

**THE IMPACT OF THE 2013 CURRICULUM AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE ON LEARNING OUTCOMES ISLAMIC RELIGIOUS EDUCATION (Experimental Study On Fourth Grade Students Of Sekolah Dasar Negeri Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, East Jakarta)**

By

**Laela Sari**

Universitas Ibnu Chaldun

Email: [umifai.laelasari@gmail.com](mailto:umifai.laelasari@gmail.com)

**ABSTRACT**

This study aims to test this hypothesis is 1) Student learning outcomes are taught with the model of learning curriculum 2013 is higher than the learners who are taught with the model of curriculum learning unit level education (KTSP) in the subjects of Islamic Religious Education. 2) There is an interaction effect between the learning model and the emotional intelligence of learners on the learning outcomes in the subjects of Islamic Religious Education. 3) The result of Islamic education learning of learners who have high emotional intelligence is higher if taught using the model of curriculum lesson 2013 than the learners who were taught using the learning model of educational unit curriculum (KTSP). 4) The result of Islamic education learning on the students who have low emotional intelligence is lower if taught by using the model of curriculum lesson 2013 than the learners who were taught using the learning model of educational unit curriculum (KTSP). This research is using experimental method. Target population is all students of public primary school Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, East Jakarta. Affordable population in this research is the students of grade IV of elementary school Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, East Jakarta consisting of 2 classes and totaling 56 students, as well as a sample of research with a simple random sampling technique based on factorial design group so selected students. This study yielded two main conclusions, namely: 1) Learning outcomes of learners who were taught with the 2013 curriculum learning model ( $x = 83,24$ ) the same as learners who were taught with the educational unit curriculum learning model (KTSP) ( $x = 82, 24$ ) in the subject of Islamic education. 2) There is no interaction effect between learning model and emotional intelligence on learning outcomes in Islamic education subject. Because in the second hypothesis there is no interaction then the presentation of the third and fourth hypotheses is not required. Based on these findings it can be concluded that there is no difference in Islamic learning outcomes that are taught by using the curriculum model of 2013 and KTSP. And there is no interaction between the 2013 curriculum learning model with emotional intelligence on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education.

**Keywords:** Curriculum 2013, KTSP, Emotional Intelligence, Learning Model, Learning Outcomes

**PENGARUH PENGGUNAAN MODEL PEMBELAJARAN KURIKULUM 2013**

## DAN KECERDASAN EMOSIONAL TERHADAP HASIL BELAJAR PENDIDIKAN AGAMA ISLAM (Studi Eksperimen pada Siswa kelas IV Sekolah Dasar Negeri Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, Jakarta Timur)

### ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji hipotesis ini adalah 1) Hasil belajar siswa yang diajar dengan model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 lebih tinggi dari pada peserta didik yang diajarkan dengan model pembelajaran kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) dalam mata pelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam. 2) Terdapat pengaruh interaksi antara model pembelajaran dan kecerdasan emosional peserta didik terhadap hasil belajar pada mata pelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam. 3) Hasil belajar pendidikan agama Islam peserta didik yang memiliki kecerdasan emosional tinggi lebih tinggi jika diajarkan menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 dari pada peserta didik yang diajar menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP). 4) Hasil belajar pendidikan agama Islam pada peserta didik yang memiliki kecerdasan emosional rendah lebih rendah jika diajar dengan menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 dari pada peserta didik yang diajar menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP). Penelitian ini menggunakan metode eksperimen. Populasi target adalah seluruh siswa sekolah dasar negeri Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, Jakarta Timur. Populasi terjangkau dalam penelitian ini adalah peserta didik kelas IV sekolah dasar negeri Jatinegara Kaum 05 Pulogadung, Jakarta Timur yang terdiri dari 2 kelas dan berjumlah 56 peserta didik, sekaligus sebagai sampel penelitian dengan teknik sampling acak sederhana berdasarkan factorial group desain sehingga terpilih peserta didik. Hasil penelitian ini yaitu : 1) Hasil belajar peserta didik yang diajar dengan menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 ( $x = 83,24$ ) sama dengan peserta didik yang diajar dengan menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum tingkat satuan pendidikan (KTSP) ( $x = 82,24$ ) dalam mata pelajaran pendidikan agama Islam. 2) Tidak terdapat pengaruh interaksi antara model pembelajaran dan kecerdasan emosional terhadap hasil belajar dalam mata pelajaran pendidikan agama Islam. Karena pada hipotesis kedua tidak ada interaksi maka penyajian hipotesis ketiga dan keempat tidak diperlukan. Berdasarkan temuan tersebut dapat diambil kesimpulan bahwa tidak ada perbedaan hasil belajar pendidikan agama Islam yang diajar dengan menggunakan model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 dan KTSP. Dan tidak terdapat interaksi antara model pembelajaran kurikulum 2013 dengan kecerdasan emosional terhadap hasil belajar pendidikan agama Islam.

**Kata Kunci:** Kurikulum 2013, KTSP, Kecerdasan Emosional, Model Pembelajaran, Hasil Belajar.

### INTRODUCTION

Education according to the National Education System Act is a conscious and planned effort to create a learning atmosphere and learning process so that students actively develop their potential to have religious spiritual strength, self-control, personality, intelligence, noble character, and skills necessary for themselves, society, nation and state. Objective of National Education No. 20 Article 3 on the National Education System explains that; National Education

serves to develop the ability and form a dignified character and civilization in order to educate the life of the nation, aims to develop the potential of students to become people who believe and fear God Almighty, Noble, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent and become democratic and responsible citizens.

Education has a system that regulates the process of teaching and learning activities that we are familiar with the curriculum. According to law No.20 of 2003 (Chapter 1, Article 1 Paragraph 19) the national education system states that the curriculum is a set of plans and arrangements regarding the objectives, content and materials of the lesson as well as the means used as guidelines for the implementation of learning activities to achieve certain goals. Curriculum changes are an integral part of the curriculum itself, that the applicable curriculum must continue to improve by prioritizing the needs of students and improving the quality of education in Indonesia. The government also continues to improve the quality of education in Indonesia by carrying out various reforms in the field of education, including by issuing Minister of education regulation no.22 on content standards for Primary and Secondary Education Units. And Regulation No. 23 on graduate Competency Standards for primary and Secondary Education Units. The government also issued Minister of education regulation no.24 of 2006 for the implementation of the regulation.

The three regulations above contain several important things including that the basic and Secondary Education Unit develops and sets the curriculum of the basic and Secondary Education Unit Level which is then known as the Education unit level curriculum (KTSP). In KTSP, the curriculum structure developed includes three components, namely subjects, local content and self-development. Education unit level curriculum (KTSP) is an operational curriculum that is prepared and implemented by each unit. KTSP is basically a Competency-Based Curriculum (KBK) developed by the Education Unit based on content standards (SI) and graduate competency standards (SKL), SK and KD contained in the SI which is a refinement of the SK and KD contained in the competency-based curriculum (KBK) curriculum 2004. While the curriculum that is still going on today in Indonesia is the KTSP curriculum and is in the stage of refinement and socialization towards the 2013 curriculum in every school, from elementary to high school. The transition of curriculum from KTSP to curriculum 2013 is as a

refinement of the previous curriculum and to improve the competence of students in facing the challenges of globalization with increasingly sophisticated communication technology.

Understanding of Islamic Religious Education is a conscious and planned effort in preparing students to know, understand, appreciate, to believe, fear and noble character in practicing the teachings of Islam from the main source of the Holy Book of the Qur'an and Hadith through guidance, teaching, training and the use of experience. Similarly, the purpose of Islamic Religious Education, which includes moral subjects to form students into people who believe and fear God Almighty and noble character. Noble character includes ethics, ethics, or morals as the embodiment of religious education. The limited number of hours of Islamic religious education lessons in the classroom, it is not possible for teachers to provide religious education materials in detail to students, then teachers of Islamic religious education are expected to be able to develop their creativity in innovative learning in order to develop the potential of students and good morals in Islamic religious education subjects in particular, and be able to create and control classes to remain conducive and fun when the teaching and learning process takes place.

A phenomenon that now exists both in the school environment and outside of school, there are still many students who have negative behavior disorders such as happy to hurt their friends, lying, lack of discipline, lack of responsibility both in learning and in all daily activities. Many factors that affect the students have a tendency to behave negatively, that's where the researchers wanted to know whether it is getting used to character education to students in all subjects at school, although character education is not only instilled in the lessons of Islamic education alone.

Based on the above, the main problems in this study are (1) is there a difference between the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP)? (2) is there an influence of interaction between learning models and emotional intelligence on student learning outcomes in Islamic education learning in elementary schools in general? (3) are there differences in the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and that uses the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP) on students who have high emotional intelligence? (4) are there differences in the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and that uses the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP) on students who have low emotional intelligence?

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study aims to reveal and obtain a set of understanding of knowing, as follows: (1) differences in learning outcomes between Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP); (2) the effect of interaction between learning models and emotional intelligence on student learning outcomes in Islamic religious education learning; (3) differences in the learning outcomes of

Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and that uses the Higher Education Unit curriculum learning model (KTSP) on students who have high emotional intelligence; (4) differences in the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that uses the 2013 curriculum learning model and that uses the Higher Education Unit curriculum learning model (KTSP) on students who have low emotional intelligence.

This research will be conducted at Sekolah Dasar Negeri Jatinegara Kaum 05, academic year 2017 - 2018 which is located at Jl. Land Koja II RW.02 Jatinegara Kaum, Pulogadung, East Jakarta. Adapaun research activities carried out in stages, namely in the early stages, the study conducted preparations carried out in October 2017, until the final stage of preparation of reporting in February 2018.

The type of research method used is experimental. Experimental type of research is research that is intended to determine whether there is a result of “something” on the subject of research. According to Sugiyono, experimental research can be interpreted as a research method used to find the effect of certain treatments on others under controlled conditions.

Experimental research tries to examine the presence or absence of influence between one variable with another. The trick is to compare one or more experimental groups that are given treatment with one or more comparison groups that do not receive treatment.

The design used in this type of research experimental method is Factorial Group Design two categories or factorial 2 X 2. Sugiyono stated that the factorial design is a modification of the true experimental design, namely by considering the possibility of a moderator variable that affects the treatment (independent variable) to the results (dependent variable).

The dependent variable is the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education, while the independent variable is the 2013 curriculum learning model with emotional intelligence as a moderator variable. Learning model factor (A) consists of curriculum learning model 2013 (A<sub>1</sub>) and KTSP learning model (a<sub>2</sub>), while the emotional intelligence factor (B) consists of high emotional intelligence (B<sub>1</sub>) and low emotional intelligence (B<sub>2</sub>). The design of the study can be seen in the table below

Table 3.2  
 Treatment design based on 2 X 2 levels

Model Pembelajaran (A)	Kurikulum 2013 (A <sub>1</sub> )	KTS (A <sub>2</sub> )
	Kecerdasan Emosional (B)	
Kecerdasan Emosional Tinggi (B <sub>1</sub> )	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub>
Kecerdasan Emosional Rendah (B <sub>2</sub> )	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub>

### **Sampling techniques and Research population.**

Arikunto argued that the population is the whole subject of research. In this study the population is all students of SDN Jatinegara Kaum 05, District Pulogadung, East Jakarta which consists of 12 classes (Grade 1 s/d Grade 6) with a total of 370 students. While the Affordable population in this study is Class IV which amounted to 2 classes of 56 learners. Sampling techniques, Arikunto states that the sample is a part or representative of the population under study. Sampling technique in this study is a random sampling technique. sampling in a random way because the characteristics of the population are homogeneous. It is said to be homogeneous because everyone gets the same teaching materials, curriculum, and environment. Decision made to determine learners who have intelligence high emotional and learners who have low emotional intelligence. The sample taken was Class IV from a 2-class population. Consideration of researchers to take samples of Class IV is because in accordance with the purpose of research to examine Class IV in order to improve the learning outcomes of Class IV and prepare for the next class. To determine the level of emotional intelligence of learners, researchers conducted the following ways :

1. Carrying out emotional intelligence tests on all students in experimental and control classes using emotional intelligence tests that have been tested for validity in other classes besides experimental and control classes. The results of emotional intelligence tests in the experimental class and the control class were then combined and averaged. Furthermore, separately the results of the emotional intelligence test in the experimental class and the control class are arranged sequentially based on scores from the highest to the lowest value.
2. Determination of the High group for learners who have high emotional intelligence and low emotional intelligence respectively taken 40%, after the value is sorted from the test participants. Groups of 20% of students who received high scores and low scores (between high emotional intelligence and low emotional intelligence) were not included in the analysis of the study. However, students who are not included in the object of the study still receive the same services as students who are subjects of research both in the experimental class and in the control class.

This study provides treatment in learning through two curriculum learning models, namely the 2013 curriculum learning model and the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP) which will show how the learning outcomes of students in Islamic religious education learning after receiving such treatment. In each class there are groups that have high emotional intelligence and low emotional intelligence. Thus there are 4 groups, namely: (1) students who use the 2013 curriculum learning model and who have high emotional intelligence; (2) students who use the 2013 curriculum learning model and who have low emotional intelligence; (3) students who use the education unit level curriculum learning model

(KTSP) and who have high emotional intelligence; (4) students who use the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP) and who have low emotional intelligence.

Data collection techniques in this study using tests and questionnaires. Tests were used to measure the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education and questionnaires were used to measure learners in emotional intelligence.

#### a. Instrument Calibration

Validity (validity) and reliability (reliability) to test the items of learning instruments Islamic religious education subjects used in this study.

#### 1) The Validity Of The Item

Validity is a measure that shows the levels of validity or validity of an instrument. A valid or valid instrument has high validity. Conversely, a less valid instrument means that it has low validity.

$$r_{pbis} = \frac{Mp - Mr}{St} \sqrt{\frac{p}{q}}$$

With understanding :

$r_{pbis}$  = biserial point correlation coefficient

$Mp$  = Mean score of sbujek-the subject who answered correctly the item sought correlation

$Mt$  = Mean total score

$p$  = proposal of the subject who correctly answered the item

$q = 1 - p$

The test results of the instrument learning outcomes of Islamic education can  $r_{xy}$  (rhitung Biserial points) is the correlation between the score of the question with a total score, as many as 40 questions. To calculate point biserial correlation, use SPSS version 25. The results of the validity test showed that 40 questionnaire statements used to measure the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education have a biserial correlation value between -0.063 to 0.602. There are 32 valid questions and 8 questions that drop the number: 4, 5, 13, 18, 21, 22, 30, and 34, so it can be concluded that the questionnaire statement is valid because  $r_{hitung} > r_{table}$  (0.276), while 8 questionnaire statement drop or not used.

#### a. Calibration Instrument (Test Instrument).

##### 1. Validity Test

Validity is a measure that shows the levels of validity or validity of an instrument. A valid or valid instrument has high validity. Conversely, a less valid instrument means that it has low validity.

Test the validity of the questionnaire item of this study to determine the extent to which this questionnaire is able to measure what should be measured. To measure the validity or not of the instrument using the product moment correlation formula as follows :

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n(\sum xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{(n(\sum x^2) - (\sum x)^2) \{n(\sum y^2) - (\sum y)^2\}}}$$

With understanding :

r = coefficient of validity of the searched item.

X = score obtained by the subject of the entire item.

Y = total score.

$\sum X$  = number of scores in the X distribution.

$\sum Y$  = number of scores in the Y distribution.

$\sum X^2$  = the number of squares in the distribution score X.

$\sum Y^2$  = the number of squares in the Y distribution score.

n = number of respondents.

The results of the emotional intelligence instrument test consisted of 40 questions to 56 respondents, based on the calculation of rxy (rhitung moment product), namely the correlation between the grain score and the total score with a significant  $\alpha = 0.05$ . The instrument is considered valid if the rhitung is greater than or equal to the rtable. Otherwise the instrument is considered invalid if rhitung is smaller with rtable. Invalid instruments are no longer used in reliability testing. Calculating the validity test of the instrument using SPSS version 25.

Determine rtable, by looking at the statistical table r. Before looking at the table r, determined the value of df by using the formula:

$$df = N - 2$$

Description:

df is the degree of freedom.

N is the amount of data.

Formula  $df = N - 2 = 49$ . And look at the value of rtable and obtained df (49;0.05)=0.276 and 95% confidence level, then the value of the table = 0.276. Then the statement value smaller than 0.276, is considered invalid and discarded for good research results.

The results of the validity test using SPSS version 25, showed that 40 questionnaire statements used to measure emotional intelligence has a product moment correlation value between -0.040 to 0.569 and there are 30 valid questionnaires with 10 drop questionnaire statements, namely no: 3, 4, 10, 15, 26, 27, 30, 32, 35, and 37. So it can be concluded that 30

questionnaire statements are valid because they have  $r_{hitung} > r_{table}$  (0.276), while 10 questionnaire statements are drop or not used.(Appendix 8)

## 2. Reliability Test

Reliability test is to determine the stability of the test questions if given repeatedly on the same object. According to Arikunto, instruments that are already reliable will produce reliable data as well. If the data is true in accordance with reality, then several times taken it will remain the same. The formula used for reliability is the alpha formula. According to Arikunto, the alpha formula is used to find the reliability of instruments whose scores are not 1 and 0, for example questionnaires or about the form of descriptions. Cronbach's Alpha formula is as follows:

$$r_{11} = \left( \frac{k}{(k - 1)} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{\sum \sigma b^2}{\sigma^2 t} \right)$$

Keterangan:

- $r_{11}$  : reliability of the instrument.
- $k$  : The number of valid statements.
- $\sum \sigma b^2$  : amount of grain variance..
- $\sigma^2 t$  : total variance..

The results of the analysis of the instrument test on emotional intelligence variables to 60 respondents consisted of 30 valid question items using SPSS version 25, Cronbach's Alpha analysis was obtained at 0.842. The minimum reliability threshold using Cronbach's Alpha is 0.70 (see table 3.5). So that with the value of  $r_{hitung} = 0.842 > 0.70$  then the problem instrument is declared reliable, and can be used to measure emotional intelligence.

Table 3.10  
 Emotional Independence Reliability Test  
 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
,842	30

## F. Data Analysis Techniques

The Data to be analyzed must be done by testing the normality and homogeneity of the data. Normality test using Kolmogorov Smirnov Test and homogeneity test using Levene's Test. Data analysis consists of descriptive and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis in the form of data presentation with frequency distribution list and histogram, mean, median, mode, and standard deviation, for inferential analysis using Anava test and Tukey test.

### 1. Test data requirements

#### a. Normality test

Normality testing is done to determine whether a normal distribution of data. This is important to know with regard to the accuracy of the selection of statistical tests to be used. Because parametric statistical tests require data to be normally distributed.

This study uses a normality test with liliefors test, this test is done because it is a single data or single frequency data, not group distribution data.

#### b. Homogeneity test

Homogeneity testing was conducted in order to test the similarity variance of each group of data. Homogeneity test requirements are required to perform inferential analysis in comparative tests.

In this study using homogeneity techniques F test because there are 2 groups of samples to be tested, namely experimental class and control class. F test is done by comparing the largest data variance divided by the smallest data variance. The steps to perform homogeneity test with F test are as follows :

- 1)  $H_0: \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2$  (variance 1 is equal to variance 2 or homogeneous)  
 $H_1: \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$  (Variant 1 is not the same as Variant 2 or is not homogeneous)

By testing criteria:

- Accept  $H_0$  if  $F_{count} < F_{table}$ ; and
  - Subtract  $H_0$  if  $F_{count} > F_{table}$
- 2) Calculating the variance of each group of data
  - 3) Determine the value of  $F_{count}$ , that is :  $F_{count} = (\text{largest variant}) / (\text{smallest variant})$
  - 4) Determine the value of  $F_{tabel}$  for significance level  $\alpha$ ,  $dk_1 = dk_{pembilang} = n_a - 1$ , and  $dk_2 = dk_{penyebut} = n_b - 1$ , in this case,  $n_a$  = number of largest variant group data (numerator) and  $n_b$  = number of smallest variant group data (denominator).
  - 5) Perform the test by comparing the value of  $F_{hitung}$  dan  $F_{tabel}$ .

## 2. Hypothesis test

Hypothesis testing in this study using the t test which means in the study conducted by comparing the data of two groups of samples, or comparing the data between the experimental group and the control group, or comparing the increase in Experimental Group data with the increase in control group data.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### A. Description of Research Results.

Description of the study describes a general description of the characteristics of the object of study of fourth grade students both for the experimental group and the control group. The explanation covers aspects of numbers, averages as well as graphs. Table 4.1 shows the scores of Islamic religious education learning outcomes of various groups.

**Table 4.9**  
**Recapitulation of the score calculation results of**  
**Islamic Education Learning Outcomes in each group**

	KELAS		Kelompok Kecerdasan Emosional		KELOMPOK 2			
	A1	A2	B1	B2	A1 B1	A1 B2	A2 B1	A2 B2
<b>Total N</b>	22	22	22	22	11	11	11	11
<b>Missing</b>	22	22	22	22	33	33	33	33
<b>Range</b>	31,25	28,12	31,25	28,12	18,75	25,00	15,62	28,12
<b>Maximum</b>	96,88	93,75	96,88	93,75	96,88	90,63	87,50	93,75
<b>Minimum</b>	65,63	65,63	65,63	65,63	78,13	65,63	71,88	65,63
<b>Mean</b>	83,24	82,24	83,24	82,24	87,78	78,69	82,38	80,40
<b>Median</b>	82,81	84,38	83,24	84,38	90,63	78,13	81,25	87,50
<b>Mode</b>	78,13 <sup>a</sup>	87,50	78,13 <sup>a</sup>	87,50	90,63	78,13 <sup>a</sup>	87,50	87,50
<b>Standard Deviation</b>	8,492	8,089	8,492	8,089	6,472	8,005	5,459	9,278
<b>Variance</b>	72,119	65,448	72,119	65,448	41,898	64,089	29,806	86,091

1. Multiple modes exist. The smallest value is shown

Experimental group (A1) and control group (A2), the average score of learning outcomes experimental group (A1) of 83.24 higher than the control group (a2) of 82.24. This indicates that the use of the 2013 curriculum learning model can successfully improve the ability of students in the field of Islamic religious education. Students who have high emotional intelligence (B1) obtain higher learning outcomes of 83.24 compared to students who have low emotional intelligence (B2) of 82.24. The results of the study will be conducted hypothesis testing, but first described the results of the study in the description, as follows:

#### 1.1 Description Of The Data Of Group A1 (Experimental Group).

Data on learning outcomes of Islamic religious education, students who follow the learning model curriculum 2013 (A1) in the can through a test that contains 30 questions with a score of 0 for the wrong answer and a score of 1 for the right answer.

Table 4.9 above that of the 22 students as a research sample in the group given learning by using the curriculum learning model 2013 (A1) obtained the average value of 83.24, the median of 82.81, mode of 78.13 a , standard deviation of 8.49, variance of 72.11, the range of values of 31.25 the smallest value of 65.63 and the largest value of 96.88. Frequency distribution of learning outcomes of Islamic religious education taught by the curriculum learning model 2013. the average value of the average learning outcomes of Islamic religious

education that are carried an average of 83.24 or below in the class interval of 83-85 as much as (49.8%) with 11 respondents while being above the average of 11 respondents (45.4%).

### 1.2 Description Of The Data Of Group A2 (Control Group).

That of the 22 students as a research sample in a group given learning by using the curriculum learning model education unit level (KTSP) (A2) obtained an average value of 82.24, a median of 84.38, 8750 mode, standard deviation of 8.08, variance of 65.44 range of values of 28.12 the smallest value of 65.63 and the largest value of 93.75.

Frequency distribution of learning outcomes of Islamic religious education taught by the curriculum learning model education unit level (KTSP). the average learning outcomes of Islamic religious education are below the average of 82.24 or below the class interval 81-83 as many as 8 respondents (40.8%), while those above the average of 14 respondents (50.1%).

## B. Testing Prerequisites Analysis

Hypothesis test in Chapter III has been explained that the data analysis of this study using Anava 2x2 analysis. Before performing the hypothesis test, the prerequisite test of data analysis is the normality and homogeneity of the data.

### 1. Normality Test

Normality testing to measure each experimental class and control Class of the normally distributed population. Normal testing of whether or not the data in this study using statistical SPSS version 25 through Kolmogorov Smirnov test. The statistical hypotheses proposed for normality testing are as follows:

H0: normally distributed Data.

H1: the Data is not normally distributed.

Test criteria:

H0 is accepted and H1 is rejected if Sig > 0.05

H0 is rejected and H1 is accepted if Sig < 0.05.\*

Normality test was conducted on the data of learning outcomes of Islamic religious education from each research group. This normality test is sufficient for the target group data because further hypothesis testing only includes the research group. Further test is about the difference in learning outcomes of Islamic religious education for two groups A1 and A2 and group B1 and B2. Below are the results of the normality test data on learning models (A1 and A2). The results of the normality test of Islamic religious education learning outcomes data can be seen from the table below:

Table 4.10  
Normality Test Score Learning Outcomes Of Islamic Religious Education  
Participants Of The Learning Model Group

	Kelompok	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score hasil Belajar	A1	,147	22	,200*	,959	22	,462
	A2	,151	22	,200*	,938	22	<b>,176</b>

\*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4.10 in the column Kolmogorov-Smirnov above it can be seen that the significant value after processing the data on the SPSS is obtained output sign value for a1 of 0.200 and A2 of 0.200 means that the value of GIS A1 is greater than the value of  $\textcircled{3}$  ( $0.200 > 0.05$ ) and the value of GIS A2 is greater than the value of  $\textcircled{3}$  ( $0.200 > 0.05$ ), then  $H_0$  is accepted so it can be concluded that the 2 class groups of learning models in this study have a normal distribution.

Table 4.11  
Normality Test Score Learning Outcomes Of Islamic Religious Education  
Emotional Intelligence Group Learners

	Kelompok	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score hasil Belajar	B <sub>1</sub>	,147	22	,200*	,959	22	<u>,462</u>
	B <sub>2</sub>	,151	22	,200*	,938	22	,176

\*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4.11 in the column Kolmogorov-Smirnov can be seen that the significant value after processing the data in SPSS then obtained the output value of sign for B1 of 0.200 and A2 of 0.200 means that the value of sig A1 greater than the value of  $\textcircled{3}$  ( $0.200 > 0.05$ ) and the value of sig B2 is greater than the value of  $\textcircled{3}$  ( $0.200 > 0.05$ ), then  $H_0$  is accepted so it can be concluded that the 2 groups of emotional intelligence in this study has a normal distribution.

Table 4.12  
Normality Test Score Learning Outcomes Of Islamic Religious Education  
Learners groups A1 B1 , A1 B2 , A2 B1 and A2 B2

	Kelompok	Kolmogorov-Smirnov <sup>a</sup>			Shapiro-Wilk		
		Statistic	Df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Score hasil Belajar	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	,215	11	,164	,919	11	,307
	A <sub>1</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	,137	11	,200*	,964	11	,824
	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>1</sub>	,151	11	,200*	,963	11	,808
	A <sub>2</sub> B <sub>2</sub>	,211	11	,183	,914	11	,271

\*This is a lower bound of the true significance.

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Table 4.12 in the column Kolmogorov-Smirnov can be seen that the significant value after processing the data in SPSS then obtained the output sign value for a1b1 of 0.164, a1b2 of 0.200, and a2b1 of 0.200 and a2b2 of 0.183. Means that the value of GIS A1B1, a1b2, a2b1, and A2B2 is greater than the value of  $\textcircled{3}$  = 0.05 then  $H_0$  is accepted so it can be concluded that all groups of data are normally distributed.

## 2. Homogeneity Test

Homogeneity test aims to see whether the data in both classes have the same variance (homogeneous) or not. The basic decision-making for homogeneity test is as follows:

- a) if the probability value (Sig value.)  $> 0.05$  or  $F_{count} < F_{table}$ , then the data in both classes have the same variance (homogeneous).
- b) if the probability value (value Sig.)  $< 0.05$  and  $F_{count} > F_{table}$ , then the data in both classes do not have the same variance (not homogeneous).

The statistical hypotheses proposed in the homogeneity test are as follows:

H<sub>0</sub>: homogeneous variance.

H<sub>1</sub>: variance is not homogeneous.

Test criteria:

H<sub>0</sub> is accepted and H<sub>1</sub> is rejected if Sig  $> 0.05$

H<sub>0</sub> is rejected and H<sub>1</sub> is accepted if Sig  $< 0.05$

The homogeneity test was conducted on two groups that were compared, namely the experimental/treatment class, namely the group of students who were taught the 2013 curriculum learning model (A1) and the control class, namely the group of students who were taught with the education unit level curriculum model (KTSP) (A2). Two groups of attributes are the group of learners who have high emotional intelligence (B1) and the group of learners who have low emotional intelligence (B2).

### C. Discussion of Research Results.

The results of testing the hypothesis described above, it turned out that only two hypotheses were put forward significantly. The description of each acceptance of the two hypotheses in question can be given the following discussion:

1. The learning outcomes of Islamic education students who are taught using the 2013 curriculum learning model are the same compared to students who are taught using the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP).

The results of calculations using SPSS data version 25 between the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that received treatment using the 2013 curriculum learning model and the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP), the results obtained are learning outcomes  $A1 \approx A2$ , IE  $83.24 \approx 82.24$ , the meaning is the same only point difference and not significant.

The conclusion of the first hypothesis is the acceptance of H<sub>0</sub> and H<sub>1</sub> rejection which states that there is no difference in the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education between groups of students who are taught using the 2013 curriculum learning model with the education unit level curriculum learning model (KTSP). Because the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education students are also influenced by external and internal factors. And the use of learning models is also influenced by external factors, one of which is the characteristics of the learning material. While the internal factors are the characteristics of learners who have emotional intelligence, and is also a very important factor to consider in an effort to use the appropriate learning model in order to achieve effective learning outcomes.

2. The influence of interaction between learning models and emotional intelligence of students on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education.

The results of the second hypothesis can be concluded that accepted H0 and rejected H1 which states there is no interaction between learners who are taught using a learning model with emotional intelligence on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education. Because the 2013 curriculum and KTSP as a learning model, there is no effect of interaction on emotional intelligence on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education. Therefore, each curriculum has advantages and disadvantages, the need to use the right methods and strategies and also pay attention to internal factors of learners, there will be a positive and conducive interaction process of teaching and learning activities, in order to achieve the expected changes in Islamic education learning.

The author can conclude based on the results of the second hypothesis test above, that for the presentation of the results of the third and fourth hypothesis test is not continued because the second hypothesis there is no interaction of the use of curriculum learning model 2013 and curriculum learning model education unit level (KTSP) with emotional intelligence on learning outcomes of Islamic religious education.

3. Factors there is no third and fourth hypothesis test results (accepted H0 and rejected H1 ), among others, namely:

- a) the factor of Islamic religious education teachers, who still need training in implementing the 2013 curriculum in the process of teaching and learning activities intensively and continuously at the elementary school level. In order to achieve the educational objectives in developing learning models using the 2013 curriculum, the need for continuous training is not only carried out by teachers in the field of Islamic religious education studies, but includes all teachers and stakeholders in schools, especially elementary schools. Because the teacher is the spearhead of the implementation of the curriculum in schools, which should have the standards of educators and educational personnel. The standard criteria of educators or teachers are about pre-service education and eligibility as well as mental, as well as in-service education. The competence of educators as agents of learning at the basic education level includes pedagogical, personality, professional, social, moral, and spiritual competencies proportionally. Competence and criteria are developed by the National Education Standards Agency (BNSP) and set by ministerial regulation, which in general must have, namely status as a teacher, have academic qualifications and competence as a learning agent in accordance with applicable legislation, have teaching experience of at least five years, and have the ability to leadership and entrepreneurship in the field of Education.

Based on the above criteria and competencies that must be owned as an educator, the researcher can conclude that for a teacher is required to have competence in accordance with the provisions of the National Education Standards Agency (BNSP) in order to achieve educational objectives in implementing the 2013 curriculum, especially at the elementary school level. Then the learning model using the 2013 curriculum can produce a hypothesis test according to the expectations of researchers. As the government's plan to socialize, develop and implement the 2013 curriculum in accordance with the demands of the development of Science and technology, especially in elementary schools.

- b) Factors instrument learning outcomes of Islamic religious education that must be tested more deeply by a competent religious expert in order to better instrument results. In preparing the instrument grating learning outcomes of Islamic religious education, the researchers realized that it has limitations only limited to a written test in the form of multiple choice (multiple choice) with a short time, so that the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education to be achieved was not optimal. There should be oral tests, written tests in the form of essays, group assignments, and Islamic religious education practices. The assessment must include all existing competencies in the 2013 curriculum, namely aspects of knowledge, skills, and attitudes as a whole and proportionally, in accordance with the core competencies that have been determined. Assessment of aspects of knowledge can be done with written, oral, and flat-filling questions. Assessment of skill aspects can be done by practical exams, skill analysis and task analysis, as well as assessment by the learners themselves. There is also an assessment of aspects of attitude, can be done with a list of attitudes (personal observation) of yourself, and a list of attitudes tailored to core competencies.

Based on the above description can be concluded that the cause of the absence of differences in the use of curriculum learning model 2013 and curriculum education unit level (KTSP) to the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education because of the lack of complete and thorough in the preparation of the instrument grating learning outcomes of Islamic religious education. And the researcher is well aware of the shortcomings and limitations that led to one of the failures of the results of the third and fourth hypothesis tests. It is necessary to compile a complete and comprehensive grid of learning outcomes instruments in the assessment / evaluation of learning outcomes of Islamic religious education in the fourth grade of Jatinegara Kaum 05 state elementary school, Pulogadung, East Jakarta, in order to comply with the provisions of the 2013 curriculum in government regulation number 32 of 2013 on the arrangement of national standards of education and the achievement of educational goals at the elementary school level.

- c) Factors of emotional intelligence instrument grids that need to be tested again by psychologists in order to produce more optimal validity and reliability. And in this experimental study, researchers used a Likert scale to measure the results of emotional intelligence variables. The Likert scale is used to measure the attitudes, opinions and perceptions of a person or group of people about social phenomena. With the Likert scale the variables to be measured are translated into variable indicators. Then the indicator is used as a starting point for compiling instrument items, which can be statements or questions. Each item of the instrument using the Likert scale has a gradation from very positive to very negative. For quantitative analysis, the answers can be given scores and answers to research instruments that use the Likert scale can be made in the form of a checklist or multiple choice. In the preparation of instruments for certain variables, it is advisable that the points of the questions are made in the form of positive, neutral or negative sentences, so that the respondent can answer seriously and consistently. In this way, the tendency of respondents to answer in certain columns of the checklist form can be reduced. In the form of a checklist, often the answer is not read, because the location of the answer is uncertain.

Based on the description above, it can be concluded that each study using the Likert scale has advantages and disadvantages in providing an instrument assessment score of emotional intelligence variables. That is one of the causes of the lack of interaction between the learning model of the 2013 curriculum and emotional intelligence on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education. In addition, it is also due to the lack of data collection techniques other than the likert scale on emotional intelligence variables, which should use other techniques such as observation and interview so that the results of the hypothesis test are as expected. In this study, the authors are well aware of the shortcomings and limitations in compiling a grid of emotional intelligence instruments. And the need for the use of other data collection techniques in this experimental study, especially for emotional intelligence variables other than questionnaires, such as observation (observation) attitudes and behaviors of each student and interviews (interviews) with students. So that it can produce a valid and reliable hypothesis test in providing an assessment of emotional intelligence variables.

- d) variable factors the use of curriculum learning model 2013 relevant to this study apart from emotional intelligence variables are independence variables and creativity variables. As in the 2013 curriculum has included an assessment of aspects of spiritual attitudes and social attitudes so that the results of this hypothesis test failed. One of the results of the hypothesis test is not proven and there is no influence between the 2013 curriculum learning model and emotional intelligence because of the use of the wrong variables, should use the variables of independence and creativity in the 2013 curriculum learning model on the learning outcomes of Islamic religious education. For further research is expected to use the 2013 curriculum learning model as X1 is more appropriate to use the variables of independence and creativity as X2 in order to produce an optimal hypothesis test in subsequent experimental research.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahmadi, Iif Khoiru, dkk, 2011, *Strategi Pembelajaran Berorientasi KTSP*, Jakarta: PT. Prestasi Pustakaraya, cet. ke-1
- Arikunto, S, 1990, *Manajemen Pengajaran Secara Manusiawi*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Arikunto, Suharsimi, 2006, *Prosedur Penelitian Suatu Pendekatan Praktik*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Aunurrahman, 2012, *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*, Bandung: CV. Alfabeta, cet.ke-8
- Budiningsih, Iffah, 2014, *Bahan Ajar (Diktat) Desain Pembelajaran*, Jakarta: Pascasarjana MTP UIA.
- Casmini, 2007, *Emotional Parenting*, Yogyakarta: Pilar Media.
- Darsono M, 2002, *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*, Semarang: IKIP Semarang Press. Depdikbud.
- Daniel, Goleman, 2002, *Emotional Intelegence: Kecerdasan Emosional, Mengapa EI Lebih Penting Dari Pada IQ*, Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Departemen Agama RI, 2003, *Penilaian*, Jakarta: Departemen Agama RI.
- Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1999, *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*, Jakarta: Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia, cet. ke-10.

- Djamarah, 2005, *Strategi Belajar Mengajar*, Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Farahgina, 2017, *Pengaruh Penggunaan Model Pembelajaran Kooperatif Tipe STAD dan Kecerdasan Emosional Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPA Siswa kelas V SD Al Azhar Syifa Budi Jatibening Pondok Gede*, Kota Bekasi, Jakarta: Tesis UIA.
- Ginanjari, Ari, dan Ridwan Mukri, 2007, *ESQ For Teens, Rahasia Sukses Membangun Kecerdasan Emosi dan Spiritual Berdasarkan 1 Ihsan, 6 Rukun Iman, 5 Rukun Islam, Seri 1 Petualangan ESQ, Why You Nedd ESQ Zero Mind Process*, Jakarta: PT. Arga, Publishing.
- Haling Abdul, 2006, *Belajar dan Pembelajaran*, Makasar: Badan Penerbit Universitas Negeri Makasar.
- Hamzah B. Uno, et al. 2012, *Model Pembelajaran*, Gorontalo: BMT Nurul Jannah, cet. ke-2.
- Hoerr, Thomas R., 2007, *Buku Kerja Multiple Intelligences*, Bandung: Mizan Media Utama, Pengantar: Jalaluddin Rakhmat, Cet. ke-1.
- Jus'aini K, 2014, *Strategi Pembelajaran Targhib-targhib, Kisah Qur'ani dan Lingkungan Keluarga Terhadap Hasil Belajar Pendidikan Agama Islam*, Akademika Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan, Universitas Islam As-Syafi'iyah Jakarta.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI, 2017, *Buku Guru Pendidikan Agama Islam dan Budi Pekerti SD/MI kelas IV*, Jakarta: Kemendikbud, cet. ke-4.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan RI, 2014, *Buku Siswa Pendidikan Agama Islam dan Budi Pekerti SD/MI kelas IV*, Jakarta: Kemendikbud, cet. ke-2.
- Kurniawan, Edi dan Mulyadi, 2016, *Pengaruh Model Pembelajaran Jigsaw dan Disiplin Belajar Siswa Terhadap Hasil Belajar Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial (Studi Eksperimen pada Siswa kelas V di SD Negeri 111/III Koto Tebat Kecamatan Air Hangat Timur Kabupaten Kerinci Provinsi Jambi)*, Akademika Jurnal Teknologi Pendidikan, Universitas Islam As-Syafi'iyah Jakarta.
- Marwani, Lisna, 2016, *Bahan Ajar Pengembangan Kurikulum*, Jakarta: Universitas Islam As-Syafi'iyah.
- Miarso Yusuf hadi, 2011, *Menyemai Benih Teknologi Pendidikan*, Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group, edisi kedua, cet.ke-5.
- Mulyasa, 2017, *Pengembangan dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*, Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya, cet.ke-9.
- Prawitasari, J.E., 2012, *Psikologi Terapan Melintas Batas Disiplin Ilmu*, Jakarta: Erlangga.
- P. Pujiyanto, 2013, *Pengelolaan Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran 2013 Sekolah Dasar (Studi Situs di SD Hj. Isriati Baiturrahman 1 Semarang)*. Tesis. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.
- Sabri, M. Alisuf, 1996, *Psikologi Pendidikan*, Jakarta: Pedoman Ilmu Jaya.
- Sagala, Syaiful, 2003, *Konsep dan Makna Pembelajaran*, Bandung Alfabeta.
- Sudjana, Nana, 1989, *Penilaian Hasil Proses Belajar Mengajar*, Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sunarto dan Agung Hartono, 2002, *Perkembangan Peserta Didik*, Jakarta: Kerjasama Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan, Aneka Cipta.
- Sugiyono, 2016, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R & D*, Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Sukmara, Dian, 2007, *Implementasi Life Skill dalam KTSP*, Bandung: Mughni Sejahtera, cet.ke-2.
- Supardi, 2016, *Aplikasi statistik dalam penelitian*, Jakarta : change publication.

- Triatna, Cepi dan Risma Kharisma, 2008, *EQ Power Panduan Meningkatkan Kecerdasan Emosional*, Bandung: CV. Citra Praya.
- <http://digilib.uinsby.ac.id/id/eprint/9317>, Nisa', Khoirotnun, Abstrak, 2011, *Pengaruh Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (KTSP) Terhadap Hasil Belajar Pada Bidang Studi PAI di SMA Kanjeng Sepuh Sidayu Gresik*. Undergraduate thesis, UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.
- Nst, V. F. H., Wijaya, D. M. ., & Azaman, A. (2025). Pengaruh Modal Intelektual Dan Komitmen Organisasional Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai Dengan Organizational Citizenship Behavior (Ocb) Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Pemerintahan Kota Medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah METADATA*, 7(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metadata.v7i1.553>
- Nst, V. F. H. . (2025). Pengaruh Motivasi Dan Kompensasi Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan PT. Suryamas Lestari Prima Tanjung Morawa. *Jurnal Ilmiah METADATA*, 6(3), 73-82. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metadata.v6i3.525>
- Nst, V. F. H., Wijaya, D. M. ., & Azaman, A. (2025). Implementasi Pengelolaan Pengetahuan Untuk Menghadapi Tantangan Digitalisasi Pada Umkm Di Kota Medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah METADATA*, 6(3), 195-208. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metadata.v6i3.549>
- Rizkina, S. (2025). Upaya Meningkatkan Kedisiplinan Dan Kemandirian Anak Usia Dini Melalui Kegiatan Practical Life Di Ra Ibunda Medan. *Jurnal Ilmiah METADATA*, 6(3), 283-295. <https://doi.org/10.47652/metadata.v6i3.583>