

Unlocking Minds: Innovative Approaches to Thematic Subject Mastery at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan through Creative Learning Strategies

Aulia Puspita Saputri, Ahwy Oktradiksa (20) and Norma Dewi Shalikhah

Education Teacher of Madrasa Ibtidaiyah, Muhammadiyah University of Magelang, Central Java 56172, Indonesia ahwy@unimma.ac.id

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to ascertain the best ways to apply Creative Thinking learning methodologies in order to enhance theme learning results. Experiments are being used in this quantitative study. A sample of 23 students was taken using the census method, and the participants of this study were class V students at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan, which had a population of 135 pupils. The findings of the pretest and posttest are used in the data collection process, together with the results of the normality test and the t test for hypothesis testing. According to the study's findings, 19 students scored higher on the pretest than the KKM 75. After applying the Creative Thinking Learning Strategy and taking a post-test with the same questions, 23 students scored higher than the KKM 75. The Pretest and Post Test scores are normally distributed since the results of the normality test, Lo = 0.809 for the Pretest and Lo = 0.133 for the Post Test, are smaller than the L table value of 0.175. Based on the data processing results with SPSS version 26.0 df, it was possible to determine that Ha was accepted and Ho was rejected with a t table value of 2.093 > 10.924, a degree of freedom of 0.05, and a df value of 22. Thus, it seems sense that learning strategies involving creative thinking have a big impact on theme learning outcomes.

Keywords: Creative Thinking, Learning Result, Thematic Lesson

1 Introduction

According to Ki Hajar Dewantara, education is an endeavour to develop a child's character, mind, and body in order to help them achieve life's ultimate goal, which is to raise children who are in harmony with the natural world and society Merging Citations. An educational institution must be able to oversee and manage the curriculum's implementation as well as enhance and develop the professional skills it contains in order to achieve these learning objectives [5, 6]. The curriculum in Indonesia has changed multiple times along its evolution to better meet the demands of raising the country's educational standards.

Z. B. Pambuko et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of 5th Borobudur International Symposium on Humanities and Social Science (BISHSS 2023)*, Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research 856, https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-273-6_79

Since 2013 until now, in 2023, most educational institutions in Indonesia have updated the curriculum under the names Curriculum 2013 and Curriculum for Independent Learning and Independent Campus [7]-[8]. With the implementation of K-13, subjects emerged that combined several subjects and combined aspects of knowledge and skills which were called thematic learning. Thematic learning emphasizes students' active participation in the learning process more than other learning approaches [9]. The relationship between a subject and other subject is important in learning.

The application of this thematic learning has the characteristics of learning by implementing student-centered learning or student-centered learning [9]. In this case, students are expected to be able to prove directly what they have learned. For this reason, techniques are needed that are designed by a teacher to be able to help students in learning activities to achieve effective and efficient learning outcomes or what are called learning strategies. Although they are not the sole element influencing learning performance, learning techniques play a significant part in the learning environment. A learning strategy is a method for figuring out how to accomplish all of the things that go into reaching learning objectives, like preparation, execution, and evaluation [10]. The actual issue is that not all educational establishments have adopted instructional and technical solutions that comply with these regulations. This occurred at MI Muhamamdiyah Jagalan, when pupils became disinterested in the ways the lecturers were presenting the curriculum. Even when they present the material, teachers fail to implement efficient learning techniques. Other than that, pupils have not demonstrated their originality or engagement with the material. due to the fact that teachers' methods of instruction are not as engaging.

2 Method

This study employs a quantitative methodology [11]. A total of 135 students from MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan made up the population for this study [12]– [13]. Of those students, 23 individuals from class V at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan served as the samples for this study. approaches for gathering data that include tests, observations, documentation, and interviews [14]. Instrument test analysis procedures, including validity, reliability, normalcy, and t-tests, are used in this study.

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Result

The teacher's role in delivering the material—namely, the ability to think fluently—and the application of the Creative Thinking Learning strategy are inextricably linked. During each meeting, the teacher works to inspire students to generate a lot of ideas, answers, and solutions to problems or questions in order to help them develop their ability to think fluently during the learning process. Following instruction using a creative thinking learning strategy, students in class V at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan took a post-test. The average score was 82.83; 17 students received a score higher than the

KKM and were deemed passed, or 82.6%, while the remaining students received an 82.6%. With the greatest score being 100 and the lowest being 50, 4 pupils, or 17.4% of the class grade V MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan students, scored below the KKM 75, demonstrating an improvement in learning methodologies.

Question Item Validity Test Results.

The validity test findings are derived from the thematic subject question validity results. Using a comparison of >r table 0.41 for items with a total of 30 question items, it can be inferred that 10 question items are invalid and 20 question items are considered valid and can be continued with good quality. Test of Reliability is shown in Table 1.

	Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items	Recommendation
0.767	30	Reliable

Table 1. Reliability Test Results for thematic subject questions

Pre-Test.

This test aims to determine students' abilities before implementing creative thinking learning strategies.

From the Pretest results can be concluded that of the 19 children who were given the Pretest questions, there were 5 students or 21.7% who got a score above the KKM and were declared passed, while the remaining 18 students or 78.3% of students got a score below the KKM 75 with the student's average score being 57.83 with the highest score being 80 and the lowest score being 25. This shows that the learning strategies implemented are not yet effective in improving class grade V thematic learning outcomes.

Post-Test.

This test aims to determine students' abilities after applying creative thinking learning strategies.

Based on the Post Test results, it can be inferred that out of the 23 kids that took the test, 17 of them scored higher than the KKM and were deemed to have passed, accounting for 82.6% of the total. The other 4 pupils, or 17.4%, were in class V. MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan's score was lower than the 75 KKM. The aforementioned table also shows that students' average score is 82.83, with 100 representing the greatest score and 50 representing the lowest. This illustrates how adopted learning strategies outperform earlier teaching techniques in terms of helping students achieve better learning results.

Normality Test.

The student pretest score data is sorted from the smallest value to the largest value and the Xi value obtained is shown in the following Table 2.

No	Y1	Ζ	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	Absolute (Fzi-Szi)	
1	25	-2.04167	0.0207	0.043478	0.022778	
2	35	-1.41978	0.0793	0.086957	0.007657	
3	40	-1.10883	0.1357	0.130435	-0.00527	
4	40	-1.10883	0.1357	0.173913	0.038213	
5	40	-1.10883	0.1357	0.217391	0.081691	
6	45	-0.79789	0.2148	0.26087	0.04607	
7	45	-0.79789	0.2148	0.304348	0.089548	
8	45	-0.79789	0.2148	0.347826	0.133026	
9	50	-0.48694	0.3156	0.391304	0.075704	
10	55	-0.176	0.4325	0.434783	0.002283	
11	60	0.13495	0.5517	0.478261	-0.07344	
12	60	0.13495	0.5517	0.521739	-0.02996	
13	65	0.445896	0.6700	0.565217	-0.10478	
14	65	0.445896	0.6700	0.608696	-0.0613	
15	65	0.445896	0.6700	0.652174	-0.01783	
16	65	0.445896	0.6700	0.695652	0.025652	
17	70	0.756841	0.7734	0.73913	-0.03427	
18	70	0.756841	0.7734	0.782609	0.009209	
19	75	1.067786	0.8554	0.826087	-0.02931	
20	75	1.067786	0.8554	0.869565	0.014165	
21	80	1.378731	0.9147	0.913043	-0.00166	
22	80	1.378731	0.9147	0.956522	0.041822	
23	80	1.378731	0.9147	1	0.0853	
Tota	1	1330				
Rate	s	57.83				
Vari	ant	258.696				
Devi	ation	16.08				

Table 2. Creative Thinking Learning Strategy Pretest Normality Test Results

From these results, the average value = 57.83 and the standard deviation is 16.08 and the calculated L value taken is the highest value in the Fi (Zi) - S(Zi) column so that the calculated L value or Lo = 0.133 and the L table value with the number of respondents was 23 respondents and obtained a value of 0.175. From these results, a comparison was made between Lo and L tabel and obtained Lo = 0.133 < L tabel = 0.175. Compute each question in the Fi (Zi) - S(Zi) column table to determine the L value. The student pre-test data is regularly distributed since Lo < = L table, according to these findings. Following the application of creative thinking learning strategies to the learning process, the following phase involves testing the normality of the Post Test data. based on the Post Test score computation findings shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Post-Test Normality Test Results for Creative Thinking Learning Strategy

No	Y1	Z	F(Zi)	S(Zi)	Absolute (Fzi-Szi)
1	50	-2.40616	0.0082	0.043478	0.035278
2	60	-1.67375	0.0475	0.086957	0.039457
3	60	-1.67302	0.0475	0.130435	0.082935
4	60	-1.67375	0.0475	0.173913	0.126413
5	75	-0.57331	0.2843	0.217391	-0.06691
6	80	-0.20748	0.4207	0.26087	-0.15983

7	80	-0.20674	0.4207	0.304348	-0.11635		
8	80	-0.20748	0.4207	0.347826	-0.07287		
9	80	-0.20674	0.4207	0.391304	-0.0294		
10	85	0.159091	0.9441	0.434783	-0.50932		
11	85	0.159824	0.9441	0.478261	-0.46584		
12	85	0.159091	0.9441	0.521739	-0.42236		
13	85	0.159824	0.9441	0.565217	-0.37888		
14	90	0.52566	0.6985	0.608696	-0.0898		
15	90 0.526393		90 0.526393 0		0.6985	0.652174	-0.04633
16	90	0.52566	0.6985	0.695652	-0.00285		
17	95	0.892962	0.8133	0.73913	-0.07417		
18	95	0.892229	0.8133	0.782609	-0.03069		
19	95	0.892962	0.8133	0.826087	0.012787		
20	95	0.892229	0.8133	0.869565	0.056265		
21	95	0.892962	0.8133	0.913043	0.099743		
22	95	0.892229	0.8133	0.956522	0.143222		
23	100	1.259531	0.8944	1	0.1056		
Tota	ıl	1095					
Rate	es	82.83					
Vari	ant	185.968					
Dev	iation	13.64					

Unlocking Minds: Innovative Approaches to Thematic Subject

759

From these results, the average value = 82.83 and the standard deviation is 13.64 and the calculated L value taken is the highest value in the Fi (Zi) - S(Zi) column so that the calculated L value or Lo = 0.143 and the L value are obtained. table with a total of 23 respondents obtained a value of 0.175. From these results, a comparison was made between L0 and Ltabel and obtained L0 = 0.143 < Ltabel = 0.175. For the L value, calculate each question item presented in the Fi (Zi) - S(Zi) column table. and obtained the L0 value = 0.143 and the L table value = 0.175. From these results, it can be concluded that L0 <= Ltable, so the students' Post Test data is normally distributed.

Uji t

In this study, the Paired Sample Test—a component of the Comparative Hypothesis Test or Comparison Test—is used for hypothesis testing in the form of a t test. The purpose of this test is to determine whether the average of two matched or related samples/groups differs. Pretest and posttest results for a paired sample test are shown in Table 4.

Respondent	Pretest	Post test
Respondent-1	65	85
Respondent-2	25	50
Respondent-3	70	90
Respondent-4	40	60
Respondent-5	60	85
Respondent-6	80	90
Respondent-7	80	95
Respondent-8	75	100

Table 4. Paired Sample Test Pretest and Post test

Respondent-9	40	80
Respondent-10	45	95
Respondent-11	45	60
Respondent-12	80	95
Respondent-13	50	95
Respondent-14	60	95
Respondent-15	70	85
Respondent-16	35	60
Respondent-17	65	80
Respondent-18	55	75
Respondent-19	75	90
Respondent-20	65	95
Respondent-21	45	80
Respondent-22	40	80
Respondent-23	65	85
Total	1330	1905
Rates	57.83	82.83
High Score	80	100
Low Score	25	50

A. P. Saputri et al.

760

The significant value (Sig.) of the SPSS output findings serves as the basis for the test. Table 5-7 presents the Paired Sample Test, Paired Sample Statistics, and Paired Sample Correlations in that order.

Table 5. Paired Sample Statistic

	Mean	Ν	Std Deviation	Std.Error Mean
Pretest	57.8261	23	16.08402	3.35375
Post Test	82.8261	23	13.63702	2.84352

Table 6. Paired Samples Correlations					
N Correlation					
Pretest dan Post Test	23	0.739			

	Mean	Std.De- viation	Std Er- ror Mean	95% Confidence In- terval of the Differ- ence		Т	df	Sig (2. tailed)
				Lower	Upper			
Pair	-	10.9751	2.2884	-	-	-	22	.000
1	25.0000	8	8	29.7460	20.2539	10.92		
Pre-	0			2	8	4		
Test								
Post								
Test								

761

The descriptive statistical findings of the two samples under study—the Pretest and Post Test scores—are summarised in this output. The average score for the Pretest was 57.82. In the meantime, the average learning outcome score for the Post Test results was 82.82. There were twenty-three pupils utilised as study samples or responders. The pretest's standard deviation number was 16,084, and the posttest's was 13,637. Mean error for the post-test is 2.843 while the pretest is 3.353. There is a descriptive difference in the average learning results between the Pretest and Post Test findings because the average value of the Pretest learning results is 57.82 < Post Test 82.82. Next, an interpretation of the results presented in Table 8 is required to demonstrate whether or not the difference is actually real and significant.

	Table 8. Paired Samples Correlations				
	Ν	Correlation			
Pretest and Post Test	23	0.739			

The correlation test findings, the relationship between the two sets of data, or the relationship between the pretest and posttest variables are displayed in the output above. The correlation coefficient value is 0.739 with a significance value (Sig.) of 0.000, as can be determined from the output above. According to the statistics, there is a link between the pretest and posttest variables because the Sig value of 0.000 is less than the probability of 0.05.

1	5		Table 9. Paired Sample Test						
	Mean	Std.De- viation	Std Error Mean		fidence In- the Differ- Upper	Т	df Si	g(2.tailed)	
Pair 1 Pre Test Post Test	25.00000	10.97518	2.28848	29.74602	20.25398	-10.924	22	.000	

In the third part of the output, this is the most important output, because in this part the answer will be found to the question in this research, namely whether or not there is an influence of the use of creative thinking learning strategies on student learning outcomes in mathematics subjects for class grade V MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan students.

The Sig value is known based on the output table shown above in Table 9. If the two-tailed value is 0.000 < 0.05, Ho is not accepted and Ha is. The use of Creative Thinking Learning learning strategies has an impact on students' learning outcomes in thematic subjects for class V MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan students, as indicated by the average difference between the results of the Pretest and Post Test [15]. The t count is known to have a negative value of -10.924. Because the average value of the Pretest results is less than the average value of the Post Test results, the t count is negative. A negative t value can signify anything positive in this situation. The computed t value therefore becomes 10.924. The next step involves searching for the t table using the significance value ($\alpha/2$) and the df value (degree of freedom) as criteria. The result

above indicates that the value 0.05/2 is 0.025 and that the df value is 22. In order to find the t table in the distribution of statistical t table values, this value is used as a guide, and 2.093 is the result. Therefore, based on the above-mentioned foundation for decision-making, it may be determined that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted because the calculated t value is 10.924 > t table 2.093. Thus, it can be said that applying creative thinking learning strategies enhances the effectiveness of thematic learning compared to not applying them.

3.2 Discussion

Application of Creative Thinking Learning in Thematic Learning at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan.

The implementation of Creative Thinking learning begins with the teacher's efforts to stimulate students' creativity during learning [16]. Followed by providing fun and interesting learning. The third thing is that teachers always respect the ideas expressed by students. Class grade V students at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan have different characteristics. Every child has their own characteristics or uniqueness. So that in generating different ideas and opinions according to their respective characteristics [17]. Fourth, develop creativity in learning. Teachers need to provide a platform for each student to develop their creativity. The next step is that the teacher provides a good response to questions and answers from students.

3.3 Effective Creative Thinking Learning Strategy to Improve Learning Outcomes at MI Muhammadiyah Jagalan.

It is evident from the preceding Paired Sample Test output table that the computed t value, which is -10,924, is negative. Because the average value of the pre-test results is lower than the average value of the post-test results, the t count has a negative value. A negative t value in this kind of situation can have a positive mean-ing. The computed t value therefore becomes 10.924. Subsequently, compare the values in the t table with the computed t. The t table is searched using the significance value ($\alpha/2$) and the df value (degree of freedom). It is clear from the result above that the t table value is 2.093, the df value is 22, and the value of 0.05/2 is equivalent to 0.025. Therefore, based on the above-mentioned foundation for decision-making, it may be determined that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted because the calculated t value is 10.924 > t table 2.093. Thus, it seems sense that learning strategies based on creative thinking have a big impact on theme learning outcomes [18].

Similarly, based on test and analysis results, Alberth Supriyanto Manurung's research from 2020, The Influence of Creative Thinking Abilities to Improve Mathematics Learning Outcomes in Elementary Schools, demonstrates that creative thinking abilities influence mathematics learning outcomes [19]. The hypothesis testing results show that the linear regression equation for the creative thinking ability variable with mathematics learning outcomes is $\vartheta = -8.739 + 0.231X$. Following testing, the regression equation model is shown to be linear and significant at the $\alpha = 0.05$ level. This indicates that a rise in one creative thinking ability score is accompanied by an increase in the mathematics learning accomplishment score of 0.231, with a constant of -8.739. The contribution between the creative thinking ability variable and mathematics learning outcomes, the coefficient of determination is 0.1672, indicating that 16.72% of the variance in the mathematics learning outcome variable is explained or determined by creative thinking abilities.

4 Conclusion

Based on the results of the research discussion, it can be concluded that the application of creative thinking learning in class grade V can provide a stimulus for creativity, attack, attract learning, and improve learning outcomes for students. Teachers using this strategy always respect the ideas submitted by students by providing a platform for each student to develop their creativity.

Reference

- 1. Alhamuddin Sejaran Kurikulum Di Indonesia (Studi Analisis Kebijakan Pengembangan Kurikulum). *Nur El-Islam* **2014**, *1*.
- Hidayat, R. Buku Ilmu Pendidikan Rahmat Hidayat & Abdillah; Wijaya, C., Amiruddin, Eds.; 1st ed.; Lembaga Peduli Pengembangan Pendidikan Indonesia: Medan, 2019; ISBN 9786239065386.
- Thabrani, A.M. Pengantar Dan Dimensi-Dimensi Pendidikan; Faisol, M., Ed.; 1st ed.; STAIN Jember Press, 2013; ISBN 978-602-8716-83-3.
- Syukur, T.A.; Rafiqoh, S. *Pengantar Ilmu Pendidikan*; Hanafie, Ed.; Jakarta, 2022; Vol. 4; ISBN 978-623-93490-3-5.
- 5. Tabroni Upaya Menyiapkan Pendidikan Yang Berkualitas. *J. Kependidikan Islam IAIN Sulthan Thaha Saifuddin* **2013**, *6*, 54–67.
- 6. Masykur, R. *Teori Dan Telaah Pengembangan Kurikulum*; 1st ed.; Anugrah Utama Raharja: Bandar Lampung, 2019; ISBN 978-623-211-112-7.
- 7. Alhamuddin Sejarah Kurikulum Di Indonesia. Nur El-Islam 2014, 1, 48–58.
- 8. Julfahnur; M., M.R.; Diana, S.; Khalik, I. Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Dalam Pembelajaran SMA. *INA-Rxiv* 2013, 7–8.
- Mangesak, A.W.; Patahuddin; Sapaile, B.I. Implementasi Pembelajaran Tematik Di Sekolah Dasar Negeri 12 Banawa Selatan Kabupaten Donggala, 2019.
- Aswan, H. Strategi Pembelajaran Berbasis PAIKEM Edisi Revisi; Ramli, M., Ed.; 2nd ed.; Yogyakarta, 2016; ISBN 978-602-6370-68-6.
- 11. Djollong, A.F. Tehnik Pelaksanaan Penelitian Kuantitatif (Technique of Quantitative Research). *Istiqra' J. Pendidik. dan Pemikir. Islam* **2014**, *2*, 86–100.
- 12. Sugiyono Metode Penelitian Pendidikan Kuantitatif, Kulaitatif, Dan R&D;; 2015;
- 13. Anggara, S. *Metode Penelitian Administrasi*; Saebani, B.A., Ed.; Cet I.; CV Pustaka Setia: Bandung, 2015;
- Fauzy, A.; Nisa, B.; Napitupulu, D.; Abdullah, F.; Satia, U.G.; Zonyfar, C.; Nuraini, R.; Purnia, D.S.; Setyawati, I.; Evi, T.; et al. *Metodologi Penelitian*; Briliant, R.N., Ed.; 1st ed.; Pena Persada, 2022; ISBN 2013206534.

A. P. Saputri et al.

- Safitri, U.N.; Oktradiksa, A.; Shalikhah, N.D. Evaluation of Thematic Learning Curriculum 2013 in Madrasah Ibtidaiyah; Atlantis Press SARL, 2024; Vol. 2022; ISBN 9782384761180.
- Bhakti, C.P.; Noor, K.W.; Ghiffari, M.A.N.; Nurpitasari, E.; Oktradiksa, A.; Ani An Online Project-Based Learning Model to Improve Students' Thinking Ability in the New Normal Era. J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 2021, 1760, 012038, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1760/1/012038.
- Anggraini, S.; Sukartono, S. Upaya Guru Dalam Meningkatkan Motivasi Belajar Peserta Didik Di Sekolah Dasar. J. Basicedu 2022, 6, 5287–5294, doi:10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.3071.
- Kurniawati, E.; Oktradiksa, A.; Sholkihah, N.D. Discovery Learning Model for Improving The Studetn Critical Thinking: A Narative Review. *Albidayah* 2021, 13, doi:10.14421/al-bidayah.v13i2.691.
- Oktradiksa; Bhakti, C.P.; Kurniawan, S.J.; Rahman, F.A.; Ani Utilization Artificial Intelligence to Improve Creativity Skills in Society 5.0. J. Phys. Conf. Ser. 2021, 1760, 012032, doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1760/1/012032.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

