

# Muntazhimah M.Pd - The Development and Validation of Mathematical Reflective Thinking Test Instruments for Prospective Mathematics Teachers Using the Rasch Model

*by Muntazhimah M.pd Uploaded By Irfan*

---

**Submission date:** 23-Dec-2021 10:57AM (UTC+0700)

**Submission ID:** 1735182293

**File name:** lemen\_-\_Translated\_untuk\_turnitin\_-\_Muntazhimah\_muntazhimah.docx (594.37K)

**Word count:** 3402

**Character count:** 19117

# The Development and Validation of Mathematical Reflective Thinking Test Instruments for Prospective Mathematics Teachers Using the Rasch Model

<sup>4</sup> Muntazhimah<sup>1</sup> \*, Reni Wahyuni<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Mathematics Education Study Program, Muhammadiyah University of Prof. Dr. Hamka

<sup>2</sup>Mathematics Education Study Program, Islamic University of Riau

\*muntazhimah@uhamka.ac.id

## Abstract

Research on developing mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers using the Rasch model is limited. This study aims to develop a reflective thinking ability test for prospective mathematics teachers analyzed using the Rasch model. The development steps consist of preparing a blueprint, writing items, reviewing items, conducting trials, analyzing test results, and revising. The test developed is a description test validated by five experts, consisting of two expert professors in evaluating mathematical ability, one expert lecturer in the field of mathematical ability, and two expert lecturers in group theory. The test was also piloted on 26 students. The study's results using the Rasch model analysis showed that this instrument was "very reliable," and 12 of the 13 test items were "valid." The instrument has fulfilled all the stages of instrument development and was declared valid and reliable; thus, this test can be used to examine prospective mathematics teachers' mathematical reflective thinking ability.

**Keywords:** mathematical reflective thinking, Rasch model, test

## Introduction

The Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14 of 2005 stipulates that a teacher or lecturer must possess pedagogic, personality, social, and professional competencies. Furthermore, Minister of National Education Regulation No. 16, the Year 2007 concerning Academic Qualification Standards and Teacher Competencies stated that one of the core competencies in pedagogic competence is to conduct assessments, evaluate learning processes and outcomes. One of the implementations to mastery of these competencies is that teachers must develop assessment instruments and evaluate processes and learning outcomes.

Various types and kinds of instruments can be used as tools to measure the achievement of learning objectives, one of these instruments is a test (Prabowo & Dahlan, 2020; Suharman, 2018; Wahyudi, 2012). A test is crucial in education, as mandated in the law above, which is also the basis that educators must be willing and able to develop test instruments. However, the data shows that the intensity of teachers in developing test instruments is minimal (Osnal, Suhartoni, 2015), resulting in many test instruments not fulfilling the standard of a quality test (Prabowo et al., 2018; Wardhani & Putra, 2016). It is necessary to analyze the quality of the instrument to obtain an excellent test. (Arifin, 2016). The instrument analysis in the future must fulfill the quality criteria in substance, construction, language and meet the elements of validity

and reliability. These stages also apply when developing research instruments in mathematics education. The instruments used in the research must also go through the analysis process.

Mathematical reflective thinking ability is an important issue in various literature, especially in professional teacher education (Amidu, 2012); (Yuen Lie Lim, 2011). Mathematical reflective thinking ability is included in Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS). It is a thinking process involving activities of reflecting ideas, problems, or information received or the process of interpretation that starts from one experience to the next by making a deeper relationship understanding and connecting other experiences or ideas. (Muin et al., 2018; Clarà, 2015). Mathematical reflective thinking ability is one of the mathematical abilities required by all students. Through this ability, students actively, earnestly, and carefully in making consideration using the knowledge obtained on the given mathematical problem.

Various studies on mathematical reflective thinking skills in prospective teachers have been carried out. Among others are the reflective thinking ability of prospective teachers in Aceh based on gender and prior knowledge (Rahmadhani et al., 2020); adapting the Reflective Thinking Questionnaire (RTQ) into the Indonesian version, and investigating its quality in prospective chemistry teachers in Tanjungpinang (Sabekti et al., 2020); and the reflective thinking process of a female student who has an independent type of cognitive style in solving algebraic problems (Agustan et al., 2017). Some of the findings included research on the development of teaching materials to develop high school students' mathematical reflective thinking skills (Hendriana et al., 2019; Nindiasari et al., 2016), and Muntazhimah (2019) regarding the development of a mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for 8th-grade junior high school students. On the other hand, research on teaching materials and instruments is rare.

From several previous studies mentioned above, research references on the development of mathematical reflective thinking tests for prospective mathematics teachers are limited. Also, most research carried out employed classical test theory instead of Rasch Model. Rasch modeling has advantages over classical theory tests, including predicting missing data ability based on a systematic response pattern (Nur et al., 2020; An & Yu, 2021). The model makes statistical analysis results more accurate. More importantly, Rasch modeling can produce standard error measurement values for the instruments used and increase the accuracy of calculations (Sumintono, Bambang & Widhiarso, 2015).

Therefore, this study aims to develop a reflective thinking ability test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers using the Rasch model to analyze the validity and reliability.

The product of this research was expected to measure the reflective thinking ability of prospective mathematics teachers and is beneficial for further research related to the learning process to improve teachers' mathematical reflective thinking ability.

## Method

This study applied the method and procedures developed by Spaan (2006), Inc (2006), and Prabowo & Dahlan (2020) in their research, including preparing a blueprint, writing items, reviewing items, conducting trials, analyzing test results, and revising to produce an effective, efficient and quality mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers.

The first step began with compiling a blueprint. Rowe (2001) stated that blueprints could be a practical guide for composing items. Thus, it can also be referred to as a test matrix guideline. This guideline will state the definition of mathematical reflective thinking ability, selecting relevant materials or courses, and adjusting sub-course achievements with mathematical reflective thinking indicators.

The next step was to write the items by deriving the indicator of reflective thinking ability into several items. Table 1 explains the definitions and indicators used in this study and examples of items designed.

**Table 1.** Definitions, Indicators, and Examples of Items.

Definition	Indicators	Examples of Items.
Think thoughtfully by applying mathematical knowledge and experience obtained so that students can analyze, evaluate and get deep meaning in solving mathematical problems.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Analyzing the truth of the question/solution/analogy or generalization of mathematics,</li> <li>Identifying mathematical concepts or formulas used in complex math problems,</li> <li>Distinguishing between relevant and irrelevant data,</li> <li>Evaluating the validity of arguments based on the concepts or properties used,</li> <li>Finding various strategies in solving math problems</li> </ol>	<p>This sample item represents the fifth indicator</p> <p>Example:  <math>H = \{[0], [3][6], [9]\}</math>.  and <math>(\mathbb{Z}_{12}, +_{12})</math> is a group.</p> <p><b>Question:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Find how many strategies are there to prove that H is a subgroup of <math>(\mathbb{Z}_{12}, +_{12})</math></li> <li>Explain the concepts, principles, characters, or rules used by these strategies</li> <li>Choose a strategy and prove that H is a subgroup of <math>(\mathbb{Z}_{12}, +_{12})</math></li> </ol>

After preparing a test instrument consisting of items representing each indicator, the third step was to review the items. This step was done by asking for a judgment by five experts to validate the material's content. The five experts consisted of two lecturers who teach the same subject as the material on the test and come from different universities, two professors who are experts in the evaluation of mathematical ability, and one lecturer who is an expert in the field of mathematical ability. After revisions were made on input from the experts, the test instrument was also asked for a limited review by five prospective mathematics teachers to check their readability. Revisions were made following input and suggestions from experts and students in a limited trial.

After revision, the next step was instrument testing conducted on 26 students. The test results were analyzed using the Rasch model assisted by Winstep Rasch 4.4.3 software, and the results were used as the basis for revision. The item samples that have been revised were then compiled into a mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers.

## Results

The study results contain the instrument testing steps analyzed in-depth using the Rasch model. Winstep Rasch 4.4.3 software was used to see the reliability and validity of this mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers. Validity and reliability are essential aspects that must be considered in developing a new instrument in research (Alavi et al., 2020). Validity is the accuracy and precision of a measuring instrument in carrying out its function. While reliability is originated from the words rely on and ability. Although reliability has various other names, such as trustworthiness, constancy, stability, consistency, and so on, the main idea contained in the concept of reliability is the extent to which the results of a measurement can be trusted.

Reliability is intended to analyze whether this instrument can be used to measure the mathematical reflective thinking ability of prospective mathematics teachers whenever and wherever it is used. This reliability analysis is based on Table 3 (Summary statistics) in the Winsteps program, as shown in Figure 1.

SUMMARY OF 26 MEASURED Person								
	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT MNSQ	ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	ZSTD
MEAN	27.2	13.0	-.67	.30	1.02	-.04	1.15	.21
SEM	1.5	.0	.13	.00	.16	.24	.21	.20
P.SD	7.6	.2	.65	.01	.78	1.21	1.04	1.02
S.SD	7.8	.2	.66	.01	.79	1.23	1.06	1.04
MAX.	53.0	13.0	1.40	.33	3.54	3.34	4.87	3.55
MIN.	16.0	12.0	-1.69	.29	.23	-1.86	.34	-1.05
REAL RMSE	.34	TRUE SD	.55	SEPARATION	1.64	Person RELIABILITY	.73	
MODEL RMSE	.30	TRUE SD	.57	SEPARATION	1.91	Person RELIABILITY	.71	
S.E. OF Person MEAN	= .13							
Person RAW SCORE-TO-MEASURE CORRELATION = 1.00								
CRONBACH ALPHA (KR-20) Person RAW SCORE "TEST" RELIABILITY = .71 SEM = 4.11								
SUMMARY OF 13 MEASURED Item								
	TOTAL SCORE	COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT MNSQ	ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	ZSTD
MEAN	54.5	25.9	.00	.25	1.01	.04	1.15	.07
SEM	9.5	.1	.23	.02	.09	.37	.18	.37
P.SD	32.9	.3	.80	.07	.33	1.27	.64	1.28
S.SD	34.3	.3	.83	.07	.34	1.33	.66	1.33
MAX.	143.0	26.0	1.14	.34	1.84	2.73	3.08	2.47
MIN.	9.0	25.0	-1.52	.11	.47	-2.78	.47	-2.74
REAL RMSE	.27	TRUE SD	.75	SEPARATION	2.77	Item RELIABILITY	.88	
MODEL RMSE	.26	TRUE SD	.76	SEPARATION	2.93	Item RELIABILITY	.88	
S.E. OF Item MEAN	= .23							

Figure 1. Output Summary Statistics Winstep 4.4.3

Figure 1 shows the Cronbach's alpha of 0.71, indicating the "Good" criteria, as presented in Table 2 (Sumintono, Bambang & Widhiarso, 2015).

Table 2. The Interpretation of Reliability based on Cronbach's Alpha Value

Score	Interpretation
$a > 0.8$	Excellent
$0.7 < a \leq 0.8$	Good
$0.6 < a \leq 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.5 < a \leq 0.6$	Poor
$a < 0.5$	Unacceptable

Furthermore, for the Person Reliability score listed in Figure 1, the output of 0.73 means that the respondents' answers are in the "good" category. The Item Reliability of 0.88 means the quality of the instrument is in the "Excellent" criteria. Hence, the test instrument for the mathematical reflective thinking ability of the prospective mathematics teachers studied can be concluded as an instrument with a high level of reliability. The detailed description can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Reliability Test Summary

Cronbach Alpha	Interpretation	Item Reliability	Interpretation	Person Reliability	Interpretation	Conclusion
0.71	Good	0.88	Excellent	0.73	Good	Reliable

The instrument's validity is intended to analyze whether the mathematical reflective thinking ability test instrument can be used as a tool to measure mathematical reflective thinking



skills for prospective mathematics teachers. The output of the Winstep software can use Table 23 (Item unidimensionality) and Table 10 (Item Fit Order). The output will present which items are appropriate to measure and what is supposed to be measured. Analysis of the validity of the Rasch approach with Winsteps software is called the fit and misfit test (valid and invalid items). The output can be seen in Figure 2.

Table of STANDARDIZED RESIDUAL variance in Eigenvalue units = Item information units

	Eigenvalue	Observed	Expected
Total raw variance in observations =	42.5612	100.0%	100.0%
Raw variance explained by measures =	29.5612	69.5%	70.5%
Raw variance explained by persons =	6.9255	16.3%	16.5%
Raw Variance explained by items =	22.6358	53.2%	54.0%
Raw unexplained variance (total) =	13.0000	30.5%	29.5%
Unexplned variance in 1st contrast =	2.7831	6.5%	1.4%
Unexplned variance in 2nd contrast =	2.3464	5.5%	18.0%
Unexplned variance in 3rd contrast =	2.1617	5.1%	16.6%
Unexplned variance in 4th contrast =	1.2525	2.9%	9.6%
Unexplned variance in 5th contrast =	1.0658	2.5%	8.2%

**Figure 2.** Output table 23 item unidimensionality Winstep 4.4.3

The item unidimensionality criterion in the Rasch model is seen from the raw variance explained by measures score in Figure 2 (69.5%). If the raw variance explained by measures score > 20% is acceptable; the score > 40% means good, and the score > 60% indicates the excellent criteria. So, this instrument meets the excellent criteria.

Furthermore, the eigenvalue and observed scores in unexplained variance 1<sup>st</sup> contrast can be rechecked to see if question items are still problematic or inappropriate. The item is not problematic if the eigenvalue is less than 3, and the observed score must be less than 15% for an appropriate item. A results summary of the analysis of the validity test with Winstep software version 4.4.3 is listed in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Validity Test Summary

Raw variance explained by measures	Interpretation	unexplained variance	1 <sup>st</sup>	Interpretation
		contrast	contrast	
		Eigenvalue	Observed	
69.5%	Excellent	2.7831	6.5%	There are no problematic items

Table 4 shows that the score of raw variances explained by measures is 69.5%, meaning that all the mathematical reflective thinking test items meet the "Excellent" criteria. More profoundly, the score observed in the unexplained variance 1<sup>st</sup> contrast is 6.5%, indicating that all items are appropriate and can be used. The eigenvalue score is 2.7831, showing that all items are good and not problematic. However, further analysis needs to be done, namely item fit order, because the eigenvalues are close to 3.

In the item fit order analysis stage, it is essential to look at **Outfit Mean Square (MNSQ)**, **Outfit Z-Standard (ZSTD)**, and the **Point Measure Correlation (Pt Mean Corr)** scores. The complete scores can be seen in Figure 3. The first line shows that for item number 1, the MNSQ outfit score is 3.08, the ZSTD is 1.44 and the PTMEASURE Corr is -0.50. The following line shows for item number 13, the scores are 1.73 and 2.47 and 0.68 and so on until the last line.

Item STATISTICS: MISFIT ORDER

ENTRY NUMBER	TOTAL SCORE	TOTAL COUNT	MEASURE	MODEL S.E.	INFIT MNSQ	ZSTD	OUTFIT MNSQ	ZSTD	PTMEASUR-CORR.	AL-EXP.	EXACT OBS%	MATCH EXP%	Item	G
1	9	26	.64	.29	.95	.21	3.08	1.44	A .50	.61	84.6	86.5	E1	A
13	40	26	.76	.22	1.84	2.73	1.73	2.47	B .68	.49	26.9	41.7	E13	E
9	43	26	-.27	.31	1.25	.82	1.32	.94	C .30	.41	57.7	57.6	E9	C
10	31	26	.80	.29	1.25	1.02	1.24	.98	D .56	.39	30.8	50.8	E10	C
2	143	26	-1.06	.11	1.08	.39	.90	-.06	E .66	.68	19.2	19.7	E2	B
4	94	26	-1.52	.18	1.08	.37	1.04	.23	F .57	.50	23.1	32.8	E4	D
7	64	26	-.45	.23	1.08	.34	1.07	.31	G .14	.57	50.0	47.6	E7	E
11	42	26	.70	.34	.88	.25	.98	.16	f .64	.66	65.4	72.0	E11	F
5	76	26	-1.00	.16	.91	-.30	.89	-.33	e .56	.56	38.5	31.1	E5	D
3	39	26	.10	.30	.90	-.27	.89	-.28	d .63	.39	73.1	55.4	E3	C
12	52	25	-.20	.31	.84	-.41	.82	-.45	c .54	.31	68.0	63.2	E12	G
6	48	26	.36	.22	.57	-1.84	.56	-1.78	b .47	.51	57.7	43.0	E6	E
8	27	26	1.14	.29	.47	-2.78	.47	-2.74	a .26	.39	84.6	50.4	E8	C
MEAN	54.5	25.9	.00	.25	1.01	.0	1.15	.1			52.3	50.1		
P.SD	32.9	.3	.80	.07	.33	1.3	.64	1.3			21.9	17.0		

Figure 3. Output Item Fit Order Winstep 4.4.3

The last analysis is the Item fit test to understand whether the items function normally to measure. The scores to consider are **outfit means-square**, **outfit z-standard**, and **point measure correlation** (Boone et al., 2014). The criteria for assessing item fit are shown in Table 5 (Sumintono, Bambang & Widhiarso, 2015).

Table 5. Item Fit Criteria

Criteria	Score
Outfit mean square (MNSQ)	$0.5 < \text{MNSQ} < 1.5$
Outfit Z-standard (ZSTD)	$-2.0 < \text{ZSTD} < +2.0$
Point Measure Correlation	$0.4 < \text{PT Measure Corr} < 0.85$

If the three criteria in Table 5 are met, the items are "appropriate", and the quality of the items is good and can be used. However, if only two criteria or one criterion are met, the items can be maintained and not be changed to be called "appropriate" items and can be used. Meanwhile, if it does not meet the criteria set in Table 5, the items are "inappropriate" and must be replaced or redesigned. The interpretation of the Item Fit test results is listed in Table 6.



**Table 6.** Item Fit Order Test Interpretation

Number	Item Code	Outfit		PT Measure Corr.	Status	Interpretation
		MNSQ	ZFTD			
1	P1	3.08	1.44	0.50	1 criterion	appropriate
2	P2	0.90	-0.06	0.66	-	appropriate
3	P3	0.89	-0.28	0.63	-	appropriate
4	P4	1.04	0.23	0.57	-	appropriate
5	P5	0.89	-0.33	0.56	-	appropriate
6	P6	0.56	-1.78	0.47	-	appropriate
7	P7	1.07	0.31	0.14	1 criterion	appropriate
8	P8	0.47	-2.74	0.26	3 criteria	inappropriate
9	P9	1.32	0.94	0.30	1 criterion	appropriate
10	P10	1.24	0.98	0.56	-	appropriate
11	P11	0.98	0.16	0.64	-	appropriate
12	P12	0.82	-0.45	0.54	-	appropriate
13	P13	1.73	2.47	0.68	2 criteria	appropriate

Table 6 shows that only one item does not meet any of the criteria (item 8), so it can be concluded that item 8 is invalid (Misfit) and must be removed. Meanwhile, the remaining items meet at least one criterion and thus are valid. Overall, the results show that the mathematical reflective thinking test instrument of prospective mathematics teachers in this study was declared reliable and valid with "very reliable" criteria, and 12 out of the 13 test items are "valid".

After analyzing the test results, the final stage is revising based on the analysis results of the trial conducted. This final stage produces a final product of a mathematical reflective thinking test instrument which is ready to be socialized and used as an instrument in research.

## Discussion

The previously described research shows that the mathematical reflective thinking test for prospective mathematics teachers has gone through all the development steps. It has been declared valid and reliable based on the Rasch model analysis. The test was expected to produce a quality mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers.

In the early stages of preparing the blueprint, the selection of material or courses relevant to the mathematical ability to be tested by this test instrument was carried out. The group theory course was chosen because it is compulsory for all prospective mathematics teachers. Furthermore, studying group theory material or algebraic structures could develop reflective

mathematical thinking skills (Yenni & Sukmawati, 2019). The preparation of the items was done by previously setting operational definitions and indicators of mathematical reflective thinking skills used in this study. Furthermore, these indicators were converted into items so that they can be used to measure the mathematical reflective thinking ability of prospective mathematics teachers.

Based on the assessment results of two lecturers who teach group theory courses at different universities, some items were confusing or inaccurate and needed improvement. After the revisions, an assessment was carried out by an expert in mathematical ability and two professors who evaluated mathematical abilities. The assessment result showed that several sentences in the questions are not sharp and need improvement as an instrument for mathematical reflective thinking skills. In addition, a limited review was also carried out by five prospective mathematics teachers for the readability test. Revisions were made following input and suggestions from experts and students in a limited trial. After the appropriate results, the test instrument was feasible to be tested.

The test results were analyzed using the Rasch model. Wibisono (2018) stated that instruments validated with the Rasch model better meet the definition of measurement and produce more holistic information. The data analysis results showed the Cronbach's alpha (KR-20) of 0.71, with person reliability of 0.73 and items up to 0.88. It showed that the instrument met the reliable criteria. However, item P8 should be eliminated because it was considered redundant (similar to item P9 that was easier to understand). This item asked for an explanation of choice between relevant and irrelevant data.

The advantages of this research are that all the planned development steps have been carried out, the tests obtained have passed the expert judgment process and were tested on mathematics education students, and were analyzed using the Rasch model approach so that a valid and reliable test of mathematical reflective thinking skills for prospective mathematics teachers has been obtained. On the other hand, the drawback of this research is that the test produced is limited by certain mathematical material, in this case the material in the group theory course, so that the use of this test is also limited to prospective mathematics teacher students who have taken the course or have studied group theory material.

This study has similarities with research conducted by, among others, by Nindiasari et al., (2016) regarding the development of teaching materials and instruments to improve mathematical reflective thinking based on a metacognitive approach in high school students (SMA), Hendriana et al., (2019) who also developed an instrument for the reflective thinking

ability of high school students, as well as Muntazhimah's research, (2019) regarding the development of a mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for 8th grade junior high school students. From the several studies that have been mentioned, it is still very difficult to find references to previous research on the development of mathematical reflective thinking tests for prospective mathematics teacher students, and the overall research on developing test instruments that has been carried out is still using classical test theory. Therefore, this study aims to develop a reflective thinking ability test instrument for prospective mathematics teacher students whose validity and reliability use the Rasch model.

The implications of the results of this study theoretically can add to the theory or literature related to how to develop a test instrument that can measure the reflective thinking ability of prospective mathematics teacher students. Practically, the test produced from this research can be used to measure the reflective thinking ability of prospective mathematics teacher students. In learning mathematics, it is not only the reflective thinking ability that needs to be measured. Critical thinking skills, creative, geometric thinking skills and other mathematical thinking skills also need to be measured. Therefore, the development of other mathematical thinking test instruments can then be carried out by referring to the current situation where there is disruption of education.

### Conclusions

The research on developing the mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers has gone through development procedures: preparing a blueprint, writing items, reviewing items, conducting trials, analyzing test results, and making revisions. The Rasch model approach was used to test the reliability and validity through the Winstep 4.4.3 software. After conducting an in-depth analysis, the results showed that the mathematical reflective thinking test instrument was declared reliable and valid with "very reliable" criteria, and 12 of the 13 test items were declared "valid". So, the mathematical reflective thinking test instrument for prospective mathematics teachers can be used in further research.

### Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the research institute of Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka who has provided funding for this research through an internal funding scheme

### Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

# Muntazhimah M.Pd - The Development and Validation of Mathematical Reflective Thinking Test Instruments for Prospective Mathematics Teachers Using the Rasch Model

## ORIGINALITY REPORT

16%

SIMILARITY INDEX

9%

INTERNET SOURCES

13%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

## PRIMARY SOURCES

1	R L Ariany, R Rosjanuardi, D Juandi. "Level of pre-service mathematics teacher's reflective thinking", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021 Publication	1%
2	<a href="http://journal.unj.ac.id">journal.unj.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%
3	<a href="http://eprints.uny.ac.id">eprints.uny.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%
4	<a href="http://repository.uhamka.ac.id">repository.uhamka.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%
5	<a href="http://journal.iaincurup.ac.id">journal.iaincurup.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1%
6	<a href="http://repository.upi.edu">repository.upi.edu</a> Internet Source	1%
7	<a href="http://thejournalofbusiness.org">thejournalofbusiness.org</a> Internet Source	1%

8	<a href="http://journal.unnes.ac.id">journal.unnes.ac.id</a> Internet Source	1 %
9	M Muntazhimah, T Turmudi, S Prabawanto. "The relation between prior knowledge and students' mathematics reflective thinking ability", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021 Publication	1 %
10	Karim, A Danaryanti. "How to develop PCK ability for prospective mathematics teachers? The case of lesson study-based field experience practice", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020 Publication	1 %
11	S H Noer, P Gunowibowo, M Triana. "Improving students' reflective thinking skills and self-efficacy through scientific learning", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020 Publication	1 %
12	<a href="http://ejournal.upi.edu">ejournal.upi.edu</a> Internet Source	1 %
13	Submitted to Academic Library Consortium Student Paper	<1 %
14	Heris Hendriana, Harry Dwi Putra, Wahyu Hidayat. "How to Design Teaching Materials to Improve the Ability of Mathematical Reflective Thinking of Senior High School	<1 %

Students in Indonesia?", EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education, 2019

Publication

15

Submitted to Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia

Student Paper

<1 %

16

[www.mdpi.com](http://www.mdpi.com)

Internet Source

<1 %

17

Mustika Wati, Saiyidah Mahtari, Sri Hartini, Heny Amelia. "A Rasch Model Analysis on Junior High School Students' Scientific Reasoning Ability", International Journal of Interactive Mobile Technologies (IJIM), 2019

Publication

<1 %

18

Ramsiah Hiranah, Happy Fitria, Achmad Wahidy. "The effect of leadership style and job motivation on the performance of teachers", JPGI (Jurnal Penelitian Guru Indonesia), 2021

Publication

<1 %

19

H Nindiasari, Y Yuhana, Novaliyosi, Sukirwan. "Effectiveness of scaffolding-based interactive teaching materials: reflective thinking ability in prospective teacher mathematics", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020

Publication

<1 %



20

Siti Rochana, Lilia Sinta Wahyuniar, Niska Shofia, Umi Mahdiyah. "Algebraic thinking profile of prospective mathematics teacher students with medium mathematics ability according to solo taxonomy", Jurnal Math Educator Nusantara: Wahana Publikasi Karya Tulis Ilmiah di Bidang Pendidikan Matematika, 2020

Publication

&lt;1 %

21

V R Riani, L H Sa'diyah, M G Purwanto, T R Ramalis, A Samsudin. "Assessing graph interpretation of high school students: an examination by students' gender", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

22

Almubarak, R Iriani. "Students' understanding of chemical bonding material through the rasch modelling data symptoms analysis", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

23

N Hermita, S Sakinah, T T Wijaya, R Vebrianto, J A Alim, Z H Putra, N Fauza, D A Dipuja, J Pereira, C Jihe. "Item Analysis of Heat Transfer Concept Using Rasch Model in Elementary School", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

24

Internet Source

&lt;1 %

25

[www.freepatentsonline.com](http://www.freepatentsonline.com)

Internet Source

&lt;1 %

26

D N Munahefi, Mulyono, M Z Zahid, E A Syaharani, R Fariz. "Analysis of mathematical creative thinking test instruments on open-ended problems with ethnomatematic nuances", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

27

E Susilaningsih, M Nuswowati, N Aprilia, A Luthfiah. "Dissemination of test instruments as product of the development research to measure the problem-solving ability of class X students by online in the pandemic period", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

28

Heru Heru, Refi Elfira Yuliani, Rieno Septra Nery, Nila Kesumawati. "PENGEMBANGAN INSTRUMEN KESIAPAN GURU MATEMATIKA PADA PEMBELAJARAN DARING DALAM PERSPEKTIF TPACK", AKSIOMA: Jurnal Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika, 2021

Publication

&lt;1 %

29

Nur Azizah, Muchlas Suseno, Bahrul Hayat. "Item Analysis of the Rasch Model Items in

&lt;1 %

the Final Semester Exam Indonesian Language Lesson", World Journal of English Language, 2021

Publication

30

[files.eric.ed.gov](https://files.eric.ed.gov)

Internet Source

<1 %

31

Dwi Isnaini, Jaslin Ikhsan. "Improving Higher Order Thinking Skills via Semi Second Life", European Journal of Educational Research, 2021

Publication

<1 %

32

M Ekawati, ECM Asih. "Mathematical reflective thinking process based on cognitive style", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019

Publication

<1 %

33

Mona Isa, Mazlan Abu Bakar, Mohamad Sufian Hasim, Mohd Khairul Anuar, Ibrahim Sipan, Mohd Zali Mohd Nor. "Data quality control for survey instrument of office investors in rationalising green office building investment in Kuala Lumpur by the application of Rasch analysis", Facilities, 2017

Publication

<1 %

34

Ellianawati, S Mufiatunnikmah, N E Setyaningsih, B Subali. "Profile of creative thinking abilities of students measured by multi representation-based creative thinking

<1 %

# assessment", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2020

Publication

35

Pacific Rim Objective Measurement Symposium (PROMS) 2014 Conference Proceedings, 2015.

Publication

<1 %

36

doczz.net

Internet Source

<1 %

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography Off