PIJAR: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pengajaran
Vol. 1 No 2 April, pp. 217-228
E-ISSN: 2964-7460, DOI: 10.58540/pijar.v1i2.198

The Effect of Course Review Horay (CRH) Cooperative Learning Model on Learning Outcomes of Elementary School Students

Mardiana
Sekolah Dasar Negeri 73 Sudu; dhiana789@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 2023-03-10
Revised 2023-04-01
Accepted 2023-04-07

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe CRH terhadap hasil belajar pada mata pelajaran IPA materi daur air siswa kelas V SD Negeri 34 Parepare. Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan kuantitatif dengan jenis penelitian eksperimen dan menggunakan desain Quasy Experimental dalam bentuk The Nonequivalent Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. Teknik sampling yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah sampling jenuh dengan jumlah sampel yaitu 50 orang siswa. Teknik pengumpulan data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini adalah tes dalam bentuk pilihan ganda (multiple choice) dan dokumentasi. Analisis data menggunakan teknik analisis statistik deskriptif dan teknik analisis statistik inferensial. Berdasarkan hasil statistik dapat disimpulkan bahwa model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe CRH berpengaruh terhadap hasil belajar pada mata pelajar IPA materi daur air siswa kelas V SD Negeri 34 Parepare. Rekomendasi penelitian adalah matapelajaran berfokus pada mata pelajaran lain.

Kata Kunci: Model Pembelajaran, Course Review Horay, Hasil Belajar

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of the CRH type of cooperative learning model on learning outcomes in the science subject on the water cycle material for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare. This study uses a quantitative approach with experimental research types and uses a Quasy Experimental design in the form of The Nonequivalent Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. The sampling technique used in this study was saturated sampling with a total sample of 50 students. The data collection technique used in this study was a test in the form of multiple choice and documentation. Data analysis used descriptive statistical analysis techniques and inferential statistical analysis techniques. Based on the statistical results, it can be concluded that the CRH type cooperative learning model has an effect on learning outcomes in natural science students on the water cycle material for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare. The research recommendation is that subjects focus on other subjects.

Keywords: *Learning Model, Course Review Horay, Learning Outcomes*

Corresponding Author:
Mardiana
SD Negeri 73 Sudu; dhiana789@gmail.com

1. INTRODUCTION

Quality education greatly affects the progress of a nation. Education is also needed by children because it is a provision to face increasingly fierce global competition. For this reason, efforts to improve the quality of education are an integral part of efforts to improve the quality of human resources in terms of knowledge, skills or abilities, as well as personality. This has given rise to encouragement for the government to improve the quality of education at every level of education, one of which is student learning outcomes at the elementary school level (Putra & Syafrudin, 2020).

Learning outcomes are results obtained by students after the learning process for a certain time, so learning outcomes are important because they can be used as a guide to find out how successful a student is in teaching and learning activities. This is in accordance with what was expressed by (Rahayu & Yulianti, 2011) which stated that "student learning outcomes can be interpreted as the level of success of students in learning subject matter at school which is expressed in scores obtained from test results to recognize a certain subject matter" (Susanto, 2013). In addition, Sudjana (Joni, 2014) also argued that "learning outcomes are abilities that students have after they receive their learning experience. This ability includes cognitive, affective and psychomotor areas. One way to improve student learning outcomes is to provide the right learning model. One of the learning models that can be used to improve learning outcomes is the CRH learning model.

The CRH learning model is a cooperative learning model that is easy to apply, involves the activities of all students without any status differences, involves the role of students as peer tutors, and contains an element of play. According to Shoimin (2014: 54) in his book said that course review horay learning is one of cooperative learning, namely teaching and learning activities by grouping students into small groups. This learning is a test of students' understanding of concepts using boxes filled with questions and numbered to write down the answers. The student who was the first to get the correct sign immediately shouted hooray or other yells. Through course review horay learning it is hoped that it can train students in solving problems by forming small groups.

According to (Huda, 2014), a course review hooray is a learning method that can create a lively and fun class atmosphere because students who can answer correctly are required to shout "hurray" or other yells they like. This method attempts to test students' understanding by answering questions, in which the answers to the questions are written on cards or boxes that have been numbered. The student or group that gives the correct answer must immediately shout "hurray" or sing the group's yell. This method also helps students to understand the concept well through group discussions.

From the previous statement, it can be concluded that the CRH learning model is a learning model or design to test students' understanding by using game strategies, namely if students

are able to answer correctly then students will scream hooray. So that the class atmosphere becomes lively and fun, encouraging students to take an active part in learning, and students are not easily bored to learn. This is in accordance with what was said by (Anggraeni, 2011) about CRH learning that " CHR is one of the lessons that can encourage students to participate actively in learning", meaning that this learning places more emphasis on understanding the material taught by the teacher by solving questions. Angreani's opinion is in line with what was expressed by (Hamid, 2013) that the Course Review Horay (CRH) learning model is a fun model because students are invited to play while learning to answer various kinds of questions submitted in an interesting way from the teacher. Through this cooperative learning can be used by teachers to create a lively and fun learning atmosphere in the classroom, so that students are more interested and excited.

In addition, learning through this model is characterized by a structure of tasks, goals and cooperative rewards that give birth to a positive attitude of dependence among others, acceptance of individual differences, and developing skills in working together between groups. Conditions like this will make a significant contribution to help students who have difficulty in learning concepts, so that in the end every student in the class can achieve maximum learning results.

Education in primary schools as the initial level of education in schools needs to be improved in quality and development, so that it can become the basis for the formation of the human as a society of noble character and has basic abilities as a provision to continue higher education and what is equally important is to develop the potentials possessed in order to improve human resources. As stated in Law no. 20 of 2003 concerning the National Education System (2016: 7) stated that national education functions to develop abilities and shape dignified national character and civilization in the context of educating the life of the nation, aiming at developing the potential of students to become human beings who believe and fear God Almighty, have noble character, are healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, and become democratic and responsible citizens.

Based on the description that has been stated above, the researcher is interested in conducting experimental research entitled "The Effect of the Course Review Horay (CRH) Type Cooperative Learning Model on Learning Outcomes in Science Subjects in Grade V Students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare".

2. METHOD

The research approach used by the researcher is a quantitative approach. The type of research used by the researcher is experimental research. In addition, the experimental design used was Quasi Experiment. In this study, the population was the fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare which consisted of two classes, namely VA and VB classes. One of these classes was used as the experimental class and the other class was used as the control class. In addition, sampling was carried out using saturated sampling technique (boring sampling). The sample in this study consisted of 50 students who were divided into two classes, namely 25

students in VA class and 25 students in VB class. The data used in this study were tests and documentation. Quantitative data analysis was carried out using statistics with the help of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 22 program to calculate data that was quantitative or can be realized with numbers obtained from the field. In addition, inferential statistics were used to analyze sample data and the results were applied to the population and it was intended to test research hypotheses.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

FINDINGS

Initial Test (Pretest) Experiment Class and Control Class

Before processing the data, the first step that must be taken was compiling the data in the form of a distribution table to make it easier for us to analyze. The frequency distribution of the single data value of the initial test (pretest) of the experimental class students can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. Frequency Distribution of Initial Test Scores (Pretest) of Experimental Class Students

No.	Score	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
1	25	1	1
2	30	2	3
3	35	6	9
4	40	4	13
5	45	5	18
6	50	4	22
7	55	1	23
8	60	2	25

From the table above it can be concluded that out of 25 students, 1 person got a score of 25, 2 people got a score of 30, 6 people got a score of 35, 4 people got a score of 40, 5 people got a score of 45, 4 people got a score of 50, 1 person got a score of 55, and 2 people got a score of 60. Then, it can also be seen that the pretest score of the experimental class students with the highest frequency was at 35 with a frequency of 6 students or as much as 12%. Meanwhile, the pretest scores of the experimental class students with the least frequency were in the scores of 25 and 60 with a frequency of 1 student or as much as 4%. Then, the results of descriptive statistics relating to students' pretest scores in the experimental class, namely the class that was given treatment in the form of the CRH Learning model, are presented as follows:

Table 2. Description of Students' Initial Test (Pretest) Scores in the Experimental Class Before Being Given Treatment in the Form of the CRH Learning Model

Statistics	Statistics Value
Sample	25
Means	42,20
Median	40
mode	35
Standard Deviations	9,138

Minimum	25
Maximum	60

Based on the experimental class pretest data above, it can be seen that the average score obtained by a total of 25 students was 42.20 with a median value of 40 and a mode of 35. Meanwhile the standard deviation obtained was 9.138 with a minimum score 25 and a maximum score of 60. Apart from the experimental class, the first step that must be taken in analyzing data in the control class is to make a frequency distribution table to make it easier for us to analyze the data. For the single data frequency distribution table, the pretest scores of students in the control class can be seen in the following table.

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Initial Test Scores (pretest) for Control Class Students

No.	Score	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
1	20	2	2
2	30	1	3
3	35	4	7
4	40	7	14
5	45	4	18
6	50	3	21
7	55	3	24
8	75	1	25

From the table above it can be concluded that of the 25 students, 2 people got a score of 20, 1 person got a score of 30, 4 people got a score of 35, 7 people got a score of 40, 4 people got a score of 45, 3 people got a score of 50, 1 person got a score of 55, and 1 person got a score of 75. Then, it can also be seen that the pretest scores of the control class students with the highest frequency were at a score of 40 for 7 students or as much as 14%. Meanwhile, the pretest scores of control class students with the least frequency were at 30 and 75 with a frequency of 1 student or as much as 2%. Then, the results of descriptive statistics related to students' pretest scores in the control class, namely the class that was given treatment in the form of conventional methods, are presented as follows:

Table 4 Description of Students' Initial Test (Pretest) Scores in the Control Class Before Being Taught with Conventional Methods

Statistics	Statistics Value
Sample	25
Means	42,40
Median	40
mode	40
Standard Deviations	11,467
Minimum	20
Maximum	75

Based on the initial test (pretest) score data, it can be seen that the average score obtained from a total of 25 students was 42.40 with a median value of 40 and a mode of 40. Meanwhile the standard deviation obtained was 11.467 with a minimum score of 20 and a maximum score of 75.

Learning Outcomes Test (Posttest) Experimental Class and Control Class

The frequency distribution of learning outcomes (posttest) for experimental class students can be seen in the following table.

Table 5. Frequency Distribution of Learning Outcomes Test Scores (Posttest) of Experimental Class Students

No.	Score	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
1	70	2	2
2	75	3	5
3	80	5	10
4	85	6	16
5	90	2	18
6	95	5	23
7	100	2	25

From the table above it can be concluded that out of 25 students, 2 people got a score of 70, 3 people got a score of 75, 5 people got a score of 80, 6 people got a score of 85, 2 people got a score of 90, 5 people got a score of 95, and 2 people got a score of 100. Then the posttest scores of experimental class students with the highest frequency were at 85 by 6 people or as much as 12%. While the posttest scores of the experimental class students with the least frequency were in the values of 70, 90, and 100 with a frequency of 2 students or as much as 4%.

The results of descriptive statistics relating to the scores of the students' learning outcomes test (posttest) in the experimental class, namely the class that was given treatment in the form of the CRH learning model, are presented as follows:

Table 6 Description of Student Learning Outcomes Test Scores (Posttest) in the Experimental Class After Being Given Treatment in the Form of the CRH Learning Model

Statistics	Statistics Value
Sample	25
Means	85,20
Median	85
mode	85
Standard Deviations	8,836
Minimum	70
Maximum	100

Based on the data on the learning outcomes test scores (posttest) it can be seen that the average score obtained from a total of 25 students is 85.20 with a median value of 85 and a

mode of 85. Meanwhile the standard deviation obtained was 8.836 with a minimum score of 70 and a maximum score of 100.

Then, the distribution table for the learning achievement test (posttest) for control class students is as follows:

Table 7 Frequency Distribution of Learning Outcomes Test Scores (Posttest) for Control Class Students

No	Score	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency
1	60	3	3
2	65	2	5
3	70	5	10
4	75	5	15
5	80	6	21
6	85	2	23
7	90	2	25

From the table above it can be concluded that of the 25 students, 3 people got a score of 60, 2 people got a score of 65, 5 people got a score of 70, 5 people got a score of 75, 6 people got a score of 80, 2 people got a score of 85, and 2 people got a score of 90. In addition, it can also be seen that the posttest scores of control class students with the highest frequency were at 80 with a frequency of 6 students or as much as 12%. Meanwhile, the posttest scores of control class students with the least frequency were in the values of 65, 85, and 90 with a frequency of 2 students or as much as 4%. Then, the statistical results related to the scores of students' learning outcomes test (posttest) in the control class, namely the class that was given treatment in the form of conventional methods, are presented as follows:

Table 8 Description of Student Learning Outcomes Test Scores (Posttest) in the Control Class After Being Given Treatment in the Form of the Conventional Method

Statistics	Statistics Value
Sample	25
Means	74,60
Median	75
mode	80
Standard Deviations	8,651
Minimum	60
Maximum	90

Based on the data on the posttest scores for the control class, it can be seen that the average score obtained from 25 students was 74.60 with a median value of 75 and mode 80. Meanwhile, the standard deviation obtained is 8.651 with a minimum score of 60 and a maximum score 90.

Inferential Statistics Results

a. Data Requirements Testing

The conditions that must be met before testing the hypothesis were testing for normality and homogeneity. All calculations were performed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22 computer program.

1) Normality Test

The normality test was used to find out whether the data was normally distributed or not, with the test criteria if the significance obtained is > 0.05 then the data is declared normally distributed. Conversely, it is said that the data is not normally distributed if the significance obtained is <0.05. Based on the results of data analysis using SPSS Version 22, normality test data were obtained in the experimental class, namely as follows:

Tabel 9. Data Normality Test Using SPSS Version 22

Experiment Class α (0.05)	
Pretest	*Posttest*
ρ-*Value* > α	ρ-*Value* > α
0,188 > 0.05	0,157 > 0.05

Based on the results of data analysis using SPSS version 22, it can be concluded that the samples were normally distributed because the values obtained were greater than the significant level of 0.05. So the normality test was fulfilled so that this analysis used parametric statistics.

1) Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test was used to determine the variance of the data population whether between two or more data groups have the same or different variants, with the test criteria if the significance obtained is > 0.05 then the variance of each subject is the same (homogeneous). Conversely, it is said that the variance of each subject is not the same (non-homogeneous) if the significance obtained is <0.05. Based on the results of the homogeneity test, it was obtained a significance value of p = 0.764 > α = 0.05, it can be concluded that the data was taken from a homogeneous sample.

a. Hypothesis testing

The learning outcomes of students in the experimental class and the control class can be compared by determining the differences in the gain scores of the two classes. Gain Score is data obtained from the difference between the results of the final test (posttest) and the results of the initial test (pretest), both in the experimental class and in the control class. The description of the gain scores for the experimental class and the control class can be seen in the table below.

Table 10 Description Of The Gain Score In The Experimental Class And The Control Class

Class	**Average value (Mean)**		***Gain Score***
	Pretest	***Posttest***	
Experiment	42,20	85,20	43
Control	42,40	74,60	32.2

Based on the table above, it shows that the pretest average value in the experimental class was 42.20, while the posttest average value in the experimental class was 85.20. This shows that there is a difference between the pretest average scores in the experimental class and the posttest average scores in the experimental class or $\mu 1 \neq \mu 2$ which means that there

were differences in the learning outcomes of class V students between before and after the use of the CRH learning model which was indicated by the difference average value.

Statistical results also show that the average value of learning outcomes (posttest) in the experimental class was higher when compared to the average value of learning outcomes (posttest) in the control class, where the average value of learning outcomes in the experimental class was 85.20 while the average value of learning outcomes in the control class was 74.60. In addition, the gain score obtained in the experimental class was 43 while the gain score in the control class was 32.2. This shows that the experimental class has a higher gain score compared to the gain score in the control class. Thus it can be stated that there was a difference in the gain score between the experimental class and the control class, so it can be said that the CRH model has an effect on the science learning outcomes of fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare.

Decision making and drawing conclusions on hypothesis testing was carried out at a significant level of 5% (0.05). The results obtained from the experimental class were significant 0.000 <0.05 and the results obtained from the tcount and ttable values showed that tcount was greater than the ttable value (17.086 > 2.064). Based on these two criteria, it can be concluded that H_0 was rejected and Ha was accepted, which means that there were differences in science learning outcomes for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare between before and after using the CRH learning model.

Based on the results and presentation above, it can be concluded that the CRH learning model has an effect on learning outcomes in science subject water cycle material for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results of descriptive statistical analysis using the SPSS version 22 program, the lowest pretest score for the experimental class was 25 and for the control class was 20 while the highest pretest score for the experimental class was 60 and for the control class was 75. The average pretest score obtained by the experimental class and control class respectively namely 42.20 and 42.40. This shows that students in both classes have almost the same ability before getting treatment. Then, after being given treatment, the highest and lowest posttest scores for the experimental class were 100 and 70 respectively, while the highest and lowest posttest scores for the control class were 90 and 60 respectively. the experimental class was 85.20 and the control class was 74.60. This shows that the average value of the posttest experimental class is higher when compared to the average posttest value of the control class.

In addition, by looking at the data above, it can be concluded that the average pretest value obtained in the experimental class and control class was lower when compared to the posttest average value in the experimental class and control class, which means that in both classes change. However, the changes that occurred in the experimental class were greater when compared to the changes that occurred in the control class which could be seen from the gain score. Where, the experimental class has a gain score of 43 and the control class has a gain score of 32.2.

The results of the analysis shows that the learning outcomes of students in the experimental class after being given treatment (posttest) were higher than before being given treatment and the changes that occur in the experimental class were greater when compared to the changes that occur in the control class. This was because the experimental class was

given treatment in the form of the CRH learning model, where the learning process was more enjoyable so that students were interested and eager to learn and in the end can improve student learning outcomes. This was in line with the opinion expressed by (Huda, 2014) which said that:

> Course review horay is a learning method that can create a lively and fun class atmosphere because students who can answer correctly are required to shout "hurray" or other yells they like. This method attempts to test students' understanding by answering questions, in which the answers to the questions are written on cards or boxes that have been numbered. The student or group that gives the correct answer must immediately shout "hurray" or sing the group's yell. This method also helps students to understand the concept well through group discussions.

The learning process using the CRH learning model in this study begins with the delivery of learning objectives and learning materials by the teacher while conducting questions and answers related to the learning material, namely the water cycle. After delivering the material, the next stage was the division of groups. The division of groups was carried out heterogeneously, one of which is by looking at the level of student ability. After dividing into groups, the teacher determines the name of the group and gives a group worksheet containing instructions for work or activities to be carried out and in the group worksheet students were asked to make a yell or cheer according to the name of the group. In addition, students were also asked to make a number of 9 boxes which were numbered according to the teacher's provisions. The students were very enthusiastic in finding and making the best yells or cheers for their group.

After each group has yelled or cheered, the next stage was the teacher reading the questions randomly that have been provided before according to the number of boxes available and students writing their answers in the boxes whose numbers are mentioned by the teacher. Then, after that the teacher and students jointly discuss the answers to the questions that have been read. The final stage was, the group that answered correctly gave a tick or check lish (√) and immediately shouts hurray and sings yells or cheers.

The learning process using the CRH learning model places more emphasis on activeness and understanding of the material, by solving questions which were expected to increase students' conceptual understanding of the subject matter and of course can improve collaboration skills between students in groups. This is in accordance with what was expressed by Angraeni (2011: 201) about CRH that "is one of the lessons that can encourage students to take an active part in learning", meaning that this learning places more emphasis on understanding the material taught by the teacher by solving questions. Then, Angraeni's opinion is in line with the opinion put forward by Huda (2014: 231) which states that the CRH learning model has the following advantages:

> a) The structure is interesting and can encourage students to be able to plunge into it. b) methods that are not monotonous because they are interspersed with entertainment, so the atmosphere is not tense. c) Enthusiasm for learning increases because the learning atmosphere is fun. d) Inter-student cooperation skills are increasingly trained.

Then, based on the statistical results of inferential analysis carried out for hypothesis testing, previously carried out testing the data analysis requirements. The results of testing the data analysis requirements stated that the pretest and posttest data for the experimental

class were normally distributed. Likewise with the homogeneity test, the variance of the pretest and posttest data for the experimental class was declared homogeneous. The results of testing the hypothesis using the Paired Sample T-test obtained a significance of 0.000 <0.05 and the results obtained from the tcount and ttable values show that tcount was greater than the ttable value (17.086 > 2.064), which means that there was a difference in the results of the pretest (before treatment) and posttest results (after treatment) so that H_0 was rejected and Ha was accepted, which means there were differences in the results of learning science for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare before and after using the CRH learning model. Based on these results, it can be concluded that the type of cooperative learning model has an effect on learning outcomes in science subject water cycle material for fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare.

However, although there was an increase in learning outcomes. Of course, researchers have constraints in implementing the CRH learning model. Some of them, namely, the time needed to make a yell or cheer was very long because each group wants the best yell or cheer. So that the application of this model was quite long, for that it was expected that the teacher can plan and manage time (allocation of time) properly and correctly because by paying attention to the time needed at each stage, each stage will be carried out properly. In addition, there was an opportunity for students to cheat because the group's score was calculated from the group that shouts cheers and then continues by singing yells or cheers. So, in overcoming this, the teacher must ask students to conclude group worksheets after the learning process is over to check again whether the group has answered correctly. Then, another obstacle faced by the researcher was that the class atmosphere became noisy, because when one group didn't shout hurray, the other groups scoffed. So it takes the assertiveness of a researcher to manage the class properly. This is in accordance with the opinion put forward by Huda (2014: 231) regarding the weaknesses of the CRH learning model, namely "a) equalizing values between passive and active students. b) there is an opportunity to cheat. c) risk disturbing the learning atmosphere of other classes.

Based on the explanation above, the constraints or weaknesses encountered when implementing the CRH learning model can be used as evaluation material in the future. So that the better the learning process by using this learning model.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the formulation of the problem that has been made and the description of the results of the research and the discussion about the effect of the CRH type cooperative learning model on the science learning outcomes of fifth grade students at SD Negeri 34 Parepare, the results of the pretest and posttest data analysis prerequisite test results for the experimental class were declared to be normally distributed. Likewise with the homogeneity test, the variance of the pretest and posttest data for the experimental class was declared homogeneous. The results of testing the hypothesis using the Paired Sample T-test obtained a significance of <0.05 and the results obtained from the tcount and ttable values show that t-test was greater than the t-table value. So that it can be concluded that there was an effect of applying the CRH type cooperative learning model to learning outcomes in the science eye on water cycle material for class V SD Negeri 34 Parepare.

REFERENCES

Anggraeni, D. (2011). Peningkatan Kualitas Pembelajaran IPS melalui Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe Course Review Horay pada siswa kelas IV SD Negeri Sekaran 01

Semarang. *Jurnal Kependidikan Dasar*, *1*(2).

Hamid, S. (2013). *Metode Edutainment*. Yogyakarta: Diva Press.

Huda, M. (2014). *Model-model Pembelajaran dan Pengajaran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.

Joni, P. dkk. (2014). Penggunaan Media Audio-Visual Pada Mata Pelajaran Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam di Sekolah Menengah Pertama Negeri 1 Pacitan. *Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran.*, *2*(2), 127-144.

Putra, P., & Syafrudin, S. (2020). Scramble Learning Model to Improve the Ability Reading the Quran in Elementary School/Model Pembelajaran Scramble untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Membaca Al-Quran pada Mata Pelajaran Al-Quran Hadits di Madrasah Ibtidaiyah. *Journal Al-Mudarris*, *3*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.32478/al-mudarris.v3i1.332

Rahayu, S., & Yulianti. (2011). Pembelajaran Sains dengan Pendekatan Keterampilan Proses Untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar dan Kemampuan Berpikir Kreatif Siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika Indonesia.*, *7*(2), 106-110.

Susanto, A. (2013). *Teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran di Sekolah Dasar*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.