

Comparative Study of Learning Outcomes Between the Application of the Seminar Method and the Preparatory Assignment Method in History LearningKhoirul Anwar¹**Abstract**

This is a comparative study of two methods of learning: the experimental method and the method of assignment preparation seminar. The purpose of this study was to determine the learning outcomes of students who were taught by both methods, as well as to know the difference between the methods of implementation of tasks and methods of preparation seminar. The approach of this research is to experimentally study the entire population of students in class XI IPS SMA 3 Demak, while the sample taken is class 1 and class XI IPS 3. Study results indicate that a class of students who were taught using seminars obtained better results than the class taught by the method of preparation tasks, although both performed equally well. This study suggests that Learners need to be encouraged to be active participants in learning; seminar methods and preparation task methods can be applied in teaching history to make students active in education.

Keywords: *Comparison of Learning Outcomes, Methods Seminar, Methods Preparation Tasks*

Introduction

Learning is a system that aims to teach students. The learning process is a series of activities that involve various components. Several factors influence the learning system, including teacher factors and student factors. Teachers are a determining component in implementing learning (Martinis, 2007; Sodiq et al., 2014; Ainina, 2014). History teachers do not only act as models or role models for students in learning. History teachers are also one of many sources of knowledge (Sa'diyah, 2012; Mawaddah, 2014).

Students have a significant role in learning in general. The criteria for learning success cannot be measured by the extent to which students have mastered the material taught by the teacher but rather by the extent to which students have carried out the learning process (Aman, 2012; Roini, 2013; Tandibadoang, 2015). Today's students are no longer considered learning objects that can be regulated and limited by the teacher's wishes; instead, they are placed as learning subjects who develop according to their interests and potential. Research on learning approaches that are centered on student activities was carried out in this thesis research. This was done because of a paradigm shift in history learning.

¹Teacher of History, SMA 3 Demak, anwark@gmail.com

In this research, comparative research was carried out on learning outcomes between the application of two learning methods, namely the seminar method and the preparatory assignment method. A seminar is an activity that discusses a particular topic which is attended by a group of people. In seminars, all participants are involved to jointly discuss the main problem and ultimately solve the problem. This activity relies on the active participation of participants, in the process there is intensive and systematic two-way communication because there are rules that must be implemented (Leo Agung, 2012)

Classroom learning often applies the discussion method in its implementation. Seminars are basically not much different from discussions, but they are packaged in a different format. This can be seen in the number of participants present and the rules that apply. The similarity between seminars and discussions is that both discuss a particular problem to find a solution or solution to the problem. This method of giving assignments is often used by teachers in history learning. In this method, the teacher provides various types of class work related to the learning of a subject. The tasks in question can be in the form of homework, discussions, observations, and so on.

Preparatory tasks are tasks given by teachers to students in order to prepare topics or subjects in history subjects that will be studied at the next meeting. In the delivery, the teacher will provide puzzles or questions related to the subject matter at the next meeting. Preparatory tasks can be categorized as homework that must be completed by students. In this way, students have equipped themselves through preparatory tasks given by the teacher (Umasih, 2012; Musadad, 2014). The seminar method and preparatory assignment method are several alternative methods that can be applied to optimize history learning. Both methods refer to learning that approaches student activities and optimizes the teacher's role in learning. Research on these two methods has never been carried out in depth so far. In this regard, the authors examined the comparison of history learning outcomes between the use of the seminar method and the preparatory assignment method for class XI IPS students at SMA Negeri 3 Demak.

Barnadib (in Jalaluddin and Idi, 2007:92) states that progressivism requires progressive education. The aim of education should be defined as the continuous reconstruction of experience. Education is not just conveying knowledge to students, but the most important thing is training the ability to think scientifically. All of this is done by education so that people can and experience progress, so that people will be able to act intelligently in accordance with the demands of the environment.

The practice of humanistic education was not much different from progressive education during the first half of the 1900s. Humanistic educators are the successors of the ideas of

progressive education. The main focus in humanistic education is affective learning outcomes, learning about ways of learning (*learning how to learn*), and increase creativity and all the potential of all students. Humanistic education experts believe that every individual child has virtues that come from within and are realistic (Anni, 2007:90; Firmansyah et al, 2015; Suryani, 2013).

Learning outcomes in a humanistic view are students' ability to take responsibility for determining what is learned and become individuals who are able to direct themselves and be independent. The humanistic approach also views the importance of educational approaches in the areas of creativity, interest in art, and curiosity. Humanistic learning in practice combines individual and small group learning methods. Humanistic learning requires a change in the teacher's status from an individual who is more knowledgeable and skilled in everything to an individual who has equal status with students. Learning is a vehicle for students to carry out self-actualization, so teachers must build this tendency and organize the class so that students come into contact with meaningful events (Anni, 2007: 91; Lionar, 2013; Ahmad, 2013).

Reconstructionism comes from the word *reconstruct* which means to rearrange. Reconstructionism is a movement that seeks to overhaul the old order and build a modern structure of cultural life (Jalaluddin et al, 2007: 118). This school was pioneered by George Count and Harold Rugg in 1930. They intended to build a new society, a society that was considered appropriate and fair. Progressivism and perennialism are two currents that underlie reconstructionism. The factor in the emergence of reconstructionism was the emergence of crises in various areas of modern life at that time. This can be seen in the current situation where culture has been disrupted by destruction, confusion and confusion, as well as in the world of education which is also experiencing a crisis (Darwati, 2011; Andamarry, 2015; Pramono, 2012).

Cooperative learning is a learning concept that includes all types of group work, including forms that are more teacher-led or teacher-directed. In general, cooperative learning is considered more teacher-directed, where the teacher sets tasks and questions that provide materials and information designed to help students solve the problem in question. Teachers usually determine a certain form of examination at the end of the assignment (Muijs et al, 2008: 89). In line with Muijs and Reynolds, Riyanto (2010:267) states that cooperative learning is learning designed to teach academic skills, as well as social and social skills. *interpersonal skill*. Anni (2007:5) stated that learning outcomes are changes in behavior that learners obtain after experiencing learning activities. Behavioral changes that must be achieved by learners after carrying out learning activities are formulated in learning objectives (Sanjaya, 2006;

Putro, 2012; Ishaqro, 2013). Gerlach and Ely (in Anni, 2007: 5), state that learning objectives are a description of the desired behavior change or a product description that shows that learning has occurred. Methods are methods used to implement plans that have been prepared in actual activities so that the goals that have been prepared are achieved optimally. Methods in a series of learning systems play an essential role. The success of implementing learning strategies really depends on how the teacher uses learning methods.

Method

This research approach is experimental research which aims to determine cause and effect relationships *causal effect relationship* between variables. Population is a generalization area consisting of objects/subjects that have the quality of certain characteristics determined by the researcher to be studied and then conclusions drawn (Sugiyono, 2009: 117). The population in this study was all students in Class XI IPS SMA Negeri 3 Demak, totaling 122 students. The consideration for determining class The sample is part of the number and characteristics possessed by a population (Sugiyono, 2009:118). Based on groups of students which are divided into several classes, samples will be taken from groups of students consisting of two classes. The two sample classes will be divided into experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. The two experimental groups will be the subjects of this research, each of whom will be treated with the application of the seminar method and the preparatory task method. The sampling technique in this research uses *cluster sampling* or group sampling technique. Data collection tools in this research are written tests, observation sheets, interview guides.

Results and Discussion

Comparative Study of Learning Outcomes Between the Application of the Seminar Method and the Preparatory Assignment Method in History Learning

Learning history is an essential aspect of education to understand past events and their impact on the present. In this learning process, the teaching methods used can have a significant influence on students' understanding and learning achievement. Two methods that are often used in teaching history are the seminar method and the preparatory assignment method. These two methods have different approaches but aim to achieve a deep understanding of historical material.

1. Seminar Method

The seminar method is a learning approach that emphasizes discussion and interaction between teachers and students, as well as between students themselves. In the context of history

learning, this method usually involves presenting material by the teacher or presentations from students who have prepared a particular topic. The discussions that ensue allow students to deepen their understanding through the exchange of ideas, analysis, and reflection together.

2. Preparatory Task Method

Meanwhile, the preparatory task method requires students to prepare specific material before meeting in the learning session. This material can take the form of reading texts, watching videos, or conducting independent research on the historical topic to be discussed. After preparing assignments, students then present their results in front of the class or hold structured discussions to discuss their findings.

3. Comparative Studies

A number of studies have been conducted to compare the effectiveness of these two methods in improving student learning outcomes, especially in the context of history learning. Study results often show that:

a. Deep Understanding:

The seminar method tends to provide greater opportunities for students to gain a deeper understanding. Discussions between students and with teachers help students to see various perspectives and sharpen their analytical skills.

b. Presentation Skills Development:

The preparatory assignment method often helps develop students' presentation and communication skills. Students have to formulate and convey their ideas orally to classmates and teachers.

c. Motivation and Engagement:

These two methods can influence students' motivation levels and involvement in learning. The seminar method that relies on active discussion can increase students' motivation to learn through social interaction. On the other hand, students who prefer to study independently may be more engaged with the preparatory task method.

d. Influence of Cultural Context:

The effectiveness of each method can also be influenced by the cultural context in which learning takes place. Some cultures may favor collaborative approaches such as seminars, while others lean more towards independent learning such as preparatory assignments.

e. Recommendations for Learning Practices

The findings from this comparative study demonstrate the importance of considering students' needs and preferences and the learning context in choosing appropriate learning methods. Combining these two methods in learning history can provide a more diverse and

comprehensive learning experience for students and prepare them to face various intellectual challenges in the future.

Thus, further research and practical experiments in applying these two methods can continue to provide new insights to improve the quality of history learning in educational environments. The descriptive analysis of the learning outcomes of experimental class 1 included collecting, compiling, arranging, processing, and simply presenting data. In this analysis, the central tendency/central tendency of the data is measured. Central tendency measurement is the average value of a data set in the form of numbers, which generally tends to be around the central point of the data distribution. Three central tendencies regarding learning outcomes reviewed in this research are mean, median, and mode. Apart from central tendency, the level of completeness of students who obtained the lowest and highest scores in the learning outcome group will be reviewed.

In experimental class 1, 40 students were registered as class XI IPS 3 SMA Negeri 3 Demak members. Results *post-test* show that the average value of experimental class 1 is 75.55, with the highest value 92 and the lowest 61. The middle/median value of the results *post-test* experimental class 1 was 77, scoring 81. The percentage of learning completion for experimental class 1 with a KKM of 75 (according to the KTSP SMA N 3 Demak) was 72.50%, with details for 29 students who completed and 11 who did not.

The descriptive analysis of the learning outcomes of experimental class 2 included collecting, compiling, arranging, processing, and simply presenting data. In this analysis, the central tendency/central tendency of the data is measured. Central tendency measurement is the average value of a set of data in the form of numbers, which generally tends to be around the central point of distribution of the number of data. Three central tendencies regarding learning outcomes reviewed in this research are mean, median, and mode. Apart from the central tendency, students' level of completeness will be reviewed, as well as the lowest and highest scores obtained in the learning outcome groups.

In experimental class 2, 38 students were registered as class XI IPS 3 SMA Negeri 3 Demak members. Results *post-test* show that the average value of experimental class 2 is 74.03, with the highest value 87 and the lowest 60. The middle or median value of the results *post-test* experimental class 2 is 75, with a score of 67. The percentage of learning completion for experimental class 2 with a KKM of 75 (according to KTSP SMA N 3 Demak) is 52.63%, with details of 20 completed and 18 students who did not. The learning outcomes in this research were obtained after treatment was given to experimental group 1 and experimental group 2. Experimental group 1 (class XI IPS 3) was given treatment using the seminar method, and

experimental group 2 (class XI IPS 1) was given treatment application of preparatory tasks in history learning. The learning results of the two groups who received the treatment were then analyzed to compare the two. The count shows a figure of 2.18, while the table shows a result of 1.67 because $2.18 > 1.67$, then H_0 is rejected. The count value, which is located in the H_0 rejection area, gives rise to the conclusion that experimental group 1 is better than experimental group 2, or in other words, students who were taught using the seminar method showed better learning outcomes than students who were taught using the preparatory task method, In history learning.

Conclusion

The results of studying history for experimental class 1 (class XI IPS 3) show the average score *post-test* amounting to 77.55 with the highest score of 92 and the lowest score of 61. The percentage of students' learning completion reached 72.50%. Class XI IPS 1 could hold a history class seminar without significant obstacles. Students feel they have found new learning experiences through the seminar method and hope there will be new things in organizing history learning. The results of studying history for experimental class 2 (class XI IPS 1) show the average score *post-test* amounting to 74.03 with the highest score of 87 and the lowest score of 60. The percentage of students' learning completion reached 52.63. The preparatory assignment method in history learning is not much different from homework.

The difference between preparatory assignments and homework is the systematization of the material used in future learning. Students have been able to carry out the preparatory assignment method well because of their ability to utilize the results of these assignments in learning. Students' history learning taught using the seminar method and the preparatory assignment method is the same as prepared and carried out as well as possible, but the results show significant differences. Students' history learning using the seminar method shows better learning outcomes than those taught using the preparatory task method. The count shows several 2.18, while the table shows a result of 1.67 because $2.18 > 1.67$, and H_0 is rejected. The count value is located in the H rejection area, which concluded that experimental group 1 was better than experimental group 2.

The suggestions put forward in this research are as follows: (1) History teachers should change the teaching paradigm from the previous activity of delivering material to setting up the learning environment; (2) Students need to be more encouraged to become active participants in learning; (3) The seminar method and preparatory assignment method can be applied in history learning to make students active in learning; (4) The seminar method and preparatory

assignment method still require further research to improve various aspects relating to preparation, implementation and afterward.

Reference

- Ahmad, T. A. (2014). Kendala Guru dalam Internalisasi Nilai Karakter pada Pembelajaran Sejarah. *Khazanah Pendidikan*, 7(1).
- Ainina, I. A. (2014). Pemanfaatan media audio visual sebagai sumber pembelajaran sejarah. *Indonesian journal of history education*, 3(1).
- Aman, A. (2012). Pengembangan model evaluasi program pembelajaran sejarah di sma. *Jurnal Penelitian Dan Evaluasi Pendidikan*, 16(2), 437-456.
- Andamarry, W. T. (2015). Strategi Pembelajaran Sejarah Kebudayaan Islam {Study Kasus Di Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs) Al-Ma'arif Tulungagung}.
- Darwati, D. (2011). Pemanfaatan Buku Teks oleh Guru dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah: Studi Kasus Di Sma Negeri Kabupaten Semarang. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 21(1).
- Fimansyah, W., & Kumalasari, D. (2015). Penanaman nilai-nilai nasionalisme melalui pembelajaran sejarah di SMA Kebangsaan Yogyakarta. *ISTORIA Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Ilmu Sejarah*, 11(1).
- Ishaqro, A. H. (2013). *Analisis Pembelajaran sejarah di pondok Pesantren Al-Muayyad Surakarta (Studi kasus Kelas X SMA Al-Muayyad Surakarta)* (Doctoral dissertation, UNS (Sebelas Maret University)).
- Leo Agung, S. (2012). Pengembangan model pembelajaran sejarah sma berbasis pendidikan karakter di solo raya. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 18(4), 412-426.
- Lionar, U. (2013). Peran Guru Sejarah Dalam Pendidikan Nilai: Suatu Refleksi. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Program Studi Pendidikan Sejarah se-Indonesia: Kajian Muatan dan Posisi Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di Kurikulum* (pp. 81-90).
- Martinis Y. (2007). *Kiat Memberlajarkan Peserta didik*. Ja- karta: Gaung Persada Press.
- Mawaddah, R. (2014). Membongkar Antikuarianisme dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah Kebudayaan Islam. *TADRIS: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 9(1), 132-152.
- Muijs, D. Dan Reynolds, D. (2008). *Effective Teaching*. London, Penerjemah. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Musadad, A. A. (2015). Model Manajemen Pembelajaran Sejarah Terintegrasi Pendidikan Multikultural untuk Membangun Wawasan Kebangsaan. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 25(2), 247-260.

- Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 22 Tahun 2006 tentang Standar Isi untuk Satuan Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah.
- Pramono, S. E. (2012). Perbaikan kesalahan konsep pembelajaran sejarah melalui metode pemecahan masalah dan diskusi. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 22(2).
- Putro, H. P. N. (2012). Model Pembelajaran Sejarah Untuk Meningkatkan Kesadaran Sejarah Melalui pendekatan Inkuiri. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 22(2).
- Riyanto, Y. (2010). *Paradigma Baru Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Roini, C. (2013). Analisis Perencanaan Pembelajaran Genetika Berpendekatan Konsep Pada Perangkat Pembelajaran Buatan Guru SMA Se-Kota Ternate. In *Proceeding Biology Education Conference: Biology, Science, Enviromental, and Learning* (Vol. 10, No. 1).
- Sa'diyah, H. (2012). *Implementasi kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan pada mata pelajaran sejarah dengan sistem kredit semester di SMA Negeri 2 Malang tahun ajaran 2011/2012* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Negeri Malang).
- Sanjaya, W. (2006). *Strategi Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Sodiq, I., Suryadi, A., & Ahmad, T. A. (2014). Program guru menulis: upaya peningkatan kompetensi profesional guru sejarah dalam penulisan karya ilmiah di Kabupaten Semarang. *Rekayasa: Jurnal Penerapan Teknologi dan Pembelajaran*, 12(1), 42-47.
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Suryani, N. (2013). Pengembangan model internalisasi nilai karakter dalam pembelajaran sejarah melalui model value clarification technique. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 23(2).
- Tandibadoang, L. (2015). *Evaluasi Program Pembelajaran Sejarah di SMA Negeri 1 Sesean Kabupaten Toraja Utara* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Negeri Makassar).
- Umasih, U. (2012). Evaluasi Pembelajaran Sejarah Pada Sma Negeri Di Dki Jakarta. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 22(2).

