Integrated Learning Model Types and Their Effect on Student's Interest and Learning Outcomes in Culture and Arts Learning (Sbdp) at SDN 104210 Amplas

Husnal Aini[1]Sitti Rahmah[2]
Medan State University[1] Medan State University[2]

Abstract: This study aims to determine the effect of the integrated learning model on students' interests and learning outcomes. The theory used is the theory of interest, learning outcomes, and the integrated type of integrated model. According to Feri Tirtoni (2018: 89) integrated learning type integrated is defined as a combination of a number of topics in different subjects, but have similar meanings in certain topics. This type of research is quantitative descriptive, with a student population of SDN 104210 Amplas, and a sample of 14 students of class V. Data collection techniques are by means of observation and documentation. The research instrument used tests and questionnaires. The results of the pretest and posttest showed that the percentage of the average pretest was 64.82%, and the posttest average was 85.87%. The percentage result shows an increase of 21.05%. Based on the results of the t test, it shows that the value of t with df = 13 and = 0.05 is 2.16037. Because t count > t table, which is 11.607 > 2.16037, it can be concluded that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. It can be concluded that, there is an effect of the integrated type of integrated learning model with increasing student interest and learning outcomes in SBdP learning at SDN 104210 Amplas.

Keywords: Integrated Model, Interests, Learning Outcomes, SBdP Learning

Introduction

Learning is basically an important activity in every level of education. This means that the learning process is very influential on the success of achieving learning objectives. According to Ubabuddin in the educative journal Vol. V No.1 (2019: 19) reveals that the notion of learning is an activity that an individual does intentionally in order to create a change in himself from those who do not understand, do not know, do not experience to understand, know and experience.

In the learning process, there are often obstacles that arise, one of which is the lack of student interest in learning. Interest according to Hardjana in the journal PGSD FIP Unimed Vol. 1 No. 2 (2014:16) is a tendency towards something or excessive desire for something based on need. Interest has an important role in each student's development. Not only that, interest also plays a big role in the success of student learning.

Learning outcomes are the level of capabilities that have been achieved by students during the process of implementing the learning provided by the teacher in the form of grades. Through learning outcomes, a teacher can see how students have understood a subject matter and the extent to which students' abilities have increased from before. To measure success in learning, it can be seen through three aspects, namely cognitive, affective and psychomotor aspects. Cognitive aspects in the form of student knowledge, psychomotor aspects in the form of student skills and affective in the form of student attitudes during learning. This can be noticed when the teacher gives grades to students in each subject that students have studied.

Based on the author's experience during the Pioneer Teaching Campus program, there are several obstacles related to interest and learning outcomes. The results of observations made by the authors during school observations at SDN 104210 Amplas, the authors saw the low interest in learning in students in the subjects of Cultural Arts and Crafts (SBdP). The lack of interest in learning in students is certainly driven by many factors. According to Purwanto in the Journal of

Cendekia Vol. 1 No. 1 (2016: 15) factors that influence interest are grouped into two forms, namely internal factors and external factors.

Student interest as one of the internal factors should encourage student interest by applying interesting learning models. But in reality, the model that is applied by the teacher during the teaching and learning process does not involve students to be active, causing students to lack the motivation to learn. The previous learning at SD 104210 Amplas in its management was still focused on the teacher (teacher center learning). This is undeniable because as an elementary school teacher is required to be able to master all fields, so that the teacher's knowledge of Cultural Arts and Crafts, especially dance, is less extensive.

The integrated learning model is an amalgamation of several subjects or what is commonly referred to as cross-disciplinary teaching. According to Muhammad Zulkifli in the Tadulako Journal of Physics Education Vol. 4 No. 1 (2016: 46) Integrated learning type integrated is a learning model that links a number of subjects by setting skills, concepts that overlap in various subjects. This model involves direct experience and the environment around the child so that it can provide opportunities for students to optimize all the potential that exists within them.

As for the implementation of this model, the author combines four subjects namely Cultural Arts and Crafts, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences and Citizenship Education. The selection of KD in each subject is KD 3.3 and 4.3 for SBdP subjects, KD 3.2 for Social Science subjects, KD 3.3 for Citizenship Education subjects and KD 3.8 for Natural Science subjects. The cross-subjects carried out by the author aim that through learning this art, students can simultaneously know all subjects in one meeting.

Based on the problems that have been presented above, the author is interested in trying it out by applying integrated learning type integrated in learning Arts, Culture and Crafts (SBdP), especially dance. this is an effort to overcome the problem of interest and learning outcomes in SBdP learning. Then the title that will be proposed by the author is "Integrated Learning Model with Integrated Type and Its Influence on Student Interests and Learning Outcomes in Learning Arts, Culture and Crafts (SBdP) at SD 104210 Amplas".

Methodology

This study uses a descriptive quantitative research design where the author wants to describe and relate two variables, namely the integrated learning model variable and the variable increasing interest and learning outcomes which in its description use, number, frequency and size.

The population in this research are students of SDN 104210 Amplas. The sample selection in this study was the fifth-grade students, totaling 14 students with a total of 6 male students and 8 female students. The data collection carried out in this study used 2 forms, namely observation and documentation. The observation used by the author is in the form of an observation sheet that is used to observe the learning process by using an integrated type of integrated learning model.

The instruments used in this study were tests and questionnaires. The test used by the author as a supporting instrument aims to see the extent to which student learning outcomes have been implemented after the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model in the form of questions. While the questionnaire used by the author to see whether there is an influence on student interest after the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model by applying the Likert scale.

Finding and Discussion

This research was carried out at SDN 104210 which is one of the educational units with an elementary level at Amplas. UPT SDN 104210 Amplas has its address at Jalan Bangun Setia Pasar III, Percut Sei Tuan District, Amplas Village, Kab. Deli Serdang, North Sumatra. In practice, SDN 104210 Amplas is under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Culture. This school was founded in 1975 until now with C accreditation based on certificate 696/BAP-SM//LL/X/2014 and is a State Unity. At the time of the research, this school was already conducting face-to-face learning. During the research process, learning was carried out twice a week and at the last meeting

once. Although learning is currently taking place face-to-face, teachers and all students continue to adhere to health protocols by wearing masks and maintaining physical distance (phsycal distancing) to prevent the high number of Covid-19 cases that have spread to date.

Before using the Integrated type of integrated learning model, the teacher in the teaching and learning process only used the lecture method. So far, in SBdP learning, especially dance, the teacher only gives assignments without any direction from the teacher. The teacher only focuses on theoretical material sourced from textbooks.

In addition, the learning model applied by the teacher does not include students to be active in learning Arts, Culture and Crafts (SBdP), especially dance. The point is, in the learning process the teacher applies the teacher center learning model in which learning is only centered on the teacher and students are only passive. While what should be student center learning, student-centered learning so that students are actively involved in every learning process. Given that elementary school teachers must master all subject competencies, the teacher's knowledge of SBdP subjects, especially dance, is still lacking.

Pretest Implementation

The implementation of learning activities using an integrated model of the integrated type was carried out for 5 meetings with a time of 2 × 35/meeting. This is done following the suitability of the learning steps that are available in the integrated type of integrated learning model.

Prior to the implementation of learning using an integrated type of integrated model, the first step the author took at the first meeting was to conduct a pretest activity. The pretest aims to find out how the students' initial knowledge in the material that will be delivered by the teacher before the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model. The questions contained in the pretest are in the form of multiple choice with a total of 40 questions that are adjusted to the basic competencies of each selected subject, namely Cultural Arts and Crafts (SBdP), Social Sciences, PPKN and Natural Sciences. Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM) in Art, Culture and Craft (SBdP) subjects with a score of 70. There were 14 students who took part in this pretest.

The results of the pretest show that the average score of students is still below the Minimum Completeness Criteria (KKM), which is a score of 65. This means that the initial ability of students regarding the material to be delivered is still low. The results of the calculation of the pretest data obtained by the fifth-grade students of SDN 104210 Amplas are in the following table:

Table 1. Knowledge Aspect Pretest Results

NO	Student's name	*Pretest*	
		Score	Amount
1.	Alvin	23	57,5
2.	Arsya	25	62,5
3.	Evan	24	60
4.	Grecia	25	62,5
5.	Intan	28	70
6.	Jery	26	65
7.	Kasih	24	60
8.	Marko	29	72,5
9.	Putri	26	65
10.	Sely	26	65
11.	Titania	28	70
12.	Tuppal	27	67,5
13.	Veri Liot	28	70
14.	Wesly	25	62,5
Total		**364**	**910**
Average value		**65**	
Lowest value		**57,5**	
The highest score		**70**	

From the table above, it can be seen that there were 14 students who took part in the pretest activity. The score for each correct answer will be given a weight of 2.5. Therefore, each question answered by students will be multiplied by 2.5. The average value of the pretest of 14 students is 65.

To calculate the average value use the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{amount of data}}{\text{many of data}} = \frac{57{,}5+62{,}5+60+62{,}5\ldots\ldots}{14} = 65$$

In addition to conducting a pretest on the knowledge aspect, the author also conducted a pretest on the skill aspect which will be described below.

Table 2. Skill Aspect Pretest Results

NO	Student's name	*Pretest score*			Average
		Dance Move	Floor Pattern Shape	Position Shift	
	Group 1				
1	Alvin	60	60	60	60
2	Arsya	65	65	62	64
3	Evan	60	65	61	62
4	Grecia	61	63	65	63
5	Intan	65	65	65	65
	Group 2				
6	Jeri	65	65	65	65
7	Kasih	70	67	67	68
8	Marko	65	61	66	64
9	Putra	70	70	70	70
10	Sely	75	62	61	66
	Group 3				
11	Tokas	67	70	70	69
12	Tuppal	60	60	60	60
13	Very Liot	62	65	65	64
14	Wesly	65	65	65	65
Total		**910**	**903**	**902**	**905**
Average value					**64,64**
Lowest value					**60**
The highest score					**70**

From the table above, it can be seen that there are 3 groups divided and each group consists of 4-5 students. The aspects that are seen are dance movements, floor patterns that are applied and the movement of positions made by students. From the table above, it can be seen that the average pretest score of 14 students in the skill aspect is 64.64. The average results are carried out using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{amount of data}}{\text{many of data}} = \frac{60+64+62+63+\cdots}{14} = 64{,}64$$

After the pretest scores were obtained, the last step in this study was a posttest to see student learning outcomes. The following is a posttest assessment which will be explained below.

Table 3. Knowledge Aspect Posttest Results

NO	Student's name	*Pretest*	
		Score	Amount
1	Alvin	31	77,5
2	Arsya	37	92,5
3	Evan	35	87,5
4	Grecia	34	85
5	Intan	32	80
6	Jery	36	90
7	Kasih	32	80
8	Marko	33	82,5
9	Putri	36	90
10	Sely	35	87,5
11	Titania	32	80
12	Tuppal	34	85
13	Veri Liot	35	87,5
14	Wesly	33	82,5
Total		**475**	**1187,5**
Average value		**84,82**	
Lowest value		**77,5**	
The highest score		**92,5**	

From the table above, it can be seen that there were 14 students who took part in the posttest activities. Just like the previous pretest, for each correct answer will be given a weight of 2.5. From these results it can be seen that the average posttest score of 14 students is 84.82. To calculate the average value use the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{amount of data}}{\text{many of data}} = \frac{77{,}5 + 92{,}5 + 87{,}5 + 85 \ldots\ldots}{14} = 84{,}82$$

Table 4. Skill Aspect Posttest Results Table

NO	Student's name	*Posttest Score*			Average
		Dance move	Floor Pattern Shape	Position Shift	
	Group 1				
1	Alvin	81	81	90	84
2	Arsya	90	85	80	85
3	Evan	85	85	85	85
4	Grecia	80	84	85	83
5	Intan	85	90	86	87
	Group 2				
6	Jeri	85	90	86	87
7	Kasih	95	83	80	86
8	Marko	85	83	90	86
9	Putri	90	92	91	91
10	Sely	95	86	86	89
	Group 3				
11	Titania	92	89	89	90
12	Tuppal	85	90	86	87
13	Very Liot	90	90	87	89
14	Wesly	88	88	88	88
Total		**1226**	**1216**	**1209**	**1217**
Average value					**86,92**
Lowest value					**83**
The highest score					**91**

From the table above, it can be seen that there are 3 groups divided and each group consists of 4-5 students. As for the aspects seen in this posttest activity, namely dance movements, floor patterns applied and position changes made by students. Before calculating the average value of the posttest results on the skill aspect, the first step that must be taken is to find the value of each student.

Furthermore, it can be seen that the results of the posttest aspects of skills were carried out in groups. However, the assessment was carried out individually with an average posttest score of 86.92 from 14 students. The average results are carried out using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{amount of data}}{\text{many of data}} = \frac{84+85+85+83+\cdots}{14} = 86{,}92$$

Based on the results of the average pretest and posttest scores that have been calculated from the cognitive and psychomotor aspects, to find out the results of students' abilities and skills in the pretest and posttest activities, it can be done by combining the average scores of each aspect. As for how to calculate it can be done with the following formula:

Calculating the combined score of the pretest (Knowledge and Skill Aspects)

$$= \frac{AP\ Average + AK\ Average}{2}$$

$$= \frac{65+64{,}64}{2}$$

$$= 64{,}82$$

Calculating the combined score of the posttest (Knowledge and Skill Aspects)

$$= \frac{AP\ Average + AK\ Average}{2}$$

$$= \frac{84{,}82+86{,}92}{2}$$

$$= 85{,}87$$

From the acquisition of the average score of the students' pretest and posttest results, there are differences. The difference in value occurs because of the treatment given before and after the pretest, namely in the form of an integrated type of integrated learning model in SBdP learning, especially dance. This can be proven by comparing the average value of the pretest results with the average value of the posttest results and multiplied by 100%, which is as follows:

Student's ability on pretest

%g = average gain of experimental class x 100%

%g = 0.6482 x 100%

%g = 64,82 %

Student's ability on posttest

%g = average gain of experimental class x 100%

%g = 0.8587 x 100%

%g = 85.87%

From the calculation results above, it can be obtained that the difference between the pretest and posttest results is 85.87% - 64.82% = 21.05%. This proves that there is an increase in student learning outcomes by 21.05% after the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model in SBdP learning, especially dance.

Student Affective Assessment

Affective assessment means relating to attitudes and changes that occur in students' self-behavior during the learning process. The affective/attitude assessment process is carried out in an integrated manner in the teaching and learning process which is observed directly by the author with the following indicators:

No	Group	Indikator	Attitude	
			Good	Not good
1	Group 1	Discipline Spirit Cooperation Honest Responsibility	√ √ √ √ √	- - - - -
2	Group 2	Discipline Spirit Cooperation Honest Responsibility	√ √ √ √ √	- - - - -
3	Group 3	Discipline Spirit Cooperation Honest Responsibility	√ √ √ √ √	- - - - -

Student Interest Result Data

The activity of filling out the questionnaire aims to assess how much student interest is before and after the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model. At the first meeting, the assessment of interest was only in the form of interviews with students and teachers. The activity of distributing the interest questionnaire was carried out at the fifth meeting (after the implementation of the integrated integrated model). This learning interest variable data was obtained through a questionnaire consisting of 20 statement questions with four alternative answers filled out by 14 students. This learning interest data is assessed based on 4 indicators, namely feelings of pleasure, interest, student attention, and student involvement. The results of distributing student interest questionnaires at the fifth meeting can be seen as follows:

Table Student Interest After Implemented Integrated Model

No	Name	Indicator																				Total	Criteria
		Feeling happy					Interest					Student Attention					Student Engagement							
1.	Alvin	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	2	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	4	4	76	Very good
2.	Arsya	3	4	4	3	3	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	4	3	65	Good
3.	Evan	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	65	Good
4.	Grecia	4	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	2	4	4	4	3	4	3	4	73	Very good
5.	Intan	3	3	3	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	62	Good
6.	Jery	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	4	71	Very good
7.	Kasih	3	3	4	2	4	3	4	4	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	1	1	2	1	2	53	Good
8.	Marko	4	3	2	3	3	2	3	4	3	2	3	3	1	3	4	1	3	4	1	2	54	Good
9.	Puti	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	72	Very good
10.	Sely	4	4	4	3	4	4	3	3	4	3	3	4	4	3	3	4	4	3	4	4	72	Very good

11.	Titania	2	4	3	3	2	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	1	3	4	60	Good
12.	Tuppal	4	3	2	3	3	3	2	3	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	3	3	4	4	1	58	Good
13.	Very Liot	3	4	4	3	4	4	3	4	4	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	3	4	3	70	Very good
14.	Wesly	4	3	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	4	3	4	3	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	70	Very good

After the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model, there was a significant increase in student interest. This can be seen through the increase in the results obtained by students from each indicator which is greater than in the first meeting from the results of interviews with students and teachers. From these four indicators of interest assessment, it appears that the gains are fairly even for each indicator. This means that all indicators of student interest have increased as a whole.

Based on the calculated data, the normality value of the research data is obtained as follows:

Table Normality test

Tests of Normality						
	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
knowledge pretest	.153	14	.200*	.952	14	.589
knowledge posttest	.151	14	.200*	.953	14	.605
skill pretest	.167	14	.200*	.952	14	.594
skill posttest	.130	14	.200*	.980	14	.972

Based on the results of the normality test that has been carried out using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, the data from the knowledge and skills pretest results and the knowledge and skills posttest results show that (.sig) > 0.05 which indicates that the pretest and posttest knowledge and skills data are normally distributed.

After the normality value is known, then the homogeneity value is calculated. The homogeneity value can be seen in the table below:

Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Pretest	Based on Mean	2.569	1	26	.121
	Based on Median	2.563	1	26	.121
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	2.563	1	24.066	.122
	Based on trimmed mean	2.568	1	26	.121
Test of Homogeneity of Variances					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Posttest	Based on Mean	7.709	1	26	.110
	Based on Median	7.297	1	26	.012
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	7.297	1	20.903	.013
	Based on trimmed mean	7.752	1	26	.010

Data is said to be homogeneous if it has a sig level > 0.05. For the results of the homogeneity test above, it shows that the posttest data has a sig of 0.110, it is known that the value of sig. >0.05

then it can be stated that the posttest data is homogeneous. After the homogeneity value is known, then the correlation value is calculated. The correlation value can be seen in the table below:

Table Correlation

Correlations			
		Learning outcomes	Interest to learn
Learning outcomes	Pearson Correlation	1	.549*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.042
	N	14	14
Interest to learn	Pearson Correlation	.549*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	
	N	14	14
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

Based on the table, the value of r_{count}=0.549 while r_table at =0.05 (N=14) is 0.4973. Because $r_{count} > r_{table}$, H_0 is rejected, which means H_a is accepted, meaning that there is a positive and significant correlation between learning outcomes and student interest in learning. After knowing that the data is normally distributed, then it meets the requirements to perform the t-test as follows:

Table T-Test Table

Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Posttest_Pengetahuan - Pretest_Pengetahuan	19.82143	6.38992	1.70778	16.13200	23.51086	11.607	13	.000
Pair 2	Posttest_Keterampilan - Pretest_Keterampilan	22.28571	2.19890	.58768	21.01611	23.55532	37.921	13	.000

It is known that if the value of |t count| > t table then Ho is rejected and H_a is accepted. And if, the value of |t count| < t table then Ho is accepted while Ha is rejected. Based on the t table, it can be seen that the t table value for the pretest and posttest knowledge with df = 13 and = 0.05 is 2.16037. Because t count > t table, which is 11.607 > 2.16037, it can be concluded that H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted. While the value of t table for pretest and posttest skills with df = 13 and = 0.05 is 2.16037. Because $t_{count} > t_{table}$, which is 21.016 > 2.16037, it can be concluded that H_o is rejected and H_a is accepted. So, it can be concluded that between the results of the pretest and posttest there was an increase in aspects of students' knowledge and skills in SBdP learning at SDN 104210 Amplas using an integrated learning model of the integrated type. From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the integrated type of integrated learning model has an effect on students' interest and learning outcomes in SBdP learning at SDN 104210 Amplas.

Conclusion

The SBdP learning process for fifth grade students at SDN 104210 using the integrated type of integrated learning model was carried out for 4 meetings. At the first meeting, pretests and interviews were conducted with students and teachers regarding students' interest in learning in order to see how big the students' initial abilities were in SBdP learning and 3 other cross lessons. The second to the fourth meeting of the learning process using an integrated type of integrated learning model by integrating SBdP learning with PPKN, science and social studies learning. Furthermore, at the fifth meeting, a posttest was carried out and the distribution of questionnaire

sheets to see how far the development of student learning outcomes and interests after the implementation of the integrated type of integrated learning model.

Based on the results of research and discussion on the integrated type of integrated learning model and its effect on interest and learning outcomes in SBdP learning, especially dance in class V at SDN 104210 Amplas, the average value of the pretest results was 64.82% while the average value of the results posttest obtained by 85.87%. From the results of these percentages, it can be seen that there was an increase of 21.05%. Through calculations with t test shows that the value of t table for pretest and posttest knowledge with df = 13 and = 0.05 is 2.16037. Because t count > t table, which is 11.607 > 2.16037, it can be concluded that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. While the value of t table for pretest and posttest skills with df = 13 and = 0.05 is 2.16037. Because t count > t table, which is 21.016 > 2.16037, it can be concluded that Ho is rejected and Ha is accepted. Furthermore, based on the correlation test, the value of r_{count} = 0.549 while r_{table} at = 0.05 (N=14) is 0.4973. Because $r_{count} > r_{table}$ then H_0 is rejected which means H_a is accepted, meaning that there is a positive and significant correlation between learning outcomes and student interest in learning

The results of the accepted hypothesis in this study indicate that Ha is accepted which indicates that there is an effect of the integrated type of integrated learning model on students interests and learning outcomes in learning Arts, Culture and Crafts (SBdP). Through the overall assessment results, SBdP learning using the integrated type of integrated learning model can increase student interest and learning outcomes at SDN 104210 Amplas.

Suggestion

For researchers, the results of the research are used as experience to be applied in the world of work later as well as learning to add knowledge to SBdP learning, especially dance. For teachers, this learning model can be used as a reference in learning so that students' interest and learning outcomes can increase.

References

Arikunto, Suharsimi. 2006. *Research Procedures a Practical Approach*. Jakarta: Asdi Mahasatya.

Djamarah, Syaiful Bahri. 2011. *Learning Psychology.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Fogarty, R. 2009. *How to Integrate the Curricula Third Edition, Thousand Oaks.* CA: Corwin.

Hamalik, Oemar. 2008. *Curriculum and Learning.* Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.

Karli Hilda and Margaretha. 2002. *Implementation of Competency-Based Curriculum* 2, Bandung: Information Media Development.

Kusumastuti, Eny. 2014. Application of Integrated Dance Learning Model for Elementary School Students: *Journal of Elementary School Pulpit*, Vol 1, No 1 (page 12), Semarang: Semarang State University.

Latino. 2011. *Experimental Psychology.* Malang: UMM Press.

Marleni, Lucy. 2016. Factors Affecting Student Interest in Class VIII SMP Negeri 1 Bangkinang, *Journal of Mathematics Education,* Vol 1, No 1 (page 150). Bangkinang: Tuanku Tambusai Hero University.

Nana, Sudjana. 2009. *Assessment of Teaching and Learning Outcomes.* Bandung: Rosdakarya Youth.Regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture Number 21 of 2016 concerning Content Standards for Primary and Secondary Education.

Purwanto, Ngalim. 2014. *Educational Psychology.* Bandung: PT Pemuda Rosdakarya.

Setiani, Ani and Donni Juni Priansa. 2015. *Student Management and Learning Models.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Simbolon, Naeklan. 2014. Factors Affecting Student Interest in Learning: Elementary School *Journal Pgsd Fip Unimed,* Vol 1, No 2 (page 16). Medan: Medan State University.

Slamet. 2013. *Learning and Factors Affecting It.* Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Sugiyono. 20155. *Research and Development Methodology.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Tirtoni, Feri. 2018. *Integrated Learning in Elementary Schools.* Sidoarjo: Umsida Press.

Trianto. 2014. *Integrated Learning Models, Concepts and Strategies in Its Implementation in KTSP*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.

Ubabuddin. 2019. The Nature of Learning and Learning in Elementary Schools in the Educational Journal, Vol V, No 1 (page 19), Sambas: Muhammad Syafiuddin Sambas Islamic Institute.

Zukira, Abduh H. Harun, and Jamaludin Jamaludin. 2013. Improving the Learning Outcomes of Third Grade Students of Alkhairaat Towera Elementary School through the Number Head Together (NHT) Cooperative Learning Model in Civics Subjects in the Online Creative Journal, Vol 3, No 4 (page 2). Palu: Tadulako University.

Zulkifli, Muhammad, Syamsu Syamsu, and Sahrul Saehana. 2016. Application of the Integrated Learning Model to Measure Student Learning Outcomes at SMP Negeri 3 Palu, *Journal of Physics Education Tadulako Online*, Vol 4, No 1 (page 46). Palu: Tadulako University.