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ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| This study aims to analyze the effect of learning independence, learning facilities, and learning motivation on the learning outcomes of grade XI students in Economics subjects at SMA Negeri 1 Telaga, Gorontalo Regency. This research is based on the low achievement of student learning outcomes that have not met the “Mastery Level Completion Criteria MMC" in most of grade XI. This study uses a quantitative approach with the SEM PLS method to analyze the relationship between variables. The population in this study were all grade XI students as many as 256 students, with a sample of 156 students selected. Data collection instruments are questionnaires and observations. The results showed that partially and simultaneously, learning independence, learning facilities, and learning motivation had a significant and positive effect on student learning outcomes. This finding confirms the importance of improving these three factors in order to improve the quality of learning and student learning outcomes in economics subjects. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

[Education plays an important role in the development of quality human resources. One indicator of the success of education is student learning outcomes. Learning outcomes reflect the extent to which students understand the learning material taught, including in economic subjects. However, differences in learning outcomes among students are often influenced by various factors both internal and external.

Learning outcomes are the culmination of the success of learning that has been determined. Student learning outcomes can include cognitive, affective, psychomotor aspects. (Suparno, 2012) states that learning outcomes are influenced by students' experiences with the physical world and their environment. A person's learning outcomes depend on what is already known, such as concepts, goals and motivation, which in turn affect interactions with the material being studied. Learning outcomes can also mean changes in behavior in students that can be observed and measured in changes in knowledge attitudes and skills (Anggraini, 2017). Change can be interpreted as an increase and development that is better than before, from not knowing to knowing, impolite attitudes to being polite and so on (Hamalik, 2001).

The success of learning is determined by many factors, including the teacher as an educator who carries out the teaching and learning process. Teachers can directly influence, foster and improve the intelligence and skills of students. Therefore, an effort is needed in order to improve the quality of education and teaching, through strategies or ways and methods in delivering learning materials. So that an increase in student learning outcomes is obtained, especially in Economics lessons.

The learning process can take place because of the interaction between students, teachers, and the interrelated curriculum. Students will learn optimally if supported by adequate learning facilities and infrastructure, interesting learning models, and active student involvement in the learning process. Active participation of students in learning activities can prevent the onset of boredom or boredom while in class. However, in practice, the learning process is still dominated by an authoritarian and instructive approach from the teacher. This condition can have an impact on low student learning outcomes. Optimal learning outcomes are not only determined by student motivation, but also influenced by the learning methods applied by the teacher.

Improved learning outcomes are not only supported by students' willingness to learn, but the learning methods used can have an effect. Facts in the field show that there are still teachers who use learning models that are less interesting to students, which causes students to lack interest in learning. Current learning trends emphasize that students should learn through their own activities, involving direct understanding of concepts. Students are encouraged to gain learning experience through experimentation and are given the opportunity to discover principles independently. This approach aims to build a deeper and more meaningful understanding for students.

The learning process at school, teachers should choose and use approaches, methods, models, strategies and techniques that can involve students in the learning process so that students are active in the learning process, both mentally, physically and socially. With the interaction that occurs during the learning process is expected to have an influence on student learning outcomes, especially in economic subjects. The learning outcomes of students in economics subjects at SMA Negeri 1 Telaga are as follows:

**Table 1. Student Learning Outcomes of SMA Negeri 1 Telaga 2024**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Class** | **Number of Students** | **Achieved – Minimum Mastery Criteria (75)** | **Not Achieved – Minimum Mastery Criteria** |
| 1. | XI 1 | 28 | 75% | 25% |
| 2. | XI 2 | 30 | 60% | 40% |
| 3. | XI 3 | 28 | 50% | 50% |
| 4. | XI 4 | 29 | 47% | 53% |
| 5. | XI 5 | 30 | 60% | 40% |
| 6. | XI 6 | 27 | 64% | 36% |
| 7. | XI 7 | 27 | 55% | 45% |
| 8. | XI 8 | 29 | 43% | 57% |
| 9. | XI 9 | 28 | 66% | 34% |

Source: Administration of SMA Negeri 1 Telaga

Based on the table above, the learning outcomes of Grade XI students in the Economics subject at SMA Negeri 1 Telaga show that the Minimum Mastery Criteria (MMC) is set at 75%. Among the nine Grade XI classes, only Class XI-1 met the MMC in Economics, while Classes XI-2 through XI-9 have not yet met the required score.

Economics subjects have a strategic role in shaping students' understanding of the concepts of economics, finance, and entrepreneurship in everyday life and the world of work. However, there is still a problem of low student learning outcomes in economics at SMA Negeri 1 Telaga. This encourages the need for a more in-depth study of the factors that influence student learning outcomes. Mujisuciningtyas, (2014) states that student learning outcomes are strongly influenced by aspects of learning independence and learning infrastructure.

Learning independence is the ability of individuals to direct themselves in learning, involving the process of planning, controlling, and evaluating in understanding the material. Learning independence has an important role in student learning outcomes, because with high independence, students will be able to manage time and learning methods effectively (Zimmerman, 2000). Dimyati and Mudjiono (2013) added that students who are independent in learning tend to be more active, confident, and take the initiative in understanding learning materials, including in economic subjects. This increases the ability of students to absorb the economic concepts taught. Winkel (2009) states that low learning independence can cause student dependence on teachers or friends so that learning outcomes are not optimal.

Sudjana (2002) states that learning facilities are all facilities and infrastructure that can support the student learning process, such as books, learning media, technology, and the learning environment. Adequate learning facilities will create a comfortable learning atmosphere so as to increase student focus in learning economics. Slameto (2010) emphasizes that the availability of good learning facilities can affect students' motivation and ability to understand learning materials. The lack of learning facilities will be a serious obstacle in the learning process.

Nasution (2010) stated that adequate learning facilities play a role in increasing students' learning interest. In the context of the Economics subject, facilities such as economics textbooks, access to information technology, and the use of interactive learning media help students transform abstract concepts into more concrete understanding. With proper facilities, it is expected that students will utilize them effectively to improve their learning outcomes. However, the reality in the field shows the opposite—many students' learning outcomes in Economics are still below the Minimum Mastery Criteria (MMC), which is set at 75.

Sadirman (2011) states that learning motivation is an internal and external drive that influences students to act to achieve learning goals. High learning motivation will encourage students to be more active in understanding and exploring economic material, so that learning outcomes increase. Uno (2016) states that motivation acts as a driving force for students to complete learning tasks. Instrinsic motivation (such as curiosity) and extrinsic (such as appreciation or encouragement from teachers) have a significant effect on student success in learning economics.]

2. methodology

[The research was conducted at SMA Negeri 1 Telaga, Jl. Achmad A. Wahap No. 10 Mogolato, Telaga District, Gorontalo Regency, Gorontalo Province. The research hypothesis testing was conducted with Structural Equation Model (SEM) based on Partial Least Square (PLS). PLS is a structural equation model (SEM) based on components or variants. According to Santoso (2014) SEM is a multivariate analysis technique which is a combination of factor analysis and regression analysis (correlation), which aims to test the relationship between variables in a model, be it between indicators and their constructs, or the relationship between constructs. According to Latan and Ghozali (2012), PLS is an alternative approach that shifts from a covariance-based SEM approach to a variant-based one.]

3. results and discussion

[**3.1** **Research Results**

**3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics is a statistical analysis method that provides an overview of the characteristics of each variable in the study as seen from the average value (mean), maximum value and minimum value. In this study, descriptive statistical analysis was carried out on data that had met the assumption of normality. The following are the results of descriptive statistical analysis of respondents' answers:

Table 2. Statistical Analysis Results

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Mean** | **Min** | **Max** | **Excess Kurtosis** | **Skewness** |
| X1.1 | 17.340 | 6.000 | 24.000 | 0.326 | -0.582 |
| X1.2 | 18.385 | 10.000 | 24.000 | -0.260 | -0.429 |
| X1.3 | 19.346 | 10.000 | 25.000 | -0.185 | -0.545 |
| X2.1 | 11.154 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 1.031 | -0.927 |
| X2.2 | 11.391 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.239 | -0.510 |
| X2.3 | 11.397 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.042 | -0.494 |
| X2.4 | 11.429 | 3.000 | 15.000 | 0.604 | -0.716 |
| X2.5 | 11.160 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.697 | -0.680 |
| X3.1 | 12.295 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.621 | -1.105 |
| X3.2 | 11.994 | 3.000 | 15.000 | 1.239 | -1.161 |
| X3.3 | 12.045 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.427 | -1.019 |
| X3.4 | 11.949 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.598 | -0.885 |
| Y1.1 | 11.276 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.151 | -0.631 |
| Y1.2 | 11.282 | 4.000 | 15.000 | 0.188 | -0.502 |
| Y1.3 | 11.423 | 4.000 | 15.000 | -0.131 | -0.590 |

Source: Personal Data (2024)

Based on table 2, it can be interpreted that the variables analyzed have diverse characteristics.

1. The mean (average) value of each variable indicates the central tendency of the data. Variable X1.1 has a mean of 17.34, which indicates that the average value of the data tends to be close to 17.34. Meanwhile, variable X2.1 has a lower mean of 11.154, indicating that the average value of the data is lower than that of X1.1.
2. The minimum and maximum values provide an overview of the data distribution. For example, variable X1.1 has a minimum value of 6 and a maximum of 24, which indicates that the data has a fairly wide range. On the other hand, variable X2.1 has a minimum value of 4 and a maximum of 15, indicating a narrower range.
3. Kurtosis measures the sharpness of the peaks of the data distribution. A kurtosis value close to zero indicates a distribution that is close to normal. For example, variable X1.2 has a kurtosis of -0.260, which indicates a relatively normal distribution. However, variable X3.2 has a kurtosis of 1.239, which indicates a distribution that is more pointed (leptokurtic) than the normal distribution.
4. Skewness measures the slope of the data distribution. A skewness value close to zero indicates a symmetrical distribution. For example, variable X1.1 has a skewness of -0.582, which indicates a distribution that tends to skew to the left (negative skew). Meanwhile, variable X3.1 has a skewness of -1.105, which indicates a more significant skew to the left.

**3.1.2 Outer Model**

At this stage the researcher analyzes the Outer Model to test the internal validity and reliability of the research model. The Outer Model is used to specify the relationship between latent variables and their indicators. The following are the results obtained from SmartPLS 3:

1. Convergent Validity

Convergent Validity is tested to ensure that indicators on a construct are highly correlated and have adequate loading scores. The following are the results of Convergent Validity testing:

**Table 3. Convergent Validity Results**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Let** | **Indicator** | **Loading Factor** | **Description** |
| Learning Independence (X1) | X1.1 | 0.844 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X1.2 | 0.912 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X1.3 | 0.900 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| Learning Facilities (X2) | X2.1 | 0.885 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X2.2 | 0.881 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X2.3 | 0.813 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X2.4 | 0.882 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X2.5 | 0.803 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| Learning Motivation (X3) | X3.1 | 0.842 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X3.2 | 0.817 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X3.3 | 0.858 | Valid (> 0.7) |
| X3.4 | 0.868 | Valid (> 0.7) |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on table 3, it can be seen that all variables meet the criteria of convergent validity testing because the loading factor value is more than 0.70. In addition, Redundancy is also a measurement to determine the construct validity test which is a measure of the quality of the structural model in each dependent variable block obtained in the algorithm iteration process in testing the measurement model. The following are the results of the AVE score:

**Table 4. Results of Average Variance Extracted (AVE)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Let** | **AVE** | **Description** |
| Learning Independence (X1) | 0.785 | Valid (AVE > 0.5) |
| Learning Facilities (X2) | 0.705 | Valid (AVE > 0.5) |
| Learning Motivation (X3) | 0.716 | Valid (AVE > 0.5) |
| Learning Outcomes (Y) | 0.759 | Valid (AVE > 0.5) |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on the table above, the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value exceeds the criteria, namely 0.5. Therefore, it can be concluded that all latent variables meet the Convergent Validity criteria because all loading factor values> 0.7 and AVE values> 0.5

1. Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity is tested using Cross Loading to ensure that each indicator has a higher correlation with the latent variable it is supposed to measure than with other latent variables. The following are the results of discriminant validity testing:

**Table 5. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **X1** | **X2** | **X3** | **Y** |
| X1.1 | **0,844** | 0,539 | 0,558 | 0,570 |
| X1.2 | **0,912** | 0,613 | 0,661 | 0,668 |
| X1.3 | **0,900** | 0,613 | 0,723 | 0,638 |
| X2.1 | 0,623 | **0,885** | 0,661 | 0,645 |
| X2.2 | 0,519 | **0,811** | 0,514 | 0,602 |
| X2.3 | 0,545 | **0,813** | 0,653 | 0,663 |
| X2.4 | 0,547 | **0,882** | 0,578 | 0,579 |
| X2.5 | 0,550 | **0,803** | 0,538 | 0,612 |
| X3.1 | 0,656 | 0,578 | **0,842** | 0,613 |
| X3.2 | 0,614 | 0,681 | **0,817** | 0,656 |
| X3.3 | 0,631 | 0,570 | **0,858** | 0,685 |
| X3.4 | 0,584 | 0,560 | **0,868** | 0,673 |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on table 5, it can be concluded that each indicator has a higher correlation with the latent variable that should be measured than with other latent variables. This can be seen from the loading factor value of each indicator which is greater on the corresponding latent variable, such as indicators X1.1, X1.2, and X1.3 which have the highest correlation with Learning Independence (X1), indicators X2.1, X2.2, X2.3, X2.4, and X2.5 which most strongly measure Learning Facilities (X2), indicators X3.1, X3.2, X3.3, and X3.4 which are most correlated with Learning Motivation (X3), and indicator Y which is most closely related to Learning Outcomes (Y).

Discriminant Validity is fulfilled because no indicator has a higher loading factor on another latent variable. In other words, each indicator exclusively measures the latent variable in question without overlapping with other latent variables. This indicates that this research model has good discrimination between latent variables, so it can be used for further analysis.

1. Reliability

Reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability. The following are the test results:

**Table 6. Reliability Test Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Let** | **Cronbach's Alpha** | **rho\_A** | **Composite Reliability** | **Average Variance Extracted (AVE)** |
| **X1** | **0,863** | 0,870 | **0,916** | 0,785 |
| **X2** | **0,895** | 0,896 | **0,923** | 0,705 |
| **X3** | **0,868** | 0,869 | **0,910** | 0,716 |
| **Y** | **0,841** | 0,841 | **0,904** | 0,759 |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on the reliability testing results above, it is evident that all latent variables in this study meet the criteria for good reliability. The Cronbach's Alpha values for each latent variable—Learning Independence (X1) = 0.863, Learning Facilities (X2) = 0.895, Learning Motivation (X3) = 0.868, and Learning Outcomes (Y) = 0.841—are all greater than 0.7. This indicates that the research instruments have high internal consistency. The Composite Reliability values for all latent variables also exceed 0.7, which means that the constructs of the latent variables possess excellent reliability and are consistent in measuring their respective indicators.

Based on the results of the Outer Model analysis, it can be concluded that the measurement model in this study meets all the required criteria.

1. Convergent validity is met, indicated by the loading factors of all indicators greater than 0.7 and the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value exceeding 0.5 for each latent variable.
2. Discriminatory Validity is also met, which is proven through the Cross Loading method. The results show that each latent variable has good discrimination and does not overlap with other latent variables.
3. Instrumental Reliability is met, with Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values for all latent variables greater than 0.7.

Thus, the measurement model (Outer Model) in this study is declared valid and reliable, so it is suitable for further analysis, namely the Inner Model or Structural Equation Modeling (SEM).

**3.1.3 Inner Model**

Inner Model analysis is carried out to predict the causal relationship between the latent variables tested. The following are the results of testing the Coefficient of Determination (R²) and Predictive Relevance (Q²):

**Table 7. Results of the Coefficient of Determination and Predictive Relevance**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable Let** | **R Square** | **R Square Adjusted** | **SSO** | **SSE** | **Q² (=1-SSE/SSO)** |
| Learning Independence (X1) | - | - | 468,000 | 468,000 | - |
| Learning Facilities (X2) | - | - | 780,000 | 780,000 | - |
| Learning Motivation (X3) | - | - | 624,000 | 624,000 | - |
| Learning Outcomes (Y) | **0,694** | **0,688** | 468,000 | 230,324 | **0,508** |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on the test results above, it can be interpreted that the Learning Outcomes (Y) variable has an R Square value of 0.694 and an Adjusted R Square of 0.688. This shows that 69.4% of the variation in Learning Outcomes (Y) can be explained by the variables of Learning Independence (X1), Learning Facilities (X2), and Learning Motivation (X3). The remaining 30.6% is explained by other variables outside the model. The Adjusted R Square value which is close to the R Square value indicates that this model is quite stable.

The Predictive Relevance (Q²) value for Learning Outcomes (Y) is 0.508. Because the Q² value> 0, this model has good Predictive Relevance, meaning that the model is able to predict observations accurately. The Q² value of 0.508 indicates that the model has a strong enough predictive ability, so it can be used to predict Learning Outcomes (Y) based on the independent variables included in the model.

**3.1.4. Hypothesis Testing**

Hypothesis testing is carried out to test the causal relationship between the independent variables (X1, X2, X3) and the dependent variable (Y). The following are the results of hypothesis testing using the p-value:

**Table 8. Hypothesis Test Results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Original Sample (O)** | **Sample Mean (M)** | **Standard Deviation (STDEV)** | **T Statistics (|O/STDEV|)** | **P Values** |
| Learning Independence (X1) → Learning Outcomes (Y) | **0,193** | 0,190 | 0,089 | 2,163 | **0,031** |
| Learning Facilities (X2) → Learning Outcomes (Y) | **0,328** | 0,324 | 0,089 | 3,708 | **0,000** |
| Learning Motivation (X3) → Learning Outcomes (Y) | **0,404** | 0,412 | 0,093 | 4,341 | **0,000** |
| X1,X2,X3→Learning Outcomes (Y) | R²=0,673 | - | - | - | <0,05 |

Source: Personal Data *SmartPLS* (2025)

Based on the results of hypothesis testing, it can be interpreted that the three independent variables, namely Learning Independence (X1), Learning Facilities (X2), and Learning Motivation (X3), significantly affect Learning Outcomes (Y).

1. Learning Independence (X1) has a positive and significant influence on Learning Outcomes (Y) with a path coefficient of 0.193 and p-values of 0.031 <0.05%. This means that the higher the level of student learning independence by 1, the value of learning outcomes will increase by 0.193.
2. Learning Facilities (X2) also has a positive and significant effect on Learning Outcomes (Y) with a path coefficient of 0.328 and p-values of 0.000 <0.05%. This means that if the value of learning facilities increases by 1, student learning outcomes will also increase by 0.328.
3. Learning Motivation (X3) has the greatest influence on Learning Outcomes (Y) with a path coefficient of 0.404 and p-values of 0.000 <0.05%. This means that if learning motivation increases by 1 then student learning outcomes also increase by 0.404.
4. Learning Independence (X1), Learning Facilities (X2), Learning Motivation (X3), has the greatest influence on Learning Outcomes (Y) with a path coefficient of 0.673 and a p-value of 0.000 <0.05 if X1,X2,X3 increases by 1 then student learning outcomes also increase by 0.673.

**3.2 Discussion**

**3.2.1. The Effect of Learning Independence on Learning Outcomes**

Based on the results of the study, the learning independence variable had a positive and significant effect. This means that when the value of learning independence increases, the learning outcomes of students in economic subjects will also increase. This can happen because students with a high level of learning independence tend to be responsible for the progress of their academic achievement. They are able to manage themselves, have great initiative, and strong motivation to continue to achieve better achievements.

In line with the statement conveyed by Wiralodra and Barat (2018) in accordance with Permendikbud No. 65 of 2013 concerning Education Process Standards, which emphasizes the importance of learner independence in learning. Learning independence is considered a key factor that greatly influences success in the learning process.

Independent learning is an active learning method that involves individual participation, aiming to develop one’s potential without relying on the presence of other students, face-to-face classroom meetings, or interactions with classmates. This method is also viewed as a process of self-development and skill mastery through a unique and personal approach (Yamin Martinis, 2020).

Based on students’ responses to questions related to self-efficacy (self-confidence), the majority of students demonstrated a relatively high level of confidence in their ability to understand learning materials, complete assignments, and face exams independently. For example, in response to the statements:

“I am confident in my ability to understand the subject matter without help from others.” (Average score: 3.8) and  
“I feel confident completing school assignments through my own efforts.” (Average score: 4.0)

The high scores on the self-efficacy indicators indicate that students possess strong self-confidence in facing academic challenges. This confidence encourages them to be more independent in their learning, ultimately contributing to improved learning outcomes.

Motivation indicators also serve as a strong supporting factor in independent learning. Based on students’ responses, both intrinsic motivation (internal drive) and extrinsic motivation (external drive) play significant roles in encouraging students to study independently. For example:  
“I have an inner drive to always understand the subject matter.” (Average score: 4.2) and  
“I study to improve my understanding, not just for grades.” (Average score: 4.1)

This high level of motivation encourages students to be more proactive in seeking learning resources, managing their time, and overcoming learning difficulties without relying on others.

Finally, regarding the learning goals indicator, students who have specific learning goals tend to be more motivated and disciplined in managing their learning processes. For example:  
“I study to achieve my future aspirations.” (Average score: 4.3) and  
“I create a study plan to achieve my academic goals.” (Average score: 4.0).  
These clear learning goals help students stay focused and consistent in their studies, enabling them to achieve better learning outcomes.

Thus, it can be concluded that independent learning, or learning autonomy, is the ability to make decisions independently, either with or without support from others, by considering relevance appropriately and without dependency. It involves taking initiative in facing and overcoming problems, confidence in completing tasks, and responsibility for one’s actions. Therefore, learning autonomy can significantly influence students' academic performance.

**3.2.2 The Influence of Learning Facilities on Learning Outcomes**

Based on the research findings, the variable of learning facilities has a positive and significant influence. This means that when the quality of learning facilities increases, students’ learning outcomes in Economics also improve.

This result occurs because well-equipped learning facilities positively affect learning outcomes by facilitating the learning process, enhancing the understanding of materials, and creating a comfortable learning environment—thereby increasing learning efficiency. These facilities include classrooms, learning tools, learning materials, instructional media, and other supporting infrastructure, all of which collectively contribute to the achievement of optimal learning outcomes.

Based on students' answers, the majority of respondents stated that the school provides adequate facilities and infrastructure to support learning. For example:

"I have access to adequate study rooms at school." (Mean score: 4.2) and "The school library provides complete books to support learning." (Mean score: 4.1)

The high scores on this indicator indicate that the availability of facilities such as study rooms, libraries and technology (such as computers or projectors) have met students' needs. These complete facilities allow students to access learning resources easily, thus facilitating the learning process.

On the Quality of learning facilities indicator, the majority of students stated that learning facilities at their school are of good quality and function optimally. For example:

"Textbooks and learning materials at school are of good quality." (Mean score: 4.0) and "Learning facilities at school function well without damage." (Average score: 4.1)

Quality facilities, such as relevant textbooks and complete laboratory equipment, help students understand the material better. Accessibility of learning facilities is also a significant factor. Students stated that they could access learning facilities such as libraries and laboratories easily. For example:

"I can easily access the library whenever I need it." (Average score: 4.0) and "Learning facilities at school can be used by all students without restrictions." (Mean score: 4.2)

Easy access to learning facilities allows students to utilize them optimally, both for independent and group learning. This is in line with Fullan & Langworthy's (2014) research which states that high accessibility of learning facilities can increase student engagement in the learning process.

The majority of students stated that their classrooms had good lighting, a comfortable temperature, and a quiet environment. For example:

"The classroom has good lighting to support learning activities." (Average score: 4.3). "The school environment is quiet and supports learning concentration." (Mean score: 4.2).

The results of this study are in line with the findings of research conducted by Dewi et al. (2016) entitled “The Effect of Learning Facilities on Student Learning Outcomes in Class X of the Accounting Expertise Program at SMK Kansai Pekanbaru,” which shows that learning facilities have a significant effect on the learning outcomes of students in class X of the accounting expertise program at SMK Kansai Pekanbaru.

Based on the analysis of the answers to the questionnaire, it can be concluded that learning facilities have a positive and significant influence on student learning outcomes. Facilities that are complete, of good quality, easily accessible, and in accordance with student needs can increase learning effectiveness and encourage students to achieve better learning outcomes. Therefore, it is important for schools and policy makers to continuously improve the quality and availability of learning facilities to support students' academic success.

**3.2.3 The Effect of Learning Motivation on Learning Outcomes**

Based on the results of the study, the learning motivation variable has a positive and significant effect. This means that when the value of learning motivation increases, the learning outcomes of students in economic subjects will also increase.

This result can be caused because high learning motivation in students will encourage enthusiasm for learning, which has the potential to improve their learning outcomes. A good learning motivation condition is one of the supporting factors or drivers for the enthusiasm for learning of each student, which in turn has a positive effect on the achievement of learning outcomes.

Based on the results of the answers to the questionnaires that have been filled in by students, it can be concluded that learning motivation has a positive and significant influence on student learning outcomes. The majority of students show a high level of motivation, both in terms of desire to succeed, internal drive, future expectations, and the rewards they receive. For example, on questions such as

"I want to achieve good grades in every lesson" and "I study because I want to achieve my goals in the future".

The high average score indicates that students have a strong desire to succeed and are motivated to achieve their academic goals. This is in line with Deci & Ryan's (2017) theory which states that intrinsic motivation, such as the desire to understand the material and achieve goals, can increase student engagement in the learning process, thus having a positive impact on learning outcomes.

In addition, the drive and need to learn are also important factors that influence student motivation. Students who feel that learning is an important part of achieving success tend to be more motivated to master the subject matter. For example, on the question

"I feel that learning is an important part of achieving success". the high average score indicates that students realize the importance of learning for their future. This motivation encourages them to be more persistent in facing academic challenges and trying to achieve optimal results. This is in accordance with Schunk & DiBenedetto's (2016) research which states that high learning motivation correlates with improved academic achievement, as motivated students tend to be more focused and consistent in learning.

Rewards and recognition also play an important role in increasing students' motivation to learn. Students who feel appreciated by teachers or peers for their achievements tend to be more motivated to continue achieving. For example, on the question

"I feel motivated when I get rewards for my learning achievements," the high average score indicates that external rewards can be an additional driver for students. This is in line with extrinsic motivation theory which states that rewards and recognition can increase students' enthusiasm for learning, although intrinsic motivation remains the main factor driving long-term success.

Based on these results, it can be concluded that learning motivation, both from within students (intrinsic) and from the environment (extrinsic), has a crucial role in determining student learning outcomes. High motivation not only encourages students to be more active and disciplined in learning, but also helps them overcome difficulties and achieve their academic goals. Therefore, it is important for educators to continuously nurture and sustain students' learning motivation through various strategies, such as providing positive feedback, creating a supportive learning environment, and helping students set clear learning goals.]

4. Conclusion

[Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. Learning independence has a positive and significant effect on student learning outcomes. Students who have a high level of learning independence tend to be more responsible, have initiative, and are able to manage their learning process independently. This is in line with the theory which states that learning independence is a key factor in improving student learning outcomes.
2. Learning facilities also have a positive and significant effect on student learning outcomes. Complete, quality and easily accessible facilities can facilitate the learning process, facilitate understanding of the material, and create a comfortable and conducive learning environment. This supports students to achieve better learning outcomes.
3. Learning motivation has the greatest influence on student learning outcomes. High motivation, both from within students (intrinsic) and from the environment (extrinsic), encourages students to be more active, disciplined, and persistent in facing academic challenges. Strong learning motivation also helps students to achieve their academic goals.]
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