

The Effect of Learning Facilities and Learning Discipline on Learning Outcomes of Economic Subjects

Irwan Maulana¹⁾ , Candra Abdillah²⁾

¹⁾Economics Education, Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Indonesia

²⁾Economics Education, Pamulang University, South Tangerang, Indonesia

Abstract

This study aimed to analyze the effect of learning facilities and discipline simultaneously on economic learning outcomes at SMA NEGERI 1 Tenjo. The research used a quantitative approach with an association methodology. The study population comprised 102 students of class X at SMA NEGERI 1 Tenjo. The sample consisted of as many as 72 students and was taken using a simple random sampling technique. The instruments used were a questionnaire on learning facilities, learning discipline, and documentation of learning outcomes. Data collection techniques included observation, questionnaires, and documentation. The data analysis technique used a prerequisite test (normality test, linearity test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, autocorrelation test) and hypothesis testing (multiple linear regression test). The results showed that there was an effect of learning facilities and learning discipline simultaneously on learning outcomes with the regression equation $Y = 4.178 + 0.252x_1 + 0.664x_2$. The magnitude of the influence of learning facilities is 67%, and 33% is influenced by other factors, while the magnitude of the influence of learning discipline is 78.7%, and 21.3% is influenced by other factors.

Keywords : Facilities; Discipline; Learning Outcomes; Economics

INTRODUCTION

One of the things that play an important role in the ability of teachers to produce superior students is to take advantage of the learning facilities available in schools where teaching and learning take place. According to Damanik (2019), learning facilities include learning media and infrastructure. Infrastructure included school buildings, places of study, sports fields, prayer rooms, art rooms, and sports facilities. Based on these opinions, educational institutions play an important role in improving the quality of education to produce high-quality students.

In addition to learning facilities, learning discipline is also important for students and must be considered by the teacher to achieve maximum learning outcomes. According to Reski et al. (2017) and Salam and Anggraini (2018), learning discipline is 1) time discipline includes being on time to school, completing homework on time, and not leaving home while studying; 2) discipline in acting includes always following the rules, not being lazy to learn, not telling others to do, and always doing things honestly and without lying.

However, in reality, the use of learning facilities and student learning disciplines is still low. Based on the results of observations at SMA Negeri 1, Tenjo. There are inadequate learning facilities, such as laboratories that are not yet available, classrooms that are not yet adequate, and incomplete reference books in the library. This has an impact on the student's learning outcomes.

In addition, the discipline of class X students is also low, as evidenced by the fact that there are students who are late in collecting assignments and untidy clothes, and the average score of student evaluation results in economics subjects at SMA Negeri 1 Tenjo is still low, which is below the minimum completion standard of 70. Based on the results of documentation of odd semester pts scores in 2021/2022 class X at SMA Negeri 1 Tenjo obtained a score of 20% (22 students out of 102) who reached KKM and 80% (80 students out of 102) who have not reached KKM, to improve learning outcomes, as a teacher must have the obligation to use existing learning facilities and use learning media, Teachers are easier to convey material to students.

Based on the above problems, researchers have conducted research related to learning facilities and student learning discipline. The purpose of the study is to find out the influence of learning facilities and learning discipline on the results of class X economics learning at SMA NEGERI 1 Tenjo.

RESEARCH METHODS

A quantitative approach is used. According to Sugiyono (201:13), quantitative research is a research method based on the philosophy of positivism, used to examine certain populations and samples, collect data using research tools, and analyze quantitative or statistical data, to test predetermined hypotheses. The methodology used by the researchers was the association method.

The population in this study was all class X students of SMA Negeri 1 Tenjo, amounting to 102 students. Sampling in this study used random sampling techniques for sampling with a total sample of 72 students.

The Data Collection Techniques and Instruments used in this study included questionnaires, documentation, and observations. Data Analysis Techniques of this study use Classical Assumption Tests (Normality Test, Linearity Test, Multicollinearity Test, Heteroskedasticity Test, Autocorrelation Test) and Hypothesis Test (Multiple Linear Regression)

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Result

1. Prerequisite Test

a. Normality test

Table 1. Normality test results

	Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
	Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	df	Sig.
Fasilitas Belajar	,093	72	,200 [*]	,968	72	,274
Kedisiplinan Belajar	,100	72	,172	,979	72	,266
Hasil Belajar	,119	72	,063	,976	72	,181

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

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

From the results of the normality test above, a sig value was obtained at a learning facility of 0.200 which means it is greater than the significant level or $0.200 > 0.05$ (5%) and the sig value in learning discipline is 0.172 which means it is greater than the significant level of $0.172 > 0.05$ (5%) meaning that the data on learning facilities and discipline are normally distributed.

b. Linearity Test

Table 2. Linearity test results

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	Corrected Total	10000,000	10000,000	72	138,889	16,053	,000
	Regression	5941,243	5941,243	1	5941,243	68,066	,000
	Residual	4058,757	4058,757	71	57,166	6,507	,019
	Total	10000,000	10000,000	73			
Total Model	Corrected Total	10000,000	10000,000	72	138,889	16,053	,000
	Regression	5941,243	5941,243	1	5941,243	68,066	,000
	Residual	4058,757	4058,757	71	57,166	6,507	,019
	Total	10000,000	10000,000	73			

From the results of the linearity test above, a significant value of learning facilities of 0.553 was obtained, which means less than a significant level or $0.553 > 0.05$ (5%) meaning that there is a significant linear relationship between learning facilities (X_1) and learning outcome variables (Y). Then the linearity test value of learning discipline obtained a sig value of $0.416 > 0.05$ meaning

that there is a significant linear relationship between learning discipline and learning outcome variables.

c. Multicollinearity Test

Table 3. Multicollinearity Test Results

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,461	3,231		1,381	,172		
	Fasilitas Belajar	,166	,096	,169	1,736	,087	,268	1,561
	Kedisiplinan Belajar	,748	,096	,759	7,798	,000	,268	1,561

a. Dependent Variable: Hasil Belajar

Based on the multicollinearity test table of the Coefficient Output above, it can be seen from the Tolerance value of $0.268 > 0.10$, which means that multicollinearity cannot occur, and a VIF of $1.561 < 10$ the conclusion is that learning facilities and learning discipline do not occur multicollinearity.

d. Heteroscedasticity Test

Table 4. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	4,461	3,231		1,381	,172		
	Fasilitas Belajar	,166	,096	,169	1,736	,087	,268	1,561
	Kedisiplinan Belajar	,748	,096	,759	7,798	,000	,268	1,561

a. Dependent Variable: Hasil Belajar

Based on the results of the heteroscedasticity test of the Coefficients Output above, a significant value of learning facilities of 0.419 was obtained more than the level of significance or $0.419 > 0.05$, then H_0 was accepted which means that learning facilities have no symptoms of heteroskedasticity and the sig value of learning discipline is 0.442 more than a significant level or $0.442 > 0.05$ then H_0 is accepted which means that learning discipline has no symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

e. Autocorrelation Test

Table 5. Autocorrelation test results

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	,898 ^a	,806	,801	4,329	1,264

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kedisiplinan Belajar, Fasilitas Belajar

b. Dependent Variable: Hasil Belajar

Based on the output of the summary model, the Durbin Watson(d) value is 1.264. Based on Durbin Watson's table with a significant level of 5% of the number of data (n) 72 and the number of independent variables K2, the value of $dL = 0.924$ and the value of $Du = 1.072$. Based on the above analysis the value of $d = 1.264$ is more $> Du = 1.072$ then H_0 is accepted which means that random errors are not correlated.

2. Hypothesis Test

The influence of learning facilities and learning discipline on class X learning outcomes at SMA Negeri 1 Tenjo

Table 6. Summary output results on double linear regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	,898 ^a	,806	,801	4,329

a. Predictors: (Constant), Kedisiplinan Belajar, Fasilitas Belajar

Based on multiple linear regression tests, the output of the summary model was calculated to have an r-value of 0.898, which means that learning facilities and learning disciplines have a very strong impact on learning outcomes. Based on the output of the summary model, the r^2 value of the total output of the multiple linear regression test is 0.806, which means that the influence of learning facilities and learning discipline on learning outcomes is 80.6% and 21.4% is influenced by other factors.

Table 7. ANOVA output results on Double linear regression

Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Total	1.000	14	.071		
Corrected Model	.999	2	.499	70.000	.000
Corrected Total	1.000	14	.071		
Corrected Model	.999	2	.499	70.000	.000
Corrected Total	1.000	14	.071		
Corrected Model	.999	2	.499	70.000	.000

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression test, the output of the anova^a model obtained a sig value of $0.000 < 0.05$, then $H_{1(3)}$ was accepted and $H_{0(3)}$ was rejected with another meaning, namely the influence between learning facilities and learning discipline on student learning outcomes.

Table 8. Output results Coefficients on Double Linear Regression

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)		4.178	.000
1	X1	.252	3.571	.001
1	X2	.664	9.375	<.001

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression test, the output of coefficients obtained from the multiple linear regression equation is $Y = 4.178 + 0.252x_1 + 0.664 x_2$. This means that the contribution of influences outside learning facilities and simultaneous learning disciplines to learning outcomes is constant 4,178. Each simultaneous increase in units of X_1 (learning facilities) and X_2 (learning discipline) increases the learning outcomes by 0.252 and 0.664 to Y (learning outcomes).

Discussion

Based on the interpretation of the results of the multiple linear regression test, it was found that learning facilities (X_1) and learning discipline (X_2) had a positive effect on learning outcomes (Y) in class X economics subjects at SMA NEGERI 1 Tenjo. This is in accordance with Sholekhah (2014) stating that every improvement in learning facilities

and learning discipline to the learning outcomes obtained by students in economics subjects. Meanwhile, if there is a decrease in learning facilities and discipline, it will also decrease learning outcomes. According to Reski (2018), Prihatin (2017) states that supportive learning facilities will be able to help students in learning, and the lack of learning aids will hinder learning progress.

Furthermore, according to Rahmawati & Suryadi (2019), Naibaho (2018) stated that teachers are facilitators, teachers must be able to provide learning facilities that facilitate student learning activities. An unpleasant learning environment, hot classes, unclean tables and chairs, and unavailable study equipment can make students lazy. Therefore, a teacher must provide learning facilities, so that the learning environment becomes pleasant for students.

Sari & Hadijah (2017) stated that discipline is essentially sincere submission based on a sense of fulfillment of duties and obligations and behaving in accordance with rules or codes of ethics that should apply in a certain environment. In addition, Handayani and Subakti (2021) revealed that learning discipline has a significant effect on learning outcomes, both individually and individually, and together.

CONCLUSION

The influence of learning facilities and learning discipline on student learning outcomes in class X economics subjects at SMA NEGERI 1 TENJO is proven by the results of a simple regression equation $Y = 4,178 + 0.252x_1 + 0.664x_2$. Based on the results of data analysis that has been carried out by researchers, it shows that the magnitude of the influence of learning facilities is 0.670 or 67% and 33%, influenced by other factors while the magnitude of the influence of learning discipline is 0.787 or 78.7% and 21.3% is influenced by other factors. The results of the study are expected to be used as a guideline for teachers to better utilize learning facilities and improve student learning discipline so that student learning outcomes can improve.

REFERENCES

- Abdillah, C., & Soffiatun, S. (2021). BELAJAR PEMBELAJARAN.
- Anggara, D. S., & Abdillah, C. (2019). Modul Metode Penelitian.
- Anggara, D. S., & Anwar, S. (2017). Statistik pendidikan.
- Anni, Catharina Tri. 2006. *Psikologi Belajar*. Semarang: Unnes Press.

- Damanik, B. E. (2019). Pengaruh Fasilitas Dan Lingkungan Belajar Terhadap Motivasi Belajar. *Publikasi Pendidikan*, 9(1), 46-52.
- Handayani, E. S., & Subakti, H. (2021). Pengaruh Disiplin Belajar terhadap Hasil Belajar Bahasa Indonesia di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 5(1), 151-164.
- Naibaho, D. (2018). Peranan guru sebagai fasilitator dalam perkembangan peserta didik. *Jurnal Christian Humaniora*, 2(1), 77-86.
- Prihatin, M. S. (2017). Pengaruh fasilitas belajar, gaya belajar dan minat belajar terhadap hasil belajar mata pelajaran ekonomi siswa kelas X IIS SMA Negeri 1 Seyegan. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ekonomi*, 6(5), 443-452.
- Rahmawati, M., & Suryadi, E. (2019). Guru sebagai fasilitator dan efektivitas belajar siswa. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran (JPManper)*, 4(1), 49-54.
- Reski, A. (2018). Pengaruh Fasilitas Belajar Terhadap Motivasi Dan Hasil Belajar Fisika Mahasiswa. *Musamus Journal of Science Education*, 1(1), 001-008.
- Reski, N., Taufik, T., & Ifdil, I. (2017). Konsep diri dan kedisiplinan belajar siswa. *Jurnal EDUCATIO: Jurnal Pendidikan Indonesia*, 3(2), 85-91.
- Salam, M., & Anggraini, I. (2018). Kedisiplinan Belajar Siswa Kelas V Di SDN 55/I Sridadi. *Jurnal Gentala Pendidikan Dasar*, 3(1), 127-144.
- Sari, B. P., & Hadijah, H. S. (2017). Meningkatkan disiplin belajar siswa melalui manajemen kelas. *Jurnal Pendidikan Manajemen Perkantoran (JPManper)*, 2(2), 233-241.
- Sholekhah, I. M. (2014). Pengaruh Fasilitas Belajar dan Lingkungan Keluarga Terhadap Hasil Belajar IPS Terpadu Melalui Motivasi Belajar SMP Negeri 1 Ambarawa (Studi Kelas VII Tahun Ajaran 2013/2014). *Economic Education Analysis Journal*, 3(2).
- Sugiyono. 2011. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif Dan R & D*. Bandung: CV. Alfabeta.
- Zulfia, R., & Syofyan, E. (2015). Pengaruh Fasilitas Belajar Di Rumah, Minat Belajar Dan Motivasi Belajar Terhadap Hasil Belajar Komputer Akuntansi. *Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 2(1).