BUKTI PERJALANAN ARTIKEL MULAI SUBMIT SAMPAI TERBIT

Pada Prosiding Internasional Bereputasi (Terindex Scopus)

Nama Prosiding	: 7th International International Conference on Mathematics, Science, and Education
Judul Artikel	: Instrument Development Design for Metacognitive Determination in Calculus Problem Solving
Penulis	: Gusti Ayu Dessy Sugiharni

Korespondensi: Gusti Ayu Dessy Sugiharni

Rincian Perjalanan Artikel:

Submit	: 15 Agustus 2020
Hasil Review	: 2 Maret 2021
Upload Revisi	: 7 April 2021
Accepted	: 27 Agustus 2020
Publish	: 1 Juni 2021

BUKTI SUBMIT (15 Agustus 2020)



Instrument Development Design for Metacognitive Determination in Calculus Problem Solving

Sugiharni G A D

Sistem Informasi, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali, Indonesia

ayu dessy@stikom-bali.ac.id

Abstract. This research main objective was to produce an instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. This study used a development approach with the research and development method. The subjects involved in this study were two psychologists and three education experts. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation, those were data collection techniques used in this study. This study used qualitative descriptive technique as the data analysis technique. The results of this study indicated a questionnaire design. It was the indicators of instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It had the percentage of effectiveness standards classified as good and very good criteria based on the five-scale categorization.

1. Introduction

A person's knowledge grows based on affirmations received from the surrounding environment. Affirmations received continuously will raise much new questions in a person. This is what encourages a person to do a novelty for certain objects through a higher thought process. This theory was sparked by some authors such as Piaget, Dubinsky and Sfard [1-3]. It is same as with Gray and Tall [4] said, a thought process arising from environmental affirmations will give rise to a concept that can be used for the novelty of an object. Where in the process will require certain symbols as a reminder of the procedure. These symbols can be used to solve problems in real life. Some of these learning symbols are summarized in calculus learning.

The chapters in calculus learning are related to one another. They start from the basic concepts of calculus to higher mental processes. It is important for students to understand them systematically, starting from the basic to the most complicated. If it is not done systematically, it will be difficult for students to solve calculus problems [5]. There were several studies that analyze it in the context of mathematics [6-11]. Some were in the context of physics [12]. There were also those in other contexts [13].

Engineering students require taking calculus courses. It means that there will be students who have a variety of characters in calculus learning. This will imply that it is necessary to develop curriculum design and interpretation to evaluate its effectiveness. It is not uncommon to find only a few students who focus on learning calculus while others are not. So it is necessary to analyze the character possessed by each student so that learning objectives can be achieved according to the applicable curriculum directions [14].

The student character problems in calculus learning are not an obstacle that cannot be solved. It is overcoming the characters diversity can be done by raising their awareness through metacognition process. Apart from cognitive, affective and psychomotor, metacognition also has an important role in the problem-solving process, especially in self-awareness [15-16]. The results of field study [17-18] and laboratory study [19] showed that students who tend to engage in metacognitive activities had a higher level of achievement than others. Brown and Palincsar conducted research related to metacognitive activities in the context of reading, while Van den Boom et al. investigated in the context of web-based learning [20].

The results of research conducted by Yoonhee Jang et al. proved that the balance between metacognitive abilities which students have and their metacognitive practice experiences can lead students to become aware [21]. The awareness which mean of it is realizing the importance of the self-monitoring role in solving a problem. The existence of this balance will make students able to overcome their difficulties when carrying out metacognitive activities in various situations. The fluid intelligence will be formed with the development of students' metacognitive abilities. It is what trains students' abstract reasoning when solving a problem. In other words, it is one step for the improvement of cognitive abilities as well [22], be it in a social, economic and health context [23], in the context of concentration and remembrance [24-25], and in the context of the skills and knowledge application [26-32].

In calculus learning related to metacognitive problems in problem solving, it is very important to take metacognitive measurements so that the direction of learning can be predicted properly. This metacognitive measurement can be done by using an instrument for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving is the form of a questionnaire. the strategy plays an important role in the development of an instrument. The strategy that often plays a role in it is a constructive strategy [33] and one that avoided is the elimination strategy [34-36]. Apart from strategy, something that also has an important role in instrument development is Likert [37-39]. Referring to the problems that occur in the field and the research results related to calculus learning and metacognitive questionnaires, the researchers were interested in conducting research related to the design of the development of metacognitive determination tools in calculus problem solving.

2. Methods

The research methodology can be used as a general sketch form to a reference for procedures in conducting research [40]. This study used a development approach with the research and development method with Borg & Gall model that focuses on the design stage [41]. This research methodology discussed instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It is designed in the form of an early indicator forming a metacognitive questionnaire in calculus problems solving.

The subjects involved in this study were two psychologist experts and three education experts. The object of this research was a metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation were data collection techniques used in this study. This research was conducted at the Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali in the calculus class.

Primary data in this study was in the form of quantitative data from respondents which used as a reference for decision making on the effectiveness standard percentage of metacognitive questionnaire designs in calculus problem solving. Where in retrieval using observation techniques and literature study. Secondary data were obtained using interview and documentation techniques. It was qualitative data which tends to be able to support percentage figures in primary data.

Descriptive quantitative analysis was the data analysis technique used. The result of effectiveness standard percentage in this study was obtained by using the following equation [42].

Percentage=
$$\frac{\sum (response x each choice integrity)}{n x highest integrity} x 100\%$$

Note:

 $\sum = sum$

n = total number of questionnaires item

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving were then converted into a five scales categorization. The calculated value of the percentage among 90%-100% includes very good criteria with affirmations which do not need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 80%-89% includes good criteria with affirmations which need a minor revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 65%-79% includes enough criteria with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 55%-64% includes criteria lacking with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 0%-54% includes poor criteria with affirmations which need revision.

3. Results and Discussion

Based on the research phase and field data collection, there were four standard metacognitive levels of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problems solving. The four levels were Tacit use, Aware use, Strategy use and Reflective use [43]. On each metacognition level there were three metacognitive aspects / criteria adopted from the Awareness of Independent Learning Inventory (AILI). Those were Metacognitive Knowledge, Metacognitive Regulation and Metacognitive Responsiveness [44]. The following were some indicators related to metacognitive questionnaire design standards in calculus problem solving.

Tacit Use

Tacit Use which means students use thoughts in solving calculus problems without realizing what and why thoughts are used. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) unable to provide an explanation of the understanding obtained after listening to calculus questions; 2) He/she does not realized the form of Calculus problems that had to be worked out systematically; 3) He/she does not pay attention to the importance of calculus problems in life. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1)_He/she does not realizing that solving Calculus problems can attract interest in learning; 2) He/she does not pay close attention to all the forms of understanding obtained about calculus problems; 3) He/she does not realize the purpose of learning in solving Calculus problems. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) solves Calculus problems without self-checking the systematic of answers; 2) ignoring criticism and suggestions for the understanding obtained about calculus learning

Aware use

Aware use, it has meaning that students use their idea in solving problems. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) realizing the need for conscious efforts in understanding Calculus problems: 2) it is able to formulate a form of understanding calculus problems: 3) realizing of mistakes when understanding the problem. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) be aware of the many things that can be learned from people in a study group; 2) know about the uselessness of a task; 3) aware of the relationship between tasks and personal goals. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) Realizing the importance of working together in a study group to solve calculus problems; 2) realize the suitability of the cooperation method in a task; 3) realize that a calculus problem can provide valuable lessons.

Strategy use

Strategy use, which means students direct their thinking processes by realizing specific strategies that increase the accuracy of their thinking. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) pay attention to how well the self learned information; 2) He/she has a way of solving unproductive cooperation in study groups; 3) He/she has a strategy about what needs to be done to study thoroughly when starting to solve a calculus problem.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) realize that solving a calculus problem will attract interest in learning; 2) know what can be learned from colleagues in solving calculus problems collaboratively; 3) have a clear idea of what you want to learn from solving a calculus problem.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) recognize the importance of personal feedback about learning goals; 2) know how much effort it takes to solve a calculus problem; 3) using strategies to communicate with learning group members about the benefits of working together in solving calculus problems.

Reflective use

Reflective use, which means students reflect on their thoughts before and after or even in the middle of the thought process, by considering the acquisition and how to improve it. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) assess the usefulness of calculus problem solving that have been done, it towards personality; 2) cross check with group members about calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) overcomes the questionable personal involvement in performing calculus problem solving.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) assess how much can be learned from group members by working together to solve calculus problems; 2) evaluate the differences in understanding that sometimes occur when working together in calculus problem solving; 3) assess self-interest in calculus problem solving.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) find out the errors contained in problem solving that carried out; 2) evaluate the systematics of calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) trying to find deeper reasons when finding information that is difficult to understand.

Based on the standard indicators of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving that had been described above, the result was the percentage of the effectiveness standard. The complete results of the effectiveness standards percentage can be shown in table 1.

Metacognition Level in Calculus Problem Solving	Metacognitive Aspects / Criteria	Indicator	Effectiveness Standards Percentage (%)
		1	88
	Metacognitive Knowledge	2	90
		3	88
		1	90
Tacit use	Metacognitive Regulation	2	85
		3	85
		1	87
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	2	87
		3	88
		1	88
	Metacognitive Knowledge	2	88
Aware use		3	88
	Mataga anitiva Degulation	1	90
	Metacognitive Regulation	2	87

TABLE 1. Effectiveness Standard Percentage of Metacognitive Questionnaire Indicators in Solving

		3	86
		1	86
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	2	86
		3	87
		1	87
	Metacognitive Knowledge	2	88
		3	88
		1	88
Strategy use	Metacognitive Regulation	2	88
		3	88
		1	88
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	2	88
		3	87
		1	86
	Metacognitive Knowledge	2	90
		3	90
		1	90
Reflective use	Metacognitive Regulation	2	90
		3	88
		1	87
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	2	86
		3	90

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus solving problems showed the good and very good criteria. The criteria that considered good were several indicators that had effectiveness standard percentage of 85%, 86%, 87% and 88%. It showed that the indicators which had those effectiveness standard percentages in their affirmation require minor revisions. Criteria that considered very goods were several indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage in their affirmation for the percentage result of 90%. It showed that the indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage in their affirmation did not require revision.

4. Conclusion

Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving in this study was able to show several indicators which had good and very good criteria. Where the indicators obtained in this study were arranged systematically according to the metacognitive level in Calculus Problem Solving. It also arranged according Metacognitive Aspects/Criteria which were adopted from the AILI concept. It is expected to be able to conduct field evaluations and make decisions on several metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus problem solving after doing a minor revision.

References

- [1] Piaget J 1972 The Principles of Genetic Epistemology (W. May, trans.)(London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)
- [2] Dubinsky E 1991 Reflective Abstraction in Advanced Mathematical Thinking, in D.O. Tall (ed.) Advanced Mathematical Thinking (Kluwer: Dordrecht)
- [3] Sfard A 1991 Educ. Stud. Matematika 22 1-36
- [4] Gray E M and Tall D O 1994 J. Res. Math. Educ. 26 115-141
- [5] Dominguez A, Barniol P and Zavala G 2017 Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ. 13(10) 6507-6531
- [6] Leinhardt G,Zaslavsky O and Stein M K 1990 Rev Educ Res 60 1-64
- [7] Hadjidemetriou C and Williams J 2002 Res. Math. Educ. 4(1) 69-87
- [8] Christensen W M and Thompson J R 2012 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 8 101-123
- [9] Planinic M, Milin-Sipus Z, Katic H, Susac A and Ivanjek L 2012 Int. J. Sci. Math. Educ. 10(6) 1393-1414
- [10] Planinic M, Ivanjek L, Susac A and Milin-Sipus Z 2013 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 9 101-126
- [11] Epstein J 2013 Not. Am. Math. Soc 60(8) 1018-1026
- [12] McDermott L C 2001 Am. J. Phys. 69(11) 1127-1137
- [13] Woolnough J 2000 J Res Sci Teach 30 259–267
- [14] Tall D 1997 Functions and Calculus, in A. J. Bishop et al (Eds.), International Handbook of Mathematics Education (Kluwer: Dordrecht)

- [15] Wang C M, Haertel G D and Walberg H J 1993 Rev Educ Res 63(3) 249–294
- [16] Zimmerman B J 1990 Educ Psychol 25 3–18
- [17] Brown A and Palincsar A S 1989 Guided cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition, in Knowing, learning and instruction, Essays in honor of Robert Glaser, ed. L.B. Resnick, (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum)
- [18] De Jong F P C M 1992 Zelfstandig leren: Regulatie van het leerproces en leren reguleren, Academisch Proefschrift [Independent learning: Regulation of the learning process and learn- ing to regulate, Dissertation] (Tilburg: Gianotten)
- [19] Veenman M V J, Elshout J J and Meijer J 1997 Learn Instr 7(2) 187–209
- [20] Van den Boom G, Paas F, Van Merriënboer J G, and Van Gog T 2004 Comput. Hum. Behav. 20(4) 551-567
- [21] Jang Y, Lee H, Kim Y, and Min K 2020 *Metacogn Learn* **10**(1) 409-420
- [22] McGrew K. S. 2009 Intelligence **37** 1–10
- [23] Deary I J 2012 Intelligence 63 453–482
- [24] Shipstead Z, Lindsey D R B, Marshall R L and Engle R W 2014 J. Mem. Lang 72, 116–141
- [25] Unsworth N, Fukuda K, Awh E and Vogel E K 2014 Cogn Psychol 71 1–26
- [26] Colom R and Flores-Mendoza C E 2007 Intelligence 35 243–251
- [27] Deary I J, Strand S, Smith P and Fernandes C 2007 Intelligence 35 13-21
- [28] Demetriou A, Makris N, Tachmatzidis D, Kazi S and Spanoudis G 2019 Intelligence 77 101404
- [29] Hattie J A C 2009 Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (New York : Routledge)
- [30] Primi R, Ferrão M E and L. S. Almeida L S 2010 Learn Individ Differ 20, 446–451
- [31] Ohtani K and Hisasaka T 2018 Metacogn Learn 13 179–212
- [32] Roth B, Becker N, Romeyke S, Schäfer S, Domnick F and Spinath F M 2015 Intelligence 53 118–137
- [33] Arendasy M and Sommer M 2005 Intelligence 33, 307–324
- [34] Becker N, Schmitz F, Falk A, Feldbrügge J, Recktenwald D, Wilhelm O, Preckel F and Spinath F 2016 J. Intell. 4, 2
- [35] Hayes T R, Petrov A A and Sederberg P B 2015 Intelligence 48 1–14
- [36] Loesche P, Wiley J and Hasselhorn M 2015 Intelligence 48 58–75
- [37] Gonthier C and Thomassin N 2015 J. Exp. Psychol. Gen. 144 916–924
- [38] Jastrzębski J, Ciechanowska I and Chuderski A 2018 Intelligence 66 44-53
- [39] Mitchum A L and Kelley C M 2010 J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn 36 699–710
- [40] Remenyi D S J, Swartz E, Money A and Williams B 1998Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method (SAGE Publications: London).
- [41] Divayana D G H, Sudirtha I G, and Gading I K 2020 Cogent Psychol 7 1-18
- [42] Divayana D G H 2019 Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn. 14(17)114-132
- [43] Setyadi D, Subanji and Muksar M 2016 IOSR-JRME 6(6) 1-7
- [44] Meijer J, Sleegers P, Elshout-Mohr M, Daalen-Kapteijns M V, Meeus W and Tempelaar D 2013 Educ. Res 55(1) 31–52

BUKTI HASIL REVIEW (2 MARET 2021)

Reviewer Feedback For	Date	March 2, 2021	
7th International International Cont	erence on Mathematics	s, Science, and Edu	ucation
Paper Title	nstrument Development I n Calculus Problem Solvi	Design for Metacogn ing	itive Determinatio
Reviewer Recommendation	Neutral		
Reviewer Ratings			
The authors contribution to the paper	Fair		
Potential interest to research community	Poor		
Originality of the work	Fair		
Use of examples and illustrations	Fair		
Quality of questions or problems raised by the Author	Poor		
Reader's confidence in Author's knowledge	Poor		
Formatting and Presentation	Poor		
Awareness of related work	Fair		
Scientific Impact or Practical Utility	Poor		
Citations and References	Fair		

Detailed Comments:

Paper Organization

The paper has been poorly written - both technically and grammatically

The title of the paper need to be changed

The Technical content of the paper to made more relevant and novelty of the proposed method to be stressed upon

Suggested to completely rewrite the paper taking into consideration the points mentioned above. The keyword "Presented" did not appear in the abstract.

Poor

Add one paragraph for organisation of the paper at the end of introduction section.

Separate section on Related works need to be mentioned so that it is easy to get information about any solutions that have been made by other researchers as well as problems that still need to be studied further. The author must be able to show the position of the research he is doing compared to other existing solutions.

The author should also discuss how the limitations affect the interpretation of their results. Methodology is one of the most critical parts of the paper that reviewers found lacking detail. The methods should be adequately described to show how the research was conducted to improve clarity and transparency.

Future work is missing. You may add this to conclusion If you're actively engaged in follow-up this work or any recommendation for further improvement.

Grammar, punctuation, or spelling errors:

Lots of mistakes are present.

Delete the text box of sponsors from the second page.

BUKTI SUDAH UPLOAD REVISI (7 April 2021)

	~ -		sti / × +	LAMP. E-1 Gusti	×	Lihat artikel	Gu 🗙 🔮	🔟 133. ME-187	ail - GUSTI AYU 🗙	0 N	m: Bukti 🗆 🗙	e View Iter	maha 🗙 🕴 [ioogle Terj	💁 G	op ×	(4) WhatsA	0
🗆 🦚 i	₿ ☆ [Ŀ		UYM%3D	HrYrSX6kK	STYMFMZ1	xMwAQAP	DDU3MWQyMj	IGQ0NS1iNzhiL1	ZiMDct	/M4YmZILW)kAGY4NW	nail/id/AAC	fice.com/	look.off	a out	\rightarrow G	~
c 🥙	D 🕸	E> I	6 4 1	Teams call 🛛 🖵	Ē	≡ ,0						Search	\sim \leftarrow	ent Items	Se			
										_				elp	He	View	Home	
~	₩ …	5	~ 🖬 ~	∡ , ☆	⊘ ~ F	d / Unread	🖄 Read	Quick steps	«	6	ý 🔓 ~	0 🗸 🔇	~ 🖻	~ T	v mail	🗹 New	=	
Ø 2 -> € ->	D 2						iusti-Ayu	ME-1873_	∓ Filter		;	Results	Î			Favorites	~	89
→ … 2021 9:40 PM	③ ← ≪ → Wed 4/7/2021 5	٢		s.ac.id>	S.Pd.,M.Pd 8@mail.unne	Y SUGIHARNI, 2019 <icmse201< td=""><td>I AYU DESS MSE UNNES 2</td><td>GUS To: 1</td><td></td><td></td><td>lts</td><td>All resul</td><td></td><td>2710</td><td>c</td><td>🕞 Inbox</td><td></td><td>쯍</td></icmse201<>	I AYU DESS MSE UNNES 2	GUS To: 1			lts	All resul		2710	c	🕞 Inbox		쯍
< the	iew them, click the	th you. To view	Business files w	shared OneDrive for Bu	d.,M.Pd has s	SUGIHARNI, S.	I AYU DESSY below.	GU link	Ø 4/7/2021	Э ц	JNNES 2019 3_Gusti-Ayu	ICMSE U ME-1873			ltems	➢ Sent I		Ø
dot	-VFibahnoUe.dot	106-090833-V	ullpaper-20210	opment-Design-for-ful	ument-Devel <mark>ISE</mark> .pdf	_Gusti-Ayu-Instr n statement- <mark>ICN</mark>	33. ME-1873_ nti-plagiarism		Sent Items	1usc +1	d is my mar . ME-1873	Attachec		3	s favorite	Drafts		~
					h l	nittee	CMSE Comm	Dear	Ø 4/7/2021	9 u	JNNES 2019 3 Gusti-Avu	ICMSE U ME-1873	0			Folders	~	1
tunity t <mark>ICMSE</mark> I	for the opportunity hat in the next ICN	Thank you for 10. I hope that	m statement. 7th <mark>ICMSE</mark> 202	ent and anti-plagiarism be published on the 71	tion stateme y paper can b	ng the confirmation to me, so m	script by fillin ave been give	man that	Sent Items	itte	MSE Comm	Dear <mark>ICN</mark>		2710	c	🖂 Inbox		×
				e.	to participate	he opportunity	egards	Best		+1	. ME-1873	133.		3	S	🔊 Drafts		•
						ugiharni	Ayu Dessy Su	Gust	8/28/2020	nes.com] Pap	/@icmseun CMSE 2020	> [7th IC			ltems	Sent I		-
						Forward	Reply 🧷	6	Sent Items	100	vist team G	Dear ICN		. 194	ted Ite	U Delet		88
									8/19/2020 Sent Items	nes.com] Full 1, I a	ou so much	no-reply > [7th <mark>I(</mark> Thank yo	-	27	Email ive	Ed Junk I		
N 77 ck	Wed 4/7 Wed 4/7 iew them, clic -VFibahnoUe iured that it for the oppo	th you. To view 106-090833-V red and ensur Thank you fo 0. I hope tha	Business files w ullpaper-2021C Ins. I have chec Im statement. Trh ICMSE 200	s.ac.id> shared OneDrive for Bu opment-Design-for-ful -outed by your teams ent and anti-plagiarism e published on the 70 e.	S.Pd, M.Pd 8@mail.unne d, M.Pd has s ument-Devek iss, pdf has been lay tion stateme to paper can b to participate	Y SUGIHARNI, 2019 «Icmse201 SUGIHARNI, SJ Gusti-Ayu-Instr Gusti-Ayu-Instr Charter ant statement- Ch ntscript which are the confirma en to me, som gethe confirma en to me, som en opportunity ugiharni Forward	I AYU DESSY MSE UNNES 2 II AYU DESSY below. 33. ME-1873_ ntl-plagiarism CMSE Comm ave been giv II be given th egards Ayu Dessy Su Reply	GUS To: II GU Iink E E E E E E To: II To: II	24/7/2021 Sent Items 24/7/2021 Sent Items 8/28/2020 Sent Items 8/19/2020 Sent Items) j husc +1) j itte +1 nes.com] Pap 300 nes.com] Full h, I a	Its JNNES 2019 3_Gusti-Ayı ME-1873 NNES 2019 3_Gusti-Ayı VISE Comm .ME-1873 (@Icmseun CMSE 2020 VISE team C VISE team C VISE 2020 VISE 2020 Out so much	All result ICMSE U ME-1873 Attached I 133. ICMSE U ME-1873 Dear ICM I 133. no-reply > [7th IK Thank you	0	2710 3 2710 3 . 194 27	< s favorite s ltems ted lte Email	 □ Inbox ○ Sent I ○ Drafts ► Folders ○ Inbox ○ Drafts ○ Prafts ○ Sent I ○ Drafts ○ Sent I ○ Drafts ○ Archive 	×	 ↔

Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving

GAD Sugiharni

Sistem Informasi, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali, Indonesia

Corresponding author : ayu dessy@stikom-bali.ac.id

Abstract. This research main objective was to produce an instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. This study used a development approach with the research and development method. The subjects involved in this study were two psychologists and three education experts. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation, those were data collection techniques used in this study. This study used qualitative descriptive technique as the data analysis technique. The results of this study indicated a questionnaire design. It was the indicators of instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It had the percentage of effectiveness standards classified as good and very good criteria based on the five-scale categorization.

5. Introduction

A person's knowledge grows based on affirmations received from the surrounding environment. Affirmations received continuously will raise much new questions in a person. This is what encourages a person to do a novelty for certain objects through a higher thought process. This theory was sparked by some authors such as Piaget, Dubinsky and Sfard [1-3]. It is same as with Gray and Tall [4] said, a thought process arising from environmental affirmations will give rise to a concept that can be used for the novelty of an object. Where in the process will require certain symbols as a reminder of the procedure. These symbols can be used to solve problems in real life. Some of these learning symbols are summarized in calculus learning.

The chapters in calculus learning are related to one another. They start from the basic concepts of calculus to higher mental processes. It is important for students to understand them systematically, starting from the basic to the most complicated. If it is not done systematically, it will be difficult for students to solve calculus problems [5]. There were several studies that analyze it in the context of mathematics [6-11]. Some were in the context of physics [12]. There were also those in other contexts [13].

Engineering students require taking calculus courses. It means that there will be students who have a variety of characters in calculus learning. This will imply that it is necessary to develop curriculum design and interpretation to evaluate its effectiveness. It is not uncommon to find only a few students who focus on learning calculus while others are not. So it is necessary to analyze the character possessed by each student so that learning objectives can be achieved according to the applicable curriculum directions [14].

The student character problems in calculus learning are not an obstacle that cannot be solved. It is overcoming the characters diversity can be done by raising their awareness through metacognition process. Apart from cognitive, affective and psychomotor, metacognition also has an important role in the problem-solving process, especially in self-awareness [15-16]. The results of field study [17-18] and laboratory study [19] showed that students who tend to engage in metacognitive activities had a higher level of achievement than others. Brown and Palincsar conducted research related to metacognitive activities in the context of reading, while Van den Boom et al. investigated in the context of web-based learning [20].

The results of research conducted by Yoonhee Jang et al. proved that the balance between metacognitive abilities which students have and their metacognitive practice experiences can lead students to become aware [21]. The awareness which means of it is realizing the importance of the self-monitoring role in solving a problem. The existence of this balance will make students able to overcome their difficulties when carrying out metacognitive activities in various situations. The fluid intelligence will be formed with the development of students' metacognitive abilities. It is what trains students' abstract reasoning when solving a problem. In other words, it is one step for the improvement of cognitive abilities as well [22], be it in a social, economic and health

context [23], in the context of concentration and remembrance [24-25], and in the context of the skills and knowledge application [26-32].

In calculus learning related to metacognitive problems in problem solving, it is very important to take metacognitive measurements so that the direction of learning can be predicted properly. This metacognitive measurement can be done by using an instrument for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving is the form of a questionnaire. the strategy plays an important role in the development of an instrument. The strategy that often plays a role in it is a constructive strategy [33] and one that avoided is the elimination strategy [34-36]. Apart from strategy, something that also has an important role in instrument development is Likert [37-39]. Referring to the problems that occur in the field and the research results related to calculus learning and metacognitive questionnaires, the researchers were interested in conducting research related to the design of the development of metacognitive determination tools in calculus problem solving.

6. Methods

The research methodology can be used as a general sketch form to a reference for procedures in conducting research [40]. This study used a development approach with the research and development method with Borg & Gall model that focuses on the design stage [41]. This research methodology discussed instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It is designed in the form of an early indicator forming a metacognitive questionnaire in calculus problems solving.

The subjects involved in this study were two psychologist experts and three education experts. The object of this research was a metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation were data collection techniques used in this study. This research was conducted at the Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali in the calculus class.

Primary data in this study was in the form of quantitative data from respondents which used as a reference for decision making on the effectiveness standard percentage of metacognitive questionnaire designs in calculus problem solving. Where in retrieval using observation techniques and literature study. Secondary data were obtained using interview and documentation techniques. It was qualitative data which tends to be able to support percentage figures in primary data.

Descriptive quantitative analysis was the data analysis technique used. The result of effectiveness standard percentage in this study was obtained by equation (1) [42].

$$Percentage = \frac{\sum (response x each choice integrity)}{n x highest integrity} x 100\%$$
(1)

Note:

 $\sum = sum$

n = total number of questionnaires item

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving were then converted into a five scales categorization. The calculated value of the percentage among 90%-100% includes very good criteria with affirmations which do not need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 80%-89% includes good criteria with affirmations which need a minor revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 65%-79% includes enough criteria with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 55%-64% includes criteria lacking with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 55%-64% includes criteria lacking with affirmations which need revision.

7. Results and Discussion

Based on the research phase and field data collection, there were four standard metacognitive levels of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problems solving. The four levels were Tacit use, Aware use, Strategy use and Reflective use [43]. On each metacognition level there were three metacognitive aspects / criteria adopted from the Awareness of Independent Learning Inventory (AILI). Those were Metacognitive Knowledge, Metacognitive Regulation and Metacognitive Responsiveness [44]. The following were some indicators related to metacognitive questionnaire design standards in calculus problem solving.

7.1. Tacit Use

Tacit Use which means students use thoughts in solving calculus problems without realizing what and why thoughts are used. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) unable to provide an explanation of the understanding obtained after listening to calculus questions; 2) He/she does not realize the form of Calculus problems that had to be worked out systematically; 3) He/she does not pay

attention to the importance of calculus problems in life. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) He/she does not realize that solving Calculus problems can attract interest in learning; 2) He/she does not pay close attention to all the forms of understanding obtained about calculus problems; 3) He/she does not realize the purpose of learning in solving Calculus problems. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) solves Calculus problems without self-checking the systematicity of answers; 2) ignoring criticism and suggestions for the understanding obtained about calculus problems; 3) ignoring the added insights gained in calculus learning

7.2. Aware use

Aware use, it has meaning that students use their idea in solving problems. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) realizing the need for conscious efforts in understanding Calculus problems; 2) it is able to formulate a form of understanding calculus problems; 3) realizing of mistakes when understanding the problem. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) be aware of the many things that can be learned from people in a study group; 2) know about the uselessness of a task; 3) aware of the relationship between tasks and personal goals. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) Realizing the importance of working together in a study group to solve calculus problems; 2) realize the suitability of the cooperation method in a task; 3) realize that a calculus problem can provide valuable lessons.

7.3. Strategy use

Strategy use, which means students direct their thinking processes by realizing specific strategies that increase the accuracy of their thinking. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) pay attention to how well the self-learned information; 2) He/she has a way of solving unproductive cooperation in study groups; 3) He/she has a strategy about what needs to be done to study thoroughly when starting to solve a calculus problem.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) realize that solving a calculus problem will attract interest in learning; 2) know what can be learned from colleagues in solving calculus problems collaboratively; 3) have a clear idea of what you want to learn from solving a calculus problem.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) recognize the importance of personal feedback about learning goals; 2) know how much effort it takes to solve a calculus problem; 3) using strategies to communicate with learning group members about the benefits of working together in solving calculus problems.

7.4. Reflective use

Reflective use, which means students reflect on their thoughts before and after or even in the middle of the thought process, by considering the acquisition and how to improve it. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) assess the usefulness of calculus problem solving that have been done, it towards personality; 2) cross check with group members about calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) overcomes the questionable personal involvement in performing calculus problem solving.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) assess how much can be learned from group members by working together to solve calculus problems; 2) evaluate the differences in understanding that sometimes occur when working together in calculus problem solving; 3) assess self-interest in calculus problem solving.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) find out the errors contained in problem solving that carried out; 2) evaluate the systematics of calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) trying to find deeper reasons when finding information that is difficult to understand.

Based on the standard indicators of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving that had been described above, the result was the percentage of the effectiveness standard. The complete results of the effectiveness standards percentage can be shown in Table 1.

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus solving problems showed the good and very good criteria. The criteria that considered good were several indicators that had effectiveness standard percentage of 85%, 86%, 87% and 88%. It showed that the indicators which had those effectiveness standard percentages in their affirmation require minor revisions. Criteria that considered very goods were several indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage in their affirmation require minor revisions. Criteria that considered very goods were several indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage in their affirmation did not require revision.

8. Conclusion

Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving in this study was able to show several indicators which had good and very good criteria. Where the indicators obtained in this study were arranged systematically according to the metacognitive level in Calculus Problem Solving. It also arranged according Metacognitive Aspects/Criteria which were adopted from the AILI concept. It is expected to be able to conduct field evaluations and make decisions on several metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus problem solving after doing a minor revision.

Metacognition Level in	Metacognitive Aspects /	Indicator	Effectiveness Standards
Calculus Problem Solving	Criteria		Percentage (%)
Tacit use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	88
		2	90
		3	88
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90
		2	85
		3	85
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	87
		2	87
		3	88
Aware use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	88
		2	88
		3	88
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90
		2	87
		3	86
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	86
		2	86
		3	87
Strategi use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	87
	c c	2	88
		3	88
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	88
	6 6	2	88
		3	88
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	88
	6	2	88
		3	87
Reflective use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	86
		2	90
		3	90
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90
	inetaeogina ve reegulation	2	90
		3	88
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	87
	ineaeogina ve icesponsi veness	2	86
		2	90
		3	90

 Table 1. Effectiveness standard percentage of metacognitive questionnaire indicators in solving.

 Calculus Problems

References

[47] Sfard A 1991 Educ. Stud. Matematika 22(1) 36

^[45] Piaget J 1972 The Principles of Genetic Epistemology London: Routledge & Kegan Paul)

^[46] Dubinsky E 1991 *Reflective Abstraction in Advanced Mathematical Thinking, in D.O. Tall (ed.) Advanced Mathematical Thinking* (Kluwer: Dordrecht)

^[48] Gray E M and Tall D O 1994 J. Res. Math. Educ. 26 115

- [49] Dominguez A, Barniol P, and Zavala G 2017 Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ. 13(10) 6507
- [50] Leinhardt G, Zaslavsky O and Stein M K 1990 Rev Educ Res 60 1
- [51] Hadjidemetriou C and Williams J 2002 Res. Math. Educ. 4(1) 69
- [52] Christensen W M and Thompson J R 2012 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 8 101
- [53] Planinic M, Milin-Sipus Z, Katic H, Susac A, and Ivanjek L 2012 Int. J. Sci. Math. Educ. 10(6) 1393
- [54] Planinic M, Ivanjek L, Susac A, and Milin-Sipus Z 2013 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 9 101
- [55] Epstein J 2013 Not. Am. Math. Soc 60(8) 1018
- [56] McDermott L C 2001 Am. J. Phys. 69(11) 1127
- [57] Woolnough J 2000 J Res Sci Teach 30 259–267
- [58] Tall D 1997 Functions and Calculus, in A. J. Bishop et al (Eds.), International Handbook of Mathematics Education (Kluwer: Dordrecht)
- [59] Wang C M, Haertel G D, and Walberg H J 1993 Rev Educ Res 63(3) 249
- [60] Zimmerman B J 1990 Educ Psychol 25 3
- [61] Brown A and Palincsar A S 1989 Guided cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition, in Knowing, learning and instruction, Essays in honor of Robert Glaser, ed. L.B. Resnick, (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum)
- [62] De Jong F P C M 1992 Zelfstandig leren: Regulatie van het leerproces en leren reguleren, Academisch Proefschrift [Independent learning: Regulation of the learning process and learn- ing to regulate, Dissertation] (Tilburg: Gianotten)
- [63] Veenman M V J, Elshout J J, and Meijer J 1997 Learn Instr 7(2) 187
- [64] Van den Boom G, Paas F, Van Merriënboer J G, and Van Gog T 2004 Comput. Hum. Behav. 20(4) 551
- [65] Jang Y, Lee H, Kim Y, and Min K 2020 Metacogn Learn 10(1) 409
- [66] McGrew K. S. 2009 Intelligence 37 1
- [67] Deary I J 2012 Intelligence 63 453
- [68] Shipstead Z, Lindsey D R B, Marshall R L, and Engle R W 2014 J. Mem. Lang 72, 116
- [69] Unsworth N, Fukuda K, Awh E, and Vogel E K 2014 Cogn Psychol 71 1
- [70] Colom R and Flores-Mendoza C E 2007 Intelligence 35 243
- [71] Deary I J, Strand S, Smith P, and Fernandes C 2007 Intelligence 35 13
- [72] Demetriou A, Makris N, Tachmatzidis D, Kazi S, and Spanoudis G 2019 Intelligence 77 101404
- [73] Hattie J A C 2009 Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (New York : Routledge)
- [74] Primi R, Ferrão M E and L S, and Almeida L S 2010 Learn Individ Differ 20 446
- [75] Ohtani K and Hisasaka T 2018 Metacogn Learn 13 179
- [76] Roth B, Becker N, Romeyke S, Schäfer S, Domnick F, and Spinath F M 2015 Intelligence 53 118
- [77] Arendasy M and Sommer M 2005 Intelligence 33 307
- [78] Becker N, Schmitz F, Falk A, Feldbrügge J, Recktenwald D, Wilhelm O, Preckel F, and Spinath F 2016 J. Intell. 4, 2
- [79] Hayes T R, Petrov A A, and Sederberg P B 2015 Intelligence 48 1
- [80] Loesche P, Wiley J, and Hasselhorn M 2015 Intelligence 48 58
- [81] Gonthier C and Thomassin N 2015 J. Exp. Psychol. Gen. 144 916
- [82] Jastrzębski J, Ciechanowska I, and Chuderski A 2018 Intelligence 66 44
- [83] Mitchum A L and Kelley C M 2010 J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn 36 699
- [84] Remenyi D S J, Swartz E, Money A and Williams B 1998*Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method* (SAGE Publications: London).
- [85] Divayana D G H, Sudirtha I G, and Gading I K 2020 Cogent Psychol 7 1
- [86] Divayana D G H 2019 Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn. 14(17)114
- [87] Setyadi D, Subanji, and Muksar M 2016 *IOSR-JRME* 6(6) 1
- [88] Meijer J, Sleegers P, Elshout-Mohr M, Daalen-Kapteijns M V, Meeus W, and Tempelaar D 2013 Educ. Res 55(1) 31

BUKTI ACCEPTED (27 Agustus 2020)

0	4) WhatsApp 🛛 🗙 🛛 🔤 Google Terj	jemahan 🗙 📄 View Item: Bukti cetak 🗙 🗿 Mail - GUS	TI AVU DES 🗴 🔶 Lihat artikel 🛛 🗴 🖹 LAMP. E-1 Gusti Ayu 🗄 🗙 🛉 + 🗸 — 🗗 🗙
÷	→ C	l/id/AAQkAGY4NWM4YmZILWZiMDetNGQ0NS1iNzhiLTRk0	DDU3MWQyMjkxMwAQAGn%28O3eHuVhOtLWjijGxlp4%3D 🗈 🖻 🛧 🛛 🌒 🗄
	Sent Items $ \smallsetminus $	← Search	😑 🔎 🖙 Teams call 🖓 📭 🛱 🌍
	Home View Help E New mail V	· 🗇 · 🚿 🔓 · ← · ← · 🖟	Quick steps ∨ 🗠 Read / Unread 🖉 ∨ 📮 ∨ 🔗 🕓 🤘 ∨ 🛱 …
83	 Favorites 		[7th ICMSE 2020] Paper accepted: Instrument-Development-Design-for
쌿	☑ Inbox 2710	All results	72 7th ICMSE 2020 <icmse@mail.unnes.ac.id></icmse@mail.unnes.ac.id>
0 •	 Sent Items Drafts Add favorite 	ICMSE UNNES 2019 Ø ME-1873_Gusti-Ayu 4/7/2021 Attached is my manusc Sent Items 133. ME-1873 +1	Te: "GUSTI AYU DESSY SUGIHARINI, S.Pa,M.Pd" <ayu_dessyl#stikom-ball.ac.id> The 8/27/2020 11:44 PM</ayu_dessyl#stikom-ball.ac.id>
× •	 ✓ Folders ☑ Inbox 2710 ☑ Drafts 3 	ICMSE UNNES 2019 Ø ME-1873_Gusti-Ayu 4/7/2021 Dear ICMSE Committe Image: Instructure Sent Items Image: Instructure +1	7th International International Conference on Mathematics, Science, and Education Dear author,
•	➢ Sent Items ⑪ Deleted Ite 194	no-reply@icmseunnes.com > [7th ICMSE 2020] Pap 8/28/2020 Dear ICMSE team Goo Sent Items	Paper 102 Mc-1873 Title: Instrument Development Design for Metacognitive Determination in Calculus Problem Solving Author(s): Gusti Ayu Dessy Sugiharni We would like to inform that your abstract is accepted to be presented in our conference. Please do finish all the steps on time : 1. Finish payment registration fee 2. Download acceptance letter
	🕝 Junk Email 27	no-reply@i <mark>cmse</mark> unnes.com > [7th <mark>ICMSE</mark> 2020] Full 8/19/2020 Thank you so much, I a Sent Items	3. Submit your full paper Best regards, 7th ICMSE 2020 Committee

BUKTI PUBLISH (1 Juni 2021)

🔇 (4) WhatsApp 🛛 🗙 🔤 Google Terjemahan 🗙 🛛 🔁 View Item: Bukti cetak: 🗙 🖉 🚮 Mail - GUSTI AYU DES: 🗙	📭 Instrument developme 🗙 📋 LAMP. E-1 Gusti	Ayu 🛙 🗙 📔 🕂 🔍 🦳 🗖 🗙
← → C		G 🕸 🖻 🛧 🔲 🌒 :
IOPSCIENCE Q Journals - Books Publishing Support O Login -		
Journal of Physics: Conference Series		
PAPER • OPEN ACCESS	125 Total downloads	You may also like
Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving		JOURNAL ARTICLES
G A D Sugiharni ¹ Published under licence by IOP Publishing Ltd Investigation of Displayer Conference Casing Mathematics and the Ameliantics	Turn on MathJax	metacognitive failures in mathematical problem solving based on
Citation G A D Sugiharni 2021 J. Phys.: Conf. Ser. 1918 042061 DOI 10.1088/1742-6596/1918/4/042061		Profile metacognitive
🔁 Article PDF		education students in microbiology course
References -		'I can now detect and rectify my error.' New generation ninth-grade learner's problem-solving Help
+ Article and author information	Abstract References	skills during experiments in physics through metacognitive brainstorming strategy
∧ L → → → → This site uses cookies. By continuing to use this site you agree to our use of cookies. To find out more, see o	our Privacy and Cookies policy.	8

ICMSE 2020

Journal of Physics: Conference Series

Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving

G A D Sugiharni

Sistem Informasi, Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali, Indonesia

Corresponding author : ayu_dessy@stikom-bali.ac.id

Abstract. This research main objective was to produce an instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. This study used a development approach with the research and development method. The subjects involved in this study were two psychologists and three education experts. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation, those were data collection techniques used in this study. This study used qualitative descriptive technique as the data analysis technique. The results of this study indicated a questionnaire design. It was the indicators of instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It had the percentage of effectiveness standards classified as good and very good criteria based on the five-scale categorization.

1. Introduction

A person's knowledge grows based on affirmations received from the surrounding environment. Affirmations received continuously will raise much new questions in a person. This is what encourages a person to do a novelty for certain objects through a higher thought process. This theory was sparked by some authors such as Piaget, Dubinsky and Sfard [1-3]. It is same as with Gray and Tall [4] said, a thought process arising from environmental affirmations will give rise to a concept that can be used for the novelty of an object. Where in the process will require certain symbols as a reminder of the procedure. These symbols can be used to solve problems in real life. Some of these learning symbols are summarized in calculus learning.

The chapters in calculus learning are related to one another. They start from the basic concepts of calculus to higher mental processes. It is important for students to understand them systematically, starting from the basic to the most complicated. If it is not done systematically, it will be difficult for students to solve calculus problems [5]. There were several studies that analyze it in the context of mathematics [6-11]. Some were in the context of physics [12]. There were also those in other contexts [13].

Engineering students require taking calculus courses. It means that there will be students who have a variety of characters in calculus learning. This will imply that it is necessary to develop curriculum design and interpretation to evaluate its effectiveness. It is not uncommon to find only a few students who focus on learning calculus while others are not. So it is necessary to analyze the character possessed by each student so that learning objectives can be achieved according to the applicable curriculum directions [14].

The student character problems in calculus learning are not an obstacle that cannot be solved. It is overcoming the characters diversity can be done by raising their awareness through metacognition process. Apart from cognitive, affective and psychomotor, metacognition also has an important role in

Content from this work may be used under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 licence. Any further distribution of this work must maintain attribution to the author(s) and the title of the work, journal citation and DOI. Published under licence by IOP Publishing Ltd 1

ICMSE 2020		IOP Publishing
Journal of Physics: Conference Series	1918 (2021) 042061	doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1918/4/042061

the problem-solving process, especially in self-awareness [15-16]. The results of field study [17-18] and laboratory study [19] showed that students who tend to engage in metacognitive activities had a higher level of achievement than others. Brown and Palincsar conducted research related to metacognitive activities in the context of reading, while Van den Boom et al. investigated in the context of web-based learning [20].

The results of research conducted by Yoonhee Jang et al. proved that the balance between metacognitive abilities which students have and their metacognitive practice experiences can lead students to become aware [21]. The awareness which means of it is realizing the importance of the self-monitoring role in solving a problem. The existence of this balance will make students able to overcome their difficulties when carrying out metacognitive activities in various situations. The fluid intelligence will be formed with the development of students' metacognitive abilities. It is what trains students' abstract reasoning when solving a problem. In other words, it is one step for the improvement of cognitive abilities as well [22], be it in a social, economic and health context [23], in the context of concentration and remembrance [24-25], and in the context of the skills and knowledge application [26-32].

In calculus learning related to metacognitive problems in problem solving, it is very important to take metacognitive measurements so that the direction of learning can be predicted properly. This metacognitive measurement can be done by using an instrument for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving is the form of a questionnaire, the strategy plays an important role in the development of an instrument. The strategy that often plays a role in it is a constructive strategy [33] and one that avoided is the elimination strategy [34-36]. Apart from strategy, something that also has an important role in instrument development is Likert [37-39]. Referring to the problems that occur in the field and the research results related to calculus learning and metacognitive questionnaires, the researchers were interested in conducting research related to the design of the development of metacognitive determination tools in calculus problem solving.

2. Methods

The research methodology can be used as a general sketch form to a reference for procedures in conducting research [40]. This study used a development approach with the research and development method with Borg & Gall model that focuses on the design stage [41]. This research methodology discussed instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving. It is designed in the form of an early indicator forming a metacognitive questionnaire in calculus problems solving.

The subjects involved in this study were two psychologist experts and three education experts. The object of this research was a metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving. Observation, interviews, literature study and documentation were data collection techniques used in this study. This research was conducted at the Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis STIKOM Bali in the calculus class.

Primary data in this study was in the form of quantitative data from respondents which used as a reference for decision making on the effectiveness standard percentage of metacognitive questionnaire designs in calculus problem solving. Where in retrieval using observation techniques and literature study. Secondary data were obtained using interview and documentation techniques. It was qualitative data which tends to be able to support percentage figures in primary data.

Descriptive quantitative analysis was the data analysis technique used. The result of effectiveness standard percentage in this study was obtained by equation (1) [42].

$$Percentage = \frac{\sum (response x each choice integrity)}{n x highest integrity} x 100\%$$
(1)

Note:

 $\Sigma = sum$

ICMSE 2020		IOP Publishing
Journal of Physics: Conference Series	1918(2021) 042061	doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1918/4/042061

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving were then converted into a five scales categorization. The calculated value of the percentage among 90%-100% includes very good criteria with affirmations which do not need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 80%-89% includes good criteria with affirmations which need a minor revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 65%-79% includes enough criteria with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 55%-64% includes criteria lacking with affirmations which need revision. The calculated value of the percentage among 0%-54% includes poor criteria with affirmations which need revision.

3. Results and Discussion

Based on the research phase and field data collection, there were four standard metacognitive levels of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problems solving. The four levels were Tacit use, Aware use, Strategy use and Reflective use [43]. On each metacognition level there were three metacognitive aspects / criteria adopted from the Awareness of Independent Learning Inventory (AILI). Those were Metacognitive Knowledge, Metacognitive Regulation and Metacognitive Responsiveness [44]. The following were some indicators related to metacognitive questionnaire design standards in calculus problem solving.

3.1. Tacit Use

Tacit Use which means students use thoughts in solving calculus problems without realizing what and why thoughts are used. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) unable to provide an explanation of the understanding obtained after listening to calculus questions; 2) He/she does not realize the form of Calculus problems that had to be worked out systematically; 3) He/she does not pay attention to the importance of calculus problems in life. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1)_He/she does not realize that solving Calculus problems can attract interest in learning; 2) He/she does not pay close attention to all the forms of understanding obtained about calculus problems; 3) He/she does not realize the purpose of learning in solving Calculus problems. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) solves Calculus problems without self-checking the systematicity of answers; 2) ignoring criticism and suggestions for the understanding obtained about calculus problems; 3) ignoring the added insights gained in calculus learning

3.2. Aware use

Aware use, it has meaning that students use their idea in solving problems. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) realizing the need for conscious efforts in understanding Calculus problems; 2) it is able to formulate a form of understanding calculus problems; 3) realizing of mistakes when understanding the problem. In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) be aware of the many things that can be learned from people in a study group; 2) know about the uselessness of a task; 3) aware of the relationship between tasks and personal goals. In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) Realizing the importance of working together in a study group to solve calculus problems; 2) realize the suitability of the cooperation method in a task; 3) realize that a calculus problem can provide valuable lessons.

3.3. Strategy use

Strategy use, which means students direct their thinking processes by realizing specific strategies that increase the accuracy of their thinking. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) pay attention to how well the self-learned information; 2) He/she has a way of solving unproductive cooperation in study groups; 3) He/she has a strategy about what needs to be done to study thoroughly when starting to solve a calculus problem.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) realize that solving a calculus problem will attract interest in learning; 2) know what can be learned from colleagues in solving calculus

ICMSE 2020		IOP Publishing
Journal of Physics: Conference Series	1918 (2021) 042061	doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1918/4/042061

problems collaboratively; 3) have a clear idea of what you want to learn from solving a calculus problem.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) recognize the importance of personal feedback about learning goals; 2) know how much effort it takes to solve a calculus problem; 3) using strategies to communicate with learning group members about the benefits of working together in solving calculus problems.

3.4. Reflective use

Reflective use, which means students reflect on their thoughts before and after or even in the middle of the thought process, by considering the acquisition and how to improve it. The indicators used as design standards for the Metacognitive Knowledge aspects were 1) assess the usefulness of calculus problem solving that have been done, it towards personality; 2) cross check with group members about calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) overcomes the questionable personal involvement in performing calculus problem solving.

In the Metacognitive Regulation there were indicators: 1) assess how much can be learned from group members by working together to solve calculus problems; 2) evaluate the differences in understanding that sometimes occur when working together in calculus problem solving; 3) assess self-interest in calculus problem solving.

In Metacognitive Responsiveness there were indicators: 1) find out the errors contained in problem solving that carried out; 2) evaluate the systematics of calculus problem solving that has been done; 3) trying to find deeper reasons when finding information that is difficult to understand.

Based on the standard indicators of metacognitive questionnaire design in calculus problem solving that had been described above, the result was the percentage of the effectiveness standard. The complete results of the effectiveness standards percentage can be shown in Table 1.

The effectiveness standard percentage results of metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus solving problems showed the good and very good criteria. The criteria that considered good were several indicators that had effectiveness standard percentage of 85%, 86%, 87% and 88%. It showed that the indicators which had those effectiveness standard percentages in their affirmation require minor revisions. Criteria that considered very goods were several indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage result of 90%. It showed that the indicators which had effectiveness standard percentage in their affirmation did not require revision.

4. Conclusion

Instrument development design for metacognitive determination in calculus problem solving in this study was able to show several indicators which had good and very good criteria. Where the indicators obtained in this study were arranged systematically according to the metacognitive level in Calculus Problem Solving. It also arranged according Metacognitive Aspects/Criteria which were adopted from the AILI concept. It is expected to be able to conduct field evaluations and make decisions on several metacognitive questionnaire indicators in calculus problem solving after doing a minor revision.

4

Journal of Physics: Conference Series

Metacognition Level in Calculus Problem Solving	Metacognitive Aspects / Criteria	Indicator	Effectiveness Standards Percentage (%)		
Tacit use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	88		
	MAN STREET, NO. 10 CONTRACTOR	2	90		
		3	88		
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90		
		2	85		
		3	85		
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	87		
		2	87		
		3	88		
Aware use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	88		
		2	88		
		3	88		
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90		
		2	87		
		3	86		
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	86		
	ing the local sector and the	2	86		
		3	87		
Strategi use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	87		
0		2	88		
		3	88		
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	88		
	0	2	88		
		3	88		
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	88		
		2	88		
		3	87		
Reflective use	Metacognitive Knowledge	1	86		
	5	2	90		
		3	90		
	Metacognitive Regulation	1	90		
		2	90		
		3	88		
	Metacognitive Responsiveness	1	87		
		2	86		
		3	90		

Table 1.	Effectiveness	standard	percentage of	of metacognitive	questionnaire	indicators in	solving.
			Calcu	lus Problems			

References

Piaget J 1972 The Principles of Genetic Epistemology London: Routledge & Kegan Paul) [1] [2] Dubinsky E 1991 Reflective Abstraction in Advanced Mathematical Thinking, in D.O. Tall (ed.)

- Advanced Mathematical Thinking (Kluwer: Dordrecht)
- Sfard A 1991 Educ. Stud. Matematika 22(1) 36 [3]
- [4] Gray E M and Tall D O 1994 J. Res. Math. Educ. 26 115
- [5] Dominguez A, Barniol P, and Zavala G 2017 Eurasia J. Math. Sci. Technol. Educ. 13(10) 6507
- [6] Leinhardt G, Zaslavsky O and Stein M K 1990 Rev Educ Res 60 1
- [7] [8] Hadjidemetriou C and Williams J 2002 Res. Math. Educ.4(1) 69
- Christensen W M and Thompson J R 2012 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 8 101

ICMSE 2020

Journal of Physics: Conference Series

IOP Publishing

1918 (2021) 042061 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/1918/4/042061

- [9] Planinic M, Milin-Sipus Z, Katic H, Susac A, and Ivanjek L 2012 Int. J. Sci. Math. Educ. 10(6) 1393
- [10] Planinic M, Ivanjek L, Susac A, and Milin-Sipus Z 2013 Phys. rev. spec. top., Phys. educ. res. 9 101
- [11] Epstein J 2013 Not. Am. Math. Soc 60(8) 1018
- [12] McDermott L C 2001 Am. J. Phys. 69(11) 1127
- [13] Woolnough J 2000 J Res Sci Teach 30 259–267
- [14] Tall D 1997 Functions and Calculus, in A. J. Bishop et al (Eds.), International Handbook of Mathematics Education (Kluwer: Dordrecht)
- [15] Wang C M, Haertel G D, and Walberg H J 1993 Rev Educ Res 63(3) 249
- [16] Zimmerman B J 1990 Educ Psychol 25 3
- [17] Brown A and Palincsar A S 1989 Guided cooperative learning and individual knowledge acquisition, in Knowing, learning and instruction, Essays in honor of Robert Glaser, ed. L.B. Resnick, (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum)
- [18] De Jong F P C M 1992 Zelfstandig leren: Regulatie van het leerproces en leren reguleren, Academisch Proefschrift [Independent learning: Regulation of the learning process and learn- ing to regulate, Dissertation] (Tilburg: Gianotten)
- [19] Veenman M V J, Elshout J J, and Meijer J 1997 Learn Instr 7(2) 187
- [20] Van den Boom G, Paas F, Van Merriënboer J G, and Van Gog T 2004 Comput. Hum. Behav. 20(4) 551
- [21] Jang Y, Lee H, Kim Y, and Min K 2020 Metacogn Learn 10(1) 409
- [22] McGrew K. S. 2009 Intelligence 37 1
- [23] Deary I J 2012 Intelligence 63 453
- [24] Shipstead Z, Lindsey D R B, Marshall R L, and Engle R W 2014 J. Mem. Lang 72, 116
- [25] Unsworth N, Fukuda K, Awh E, and Vogel E K 2014 Cogn Psychol 71 1
- [26] Colom R and Flores-Mendoza C E 2007 Intelligence 35 243
- [27] Deary I J, Strand S, Smith P, and Fernandes C 2007 Intelligence 35 13
- [28] Demetriou A, Makris N, Tachmatzidis D, Kazi S, and Spanoudis G 2019 Intelligence 77 101404
- [29] Hattie J A C 2009 Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement. (New York : Routledge)
- [30] Primi R, Ferrão M E and L S, and Almeida L S 2010 Learn Individ Differ 20 446
- [31] Ohtani K and Hisasaka T 2018 Metacogn Learn 13 179
- [32] Roth B , Becker N, Romeyke S, Schäfer S, Domnick F, and Spinath F M 2015 Intelligence 53 118
- [33] Arendasy M and Sommer M 2005 Intelligence 33 307
- [34] Becker N, Schmitz F, Falk A, Feldbrügge J, Recktenwald D, Wilhelm O, Preckel F, and Spinath F 2016 J. Intell. 4, 2
- [35] Hayes T R, Petrov A A, and Sederberg P B 2015 Intelligence 48 1
- [36] Loesche P, Wiley J, and Hasselhorn M 2015 Intelligence 48 58
- [37] Gonthier C and Thomassin N 2015 J. Exp. Psychol. Gen. 144 916
- [38] Jastrzębski J, Ciechanowska I, and Chuderski A 2018 Intelligence 66 44
- [39] Mitchum A L and Kelley C M 2010 J Exp Psychol Learn Mem Cogn 36 699
- [40] Remenyi D S J, Swartz E, Money A and Williams B 1998Doing Research in Business and Management: An Introduction to Process and Method (SAGE Publications: London).
- [41] Divayana D G H, Sudirtha I G, and Gading I K 2020 Cogent Psychol 7 1
- [42] Divayana D G H 2019 Int. J. Emerg. Technol. Learn. 14(17)114
- [43] Setyadi D, Subanji, and Muksar M 2016 IOSR-JRME 6(6) 1
- [44] Meijer J, Sleegers P, Elshout-Mohr M, Daalen-Kapteijns M V, Meeus W, and Tempelaar D 2013 Educ. Res 55(1) 31