



DOI: [10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1147](https://doi.org/10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1147)

ORIGINAL RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Effect of the Probing-Prompting Model on Islamic Religious Education Learning Outcomes

Aziza Wati^{1*}, Dedi Setiawan¹, Sunarto¹

¹ Universitas Ma'arif Lampung, Indonesia

Correspondence: aziza262@gmail.com

Article History: Received: 20 February 2026 • Revised: 25 March 2025 • Accepted: 15 April 2026

• Published: 30 April 2026

ABSTRACT

This research is motivated by the low learning outcomes of Islamic Religious Education (PAI) among fourth-grade students at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat, caused by conventional teaching models that are monotonous and fail to engage student activity. This study aims to: (1) describe the implementation of the Probing-Prompting learning model; (2) analyze PAI learning outcomes after implementing the model; and (3) examine the effect of the Probing-Prompting model on PAI learning outcomes. A quantitative method with a quasi-experimental design (nonequivalent control group) was employed. The population consisted of all fourth-grade students (64 students), with class IV A as the control group (21 students) and class IV B as the experimental group (21 students), selected using cluster sampling. The instrument was a validated multiple-choice test (10 valid items, reliability 0.680). Data analysis techniques included normality test (Shapiro-Wilk), homogeneity test (Levene), and hypothesis test (independent sample t-test). The results showed: (1) the implementation of the Probing-Prompting model proceeded well through the syntax of presenting students with new situations, providing guiding and probing questions, and reinforcing material; (2) learning outcomes of the experimental group (post-test mean 81.74) were higher than those of the control group (post-test mean 71.30); (3) the hypothesis test showed a significance value (2-tailed) of $0.002 < 0.05$, thus H_a was accepted. This study concludes that the Probing-Prompting learning model has a positive and significant effect on PAI learning outcomes of fourth-grade students at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat.

Keywords: Probing-Prompting, Learning Outcomes, Islamic Religious Education, Elementary School, Quasi-Experiment



ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini dilatarbelakangi oleh rendahnya hasil belajar Pendidikan Agama Islam (PAI) siswa kelas IV SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat, yang disebabkan oleh model pembelajaran konvensional yang monoton dan kurang melibatkan keaktifan siswa. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk: (1) mendeskripsikan penerapan model pembelajaran Probing-Prompting; (2) menganalisis hasil belajar PAI setelah penerapan model tersebut; dan (3) menguji pengaruh model Probing-Prompting terhadap hasil belajar PAI. Metode yang digunakan adalah kuantitatif dengan jenis quasi-experimental design (nonequivalent control group). Populasi adalah seluruh siswa kelas IV (64 siswa), dengan sampel kelas IV A sebagai kelas kontrol (21 siswa) dan IV B sebagai kelas eksperimen (21 siswa) yang dipilih menggunakan cluster sampling. Instrumen berupa tes pilihan ganda yang telah divalidasi (10 soal valid, reliabilitas 0,680). Teknik analisis data meliputi uji normalitas (Shapiro-Wilk), uji homogenitas (Levene), dan uji hipotesis (independent sample t-test). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan: (1) penerapan model Probing-Prompting berjalan dengan baik melalui sintaks menghadapkan siswa pada situasi baru, pemberian pertanyaan menuntun dan menggali, serta penguatan materi; (2) hasil belajar kelas eksperimen (mean post-test 81,74) lebih tinggi dibandingkan kelas kontrol (mean post-test 71,30); (3) uji hipotesis menunjukkan nilai signifikansi (2-tailed) $0,002 < 0,05$, sehingga H_0 diterima. Penelitian ini menyimpulkan bahwa model pembelajaran Probing-Prompting berpengaruh positif dan signifikan terhadap hasil belajar PAI siswa kelas IV SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat.

Kata Kunci: Probing-Prompting, Hasil Belajar, Pendidikan Agama Islam, Sekolah Dasar, Kuasi-Eksperimen

How to cite: Wati, A., Setiawan, D., & Sunarto, S. (2026). The Effect of the Probing-Prompting Model on Islamic Religious Education Learning Outcomes. *Assyfa Journal of Islamic Studies*, 4(1), 560-571. <https://doi.org/10.61650/ajis.v4i1.1147>

1. INTRODUCTION

Education is the principal foundation for developing high-quality human resources. Within Indonesia's national education system, Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System states that education aims to develop students' potential so that they become faithful, pious, morally upright, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, democratic, and responsible citizens. Islamic Religious Education (IRE), as a compulsory subject, has a strategic role in achieving these goals because it not only transfers religious knowledge but also shapes students' Islamic attitudes and personalities (Hidayat & Syafe'i, 2018; Nurmadiyah, 2014). In practice, however, the achievement of IRE objectives continues to face various obstacles, particularly student learning outcomes that have not yet reached an optimal level.

One factor that influences learning outcomes is the instructional model used by the teacher. A learning model is a conceptual framework describing systematic procedures for organizing learning experiences to achieve particular objectives (Rusman, 2014; Sutikno, 2019). An appropriate model can create an active, innovative, creative, effective, and enjoyable learning environment. Conversely, monotonous and teacher-centered instruction tends to make students passive and bored and makes it difficult for them to understand material deeply (Helmiati, 2023; Shoimin, 2017). In Islamic Religious Education, normative and abstract material requires instructional strategies that gradually elicit students' understanding.

Initial observations conducted at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat in September 2025 showed that fourth-grade IRE instruction was still dominated by lectures. Teachers presented material orally

and occasionally used printed textbooks and PowerPoint, but two-way interaction between teachers and students was very limited. Consequently, students tended to be passive, unenthusiastic, and unable to understand the material adequately. Daily-test data showed that 37 of 64 fourth-grade students (57.81%) had not achieved the Learning Objective Achievement Criteria (KKTP) of 70, while only 27 students (42.19%) had achieved or exceeded it. This condition indicates a serious instructional problem that requires immediate attention.

Low IRE learning outcomes are not limited to SD Negeri 83 Krui but are also common in Indonesian elementary schools. Tasya and Abadi (2019) identified internal factors such as interest, motivation, and study habits, as well as external factors such as instructional models, the environment, and family support. Among the external factors, insufficiently varied learning models are a principal cause of boredom and limited active engagement (Ardiansyah & Nana, 2020). An innovative model is therefore needed to activate students and improve their understanding of IRE material.

One model considered capable of addressing these problems is Probing-Prompting. In this model, the teacher presents a sequence of guiding (prompting) and exploratory (probing) questions that encourages students to connect prior knowledge and experience with new knowledge (Miftahul Huda, 2016; Wirawan Fadly, 2022). Probing refers to investigating or examining information already possessed by students, while prompting involves encouraging or guiding students when they encounter difficulty in finding an answer (Swarjawa et al., 2013; Ummu Kalsum et al., 2018). Through a systematic question-and-answer approach, the model can explore students' thinking in depth.

Previous studies have examined the effectiveness of Probing-Prompting across various subjects. Munjani (2021) investigated its effect on eighth-grade science learning outcomes at SMP Negeri 30 Semarang and found a large effect size ($d = 0.82$), with the experimental posttest mean (76.25) exceeding that of the control group (71.38). Winda Holillah and Siti Romlah (2022) studied the model in Aqidah Akhlak at MTs Nurrezky Hasanah Ciparay and reported a positive effect, with 67.5% of students achieving a good learning-performance category. Ratika Ningsih (2018) likewise reported a positive effect of Probing-Prompting Learning on fifth-grade social studies outcomes at SDN 13 Surau Gadang Padang.

Despite these positive findings, several gaps remain. First, most previous studies involved science, social studies, and Aqidah Akhlak at junior secondary schools and madrasahs, whereas research on elementary-school IRE remains limited. Second, elementary students differ from junior secondary students in abstract-thinking ability and attention span and therefore require specific examination. Third, the coastal setting of Krui, Pesisir Barat, where access to instructional innovation is limited, has rarely been studied. Fourth, previous studies generally did not provide a detailed account of the Probing-Prompting syntax in an actual classroom setting.

The novelty of this study lies in: (1) its specific focus on fourth-grade elementary-school IRE, which has rarely been examined in Probing-Prompting research; (2) its coastal location and students' distinctive socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds; (3) its detailed description of the model's syntax for teaching hard work, diligence, perseverance, and carefulness; (4) the use of a quasi-experimental pretest-posttest control-group design that permits more accurate measurement

of effects; and (5) validity, reliability, difficulty-index, and discrimination-index testing to ensure that the test instrument was appropriate.

The study is increasingly urgent in view of the Merdeka Curriculum's emphasis on student-centered learning and strengthening the Pancasila Student Profile. IRE content on commendable behavior—hard work, diligence, perseverance, and carefulness—is highly relevant to a model that encourages students to think actively and derive meaning from their own experiences (Ministry of Education and Culture, 2014). A systematic Probing-Prompting question-and-answer approach is expected to develop critical thinking while internalizing these character values. The study therefore addresses three questions: (1) How is the Probing-Prompting model implemented in fourth-grade IRE at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat? (2) What are students' IRE learning outcomes after implementation? and (3) To what extent does the model affect those outcomes?

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study used a quantitative approach and a quasi-experimental nonequivalent control-group design. Two existing classes were used without changing student composition, with a pretest before treatment and a posttest afterward (Sugiyono, 2017; Nanang Martono, 2016). The experimental class received Probing-Prompting instruction, while the control class received conventional lecture-based instruction. The design was: O1 (experimental pretest) → X (Probing-Prompting treatment) → O2 (experimental posttest); O3 (control pretest) → – (conventional instruction) → O4 (control posttest).

The research was conducted at SD Negeri 83 Krui in Pekon Way Nukak, Karya Penggawa District, Pesisir Barat Regency, Lampung Province, during September 2025 in the 2025/2026 academic year. The location was purposively selected because: (1) daily-test data indicated low fourth-grade IRE outcomes; (2) Probing-Prompting had never been implemented at the school; and (3) the location was accessible to the researcher. The population consisted of all 64 fourth-grade students in classes IV A (22 students), IV B (21), and IV C (21). Cluster sampling was used to randomly select two of the three classes (Suharsimi Arikunto, 2016; Wiratna Sujarweni, 2014). Class IV A served as the control group and class IV B as the experimental group, with 21 students in each group.

The independent variable was the Probing-Prompting learning model, and the dependent variable was student IRE learning outcomes for the topics of hard work, diligence, perseverance, and carefulness. Data were collected through: (1) observation of model implementation in the experimental class; (2) a 10-item multiple-choice pretest and posttest measuring cognitive learning outcomes; and (3) documentation of the school profile, student lists, and activity photographs (Makbul, 2021; Putri, 2019). The test was piloted with 22 students outside the sample to examine validity, reliability, difficulty, and discrimination. Pearson product-moment analysis using SPSS showed that all 10 items were valid ($r\text{-count} > r\text{-table } 0.423$). Cronbach's alpha was 0.680 (> 0.60), indicating reliability (Janna & Heerianto, 2021). Four items were of moderate difficulty and six were easy; discrimination analysis classified four items as very good, five as good, and one as adequate.

Table 1. Nonequivalent Control-Group Research Design

Group	Pretest	Treatment	Posttest
Experimental (IV B)	O1	X (Probing-Prompting)	O2
Control (IV A)	O3	– (Lecture)	O4

Data analysis included prerequisite and hypothesis tests. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used for normality because each group had fewer than 30 students, while Levene's test was used for homogeneity. Data were considered normally distributed and homogeneous when significance values exceeded 0.05. After both assumptions were satisfied, an independent-samples t-test was conducted at $\alpha = 0.05$. The alternative hypothesis (a difference between experimental and control learning outcomes) was accepted when the two-tailed significance was below 0.05; the null hypothesis was accepted when it exceeded 0.05 (Goleman et al., 2018; Putri, 2019). All analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics 24.

3. RESULTS AND FINDINGS

3.1 Implementation of the Probing-Prompting Learning Model

The second meeting was held on Wednesday, September 10, 2025, on diligence and perseverance. After greetings, prayer, and a brief review, the teacher displayed an image of a child studying diligently by candlelight during a power outage. Students responded to a series of probing questions: “What is the child doing? Why does the child continue studying in the dark? Have you ever studied under difficult conditions? How did you feel? What kept you motivated?” When a student replied “I don't know,” the teacher provided a prompt rather than immediately redirecting the question: “Have you ever felt too lazy to study? What did you do to overcome it?” Students were then able to identify the child's diligence and perseverance in not giving up easily.

The third meeting was held on Friday, September 12, 2025, on carefulness. After reviewing earlier material, the teacher presented an image of a student repeatedly reading examination questions and checking answers. The teacher asked: “How is the student in the image different from a classmate who works hastily? Which approach is better, and why?” Following a short discussion, students explained that the student in the image was more careful because the questions were read thoroughly and answers were checked. The teacher reinforced the importance of carefulness in achieving maximum learning results. The experimental class then completed the same test used for the pretest.

3.2 Islamic Religious Education Learning Outcomes

Table 2. Experimental-Class Pretest and Posttest Scores

Statistic	Pretest	Posttest
Highest Score	60	100
Lowest Score	40	60
Mean	46.52	81.74
Median	50	80

The experimental pretest mean was 46.52, far below the KKTP of 70. After Probing-Prompting treatment, the posttest mean increased to 81.74, a gain of 35.22 points. The highest posttest score was 100, achieved by two students, while the lowest was 60. The increase in the median from 50 to 80 also indicates consistent improvement among most students.

Table 3. Control-Class Pretest and Posttest Scores

Statistic	Pretest	Posttest
Highest Score	60	90
Lowest Score	30	50
Mean	47.39	71.30
Median	50	70

The control class, taught through lectures, obtained a pretest mean of 47.39, comparable to the experimental mean of 46.52 and indicating similar initial ability. The control posttest mean increased to 71.30, a gain of 23.91 points. The highest posttest score was 90 and the lowest 50. The experimental group therefore achieved a higher posttest mean ($81.74 > 71.30$) and a greater increase ($35.22 > 23.91$).

3.3 Effect of the Probing-Prompting Learning Model

Table 4. Normality Test Results (Shapiro-Wilk)

Class	Statistic	df	Sig.	Interpretation
Experimental Posttest	0.924	21	0.102	Normal ($p > 0.05$)
Control Posttest	0.909	21	0.053	Normal ($p > 0.05$)

The experimental and control posttest significance values were 0.102 and 0.053, respectively, both greater than 0.05. The learning-outcome data for both groups were therefore normally distributed. Levene's test was then used to determine equality of variances.

Table 5. Homogeneity Test Results (Levene's Test)

Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.	Interpretation
0.102	1	40	0.752	Homogeneous ($p > 0.05$)

The significance value was $0.752 > 0.05$, indicating equal variances between the two groups. With both assumptions satisfied, the hypothesis was tested using an independent-samples t-test.

Table 6. Hypothesis Test Results (Independent-Samples t-Test)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality of Means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Equal variances assumed	0.102	0.752	3.403	40	0.002
Equal variances not assumed			3.403	39.821	0.002

The two-tailed significance value was 0.002. Because this value was below 0.05, the alternative hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis rejected. There was therefore a significant difference in IRE learning outcomes between the Probing-Prompting experimental class and the lecture-based control class.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings show that Probing-Prompting was implemented successfully in the experimental class and had a positive effect on IRE learning outcomes. Its effectiveness is related to its systematic use of structured questions to explore and guide students' thinking (Miftahul Huda, 2016; Wirawan Fadly, 2022). Unlike one-way lectures, Probing-Prompting positions students as active participants who must remain prepared because the teacher may select anyone to answer. This creates a challenging yet enjoyable learning environment, consistent with Agus Krisno Budiyanto's (2016) view that the model activates students through activities requiring concentration and responsiveness.

The model was implemented through seven steps described by Aris Shoimin (2017): (1) presenting students with a new situation or image; (2) providing thinking time; (3) posing a problem to the entire class; (4) providing additional thinking time; (5) selecting a student to answer; (6) presenting another guiding question when the response is incomplete or stalled; and (7) asking a final question to ensure whole-class understanding. This syntax was effective in IRE because moral topics such as hard work, diligence, perseverance, and carefulness are appropriately taught through concrete everyday examples that are subsequently explored through questions (Amran Mahmud, 2020; Baharuddin Hafid et al., 2023).

The higher experimental learning outcomes compared with the control outcomes (81.74 versus 71.30) are consistent with Munjani's (2021) findings in science and Ratika Ningsih's (2018) findings in social studies. The experimental posttest mean of 81.74 shows that most students achieved or exceeded the KKTP of 70. The 35.22-point increase from the pretest mean of 46.52 was substantial. Probing-Prompting helped students with initially limited understanding develop stronger comprehension through a series of guiding and exploratory questions. These results

support the proposition that inquiry- and question-based learning improves cognitive understanding (Sutikno, 2019; Helmiati, 2023).

The model's success can also be explained through cognitive learning theory. Gradually sequenced questions helped students build new knowledge structures by connecting new material with prior knowledge and everyday experience. Assimilation and accommodation occurred as students attempted to answer probing questions, so new knowledge was constructed rather than passively received (Husamah, 2016; Aunurrahman, 2016). When students described their parents' hard work, for example, they constructed an understanding of hard work as sustained effort to achieve a goal. Self-constructed knowledge is more likely to be retained in long-term memory than information received only through lectures.

Affectively, Probing-Prompting also improved motivation and self-confidence. Experimental students appeared more enthusiastic and willing to express opinions than control students. The supportive atmosphere arose because the teacher offered prompting questions when students struggled rather than criticizing them or immediately redirecting the question (Swarjawa et al., 2013). Prompts such as “Try to remember, have you ever seen ...?” and “What do you think would happen if ...?” helped students feel supported and less embarrassed by incorrect answers. This is consistent with Ummu Kalsum et al. (2018), who found that Probing-Prompting develops students' courage and ability to answer questions and express opinions.

The comparison of learning gains confirms that Probing-Prompting was more effective than lectures. The experimental class improved by 35.22 points, while the control class improved by 23.91 points. The 11.31-point difference was statistically significant ($p = 0.002$) and educationally meaningful because it affected mastery. Sixteen of 21 experimental students (76.19%) achieved the KKTP in the posttest, compared with 11 of 21 control students (52.38%). Thus, Probing-Prompting increased classical mastery by 23.81 percentage points relative to lectures, directly addressing the study's objective of identifying an effective model for low IRE learning outcomes.

Another advantage is the model's ability to engage all students rather than only high-achieving or outspoken students. Lecture-based interaction tends to be dominated by a small number of active students, while others remain passive. In Probing-Prompting, random selection requires every student to remain prepared, encouraging normally passive students to read, prepare, and seek understanding (Shoimin, 2017). Some students were surprised and hesitant when selected during the first meeting, but by the second and third meetings they were more prepared and confident. The model therefore improved not only cognitive outcomes but also social-emotional skills.

The hypothesis-test significance of 0.002 provides strong empirical evidence that Probing-Prompting affects IRE learning outcomes. This is consistent with Winda Holillah and Siti Romlah (2022), who reported a positive effect on Aqidah Akhlak achievement, with 82.5% of students in a good category for model implementation and 67.5% in a good achievement category. Although their study used a survey rather than an experiment, the result aligns with the present stronger design. Munjani (2021) also obtained $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$ ($3.314 > 2.042$) and a large effect size ($d = 0.82$) using an independent-samples t -test.

The theoretical implication is stronger support for the effectiveness of question-based learning in improving cognitive outcomes, particularly for conceptual and applied content such as character values in IRE. Vygotsky's zone of proximal development is relevant because prompting questions act as scaffolding that helps students achieve higher understanding with teacher support (Rusman, 2014). Without such scaffolding, students may remain at their current level of thinking. Probing-Prompting provides structured support through questions progressing from easy to difficult and from concrete to abstract.

The practical implications are important for elementary-school IRE teachers. First, teachers should vary lecture-based instruction with Probing-Prompting, particularly for value-based content and examples from everyday life. Second, probing and prompting questions should be prepared before instruction, with attention to difficulty and logical sequence. Effective questions explore student thinking without causing frustration (Amran Mahmud, 2020). Third, teachers must create a warm and non-threatening classroom atmosphere so students are not afraid of incorrect answers. Failure to establish psychological safety may become a weakness of the model (Shoimin, 2017).

The study has several limitations: (1) the sample was relatively small, with 21 students in each group, limiting generalizability; (2) treatment lasted only three meetings and could not measure long-term effects; (3) the test measured only cognitive levels C1-C6 and did not assess affective or psychomotor outcomes; (4) students' learning styles and initial motivation, which may moderate treatment effects, were not measured; and (5) external factors such as home learning support could not be fully controlled. Future research should use larger samples, longer treatment periods, and measures of affective attitudes and psychomotor skills.

Despite these limitations, the study contributes to the development of elementary-school IRE, especially in coastal regions that may have limited access to instructional innovation. Probing-Prompting was effective, easy to implement, and required neither expensive resources nor sophisticated equipment. With appropriate training, teachers in remote areas can adopt the model to improve IRE quality. Future studies may integrate it with digital media or educational games to motivate technology-oriented Generation Alpha students.

5. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The Probing-Prompting model was implemented successfully for fourth-grade IRE content on hard work, diligence, perseverance, and carefulness at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat. Through a sequence of guiding and exploratory questions, the model activated students as thinkers who analyzed and constructed knowledge rather than merely listening. The experimental posttest mean was 81.74, exceeding the lecture-based control mean of 71.30. The experimental gain was 35.22 points, compared with 23.91 points in the control group. The independent-samples t-test yielded a two-tailed significance of $0.002 < 0.05$, indicating a significant difference. The alternative hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis rejected; therefore, the Probing-Prompting learning model had a positive and significant effect on fourth-grade IRE learning outcomes at SD Negeri 83 Krui Pesisir Barat.

6. REFERENCES

- Agus Krisno Budiyo. (2016). Sintak 45 model pembelajaran dalam student centered learning (SCL). Malang: UMM Press.
- Amran Mahmud. (2020). Pemodelan dalam proses pembelajaran mendesain pembelajaran menjadi berkarakter serta berkualitas. Jawa Barat: Forum Silaturahmi Dokter Indonesia.
- Ardiansyah, A. A., & Nana. (2020). Peran mobile learning sebagai inovasi dalam pembelajaran di sekolah. *Indonesian Journal of Education Research and Review*, 3(1), 47-56.
- Aris Rianto. (2021). Model pembelajaran round club dan hasil belajar. Jawa Barat: Guepedia.
- Aris Shoimin. (2017). *68 model pembelajaran inovatif dalam kurikulum 2013*. Yogyakarta: AR-RUZZ MEDIA.
- Aunurrahman. (2016). Belajar dan pembelajaran. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Azizah, N. K. S., dkk. (2022). Buku panduan model pembelajaran Nobangan. Jawa Barat: Guepedia.
- Baharuddin Hafid, St. Syamsudduha, & Amalia Syurgawi. (2023). Konsep desain pembelajaran model Bela H. Banathy pada pendidikan di Indonesia. *Al-Ubudiyah: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Studi Islam*, 4, 131-138.
- Casmita. (2012). Manajemen evaluasi pendidikan agama Islam. Yogyakarta: CV Budi Utama.
- Dana Ratifi Suardi. (2012). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi hasil belajar peserta didik kompetensi dasar ayat jurnal penyesuaian. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi*, 1(2).
- Dani Firmansyah. (2015). Pengaruh strategi pembelajaran dan minat belajar terhadap hasil belajar matematika. *Jurnal Pendidikan Unsika*, 3(1).
- Djamaluddin, A., & Wardana. (2019). Belajar dan pembelajaran. CV Kaaffah Learning Center.
- Fajri Ismail. (2014). Evaluasi pendidikan. Palembang: Tunas Gemilang Pers.
- Goleman, D., et al. (2018). Metode penelitian dengan pendekatan kuantitatif. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9), 1689-1699.
- Gusnarib Wahab. (2021). Teori-teori belajar dan pembelajaran. Indramayu: Adab.
- Harbi Gustari. (2020). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi hasil belajar fiqih pada peserta didik kelas VII di MTS NU Bandar Lampung. Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung.
- Hasruddin Dute. (2021). Pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam dalam masyarakat pluralistik. Jakarta Selatan: Publica Indonesia Utama.
- Helmiati. (2023). Model pembelajaran. Sleman Yogyakarta: Aswaja Pressindo.
- Hidayat, T., & Syafe'i, M. (2018). Peran guru dalam mewujudkan tujuan pembelajaran Pendidikan Agama Islam di sekolah. *Jurnal Ilmu Islam*, 2(1), 101-110.
- Husamah. (2016). Belajar dan pembelajaran. Malang: Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang (UMM Press).
- Janna, N. M., & Heerianto. (2021). Konsep uji validitas dan reliabilitas dengan menggunakan SPSS. *Jurnal Darul Dakwah Wal-Irsyad*.

- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). Pendidikan Agama Islam dan budi pekerti (Cet. 2). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- M. Thobroni. (2017). Belajar & pembelajaran: Teori dan praktik. Yogyakarta: Ar-Ruzz Media.
- Miftahul Huda. (2016). Model-model pengajaran dan pembelajaran: Isu-isu metodis dan paradigmatis (Cet. V). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.
- Muhammad Makbul. (2021). Metode pengumpulan data dan instrumen penelitian.
- Munjani, M. (2021). Pengaruh model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe probing-prompting terhadap hasil belajar IPA siswa kelas VIII H SMP Negeri 30 Semarang. *Wawasan Pendidikan*, 1(2), 234-245.
- Muzaffar, A. (2018). Derivasi indikator hasil belajar bahasa Arab. *LISANUNA: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa Arab dan Pembelajarannya*, 7(2), 213-225.
- Nanang Martono. (2016). Metode penelitian kuantitatif (Edisi Revisi 2). Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Nurmadiyah. (2014). Kurikulum Pendidikan Agama Islam. *Jurnal Al-Afkar*, 3(2), 45-58.
- Nurul Hidayah. (2023). Pengaruh model pembelajaran jigsaw dalam mata pelajaran IPA untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar kognitif peserta didik kelas VIII SMP Negeri 7 Halmahera Utara.
- Nurul Maharan dkk. (2025). Model pembelajaran yang efektif dalam penanaman pendidikan karakter sejak dini pada sekolah alam. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 9(1), 38-52.
- Putri, F. A. (2019). Pengaruh model pembelajaran probing prompting terhadap hasil belajar PAI pada peserta didik kelas XI di SMA Negeri 1 Tanjung Raya Kabupaten Mesuji.
- Putu Andre Payadnya, Made Surya Hermawan, dkk. (2022). Panduan lengkap penelitian tindakan kelas (PTK). Yogyakarta: CV Budi Utama.
- Rahmat Kamal. (2024). Belajar dan pembelajaran. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 8(1).
- Ratika Ningsih. (2018). Pengaruh model probing prompting learning terhadap hasil belajar IPS siswa kelas V SDN 13 Surau Gadang Padang.
- Rusman. (2014). Model-model pembelajaran mengembangkan profesionalisme guru (Cet. 2). Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Sobry Sutikno. (2019). Metode dan model pembelajaran: Menjadikan proses pembelajaran menjadi lebih variatif, aktif, inovatif, efektif dan menyenangkan. Lombok: Holistica.
- Sugiyono. (2017). Metode penelitian pendidikan (pendekatan kuantitatif, kualitatif dan R&D). Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Suharsimi Arikunto. (2016). Prosedur penelitian suatu pendekatan praktik. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.
- Sukendra, I. K., & Atmaja, I. K. S. (2020). Instrumen penelitian. *Journal Academia*.
- Sutomo. (2019). Model-model pembelajaran. Klaten: Lakeisha.
- Swarjawa, I. W. E., Suarjana, M., & Garminah, N. N. (2013). Pengaruh model pembelajaran probing-prompting terhadap hasil belajar IPA siswa kelas V di SD Negeri 1 Sebatu. *Jurnal Mimbar PGSD Undiksha*, 1(1).

- Syafaruddin, dkk. (2017). Ilmu pendidikan Islam. Jakarta: Hijri Pustaka Utama.
- Syarifuddin. (2012). Inovasi baru kurikulum 2013 Pendidikan Agama Islam dan budi pekerti. Yogyakarta: CV Budi Utama.
- T.P. (2006). Pendidikan Agama Islam dalam perspektif multikulturalisme (Cet. 1). Jakarta: Balai Litbang Agama.
- Tasya, N., & Abadi, A. P. (2019). Faktor penyebab rendahnya hasil belajar peserta didik. Jurnal Unsika Sesionedika.
- Ummu Kalsum, Nur Aisyah Humayrah, dkk. (2018). Penerapan model based learning teknik probing prompting terhadap pemahaman konsep fisika. Jurnal J-Hest, 1(1), 55-64.
- Winda Holillah, & Siti Romlah. (2022). Pengaruh penerapan metode probing prompting terhadap prestasi belajar siswa pada mata pelajaran akidah akhlak di MTs Nurrezky Hasanah Ciparay. Attaqwa: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam dan Anak Usia Dini, 1(1).
- Wiratna Sujarweni. (2014). Metodologi penelitian. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru.
- Wirawan Fadly. (2022). Model-model pembelajaran untuk implementasi kurikulum merdeka. Bening Pustaka.