as 0.72 and control class obtained as much as 0.60. The scores interpreted into N-gain criteria, after interpreting, it was obtained that implementation in experimental class including high than control class is medium.

Hypothesis Test *Pretest*

This the result of pretest with test (t) as follows:

Table 4

t test of pretest experimental and control class

Class	Average	Variant	N	t_{count}	t_{table}
VA	44,07	197,46	21	0,122	
VB	44,23	182,74	65		1,682

Based on the results of the calculation of the (t) test the results of the pretest t-test obtained t count = 0.122 and t table = 1.682 thus tcount (0.122) <t table (1.682) means that there are no differences or before the treatment of both experimental and control classes, both classes have the same ability relatively.

Test the Postest Hypothesis

Test of two average differences in the post test was conducted to test the hypothesis whether there were differences in the final test post-test learning between the experimental class and the control class. The decision making criteria in the t test are as follows:

Accept H_0 if $t_{count} < t_{table}$

Reject H_0 if $t_{count} > t_{table}$

Table 5

t test of posttest experimental and control class

Class	Average	Varian t	N	t_{count}	t_{table}
VA	84,21	72,10	21	2,680	1,682
VB	77,59	53,15	65		

Based on the result of calculation t test and posttest obtained $t_{count} = 2.680$ and $t_{table} = 1.682$ and t_{count} (2.680) > t_{table} (1.682) It means that there are differences when it has been given treatment to both of classes and the hypothesis is accepted.

Hypothesis Test *Gain*

Gain is the differences score between posttest and pretest to know increasing students' learning outcome which uses Guided Note Taking with lecturer method. The difference both of average on gain is done to test hypothesis. Then, the result calculation can been seen on table description N-Gain control and experimental class.

Table 6

t test of N-gain experimental and control class

Class	Average	Varian t	N	t_{count}	t_{table}
VA	40,47	149,77	21	1,747	1,682
VB	34,09	126,44	65		

Based on the calculation of the results of the t-test gain $t_{count} = 1.747$ and $t_{table} = 1.682$ with a significant level of 5%, then t_{count} (1.747)> t_{table} (1.682) thus, there is an increase (gain) between the experimental classes using guided note taking method with class controls that use the lecture method

b. Discussion

This research aims to determine the initial ability (pretest), differences in learning outcomes (posttest) and differences in gain (gain) between experimental classes, namely the class that received guided note taking method with the control class, the class that received the lecture method. To see the influence of the learning method used, before doing the learning, the researcher gives an test (pretest) to determine the students' abilities. The test (pretest) was given to the two classes which were used as research subjects in Pakembangan elementary school, namely grade VA as an Experiment class with

21 students and grade VB as Control class with 22 students. The tests used the pretest and posttest were in the form of multiple choice questions with a total of 20 questions.

The test (pretest) is carried out before the two classes are given treatment with the aim of knowing the students' knowledge before the learning process is carried out, and to see the students' ability between the experimental class and the control class which will be used as the research, which is the same or not. Then, the two classes were given different treatments, in the experimental class students will be given by using the guided note taking method and the control class using the lecture method. Then, the two classes are given a final test (posttest) to determine the increase in learning outcomes of the two classes. The test results (pretest) experimental class with the number of students 21 people obtained an average of 44.07 with the highest score of 70 and the lowest score of 25 and a standard deviation of 12.87. While in the control class that took the test as much as 22 students obtained an average of 44.23 with the highest score of 70 and the lowest score of 25 and a standard deviation of 12.58.

From these data, the next step is to test the normality test and homogeneity test. The results of the normality test in the experimental class obtained X2 count = 3.87 by taking the significance level of 5% (0.95) with db = 3, then obtained X2 table = 5.99. Then, X2 count = 3.87 <X2 table = 5.99. While in the control class normality test obtained X2 count = 4.53 by taking a significance level of 5% (0.95) with db = 3, then obtained X2 table = 5.99. Then, X2 count = 4.53 <X2 table = 5.99. This shows that the test results (pretest) in the experimental class and the control class are declared normal because X2 count <X2 table. While the homogeneity test results obtained Fcount = 1.27 and Ftable = F0.05 (20/21) = 4.38. So that the initial data of the research was declared homogeneous because Fcount <Ftable. From the data above shows that the results of the test (pretest) of the experimental class and the control class have an average score that is not much different and the two data are normally distributed and homogeneous. Then, it means there is no difference or before the treatment both classes have relatively the same ability. This is a reference for researchers to conduct experiments by giving treatment.

After being given a different treatment, the grade VA as the experimental group was given guided note taking method and the grade VB as the control group was given a lecture method, for several meetings with different treatments then each class was given a final test (posttest). The final test (posttest) experimental class with the number of students 21 people obtained an average of 84.21 with the highest score of 100 and the lowest score of 70 and the standard deviation of 8.58. while in the control class who took the test as much as 22 students obtained an average of 77.59 with the highest score of 95 and the lowest score of 65 and a standard deviation of 7.93. This shows that the posttest results between classes using guided note taking methods and control classes that use the lecture method have different average scores.

From these data, normality and homogeneity tests are carried out where the results of the experimental class normality test obtained X2 count = 3.27 by taking a significance level of 5% (0.95) with db = 3, then obtained X2 table = 5.99. Then, X2 count = 3.27 <X2 table = 5.99. Whereas in the control class normality test obtained X2 count = 2.52 by taking a significance level of 5% (0.95) with db = 3, then obtained X2 table = 5.99. Then, X2 count = 2.52 <X2 table = 5.99. This shows that the final test results (posttest) in the experimental class and control class are showed normal because X2 count <X2 table. While the homogeneity test results obtained Fcount = 1.17 and Ftable = F0.05 (20/21) = 4.38. So that the initial data of the research is declared homogeneous because Fcount <Ftable. From these data can be used as a reference to test hypotheses.

Hypothesis analysis using t-test on the final test (posttest) data obtained t count> t table (0.05) (db) = 2.680> 1.682, from the data H1 is accepted and H0 is rejected, namely there are differences in learning outcomes (posttest) students who use the Guided Note Taking method with students who use the lecture method. As well as the hypothesis analysis using the t test (gain) is obtained t count> t table (0.05) (db) = 1.747> 1.682, meaning that there is a difference in student learning outcomes using guided notes with students using the lecture method.

The increasing achievement of student learning outcomes in the experimental class using guided note taking methods is very good because in the learning students are actively involved responsible for

learning so that the results of their work can affect their individual scores and groups. This is the Guided Note Taking the method of students can find out the material being discussed in learning so using the Guided Note Taking method can train students' memory so that they focus on learning. Students will be more active in front of the class and active express opinions. As for the implementation in the field, researcher still find obstacles, the main obstacle in using guided notes is taking the learning method and the lecture method is the allocation of time, especially in applying guided notes. Students from the beginning of learning which starts from the planning stage to the end of learning so that it requires more time relatively. Apart from the above constraints, basically guided note taking method is a learning method that can improve student learning outcomes, especially on social science subject in grade V elementary school through statistical test data, research results show an increase in student learning outcomes in the experimental class and control class, but in the experimental class there was a greater increase compared to the control class.

Based on the research that the researcher did, this showed that the use of the guided note taking method had a positive impact in learning. This is evidenced by the increase in student learning outcomes in the experimental class experiencing an increase in learning outcomes (gain) is much higher than the increase in the results of learning (gain) control class that uses the lecture method.

4. Conclusion

Based on the results of research conducted that the use of guided note taking method has a positive impact on learning. This means that when learning students are more active in participating in learning activities. This is evidenced by the increase in learning outcomes of students in the experimental class experiencing an increase in learning outcomes higher than the increase in control class learning outcomes that use conventional learning methods, and can improve student learning outcomes.

References

Arikunto, Suharsimi. (2013). *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktek*. Cet.15. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta

Azis,dkk. (2015). *Pengggunaan Metode Guided Note Taking Dalam Peningkatan Hasil Belajar Ips tentang Perjuangan Masa Kemerdekaan Pada Siswa Kelas V Sd Negeri 4 Bumirejo Kebumen Tahun Ajaran 2015/2016.* Jurnal [Online] Kalam Cendekia Vol 4 (5.1). [05 Januari 2018].

Depdiknas. *Undang-Undang Repunalblik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Jakarta.

Hanggara, Agie dan Darsih, Endang. (2018). *Dasar STATISTIKA Manual dan SPSS*. Kuningan: Mujahid Press.

Riduwan,M.B.A. (2017). *Dasar-dasar Statistika*. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Silberman, Melvin. (2016). *Active Learning: 101 Strategi Pembelajaran Aktif*. Bandung: Nuansa Cendekia. Cet. XI.

Slameto. (2013). *Belajar & Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Somantri, Ating dan Muhidin, A Sambas. (2014). *Aplikasi Statistika dalam penelitian*. Bandung: Pustaka setia.

Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode penelitian pendidikan pendekatan kuntitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D*. Bandung; Afabeta. Cet.21.

. (2017). *Statistika untuk penelitian.* Bandung: Alfabeta. Cet. 28.

Supriatna, Nana, dkk. (2009). *Bahan Belajar Mandiri Pendidikan IPS di SD*. Bandung: UPI PRESS.

Suprijono, Agus. (2016). *Cooperative Learning Teori dan Aplikasi PAIKEM.* Cet. XV. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Susanto, Ahmad. (2015). *Pengembangan Pembelajaran IPS di SD.* Jakarta: Kencana.

Trianto. (2011). *Model Pembelajaran Terpadu.* Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.