



ISBN : 978 - 602 - 397 - 058 - 2
Number 1 / 2017, June, 27th 2017

PROCEEDING ICMETA

International Conference on Mathematics:
Education, Theory, and Application
December, 6-7th 2016

Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Universitas Sebelas Maret

PROCEEDING

ICMETA

International Conference
on Mathematics : Education, Theory, and Application

Mathematics in the Science and Art

Number : 1|27th June 2017
ISBN : 978-602-397-058-2

Reviewers :

Prof. Dr. Budiyo, M.Sc.
Prof. Drs. Tri Atmojo Kusmayadi, M.Sc., Ph.D.
Dr. Sutanto, DEA
Drs. Isnandar Slamet, M.Sc., Ph.D.
Dr. Diari Indriati, M.Si.
Dr. Hasih Pratiwi, M.Si.
Dr. Dewi Retno Sari Saputro, M.Kom
Wakhid, MT.

Editors :

Dra. Purnami Widyaningsih, M.App.Sc.
Ririn Setyowati, M.Sc.
Riris Listya Dahita Putri, S.Si.
Kornelius Ronald Demu
Rifqi Choiril Affan

Layout :

Nughthoh Arfawi Kurdhi, M.Sc.
Vika Yugi Kurniawan, M.Sc.
Putranto Hadi, M.Si.

December, 6th-7th 2016
Department of Mathematics
Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Universitas Sebelas Maret

PREFACE

This proceeding contains papers collected from event of The International Conference on Mathematics: Education, Theory, and Application (ICMETA). Some papers presented in ICMETA were published in Journal of Physics: Proceeding Series and others were published in this proceeding.

The ICMETA is conference that was first accomplished by Department of Mathematics, Universitas Sebelas Maret and is planned to be held biennially. This conference is an organization of scientific meetings among mathematicians, students, teachers, researchers, and practitioners from various colleges and related institutions. The goals of the conference are

- (a) to increase the role of mathematics, statistics, mathematics education, and computer science in an effort to overcome various problems;
- (b) to disseminate, discuss, and communicate the results of research in the fields of mathematics, statistics, mathematics education and computer sciences;
- (c) to facilitate communication and discussion related to the problems and current issues of education, sciences, and technology.

As a scientific meeting event we invited experts from 6 different countries including Indonesia, Australia, the Netherlands, Malaysia, Japan, and France as keynote speakers. They were

1. Prof. Dr. Edy Tri Baskoro, M.Sc. (Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Bandung Institute of Technology, Indonesia),
2. Dr. Darfiana Nur, M.Sc. (Statistical Science in the School of Computer Science, Engineering and Mathematics, Flinders University, Australia),
3. Dr. G.R. (Ruud) Pellikaan (Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Netherlands),
4. Prof. Dr. Mohd Bin Omar (Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Faculty of Science, University of Malaya, Malaysia),
5. Prof. Dr. Kenjiro T. Miura (Realistic Modeling Laboratory, Department of Mechanical Engineering, Shizuoka University, Japan),
6. Dr. Sutanto, DEA (Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, March Eleven University, Indonesia),
7. Dr. Hanna Arini Parhusip (Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Mathematics, SWCU, Salatiga Indonesia), and
8. Dr. Benoît Liquet (Laboratory of Mathematics and Their Applications, Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adou, France).

Call for Papers for this conference has been notified to several academic and professional associations (IndoMS) since April until October 2016 to be able to muster 53 colleges and polytechnics as well as related agencies including the National Institute of Aeronautics and Space (LAPAN). Attending

participants and keynote speakers were from Australia, Europe and Asia. Additionally, Indonesian participants were from various provinces such as: DKI Jakarta, West Java, Yogyakarta, Central Java, East Java, Bali, Southeast Sulawesi, West Sumatra, Riau Islands, and South Sulawesi. During the two days conference, the researchers presented the most lectured discoveries in Mathematics and Statistics as well as established network for possible joint researches and collaborations among the participants. The conference is consisting parallel sessions and plenary sessions from invited speakers with various interesting topics which held in two days.

We are grateful to all the members of the program committee who contributed for the success in framing the program. We also thank all the delegates who contributed to the success of this conference by accepting our invitation and submitting articles for presentation in the scientific program. We wish for all of us a grand success in our scientific life and we do hope that the coming conferences will pick up similar success, and even better.

Finally, we wish that proceeding will be useful for readers and researchers who want to look for materials in order to support their study.

Chair of ICMETA 2016

Dr. Dewi Retno Sari Saputro, M.Kom

E-mail : dewiretnoss@staff.uns.ac.id

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences
Universitas Sebelas Maret

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title	i
Preface	ii
Table of Contents	iv
The Development of Social Arithmetical Teaching Equipment with Problem Based Learning Model (Tri Andari and Restu Lusiana)	1
Development of Teaching Materials Based Digital Storytelling on Strategy Learning Mathematics Course (Dwijayanti and Rasiman)	13
The Use of Core Model in Enhancing The Mathematical Reasoning Ability of Junior High School (Dahlia Fisher and Poppy Yaniawati).....	22
Fuzzy Logic for Grasping Type Classification of Human Hand Based on Myoelectric Signal Parameter (Hartono, Priadythama, and Rochman)	33
Gas Measurement System (Haryono and Dian Yudha R).....	42
Technical Implementation of Gas Measurement System (Haryono)	51
The Context of Students Following The Introduction Probability Theory Course in The Reflective Pedagogy Perspective (Hongki Julie)	60
Student Misconceptions in Solving Real Analysis Problem Based on Reasoning Framework (Rita Pramujiyanti Khotimah).....	70

Preliminary Study: Mathematics' Teacher Conception in Supporting the Integration of Mathematics' Literacy and Mathematics Teaching and Learning (N D S Lestari, D Juniati, and St Suwarsono)	76
The Development of Introduction for Basic Mathematics Based Structured Tasks Textbook to Improve the Ability of Logical Thinking (Restu Lusiana and Tri Andari)	84
On Gamma Labeling of Double Cones Graph (Titin Sri Martini and Mania Roswitha)	95
Upgrading Statistical Reasoning Ability Junior High School Students Through Contextual Teaching and Learning (Iyam Maryati)	101
Beliefs in Problem Solving: Case Study in Circles Tangents Line Materials (Muhtarom, Dwi Juniati, and Tatag Yuli Eko Siswono)	108
Test of Difference Between Paired Sample by Using Mcnemar Test (Tantri Nawangsari)	117
Diagnosis of The Diabetes Mellitus Disease with Fuzzy Inference System Mamdani (Za'imaitun Niswati, Aulia Paramita, and Fanisya Alva Mustika)	126
Learning Mathematics with Traditional Game "Jirak": Impact on Mathematics Disposition and Students' Achievement (Nizaruddin, Muhtarom, and Sugiyanti)	134
Mathematics learning activities of the acceleration class program of SMA Negeri 2 Purwokerto (Paskalia Pradanti and St Suwarsono)	141
On The Strong Metric Dimension of Lollipop Graph and Generalized Web Graph (Tiffani Arzaqi Putri and Tri Atmojo Kusmayadi)	146
The Use of Modules and Game "Code" On The Padlock as a Media to Improve Motivation of XI Accounting Class in the Material of Combinatorial Analysis in SMK Putra Tama Bantul (Anindiati Praminto Putri)	151
Effect of Students Creativity in Wolfram Mathematica Assisted on Learning Achievement in Linear Algebra Course (Noviana D R, Aryo A N, Lukman H, Tri Atmojo K, and Budi U)	157
Seventh Grade Students' Performance in Dealing with Multiplication of Fractions	

(Veronika Fitri Rianasari and Hongki Julie)	165
Multivariate Adaptive Regression Spline (MARS) Model on Dengue Hemorrhagic Fever (DHF) Sufferers in Semarang (Dewi Retno Sari S, D H Puspitaningrum, N A Kurdhi, and Respatiwan)	170
Students Learning Activities in Mathematics Learning Using Scientific Approach SMA Negeri 10 in Class XI MIA 4 Of Yogyakarta (Maria Rettian A S and St Suwarsono)	179
Breast Cancer Detection Using Data Mining Classification Methods (Ni Wayan P S, Rayung Wulan, and Mei Lestari)	185
An Empirical Analysis of Portfolio Performance Using Maximin and Fuzzy Linear Programming (Retno Subekti and Rosita Kusumawati)	192
Geometry High School Students Thinking Ability Based on Level Van Hiele (Abi Suwito, Ipung Yuwono, I Nengah Patra, and Santi Irawan)	200
The Evaluation of E-Learning Maturity at Senior High Schools in Yogyakarta (Nur Hadi Waryanto, Nur Insani, and Retno Subekti)	208
Learning Analysis Based on Humanism Theory and Mathematics Creative Thinking Ability of Student (Hevy Risqi Maharani and Sukestiyarno).....	218

The context of students following the introduction probability theory course in the reflective pedagogy perspective

Hongki Julie

Mathematics Education Department, Sanata Dharma University

hongkijulie@yahoo.co.id

Abstract: the introduction of the probability theory course aimed to equip the mathematics education students about the probability theory basic knowledge. This subject was important, as it contained a pre requisite knowledge for the elementary statistics course, the statistical methods course, and the practicum of statistical methods course, and a provision for students in mathematics education department to teach the probability theory in high school and / or vocational school. The nature of this course was mandatory to pass, meaning that if a student wants to graduate from this course, then he or she should get the value of C for this course. From the experience of previous years, there were still many students who had difficulty to understand the material from this course. From the experience of previous years, the difficulty experienced by students was to translate the problems into mathematical symbols corresponding existing in the probability theory. In general, if a student had been able to translate problems into mathematical symbols, then the student would be able to resolve the problem. In the implementation of teaching learning process by using pedagogy reflective, there were five steps that need to be implemented, that were to know the context of the learner, provide experience to students, ask students to reflect, ask students to do actions, and evaluate of the learner achievements. In this paper, the author would only present about how the researcher could recognize the context of students who followed the introduction probability theory and what were the students' context profiles. The results obtained by the researcher in this study were as follows: (1) the results of the reseacher tracking through academic information system (SIA) about the context of the area of origin of students that obtained by the reseacher were as follows: (a) there were five students from Sumatra, (b) 18 students from Java, (c) five students from East Nusa Tenggara, (d) four students from Kalimantan, (5) one student from Sulawesi, and (e) four students from Papua, (2) the results of the researcher tracking through SIA about the students' GPA were (a) two students had GPA between 3.50 to 4.00, (b) 11 students had GPA between 3.00 to 3.49, (c) seven students had GPA between 2.50 to 2.99, (d) 13 students had GPA between 2.00 to 2.49, and (e) four students had GPA below 2.00. In addition to the data from the SIA, the researcher also conducted a test to determine the pre-ability of the students on the multiplication principle, permutations, and combinations. Results obtained were as follows: (1) 14 students could use the multiplication principle to solve a problem; (2) no student could use the multiplication principle and permutations to solve a problem; (3) five students could use cyclical permutations to solve a problem; (4) six students could use permutations if contains the same elements to solve the problem; and (5) no student could use the multiplication principle and combinations to solve a problem.

Keywords: reflective pedagogy, context, experience, reflection, action and evaluation.

1. Introduction

The introduction probability theory course aimed to equip the mathematics education students about the probability theory basic knowledge. This subject was important for them, as it contained a pre requisite knowledge for the elementary statistics course, the statistical methods course, and the practicum of statistical methods course, and a provision for students in mathematics education department to teach the probability theory in high school and / or vocational school. The nature of this course was mandatory to pass, meaning that if a student wants to graduate from this course, then he or she should get the value of C for this course.

From the experience of previous years, there were still many students who had difficulty to understand the material from this course. From the experience of previous years, the difficulty experienced by students was to translate the problems into mathematical symbols corresponding existing in the probability theory. In general, if a student had been able to translate problems into mathematical symbols, then the student would be able to resolve the problem.

2. Research Question

What was the context of students taking the introduction probability theory course?

3. Theory Framework

Pedagogy was the efforts made by teachers in assisting students in their growth and development and closely related to the beliefs and vision of teachers about a personal ideal figure to be formed through a teaching and learning process (Komunitas Studi dan Pengembang PPR Yogyakarta, 2012).

According to Father Arrupe (in Komunitas Studi dan Pengembang PPR Yogyakarta, 2012), the aim of Jesuit education was to form men and women for others. Father Kolvenbach (in Komunitas Studi dan Pengembang PPR Yogyakarta, 2012), formulated in more detail that the purpose of education of the Jesuits was to form leaders of ministry that modeled in Jesus Christ, men and women who were competent in their fields, have a conscience that was true, and has a concern growing and love of neighbor.

There were three main elements in the implementation of teaching learning process by using Reflective Pedagogical Paradigm (PPR), which is experience, reflection, and action. In carrying out the three main elements, the lecture assisted by elements of the student context understanding before the teaching learning process was began, and the evaluation of the student achievement undertaken by the lecture after the teaching learning process was finished (Suparno, 2015).

In preparing the learning process by PPR, a teacher needed to recognize the context of students. The following points should be considered a teacher or lecturer in knowing the context of students: (1) the student context, (2) the concept and initial understanding of students, (3) the economic, social, political, cultural, and media context, (4) university environment, and (5) the educational context in Indonesia (in Komunitas Studi dan Pengembang PPR Yogyakarta, 2012, and Suparno, 2015). The lecture's efforts knowing the context of students who followed the course would help the lecture to design the teaching learning activities that could provide an experience that was consistent with the students' context.

There were some expert opinion on why the lecture important to know the students' context as follows:

- a. Skemp (2009) states that
 - 1) Mathematics was a way of using the human mind which greatly increases the strength of the human way of thinking.
 - 2) Mathematics should be taught in ways that allow students to use their intelligence and not just rote learning.

- 3) There were two principles in the mathematics teaching learning process, namely:
 - a) The mathematics concept level which was higher than the students' mathematics concept level could not be communicated to them by giving a definition, but to provide a sample set accordingly.
 - b) Because one mathematics material could become conditional for other materials, the lecture should ensure that other concepts that have been formed in the minds of learners first.
- b. Bruner (in Dahar, 2011: 75) said the knowledge construction process was done by connecting the new information with the information that already exists within him or her.
- c. Ausubel (in Dahar, 2011: 95) said a person would be learned significantly if he or she could establish a connection between the new information it receives with the relevant concepts that already exist in the cognitive structure of the person.
- d. According to Suparno (1997, 2001), schema or schemata (plural) was a mental or cognitive structures in which someone intellectually adapt and coordinate the surrounding environment. Scheme would adapt and change over a person's cognitive development. According to Suparno (2001), more and more experienced in life and to make contact with the environment, the scheme someone will multiply.
- e. According to Skemp (2009), a scheme had three functions: (1) integrating existing knowledge; (2) a tool for learning; and (3) making a person could understand something.

4. Research Methodology

To answer the research question, the researcher would perform the following steps:

- a. The lecturer find data of students who followed the introduction probability theory course through the Academic Information System (SIA). The students data was about the students' hometown and the students' GPA.
- b. Ask students to answer five questions relating to the material Probability Theory at the high school level.

5. Research Results

- a. The students' hometown and GPA contexts

The results obtained by the researcher in this study were as follows:

- 1) The results of the researcher tracking through academic information system (SIA) about the context of the area of origin of students that obtained by the reseacher were as follows:
 - a) Five students from Sumatra.
 - b) 18 students from Java.
 - c) Five students from Nusa Tenggara.
 - d) Four students from Kalimantan.
 - e) One student from Sulawesi.
 - f) Four students from Papua.
- 2) the results of the researcher tracking through SIA about the students' GPA were as follows:
 - a) Two students had GPA between 3.50 to 4.00.
 - b) 11 students had GPA between 3.00 to 3.49.
 - c) Seven students had GPA between 2.50 to 2.99.
 - d) 13 students had GPA between 2.00 to 2.49.
 - e) Four students had GPA below 2.00.

- b. The students' ability about the probability theory on senior high school level
Before starting the lecture, the lecturer gave five questions about the probability theory on high school level. The purpose of the provision of these problems was to give an overview to the beginning student ability on the probability theory on senior high school level. The problems were as follows:
- 1) How many the letter arrangement that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter is a vowel?
The indicator which would be measured for this problem was students could use the multiplication principle to solve the problem.
 - 2) There are 5 Mathematical books, 4 Physical books and 3 Chemistry books that would be compiled into a rack that could hold all the books. How many possible arrangements if similar books must be arranged side by side?
The indicator which would be measured for this problem was students could use the multiplication principle and permutations to solve problems.
 - 3) Six people would sit down with a circular position. If there were two friends who always sat side by side, how many sitting arrangement that could be made?
The indicator which would be measured for this problem was students could use to solve the cyclical permutations problem.
 - 4) How many of the letter arrangement that can be compiled from word Mississippi.
The indicator which would be measured for this problem was students could use permutations if contains the same elements to solve the problem.
 - 5) There were 20 dancers in a studio. At the same time they danced in the hotel A and B. In the hotel A, they need five dancers, and in the hotel B, they need nine dancers. How many dancers arrangement could be set up for dancing in the hotel A and B?
The indicator which would be measured for this problem was students could use the multiplication principle and combinations to solve problems.

The student answer description for those problems were as follows:

- 1) How many the letter arrangement that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter is a vowel?
 - a) First answer:
The arrangement of letters that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel was $3 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 360$ arrangements.
There were 12 students who answered that way.
 - b) Second answer:

$$E \rightarrow 5! = 120;$$

$$I \rightarrow 5! = 120$$

$$O \rightarrow 5! = \underline{120}_+$$
 360 arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
 - c) Third answer:
The arrangement of letters that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel was $3 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 180$ arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
 - d) Fourth answer:
The arrangement of letters that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel was $6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 720$ arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
 - e) Fifth answer:

$$P_{(6,3)} = \frac{6!}{3!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!} = 120 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There were six students who answered that way.

f) Sixth answer:

There were three vowels.

$$C_{(6,3)} = \frac{6!}{3!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!} = 120 \text{ arrangements.}$$

Having regard to the above requirements, then the arrangement of letters that could be established was $\frac{120}{3} = 40$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

g) Seventh answer:

There were three vowels.

$$C_{(6,3)} = \frac{6!}{3!(6-3)!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!3!} = 20 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There was a student who answered that way.

h) Eighth answer:

There were three vowels.

$$P_{(6,3)} = \frac{6!}{3!(6-3)!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!3!} = 20 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There was a student who answered that way.

i) Ninth answer:

There were six letters in the word RESIKO consisting of three vowels and three consonants.

$$\frac{6!}{3!3!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!3!} = 20 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There were three vowels, so the arrangement of letters that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel was $20 \times 3 = 60$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

j) Tenth answer:

$$C_{(3,1)} + C_{(3,1)} = \frac{3!}{1!2!} + \frac{3!}{1!2!} = 3 + 3 = 6 \text{ arrangements.}$$

So, there were six arrangement of letter that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel.

There was a student who answered that way.

k) Eleventh answer:

$$\text{RESIKO} = 3 \times 3 = 9 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There was a student who answered that way.

l) Twelveth answer:

720 arrangements of letter that could be formed by the letters in the word RESIKO without any repetition, if the first letter was a vowel.

There was a student who answered that way.

m) Thirteenth answer:

IR, IS, IK, IRS, IRK, ISK, ER, ES, EK, ERS, ESK, ERK, OR, OS, OK, ORS, ORK, OSK, IRSK, ERSK, ORSK.

There were two students who answered that way.

n) There were six students who did not answer it.

2) There were 5 Mathematical books, 4 Physical books and 3 Chemistry books that would be compiled into a rack that could hold all the books. How many possible arrangements if similar books must be arranged side by side?

a) First answer:

$$\text{The number of book arrangement was } 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 6 \text{ arrangements.}$$

There were eleven students who answered that way.

b) Second answer:

The number of mathematical book arrangement was $C_{(5,2)} = \frac{5!}{(5-2)!2!} = \frac{5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!2!} = 10$ arrangements.

The number of physical book arrangement was $C_{(4,2)} = \frac{4!}{(4-2)!2!} = \frac{4 \times 3 \times 2!}{2!2!} = 6$ arrangements.

The number of chemistry book arrangement was $C_{(3,2)} = \frac{3!}{(3-2)!2!} = \frac{3 \times 2!}{1!2!} = 3$ arrangements.

So, the number of book arrangement was $10 + 6 + 3 = 19$ arrangements.

There were three students who answered that way.

c) Third answer:

The number of mathematical book arrangement was $\frac{5!}{(5-2)!2!} = \frac{5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!2!} = 10$ arrangements.

The number of physical book arrangement was $\frac{4!}{(4-2)!2!} = \frac{4 \times 3 \times 2!}{2!2!} = 6$ arrangements.

The number of chemistry book arrangement was $\frac{3!}{(3-2)!2!} = \frac{3 \times 2!}{1!2!} = 3$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

d) Fourth answer:

The number of mathematical book arrangement was $5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 120$ arrangements.

The number of physical book arrangement was $4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 24$ arrangements.

The number of chemistry book arrangement was $3 \times 2 \times 1 = 6$ arrangements.

So, the number of book arrangement was $120 + 24 + 6 = 150$ arrangement in one possibility.

So, all of the book arrangement was $150 \times 6 = 900$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

e) Fifth answer:

The number of book arrangement was $5! + 4! + 3! = 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 + 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 + 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 120 + 24 + 6 = 150$ arrangements.

There was three students who answered that way.

f) Sixth answer:

The number of book arrangement was $5! + 4! + 3! + 3! = 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 + 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 + 3 \times 2 \times 1 + 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 60 + 24 + 6 + 6 = 96$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

g) Seventh answer:

The number of book arrangement was $5 \times 4 \times 3 = 60$ arrangements.

There was two students who answered that way.

h) Eighth answer:

The number of book arrangement was $\frac{5 \times 4 \times 3}{2} = \frac{60}{2} = 30$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

i) Ninth answer:

The number of book arrangement was two arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

j) Tenth answer:

The number of book arrangement was $C_{(12,2)} - C_{(5,2)} - C_{(4,2)} - C_{(3,2)} = \frac{12!}{2!10!} - \frac{5!}{2!3!} - \frac{4!}{2!2!} - \frac{3!}{2!1!} = 66 - 10 - 6 - 3 = 50 - 3 = 47$ arrangements.

So, the number of book arrangement was 47.

There was a student who answered that way.

k) Eleventh answer:

The number of book arrangement was $C_{(12,10)} = \frac{12!}{10!2!} = \frac{12 \times 11 \times 10!}{10!2!} = 66$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

l) Twelveth answer:

The number of book arrangement was $\frac{12!}{3!4!5!}$ arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

m) There were nine students who did not answer it.

3) Six people would sit down with a circular position. If there were two friends who always sat side by side, how many sitting arrangement that could be made?

a) First answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $2 \times (5 - 1)! = 2 \times 4! = 2 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 2 \times 24 = 48$ sitting arrangements.

There were five students who answered that way.

b) Second answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $(5 - 1)! = 4! = 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 24$ sitting arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

c) Third answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $(6 - 1)! = 5! = 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 120$ sitting arrangements.

There were nine students who answered that way.

d) Fourth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $2 \times (6 - 1)! = 2 \times 5! = 2 \times 60 = 120$ sitting arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

e) Fifth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $6! = 6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 720$ sitting arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

f) Sixth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $\frac{6!}{2} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1}{2} = \frac{720}{2} = 360$ sitting arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

g) Seventh answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $(4 - 1)! = 3! = 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 6$ sitting arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

h) Eighth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $P_{(4,2)} = \frac{4!}{2!} = \frac{4 \times 3 \times 2!}{2!} = 12$ sitting arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

i) Ninth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $P_{(6,2)} = \frac{6!}{(6-2)!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4!}{4!} = 30$ sitting arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

j) Tenth answer:

The number of sitting arrangement was $P_{(5,2)} = \frac{5!}{(5-2)!} = \frac{5 \times 4 \times 3!}{3!} = 20$ sitting arrangements.

- There was a student who answered that way.
- k) Eleventh answer:
The number of sitting arrangement was $C_{(6,2)} = \frac{6!}{4!2!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4!}{4!2!} = 15$ sitting arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- l) Twelveth answer:
The number of sitting arrangement was $C_{(6,2)} = \frac{6!}{2!} = \frac{6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2!}{2!} = 360$ sitting arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- m) Thirteenth answer:
The number of sitting arrangement was $4 \times 3 \times 2 = 24$ sitting arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- n) Fourteenth answer:
The number of sitting arrangement was $4 \times 2 = 8$ sitting arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- o) Fifteenth answer:
The number of sitting arrangement was $5^2 = 25$ sitting arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- p) There were six students who did not answer it.
- 4) How many of the letter arrangement that can be compiled from word Mississippi.
- a) First answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $\frac{10!}{4!4!} = \frac{10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7 \times 6 \times 5 \times 4!}{4!4!} = 6300$ letter arrangements.
There were six students who answered that way.
- b) Second answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $\frac{10!}{2!4!} = \frac{10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7 \times 6 \times 5 \times 4!}{2!4!} = 75600$ letter arrangements.
There were three students who answered that way.
- c) Third answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $10! = 3628800$ letter arrangements.
There were seven students who answered that way.
- d) Fourth answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $(n - 1)! = (10 - 1)! = 9! = 110880$ letter arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- e) Fifth answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $2 \times 4 \times 10 = 80$ letter arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- f) Sixth answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $C_{(10,2)} = \frac{10!}{8!2!} = \frac{10 \times 9 \times 8!}{8!2!} = 45$ letter arrangements.
There were four students who answered that way.
- g) Seventh answer:
The number of the letter arrangement was $C_{(10,3)} = \frac{10!}{7!3!} = \frac{10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7!}{7!3!}$ letter arrangements.
There was a student who answered that way.
- h) Eighth answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was $P_{(10,4)} = \frac{10!}{(10-4)!} = \frac{10!}{4!} = 10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7 \times 6 \times 5$ letter arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

i) Ninth answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was $P_{(10,4)} = \frac{(10-4)!}{4!} = \frac{6!}{4!} = 30$ letter arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

j) Tenth answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was $\frac{10!}{(10-4)!} = \frac{10 \times 9 \times 8 \times 7 \times 6!}{6!} = 5040$ letter arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

k) Eleventh answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was 10^{10} letter arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

l) Twelfth answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was $\frac{10!}{3} = 1209600$ letter arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

m) Thirteenth answer:

The number of the letter arrangement was $4! = 24$ letter arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

n) There were six students who did not answer it.

5) There were 20 dancers in a studio. At the same time they danced in the hotel A and B. In the hotel A, they need five dancers, and in the hotel B, they need nine dancers. How many dancer arrangement could be set up for dancing in the hotel A and B?

a) First answer:

The number of dancer arrangement was $C_{(20,5)} + C_{(15,9)} = \frac{20!}{5!(20-5)!} + \frac{15!}{9!(15-9)!} = 15504 + 5005 = 20509$ dancer arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

b) Second answer:

The number of dancer arrangement was $C_{(20,5)} + C_{(20,9)} = \frac{20!}{5!(20-5)!} + \frac{20!}{9!(20-9)!}$ dancer arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

c) Third answer:

The number of dancer arrangement was $(20 - 14)! = 6! = 6 \times 5 \times 4 \times 3 \times 2 \times 1 = 720$ dancer arrangements.

There were two students who answered that way.

d) Fourth answer:

The number of dancer arrangement was $C_{(20,14)} = \frac{20!}{14!6!} = 26760$ dancer arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

e) Fifth answer:

The number of dancer arrangement was $C_{(20,13)} = \frac{20!}{13!7!}$ dancer arrangements.

There was a student who answered that way.

f) There were 29 students who did not answer it.

6. Conclusions

From the previous description, the researcher obtained the students' context profiles taking the introduction probability theory course were as follows:

1. 18 came from the Java Island.
2. 19 came from outside the Java Island.
3. 13 students had GPA between 3.00 to 4.00.
4. 20 students had GPA between 2.00 to 2.99.
5. Four students had GPA below 2.00.
6. 14 students could use the multiplication principle to solve a problem.
7. A student could use the multiplication principle and permutations to solve a problem.
8. Five students could use cyclical permutations to solve a problem.
9. Six students could use permutations if contains the same elements to solve the problem.
10. No student could use the multiplication principle and combinations to solve a problem.

References

- [1] Dahar, Retno Wilis. 2011. *Teori-teori Belajar dan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- [2] Komalasari, Kokom. 2010. *Pembelajaran Kontekstual: Konsep dan Aplikasinya*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- [3] Komunitas Studi dan Pengembang PPR Yogyakarta. 2012. *Paradigma Pedagogi Reflektif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- [4] Solso. 1991. *Cognitive Psychology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- [5] Skemp, Richard R. 2009. *Psychology of Learning Mathematics*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.
- [6] Suparno, Paul. 1997. *Filsafat Konstruktivisme dalam Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- [7] Suparno, Paul. 2001. *Teori Perkembangan Kognitif Jean Piaget*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- [8] Suparno, Paul. 2015. *Pembelajaran di Perguruan Tinggi Bergaya Paradigma Pedagogi Reflektif*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Universitas Sanata Dharma.



CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that

Hongki Julie

has presented a paper entitled

The Students' Context Following the Introduction Probability Theory Course
in the Reflective Pedagogy Perspective

International Conference on Mathematics : Education, Theory & Application
(ICMETA) 6-7 December 2016



Prof. Il. Aji Handono Ramelan, M.Sc.(Hons), Ph.D.
Dean



Surakarta, 7 December 2016
Dr. Dewi Retno Sari Saputro, S.Si., M.Kom.
Chair of ICMETA 2016



129E1001-007-12-2016