Jurnal Riset Rumpun Ilmu Pendidikan
Volume 5 Nomor. 1 April 2026
E-ISSN .: 2828-8483; P-ISSN .: 2828-8432, Hal 682-695
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55606/jurripen.v5i1.8454
Tersedia: https://prin.or.id/index.php/JURRIPEN

Arabic Learning Outcomes among Boarding and Non-Boarding Students at MAS DDI Pattojo: A Comparative Study

Andi Nurul Hidayatullah[1*], Munawarah[2], Nurwan[3], Hikmatul Azizah[4]
[1,3-4] Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Al-Gazali Soppeng, Indonesia
[2]Universitas Islam DDI A.G.H. Abdurrahman Ambo Dalle, Indonesia
Email: andinurulhidayatullah@staialgazalisoppeng.ac.id[1*], munawarah@ddipolman.ac.id[2], nurwan@staialgazalisoppeng.ac.id[3], hikmatul.azizah@email.com
*Author Correspondence: andinurulhidayatullah@staialgazalisoppeng.ac.id

Abstract. *This study aims to: (1) describe the Arabic learning outcomes of boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo; (2) describe the Arabic learning outcomes of non-boarding students; and (3) compare the learning outcomes of both groups. The research used a quantitative method with sociological and pedagogical approaches. The population consisted of 77 students from grades X and XI, with a saturated sampling technique involving 45 boarding students and 32 non-boarding students. Data were collected through observation, tests, and documentation, while data analysis applied descriptive and inferential statistical techniques. The findings show that both groups demonstrated relatively low performance in Arabic reading skills (mahārah qirā'ah). Boarding students achieved an average score of 30.89, while non-boarding students obtained an average score of 29.69. Furthermore, the Mann-Whitney U test revealed no significant difference between the two groups, as indicated by an Asymp. Sig. value of 0.615, which is greater than 0.05. These results indicate that the place of residence, whether boarding or non-boarding, is not a major factor influencing Arabic learning outcomes at MAS DDI Pattojo, suggesting that other educational or instructional factors may play a more significant role.*

Keywords: *Arabic Learning; Boarding Students; Comparative Study; Learning Outcomes; Non-Boarding Students.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Education, as a fundamental and constructive phenomenon in human life, is not merely a process of transferring knowledge but also the formation of individual character and potential. Therefore, we are required to conduct in-depth and ongoing scientific reflection on education, not only as a form of accountability for the actions of educating and being educated, but also as an effort to continuously refine and improve the quality of the educational process itself, in order to achieve noble and sustainable educational goals (Hasbullah, 2012).

The objectives of PBA (Arabic Language Education) in Madrasas have been regulated in the Decree of the Minister of Religion No. 183 of 2019 concerning the Curriculum for Islamic Religious Education and Arabic in Madrasas, namely:

The development of the Arabic language curriculum aims to prepare students who have the ability to use Arabic as a global communication tool and a tool to deepen their understanding of religion from authentic sources which generally use Arabic and through a continuous chain of knowledge (isnad) process that continues to its original source, namely the Qur'an and the hadith.

Based on this goal, it is important to study Arabic as the language of the Koran in order to study the sources of Islamic teachings. Mastery of Arabic is the main key for anyone who

Naskah Masuk: 28 Desember 2025; Revisi: 25 Januari 2026; Diterima: 09 Februari 2026;
Tersedia: 11 Februari 2026

wants to understand the teachings of Islam in depth and accurately(Laila Navilah Hasanah, 2018). As the word of Allah SWT. which uses the Qur'an as guidance in Arabic in QS ar- Ra'd /13: 37.

وَ كَذٰلِكَ اَنْزَلْنٰهُ حُكْمًا عَرَبِيًّا ... (٣٧)

Translation:

Thus We have revealed it (the Qur'an) as a legal determinant in Arabic.

Arabic language proficiency is key to understanding Islamic religious texts, including the Quran and Hadith, the primary sources of Islamic teachings. Madrasahs, as formal educational institutions with structured programs, play a crucial role in equipping students with adequate Arabic language skills. Thus, they contribute to achieving broader educational goals. Their success can be measured through students' learning outcomes, particularly in Arabic language mastery and understanding of religious teachings. Learning outcomes are a manifestation of behavioral changes that occur in students after undergoing the learning process. These changes can be seen in increased understanding, abilities, and skills, for example, from ignorance to knowledge and from lack of understanding to deep understanding (Kunandar, 2013).

The factors that influence students' learning outcomes are divided into three categories: internal factors, external factors, and learning approaches. Internal factors refer to the physical and mental conditions that influence students' learning abilities. External factors include the conditions and circumstances of the students' surroundings. Learning approach factors refer to the types of learning efforts students undertake, including the strategies and methods used to understand the subject matter (Suteja and Akhmad Affandi, 2016).

Based on these factors, housing is an external factor that influences learning outcomes. Because housing serves as both the primary residence and a learning environment outside of school hours, the condition of the residence (both in terms of comfort, security, and accessibility to learning facilities) can impact concentration, health, and ultimately learning outcomes (Bahtiar Afwan, 2017). Likewise, the madrasah environment is an external factor that can influence students' learning outcomes. One such factor is MAS DDI Pattojo in Soppeng Regency, which gives its students full rights to choose between living in or outside the dormitory. Boarding students have a daily schedule and rules that apply in the dormitory, while non-boarding students tend to be free to determine their activities after the learning process at the madrasah is complete.

Boarding students are expected to have better learning outcomes than non-boarding students due to the more conducive learning environment in the dormitory. However, additional Arabic language tutoring at the DDI Pattojo Islamic Boarding School for boarding students only takes place once a week (30 minutes every Sunday morning), and is generally applicable to students at the Islamic Junior High School (Madrasah Tsanawiyah) and Islamic Senior High School (Madrasah Aliyah). This raises questions about the impact of this tutoring on improving the Arabic language learning outcomes of boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo.

Based on the researcher's observations, Arabic language learning activities between boarding school students and non-boarding school students are not much different, so to find out the comparison of their Arabic language learning outcomes, the researcher conducted a study entitled "Arabic Learning Outcomes among Boarding and Non-Boarding Students at MAS DDI Pattojo: A Comparative Study".

2. METHOD

This type of research is quantitative. Research that requires data in the form of numbers or values, or data in the form of information, comments, opinions, or sentences that are quantified, is called quantitative research. This type of quantitative research is closely related to statistical analysis (Mundir, 2016).

The approaches used in this research are pedagogical and sociological. The population is a group of subjects or objects that share certain characteristics or traits that the researcher determines to be studied and conclusions drawn (Muhammad Darwin, 2021). The population to be studied is all students in grades 10 and 11 of MAS DDI Pattojo. Grade 12 students are not included in the study population because they completed their final exams before the study began.

Table 1. Population.

Number	Class	Boarding Students	Non Boarding Students	Total
1.	X	27	22	**49**
2.	XI	18	10	**28**
TOTAL		**45**	**32**	**77**

Data source: MAS DDI Pattojo Administration

A sample is a selected portion of a population selected through a sampling method in a study. If the population is less than 100 people, the entire sample is taken. However, if the population is greater than 100, 10-15% or 20-25% of the population can be taken. Saturated

sampling is a sampling technique in which all members of the population are included in the research sample (Ketut Swarjana, 2022).

Based on sampling theory and considering the limited population of grades 10 and 11 of MAS DDI Pattojo, which only had 77 respondents (less than 100), the researcher used a saturated (census) sampling technique. All members of the population served as the research sample. Therefore, the sample consisted of 45 boarding students and 32 non-boarding students.

Data collection methods include various techniques selected according to the type of research. These techniques can include observation, interviews, documentation studies, questionnaires, tests, or the use of data cards (STAI Al-Gazali Soppeng Lecturer Team). Because this research uses a quantitative approach, the data collection techniques used include tests, observation, and documentation.

The test referred to by the researcher is an objective written multiple-choice test used to measure students' learning outcomes in the Arabic reading skill (*maharah qiro'ah*). This study used unstructured non-participant observation, where the researcher simply observed respondents without interfering or being involved in their daily activities. Research data was collected through the collection and recording of relevant documents at MAS DDI Pattojo, such as the school's history, vision and mission, school profile, and learning outcome data.

The data processing referred to by the researcher refers to the processing of data after the data sought in the research field has been collected. Data processing is intended to facilitate the subsequent data analysis process. In quantitative research, there are three general stages used in data processing: editing, coding, and tabulation.

The data analysis techniques used in this study were descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. Descriptive statistics refer to the calculation of range, minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation values using SPSS 22 software. Meanwhile, the inferential statistic used, as needed for the research, is the t-test. Before conducting the t-test, a normality test was first performed. Because the data were not normally distributed, the researcher chose a non-parametric test, namely the Mann-Whitney test.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Overview of Arabic Language Learning Outcomes of Boarding School Students

The results of this study discuss the description and analysis of data obtained from research activities on the comparison of Arabic language learning outcomes between boarding and non-boarding students. The variables in this study are two types of data, namely the Arabic

language learning outcome variable and the boarding and non-boarding students variable at MAS DDI Pattojo (grades X and XI). The learning outcomes were obtained using a test method.

Based on the test score data, it can be defined that the highest score is 70 and the lowest score is 10. After knowing the highest and lowest scores, the researcher then used them to determine the category of Arabic language learning outcomes. The following are the steps taken by the researcher in descriptive analysis using the SPSS 22 application to describe the Arabic language learning outcomes of boarding school students:

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics Boarding Students.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Boarding	45	60	10	70	30.89	16.627
Valid N (listwise)	45					

Researchers can describe the distribution of the data obtained, namely variable X1 (Boarding Students) which can be described that the number of samples (N) is 45 students, the range value is 60, the minimum value is 10 and the maximum value is 70, while the average value obtained is 30.89 and the standard deviation is 16.627.

Based on the results of descriptive statistical analysis on the learning outcomes of boarding school students in Arabic language recitation, it can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. Frequency Distribution of Boarding Students.

No.	Category	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very Good	61 - 80	3	6.5
2	Good	41 - 60	5	11
3	Fair	21 - 40	17	38
4	Poor	≤ 20	20	44,5
	Total		**N=45**	**100**

This study uses the following formula to calculate the percentage of each category:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\ \%$$

Description:

f = Frequency whose percentage is being sought

N = Total number of respondents

P = Percentage number

The frequency distribution table and percentage of the learning outcomes of boarding school students in Arabic language recitation shows that 20 students have the highest frequency, falling in the <20 (poor) category, with a percentage of 44%. The lowest frequency is 3 students, falling in the 61-80 (very good) category, with a percentage of 6.5%.

Based on the categorization of the learning outcomes of boarding school students in Arabic language recitation, there are 20 students in the poor category, 17 students in the adequate category, 5 students in the good category, and 3 students in the very good category.

The conversion guidelines used in changing numerical scores into value codes on a four-point scale are:

Table 4. Value Code.

Score Number	Value Code
81 – 100	A (Very Good)
70 – 80	B (Good)
50 – 69	C (Fair)
≤ 50	K (Poor)

Data Source: 2024 MAS DDI Pattojo Educational Unit Curriculum Document (KSP)

If the maximum score set based on the answer key is 80, then the 81% numerical score = 0.81 x 80 = 64.8, the 70% numerical score = 0.70 x 80 = 56, and the 50% numerical score = 0.50 x 80 = 40. Thus, the conversion table is as follows:

Table 5. Code Value Conversion.

Score Number	Value Code
64,8 –80	A (Very Good)
56 – 63	B (Good)
40 – 55	C (Fair)
≤ 39	K (Poor)

Based on table 5 of the value code conversion, the average value of the Arabic language maha>rah qira>'ah test for boarding school students is 30.89, which is in the less category.

Overview of Arabic Language Learning Outcomes of Non-Boarding School Students

Based on the test score data, it can be defined that the highest score is 70 and the lowest score is 10. After knowing the highest and lowest scores, the researcher then used them to determine the category of Arabic language learning outcomes. The following are the steps taken by the researcher in descriptive analysis using SPSS 22 to describe the Arabic language learning outcomes of boarding school students:

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics of Non-Boarding Students.

	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Non-Boarding	32	60	10	70	29.69	17.318
Valid N (listwise)	32					

The researcher can describe the distribution of the data obtained, namely the variable X2 (non-boarding students) can be described that the number of samples (N) is 32 students, the range value is 60, the minimum value is 10 and the maximum value is 70, while the average value obtained is 29.69 and the standard deviation is 17,318.

Based on the results of descriptive statistical analysis on the learning outcomes of the boarding students' Arabic language maha>rah qira>'ah can be seen in the following table:

Table 7. Frequency Distribution of Non-Boarding Students.

No	Category	Interval	Frequency	Percentage
1	Very Good	61 - 80	1	3
2	Good	41 - 60	5	19
3	Fair	21 - 40	8	25
4	Poor	$\leq$ 20	18	53
Total			**N=32**	**100**

This study uses the following formula to calculate the percentage of each category:

$$P = \frac{f}{N} \times 100\ \%$$

Description:

f = Frequency whose percentage is being sought

N = Total number of respondents

P = Percentage number

The frequency distribution table and percentage of Arabic language learning outcomes for non-boarding students shows that 18 is the highest frequency, falling in the <20 range (poor category) with a percentage of 53%, and 1 is the lowest frequency, falling in the 61–80 range (very good category) with a percentage of 3%.

Based on the categorization of Arabic language learning outcomes for non-boarding students, there are 18 students in the poor category, 8 students in the adequate category, 5 students in the good category, and 1 student in the very good category.

The conversion guidelines used in changing numerical scores into value codes on a four-point scale are:

Table 8. Value Code.

Score Number	Value Code
81 – 100	A (Very Good)
70 – 80	B (Good)
50 – 69	C (Fair)
≤ 50	K (Poor)

Data Source: 2024 MAS DDI Pattojo Educational Unit Curriculum Document (KSP)

If the maximum score is determined based on the answer key = 80, then the numerical score of 81% = 0.81 x 80 = 64.8, the numerical score of 70% = 0.70 x 80 = 56, the numerical score of 50% = 0.50 x 80 = 40. Thus, the conversion table is obtained as follows:

Table 9. Code Value Conversion.

Score Number	Value Code
64,8 –80	A (Very Good)
56 – 63	B (Good)
40 – 55	C (Fair)
≤ 39	K (Poor)

Based on table 4.18 of the value code conversion, the average value of the Arabic language maha>rah qira>'ah test for boarding school students is 29.69, which is at a value of K (less).

Comparison of Arabic Language Learning Outcomes between Boarding School Students and Non-Boarding School Students

Tabel 10. *Test of Normalitiy.*

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Boarding	.218	32	.000	.895	32	.005
Non-Boarding	.243	32	.000	.878	32	.002

A Kolmogorov-Smirnov normality test analysis conducted using SPSS 22 software showed that both data groups, namely the boarding and non-boarding students, had a significance value of less than 0.05. The significance value for the boarding group was 0.000, and for the non-boarding group, it was also 0.000. Therefore, it can be concluded that both data groups are not normally distributed.

Therefore, because the assumption of normality was not met, the use of parametric statistical analysis methods such as the t-test cannot be applied in this study. Because the results

of the normality test indicate that the data are not normally distributed, this study will use the Mann-Whitney U test, an appropriate non-parametric statistical method for analyzing data that does not meet the assumption of normality.

Table 11. Ranks.

	Class	N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Arabic Learning Outcomes	Boarding	45	40.06	1802.50
	Non Boarding	32	37.52	1200.50
	Total	77		

Table 12. *Test Statistics*[a.]

	Arabic Learning Outcomes
Mann-Whitney U	672.500
Wilcoxon W	1200.500
Z	-.504
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.615

The Mann-Whitney U-Test Decision-Making Basis

1) If the Asymp.Sig. value is <0.05, then H0 is rejected.

2) If the Asymp.Sig. value is >0.05, then H0 is accepted.

Based on the statistical test output, the Asymp.Sig. value (2-tailed) was recorded at 0.615, which is greater than 0.05. This indicates that the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted. Thus, it is concluded that there is no significant difference in Arabic language learning outcomes between boarding and non-boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo.

Discussion

This study aims to compare Arabic language learning outcomes (specifically maha>rah qira>'ah) between boarding and non-boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo. Data analysis was conducted in two stages: descriptive analysis and inferential analysis. Descriptive analysis provides a general overview of the learning outcomes of boarding and non-boarding students, while inferential analysis tests for significant differences in Arabic language learning outcomes between boarding and non-boarding students.

There is a difference in the average Arabic language learning outcome test scores between boarding and non-boarding students, with boarding students obtaining an average score of 30.89 and non-boarding students 29.69, which is at a K (less), based on the results of the Arabic language score code conversion of MAS DDI Pattojo. This difference is not statistically significant. The results of the Mann Whitney U test support the null hypothesis, which indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups. In addition, the

frequency distribution analysis revealed that non-boarding students had a higher proportion in the "less" category (53%) compared to boarding students (44.5%). Conversely, boarding students had a slightly higher proportion in the "very good" category (6.5%) compared to non-boarding students (3%). This indicates the need for more attention to the learning outcomes of non-boarding students. Overall, the results indicate that there is no significant difference in Arabic language maha>rah qira>'ah learning outcomes between boarding and non-boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo.

Based on the documents collected by the researcher, namely the Arabic report card scores (which assess all aspects and skills in Arabic language learning) for the odd semester of grades X and XI in the 2024/2025 Academic Year, the average score for boarding students is 78.48 and for non-boarding students is 74.68. This means that both are at a B (Good) score based on the Arabic language score code sourced from the 2024 MAS DDI Pattojo Education Unit Curriculum Document (KSP). This documentation is in line with the statistical results of the study.

This is supported by researchers' observations that boarding school students tend to have better access to learning resources that support their learning process, such as more intensive tutoring from teachers. However, the amount of tutoring time focused on Arabic language learning is still limited, resulting in no significant difference in learning outcomes compared to non-boarding school students. Therefore, Arabic language tutoring needs to be increased. Furthermore, the more structured and focused learning environment in boarding schools can provide additional motivation for students to be more serious about their studies. However, this advantage in access and the learning environment in boarding schools has not yet significantly impacted Arabic language learning outcomes, indicating the need for more effective and intensive learning strategies, especially for boarding school students, to optimally utilize this potential.

Meanwhile, non-boarding school students often face challenges in creating a conducive learning environment at home due to more flexible schedules and various factors, such as a lack of family support. Therefore, greater attention needs to be given to non-boarding school students to help them improve their Arabic language learning outcomes, such as through motivational programs, study skills training, and stronger social support.

It is important to formulate effective strategies to increase interest and motivation in learning among boarding and non-boarding students, as well as to conduct regular evaluations and monitoring to ensure student learning progress. This is expected to improve student grades

and provide a better opportunity to achieve the desired Arabic language competency, particularly in the field of recitation.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the data collected and systematically described in this thesis, the researcher concludes that: (1) The Arabic language learning outcomes of boarding school students are in the poor category, with an average score of 30.89 on the maharah qira'ah test. (2) The Arabic language learning outcomes of non-boarding school students are in the poor category, with an average score of 29.69 on the maharah qira'ah test. (3) There is no difference in Arabic language learning outcomes between boarding school students and non-boarding school students at MAS DDI Pattojo. This is based on the statistical test output, with the Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) value recorded at 0.615, which is greater than 0.05, indicating that the null hypothesis (H0) is accepted.

The Arabic reading skill (mahārah qirā'ah) outcomes of both boarding and non-boarding students at MAS DDI Pattojo are similarly low, with no statistically significant difference. This suggests that living arrangement is not the primary factor influencing Arabic learning outcomes. Future interventions should focus on improving curriculum delivery, home learning environments, and student motivation rather than solely emphasizing residential status.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, K., et al. (Eds.). (2022). *Quantitative research methodology.* Muhammad Zaini Publishing Foundation.

Afwan, B. (2017). *Comparison of learning outcomes between students living in dormitories and students living at their parents' homes in history for grade X of Al-Kautsar Senior High School, Bandar Lampung, academic year 2015/2016* [Undergraduate thesis, University of Lampung].

Agustin, P., & Permatasari, R. I. (2020). The effect of education and compensation on the performance of the new product development (NDP) division at PT Mayora Indah Tbk. *M-Progress Scientific Journal, 10*(2).

Andrean, S., & Devi, A. D. (2020). Islamic education from a sociological perspective. *Journal of Education, 5*(2).

Arikunto, S. (2013). *Fundamentals of educational evaluation.* Bumi Aksara.

Artama, S., et al. (Eds.). (2023). *Evaluation of learning outcomes* (1st ed.). PT Mifandi Mandiri Digital.

Aziza, L. F., & Muliansyah, A. (2020). Arabic language skills with a comprehensive approach. *El-Tsaqafah: Journal of the Department of PBA, 19*(1). https://doi.org/10.20414/tsaqafah.v19i1.2344

Bahri, et al. (2020). History of the DDI Pattojo Islamic boarding school in Soppeng Regency (1947–2018). *Criksetra: Journal of History Education, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.36706/jc.v9i1.10935

Darwin, M., et al. (Eds.). (2021). *Quantitative research methods.* CV Media Sains Indonesia.

Dimyati, & Mujiono. (2006). *Learning and teaching* (3rd ed.). Rineka Cipta.

Fadhil, R., & Agustiar. (2024). Analysis of the qira'ah recitation ability of grade X students of State Islamic Senior High School 1 Meranti Islands. *Educantum Education Journal, 4*(2).

Fadlillah, R. H. (2017). *Using the Fort Capture game strategy to improve vocabulary listening skills in Arabic language subjects for grade III students of MI Al Karimah Surabaya* [Undergraduate thesis, Sunan Ampel State Islamic University].

Firda. (2019). *Comparative study of Islamic religious education learning achievement between boarding and non-boarding students at UNISMUH Makassar Junior High School* [Undergraduate thesis, Muhammadiyah University of Makassar].

Fitri, A., et al. (Eds.). (2023). *Fundamentals of statistics for research* (1st ed.). Yayasan Kita Menulis.

Habsoh, R. S. (2020). *Analysis of difficulties in determining the main idea of paragraphs in fourth grade elementary school* [Undergraduate thesis, Indonesian University of Education].

Hasanah, L. N. (2018). *A comparative study of Arabic language learning achievement of students living in and outside dormitories* [Undergraduate thesis, State Islamic Institute of Purwokerto].

Hasbullah. (2012). *Fundamentals of education* (10th ed.). Rajawali Press.

Hasibuan, M. N., & Sa'diyah, H. (2023). Contextual teaching and learning methods in maharah qira'ah learning. *Revorma Journal, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.62825/revorma.v3i1.35

Hendri, M. (2017). Learning Arabic speaking skills through a communicative approach. *Potensia: Journal of Islamic Education, 3*(2).

KBBI VI Online. (n.d.). https://kbbi.kemdikbud.go.id

Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Decree of the Minister of Religious Affairs No. 183 of 2019 concerning the curriculum for Islamic religious education and Arabic in madrasahs.*

Kementerian Agama Republik Indonesia. (2020). *Al-Qur'an memorizing.* Cordoba.

Khoiriyah. (2015). *A comparative study of Arabic language learning achievement between boarding and non-boarding students* [Undergraduate thesis, State Islamic College Pekalongan].

Kunandar. (2013). *Authentic assessment of student learning outcomes based on the 2013 curriculum.* Rajawali Pers.

Lestari, A. I. (2019). *The role of the Jauharotul Hikmah Islamic boarding school in shaping children's character* [Undergraduate thesis, Muhammadiyah University of Surabaya].

Lestari, Y. A., Syamsuddin, M. B., & Usman, M. (2022). The relationship between learning motivation and Arabic language achievement. *Al-Fashahah, 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.59562/al-fashahah.v2i2.40436

Mundir. (2013). *Qualitative and quantitative research methods* (1st ed.). STAIN Jember Press.

Nasarudin, et al. (Eds.). (2024). *Combination research methods* (1st ed.). CV Gita Lentera.

Nasution, H. F. (2016). Research instruments and their urgency in quantitative research. *Al-Masharif, 4*(1).

Noor, J. (2016). *Research methodology for undergraduate theses, dissertations, and scientific papers.* Prenadamedia Group.

Nurrahma. (2024). *Comparative analysis of academic achievement between memorization and non-memorization students* [Undergraduate thesis, Al-Gazali Islamic College of Soppeng].

Nurrita, T. (2018). Development of learning media to improve student learning outcomes. *Misykat, 3*(1).

Oktaviani, M. A., & Notobroto, H. B. (2014). Comparison of normality test methods. *Journal of Biometrics and Population, 3*(2).

Purwanto, N. (2002). *Educational psychology.* Remaja Rosdakarya.

Purwanto. (2009). *Evaluation of learning outcomes.* Pustaka Belajar.

Quraisy, A., & Madya, S. (2021). Nonparametric Mann–Whitney analysis of differences in problem-solving ability. *Journal of Statistics and Application on Teaching and Research, 3*(1).

Rafikasari, E. F. (2021). *Statistics for economics and business* (1st ed.). Akademia Pustaka.

Rahmadi. (2011). *Introduction to research methodology* (1st ed.). Antasari Press.

Rinaldi, S. F., & Mujianto, B. (2017). *Research methodology and statistics.* Ministry of Health of the Republic of Indonesia.

Rohimi. (2018). *A comparative study of Islamic education achievement* [Undergraduate thesis, Islamic University of Indonesia].

Rohmansyah, T. (2017). *Comparison of Islamic jurisprudence learning outcomes* [Undergraduate thesis, Raden Intan State Islamic Institute].

Sali, M. (2019). *Disciplining students* (1st ed.). Ar-Ruzz Media.

Setiawan, I. (2013). *Guidance and development of students in boarding educational institutions.* Smart Writing.

Setyawan, D. A. (2021). *Practical instructions for data normality and homogeneity testing with SPSS* (1st ed.). Tahta Media.

Siddin, H., & Wekke, I. S. (2021). *Cognitive learning model for students' critical thinking skills* (1st ed.). Adab Publishers.

Siregar, S. (2017). *Quantitative research methods completed with comparison of manual calculations & SPSS* (4th ed.). Kencana.

Sudirman, S., al-Kattanie, A. H., & al-Hamat, A. (2021). Strategies for implementing Arabic language teaching skills. *Rayah Al-Islam, 5*(1). https://doi.org/10.37274/rais.v5i1.402

Sugiyono. (2015). *Statistics for research.* Alfabeta.

Sugiyono. (2016). *Quantitative, qualitative, and R&D research methods* (19th ed.). Alfabeta.

Sundari, U. Y., et al. (Eds.). (2024). *Research methodology* (1st ed.). CV Gita Lentera.

Suteja, & Affandi, A. (2016). *Fundamentals of education* (1st ed.). CV Elsi Pro.

Swarjana, I. K. (2022). *Population-sample, sampling techniques, & bias in research.* Andi.

Syah, M. (2017). *Educational psychology with a new approach* (20th ed.). Remaja Rosdakarya.

Tim Dosen STAI Al-Gazali Soppeng. (2019). *Guidelines for writing scientific papers: Papers, theses, and research reports.*

Wardana, & Djamaluddin, A. (2021). *Learning and teaching: Theory, design, models, and achievement* (2nd ed.). CV Kaaffah Learning Center.

Wijayati, H., Widhiyoga, G., & Rachmawati, I. (2024). *Qualitative & quantitative research methods.* Anak Hebat Indonesia.