

**DESAIN DIDAKTIS SISTEM PERSAMAAN LINIER DUA VARIABEL
UNTUK SISWA SEKOLAH MENENGAH PERTAMA**

TESIS

Diajukan untuk memenuhi sebagian syarat untuk memperoleh
gelar Magister Pendidikan Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika



oleh

NILAM MANIK MALELA

NIM 2010289

**PROGRAM STUDI S2 PENDIDIKAN MATEMATIKA
FAKULTAS PENDIDIKAN MATEMATIKA DAN ILMU PENGETAHUAN ALAM
UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA**

2022

LEMBAR HAK CIPTA

DESAIN DIDAKTIS SISTEM PERSAMAAN LINIER DUA VARIABEL UNTUK SISWA SEKOLAH MENENGAH PERTAMA

Oleh:

Nilam Manik Malela

S.Pd. Universitas Negeri Malang, 2018

Sebuah tesis yang diajukan untuk memenuhi salah satu syarat memperoleh gelar Magister Pendidikan (M.Pd.) pada Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika, Fakultas Pendidikan Matematika dan Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam

© Nilam Manik Malela 2022
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
November 2022

Hak Cipta dilindungi undang-undang.

Tesis ini tidak boleh diperbanyak seluruhnya atau sebagian dengan dicetak ulang, difotokopi, atau cara lainnya tanpa ijin dari penulis.

LEMBAR PENGESAHAN

**DESAIN DIDAKTIS SISTEM PERSAMAAN LINIER DUA VARIABEL
UNTUK SISWA SEKOLAH MENENGAH PERTAMA**

Oleh:

NILAM MANIK MALELA

NIM 2010289

disetujui dan disahkan oleh:

Pembimbing I



Dr. H. Sufyani Prabawanto, M.Ed.
NIP. 196008301986031003

Pembimbing II



Imam Nugraha Albania, M.Pd., Ph.D.
NIP. 198604062010121003

Mengetahui,

Ketua Program Studi Pendidikan Matematika



Dr. H. Dadang Juandi, M.Si.
NIP. 196401171992021001

ABSTRAK

“Desain Didaktis Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel untuk Siswa Sekolah Menengah Pertama”

Nilam Manik Malela (2010289). Program Studi Magister Pendidikan Matematika. Fakultas Pendidikan Matematika dan Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel merupakan salah satu topik penting dalam mata pelajaran matematika. Meskipun demikian, terdapat hambatan belajar saat siswa mempelajari topik ini. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengatasi hambatan belajar siswa pada materi ini. Penelitian ini adalah penelitian kualitatif dengan menerapkan penelitian desain didaktis berdasarkan pada teori situasi didaktis oleh Brousseau. Hasil analisis *learning obstacles* menunjukkan bahwa jenis kendala siswa termasuk dalam *ontogenical obstacle*, *didactical obstacles*, dan *epistemological obstacle*. *Ontogenical obstacles* terjadi ketika siswa kesulitan dalam melakukan perhitungan bilangan bulat, membuat grafik linier, dan membuat model matematika dari masalah kontekstual. *Didactical obstacles* terjadi saat siswa melakukan kesalahan ketika memilih konstanta pengali untuk kedua persamaan dalam sistem. Siswa hanya mengikuti langkah-langkah pada metode eliminasi tanpa memahami tujuan melakukan metode tersebut. *Epistemological obstacle* terjadi ketika siswa tidak bisa menginterpretasikan solusi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel. Berdasarkan analisis *learning obstacles* dan *hypothetical learning trajectory*, suatu desain didaktis disusun untuk mengatasi hambatan belajar Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel. Hasil implementasi desain didaktis tersebut menunjukkan bahwa kendala siswa ketika menentukan konstanta pengali bisa diminimalkan. Siswa bisa menjelaskan dengan bahasanya sendiri alasan dia memilih konstanta pengali. Siswa bisa menunjukkan cara memilih operasi tambah atau kurang ketika ingin mengeliminasi salah satu variabel. Melalui permasalahan yang disajikan dengan gambar terlebih dahulu, siswa bisa memahami cara membuat model matematika dari masalah kontekstual.

Kata kunci: Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel, Penelitian Desain Didaktis

ABSTRACT

"Didactical Design of Linear Equation Systems in Two Variables for Junior High School Students"

Nilam Manik Malela (2010289). Master Program of Mathematics Education. Faculty of Mathematics and Sciences Education. Indonesia University of Education.

Linear Equation Systems in Two Variables is one of the important topics in mathematics. However, there are learning obstacles when students study this topic. This study aims to overcome student learning obstacles on this topic. This was a qualitative study that used didactical design research based on Brousseau's theory of didactical situation. The results of the learning obstacles analysis show that the types of student obstacles are included in ontogenical obstacle, didactical obstacles, and epistemological obstacle. Ontogenical obstacles occur when students have difficulty calculating integers, making linear graphs, and making mathematical models from contextual problems. Didactical obstacles occur when students make mistakes when choosing a constant multiplier for both equations in the system. Students just perform the steps of the elimination method without understanding its purpose. Epistemological obstacle occurs when students cannot interpret the solution of the Linear Equation Systems in Two Variables. Based on the analysis of learning obstacles and a hypothetical learning trajectory, a didactical design was developed to overcome the learning obstacles of the Linear Equation Systems in Two Variables. The results of the implementation of the didactical design show that students' obstacles when determining the multiplier constant can be minimized. Students can explain why they chose the constant multiplier in their own language. Students can show how to choose the operation of adding or subtracting when they want to eliminate one of the variables. Through the problems presented with pictures first, students can understand how to make mathematical models of contextual problems.

Keywords: *Learning Linear Equation Systems in Two Variables, Didactical Design Research*

DAFTAR ISI

	Halaman
LEMBAR HAK CIPTA	i
LEMBAR PENGESAHAN	ii
LEMBAR PERNYATAAN	iii
KATA PENGANTAR	iv
UCAPAN TERIMA KASIH	v
ABSTRAK	vii
ABSTRACT	viii
DAFTAR ISI	ix
DAFTAR TABEL	xi
DAFTAR GAMBAR	xii
DAFTAR LAMPIRAN	xiv
BAB1. PENDAHULUAN	
1.1 Latar Belakang	1
1.2 Tujuan Penelitian	11
1.3 Pertanyaan Penelitian	11
1.4 Manfaat Penelitian	11
1.5 Definisi Operasional	12
BAB 2. KAJIAN PUSTAKA	
2.1 <i>Learning Obstacles</i> (Hambatan-Hambatan Belajar).....	13
2.2 Desain Didaktis	14
2.3 Hubungan Pedagogis, Hubungan Didaktis, dan Antisipasi Didaktis Pedagogis	17
2.4 <i>Learning Trajectory</i>	19
2.5 Teori Belajar	20
2.6 Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel (SPLDV)	22
2.7 Penelitian Lain tentang Desain Didaktis Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel	25
BAB 3. METODE PENELITIAN	
3.1 Desain Penelitian	27
3.2 Lokasi dan Subjek Penelitian	28
3.3 Instrumen Penelitian	29
3.4 Pengumpulan Data	30
3.5 Analisis Data	31
3.6 Prosedur Penelitian	32

BAB 4. PAPARAN DATA DAN HASIL PENELITIAN

4.1 Hasil Penelitian

- 4.1 *Learning Obstacles* Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel33
- 4.2 *Hypothetical Learning Trajectory* (HLT) Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel50
- 4.3 Desain Didaktis Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel ...65
- 4.4 Implementasi Desain Didaktis dan Tes91

4.2 Pembahasan

- 4.2.1 *Learning Obstacles* Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel158
- 4.2.2 *Hypothetical Learning Trajectory* (HLT) Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel162
- 4.2.3 Desain Didaktis Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel .164
- 4.2.4 Implementasi Desain Didaktis167

BAB 5. SIMPULAN DAN SARAN

- 5.1 Simpulan178
- 5.2 Saran183

DAFTAR RUJUKAN184

LAMPIRAN193

DAFTAR TABEL

Tabel	Halaman
4.1 Soal Tes Pendahuluan	33
4.2 Daftar Subjek Awal yang Diwawancara	34
4.3 <i>Hypothetical Learning Trajectory</i> (HLT)	52
4.4 Bagian 1 Tugas 1	58
4.5 Bagian 1 Tugas 2A	58
4.6 Pertanyaan Tentang Metode Substitusi	59
4.7 Bagian 1 Tugas 2B	59
4.8 Pertanyaan Tentang Metode Eliminasi	60
4.9 Bagian 1 Tugas 3	61
4.10 Pertanyaan Tentang Himpunan Penyelesaian	61
4.11 Bagian 1 Tugas 4	62
4.12 Bagian 2 Tugas 1	62
4.13 Himpunan Penyelesaian pada Grafik	63
4.14 Bagian 2 Tugas 2	64
4.15 Soal pada Bagian 3	65
4.16 <i>Lesson Design</i> I	66
4.17 <i>Lesson Design</i> II	79
4.18 <i>Lesson Design</i> III	86
4.19 Waktu Pelaksanaan Penelitian	91
4.20 Subjek Wawancara	121
4.21 Desain Didaktis Terimplementasi dan Revisi tentang Istilah pada Ekspresi Aljabar	145
4.22 Desain Didaktis Terimplementasi dan Revisi pada Tugas 2A	147
4.23 Desain Didaktis Terimplementasi dan Revisi pada Tugas 3	151
4.24 Desain Didaktis Terimplementasi dan Revisi Berkaitan dengan Situasi Validasi	153
4.25 Pertanyaan untuk Memahami Grafik Linier	154
4.26 Desain Didaktis Berkaitan dengan Pemahaman Grafik Linier	154
4.27 Revisi Ilustrasi Masalah pada LKS Bagian 2	156
4.28 Desain Didaktis Terimplementasi dan Revisi Berkaitan dengan Situasi Institusionalisasi Submateri Metode Grafik	156

DAFTAR GAMBAR

Gambar	Halaman
1.1 Kesalahan Melakukan Perhitungan Operasi Aljabar	2
1.2 Kesalahan Memilih Konstanta Pengali	3
1.3 Contoh Langkah-langkah Eliminasi pada Buku Teks	4
1.4 Buku Pegangan Guru pada Materi Metode Eliminasi	4
2.1 Segitiga Didaktis oleh Kansanen (2003)	17
2.2 Segitiga Didaktis yang Dimodifikasi (Suryadi, 2013)	19
2.3 Istilah pada Ekspresi Aljabar	23
3.1 Prosedur Penelitian	32
4.1 Hasil Pekerjaan SA2 untuk Soal Nomor 1	34
4.2 Pekerjaan SA1 pada Soal Nomor 1	35
4.3 Pekerjaan SA1 pada Soal Nomor 2	36
4.4 Langkah Eliminasi oleh SA2 pada Soal Nomor 1	37
4.5 Langkah Eliminasi oleh SA2 pada Soal Nomor 2	37
4.6 Proses Eliminasi oleh SA1	38
4.7 Kesalahan Menggambar Grafik Linier	40
4.8 Model SPLDV Soal Nomor 2 oleh SA2	42
4.9 Model SPLDV Soal Nomor 2 oleh SA3	43
4.10 Model Matematika yang Dibuat SA1	44
4.11 Pekerjaan SA3 pada Soal Nomor 1	46
4.12 Contoh Langkah-langkah Eliminasi pada Buku Teks	48
4.13 Buku Pegangan Guru pada Materi Metode Eliminasi	48
4.14 Contoh Metode Eliminasi dengan Koefisien Variabel Berbeda	49
4.15 <i>Hypothetical Learning Trajectory</i> (HLT) Materi Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel	51
4.16 Tugas Pendahuluan	57
4.17 Kuis Motivasi	92
4.18 Pertanyaan pada Tugas Pendahuluan	94
4.19 Beberapa Model Matematika yang Dibuat oleh Siswa	95
4.20 Pertanyaan pada Bagian 1 Tugas 1	96
4.21 Contoh Jawaban Siswa pada Tugas 1	98
4.22 Sajian Bagian 1 Tugas 2A	100
4.23 Contoh Jawaban Siswa pada Tugas 2A	101
4.24 Contoh Jawaban Siswa pada Tugas 2B	105
4.25 Menentukan Nilai y Melalui Persamaan Pertama	107
4.26 Menentukan Nilai y Melalui Persamaan Kedua	107
4.27 Sajian Masalah Bagian 1 Tugas 3	108
4.28 Contoh Jawaban Siswa pada Tugas 3	112
4.29 Hasil Latihan Menggambar Grafik	117

4.30 Contoh Hasil Grafik yang Digambar Siswa	118
4.31 Hasil Gambar Grafik oleh Siswa di Depan Kelas	119
4.32 Pengecekan Titik Potong Grafik dan Titik di Luar Grafik ke Kedua Persamaan Dalam SPLDV	120
4.33 Hasil Pekerjaan S4 pada Soal Nomor 1	122
4.34 Hasil Pekerjaan S3 pada Soal Nomor 1	123
4.35 Hasil Pemodelan S4 dari Masalah Nomor 2	125
4.36 Hasil Pemodelan S5 dari Masalah Nomor 2.....	125
4.37 Hasil Pemodelan S1 dari Masalah Nomor 2.....	126
4.38 Hasil Pemodelan S3 dari Masalah Nomor 2.....	127
4.39 Hasil Pekerjaan S4 pada Soal Nomor 3	130
4.40 Hasil Pekerjaan S2 pada Soal Nomor 3	131
4.41 Hasil Pekerjaan S3 pada Soal Nomor 3	133
4.42 Hasil Pekerjaan S1 pada Soal Nomor 4	135
4.43 Hasil Pekerjaan S4 pada Soal Nomor 4	136
4.44 Hasil Pekerjaan S2 pada Soal Nomor 5	137
4.45 Hasil Pekerjaan S4 pada Soal Nomor 5	138
4.46 Hasil Pekerjaan S5 pada Soal Nomor 5	139
4.47 Hasil Pekerjaan S5 pada Soal Nomor 6	140
4.48 Hasil Pekerjaan S4 pada Soal Nomor 6	141
4.49 Hasil Pekerjaan S1 pada Soal Nomor 1	142
4.50 Istilah-istilah pada Bentuk Aljabar	146
4.51 Ilustrasi Gambar pada Bagian 1 Tugas 1	147
4.52 Ilustrasi Gambar pada Bagian 1 Tugas 2A	149
4.53 Bacaan tentang Pengertian Metode Substitusi dan Metode Eliminasi	150
4.54 Bentuk Awal Soal SPLDV di Bagian 3	157
4.55 Revisi Bentuk Soal SPLDV di Bagian 3	157

DAFTAR LAMPIRAN

Lampiran	Halaman
1. Soal Tes Pendahuluan dan Alternatif Jawaban	
a. Soal Tes Pendahuluan	193
b. Alternatif Jawaban Soal Tes Pendahuluan	194
2. Hasil Pekerjaan Siswa pada Soal Tes Pendahuluan	
a. Hasil Pekerjaan Subjek Awal 1 (SA1)	196
b. Hasil Pekerjaan Subjek Awal 2 (SA2)	198
c. Hasil Pekerjaan Subjek Awal 3 (SA3)	199
3. Lembar Kerja Siswa	200
4. Soal Tes, Alternatif Jawaban, dan Rubrik Penilaian	217
5. Pedoman Wawancara Siswa	243
6. Pedoman Wawancara Guru	244
7. Hasil Observasi oleh Observer	245
8. Hasil Pekerjaan Subjek pada Soal Tes	
a. Hasil S1 Mengerjakan Soal Tes	253
b. Hasil S2 Mengerjakan Soal Tes	256
c. Hasil S3 Mengerjakan Soal Tes	260
d. Hasil S4 Mengerjakan Soal Tes	263
e. Hasil S5 Mengerjakan Soal Tes	267
9. <i>Lesson Design</i> (Desain Didaktis) Rekomendasi	271
10. Lembar Kerja Siswa yang Telah Direvisi	305
11. Surat Izin Penelitian	325
12. Surat Keterangan Telah Melaksanakan Penelitian	326

DAFTAR RUJUKAN

- Adams, P. (2006). Exploring Social Constructivism: Theories and Practicalities. *Education*, 34(3), 243–257.
- Afriliziana, L. A., & Kartini. (2021). Analysis of Students' Ability To Understand Mathematics Concepts for Class VIII SMP/MTs. *Journal of Innovative Mathematics Learning*, 4(2), 49–62.
- Allen, D. E., Donham, R. S., & Bernhardt, S. A. (2011). Problem-Based Learning. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, 2011(128), 21–29.
- Al-Mutawah, M. A., Thomas, R., Eid, A., Mahmoud, E. Y., & Fateel, M. J. (2019). Conceptual Understanding, Procedural Knowledge and Problem-Solving Skills in Mathematics: High School Graduates Work Analysis and Standpoints. *International Journal of Education and Practice*, 7(3), 258–273.
- Amineh, R. J., & Asl, H. D. (2015). Review of Constructivism and Social Constructivism. *Journal of Social Sciences, Literature and Languages*, 1(1), 9–16.
- Anggraena, Y., Felicia, N., Ginanto, D. E., Pratiwi, I., Utama, B., Alhapip, L., & Widiaswati, D. (2021). *Kurikulum Untuk Pemulihan Pembelajaran*. 123.
- Artigue, M. (2009). “Didactical Design in Mathematics Education”. Dalam *Nordic Research in Mathematics Education* (hlm. 5-16). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- As'ari, A. R., Tohir, M., Valentino, E., Imron, Z., & Taufiq, I. (2017). *Matematika Kelas VIII SMP/MTs Semester I* (Revisi). Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Azizah, U. N. (2016). *Desain Didaktis Materi Sistem Persamaan Linear Dua Variabel pada Siswa Sekolah Menengah Pertama*. (Tesis). Sekolah Pascasarjana, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung.
- Beecher, J. A., Penna, J. A., & Bittinger, M. L. (2012). *Algebra and Trigonometry* (Edisi Keempat). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Berg, C. A., & Smith, P. (1994). Assessing Students' Abilities to Construct and Interpret Line Graphs: Disparities Between Multiple Choice and Free Response Instruments. *Science Education*, 78(6), 527–554.
- Boonen, A. J. H., Van Wesel, F., Jolles, J., & Van der Schoot, M. (2014). The Role of Visual Representation Type, Spatial Ability, and Reading Comprehension in Word Problem Solving: An Item-Level Analysis in Elementary School Children. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 68, 15–26.
- Brousseau, G. (2002). *Theory of Didactical Situations in Mathematics*. New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Brousseau, G., & Warfield, V. (2020). Didactic Situations in Mathematics Education. Dalam S. Lerman (Penyunting), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (Edisi Kedua, hlm. 206–213). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Capraro, M. M., An, S. A., Ma, T., Rangel-Chavez, A. F., & Harbaugh, A. (2012). An Investigation of Preservice Teachers' Use of Guess and Check in Solving A Semi Open-Ended Mathematics Problem. *Journal of Mathematical Behavior*, 31(1), 105–116.
- Capraro, M. M., & Joffrion, H. (2006). Algebraic Equations: Can Middle-School Students Meaningfully Translate from Words to Mathematical Symbols? *Reading Psychology*, 27(2-3), 147–164.
- Carpenter, T. P., & Lehrer, R. (1999). Teaching and Learning Mathematics With Understanding. Dalam E. Fennema & T. A. Romberg (Penyunting), *Mathematics Classrooms That Promote Understanding* (Edisi Pertama). New York: Routledge.
- Chasanah, C., Riyadi, & Usodo, B. (2020). The Effectiveness of Learning Models on Written Mathematical Communication Skills Viewed from Students' Cognitive Styles. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(3), 979–994.
- Clements, D. H., & Sarama, J. (2011). Early Childhood Mathematics Intervention. *Science*, 333(6045), 968–970.
- Creswell, John W. (2009). *Research Design Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (Edisi Ketiga). Los Angeles: Sage Publication.
- Daro, P., Mosher, F. A., & Corcoran, T. (2011). Learning Trajectories in Mathematics Education: A Foundation for Standards, Curriculum, Assessment, and Instruction. *CPRE Research Report*.
- De Corte, E. (1995). Fostering Cognitive Growth: A Perspective from Research on Mathematics Learning and Instruction. *Educational Psychologist*, 30(1), 37–46.
- Debrenti, E. (2015). Visual Representations in Mathematics Teaching: An Experiment with Students. *Acta Didactica Napocensia*, 8(1), 19–25.
- Deliyianni, E., Monoyiou, A., Elia, I., Georgiou, C., & Zannettou, E. (2009). Pupils' Visual Representations in Standard and Problematic Problem Solving in Mathematics: Their Role in The Breach of The Didactical Contract. *European Early Childhood Education Research Journal*, 17(1), 95–110.
- Deniz, Ö., & Uygur-Kabael, T. (2017). Students' Mathematization Process of the Concept of Slope within the Realistic Mathematics Education. *Hacettepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi (H.U. Journal of Education)*, 32(1), 123–142.
- Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S. (2009). *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

- Djudin, T. (2017). Using Metacognitive Strategies to Improve Reading Comprehension and Solve a Word Problem. *JETL (Journal Of Education, Teaching and Learning)*, 2(1), 124.
- Dorko, A. (2019). Generalization, Assimilation, and Accommodation. *The Mathematics Educator*, 28(2), 33–51.
- Douady, R. (2013). Tool, Object, Setting, Window: Elements for Analysing and Constructing Didactical Situations in Mathematics. Dalam A. Bishop, S. Mellin-Olsen, & J. van Dormolen (Penyunting), *Mathematical Knowledge: Its Growth Through Teaching* (hlm. 109–130). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Duffy, G., Sorby, S., & Bowe, B. (2020). An Investigation of the Role of Spatial Ability in Representing and Solving Word Problems among Engineering Students. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 109(3), 424–442.
- Ernawati, E., & Muzaini, M. (2020). The Analysis of Students' Learning Difficulties in Solving Systems of Linear Equation Problems in Two Variables. *Jurnal Studi Guru Dan Pembelajaran*, 3(3), 391–398.
- Ersoy, E. (2016). Problem Solving and Its Teaching in Mathematics. *Journal of New Horizons in Education*, 6(2), 79–87.
- Faizah, S., Nusantara, T., Sudirman, & Rahardi, R. (2022). Constructing Students' Thinking Process through Assimilation and Accommodation Framework. *Mathematics Teaching-Research Journal*, 14(1), 253–269.
- Glazer, N. (2011). Challenges with Graph Interpretation: A Review of The Literature. *Studies in Science Education*, 47(2), 183–210.
- Gravemeijer, K. (2004). Local Instruction Theories as Means of Support for Teachers in Reform Mathematics Education. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 6(2), 105–128.
- Griffin, C. C., Gagnon, J. C., Jossi, M. H., Ulrich, T. G., & Myers, J. A. (2018). Priming Mathematics Word Problem Structures in a Rural Elementary Classroom. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 37(3), 150–163.
- Haghverdi, M., Semnani, A. S., & Seifi, M. (2012). The Relationship between Different Kinds of Students' Errors and The Knowledge Required to Solve Mathematics Word Problems. *Bolema*, 26(42B), 649–665.
- Hatisaru, V. (2021). "The Use of Pictorial Representations in Mathematics Problem Solving". Dalam J. Novotná & H. Moraová (Penyunting), *Broadening experiences in Elementary School Mathematics Proceedings: International Symposium Elementary Mathematics Teaching* (hlm. 194–202). Prague: Charles University, Faculty of Education.
- Herawaty, D., & Widada, W. (2017). "The Influence of Contextual Learning Models and the Cognitive Conflict to Understand Mathematical Concepts and Problems Solving Abilities". Dalam *1st Annual International Conference on Mathematics, Science, and Education (ICoMSE 2017)*, (hlm. 224–230). ____: Atlantis Press.

- Hersant, M., & Marie-Jeanne, P.-G. (2005). Characterization of An Ordinary Teaching Practice with The Help of The Theory of Didactic Situations. Dalam C. Laborde, M.-J. Perrin-Glorian, & A. Sierpiska (Penyunting), *Beyond the Apparent Banality of the Mathematics Classroom* (hlm. 113–151). Boston: Springer.
- Hirtle, J. S. P. (1996). Social Constructivism. *English Journal*, 85(1), 91.
- Hoon, T. S., Singh, P., Han, C. T., Nasir, N. M., Rasid, N. S. B. M., & Zainal, N. B. (2020). An Analysis of Knowledge in STEM: Solving Algebraic Problems. *Asian Journal of University Education*, 16(2), 131–140.
- Hudson, B. (2008). Didactical Design Research for Teaching as A Design Profession. Dalam B. Hudson & P. Zgaga (Penyunting), *Teacher Education Policy in Europe: a Voice of Higher Education Institutions* (hlm. 345–364). Umeå: Faculty of Teacher Education, University of Umeå in co-operation with the Centre for Educational Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana.
- Hunter, J. (2017). Developing Interactive Mathematical Talk: Investigating Student Perceptions and Accounts of Mathematical Reasoning in A Changing Classroom Context. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 47(4), 475–492.
- Inoue, N. (2005). The Realistic Reasons Behind Unrealistic Solutions: The Role of Interpretive Activity in Word Problem Solving. *Learning and Instruction*, 15(1), 69–83.
- Irvine, J. (2020). Positively Influencing Student Engagement and Attitude in Mathematics Through an Instructional Intervention Using Reform Mathematics Principles. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 9(2), 48.
- Johanning, D. I. (2007). Is There Something to be Gained from Guessing? Middle School Students' Use of Systematic Guess and Check. *School Science and Mathematics*, 107(4), 123–131.
- Jupri, A., Drijvers, P., & van den Heuvel-Panhuizen, M. (2014). Difficulties in initial algebra learning in Indonesia. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, 26(4), 683–710.
- Kansanen, P. (2003). Studying - The Realistic Bridge between Instruction and Learning: An Attempt to A Conceptual Whole of The Teaching-Studying-Learning Process. *Educational Studies*, 29(2-3), 221–232.
- Kaur, B. (2019). The Why, What and How of The “Model” Method: A Tool For Representing and Visualising Relationships When Solving Whole Number Arithmetic Word Problems. *ZDM - Mathematics Education*, 51(1), 151–168.
- Kenney, R., An, T., Kim, S. H., Uhan, N. A., Yi, J. S., & Shamsul, A. (2020). Linear Programming Models: Identifying Common Errors in Engineering Students' Work with Complex Word Problems. *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 18(4), 635–655.

- Kolar, V. M., & Hodnik, T. (2021). Mathematical Literacy from The Perspective of Solving Contextual Problems. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *10*(1), 467–483.
- Kramarski, B., & Mevarech, Z. R. (2003). Enhancing Mathematical Reasoning in The Classroom: The Effects of Cooperative Learning and Metacognitive Training. *American Educational Research Journal*, *40*(1), 281–310.
- Larson, R. (2013). *Algebra and Trigonometry* (Edisi Kesembilan). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Linchevski, L., & Livneh, D. (1999). Structure Sense: The Relationship Between Algebraic and Numerical Contexts. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, *4*, 173–196.
- Lin-Siegler, X., Dweck, C. S., & Cohen, G. L. (2016). Introduction: Instructional Interventions that Motivate Classroom Learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *108*(3), 295–299.
- Lodico, Marguerite G., Spaulding, Dean T., & Voegtle, Katherine H. (2010). *Methods in Educational Research, From Theory to Practice* (Edisi Kedua). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Long, C. (2005). Maths Concepts in Teaching: Procedural and Conceptual Knowledge. *Pythagoras*, *0*(62), 59–65.
- Low, R., & Over, R. (1990). Text Editing of Algebraic Word Problems. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, *42*(1), 63–73.
- Macblain, S., & Gray, C. (2012). *Learning Theories in Childhood*. London: SAGE Publication.
- Manouchehri, A., & John, D. S. (2006). From Classroom Discussion to Group Discourse. *Mathematics Teacher*, *99*(8), 544–551.
- Mauliyda, M. A., Annizar, A. M., Hidayati, V. R., & Mukhlis, M. (2020). Analysis of Students' Verbal and Written Mathematical Communication Error in Solving Word Problem. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, *1538*(1).
- McCormick, R. (1997). Conceptual and Procedural Knowledge. *International Journal of Technology and Design Education*, *7*(1-2), 141–159.
- Merrit, J., Lee, Mi, Y., Rillero, P., & Kinach, B. (2017). Problem-Based Learning in K–8 Mathematics and Science Education: A Literature Review. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, *11*(2), 5–17.
- Minaldi, Q. I., Halini, & Silvia. (2015). Analisis Kesalahan Siswa dalam Menyelesaikan Sistem Persamaan Linier Dua Variabel di Kelas VIII SMP. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pembelajaran Khatulistiwa*, *4*(9), 1–10.
- Morash, R. P. (1987). *Bridge to Abstract Mathematics: Mathematical Proof and Structures* (Edisi Pertama). New York: Random House, Inc.
- NCTM. (2000). *Principles and Standards for School Mathematics*. Reston: The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Inc.

- Nicolaidou, M., & Philippou, G. (1997). Attitudes Towards Mathematics, Self-Efficacy and Achievement in Problem-Solving. *European Research in Mathematics Education III*, 1–11.
- Novotná, J., Eisenmann, P., Příbyl, J., Ondrušová, J., & Břehovský, J. (2012). Problem Solving in School Mathematics Based on. *Journal on Efficiency and Responsibility in Education and Science*, 7(1), 1–6.
- Nurhasanah, H., Prabawanto, S., & Sumiaty, E. (2019). Didactical Design Development Of Linear Equation In Two Variables Based Learning Obstacle And Hypothetical Learning Trajectory. *Journal of Innovative Mathematics Learning*, 2(4), 186–193.
- Nurhayati, E., Nurfauziah, P., & Fitriani, N. (2021). Memahami Materi Sistem Persamaan Linear Dua Variabel (SPLDV) dalam Pembelajaran Daring. *Jurnal Pembelajaran Matematika Inovatif*, 4(6), 1609–1620.
- Owen, E., & Sweller, J. (1985). What Do Students Learn While Solving Mathematics Problems? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3), 272–284.
- Öztürk, M., Akkan, Y., & Kaplan, A. (2020). Reading Comprehension, Mathematics Self-Efficacy Perception, and Mathematics Attitude as Correlates of Students' Non-Routine Mathematics Problem-Solving Skills in Turkey. *International Journal of Mathematical Education in Science and Technology*, 51(7), 1042–1058.
- Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1994). Role of Self-Efficacy and Self-Concept Beliefs in Mathematical Problem Solving: A Path Analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 86(2), 193–203.
- Pajares, F., & Miller, M. D. (1997). Mathematics Self-Efficacy and Mathematical Problem Solving: Implications of Using Different Forms of Assessment. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 65(3), 213–228.
- Pongsakdi, N., Kajamies, A., Veermans, K., Lertola, K., Vauras, M., & Lehtinen, E. (2020). What Makes Mathematical Word Problem Solving Challenging? Exploring the Roles of Word Problem Characteristics, Text Comprehension, and Arithmetic Skills. *ZDM - Mathematics Education*, 52(1), 33–44.
- Powell, S. R., & Fuchs, L. S. (2018). Effective Word-Problem Instruction: Using Schemas to Facilitate Mathematical Reasoning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 51(1), 31–42.
- Prahmana, R. C. I., & Kusumah, Y. S. (2016). The Hypothetical Learning Trajectory on Research in Mathematics Education Using Research-Based Learning. *Pedagogika*, 123(3), 42–54.
- Rohid, N., Suryaman, & Rusmawati, R. D. (2019). Students' Mathematical Communication Skills (MCS) in Solving Mathematics Problems: A Case in Indonesian Context. *Anatolian Journal of Education*, 4(2), 19–30.

- Rustam, A., & Ramlan, A. M. (2017). Analysis of Mathematical Communication Skills of Junior High School Students of Coastal Kolaka. *Journal of Mathematics Education*, 2(2), 45–50.
- Salinan Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Republik Indonesia Nomor 37 Tahun 2018 tentang Perubahan Atas Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Nomor 24 Tahun 2016 tentang Kompetensi Inti dan Kompetensi Dasar Pelajaran pada Kurikulum 2013 pada Pendidikan Dasar dan Pendidikan Menengah
- Salinan Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2021 tentang Asesmen Nasional
- Santoso, D. A., Farid, A., & Ulum, B. (2017). Error Analysis of Students Working about Word Problem of Linear Program with NEA Procedure. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 855(1).
- Santoso, T., Nafis, H. L. H., & Oktama, M. Y. (2019). Analyzing Students' Error in Problem Solving of Two-Variable Linear Equation System: A Case Study of Grade Eight Students of Indonesian Junior High School. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 18(11), 283–296.
- Saragih, D. I., & Surya, E. (2017). Analysis the Effectiveness of Mathematics Learning Using Contextual Learning Model. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research*, 34(1), 135–143.
- Sari, C. K., Sutopo, S., & Aryuna, D. R. (2016). The Profile of Students' Thinking in Solving Mathematics Problems Based on Adversity Quotient. *JRAMathEdu (Journal of Research and Advances in Mathematics Education)*, 1(1), 36–48.
- Sari, Y. M., & Valentino, E. (2017). An Analysis of Students Error in Solving PISA 2012 and Its Scaffolding. *JRAMathEdu (Journal of Research and Advances in Mathematics Education)*, 1(2), 90–98.
- Sarrazy, B., & Novotná, J. (2013). Didactical Contract and Responsiveness to Didactical Contract: A Theoretical Framework for Enquiry into Students' Creativity in Mathematics. *ZDM - International Journal on Mathematics Education*, 45(2), 281–293.
- Schunk, D. H. (2012). *Learning Theories: An Educational Perspective* (Edisi Keenam). Canada: Pearson.
- Simamora, R. E., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin, H. (2018). Improving Students' Mathematical Problem Solving Ability and Self-Efficacy through Guided Discovery Learning in Local Culture Context. *International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education*, 14(1), 61–72.
- Simon, M. (2020). Hypothetical Learning Trajectories in Mathematics Education. Dalam S. Lerman (Penyunting), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (Edisi Kedua, hlm. 354–357). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Slavit, D. (1998). The Role of Operation Sense in Transitions from Arithmetic to Algebraic Thought. *Educational Studies in Mathematics*, 37(3), 251–274.

- Star, J. R., & Stylianides, G. J. (2013). Procedural and Conceptual Knowledge: Exploring the Gap Between Knowledge Type and Knowledge Quality. *Canadian Journal of Science, Mathematics and Technology Education*, 13(2), 169–181.
- Stewart, J., Redlin, L., & Watson, S. (2015). *Algebra and Trigonometry* (Edisi Keempat). Boston: Cengage Learning.
- Sugiarti, L., & Karyati, K. (2021). “An Analysis of the Difficulty in Solving Algebra of the Students of Junior High School in Bantul Regency”. Dalam S. Menggo, Y. S. Lon, F. Widyawati, A. P. Yuliantari, & R. Rahim (Penyunting), *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Education, Humanities, Health and Agriculture, ICEHHA 2021, 3-4 June 2021, Ruteng, Flores, Indonesia*. ____: EAI.
- Sugiarti, L., & Retnawati, H. (2019). Analysis of Student Difficulties on Algebra Problem Solving in Junior High School. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1320(1).
- Sukoriyanto, S., Nusantara, T., Subanji, S., & Chandra, T. D. (2016). Students’ Errors in Solving the Permutation and Combination Problems Based on Problem Solving Steps of Polya. *International Education Studies*, 9(2), 11.
- Suratno, T. (2016). Didaktik dan Didactical Design Research. Dalam D. Suryadi, E. Mulyana, T. Suratno, D. A. K. Dewi, & S. Y. Maudy (Penyunting), *Monograf Didactical Design Research* (hlm. 1–11). Bandung: Rizqi Press.
- Suryadi, D. (2013). “Didactical Design Research (DDR) dalam Pengembangan Pembelajaran Matematika”. Dalam *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Matematika dan Pendidikan Matematika* (hlm. 3-12). Bandung: STKIP Siliwangi Bandung.
- Suryadi, D. (2019). *Penelitian Desain Didaktis (DDR) dan Implementasinya*. Bandung: Gapura Press.
- Syamsuddin, S., & Istiyono, E. (2018). “The effectiveness of mathematics learning through contextual teaching and learning approach in Junior High School”. Dalam *AIP Conference Proceedings* (Vol. 2014, No. 1, hlm. 020085). ____: AIP Publishing.
- Tackie, N. A., Sheppard, P., & Flint, T. K. (2019). Engendering Algebraic Readiness through Pictorial Representations. *Investigations in Mathematics Learning*, 11(3), 207–219.
- Takaya, K. (2008). Jerome Bruner’s Theory of Education: From Early Bruner to Later Bruner. *Interchange*, 39(1), 1–19.
- Tan, S. T. (2008). *College Mathematics for the Managerial, Life, and Social Sciences* (Edisi Ketujuh). Belmont: Thomson Brooks/Cole.
- Tanton, J. (2015). *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*. New York : Facts On File
- Ulu, M. (2017). Errors Made by Elementary Fourth Grade Students when Modelling Word Problems and the Elimination of Those Errors through

- Scaffolding. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 9(3), 553–580.
- Unver, S. K., Hidiroglu, C. N., Dede, A. T., & Guzel, E. B. (2018). Factors Revealed while Posing Mathematical Modelling Problems by Mathematics Student Teachers. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 7(4), 941–952.
- Vula, E., Avdyli, R., Berisha, V., Saqipi, B., & Elezi, S. (2017). The Impact of Metacognitive Strategies and Self-Regulating Processes of Solving Math Word Problems. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 10(1), 49–59.
- Warsito, Darhim, D., & Herman, T. (2018). Improving Students' Mathematical Representational Ability Through RME-Based Progressive Mathematization. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 948(1).
- Weber, E., Walkington, C., & McGalliard, W. (2015). Expanding Notions of “Learning Trajectories” in Mathematics Education. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, 17(4), 253–272.
- Widyatiningtyas, R., Kusumah, Y. S., Sumarmo, U., & Sabandar, J. (2015). The Impact of Problem-Based Learning Approach to Senior High School Students' Mathematics Critical Thinking Ability. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, 6(2), 30–38.
- Zhou, D., Du, X., Hau, K. T., Luo, H., Feng, P., & Liu, J. (2020). Teacher-Student Relationship and Mathematical Problem-Solving Ability: Mediating Roles of Self-Efficacy and Mathematical Anxiety. *Educational Psychology*, 40(4), 473–489.
- Zill, D. G., & Dewar, J. M. (2011). *Algebra and Trigonometry* (Edisi Ketiga). United States: Jones & Bartlett Learning.