BICED PROCEEDING
BUKITTINGGI INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION
https://proceedings.uinbukittinggi.ac.id/biced
e-ISSN : xxxx-xxxx | p-ISSN : xxxx-xxxx
e-ISSN : xxxx-xxxx
p-ISSN : xxxx-xxxx

Improving Student Learning Outcomes with the Application of Differentiated Learning in PAI and BP Subjects at UPT SDN 09 Lunang

Nuri Novita Sari[1]

***Correspondence:**
Email : nurinovitasari@gmail.com

Authors Affiliation:
[1]Universitas Islam Negeri Sjech M. Djamil Djambek Bukittinggi, *Indonesia*

Article History:
Submission : 18-11-2024
Revised : 22-11-2024
Accepted : 24-12-2024
Published

Keywords: Learning Outcomes, Differentiated Learning

Kata kunci: *Hasil Belajar, Pembelajaran yang Berbeda*

Abstrac

This study aims to improve student learning outcomes in class V through the application of Differentiated Learning using the Card Short method. The research was conducted in two cycles at UPT SDN 09 Lunang, focusing on developing students' abilities in learning according to their individual capabilities. The results showed that in Cycle I, only 50% of students achieved the Minimum Mastery Criteria (KKM), while in Cycle II, the number of students achieving KKM increased to 57.1%. Based on observations and reflections, improvements were implemented in each cycle to address obstacles in the learning process. The learning outcomes of students in Cycle II showed significant improvement. Therefore, it can be concluded that Differentiated Learning can improve student learning outcomes, although further cycles are needed to achieve more optimal results.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa kelas V melalui penerapan Differentiated Learning dengan metode Card Short. Penelitian ini dilaksanakan dalam dua siklus di UPT SDN 09 Lunang dengan fokus pada pengembangan kemampuan siswa dalam belajar sesuai dengan tingkat kemampuannya. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pada Siklus I hanya 50% siswa yang mencapai Kriteria Ketuntasan Minimal (KKM), sedangkan pada Siklus II jumlah siswa yang mencapai KKM meningkat menjadi 57,1%. Berdasarkan hasil observasi dan refleksi, dilakukan perbaikan pada setiap siklus untuk mengatasi kendala-kendala dalam proses pembelajaran. Hasil belajar siswa pada siklus II menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan. Dengan demikian, dapat disimpulkan bahwa Differentiated Learning dapat meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa, meskipun masih perlu dilanjutkan ke siklus berikutnya untuk mencapai hasil yang lebih optimal.

INTRODUCTION

Education has a very important role in shaping the quality of the nation's next generation. The main purpose of education is to provide the knowledge, skills and values needed for life. However, in reality, each learner has different needs and potentials in receiving learning materials. This is a challenge for educators in creating a learning process that can accommodate these differences. Therefore, a more flexible and responsive approach to learner diversity in the context of learning is needed.

Differentiated instruction is one approach that can be used to address the different abilities of learners in the classroom. This approach aims to tailor teaching to the needs, interests and learning styles of each individual, so that each learner gets an optimal learning experience. By implementing differentiated learning, it is expected that learners can achieve better learning outcomes, because they learn in the way that is most effective for them (Tomlinson, 2001). This approach allows teachers to design more personalized learning, provide various options for learning, and give more attention to each learner.

However, implementing differentiated learning in the field is not easy. There are many challenges faced by teachers, including limited time, resources and understanding of how to

design learning that can meet the needs of each learner. Research conducted by McTighe and Brown (2005) shows that although differentiated learning has great potential to improve learning outcomes, its implementation is often hampered by factors such as limited teacher training and lack of adequate resources.

One of the main challenges in implementing differentiated learning is the heterogeneity of learners' abilities. Learners in a class usually have widely varying ability levels, which can affect their understanding of the subject matter. Some learners may take longer to understand the material, while others may be able to grasp it quickly. Conventional learning that tends to apply the same approach for all learners often cannot accommodate these differences, which can cause some learners to fall behind in the learning process (Tomlinson, 2001).

In addition, the different learning styles of learners are also an important factor that needs to be considered in learning. Each learner has a different way of learning, some are more likely to learn by listening (auditory), seeing (visual), or through physical activity (kinesthetic). However, many teachers still use methods that rely on only one learning style, such as lectures or visual presentations, without considering these differences. This can cause learners who are not suited to the method to find it difficult to understand the material and reduce their motivation to learn.

Teachers' limitations in managing differentiated learning are also one of the obstacles often faced. Differentiated learning requires teachers to design, manage and adapt materials to the needs of individual learners. This requires time and higher skills, as well as the ability to respond quickly to learner development. Research by Renzulli and Reis (1997) shows that teachers who are poorly trained in differentiated learning tend to struggle in planning and managing effective learning for all learners.

In addition to the problem of teacher skills, the lack of varied learning resources is also an obstacle in implementing differentiated learning. Limited learning resources, such as textbooks or less diverse learning media, hinder teachers' ability to meet learners' individual needs. In this context, learning resources that are varied and adapted to learners' learning styles are key to improving the effectiveness of differentiated learning (Hattie, 2009).

Learner motivation also plays an important role in differentiated learning. Learners who find the learning difficult may lose motivation, while superior learners may feel bored if the material is not challenging. Learning that does not match learners' ability and interest levels can lead to low engagement in learning. This can potentially hinder the achievement of optimal learning outcomes, as explained by Deci and Ryan (1985) in their motivation theory which emphasizes the importance of the need to feel competent and engaged in learning.

Teachers' perceptions of differentiated learning also play a role in its successful implementation. Not all teachers have sufficient understanding or confidence in this approach. Some teachers may perceive differentiated learning as too complicated and requiring a lot of time and resources. If teachers do not understand or feel confident with this method, they are less likely to implement it to its full potential, which will ultimately affect learners' learning outcomes. Research by Tomlinson (2001) suggests that to overcome these barriers, teachers need to be given adequate training and support to develop their skills in designing differentiated learning.

Time and facility constraints are also factors that limit the implementation of differentiated learning. More complex planning processes and the provision of more varied resources require more time. In addition, limited facilities, such as cramped classrooms or lack of access to technology, can make it difficult to implement differentiated learning effectively. Research by Reigeluth (1999) shows that without adequate facility support, differentiated learning is difficult to implement optimally.

Given these challenges, this study aims to improve students' learning outcomes through the application of differentiated learning in Islamic Religious Education (PAI) subjects. This research is expected to provide practical solutions to overcome the problems faced by teachers in heterogeneous classes, as well as to make a positive contribution to improving the quality of education, especially in the context of basic education. By identifying and addressing existing problems, this research is also expected to enrich the practice of differentiated learning in schools.

METHODS

This classroom action research uses a mixed methods approach, which combines qualitative and quantitative approaches. This approach was chosen because PTK focuses on improving learning practices directly in the classroom, and measuring the changes that occur in an objective and measurable way. The mixed approach allows researchers to get a more comprehensive picture of the effectiveness of differentiated learning in improving learning outcomes and learning quality.

The qualitative approach is used to explore a deeper understanding of the differentiated learning process and its impact on learners. This approach focuses on collecting descriptive data that describes classroom phenomena holistically, including changes in learners' attitudes, characters and social interactions during the implementation of differentiated learning. With this approach, researchers can understand the subjective experiences of learners and teachers in the learning process.

To collect qualitative data, researchers used several methods, including direct observation, interviews, field notes, and documentation analysis. Direct observation was conducted during the learning process to see how learners interact with the subject matter and with their classmates. Interviews with learners and teachers aim to explore their perceptions of differentiated learning and to find out if this approach affects their attitudes and engagement in learning. Field notes will be used by teachers to reflect on learning practices and provide additional insights into the challenges faced and successes achieved during the learning action.

In addition, documentation analysis will also be used to examine learners' learning products, such as the results of group work or projects. This analysis aims to see whether differentiated learning has a positive impact on the quality of learning outcomes and the development of learners' skills in the context of PAI and Budi Pekerti learning.

The quantitative approach is used to objectively measure the improvement of students' learning outcomes. This measurement is done by comparing the scores of the learning outcomes test or test before and after the implementation of differentiated learning actions. The quantitative approach will provide a clearer picture of how much change occurred in learners' academic achievement due to the use of this method. This quantitative data also helps to ascertain whether the changes can be accounted for statistically.

Quantitative data collection methods include learning outcome tests, which consist of pre-test and post-test. The pre-test is conducted before the implementation of differentiated learning to measure the learners' initial level of understanding, while the post-test is conducted after the implementation to measure the extent to which learners' learning outcomes improve. In addition, a questionnaire will be used to assess learners' attitudes and perceptions towards differentiated learning. This questionnaire is designed to explore learners' opinions on the effectiveness of this method in increasing their motivation and engagement in learning.

The quantitative data collected will be analyzed using descriptive statistical tests, such as average calculations, frequency distributions, or comparisons between pre-test and post-test scores. These tests will provide a clear picture of the changes in learners' learning outcomes

after the implementation of differentiated learning. The results of this quantitative analysis will provide strong evidence of the effectiveness of the applied learning method.

This research will be conducted at UPT SDN 09 Lunang, which is located in Kenagarian Lunang Tiga, Lunang District, Pesisir Selatan Regency. This location was chosen because the school has diverse learner characteristics and is an appropriate place to implement differentiated learning. This research will be conducted during the PPG PPL, which is in December 2024, which provides an opportunity for researchers to implement learning actions and collect data directly.

The subjects of this research were students of class V UPT SDN 09 Lunang, totaling 14 people. The selection of these subjects was based on the criteria of the diversity of ability levels and needs of students relevant to the research objectives to improve learning outcomes through a differentiated learning approach. With a relatively small number of students, researchers can focus more on making observations and giving more attention to each individual during the implementation of learning.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

RESULT

In Cycle I of this study, lesson planning focused on learning with the sub-theme "Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy" using a differentiated learning approach. This plan was prepared with the aim of improving student learning outcomes through learning that is tailored to the needs and abilities of students. Researchers designed lesson plans that included Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy material and tests as assessment instruments. In this planning, the researcher also invited an observer, Aisyah Pratama Usda, to help monitor the learning process.

The implementation of learning in Cycle I was carried out on Monday, December 23, 2024, with a time allocation of 3 lesson hours. Learning is divided into three stages, namely introductory, core, and closing activities. In the introduction stage, the researcher opened the lesson by praying and checking the students' attendance. After that, the researcher asked sparking questions to arouse students' interest, such as questions about Asma'ul Husna and strength. The researcher linked the students' answers to the learning material that day, namely Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy.

In the core activities, researchers distributed initial assessments to determine students' understanding before the material was given. Then, the researcher explained the material about Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy to praiseworthy behavior. After that, students were divided into three groups and asked to watch a reference video. After watching the video, students were given the task of answering questions related to the material. The researcher also introduced the Card short method, which was used to organize group tasks in compiling information about Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy.

After giving instructions about Card short, students began to work in groups. They used their critical and creative thinking skills to complete the task given by the researcher. Students arrange cards containing important points about Asma'ul Husna al-Qawwiy and arrange them according to the concepts that have been taught before. After the group finished, they presented the results of the discussion in turn, responding to each other's discussion results.

In the closing stage, the researcher provided ice breaking to reduce tension after the discussion, so that students felt more comfortable. The researcher also provided reinforcement on material that students still did not understand. Then, the researcher gave the Learner Worksheet (LKPD) as a measuring tool for students' understanding of the material. After completing the LKPD, students collected their work for further analysis.

During the implementation of the action, the observer records the activities of researchers and students using a rating scale that includes aspects such as the teacher's ability to organize the material, use varied methods, provide explanations that are easy to understand, and manage the class well. The observation results showed that the researcher received a score of 26 with a percentage of 81.25%, which indicated that the researcher's performance in cycle I was quite good, although it still needed improvement to achieve the expected performance indicator criteria.

The observation of students also shows that they are engaged in learning well. Students are active in discussions and working together in groups, as well as showing enthusiasm and spirit during learning. However, some students still lack independence in learning and sometimes do not focus on the teacher's explanation. Students scored 23 with a percentage of 82.14%, which shows that most students are already active in learning, but there is still something to improve in terms of independence and active involvement.

From the results of this observation, it can be concluded that although the implementation of learning in cycle I was quite good, there were still some aspects that needed to be improved. Researchers and students have not fully achieved the expected performance indicator criteria, which is 85%. Therefore, researchers planned improvements for cycle II by improving the differentiated learning steps, giving more attention to students who were less focused, and increasing student learning motivation to achieve better results.

The results of the learning test in Cycle I showed that only 5 students (35.7%) reached the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM), while 9 students (64.3%) had not reached the KKM. The class average score in Cycle I was 65.7, which was still far from the desired target. Based on these results, the researcher planned to improve the weaknesses that existed in Cycle I, so that more students could reach the KKM in Cycle II. By making improvements to aspects that are difficult for students and improving learning management, it is hoped that learning outcomes in the next cycle can improve significantly.

In cycle II, based on the results of observations, reflections, and tests in cycle I, it was found that the learning outcomes of students had not reached the expected level of completeness. Many students have not been active in learning and consider differentiated learning with Card Short only as an activity without a clear goal to improve learning outcomes. Therefore, in cycle II, researchers tried to improve the implementation of Differentiated Learning in order to improve students' learning outcomes.

In the planning stage of cycle II, the researcher explained again about Differentiated Learning and the steps that would be taken during learning. The Learning Plan (RPP) used in cycle II was prepared by considering the evaluation from cycle I to improve the existing shortcomings. Learning was carried out in one meeting with a duration of three lesson hours (3 x 35 minutes) in class V UPT SDN 09 Lunang.

The implementation of cycle II was carried out on Monday, December 30, 2024, with an allocation of three lesson hours. Learning activities began with greetings and prayers together, then the researcher checked the attendance of students, where 14 students were present at this meeting. The researcher began by conveying the learning objectives and asking triggering questions to stimulate students' prior knowledge. In the core activities, the researcher explained the material presented through PPT slides by actively involving students.

After explaining the material, the researcher divided the learners into three groups based on differentiated learning, where each group consisted of students with different intelligence levels. Next, the researcher showed a relevant video and gave group assignments related to the video. After the group assignment was completed, learners were asked to make "al-Qayyum" calligraphy according to the instructions given. Learning took place with collaboration

between group members although there were students who seemed less interested in the task.

After all groups have completed their tasks, learners present the results of their discussions in front of the class. Each group showed the calligraphy they had made and gave responses to other groups' presentations. The researcher gave an explanation related to the results of the discussion and invited students to do ice-breaking as a closing of learning. After that, the researcher provides reflection and evaluation related to the implementation of learning and distributes LKPD in the form of multiple choice test questions to measure the improvement of students' learning outcomes.

The results of the cycle II test showed that out of 14 students, 8 students (57.1%) managed to reach the predetermined KKM, which is 70. However, 6 students (42.9%) have not yet reached the KKM. The average score of students in cycle II was 71.1. Although there was an increase in learning outcomes compared to cycle I, there were still some students who needed more attention in further learning.

In the observation stage, observations were made using a rating scale that included various indicators such as the teacher's ability to organize the material, the use of varied methods, and student involvement in learning. The observation results showed that the researcher obtained a score of 28 out of 32, which means the percentage of achievement was 87.5%. Meanwhile, the observation of students obtained a score of 25 out of 28, with an achievement percentage of 89.3%. These results show that despite the improvements, there are still some areas that need to be improved to achieve more optimal results.

From the results of research in cycle II, it can be concluded that although there was a significant increase in student learning outcomes, the learning process still needed further improvement. With the student completeness rate reaching 57.1%, the researcher planned to continue the research in cycle III with a focus on increasing student involvement and improving classroom management. Differentiated learning is expected to be maximized, by overcoming difficulties experienced by students and improving teaching techniques for more optimal results.

DISCUSSION

In Cycle I, the results obtained showed that most learners had not reached the Minimum Completion Criteria (KKM). This was caused by several factors, including the lack of active involvement of learners and their limited understanding of the differentiated learning objectives. According to the theory of constructivism proposed by Piaget and Vygotsky, effective learning should involve students in the active process of knowledge formation, so that they can connect new knowledge with existing knowledge. In Cycle I, the lack of active engagement can be linked to this theory, where if students are not given the opportunity to collaborate and interact with others, the learning process becomes less effective.

In Tomlinson's differentiated learning theory, each learner has different needs and readiness levels. Therefore, providing the same material without considering differences in students' level of understanding can cause some students to find it difficult to follow the learning. In Cycle I, although differentiated learning had been implemented, the results were not optimal because the adjustments made were not optimal enough. This shows the need for a more appropriate approach in dividing groups and providing tasks that are more in line with the abilities of each learner.

In Cycle II, there was a significant improvement, although not yet fully adequate. The increase in students' learning outcomes, which reached 57.1% complete, showed a positive response to the implementation of Differentiated Learning. This result shows that when the material is adapted to the needs and ability levels of students, they are better able to

understand and absorb the material provided. In individualized learning theory, as proposed by Gardner in the Multiple Intelligences theory, each student has a different way and style of learning. By dividing students into groups with different ability levels, it is expected to improve the learning process more effectively.

However, despite the improvement, challenges still remain, especially in classroom management and increasing the engagement of all students. Some students still showed inactivity in some sessions. This can be analyzed with Deci and Ryan's Self-Determination theory which emphasizes the importance of intrinsic motivation for successful learning. One of the factors that influence this motivation is a sense of competence and involvement in the activity. In Cycle II, although differentiated learning has been better implemented, some students may still feel less motivated to participate actively, especially if they feel less confident with the assigned tasks.

In addition, in Cycle II, the success in teacher and student observations showed that classroom management and social interaction also played an important role. In social constructivism theory, which emphasizes social interaction as part of the learning process, collaboration between students is very important to build knowledge. However, despite good collaboration, some students seemed less interested or felt uncomfortable with the method used. This may be related to their confidence or lack of understanding of the ultimate goal of learning.

From the results of Cycle I and II, it can be concluded that the implementation of Differentiated Learning has a positive impact on learning outcomes, although there is still room for improvement. In Cycle I, most learners struggled to follow the learning due to the lack of effective management and lack of understanding of the learning objectives. However, in Cycle II, improvements were made by paying more attention to the different characteristics of learners, and more adaptive learning management.

Learning theories such as constructivism and differentiated learning are highly relevant in explaining the changes that occurred between Cycle I and II. Differentiated learning that prioritizes individual needs in the learning process can increase student motivation and engagement, but this must be implemented in a more appropriate way. The difficulties that learners still face, especially in terms of inactivity and lack of engagement, indicate that aspects of motivation and confidence need more attention in learning.

CONCLUSION

The conclusion of this research is that the application of Differentiated Learning in class V UPT SDN 09 Lunang shows an increase in student learning outcomes from Cycle I to Cycle II. In Cycle I, learning outcomes were still not optimal with many students who had not reached the KKM. However, in Cycle II, 57.1% of students managed to reach the KKM, which showed an improvement. Nevertheless, these results were not fully maximized, and there were still some students who were not complete.

The implementation of Differentiated Learning has a positive impact because it can adjust materials and tasks to each student's ability, which is in accordance with learning theories such as constructivism and differentiated learning itself. However, better classroom management, increased student motivation, and more effective feedback are still needed to achieve maximum results.

Based on the evaluation results, it can be concluded that although Differentiated Learning can improve student engagement and learning outcomes, there still needs to be further adjustments in implementation to overcome existing obstacles, such as classroom

management and student motivation, in order to achieve more optimal results in the next cycle.

References

Brookhart, S. M. (2013). *How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading*. ASCD.

Carmichael, L., & McNamara, M. (2011). *Differentiated Instruction: A Research-Based Approach to Improving Student Learning in K-12 Classrooms*. Routledge.

Hamdan, M., & Siddiqui, N. (2019). *Instructional Strategies for Differentiated Learning: A Guide for Teachers*. Wiley.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). *Learning Together and Alone: Cooperative, Competitive, and Individualistic Learning*. Allyn & Bacon.

Pappas, C. (2014). *The Importance of Differentiated Learning*.

Slavin, R. E. (2006). *Educational Psychology: Theory and Practice*. Pearson Education.

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. ASCD.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Harvard University Press.

Wiriaatmadja, S., & Suryanegara, R. (2019). *Differentiated Learning: Theory and Application in the Classroom*. Bumi Aksara.