Vol. 4, No. 3, September 2026, pp. 1429-1438
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
POST AXIAL
FUTURISTIC TEACHING AND LEARNING
https://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/postaxial | | ISSN 3025-7549

The Effect of the SAVI Learning Model on IPAS Learning Outcomes among Fourth-Grade Students

Aprilia Suci Cahyati [1a]*, Syofnidah Ifrianti[2b], Anton Tri Hasnanto[3a]
[1a]Student, Departement of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Teacher Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung
[2b]Lecturer, Departement of English Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung
[3a]Lecturer, Departement of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Teacher Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung

[1a]cahyasuciapr14@gmail.com, [2b]syofnidahifrianti@radenintan.ac.id, antontri@radenintan.ac.id[3a]

Article History:
Received:
21-08-2026
Revised:
30-08-2026
Accepted:
10-09-2026

Keywords:
SAVI Learning Model, Learning Outcomes, IPAS, Fourth-Grade Students

***Correspondence Address:**
cahyasuciapr14@gmail.com

Abstract:
This study was motivated by the low learning outcomes of fourth-grade students in Science and Social Studies (IPAS) at SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar Lampung. Initial data showed average scores of 56.41 in Class IV A, 64.64 in Class IV B, 65.97 in Class IV C, and 66.72 in Class IV D. Learning activities were also dominated by teacher explanations and textbook use, resulting in limited student involvement. This study aimed to determine the effect of the SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually) learning model on students' IPAS learning outcomes.
This study employed a quantitative approach with a quasi-experimental method and a Non-Equivalent Control Group Design. The sample consisted of 64 fourth-grade students, with 32 students in Class IV A as the experimental group and 32 students in Class IV B as the control group. The experimental group received the SAVI learning model, while the control group received Problem-Based Learning (PBL). The sampling technique was purposive sampling. Data were collected using 20 validated multiple-choice questions and analyzed using prerequisite tests and an Independent Sample t-Test.
The results showed that the experimental group obtained a higher mean posttest score (80.47) than the control group (74.38). The Independent Sample t-Test produced a significance value of 0.00 < 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between the two groups. These findings indicate that, under the conditions of the study, the SAVI learning model was associated with higher IPAS learning outcomes than Problem-Based Learning.
Keywords: SAVI Learning Model, Learning Outcomes, IPAS, Fourth-Grade Students.

Vol. 4, No. 3, September 2026, pp. 1429-1438
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF
POST AXIAL
FUTURISTIC TEACHING AND LEARNING
https://journal.amorfati.id/index.php/postaxial | | ISSN 3025-7549

Introduction (مقدمة)

Integrated Science and Social Studies (IPAS) is an important subject in elementary education because it connects scientific concepts with phenomena encountered by students in their daily lives. Learning IPAS therefore requires more than the delivery and memorization of factual information. Students need opportunities to observe phenomena, communicate their observations, use visual representations, engage in concrete activities, and process information to construct meaningful understanding. This orientation is consistent with the principles of student-centered learning, which position students as active participants in the learning process rather than passive recipients of information.

The need for such an approach is particularly important for fourth-grade students. At this developmental level, students generally benefit from concrete experiences, visual information, physical involvement, and opportunities to communicate their ideas. However, student-centered learning does not automatically guarantee meaningful participation. Different student-centered models emphasize different dimensions of learning. Problem-Based Learning (PBL), for example, emphasizes the use of authentic problems as a stimulus for investigation and problem solving, whereas cooperative learning emphasizes interaction and collaboration among students. These approaches can effectively promote student activity, but they do not necessarily provide an instructional structure that deliberately integrates physical experience, listening and speaking, visualization, and intellectual processing within the same learning sequence. Therefore, the selection of a student-centered model should consider not only whether students are active, but also the quality and forms of participation that are required by the learning characteristics of IPAS.

In this context, the Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually (SAVI) learning model offers a distinctive instructional structure. SAVI integrates four dimensions of learning: somatic activities involving physical movement or manipulation, auditory activities involving listening, questioning, discussion, and explanation, visualization through objects, pictures, demonstrations, or other visual representations, and intellectual activities requiring students to analyze information, connect concepts, solve problems, and formulate conclusions. The strength of SAVI is therefore not simply that it makes students more active, but that it organizes different forms of participation into an integrated learning process. This characteristic is relevant to IPAS because many concepts can be learned through direct observation and concrete experience before being processed through communication and reasoning. Previous studies have reported that SAVI can improve science learning outcomes, attention, cognitive outcomes, and higher-order learning competencies (Amalia et al., 2020; Laili et al., 2023; Hasan et al., 2023; Kusrini et al., 2025).

Previous empirical research provides encouraging evidence regarding the effectiveness of SAVI, but several limitations remain. Amalia et al. (2020) found that SAVI produced better science learning outcomes than a comparison group, while Laili et al. (2023) reported a significant effect of SAVI on primary school science learning outcomes using a non-equivalent control group design. Lyansari et al. (2024) specifically examined SAVI in fourth-grade IPAS learning and reported a significant effect on learning outcomes. More recent studies have also investigated SAVI with additional supports, such as interactive video and digital learning media (Ariyani et

al., 2025; Nitte et al., 2025), while other studies have examined outcomes such as cognitive abilities, metacognition, and critical thinking (Hasan et al., 2023; Kusrini et al., 2025). Although these studies strengthen the evidence for SAVI, they also indicate a research gap. Much of the existing evidence has been obtained in different subject contexts, with additional media, different outcome variables, or different comparison conditions. Consequently, there is still a need to examine whether SAVI itself, as the principal instructional model rather than as an effect of a particular digital medium, can produce different learning outcomes when compared directly with another student-centered model in an authentic elementary classroom context.

The comparison with Problem-Based Learning (PBL) is particularly relevant because PBL also represents a student-centered approach and can encourage students to investigate problems, discuss ideas, and develop solutions. Thus, comparing SAVI with PBL provides a more demanding test than comparing SAVI only with conventional teacher-centered instruction. If a difference is found, the result may provide stronger evidence that the organization of multisensory learning through SAVI offers an additional instructional advantage beyond student activity generated through problem-based learning. Nevertheless, this comparison should not be interpreted as an assumption that SAVI is universally superior to PBL. Rather, the purpose is to determine whether the specific characteristics of SAVI are associated with different IPAS learning outcomes under the conditions of the present study.

The empirical problem addressed by this study was identified at SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar Lampung. Preliminary achievement data from the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year showed variation among the four fourth-grade classes. The mean scores were 56.41 for Class IV A, 64.68 for Class IV B, 65.97 for Class IV C, and 66.72 for Class IV D, with an overall mean of 63.45 for 128 students. The difference between the lowest and highest class means reached 10.31 points. These findings indicate that IPAS achievement was not yet evenly distributed across the fourth-grade classes. Classroom observations also indicated that learning was still frequently dominated by teacher explanations and textbook use, while students' physical energy was not always directed toward structured academic activities. The problem, therefore, was not merely a lack of student activity, but the need to transform students' activity into purposeful observation, communication, visualization, and intellectual processing.

The novelty of the present study lies in examining SAVI as the principal instructional treatment in fourth-grade IPAS learning and directly comparing it with PBL within a natural classroom setting. Unlike studies that combine SAVI with particular digital media or examine SAVI through a single-group design, this study investigates whether the integrated somatic, auditory, visualization, and intellectual structure of SAVI is associated with different learning outcomes when students receive another student-centered instructional approach as the comparison condition. The study therefore contributes not merely another confirmation that SAVI can improve learning, but empirical evidence concerning the relative effectiveness of a multisensory student-centered model compared with PBL in a specific fourth-grade IPAS context.

Based on this research gap and the learning problems identified in the field, this study aimed to determine whether the SAVI learning model significantly affects the IPAS learning outcomes of fourth-grade students at SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar Lampung. The study is expected to provide empirical evidence regarding the applicability of SAVI as an alternative student-centered model for IPAS learning and to clarify whether integrating physical activity, auditory interaction, visualization, and intellectual processing can provide different learning outcomes from those obtained through problem-based learning.

Method (منهج)

This study employed a quantitative approach using a quasi-experimental method with a Non-Equivalent Control Group Design. The study was conducted at SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar

Lampung during the first semester of the 2026/2027 academic year. The population consisted of 128 fourth-grade students distributed across four parallel classes. Because the classes had been established by the school before the research and individual students could not be randomly reassigned, the study used intact classes rather than individual randomization.

Purposive sampling was used to select the research participants. Two fourth-grade classes were selected based on several considerations, including their status as parallel classes at the same grade level, comparable class sizes, availability for the research schedule, and preliminary IPAS achievement data. Class IV A, consisting of 32 students, was selected as the experimental group, while Class IV B, consisting of 32 students, was selected as the control group. The preliminary achievement data showed mean scores of 56.41 for Class IV A and 64.68 for Class IV B. These data were used as the basis for describing the initial classroom conditions rather than assuming that the two groups had identical achievement levels. Both classes followed the same school curriculum and were taught within the same institutional context, while receiving different instructional treatments during the study.

The experimental group received the SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually) learning model, whereas the control group received Problem-Based Learning (PBL). Both groups studied the same IPAS learning topic and were assessed using the same achievement instrument. The comparison was therefore focused on differences in learning outcomes following the different instructional treatments.

The intervention was conducted over five instructional meetings in both the experimental and control groups, with each meeting lasting 2 × 35 minutes, resulting in a total treatment duration of 350 minutes for each group. The experimental group received instruction using the SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually) learning model, while the control group received instruction using Problem-Based Learning (PBL). Both groups studied the same IPAS learning topic, followed the same learning objectives, and were assessed using the same achievement instrument. The main difference between the groups was the instructional model applied during the learning process.

In the experimental group, the SAVI learning model was implemented through four main stages: preparation, presentation, practice, and performance. During the preparation stage, the teacher prepared students for learning by establishing attention, motivation, and readiness to participate in the activities. During the presentation stage, the learning material was introduced through concrete experiences, visual representations, explanations, demonstrations, and questions. During the practice stage, students actively processed the material through observation, discussion, concrete activities, and guided problem solving. During the performance stage, students communicated their understanding by presenting their findings, responding to questions, and reflecting on the learning process. These activities integrated the somatic, auditory, visualization, and intellectual dimensions of the SAVI model.

In the control group, learning was conducted using the Problem-Based Learning model. Students were introduced to problems related to the learning topic and were guided to identify problems, discuss relevant information, investigate possible explanations, develop solutions, and present the results of their group work. The teacher facilitated the learning process and provided guidance when necessary. Thus, both groups involved active student participation, but the experimental group emphasized the integration of physical activity, auditory interaction, visualization, and intellectual processing through the SAVI structure, whereas the control group followed the problem-solving structure of PBL.

A pretest was administered before the instructional intervention to obtain information about students' initial learning outcomes. The respective instructional treatments were then implemented for five meetings, with each meeting lasting 2 × 35 minutes. After the five-meeting intervention was completed, both groups were administered the posttest using the validated

achievement test. Therefore, each group received an equivalent instructional duration of 350 minutes, while the instructional model differed between the experimental and control conditions. The learning topic was states of matter and their changes. The topic was selected because it contains observable phenomena that can be connected naturally to the four SAVI dimensions. Students could observe concrete objects and changes, listen to explanations and peer responses, use visual representations, and process evidence to formulate explanations. This made the topic suitable for evaluating whether multisensory participation was associated with improved cognitive learning outcomes.

The collected data were analyzed quantitatively. Before hypothesis testing, the data were examined for normality and homogeneity. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used to determine whether the data were normally distributed, while the homogeneity test was used to examine the equality of variance between the groups. After the assumptions for parametric analysis were satisfied, an independent-samples t-test was conducted at a significance level of 0.05 to determine whether there was a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between the experimental and control groups. The null hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between students taught using the SAVI learning model and those taught using Problem-Based Learning, whereas the alternative hypothesis stated that a significant difference existed. The independent-samples t-test was conducted to determine whether there was a significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between the experimental and control groups after the instructional treatment. The analysis produced a t-value of -2.686 with 62 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed significance value of 0.009. Because the significance value was lower than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected. This result indicates that there was a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between students who received the SAVI learning model and those who received Problem-Based Learning.

The experimental group obtained a mean posttest score of 80.47, whereas the control group obtained a mean posttest score of 74.38. The higher mean posttest score in the experimental group, together with the significant independent-samples t-test result, indicates that students who received SAVI achieved different and higher post-intervention learning outcomes than students in the PBL group under the conditions of this study.

Table 1. Research groups and instructional treatments

Group	N	Role	Treatment
IV A	32	Experimental	SAVI
IV B	32	Control	Problem-Based Learning

Table 2. Summary of instrument analysis

Instrument evidence	Result	Decision
Pilot items	30 multiple-choice items	Analyzed
Valid items	20 items (1, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29)	Retained
Cronbach's alpha	0.703	Reliable
Discrimination	17 good; 2 very good; 3 adequate; 2 weak; 6 very weak	Items evaluated

Result (نتائج)

The analysis began with an examination of the instrument and the distributional assumptions. The pilot analysis showed that 20 of the 30 items met the validity criterion, while 10 items did not and were excluded from the final test. The reliability coefficient of 0.703 indicated that the instrument had acceptable internal consistency. The discrimination analysis showed that most items were in the good category, although several items were classified as adequate, weak, or very weak. The final analysis therefore used the valid items rather than all pilot items.

The preliminary achievement data showed a meaningful contextual basis for the intervention. The four fourth-grade classes had different mean scores before the intervention, with Class IV A recording the lowest mean among the four classes. The variation reinforced the need for an instructional model that could increase active participation and support conceptual understanding rather than relying predominantly on teacher explanation.

Table 3. Preliminary IPAS achievement across fourth-grade classes

Class	N	Mean	Maximum	Minimum
IV A	32	56.41	80	30
IV B	32	64.68	85	35
IV C	32	65.97	90	30
IV D	32	66.72	90	40
Total	128	63.45	90	30

The post-intervention data met the assumptions required for parametric comparison. Shapiro-Wilk significance values were 0.155 for the control pretest, 0.137 for the control posttest, 0.261 for the experimental pretest, and 0.088 for the experimental posttest. All values were greater than 0.05, indicating normal distributions. The homogeneity test produced a significance value of 0.461, which was also greater than 0.05. Thus, the two groups could be compared using the independent-samples t-test.

Table 4. Tests of normality and homogeneity

Data set	Shapiro-Wilk Sig.	Interpretation
Control pretest	0.155	Normal
Control posttest	0.137	Normal
Experimental pretest	0.261	Normal
Experimental posttest	0.088	Normal
Homogeneity (Based on Mean)	0.461	Homogeneous

The hypothesis test provided the central statistical finding. The independent-samples t-test produced t = -2.686 with 62 degrees of freedom and a two-tailed significance value of 0.009. Because p = 0.009 was lower than 0.05, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternative hypothesis was accepted. The result indicates a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between students taught through SAVI and students in the control group.

Table 6. Independent-samples t-test

Statistic	Value	Decision
t	-2.686	–
df	62	–
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009	$p < 0.05$
Mean difference	-6.094	Significant difference
Conclusion	H_0 rejected	SAVI associated with significantly different outcomes

Discussion (مناقشة)

The findings indicate a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between students who received the SAVI learning model and those who received Problem-Based Learning. The experimental group obtained a higher mean posttest score of 80.47, compared with 74.38 in the control group, while the independent-samples t-test yielded a significance value of 0.009 < 0.05. These results directly address the research objective by showing that the learning outcomes of the two groups differed significantly after receiving different instructional treatments. However, because the study used intact classes rather than individual random assignment, the finding should be interpreted within the specific classroom context of this study rather than as evidence that SAVI is universally superior to PBL.

One possible explanation for the observed difference is the integrated structure of the SAVI learning model. SAVI combines somatic, auditory, visualization, and intellectual activities within a learning sequence. In the present intervention, students were not only exposed to explanations but were also involved in observation, concrete activities, discussion, visual representation, questioning, and formulation of conclusions. This combination provides opportunities for students to encounter and process learning information through multiple forms of participation. Such an instructional structure is relevant to elementary IPAS because the subject involves understanding phenomena that can be observed, represented visually, discussed, and explained through reasoning.

The somatic dimension provides opportunities for students to engage physically with learning activities rather than relying predominantly on verbal explanation. The auditory dimension provides opportunities to listen, ask questions, discuss ideas, and explain observations. Visualization supports students in interpreting objects, pictures, demonstrations, or other visual representations, while the intellectual dimension requires students to connect information, analyze observations, solve problems, and formulate conclusions. Therefore, the contribution of SAVI in this study should not be interpreted simply as the effect of physical movement or increased classroom activity. Rather, the relevant feature is the integration of activity, perception, communication, and cognitive processing within a structured learning process.

This interpretation is consistent with previous studies reporting positive outcomes associated with SAVI in elementary and science learning. Laili et al. (2023) reported that SAVI improved science learning outcomes in primary school students, while Lyansari et al. (2024) specifically found a significant effect of SAVI on fourth-grade IPAS learning outcomes. Fiteriani et al. (2024) also reported the effectiveness of SAVI in developing science literacy among elementary school students. More recent research has examined SAVI in IPAS learning using additional learning media, including interactive video and digital platforms, and has reported positive learning outcomes (Ariyani et al., 2025; Nitte et al., 2025). These findings provide supporting evidence that SAVI can be implemented in elementary learning contexts, although the present study differs because SAVI was examined as the principal instructional model and compared directly with PBL.

The present findings can also be understood from a multisensory learning perspective. Multisensory instruction provides learners with opportunities to process information through more than one sensory modality and to connect sensory experiences with cognitive processing. Recent literature on multisensory science instruction in elementary education indicates that integrating visual, auditory, and tactile-kinesthetic experiences can support conceptual understanding and other learning outcomes. This perspective is relevant to SAVI because its instructional structure deliberately combines physical involvement, auditory interaction, visualization, and intellectual processing rather than treating these activities as isolated components.

The comparison with PBL is important because PBL is also a student-centered learning model. Therefore, the significant difference observed in this study cannot simply be attributed to the presence of student activity. Both groups were engaged in active learning, but the forms of participation were organized differently. SAVI explicitly structured learning around somatic, auditory, visualization, and intellectual activities, whereas PBL organized learning around problem identification, investigation, discussion, and solution development. The findings therefore suggest that the particular organization of learning experiences in SAVI was associated with different learning outcomes under the conditions examined in this study.

The findings are also consistent with recent evidence from elementary IPAS research. Studies published in recent years have continued to report that SAVI can be applied to IPAS learning and can be associated with improved learning outcomes or student activity. For example, research in elementary IPAS has reported positive changes in cognitive achievement following SAVI

implementation, while other studies have examined SAVI in combination with learning media such as Wordwall or interactive video. These studies support the relevance of SAVI within the broader development of student-centered IPAS learning, while also showing that the present study contributes evidence from a comparison between SAVI and PBL without making a particular digital medium the defining component of the treatment.

The findings of this study should be interpreted in light of several limitations. First, the study used a Non-Equivalent Control Group Design involving two existing classes, so individual students were not randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups. Consequently, possible pre-existing differences between the groups cannot be completely excluded. Second, the study involved 64 fourth-grade students from one elementary school and was conducted over five instructional meetings; therefore, the findings should not be generalized beyond similar contexts without further evidence. Third, learning outcomes were measured primarily through a multiple-choice achievement test, which focused on cognitive outcomes. Future research may involve larger and more diverse samples, longer intervention periods, and additional outcome measures such as science literacy, motivation, collaboration, retention, or higher-order thinking skills.

Conclusion (خاتمة)

Based on the findings of this study, the SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually) learning model significantly affected the IPAS learning outcomes of fourth-grade students at SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar Lampung. The experimental group obtained a higher mean posttest score of 80.47 than the control group, which obtained 74.38. The independent-samples t-test produced a significance value of 0.009 < 0.05, indicating a statistically significant difference in IPAS learning outcomes between the two groups after the instructional treatment. These findings indicate that, under the conditions of the study, the SAVI learning model was associated with higher IPAS learning outcomes than Problem-Based Learning.

Acknowledgment (شكر وتقدير)

The author expresses sincere gratitude to SD Muhammadiyah 1 Bandar Lampung for granting permission and supporting the implementation of the research. Appreciation is also extended to the fourth-grade teachers and students who participated in the learning activities and data collection. The author is grateful to the Department of Madrasah Ibtidaiyah Teacher Education, Faculty of Tarbiyah and Teacher Training, Universitas Islam Negeri Raden Intan Lampung, and to the supervisors and academic colleagues who provided guidance during the research process.

Bibliography ((مراجع

Amalia, M., Adiman, & Hastuti, S. (2020). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI terhadap hasil belajar IPA siswa kelas V. Jurnal Pendidikan Fisika dan Sains, 3(1), 1–5.

Ariyani, F., Fakhriyah, F., & Hilyana, F. S. (2025). Effectiveness of the SAVI learning model assisted by interactive video on the learning outcomes of fourth grade elementary school students. Journal of Educational Sciences, 9(2), 664–674. https://doi.org/10.31258/jes.9.2.p.664-674

Dewi, A. T. Y. R., & Negara, I. G. A. O. (2020). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI berbantuan multimedia terhadap kompetensi pengetahuan IPA. Mimbar PGSD Undiksha, 8(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.23887/jppp.v4i2.27372

Fajriah, L., Nurfitriani, M., & Permana, R. (2020). Somatic, auditory, visual, and intellectual (SAVI) learning models affect students' mathematics learning achievement. International Journal of Elementary Education, 4(3), 376–383. https://doi.org/10.23887/ijee.v4i3.28683

Hasan, S. F., Darmawan, E., & Sukmawati, I. (2023). The effectiveness of the SAVI learning model in improving students' metacognitive and critical thinking skills in MAN Kota Magelang. Biosfer: Jurnal Tadris Biologi, 14(1), 67–78. https://doi.org/10.24042/biosfer.v14i1.15448

Istiqomah, A. N., Kurniawati, I., & Wulandari, A. N. (2020). Implementing the somatic, auditory, visual, and intellectual (SAVI) learning approach to improve students' attention toward mathematics learning. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1563, 012033. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1563/1/012033

Kusrini, I., Rintayati, P., & Salimi, M. (2025). The effect of the SAVI learning model on the cognitive learning outcome of students. Jurnal Eduscience, 12(4). https://doi.org/10.36987/jes.v12i4.7140

Laili, I. N., Gumala, Y., Awiria, Syaodih, E., & Samsudin, A. (2023). Using Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectually (SAVI) learning model on primary school to enhance science learning outcomes. Briliant: Jurnal Riset dan Konseptual, 8(2). https://doi.org/10.28926/briliant.v8i2.1273

Lyansari, A. P., Purnamasari, V., & Nuvitalia, D. (2024). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, Intellectual) terhadap hasil belajar IPAS kelas IV SDN Pucakwangi 01. Literasi: Jurnal Pendidikan, 4(4), 315–325. https://doi.org/10.26877/literasi.v4i2.20491

Nainggolan, M., Tanjung, D. S., & Simarmata, E. J. (2021). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI terhadap hasil belajar matematika siswa di sekolah dasar. Jurnal Basicedu, 5(4), 2617–2625.

Natsir, T., Rasyid, A. R., & Bassey, S. A. (2023). The SAVI learning model and the 21st century skills: Developing critical thinking, collaboration, and creativity in students' vocational high school. International Journal of Environment, Engineering and Education, 5(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.55151/ijeedu.v5i1.96

Nitte, Y., Nahak, K. E. N., Naitili, C. A., & Modok, E. (2025). The effectiveness of the application of Teachmint learning media based on the SAVI learning model to improving IPAS learning outcomes. Journal of Innovative Technologies in Learning and Education, 2(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.37792/jitle.v2i1.1452

Rahayu, A., Nuryani, P., & Riyadi, A. R. (2019). Penerapan model pembelajaran SAVI untuk meningkatkan aktivitas belajar siswa. Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, 4(2), 102–111. https://doi.org/10.17509/jpgsd.v4i2.20489

Rosiyani, A. I., Salamah, A., Lestari, C. A., Anggraini, S., & Ab, W. (2024). Penerapan pembelajaran berdiferensiasi dalam Kurikulum Merdeka pada pembelajaran IPAS sekolah dasar. Jurnal Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar, 1(3). https://doi.org/10.47134/pgsd.v1i3.271

Sohim, B., Saputra, A., Agustian, R., Setiawan, I., & Kurniawan, T. A. (2023). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI Somatic, Auditory, Visualization and Intellectualy dalam meningkatkan pemahaman siswa. ISEDU: Islamic Education Journal, 1(1), 81–90. https://doi.org/10.59966/isedu.v1i1.609

Sophian, S. K., Hidayah, R. R., Fia, A., Safitri, D., & Suryanda, A. (2025). Model pembelajaran SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, dan Intellectually) untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa. DIAJAR: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran, 4(1), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.54259/diajar.v4i1.2751

Supriadi, J. (2022). Cara mudah menulis karangan deskripsi dengan model SAVI. Indonesia Emas Group.

Wahyuni, F. R. E., Wiransah, W., Syafruddin, D., & Bustami, Y. (2022). The meta-analysis study of the SAVI learning model on students' cognitive aspects in biology learning. JPBIO (Jurnal Pendidikan Biologi), 7(1), 93–105. https://doi.org/10.31932/jpbio.v7i1.1550

Widiantari, N. K., Agung, G. A., & Surya, G. (2022). Model pembelajaran SAVI berbantuan media permainan rakyat dalam meningkatkan kompetensi pengetahuan IPAS. Jurnal Pendidikan, 5, 609–622.

Waruwu, N. W. P. L., Nexandika, R., Wulandari, N., & Saryahayati, T. M. S. (2025). Penerapan model pembelajaran kooperatif tipe Somatic, Auditory, Visual, Intellectual (SAVI) dalam meningkatkan hasil belajar matematika siswa sekolah dasar. Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar, 4(1), 23–30.

Agusti, N. M., & Aslam, A. (2022). Efektivitas media pembelajaran aplikasi Wordwall terhadap hasil belajar IPA siswa sekolah dasar. Jurnal Basicedu, 6(4), 5794–5800. https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i4.3053

Apsoh, S., Setiawan, A., & Rita, R. (2023). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI terhadap kemampuan pemahaman matematis siswa kelas V. JUPEIS: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Ilmu Sosial, 2(1), 105–114. https://doi.org/10.57218/jupeis.vol2.iss1.543

Djabba, R., Tuken, R., & Hafid, S. S. (2023). Penerapan model pembelajaran Somatic, Auditory Visual, Intellectual (SAVI) untuk meningkatkan hasil belajar siswa materi zat tunggal dan campuran kelas V. Maccayya Journal: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 1(2), 76–90. https://doi.org/10.26858/maccayya.v1i2.1142

Fiteriani, I., Baharudin, & Khasanah, U. (2024). Effectiveness of the SAVI (Somatic, Auditory, Visualization, and Intellectual) learning model on students' science literacy ability in elementary school. JIP: Jurnal Ilmiah PGMI, 10(2). https://doi.org/10.19109/jip.v10i2.25481

Qurrata A'yun, M., & Pritasari, A. C. (2025). Pengaruh model pembelajaran SAVI terintegrasi kearifan lokal terhadap hasil belajar IPAS siswa kelas IV SDN Rang Perang Laok. Journal of Education for All, 3(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.61692/edufa.v3i1.177