

Difference Of Learning Mathematics Between Open Question Model And Conventional Model

by Turnitin®

Submission date: 08-Jan-2022 06:12PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1738821423

File name: jurnal_MJML_bahasa_inggris.pdf (349.88K)

Word count: 3764

Character count: 18367

Difference Of Learning Mathematics Between Open Question Model And Conventional Model

Ahmad Afandi¹

¹IKIP PGRI Jember, Jember, Indonesia, 68121

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received (filled by editor)

Revised (filled by editor)

Accepted (filled by editor)

KEYWORDS

Results of learning mathematics

Model of open learning problem

Conventional learning model.

ABSTRACT

Open learning model as well as conventional learning model is a learning model that is able to enable students in acquiring knowledge and learning experiences. The purpose of this research is to know the difference of learning result between students taught by using model of open matter problem and conventional learning model on the subject of wake up space. This research was conducted at SMP Al Badri Arjasa Jember in February 2018. The research subjects were 70 students in two classes namely class VIII-A and class VIII-B. This research uses experimental design that is, one experiment class and one control class. The results obtained in the study are learning outcomes using open-ended learning model and conventional learning model. T-test conducted shows that there are differences. A verage learning outcomes of experimental class students after treatment was 69.657 while the control class learning outcome was 56.886. The conclusion that can be drawn from data analysis and discussion result is difference of student learning result by using model of open learning problem with conventional learning model, and model of open learning problem is suitable to be applied to the subject of student room of SMP Al Badri Arjasa Jember.

1. Introduction

Efforts to develop the potential of students as well as in improving the quality of education, especially mathematics education many done, even continuously strived, but the quality of education achieved not in accordance with the desired expectations. Based on the results of interviews with some teachers who have experienced as a teacher of mathematics, especially Junior High School teacher Al Badri Arjasa Jember, that in teaching mathematics students are expected not only to remember, understand, and apply course, but students are also expected to analyze and evaluate information. Therefore, in teaching mathematics teachers do not transfer knowledge to students but how teachers direct students to build new knowledge according to their own thinking.

Soedjadi (2000: 6) argues that "a teacher will be able to use mathematics to bring students to a defined goal, if students can understand well the mathematics that will be used as a vehicle for education". If the teacher's understanding of mathematics is not good enough to ensure that the use of mathematics as a vehicle of education will also not work as expected.

From the above to achieve the goal of mathematics education the role of teachers is very important. With the development of the times many emerging models of learning that exist in schools. From the conventional learning model, it develops into an interesting and non-boring learning model. But there are still many teachers or teaching staff who use conventional learning models in learning activities. This could mean that teachers or faculty can only use conventional learning models and do not seek to find learning models that may be better and more suitable for their students, or it may be just a conventional learning model that is suitable for students.

In the learning process, it is necessary to give the students the opportunity to think freely according to their interests and abilities. For that the use of learning model is very important for the success of a teaching and learning activities. One of the learning models that can be used is the open learning model. With the open learning model, it is expected that the classroom activity will be full of mathematical ideas and ultimately can improve the creativity and learning outcomes and can develop students' self potential. The open-ended learning model is a learning model that presents a problem that has a correct final solution or answer of more than one answer and provides an opportunity for students to answer the problem with various strategies and ways that are believed to fit their abilities. The purpose of the open-ended learning model is not to get an answer but to emphasize how to

arrive at an answer. Thus there is not only one approach or method in getting the right answer, but some or many of the "openness" traits.

Hudojo (1990: 40) suggests that "mathematics is a tool for developing ways of thinking". This means that the open-ended learning model that gives students the opportunity to solve problems in accordance with their ability to think in the learning process and mathematics learning is better than with the conventional learning model that emphasizes teacher-centered learning activities, so that students are more passive and students can not develop his way of thinking.

2. Research Methods

This study included the type of experimental research. In experimental research there are two variables that are free or treatment and control. Independent variable or treatment in this research is learning by using learning model about terbuka, while control variable in this research is learning by using conventional learning model. The study population is all students of class VIII consisting of four classes and taken two classes as sample from research. Prior to sampling, homogeneity tests were first performed to determine whether the sample group was homogeneous or not. If it is known that the sample group is homogeneous, then sampling is done by cluster sampling technique (Area Sampling). In this study the material used is the subject of building space especially in the sub subject of the cube and the beam. Based on the types and variables of the research above, then using the research design is "pretest-posttest control group design" (Sugiyono, 2010: 112).




Fig 1. Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design

The instrument used is Test Problem. Problem test is the questions given to students to know the level of student ability after following the learning process. In this research about the test that will be given to the students is a matter of essay test (description) which consists of 5 problems in the form of open matter model of subject matter wake subspace space discussion of cubes and beams. The test in this study was conducted twice in the beginning and at the end. Pre-test is a test done at the beginning of the learning, post-test is a test done at the end of learning. Problem test used is a matter of tests that have met certain requirements are: validity, reliability, distinguishing power, and the level of difficulty.

2.1 Validity

Validity is a measure that indicates the level of validity or validity of an instrument. Validity used is the test of construct validity (construct validity). After the data obtained from the test results, then the test of construct validity is done by factor analysis, that is by correlating between instrument item scores with Pearson Product Moment formula. As follows

$$r_{XY} = \frac{N \sum XY - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{(N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2)(N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2)}} \quad (\text{Arikunto, 1998:162})$$

Information:

- r_{xy} = Correlation coefficient,
- n = Number of respondents,
- $\sum X$ = Number of test class scores 1,
- $\sum Y$ = Number of test class scores 2,
- $\sum XY$ = Total multiplication of test scores 1 class and test class 2,
- $\sum X^2$ = The sum of squares of test grade scores 1,
- $\sum Y^2$ = Quantity of test scores class size 2.

Next is calculated by t-test with the formula: $t_{count} = \frac{r\sqrt{n-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$

Where:

- t = Value t count
- r = Coefficient of correlation r count
- n = Number of respondents

Distribution (Table t) for $\alpha = 0.05$ and degrees of freedom ($dk = n-2$)

Rule of applicability:

- a) If t count > t table means valid
- b) If t count < t table means not valid

Table 1. Criterion validity

Limitations	Criteria
$0,80 < r_{xy} \leq 1,00$	Very high
$0,60 < r_{xy} \leq 0,80$	High
$0,40 < r_{xy} \leq 0,60$	Enough
$0,20 < r_{xy} \leq 0,40$	Low
$r_{xy} \leq 0,20$	Very low

Ruseffendi (in Jihad dan Haris, 2008: 180).

2.2 Reliability

According to Arikunto (1998: 170) "reliability refers to a sense that an instrument can be trusted to be used as a data-gathering tool because the instrument is already good". The formula used in the reliability test is by using the Alpha method with the reason that this formula can be used to test a test question in the form of a test description where the score per item because different. Testing formula using Alpha method as follows:

$$r_{11} = \left[\frac{k}{k-1} \right] \left[1 - \frac{\sum S_i}{S_t} \right]$$

Where:

- r_{11} = Value of reliability
- k = Number of items
- $\sum S_i$ = Number of variance score of each item
- S_t = Variance Total

Result of r_{11} then consulted with r_{table} with $dk = N - 1$, and significant 0,05 (5%). Rule of applicability:

- a) If $r_{11} > r_{table}$ means reliable.
- b) If $r_{11} < r_{table}$ means not reliable (Riduwan, 2010:118).

Table 2. Criteria of Reliability

Limitations	Criteria
$r_{11} \leq 0,20$	Very Low
$0,20 < r_{11} \leq 0,40$	Low
$0,40 < r_{11} \leq 0,70$	Enough
$0,70 < r_{11} \leq 0,90$	High
$0,90 < r_{11} \leq 1,00$	Very High

(Ruseffendi, 1998: 144)

2.3 Differentiating Power

Differentiating power is the ability of a problem to distinguish between clever students and students who are not smart. The differentiating power can be calculated using the following formula:

$$DP = \frac{S_A - S_B}{\frac{1}{2}n_{max}} \quad (\text{Jihad dan Haris, 2008: 189})$$

Where:

- DP = Distinct Power
- S_A = Number of top group scores
- S_B = Number of bottom group scores
- n = Number of upper and lower group respondents
- Maks = Maximum score of the question.

Tabel 3. Power Distinguishing Criteria

Limitations	Criteria
0.71 - 1.00	Very Good
0.41 - 0.70	Good
0.21 - 0.40	Enough
0.00 - 0.20	Less

Ruseffendi (in Jihad dan Haris, 2008: 181)

2.4 Level of difficulty

A good test is a problem that has a difficulty level of tiered problems of easy, medium and difficult where it can be searched using the following difficulty formula

$$TK = \frac{S_A + S_B}{n \cdot \text{max}}$$

Dimana:

- TK = Tribulation
- S_A = Total upper group score
- S_B = Total bottom group score
- n = Number of upper and lower group respondents
- Max = Maximum score of the question

(Jihad dan Haris, 2008: 182)

Tabel 4. Criteria for Tribune

Limitations	Criteria
0.71 - 1.00	Easy
0.31 - 0.70	Medium
0.00 - 0.30	Hard

Sudjana (in Jihad dan Haris, 2008: 182)

2.5 Homogeneity Test

Zainal Arifin (2011: 286) suggests the purpose of homogeneity test is to know whether the second variance of the sample data homogeneous or not. To know whether or not the variance of the samples the researchers used the homogeneity test by taking data from the daily test value on the previous material. The steps for testing homogeneity are as follows:

1. Determine the variance with the following formula:

$$F_{\text{count}} = \frac{\text{Greatest variance}}{\text{Smallest variance}}$$

2. Comparing the value of F_{count} with F_{table},

F_{table} can be obtained by the formula dk numerator = n - 1 (Greatest Variance) and dk denominator = n - 1 (Smallest Variance) and to a significant extent (α) = 0.05. To conclude the comparison as follows:

If F_{count} ≤ F_{table}, then homogeneous

If F_{count} ≥ F_{table}, then it is not homogeneous (Riduwan, 2004:120).

3. Conduct a T-Test using the following formula:

- a. If the variance is the same (homogeneous) μ₁ = μ₂, the formula used is

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}} \text{ with } s^2 = \frac{(n_1 - 1)s_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)s_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}$$

t_{table} = t_(n₁+n₂-2), where the degree of (db) = (n₁ + n₂ - 2) and a significance level of 0.05.

- b. If the variance is not same (is not homogeneous) μ₁ ≠ μ₂, the formula used is

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$$

t_{table} = t_[(1-n)(n₁+n₂-2)], where the degree of (db) = (n₁ + n₂ - 2) and a significance level of 0.05.

To conclude the comparison: If t_{count} ≤ t_{table}, then homogeneous and If t_{count} ≥ t_{table}, then it is not homogeneous

(Sugiyono, 2007: 138).

2.6 Data Normality Test

Zainal Arifin (2011: 287) said that "the amount of data above 30, so no need to test the data normality". So in this study the researchers did not use the normality test because the number of students in class VIII SMP Al Badri Arjasa Jember each class more than 30 students.

2.7 Data Analysis Techniques

After testing the similarity of variance, then to know the difference of learning result between experiment class and control class using formula with the following conditions:

a) If both samples have the same variant.

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_1 : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

By using the formula:

$$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{s \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_1} + \frac{1}{n_2}}}$$

With standard sample deviation (S)

$$s = \sqrt{\frac{(n_1-1)S_1^2 + (n_2-1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}$$

Information :

t = T-test value sought

\bar{x}_1 = Group average 1

\bar{x}_2 = Group average 2

s = Composite raw deviation

S_1^2 = Standard deviation of sample 1 squared (variance 1)

S_2^2 = Standard deviation of sample 2 squared (variance 2)

n_1 = Number of samples 1

n_2 = Number of samples 2

By the criterion H_0 is accepted if $-t_{1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha} < t < t_{1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha}$, where $t_{1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha}$ is obtained from the distribution list t with

dk = ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) and probability $(1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha)$. And with a real level (α) 0.05 (5% error rate).

b) If both groups have unequal variants.

$$H_0 : \mu_1 = \mu_2$$

$$H_1 : \mu_1 \neq \mu_2$$

By using the formula:

$$t' = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{S_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}\right)}}$$

By the criterion H_0 is accepted if $-\frac{w_1 t_1 + w_2 t_2}{w_1 + w_2} < t' < \frac{w_1 t_1 + w_2 t_2}{w_1 + w_2}$ with $w_1 = \frac{S_1^2}{n_1}$, $w_2 = \frac{S_2^2}{n_2}$,

$$t_1 = t_{(1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha), (n_1-1)}, t_2 = t_{(1-\frac{1}{2}\alpha), (n_2-1)}$$

H_0 : There is no difference of mathematics learning result by using open learning model model and conventional learning model on the subject of building space in grade VIII Junior High School Al Badri Arjasa Jember.

H_1 : There are differences in mathematics learning outcomes using open-ended learning model and conventional learning model on the subject of building space in grade VIII Junior High School Al Badri Arjasa Jember.

3. Results and Discussion

The initial activity of the study started with pre-test in the experimental class and control class, then the next meeting was the giving of materials, where the researcher taught using the open-ended learning model in the


experimental class and taught using the conventional learning model in the control class. Giving material done four times, each material is given 2 hours lesson 2×40 minutes. And the last meeting in the form of post-test in the experimental class and control class.

3.1 Results of Pre-Test

Before the students get the treatment done homogeneity test first with the data used is the result of pre-test. The pre-test for the experimental class and the control class was performed on February 05, 2018. The questions used in the pre-test will also be used for the post-test, the five tested questions, the test questions.

Question (Pre Test & Post Test)

1. Given the length of the entire rib of the beam is 64 cm, specify the length, width and height of the beam?
2. Eyla wants to create 8 skeleton beams made of wire. If the available wire is only 768 cm, then how many length, width and height of the beam may Eyla make?
3. Watch the PQRS.TUVW beam on the side! If known volume 640 cm³. Calculate the length of PQ, QR, RV and the surface area of the block!



4. Given ABCD.EFGH beam with $AB = 2x$ cm, $BC = (x + 1)$ cm, and $BF = x$ cm. If you want to fill the beam with water volume less than 500 cm³. Determine the value of x and what size of the beam you will make?
5. A large box shaped beam length of 27 cm, width 10 cm, and height 8 cm. If the big box will be filled by a few small boxes in the shape of a cube, then determine the length of the cube's ribs!

The lowest value in the control class is 5 and the highest value is 55 then for the experimental class the lowest value is 10 and the highest value is 51. For more details can be seen in table 5 below:

Table 5. Values of pre-test of experimental and control class students

NO	Component	Class of Experiment VIII-A	Class of Control VIII-B
1	Number of Students	35	35
2	Lowest Value	10	5
3	Top Rated	51	55
4	Average Score	30,629	28,714
5	Varians	108,887	199,445
6	Standard Deviation	10,435	14,123

Based on the results of analysis and calculation, the pre-test values of the experimental class and control classes are normal and homogeneous distributed. The first data to be compared is the average pre-test value between the experimental class and the control class, for the experimental class, the average value is 30,629 and the control class is 28,714. The variants for the experimental class obtained 108,887 and control class 199,445.

3.2 Determination of Research Respondents

The data used to test homogeneity is the value of mathematical repetition of all students of class VIII. Furthermore, to determine the class pairs to be used as research respondents conducted drawing techniques on homogeneous classes. From the draw results obtained pair of class VIII-A and VIII-B as respondents research. In order to determine the experimental and control classes, a drawing of the classes VIII-A and VIII-B was conducted. Based on the result of the draw of the selected class VIII-A as the experimental class and VIII-B as the control class. The number of VIII-A and VIII-B students before and after the pre-test and post-test were 35 students. So the number of Respondents in this study is 70 students.

3.3 Homogeneity Test

The results of the homogeneity test can be seen in Table 6 and Table 7 below.

Table 6. Homogeneity test Pre-test Experiment class and control class

No	Class	N	Average	Standar Deviasi	Varian	F _{count}	F _{table}	T _{count}	t _{table}
1	VIII-A	35	30,629	10,435	108,887	1.832	1.776	0,645	1,999
2	VIII-B	35	28,714	14,123	199,445				

Based on the description on the homogeneity test table, the pre-test grade of the experimental class and the control class according to the rules of the applicable decision, it can be concluded that the experimental and control classes are not homogeneous.

Table 7. Post-test Homogeneity Test Class experiment and control class

No	Class	N	Average	Standar Deviasi	Varian	F _{count}	F _{table}	T _{count}	t _{table}
1	VIII-A	35	69,637	25,137	631,879	1.529	1.776	2,337	1.999
2	VIII-B	35	56,886	20,332	413,398				

Based on the description on the homogeneity test table, the post-test grade of the experimental class and the control class adjusted to the applicable decision rule, it can be concluded that the experimental class and control class are not homogeneous.

3.4 Results of Post-Test

Post-tests for the experimental class and control classes were conducted on Monday, February 26, 2018. The lowest score on the control class is 23 and the highest value is 100, and then for the experimental class the lowest value is 40 and the highest value is 100. For more details, seen in Table 8 below:

Table 8. Comparison of post-test results of experimental and control class students

NO	Componen	Class of Experiment VIII-A	Class of Control VIII-B
1	Number of Students	35	35
2	Lowest Value	40	23
3	Top Rated	100	100
4	Average Score	69,657	56,886
5	Varians	631,879	413,398
6	Standard Deviation	25,137	20,332

Furthermore, based on the results of the analysis and the calculation results obtained that the value of post-test experimental class and control class distributed normal and not homogeneous. For the experimental class obtained an average value of 69.657 and for the control class obtained an average value of 56.886, while the variant for the experimental class obtained value 631,879 and control class 413,398. Then after obtained the calculation proceed to answer the hypothesis proposed. The calculations were performed by using t-test analysis, compared to the post-test of the experimental group and the control group. Obtained t-count is 3.337 and t-table is 1.999 for a significance level of 5% based on the result it can be said that $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$. In accordance with the criteria if $t\text{-count} > t\text{-table}$ then H_0 rejected and H_1 accepted. This means, there are differences in mathematics learning outcomes by using the model of learning about open problems and conventional learning model on the subject of building space in class VIII Junior High School Al Badri Arjasa Jember.

4. Conclusions

Based on the results of research, hypothesis testing and discussion can be concluded as follows:

- There are differences in mathematics learning outcomes by using open-ended learning model and conventional learning model on the subject of building space in Grade VIII of Junior High School Al Badri Arjasa Jember.
- Learning model of open matter is suitable to be applied to the subject of wake up space in class VIII Junior High School Al Badri Arjasa Jember.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Al Badri Arjasa Jember School who has given permission to do research.

References

- Asmedy. 2012. Development Of Learning Tools Logic With Open Ended Approach In Class X High School. Thesis not published. Surabaya: UNESA Graduate Program.
- Arikunto, S. 1998. Research Procedure A Practice Approach (Revised Edition IV). Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.
- Arifin, Z. 2011. Educational Research Methods and New Paradigm. Bandung: ROSDA.
- Ruseffendi. 1998. Fundamentals of Education Research and Other Non-Exact Areas. Semarang: IKIP Semarang.
- Hudojo, H. 1990. Development of Curriculum And Mathematics Learning. Malang: State University of Malang.
- Tampomas, H. 2005. Mathematics 3 For SMP / MTs Class IX. Jakarta: Yudhishthira.
- Mahmudi, A. 2008. Developing Open-Ended Problems in Mathematics Learning, (Online), ([http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/penelitian/Ali Mahmudi, S.Pd, M.Pd, Dr./Makalah 02 PIPM 2008_ExecutingSoal36_Open_.pdf](http://staff.uny.ac.id/sites/default/files/penelitian/Ali_Mahmudi,_S.Pd,_M.Pd,_Dr./Makalah_02_PIPM_2008_ExecutingSoal36_Open_.pdf), accessed 4 December 2017).
- Soedjadi, R. 2000. Tips on Mathematics Education in Indonesia. Jakarta: Ministry of National Education.
- Sugiyono. 2007. Statistics For Research. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Sugiyono. 2010. Educational Research Methods. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Basleman, A. & Mappa, S. 2011. Adult Learning Theory. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Sudjana. 2005. Statistical Method. Bandung: TARSITO.
- Riduwan. 2010. Learn Easy Research For Teachers-Employee and Beginner Researcher. Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Jihad & Haris. 2010. Evaluation of Learning. Yogyakarta: Multi Pressindo.
- National Education Standards Agency. 2006. KTSP And Assessment of Competence Based Mathematics Learning. Jakarta: BSNP.

Difference Of Learning Mathematics Between Open Question Model And Conventional Model

ORIGINALITY REPORT

21 %
SIMILARITY INDEX

13 %
INTERNET SOURCES

13 %
PUBLICATIONS

7 %
STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1 www.scirj.org Internet Source **1** %

2 Repository.umy.ac.id Internet Source **1** %

3 Justin Hidayat Soputra, Harman Malau. "THE EFFECT OF CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND COMPENSATION ON EMPLOYEE WORK MOTIVATION AT TOURISM ATTRACTION IN WEST JAVA", Abstract Proceedings International Scholars Conference, 2019
Publication **1** %

4 repo.uinsatu.ac.id Internet Source **1** %

5 Nur Seviana Mar'atus Sholikhah, Budi Hastuti, Nurma Yunita Indriyanti. "Implementation of 4Es combined with drill and practice learning model by considering mathematics ability on the students' learning achievement on the topic of solubility and solubility product", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020 **1** %

6	repository.ung.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
7	Submitted to Universitas Islam Bandung Student Paper	1 %
8	a-research.upi.edu Internet Source	1 %
9	Submitted to Nottingham Trent University Student Paper	1 %
10	Submitted to Universitas Negeri Manado Student Paper	1 %
11	www.jurnal.unsyiah.ac.id Internet Source	1 %
12	H. Umam, Dafik, M Irvan. "The Analysis of Implementation of Discovery Based Learning to improve Students Higher Order Thinking Skills in Solving r-Dynamic Vertex Coloring Problem Based on Their Reflective Thinking Skill", IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 2019 Publication	1 %
13	moam.info Internet Source	<1 %
14	Johan Setiawan, Ajat Ajat Sudrajat, Aman Aman, Dyah Kumalasari. "Development of	<1 %

higher order thinking skill assessment instruments in learning Indonesian history", International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education (IJERE), 2021

Publication

15 Prihadi, Murtono, Gunawan Setiadi. "Effectiveness of Blended Learning to Improve Critical Thinking Skills and Student Science Learning Outcomes", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021 <1 %

Publication

16 digilib.unila.ac.id <1 %
Internet Source

17 docplayer.net <1 %
Internet Source

18 ejournal.aibpm.org <1 %
Internet Source

19 ilkogretim-online.org.tr <1 %
Internet Source

20 ojs.fkip.ummetro.ac.id <1 %
Internet Source

21 pubs.sciepub.com <1 %
Internet Source

22 Juniman Silalahi. "The Effects of Collaborative Learning Models on Engineering Mechanics <1 %

Learning Outcomes", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

23

Aulia Akhrian Syahidi, Arifin Noor Asyikin, Asy'ari. "Applying Student Team Achievement Divisions (STAD) Model on Material of Basic Programme Branch Control Structure to Increase Activity and Student Result", IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering, 2018

Publication

<1 %

24

Submitted to Universitas Negeri Surabaya The State University of Surabaya

Student Paper

<1 %

25

garuda.kemdikbud.go.id

Internet Source

<1 %

26

Submitted to University of Western Sydney

Student Paper

<1 %

27

adoc.pub

Internet Source

<1 %

28

Submitted to UIN Raden Intan Lampung

Student Paper

<1 %

29

Submitted to Universitas Islam Indonesia

Student Paper

<1 %

30

Submitted to Universitas Negeri Jakarta

Student Paper

<1 %

31	Submitted to Universitas Negeri Semarang Student Paper	<1 %
32	Submitted to University of Leeds Student Paper	<1 %
33	Wuryanti Kuncoro, Alfazar Edi Putra. "The Improvement of Employee Performance Through Islamic Leadership, Emotional Quotient, and Intrinsic Motivation", International Business Research, 2020 Publication	<1 %
34	scipg.com Internet Source	<1 %
35	Dwi Oktaviana, Utin Desy Susiaty. "Development of Test Instruments Based on Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy to Measure the Students' Higher Order Thinking Skills", JIPM (Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Matematika), 2020 Publication	<1 %
36	ejournal.staimnglawak.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
37	fr.scribd.com Internet Source	<1 %
38	id.scribd.com Internet Source	<1 %

journal2.um.ac.id

39

Internet Source

<1 %

40

ejournal.nusamandiri.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

41

scholar.sun.ac.za

Internet Source

<1 %

42

Galih Raspati, Andi Riyanto. "The Effectiveness of The Implementation of SPIP and SIMDA Its Impact Against The Quality of Financial Statements", Jurnal Ecodemica: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Bisnis, 2021

Publication

<1 %

43

Joshua Marthin Simbolon. "THE EFFECT OF PICTURE AND PICTURE ON STUDENTS' ACHIEVEMENT IN WRITING DESCRIPTIVE TEXT", Jurnal JOEPALLT (Journal of English Pedagogy, Linguistics, Literature, and Teaching), 2021

Publication

<1 %

44

Raisuz Zahro, Jumadi, Insih Wilujeng, Heru Kuswanto. " The Effect of Web-Assisted Problem Based Learning Model on Physics Conceptual Understanding of 10 Grade Students ", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

<1 %

45

Wenge Guo, Wen Yan, Jianjun Hou. "Chapter 23 The Effects of "Facilitating" in an Online Asynchronous Teachers Training Course", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2010

Publication

<1 %

46

A. L. Mazzei, M. T. Fogli - Muciaccia, V. Picciarelli. "Effect of a Piagetian mini - laboratory on the acquisition of typical formal operational schemata", European Journal of Science Education, 1986

Publication

<1 %

47

A. St. Aisyah Nur, Anwar Ramli, Mrs. Inanna, Andi Muhamad Iqbal Akbar Asfar, A. M. Irfan Taufan Asfar, Mrs. Ernawati. "ANALYSIS CURIOSITY AND ANALOGY ABILITIES OF COLLEGE STUDENT REVIEWED FROM A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MUHAMMADIYAH BONE", JIRA: Jurnal Inovasi dan Riset Akademik, 2021

Publication

<1 %

48

I Tsani, S Huda, M Yasin, M Syazali, W R Sari, K Jermsttiparsert. "The Impact of Group Investigation (GI) Learning Models on Sequence and Series: A Study Case Numerical Skills Analysis in Islamic Boarding School", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020

Publication

<1 %

49

repository.iainpalopo.ac.id

Internet Source

<1 %

50

Ni Ummu Kulsum, Kristayulita Kristayulita.
"Student Problem Solving Analysis by Step
John Dewey Reviewed from Learning Style",
IJECA (International Journal of Education and
Curriculum Application), 2019

Publication

<1 %

51

Ralph L. Mosher, Paul R. Sullivan. "A
Curriculum in Moral Education for
Adolescents", Journal of Moral Education,
2006

Publication

<1 %

52

Yerimadesi, Y Kiram, Lufri, Festiyed.
"Development of guided discovery learning
based module on colloidal system topic for
senior high school", Journal of Physics:
Conference Series, 2018

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off

Difference Of Learning Mathematics Between Open Question Model And Conventional Model

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8
