Artikel di submit via sistem Jurnal yang bernama DergiPark yang awal saat masih di kelola dengan baik oleh Genç Bilge Yayıncılık pada tanggal 12 Juni 2019.





Artikel yang di submit pada tanggal 12 Juni 2019 dengan judul awal

“Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student”

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 17-35, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics especially about a fraction. The method used is Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) Approach by using the context of pipettes. Data collection techniques used are video recordings, documentation, and written data. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of deaf-mute student. All student's strategy in learning process would be described in this paper.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-10.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019*.

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Aziz, 2015). According to Thompson (2010), there are several indicators that show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly. Therefore, deaf student educators must be specifically aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003). Gottardis (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler, *et al*., 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematical learning approach (Khairunnisak, *et al*., 2012; Lestari, *et al*., 2018; Yuanita, *et al*., 2018). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia) (Yuanita, et al., 2018). PMRI starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak, et al., 2012; Nasution, et al., 2018; Saleh, et al., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017 ; Yuanita, et al., 2018; Putri, et al., 2017). Therefore, the application of PMRI can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari, et al., 2018; Yuanita, et al., 2018; Maulydia, et al., 2017). Thus, the approach of realistic mathematics education can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. fractions are the most important subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid, et al., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution, et al., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Putri, et al., 2017). On the other hand, Suriwati et al., (2014) argues that in the learning process in schools deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions. In line with the above problems, through the application of PMRI students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution, et al., 2018; Saleh, et al., 2018; Warsito, et al., 2019). Therefore, a realistic mathematical education approach can be applied to fraction learning for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito, et al., 2019). The application of Single Subject Research (SSR) is able to describe the increase in fractional counting operations in SDLB class V deaf students through contextual

problems (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito et al. (2019) states that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an important part in embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a basic mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio, et al., 2016). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematical education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristic characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive research with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Participants

The research subject of this study was the one of the seventh grade deaf-mute student as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who have limited communication and knowledge which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Normally, he is the seventh grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

The data collection techniques of this studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests. The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document learning process taking plac, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each question validated by the validator lecturer. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design. In the analysis of conditions, the first is the length of the condition stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are used to see the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one phase. Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions. Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for 8 days, in the baseline phase there were 3 sessions and the intervention phase was conducted in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each session, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of student to solve problems related to fractions. While the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84

	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase the score obtained is very low, while in the intervention phase it increases. As presented in graphical form in Figure I.



Figure 1.
Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is 3 sessions for the baseline (A) and 5 sessions for intervention (B).

b. Direction Tendency



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).

c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase can be seen in Figure 3.



Figure 3.
Mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase

Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are 4 data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends
Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.

e. Stability Level
The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.

f. Level Change
In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	 (=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stabil $\frac{}{24 - 28}$	Stabil $\frac{}{84 - 100}$
6.	Level Change	$26 - 24$ (+2)	$90 - 84$ (+6)

2. Visual Analysis Between Conditions
In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2: 1 which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:

a. Number of Variables
The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3 the number

1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3 the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.

b. Change in Direction Tendency
Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).

c. Changes in Stability Trends
Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.

d. Level Change
The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for comparison of conditions B: A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions, can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stabil ke Stabil
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary

analysis table above which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, namely:

1. Baseline Phase (A)

   Giving the baseline phase is carried out for 3 days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the problem. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is very low because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Figure 4.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much, around 1-2 points, this can be seen in Figure 5.



Figure 5.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session the students' grades declined, this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results and the location of errors was almost the same. This shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (KPK), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. This is supported by Sukajati (2008) that in order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (KPK).

2. Intervention Phase (B)

The intervention phase was carried out for 5 days. Interventions given to students in the form of PMRI approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. In the first session of the intervention phase, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 7. Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. This can be seen in Figure 8.

Figure 7.
Use of the Pipette Context



Figure 8.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 9. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning. The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 10.



Figure 9.

Use of Fractional Rods



Figure 10.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple (KPK). This is in accordance with Pratini & Rianasari, (2015) that in order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple (KPK) from the two denominators or fractions of value. Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases. This can be seen in Figure 11.



Figure 11.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 12.



Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus, students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 13.



Figure 13.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the PMRI approach in fraction learning. Thus, the PMRI approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (PMRI) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Zabeta, et al. 2015).

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve learning outcomes.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does

not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Ahmad Dahlan University for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Dr. Yeliz BOLAT was born in Hatay, Turkey. She graduated from Department of Primary School Education, Faculty of Education of Mustafa Kemal University in 2002. She has been working as a primary school teacher for sixteen years. She completed master Department of Primary School Education, Faculty of Education of Çukurova University in 2008. And then she completed her doctorate in the same university's curriculum and instruction department in 2016. Bolat's concept teaching, learning strategies, interdisciplinary teaching, authentic evaluation are the subjects to be studied. She give courses teachers about support for training rooms.

Affiliation: Primary School Teacher Ministry of Education, Adana, Turkey.
E-mail: yelizdikbas@gmail.com
Phone: ……

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate Research in Mathematics With Deaf and Hard-of-hearing Students: Four Perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A Cross-National Comparison of Turkish and American Mathematics Textbooks in Terms of Fraction Division Task Contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Aziz, S. (2015). *Pendidikan Seks Anak Berkebutuhan Khusus.* Yogyakarta: Gava Media.

Fazio, L. K., Kennedy, C. A., & Siegler, R. S. (2016). Improving Children's Knowledge of Fraction Magnitudes. *Public Library of Science*, 1-14.

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed).* New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding Magnitudes to Understand Fractions. *Asia Pacific Microwave Conference* (pp. 36-40). Adelaide: ResearchGate.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A Synthesis of Research on Deaf and Hearing Children's Mathematical Achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131–150.

Karaca, S. Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The Effects of Realistic Mathematics Education on Students' Math Self Reports in Fifth Grades Mathematics Course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A. D. (2012). Supporting Fifth Graders in Learning Multiplication of Fraction with Whole Number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Lang, G. H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based Science Instruction for Deaf Students: What Research Says to The Teacher. *Instructional Science*, 277-298.

Lestari, S. A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing Learning Materials Based on Realistic Mathematics Education with Malay Culture Context to Improve Mathematical Communication Ability and Self-efficacy of Students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Maulydia, S. S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The Development of Mathematic Teaching Material Through Realistic Mathematics Education to Increase Mathematical Problem Solving of Junior High School Students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A Review of the Literature: Fraction Instruction for Struggling Learners in Mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109–119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R. R. (2018). Developing Deaf Students Fraction Skills Requires Understanding Magnitude and Whole Number Division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F. N., Choiri, A. S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single Subject Research: Increasing Mathematics Learning Outcomes of The Additive Fractions Using Fractional Block Media Toward Students With Visual Impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M. F., Putri, R. I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing Sport in Learning Fractions of The Fourth Grade Students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Pagliaro, C. M. (1998). Mathematics Reform in the Education of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pratini, H. S., & Rianasari, V. F. (2015). "Pengembangan Prototipe Perangkat Pembelajaran Penjumlahan Pecahan dengan Pendekatan PMRI di Kelas IV". *Jurnal Derivat*, 2(2), 85-94.

Putri, R. I., Gunawan, M. S., & Zulkardi. (2017). Addition of Fraction in Swimming Context. *Journal of Physics*, 1-11.

Ramadhani, T. H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). Penerapan Pendekatan Matematika Realistik untuk Meningkatkan Kemampuan Operasi Hitung Pecahan pada Siswa Tunarungu Kelas V SDLB. *JASSI_anakku*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R. C., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving The Reasoning Ability of Elementary School Student Through The Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Sukajati. (2008). *Pembelajaran Operasi Penjumlahan Pecahan di SD Menggunakan Berbagai Media.* Yogyakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Peningkatan Mutu Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan.

Suriwati, L. M., Nilakusmawati, D. P., & Sumarjaya, I. W. (2014). Efektivitas Pembelajaran dengan Media Visual untuk Meningkatkan Hasil Belajar Siswa Tunarungu Pokok Bahasan Pecahan Senilai. *Seminar Nasional Matematika* (pp. 165-170). Denpasar: ResearchGate.

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The Design Learning of Fraction With Realistic Mathematics Education in Elementary School. *Journal of Physics*, 1-10.

Yuanita, P., Zulnaidi, H., & Zakaria, E. (2018). The Effectiveness of Realistic Mathematics Education Approach: The Role of Mathematical Representation As Mediator Between Mathematical Belief and Problem Solving. *Public Library of Science*, 1-20.

Zabeta, M., Hartono, Y., & Putri, R. I. (2015). "Desain Pembelajaran Materi Pecahan Menggunakan Pendekatan PMRI di Kelas VII". *Jurnal Beta*, 8(1), 86-99.

Permintaan untuk menyesuaikan template dan mengirimkan copyright transfer form pada tanggal 13 Juni 2019.






https://dergipark.org.tr/journal/2561/article-workflow/133522
What can I do in this step?
Pre-Review
Review
Edit
View Submission Details
Submission Metadata
Corrections by Author - prereview
Finished Issue
Assigned to: You (rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id)
Created by: @hasansaidtortop (hasansaidfen@gmail.com)
Created At: 2019-06-13 21:12 (7 days ago)
7 days ago
You
ID 576234 - Copyright Transfer Agreement Form - Jannah & Prahmana - Signed.pdf
7 days ago
You
ID 576234 - Copyright Transfer Agreement Form - Jannah & Prahmana - Signed.jpeg
7 days ago
You
About the paper namely JEGYS-7-2-10.docx, It's not our paper.
7 days ago
You
ID 576234 - JEGYS - Jannah & Prahmana.docx
Corrections by Author - prereview
Finished Issue
Assigned to: You (rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id)
Created by: @hasansaidtortop (hasansaidfen@gmail.com)


https://dergipark.org.tr/journal/2561/article-workflow/133522
What can I do in this step?
Pre-Review
Review
Edit
View Submission Details
Submission Metadata
Corrections by Author - prereview
Finished Issue
Assigned to: You (rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id)
Created by: @hasansaidtortop (hasansaidfen@gmail.com)
Created At: 2019-06-13 21:12 (7 days ago)
7 days ago
You
ID 576234 - JEGYS - Jannah & Prahmana.docx
7 days ago
You
Here, it is our paper that already using the template of JEGYS from https://dergipark.org.tr/jegys/page/6528
@hasansaidtortop
very thanks
7 days ago
Corrections by Author - prereview
Finished Issue
Assigned to: You (rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id)
Created by: @hasansaidtortop (hasansaidfen@gmail.com)

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists

Copyright Transfer Agreement Form

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS in short)
(Please fill in the form, sign, scan and send it to: editorjegys@gmail.com)

Corresponding Author	**Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA**		
Title of Manuscript	**Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student**		
Address:	**Jl. Pramuka 42, Pandeyan, Umbulharjo, Yogyakarta 55161, Indonesia**		
Telephone No:	**+6281287447886**	**E-mail**	**rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id**

Co-Author Information

Co-Author	E-mail	Affiliations
Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH	**anisasajalah95@gmail.com**	**Universitas Ahmad Dahlan**

The author(s) warrant that the manuscript submitted is his/her/their own original research. All participated authors in this work take public responsibility and have approved that the manuscript has not been sent any other journal for publication. All matter included in the manuscript does not violate any existing copyright rules and any intellectual property rights of any person or entity. The manuscript meets ethical standards applicable to the research discipline.

I/We (my co-authors) indemnify **JEGYS** and the editors of the Journal and hold them harmless from any loss, expense or damage occasioned by a claim or suit by a third party for copyright infringement, or any suit arising out of any breach of the foregoing warranties as a result of publication of my/our article. The undersigned with the consent of all the authors, hereby transfer, to the extent that there is copyright to be transferred, the exclusive copyright interest in the above-cited manuscript, in this and all subsequent editions of this manuscript, and in derivatives, translations or ancillaries, in English and in foreign translations, in all formats and media of expression now known or later developed, including electronic, to **JEGYS.**

Sign Here For Copyright Transfer		
Print Authorized (Corresponding Author) Name and Title	**Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA**	
Original Signature (in ink)		Date: June 14, 2019
Print Co-Author Name and Title	**Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd.**	
Original Signature (in ink)		Date: June 14, 2019
Print Co-Author Name and Title		
Original Signature (in ink)		Date:

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) Approach by using the context of pipettes. Data collection techniques used are video recordings, documentation, and written data. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student. All intervention and student's strategy in learning process would be described in this paper.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-21.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick *et al.*, 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin *et al.*, 2007). Gottardis *et al.* (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler *et al.*, 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak *et al.*, 2012; Lestari *et al.*, 2018; Prahmana *et al.*, 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana *et al.*, 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak *et al.*, 2012; Nasution *et al.*, 2018; Saleh *et al.*, 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari *et al.*, 2018; Prahmana *et al.*, 2012; Maulydia *et al.*, 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid *et al.*, 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al.*, 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey *et al.*, 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al.*, 2018; Saleh *et al.*, 2018; Warsito *et al.*, 2019).

Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito *et al*., 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito *et al*. (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio *et al*., 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Participants

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests. The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking

place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the validator lecturer. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design. In the analysis of circumstances, the first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period. Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions. Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

   c. Stability Trends
      The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the

lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.

Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends

Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.

e. Stability Level

The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.

f. Level Change

In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.

Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	 (=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable	Stable
		24 – 28	84 – 100
6.	Level Change	26 – 24	90 – 84
		(+2)	(+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions

In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:

a. Number of Variables

The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.

b. Change in Direction Tendency

Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).

c. Changes in Stability Trends

Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in

conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.

d. Level Change
The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained

is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English:
Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the

Figure 5.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys *et al.*, 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)

The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their

research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan *et al*., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al*., 2011).

In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).



Figure 7.
The Student Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number line!

Figure 9.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.

Figure 10.
Use of Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Figure 11.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer *et al.*, 2002; Siegler *et al.*, 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving

several problem in learning mathematics, such as operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana *et al*., 2012; Reys *et al*., 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Translate in English:

Simplify the addition of the following fractions that have different

Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal, the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the multiplier

number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer *et al.*, 2002; Fazio *et al.*, 2016; Khairunnisak *et al.*, 2012; Siegler *et al.*, 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey *et al.*, 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus, students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the final

meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Figure 14.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan *et al*., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al*., 2011).

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does

not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

Permintaan untuk merevisi artikel sesuai hasil review dan rekapitulasi hasil penilaian dari masing-masing reviewer pada tanggal 18 Juni 2019.



Hasil revisi sesuai saran dan masukan reviewer dikirim kembali pada tanggal 18 Juni 2019





Reviewers Guide

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS)
ISSN : 2149-360X

SECTION I : Information	
Reviewer's Name:	xxxxx
E-Mail:	xxxxxx
Manuscript Number:	576234
Title:	Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student
Authors:	XXXXX
Date Sent to Reviewer:	27.03.2018
Date Expected From Reviewer:	27.04.2018
SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript	
General comment:	
Introduction:	adequate but theoretical knowledge should be increased
Methodology:	adequate but theoretical knowledge should be increased
Results:	It is sufficient
Discussion:	Results should be given detailed item by item dependent dependent variables the results should be compared with the literature
Bibliography/References:	
Others:	
Decision:	The manuscript can be published according to the suggestions.
SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)	
Originality:	2
Contribution to the Field:	2
Technical Quality:	3
Clarity of Presentation :	2
Depth of Research:	2
SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)	
Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	x
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit to Another Publication Such As:	
Reject on Grounds of (Please Be Specific):	
SECTION V: Additional Comments	
method section should be developed results should be regulated suggestions can be added.	

Genç Bilge yayıncılık

Reviewers Guide

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS)
ISSN : 2149-360X

Genç Bilge
yayıncılık

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

XXXXXXXX

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) Approach by using the context of pipettes. Data collection techniques used are video recordings, documentation, and written data. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student. All intervention and student's strategy in learning process would be described in this paper.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

Commented [E1]: Let us give information about the research participants

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-21.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick *et al*., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin *et al*., 2007). Gottardis *et al.* (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler *et al*., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak *et al*., 2012; Lestari *et al*., 2018; Prahmana *et al*., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana *et al*., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak *et al*., 2012; Nasution *et al*., 2018; Saleh *et al*., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari *et al*., 2018; Prahmana *et al*., 2012; Maulydia *et al*., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid *et al*., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al*., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey *et al*., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al*., 2018;

Saleh *et al.*, 2018; Warsito *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito *et al.*, 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito *et al.* (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio *et al.*, 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Commented [E2]: let's give this information in the method section

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Commented [E3]: Let's give information about the features of who made the application of courses

Participants

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

Commented [E4]: duration of research, hypothesis or sub-problems of research,
dependent, independent variables of the research should be given

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests. The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The

video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the validator lecturer. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Commented [E5]: how many lessons were made, how many videos were made, Let's give information

Commented [E6]: What are the questions in the written test form, how was it prepared, validity, reliability provided

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design. In the analysis of circumstances, the first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period. Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions. Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

   c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends

Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.

e. Stability Level

The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.

f. Level Change

In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.

Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	(=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable 24 – 28	Stable 84 – 100
6.	Level Change	$26 - 24$ (+2)	$90 - 84$ (+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions

In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:

a. Number of Variables

The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.

b. Change in Direction Tendency

Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).

c. Changes in Stability Trends
Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.

d. Level Change
The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
   Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English: Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the

Figure 5.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Translate in English:

simplify the addition of the following

Figure 6.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys *et al.*, 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)
   The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan *et al.*, 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al.*, 2011).
   In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).

Figure 7.
The Student Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number

Figure 9.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.

Figure 10.
Use of Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Figure 11.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer *et al*., 2002; Siegler *et al*., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as

operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana *et al.*, 2012; Reys *et al.*, 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Translate in English:

Simplify the addition of the following fractions that have different

Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal, the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the

multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer *et al.*, 2002; Fazio *et al.*, 2016; Khairunnisak *et al.*, 2012; Siegler *et al.*, 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey *et al.*, 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus, students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the

final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of

Figure 14.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan *et al.*, 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al.*, 2011).

Commented [E7]: research results should be given as unsupported and unsupported with literature.

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes.

Commented [E8]: recommendations based on research findings

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and

does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

JEGYS Writing Rules Reviewers Guide

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS)
ISSN : 2149-360X

SECTION I : Information	
Reviewer's Name:	xxxxx
E-Mail:	xxxxx
Manuscript Number:	576234
Title:	Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student
Authors:	XXXXX
Date Sent to Reviewer:	14.06.2019
Date Expected From Reviewer:	18.06.2019
SECTION II: Comments per Section of Manuscript	
Language Proficiency:	good
Fluency:	good
Spelling:	good
Table Design:	good
Figure Design:	good
Bibliography/References (APA):	References should be done according to APA style
Abstract Length	good
Biodata	good
Others:	good
Decision:	The spelling rules of the journal should be taken into consideration
SECTION III - Please rate the following: (1 = Excellent) (2 = Good) (3 = Fair) (4 = poor)	
Language Proficiency:	2
Fluency:	2
Spelling:	2
Table Design:	2
Figure Design:	2
Bibliography/References (APA):	2
Abstract Length	2
Biodata	2
Others:	2
SECTION IV - Recommendation: (Kindly Mark With An X)	
Accept As Is:	
Requires Minor Corrections:	x
Requires Moderate Revision:	
Requires Major Revision:	
Submit to Another Publication Such As:	
Reject on Grounds of (Please Be Specific):	
SECTION V: Additional Comments	
The sample template and APA style of the journal should be considered.	

Genç Bilge yayıncılık

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

XXXXXXXX

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) Approach by using the context of pipettes. Data collection techniques used are video recordings, documentation, and written data. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student. All intervention and student's strategy in learning process would be described in this paper.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-21.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

Commented [H1]: information about the participants

Commented [H2]: clear information about the method of research

Commented [H3]: clear information

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick *et al*., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin *et al*., 2007). Gottardis *et al.* (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler *et al*., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak *et al*., 2012; Lestari *et al*., 2018; Prahmana *et al*., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana *et al*., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak *et al*., 2012; Nasution *et al*., 2018; Saleh *et al*., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari *et al*., 2018; Prahmana *et al*., 2012; Maulydia *et al*., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid *et al*., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al*., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey *et al*., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution *et al*., 2018;

Commented [H4]: Review by APA style

Commented [H5]: Review by APA style

Commented [H6]: Review by APA style

Commented [H7]: Review by APA style

Commented [H8]: Review by APA style

Saleh *et al.*, 2018; Warsito *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito *et al.*, 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito *et al.* (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio *et al.*, 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

Participants

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests. The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The

Commented [H9]: should be supported with literature

video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the validator lecturer. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

Commented [H10]: should be supported with literature

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design. In the analysis of circumstances, the first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period. Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions. Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Commented [H11]: Review by APA style

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Commented [H12]: Review by APA style

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

Commented [H13]: Review by APA style

   c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Commented [H14]: Review by APA style

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends

Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.

e. Stability Level

The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.

f. Level Change

In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.

Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

Commented [H15]: Review by APA style

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency	↘	→
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	↘	→
		(=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable	Stable
		24 – 28	84 – 100
6.	Level Change	$26 - 24$	$90 - 84$
		(+2)	(+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions

In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:

a. Number of Variables

The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.

b. Change in Direction Tendency

Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).

c. Changes in Stability Trends
Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.

d. Level Change
The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

Commented [H16]: Review by APA style

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	(26 – 84) (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
   Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English: Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Commented [H17]: Review by APA style

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the

Figure 5.
Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 2

Commented [H18]: Review by APA style

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Translate in English:

simplify the addition of the following

Figure 6.

Results of Student Work in the Baseline Phase 3

Commented [H19]: Review by APA style

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys *et al.*, 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)

The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan *et al.*, 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al.*, 2011).

In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).

Figure 7.
The Student Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Commented [H20]: Review by APA style

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number

Figure 9.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.

Figure 10.
Use of Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Figure 11.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer *et al*., 2002; Siegler *et al*., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as

operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana *et al.*, 2012; Reys *et al.*, 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Translate in English:

Simplify the addition of the following fractions that have different

Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal, the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the

multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer *et al.*, 2002; Fazio *et al.*, 2016; Khairunnisak *et al.*, 2012; Siegler *et al.*, 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey *et al.*, 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus, students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the

final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of

Figure 14.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan *et al.*, 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty *et al.*, 2011).

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and

Commented [H21]: should be supported with literature

does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Commented [H22]: Review by APA style

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

Permintaan untuk mengirimkan hasil cek plagiarism dan revisi ucapan terimakasih dalam bentuk artikel revisi kedua pada tanggal 20 Juni 2019.





Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The research method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) approach by using the context of pipettes. The research subject consisted of one deaf-mute-male student in seventh grade at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia who got handling in the learning process using IRME approach. The research subject was purposively chosen based on the character of a research subject who have difficulty in understanding the topic of the fraction. The research subject received eight treatments, three meetings for the baseline phase and five meetings for the intervention phase, during approximately two months. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design to describe the development of student who has special characteristic in the fraction learning process. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-21.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick et al., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin et al., 2007). Gottardis et al. (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler et al., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana et al., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012; Maulydia et al., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid et al., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al.,

2018; Warsito et al., 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito et al., 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito et al. (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio et al., 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. Single-subject research plays an important role in the development of evidence-based practice in special education (Horner et al., 2005). In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. The researcher designed the learning process in five meetings for the intervention phase, starting from the introduction of fraction using the pipette context until the implementation of the fraction to solve some daily life problem. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Participant

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

This research was carried out in eight meeting in the even semester of the 2018/2019 academic year for approximately two months at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia. In the first three meetings namely the baseline phase, the researcher gave a number of problems related to the topic of fraction to be solved by the student. In each meeting, the researcher only provides the explanation of how the question must be solved without providing assistance with how to solve it. The results of this phase are used as the basis for researchers in designing the learning activities that are implemented in the intervention phase. Furthermore, in the last five meetings namely intervention phase, the researcher implemented the learning activities that have been designed using the IRME approach and the pipette context. At the end of the learning process at each meeting, researchers provide problems that must be solved by student. The results obtained by students are used as a basis in the process of developing students' understanding of the topic taught namely fraction. In this research, the dependent variables are the understanding in fraction and learning outcome of student and the independent variable is IRME approach by using the pipette context.

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the lecturer as the validator. The validation process started with making a question form containing the indicators of mathematical understanding for the fraction. Each question made is developed based on the textbooks that student uses in school and the indicators designed by the researcher. Furthermore, the questions that have been made are validated by the lecturer qualitatively related to the construct and contents of the question. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Sunanto et al. (2005) stated that there are six phases in the analysis of circumstances. The first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are

used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period.

Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions (Sunanto et al., 2005). Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends
   Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.
e. Stability Level
   The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.
f. Level Change
   In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	 (=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable	Stable
6.	Level Change	24 – 28 26 – 24 (+2)	84 – 100 90 – 84 (+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions
   In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:
   a. Number of Variables
      The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.
   b. Change in Direction Tendency
      Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).
   c. Changes in Stability Trends
      Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.
   d. Level Change
      The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for

comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English:
Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the simplest form!

Figure 5.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys et al., 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)
   The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their

research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011).
In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).



Figure 7.
The Student's Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number line!

Figure 9.
Results of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.



Figure 10.
Student's Work using Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Translate in English:
Please, arrange in descending order of each following fractions:

Figure 11.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer et al., 2002; Siegler et al., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the

numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana et al., 2012; Reys et al., 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Translate in English:

Simplify the addition of the following fractions that have different denominator!

Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal,

the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 2016; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Siegler et al., 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus,

students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of the following fractions in order so that they form a certain pattern.

Figure 14.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011). However, the use of concrete materials alone, i.e. the context of pipette, does not guarantee successful acquisition of mathematical concepts (Brown et al., 2009). Sarama and Clements (2009) argue that the main weakness of the context manipulative is that students can act in a way that is personally meaningful but not meaningful in the field of mathematics. They found that virtual manipulatives offer a potential solution because there is a limited set of possible actions that students can

perform on them. An entirely different theoretical framework for understanding why realistic concrete materials may hinder learning: Realistic concrete materials may sometimes do too much of the work for learners (Martin, 2009). Finally, Brown et al. (2009) suggest that educators must clearly and consistently link the concrete materials with appropriate symbol systems. In order for knowledge to be transferred from concrete topics, students must understand that they do not learn about a new system isolated from mathematics; rather, they use the concrete materials to develop new knowledge and understanding of the symbol system in which they usually work.

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes. The small size of the research subject and the single subject research methodology are limitations to reduce the generalization of the research results. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the pipette context could be implemented in the class with randomly sampling with the big size of the research subject, so that that the result could be generalized. On the other hands, the researcher suggests that another researcher can develop the learning activities using another context to help the deaf-mute students in learning another topic in mathematics.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion, especially to Drs. Sunaryo, M.Pd., and Drs. Abdul Taram, M.Si., as the validator for our research instruments and also Uswatun Khasanah S.Si., M.Sc., as the head of mathematics education department who support this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Brown, M.C., McNeil, N.M., & Glenberg, A.M. (2009). Using concreteness in education: Real problems, potential solutions. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 160-164.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Horner, R.H., Carr, E.G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional children, 71*(2), 165-179.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Martin, T. (2009). A theory of physically distributed learning: How external environments and internal states interact in mathematics learning. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 140-144.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Sarama, J., & Clements, D.H. (2009). "Concrete" computer manipulatives in mathematics education. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 145-150.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Sunanto, J., Takeuchi, K., & Nakata, H. (2005). *Introduction to Research with Single Subjects*. University of Tsukuba: Center for Research on International Cooperation in Education Develpment (CRIED).

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

ID 576234 - JEGYS - Jannah & Prahmana - Revise 1

By Prahmana & Jannah

WORD COUNT	6008	TIME SUBMITTED	20-JUN-2019 03:08PM
		PAPER ID	48057799

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The research method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) approach by using the context of pipettes. The research subject consisted of one deaf-mute-male student in seventh grade at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia who got handling in the learning process using IRME approach. The research subject was purposively chosen based on the character of a research subject who have difficulty in understanding the topic of the fraction. The research subject received eight treatments, three meetings for the baseline phase and five meetings for the intervention phase, during approximately two months. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design to describe the development of student who has special characteristic in the fraction learning process. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, *7*(2), 1-21. *DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick et al., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Luckner & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin et al., 2007). Gottardis et al. (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler et al., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana et al., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012; Maulydia et al., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid et al., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al.,

2018; Warsito et al., 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito et al., 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito et al. (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio et al., 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. Single-subject research plays an important role in the development of evidence-based practice in special education (Horner et al., 2005). In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. The researcher designed the learning process in five meetings for the intervention phase, starting from the introduction of fraction using the pipette context until the implementation of the fraction to solve some daily life problem. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Participant

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

This research was carried out in eight meeting in the even semester of the 2018/2019 academic year for approximately two months at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia. In the first three meetings namely the baseline phase, the researcher gave a number of problems related to the topic of fraction to be solved by the student. In each meeting, the researcher only provides the explanation of how the question must be solved without providing assistance with how to solve it. The results of this phase are used as the basis for researchers in designing the learning activities that are implemented in the intervention phase. Furthermore, in the last five meetings namely intervention phase, the researcher implemented the learning activities that have been designed using the IRME approach and the pipette context. At the end of the learning process at each meeting, researchers provide problems that must be solved by student. The results obtained by students are used as a basis in the process of developing students' understanding of the topic taught namely fraction. In this research, the dependent variables are the understanding in fraction and learning outcome of student and the independent variable is IRME approach by using the pipette context.

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the lecturer as the validator. The validation process started with making a question form containing the indicators of mathematical understanding for the fraction. Each question made is developed based on the textbooks that student uses in school and the indicators designed by the researcher. Furthermore, the questions that have been made are validated by the lecturer qualitatively related to the construct and contents of the question. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Sunanto et al. (2005) stated that there are six phases in the analysis of circumstances. The first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are

used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period.

Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions (Sunanto et al., 2005). Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.

Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



22

Figure 1.

The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper lim30nd lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data poi21 that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends
   Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.
e. Stability Level
   The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.
f. Level Change
   In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency	↘	→
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	↘	→
5.	Stability Level	(=) Stable	(=) Stable
6.	Level Change	24 – 28 26 – 24 (+2)	84 – 100 90 – 84 (+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions

In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:

a. Number of Variables

The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.

b. Change in Direction Tendency

Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).

c. Changes in Stability Trends

Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency or stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.

d. Level Change

The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for

comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap

The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.

Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	(26 – 84) (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)

   Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Figure 4.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Figure 5.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys et al., 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)

The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their

research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011).
In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).



Figure 7.
The Student's Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number line!

Figure 9.
Results of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.

Figure 10.
Student's Work using Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Figure 11.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of t14 different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multip4 from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer et al., 2002; Siegler et al., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value 7tained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the

numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana et al., 2012; Reys et al., 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal,

the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 2016; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Siegler et al., 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus,

students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of the following fractions in order so that they form a certain pattern.

Figure 14.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequent fractions (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Sharty et al., 2011). However, the use of concrete materials alone, i.e. the context of pipette, does not guarantee successful acquisition of mathematical concepts (Brown et al., 2009). Sarama and Clements (2009) argue that the main weakness of the context manipulative is that students can act in a way that is personally meaningful but not meaningful in the field of mathematics. They found that virtual manipulatives offer a potential solution because there is a limited set of possible actions that students can

perform on them. An entirely different theoretical framework for understanding why realistic concrete materials may hinder learning: Realistic concrete materials may sometimes do too much of the work for learners (Martin, 2009). Finally, Brown et al. (2009) suggest that educators must clearly and consistently link the concrete materials with appropriate symbol systems. In order for knowledge to be transferred from concrete topics, students must understand that they do not learn about a new system isolated from mathematics; rather, they use the concrete materials to develop new knowledge and understanding of the symbol system in which they usually work.

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes. The small size of the research subject and the single subject research methodology are limitations to reduce the generalization of the research results. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the pipette context could be implemented in the class with randomly sampling with the big size of the research subject, so that that the result could be generalized. On the other hands, the researcher suggests that another researcher can develop the learning activities using another context to help the deaf-mute students in learning another topic in mathematics.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion, especially to Drs. Sunaryo, M.Pd., and Drs. Abdul Taram, M.Si., as the validator for our research instruments and also Uswatun Khasanah S.Si., M.Sc., as the head of mathematics education department who support this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Brown, M.C., McNeil, N.M., & Glenberg, A.M. (2009). Using concreteness in education: Real problems, potential solutions. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 160-164.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed).* New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International, 13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Horner, R.H., Carr, E.G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional children, 71*(2), 165-179.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science, 31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Martin, T. (2009). A theory of physically distributed learning: How external environments and internal states interact in mathematics learning. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 140-144.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf, 143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation.* Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Sarama, J., & Clements, D.H. (2009). "Concrete" computer manipulatives in mathematics education. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 145-150.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Sunanto, J., Takeuchi, K., & Nakata, H. (2005). *Introduction to Research with Single Subjects*. University of Tsukuba: Center for Research on International Cooperation in Education Develpment (CRIED).

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

ID 576234 - JEGYS - Jannah & Prahmana - Revise 1

ORIGINALITY REPORT

13%

SIMILARITY INDEX

PRIMARY SOURCES

1	cognitrn.psych.indiana.edu Internet	74 words — 1%
2	www3.nd.edu Internet	52 words — 1%
3	www.jegys.org Internet	48 words — 1%
4	"International Handbook of Mathematical Learning Difficulties", Springer Nature, 2019 Crossref	33 words — 1%
5	Terezinha Nunes. "Chapter 42-2 Deaf Children, Special Needs, and Mathematics Learning", Springer Science and Business Media LLC, 2018 Crossref	32 words — 1%
6	us.sagepub.com Internet	31 words — 1%
7	ejournal.unsri.ac.id Internet	27 words — 1%
8	journals.sagepub.com Internet	25 words — < 1%
9	www.mdpi.com Internet	23 words — < 1%
10	www.gplra.org Internet	22 words — < 1%
11	Andriyani, M Maulana. "Cubaritme in the trajectory learning of multiplication concept", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019 Crossref	22 words — < 1%
12	www.dare2ski.com Internet	21 words — < 1%
13	pdfs.semanticscholar.org Internet	18 words — < 1%
14	R I I Putri, M S Gunawan, Zulkardi. "Addition of fraction in	

	swimming context", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2017 Crossref	16 words — < 1 %
15	arizona.openrepository.com Internet	16 words — < 1%
16	unipasby.ac.id Internet	16 words — < 1%
17	P. J. Schloss. "Guidelines for Teachers' Interpretations of Student Performance Data", Remedial and Special Education, 07/01/1984 Crossref	15 words — < 1%
18	R Anggraini, Somakim, Hapizah. " Students' understanding of logarithms using the growth of context ", Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2019 Crossref	14 words — < 1%
19	docplayer.net Internet	11 words — < 1%
20	digitalcommons.liberty.edu Internet	9 words — < 1%
21	Erin E. G. Lundblom, Juliann J. Woods. "Working in the Classroom", Communication Disorders Quarterly, 2012 Crossref	9 words — < 1%
22	Philip D. Nordness, Ann Haverkost, Annette Volberding. "An Examination of Hand-Held Computer-Assisted Instruction on Subtraction Skills for Second Grade Students with Learning and Behavioral Disabilities", Journal of Special Education Technology, 2011 Crossref	9 words — < 1%
23	media.neliti.com Internet	9 words — < 1%
24	pubs.sciepub.com Internet	9 words — < 1%
25	slam.uconn.edu Internet	9 words — < 1%
26	earli.org Internet	9 words — < 1%
27	"Global Learning in the 21st Century", Springer Nature, 2016 Crossref	8 words — < 1%

28	digilib.gmu.edu Internet	8 words — < 1%
29	B, Bustang, Zulkardi Z, Darmawijoyo D, Maarten Dolk, and Dolly Van Eerde. "Developing a Local Instruction Theory for Learning the Concept of Angle through Visual Field Activities and Spatial Representations", International Education Studies, 2013. Crossref	8 words — < 1%
30	scholarcommons.usf.edu Internet	8 words — < 1%
31	Der-Ching Yang. "A Study of the Performance of 5th Graders in Number Sense and its Relationship to Achievement in Mathematics", International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education, 12/2008 Crossref	8 words — < 1%
32	R. I. I. Putri, Zulkardi. "Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory", AIP Publishing, 2017 Crossref	8 words — < 1%
33	dspace.lboro.ac.uk Internet	8 words — < 1%
34	kefdergi.kastamonu.edu.tr Internet	8 words — < 1%
35	"Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education", Springer Nature, 2014 Crossref	7 words — < 1%
36	Megan C. Brown. "Using Concreteness in Education: Real Problems, Potential Solutions", Child Development Perspectives, 12/2009 Crossref	6 words — < 1%
37	Shulha Kynanda Putri, Hasratuddin Hasratuddin, Edi Syahputra. "Development of Learning Devices Based on Realistic Mathematics Education to Improve Students' Spatial Ability and Motivation", International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 2019 Crossref	6 words — < 1%

EXCLUDE QUOTES OFF
EXCLUDE BIBLIOGRAPHY ON
EXCLUDE MATCHES OFF

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 1-21, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 30 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The research method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) approach by using the context of pipettes. The research subject consisted of one deaf-mute-male student in seventh grade at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia who got handling in the learning process using IRME approach. The research subject was purposively chosen based on the character of a research subject who have difficulty in understanding the topic of the fraction. The research subject received eight treatments, three meetings for the baseline phase and five meetings for the intervention phase, during approximately two months. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design to describe the development of student who has special characteristic in the fraction learning process. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student.

Keywords:
Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 1-21.*DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.2019.xx*

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick et al., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin et al., 2007). Gottardis et al. (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler et al., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana et al., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012; Maulydia et al., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid et al., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al.,

2018; Warsito et al., 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito et al., 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito et al. (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio et al., 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. Single-subject research plays an important role in the development of evidence-based practice in special education (Horner et al., 2005). In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. The researcher designed the learning process in five meetings for the intervention phase, starting from the introduction of fraction using the pipette context until the implementation of the fraction to solve some daily life problem. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Participant

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

This research was carried out in eight meeting in the even semester of the 2018/2019 academic year for approximately two months at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia. In the first three meetings namely the baseline phase, the researcher gave a number of problems related to the topic of fraction to be solved by the student. In each meeting, the researcher only provides the explanation of how the question must be solved without providing assistance with how to solve it. The results of this phase are used as the basis for researchers in designing the learning activities that are implemented in the intervention phase. Furthermore, in the last five meetings namely intervention phase, the researcher implemented the learning activities that have been designed using the IRME approach and the pipette context. At the end of the learning process at each meeting, researchers provide problems that must be solved by student. The results obtained by students are used as a basis in the process of developing students' understanding of the topic taught namely fraction. In this research, the dependent variables are the understanding in fraction and learning outcome of student and the independent variable is IRME approach by using the pipette context.

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the lecturer as the validator. The validation process started with making a question form containing the indicators of mathematical understanding for the fraction. Each question made is developed based on the textbooks that student uses in school and the indicators designed by the researcher. Furthermore, the questions that have been made are validated by the lecturer qualitatively related to the construct and contents of the question. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Sunanto et al. (2005) stated that there are six phases in the analysis of circumstances. The first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are

used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period.

Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions (Sunanto et al., 2005). Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends
   Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.
e. Stability Level
   The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.
f. Level Change
   In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	 (=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable	Stable
6.	Level Change	24 – 28 26 – 24 (+2)	84 – 100 90 – 84 (+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions
   In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:
   a. Number of Variables
      The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.
   b. Change in Direction Tendency
      Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).
   c. Changes in Stability Trends
      Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.
   d. Level Change
      The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for

comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English:
Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the simplest form!

Figure 5.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys et al., 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)
   The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their

research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011).
In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).



Figure 7.
The Student's Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number line!

Figure 9.
Results of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.



Figure 10.
Student's Work using Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.



Translate in English:
Please, arrange in descending order of each following fractions:

Figure 11.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer et al., 2002; Siegler et al., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the

numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana et al., 2012; Reys et al., 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Translate in English:

Simplify the addition of the following fractions that have different denominator!

Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal,

the students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 2016; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Siegler et al., 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus,

students experience errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of the following fractions in order so that they form a certain pattern.

Figure 14.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011). However, the use of concrete materials alone, i.e. the context of pipette, does not guarantee successful acquisition of mathematical concepts (Brown et al., 2009). Sarama and Clements (2009) argue that the main weakness of the context manipulative is that students can act in a way that is personally meaningful but not meaningful in the field of mathematics. They found that virtual manipulatives offer a potential solution because there is a limited set of possible actions that students can

perform on them. An entirely different theoretical framework for understanding why realistic concrete materials may hinder learning: Realistic concrete materials may sometimes do too much of the work for learners (Martin, 2009). Finally, Brown et al. (2009) suggest that educators must clearly and consistently link the concrete materials with appropriate symbol systems. In order for knowledge to be transferred from concrete topics, students must understand that they do not learn about a new system isolated from mathematics; rather, they use the concrete materials to develop new knowledge and understanding of the symbol system in which they usually work.

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes. The small size of the research subject and the single subject research methodology are limitations to reduce the generalization of the research results. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the pipette context could be implemented in the class with randomly sampling with the big size of the research subject, so that that the result could be generalized. On the other hands, the researcher suggests that another researcher can develop the learning activities using another context to help the deaf-mute students in learning another topic in mathematics.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion, especially to Drs. Sunaryo, M.Pd., and Drs. Aris Thobirin, M.Si., as the validator for our research instruments and also Uswatun Khasanah S.Si., M.Sc., as the head of mathematics education department who support this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Brown, M.C., McNeil, N.M., & Glenberg, A.M. (2009). Using concreteness in education: Real problems, potential solutions. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 160-164.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth- and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Horner, R.H., Carr, E.G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional children, 71*(2), 165-179.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Martin, T. (2009). A theory of physically distributed learning: How external environments and internal states interact in mathematics learning. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 140-144.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Sarama, J., & Clements, D.H. (2009). "Concrete" computer manipulatives in mathematics education. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 145-150.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Sunanto, J., Takeuchi, K., & Nakata, H. (2005). *Introduction to Research with Single Subjects*. University of Tsukuba: Center for Research on International Cooperation in Education Develpment (CRIED).

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

Artikel diterima dan permintaan pembayaran publication fee pada tanggal 21 Juni 2019



Gmail editorjegys@gmail.com

Compose

Inbox 407
Starred
Snoozed
Sent
Drafts
Academia dan Res... 19
IConProCS 204
Notes
Publons 2
Rejected Email
Research Gate 38
Sejarah Matematik... 24
More

Meet
New meeting
My meetings

Hangouts
Rully
No recent chats
Start a new one

3 of 4

Publication fee Inbox ×

Editor JEGYS <editorjegys@gmail.com>
to me

Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 3:12 PM

Finished your publication process

100 $
Dollar Account
Bank Name: İşbank, Florya Branch, Istanbul-TURKEY
My name : Hasan Said TORTOP
Swift Code: ISBKTRIS
IBAN: TR45 0006 4000 0023 3000 7063 18

Best regards

–
Best regards

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS)
Assoc. Prof. Hasan Said TORTOP
Editor of the JEGYS
Web Site: http://dergipark.gov.tr/jegys.
Twitter Account: https://twitter.com/editorjegys
Facebook Account: https://www.facebook.com/editorjegys

Pengajuan waiver author berdasarkan informasi di website jurnal pada tanggal 21 Juni 2019



Gmail editorjegys@gmail.com

Compose

Inbox 407
Starred
Snoozed
Sent
Drafts
Academia dan Res... 19
IConProCS 204
Notes
Publons 2
Rejected Email
Research Gate 38
Sejarah Matematik... 24
More

Meet
New meeting
My meetings

Hangouts
Rully
No recent chats
Start a new one

2 of 4

Re: Publication fee Inbox ×

Rully Indra <rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id>
to Editor, hasansaidfen

Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 5:49 PM

Dear Editor of Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists,

Wishing you beautiful days with good health and happiness.
Firstly, we would like to say many thanks for your positive email regarding the result of our submission paper. Furthermore, based on the information written on this link, https://dergipark.org.tr/jegys/writing-rules, especially in **"Fees and Charges"** section. We found a sentence like this:

Fees and Charges

Authors are not required to pay any for a handling fee, for editing or something else.

We understand this sentence as a statement which states that the Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists does not apply a publication fee policy for Authors. It's one of our reason why we really hope our paper could be published in your journal because our research doesn't have funding or sponsor, especially for publication fee. We do it all the research process by ourselves. Therefore, we are writing to ask about the policy for our publication fee respectfully. Based on the existing regulation or procedure in your journal stated in this link, https://dergipark.org.tr/jegys/writing-rules, is it possible for our paper to be exempt from the publication fee, but it could still be published in your journal? Instead, I am willing to be a reviewer in your journal and review several papers that you assign to me. My expertise is in mathematics education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, and design research. For more details about my publication, please check in https://www.scopus.com/authid/detail.uri?authorId=57192302745.

We really hope that our paper would be published in your journal after several phases during the couple week ago. Thank you very much for your help, and we do really appreciate it.

Best wishes,
Dr. Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana

On Fri, Jun 21, 2019 at 3:12 PM Editor JEGYS <editorjegys@gmail.com> wrote:

Finished your publication process

100 $
Dollar Account
Bank Name: İşbank, Florya Branch, Istanbul-TURKEY
My name : Hasan Said TORTOP
Swift Code: ISBKTRIS
IBAN: TR45 0006 4000 0023 3000 7063 18

Best regards

--
Best regards

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists (JEGYS)
Assoc. Prof. Hasan Said TORTOP
Editor of the JEGYS
Web Site: http://dergipark.gov.tr/jegys
Twitter Account: https://twitter.com/editorjegys
Facebook Account: https://www.facebook.com/editorjegys

Editor JEGYS <editorjegys@gmail.com> Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 7:29 PM
to me

dear author
Our journal (JEGYS) indexed in SCOPUS since June 2019, and then a lot of articles has been submitted, so we decided that Article Processing Charge. I've forgot to erase this stmatent "Authors are not required to pay any for a handling fee, for editing or something else." but we take 100 $ for processing and publication.
for your kindly message
After submission, I introduce authors for APS fee

I will publish your article, I want to happy, if you pay. İf you cant pay fee, doesnt matter this time. 😉

Rully Indra <rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id> Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 8:07 PM
to Editor

Dear the kind Editor,

Thank you very much for your help and appreciation for our paper to be published in your journal, although, we can't pay the publication fee. I do really appreciate it.
Once again, many thanks for all your help regarding this matter.

Regards,
Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana

Editor JEGYS <editorjegys@gmail.com> Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 8:09 PM
to me

Ok did you plagiarism report?

21 Haz 2019 Cum, saat 16:08 tarihinde Rully Indra <rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id> şunu yazdı:

Rully Indra <rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id> Fri, Jun 21, 2019, 8:22 PM
to Editor

Dear the kind Editor,

Herewith, I attached our plagiarism report by using iThenticate. I also already send the report to Dr. Hasan Said TORTOP using DergiPark Journal System. The result of our similarity check is 13%. We really hope the result could fulfill the requirement of your journal, namely Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists. Once again, thank you very much for your cooperation and help. We do really appreciate it.

Regards,
Rully Charitas Indra Prahmana

Artikel terbit pada tanggal 27 Juni 2019

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists

Year 2019, Volume 7 , Issue 2, Pages 299 - 321 2019-06-27

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH [1], Rully Charitas İndra PRAHMANA [2]

https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.576234

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) Approach by using the context of pipettes. Data collection techniques used are video recordings, documentation, and written data. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student. All intervention and student's strategy in learning process would be described in this paper.

Keywords

Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

References

- Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. A Journal of Mathematics, 7(3), 247-264.
- Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. International Online Journal of Educational Sciences, 10(4), 88-106.
- Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.
- Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48(2), 139-146.
- Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth-and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33(2), 111-144.
- Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Research in Learning Mathematics.
- Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. PloS One, 11(10), e0165243.
- Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188(1), 012031.
- Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed). New York: Megraw-Hill.
- Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21(2), 36-40.
- Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. Deafness & Education International, 13(3), 131-150.
- Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2 (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.
- Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction, 9(1), 81–103.
- Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. Journal on Mathematics Education, 3(1), 71-86.
- Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14(4), 409-421.
- Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. Instructional Science, 31(4-5), 277-298.
- Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. American Journal of Educational Research, 6(11), 1473-1480.
- Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. American Annals of the Deaf, 148(3), 251-258.
- Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education, 3(2), 2965-2971.
- Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 26(2), 109-119.
- Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. Journal of Education and Learning, 7(2), 12-20.
- Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. European Journal of Special Education Research, 2(2), 89-104.
- Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. Journal on Mathematics Education, 9(1), 69-80.
- Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.
- Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. American Annals of the Deaf, 143(1), 22-28.
- Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. Doctoral Dissertation. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Authors of the Article

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH [1]

Rully Charitas İndra PRAHMANA [2]

- Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. Journal on Mathematics Education, 5(1), 17-26.
- Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. Journal on Mathematics Education, 3(2), 115-132.
- Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868(1), 050005.
- Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. JASSI ANAKKU, 18(1), 55-61.
- Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). Helping Children Learn Mathematics. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. Journal on Mathematics Education, 9(1), 41-54.
- Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. Child Development, 78(2), 376-396.
- Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. Journal on Mathematics Education, 1(1), 11-16.
- Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students' learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. Journal on Mathematics Education, 2(2), 147-162.
- Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. Cognitive psychology, 62(4), 273-296.
- Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. Learning and Instruction, 14(5), 503-518.
- Thompson, J. (2010). The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180(1), 012110.

Details

Primary Language	en
Subjects	Education, Special
Journal Section	STEM Education
Authors	**Orcid:** 0000-0003-1284-2662 **Author:** Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH **Institution:** Universitas Ahmad Dahlan **Country:** Indonesia **Orcid:** 0000-0002-9406-689X **Author:** Rully Charitas İndra PRAHMANA **(Primary Author)** **Institution:** Universitas Ahmad Dahlan **Country:** Indonesia
Dates	**Publication Date :** June 27, 2019

Cite

Bibtex	`@research article { jegys576234, journal = {Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists}, issn = {}, eissn = {2149-360X}, address = {editorjegys@gmail.com}, publisher = {Genç Bilge Yayıncılık}, year = {2019}, volume = {7}, pages = {299 - 321}, doi = {10.17478/jegys.576234}, title = {Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student}, key = {cite}, author = {Jannah, Anisa Fatkhul and Prahmana, Rully Charitas İndra} }`
APA	Jannah, A , Prahmana, R . (2019). Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student . Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists , 7 (2) , 299-321 . DOI: 10.17478/jegys.576234
MLA	Jannah, A , Prahmana, R . "Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student" . Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists 7 (2019): 299-321 <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/jegys/issue/45717/576234>
Chicago	Jannah, A , Prahmana, R . "Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student". Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists 7 (2019): 299-321
RIS	TY - JOUR T1 - Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student AU - Anisa Fatkhul Jannah , Rully Charitas İndra Prahmana Y1 - 2019 PY - 2019 N1 - doi: 10.17478/jegys.576234 DO - 10.17478/jegys.576234 T2 - Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists JF - Journal JO - JOR SP - 299 EP - 321 VL - 7 IS - 2 SN - -2149-360X M3 - doi: 10.17478/jegys.576234 UR - https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.576234 Y2 - 2019 ER -
EndNote	%0 Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student %A Anisa Fatkhul Jannah , Rully Charitas İndra Prahmana %T Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student %D 2019 %J Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists %P -2149-360X %V 7 %N 2 %R doi: 10.17478/jegys.576234 %U 10.17478/jegys.576234
ISNAD	Jannah, Anisa Fatkhul , Prahmana, Rully Charitas İndra . "Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student". Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists 7 / 2 (June 2019): 299-321 . https://doi.org/10.17478/jegys.576234
AMA	Jannah A , Prahmana R . Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student. JEGYS. 2019; 7(2): 299-321.
Vancouver	Jannah A , Prahmana R . Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student. Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists. 2019; 7(2): 299-321.
IEEE	A. Jannah and R. Prahmana , "Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student", *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 299-321, Jun. 2019, doi:10.17478/jegys.576234

Full Text File (703) Full Text File (703)

Artikel terbit di Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, Vol. 7 No. 2, 299-321

[DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.576234]

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7(2), 299-321, June 2019
e-ISSN: 2149- 360X
http://jegys.org

Research Article

Learning Fraction using the Context of Pipettes for Seventh-Grade Deaf-Mute Student

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH[1] & Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA[2]

Received: 11 June 2019 **Accepted:** 21 June 2019

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The research method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) approach by using the context of pipettes. The research subject consisted of one deaf-mute-male student in seventh grade at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia who got handling in the learning process using IRME approach. The research subject was purposively chosen based on the character of a research subject who have difficulty in understanding the topic of the fraction. The research subject received eight treatments, three meetings for the baseline phase and five meetings for the intervention phase, during approximately two months. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design to describe the development of student who has special characteristic in the fraction learning process. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student.

Keywords:
Indonesia realistic mathematics education approach, deaf-mute student, fraction, single subject research

To cite this article:

Jannah, A.F., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student. *Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists, 7*(2), 299-321. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.17478/jegys.576234

[1] Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com/ORCID No: 0000-0003-1284-2662.
[2] Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia, E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id (Corresponding author)/ORCID No: 0000-0002-9406-689X.

Introduction

One of the physical abnormalities in children is deafness that has barriers in communication because of weak hearing, resulting in limited mastery of language and knowledge (Cole & Flexer, 2015; Schick et al., 2007). Several indicators show that a child experiences hearing problems, namely not responding when spoken to, cannot speak clearly, often presses the ear, requests that the information conveyed be repeated, and the ability to speak very slowly (Thompson, 2010). Therefore, deaf student educators must be explicitly aware of the child's ability factors (Lang & Steely, 2003; Kritzer, 2009; Colin et al., 2007). Gottardis et al. (2011) argues that deaf students lag behind their hearing peers in mathematics. Thus, there needs to be increased attention and encouragement to reform mathematics in deaf education (Pagliaro, 1998; Adler et al., 2014). On the other hands, it is of great importance that deaf children have adequate access to mathematical thinking, but unfortunately, most deaf children show a severe delay in mathematics learning that has been persistent over many years (Nunes, 2014). So, deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which results in lagging behind their hearing peers in learning mathematics.

Realistic Mathematics Education (RME) has long been developed in the Netherlands in 1970 by the Freudenthal Institute which is a mathematics learning approach (Gravemeijer, 2008; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012). RME began to be applied in Indonesia in 2001 as PMRI (*Pendidikan Matematika Realistik Indonesia*) or Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) (Sembiring, 2010; Prahmana et al., 2012). IRME starts from the context (real experience) in everyday life by students towards formal mathematics of student knowledge (Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al., 2018; Karaca & Özkaya, 2017). The implementation of IRME can change mathematics learning to be more meaningful and enjoyable (Lestari et al., 2018; Prahmana et al., 2012; Maulydia et al., 2017). Therefore, the realistic mathematics education approach can transform mathematics learning into more meaningful and enjoyable through the context of daily life that is transformed into mathematical problems.

One of the mathematical problems that can be transformed in everyday life is the concept of fractions. Fractions are the essential subject matter to learn (Misquitta, 2011; Gabriel, 2016; Mujahid et al., 2017; Avcu, 2018). However, many students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). On the other hand, the deaf students have difficulty understanding the concept of fractions in the mathematics learning process (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011; Mousley & Kelly, 2018). In line with the above problems, through the application of IRME, students can gradually understand the concept of fractions (Nasution et al., 2018; Saleh et al.,

2018; Warsito et al., 2019). Therefore, the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education approach can be applied to learning fraction for deaf-mute students.

Fractions involve complex problems for students (Warsito et al., 2019; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). The implementation of Single Subject Research (SSR) can describe the increase in fractional counting operations for fifth grade deaf students through realistic mathematics approach (Ramadhani & Tarsidi, 2017). In line with that, Warsito et al. (2019) state that with realistic mathematics learning principles, context becomes an integral part of embedding the concept of fractions. Understanding fractions is a fundamental mathematical skill, so students need to know where the fractions are in the number line (Mousley & Kelly, 2018; Fazio et al., 2016; Fitri & Prahmana, 2019). Seeing many researchers who apply realistic learning, the use of pipette contexts can make it easier for deaf-mute students to understand the concept of fractions on a number line.

Method

This type of research used the descriptive analysis with the Single Subject Research (SSR) research method which aims to determine the development of class VII deaf-mute student in fractional material. Single-subject research plays an important role in the development of evidence-based practice in special education (Horner et al., 2005). In this study of research used the A-B design. The first condition was called baseline (A), the subjects were assessed at several sessions until they appeared stable without intervention, after the baseline condition (A) stabilized the intervention condition (B) began to be applied within a certain period of time until the data was stable (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009).

This study uses the pipette context by implementing a realistic mathematics education approach to determine the role of context in the introduction of the concept of fractions in deaf-mute students. The researcher designed the learning process in five meetings for the intervention phase, starting from the introduction of fraction using the pipette context until the implementation of the fraction to solve some daily life problem. Furthermore, the researcher used the SSR research method to describe the development of students who possessed these characteristics in the fraction learning process.

Participant

The research subject of this study was one of the seventh-grade deaf-mute students as a single subject. The student has difficulty understanding the fraction material. He is a deaf-mute student who has limited communication and knowledge, which result in his limitations in learning mathematics. Typically, he is a seventh-grade student. This research was conducted at Public Special School in Bantul, Indonesia.

Data Collection

This research was carried out in eight meeting in the even semester of the 2018/2019 academic year for approximately two months at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia. In the first three meetings namely the baseline phase, the researcher gave a number of problems related to the topic of fraction to be solved by the student. In each meeting, the researcher only provides the explanation of how the question must be solved without providing assistance with how to solve it. The results of this phase are used as the basis for researchers in designing the learning activities that are implemented in the intervention phase. Furthermore, in the last five meetings namely intervention phase, the researcher implemented the learning activities that have been designed using the IRME approach and the pipette context. At the end of the learning process at each meeting, researchers provide problems that must be solved by student. The results obtained by students are used as a basis in the process of developing students' understanding of the topic taught namely fraction. In this research, the dependent variables are the understanding in fraction and learning outcome of student and the independent variable is IRME approach by using the pipette context.

The data collection techniques of these studies are video recordings, documentation, and written tests (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). The instruments used are based on data collection techniques, namely videos, photos, and written student test sheets. The video is used to describe learning activities at the intervention phase and when students work on the questions given by the researcher. Photos are used to document the learning process taking place, and the results of students' written tests are evidence in conducting research and as the material for analysis. The students' written test sheet contains the students' answer in solving the questions given by the researcher with each item validated by the lecturer as the validator. The validation process started with making a question form containing the indicators of mathematical understanding for the fraction. Each question made is developed based on the textbooks that student uses in school and the indicators designed by the researcher. Furthermore, the questions that have been made are validated by the lecturer qualitatively related to the construct and contents of the question. This instrument is used to see the effects that occur after the research is conducted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis technique uses analysis in conditions and between conditions, with A-B research design (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2009). Sunanto et al. (2005) stated that there are six phases in the analysis of circumstances. The first is the length of the term stating the number of sessions or meetings conducted during the study in the baseline phase and intervention. Second, the direct tendency is used to see the description of the behavior of the subject being studied. Third, stability trends are

used to know the stability of each phase. The researcher used a stability tendency of 15%. Fourth, data traces or trend traces in each measurement phase are used to see whether the data can be said to decrease (-), up (+) or flat (=). Fifth, stability and range levels are used to see how large or small the range of data groups are in the baseline phase or intervention. Sixth, changes in level indicate the magnitude of data changes in one period.

Furthermore, the analysis between conditions is almost the same as analysis in conditions (Sunanto et al., 2005). Both of them discussed the same thing. First, the number of variables changed, namely the number of dependent variables in the study. Second one changes in the direction and effect tendencies can take the data in the analysis under conditions. Third one changes in the tendency of stability from the baseline phase to the intervention, namely to see phase changes before or after the intervention based on the analysis in the condition. Fourth, level changes are used to see changes that occur based on the difference in data points. Fifth, the overlap percentage is used to see the effect of the intervention on changes that are better or worse by the target behavior.

Results and Discussion

This research was conducted for eight days, in the baseline phase, there were three sessions, and the intervention phase was done in 5 sessions. The time or duration of the implementation of the intervention phase measurement is different for each course, according to the conditions of the student. The dependent variable in this study is the ability of the student to solve problems related to fractions. Furthermore, the independent variable is the use of the pipette context to see student learning outcomes. The student learning outcomes in this study are in Table 1.

Table 1.
Student Result

Phase	Implementation Date	Score
Baseline (A)	19 March 2019	24
	20 March 2019	28
	21 March 2019	26
Intervention (B)	25 March 2019	84
	26 March 2019	84
	27 March 2019	100
	01 April 2019	84
	02 April 2019	90

Table 1 shows the measurement of scores obtained by students in solving problems in fractions. It is seen that in the initial condition or baseline phase, the score received is deficient, while in the intervention phase, it increases, as presented in graphical form in Figure 1.



Figure 1.
The Visual Data of Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

Furthermore, the data obtained is analyzed, namely:

1. The Analysis in Conditions
   a. Length of Condition
      Figure 1 shows a graph of student learning outcomes using A-B research design. The length of the measurement phase is three sessions for the baseline (A) and five sessions for intervention (B).
   b. Direction Tendency
      Figure 2 shows the direction trends obtained through the intersection of vertical lines that divide the same part in each phase with a graph (split-middle).



Figure 2.
Trends in Subject Direction

c. Stability Trends

The stability criteria used a stability tendency of 15% to determine the stability range, upper limit, and lower limit for each phase. The mean level, upper limit, and lower limit in the baseline phase and intervention phase. Figure 3 shows that the baseline phase data points are in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple) which is 3. The percentage of baseline phase data points that are in the range of stability is 100% then the data is declared stable. In the intervention phase there are four data points in the upper limit range (green) and the lower limit (purple). The percentage of intervention phase data points that are in the range of stability is 80% of the data is declared stable, because the range of data is at intervals of 80% - 100%.



Figure 3.
Mean Level, Upper Limit, and Lower Limit in the Baseline Phase and Intervention Phase

d. Data Trace or Trace Trends
   Both phases show a flat tendency due to improved but less visible changes.
e. Stability Level
   The calculation of the level of stability of the data can be seen in the calculation of stability trends. The data baseline phase is stable with a range of $24 - 28$ and the data intervention phase is stable with a range of $84 - 100$.
f. Level Change
   In the baseline phase there was a difference of 2, meaning a change and the intervention phase obtained by the difference of 6 also showed a change (improved). All components that have been calculated can be summarized as in Table 2.

Table 2.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results in Conditions

No	Condition or Phase	A1	B2
1.	Length of Condition	3	5
2.	Direction Tendency		
3.	Stability Trends	Stable (100%)	Stable (80%)
4.	Data Trace or Trace Trends	 (=)	(=)
5.	Stability Level	Stable	Stable
		24 – 28	84 – 100
6.	Level Change	26 – 24	90 – 84
		(+2)	(+6)

2. Visual Analysis between Conditions
   In this study an analysis was carried out between conditions by comparing the intervention phase (B) with the baseline phase (A), which is 2:1, which means that the code for the baseline phase is 1 and the intervention phase code is 2. There are several stages to analyze between conditions, namely:
   a. Number of Variables
      The variable that was changed in this study was an understanding of the concept of fraction of deaf-mute students in fractions. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one. In Table 3, the number 1 is written which means that the variable changed is only one.
   b. Change in Direction Tendency
      Changes in direction trends in the analysis between conditions can be determined by taking data from the analysis under conditions. Writing changes in direction trends similar to analysis in conditions, both of which have a good impact (+).
   c. Changes in Stability Trends
      Changes in the tendency of stability in the analysis between conditions can be determined by looking at the data on the tendency for stability of analysis in conditions. In this study the changes that occur from the baseline phase to the intervention phase are stable to stable.
   d. Level Change
      The last session data point of the baseline phase was 26 and the first session data point of the intervention phase was 84. Then disputed to obtain 58 for

comparison of conditions B:A. Sign (+) means experiencing an increase from the previous data.

e. Percentage of Overlap
The percentage of overlap of data in the comparison of the baseline phase and intervention phase is 0%. As a small percentage overlap, the better the influence of intervention on the target behavior. All components of data analysis between conditions can be summarized as in Table 3.

Table 3.
Summary of Visual Analysis Results between Conditions

No	Comparison of Conditions	B1/A1 (2:1)
1.	Number of Variables	1
2.	Change in Direction Tendency and Effect	(=) (=)
3.	Changes in Stability Trends	Stable to Stable
4.	Level Change	$(26 - 84)$ (+) 58
5.	Percentage of Overlap	0%

Based on the results of the research that has been carried out, there is an increase in the understanding of deaf students on fractional material using the pipette context. Changes that occur can be observed in the graphic image and summary analysis in Table 2 and Table 3, which includes visual analysis, analysis in conditions, and analysis between conditions in Figure 2 and Figure 3. To be clearer, researchers discuss the results of research in each phase, such as:

1. Baseline Phase (A)
Giving the baseline phase is carried out for three days. The baseline given to students is in the form of a written test sheet regarding fraction material. In the first session, the researcher instructed students to work on the problem, but students felt hesitant and not confident to work on the issue. Then the researcher gives direction about the matter, and students start working. The value obtained is shallow because students do not yet understand the concept of fractions related to different denominators, as seen in Figure 4.



Translate in English: Please, arrange in ascending order of each following fractions:

Figure 4.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 1

Furthermore, in the second session, the researchers instructed students to work on the questions again. Student grades start to increase because students have started to remember a little about the concept of the same denominator. This increase in value is not much; around 1-2 points. The information can be seen in Figure 5.



Translate in English:

Please, adding and writing in the simplest form!

Figure 5.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 2

In the third session, the students' grades declined; this was due to students not yet understanding the whole concept of fractions as in the first meeting. Measurements in the baseline phase obtained results, and the location of errors was almost the same. It shows that students experience difficulties in certain parts, namely in different denominators. Students can equate the denominator by changing all denominators in the form of least common multiple (LCM), but when operating the sum of fractions the numerator value has not been adjusted, as shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6.
Results of Student's Work in the Baseline Phase 3

The numerator adjustments that have not been done by these students, indicate the existence of prerequisites that students have not mastered before carrying out the operations of adding different fractions of the denominator. In order to study the sum of the mentioned fractions differently, there are several prerequisites that must be mastered by students, namely the sum of the same denominational fractions, fractions worth, and least common multiple (Misquitta, 2011; Pitsi, 2016; Reys et al., 2014).

2. Intervention Phase (B)
   The intervention phase was carried out for five days. Interventions given to students in the form of IRME approaches in fraction learning use the context of pipettes. This approach used is because several researcher documented their

research using IRME that can be improving the students' understanding in learning fraction (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011).
In the first session of the intervention phase, the researcher asks students to show a fraction. Then students show with a number line picture, however, there is a mistake in the concept of the equality fractions. Students have written number 1 in the number line, but students also write the fraction of number 1 which is 9/9 (Figure 7).



Figure 7.
The Student's Mistake in the Concept of the Equality Fractions in Number Line

Furthermore, researchers used pipettes as a medium in developing an understanding of fraction concepts, as seen in Figure 8. The pipette roles as a slide or arithmetic ruler and the bookmark roles as a point for writing the fractions. The use of pipettes is a mathematical model to emerging students' mathematical understanding from real to abstract.

Figure 8.
Use of the Pipette Context

Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheets that had been given. In the first session, students can work on the questions related to the number line. So that it can be said students begin to master the concept of fractions regarding number lines. It can be seen in Figure 9.



Translate in English:

draw the following fraction on the number line!

Figure 9.
Results of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 1

In the second session the researchers used fraction board media, as seen in Figure 10. Then the researcher gave a written test sheet to test how students understood the fraction learning.

Figure 10.
Student's Work using Fractional Rods

The results obtained show that students begin to understand the concept of fractions in sorting fractions, shown in Figure 11.

Translate in English:
Please, arrange in descending order of each following fractions:



Figure 11.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 2

Measuring the third session of the intervention phase, the researcher explained how to add different denominations to the denominator using the least common multiple. In order to obtain results from the sum of the different denominators of denominations, it must equate the denominator first by finding the least common multiple from the two denominators or fractions of value (Stafylidou & Vosniadou, 2004; Cramer et al., 2002; Siegler et al., 2011). Then the researcher instructed students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. The results obtained show that students can understand the explanation of the researcher well, so that the value obtained increases that can be seen in Figure 12.

Figure 12 shows that students have been able to solve the addition operations of two fractions that have different denominators. Students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator before doing the addition operation on the numerator. For the process of equating the denominator, students look for LCM from both denominator numbers and then do multiplication operations on the

numerator. The entire process of multiplication and addition in each question is able to be resolved properly, because students already have a good knowledge of number operations. The number operations is essential knowledge in solving several problem in learning mathematics, such as operation for fraction numbers (Prahmana et al., 2012; Reys et al., 2014; Prahmana & Suwasti, 2014).



Figure 12.
Results of Student Work in the Intervention Phase 3

In the fourth session the researcher gave a written test sheet to students to do as in the previous session, but the results obtained by students decreased. This is because students experience errors in calculating multiplication when equating the denominator. Thus, students are less precise when sorting fractions in descending order, as shown in Figure 13.

Figure 13 explains that students are able to carry out operations to equate the denominator process first. After all the denominators for each fraction are equal, the

students sort the numerator from the highest to the lowest. To find multiplier numbers so that the denominator is the same, students use LCM on all three denominators in each fraction. The result of the LCM, also as the multiplier number in the numerator. LCM is one of the best ways to solve fraction operations that have different denominators by using the its result as a multiplier number for the numerator and denominator of the fraction (Avcu, 2018; Cramer et al., 2002; Fazio et al., 2016; Khairunnisak et al., 2012; Siegler et al., 2011), especially for deaf-mute student (Markey et al., 2003; Misquitta, 2011).



Figure 13.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 4

Furthermore, giving the final intervention phase namely in the fifth session, the researcher instructed the students to work on the written test sheet as in the previous session. When students work on questions related to fractions of value, researchers ask students to include how to work on the question. But students feel confident and choose not to include ways to work on the problem. Thus, students experience

errors when calculating in forming a certain pattern in fraction sorting, as shown in Figure 14.

Figure 14 describes that students have been able to see the pattern of each numerator and denominator in fractions. It makes the results obtained at the final meeting better. The student is directly able to multiply each numerator and denominator with a number pattern that has been found before. However, in the last problem, the student has not been able to solve the problem completely, because of his confidant.



Translate in English:

Write three equality of rational numbers of each of the following fractions in order so that they form a certain pattern.

Figure 14.
Result of Student's Work in the Intervention Phase 5

The results obtained by students in the intervention phase, showed an understanding of the fraction concept after giving the context of the pipette and fraction board based on the IRME approach in fraction learning. Thus, the IRME approach is able to improve student learning outcomes in fraction material. In accordance with previous researchers that the use of the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Approach (IRME) has helped students understand the concept of sequential fractions (Fauzan et al., 2002; Putri & Zulkardi, 2017; Shanty et al., 2011). However, the use of concrete materials alone, i.e. the context of pipette, does not guarantee successful acquisition of mathematical concepts (Brown et al., 2009). Sarama and Clements (2009) argue that the main weakness of the context manipulative is that students can act in a way that is personally meaningful but not meaningful in the field of mathematics. They found that virtual manipulatives offer a potential solution because there is a limited set of possible actions that students can

perform on them. An entirely different theoretical framework for understanding why realistic concrete materials may hinder learning: Realistic concrete materials may sometimes do too much of the work for learners (Martin, 2009). Finally, Brown et al. (2009) suggest that educators must clearly and consistently link the concrete materials with appropriate symbol systems. In order for knowledge to be transferred from concrete topics, students must understand that they do not learn about a new system isolated from mathematics; rather, they use the concrete materials to develop new knowledge and understanding of the symbol system in which they usually work.

Conclusion

The role of the pipette context in the introduction of the concept of fractions can make it easier for deaf-mute student to solve a problem related to fractions. The development of deaf-mute students in fraction learning through the pipette context based on the PMRI approach can improve for his learning outcomes. The small size of the research subject and the single subject research methodology are limitations to reduce the generalization of the research results. Therefore, the researcher recommends that the pipette context could be implemented in the class with randomly sampling with the big size of the research subject, so that that the result could be generalized. On the other hands, the researcher suggests that another researcher can develop the learning activities using another context to help the deaf-mute students in learning another topic in mathematics.

Disclosure and Conflicts of Interest

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. This research is original work and does not contain any libelous or unlawful statements or infringe on the rights or privacy of others or contain material or instructions that might cause harm or injury.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion, especially to Drs. Sunaryo, M.Pd., and Drs. Aris Thobirin, M.Si., as the validator for our research instruments and also Uswatun Khasanah S.Si., M.Sc., as the head of mathematics education department who support this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

Biodata of the Authors

Anisa Fatkhul JANNAH, S.Pd. was born in Sragen, Indonesia. She is a fresh graduate with Cum Laude predicate from the Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Her research interests lie in the disabilities student, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education.

Affiliation: Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: anisasajalah95@gmail.com
Phone: +6282137702138

Dr. Rully Charitas Indra PRAHMANA was born in Medan, Indonesia. He is a Senior Lecturer and Researcher in Mathematics Education Department at Universitas Ahmad Dahlan (UAD). His research interests lie in the teacher and teacher education, mathematics education, higher education, Ethnomathematics, inclusion education, single subject research, realistic mathematics education, design research, and youth practices and their education.

Affiliation: Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
E-mail: rully.indra@mpmat.uad.ac.id
Phone: +6281287447886

References

Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., & Kusha, R. (2014). Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives. *A Journal of Mathematics*, *7*(3), 247-264.

Avcu, R. (2018). A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *10*(4), 88-106.

Brown, M.C., McNeil, N.M., & Glenberg, A.M. (2009). Using concreteness in education: Real problems, potential solutions. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 160-164.

Cole, E.B., & Flexer, C. (2015). *Children with Hearing Loss: Developing Listening and Talking, Birth to Six*. San Diego, CA: Plural Publishing.

Colin, S., Magnan, A., Ecalle, J., & Leybaert, J. (2007). Relation between deaf children's phonological skills in kindergarten and word recognition performance in first grade. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48*(2), 139-146.

Cramer, K.A., Post, T.R., & delMas, R.C. (2002). Initial fraction learning by fourth-and fifth-grade students: A comparison of the effects of using commercial curricula with the effects of using the rational number project curriculum. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 33*(2), 111-144.

Fauzan, A., Slettenhaar, D., & Plomp, T. (2002). Traditional mathematics education vs. realistic mathematics education: Hoping for changes. In *Proceedings of the 3rd International Mathematics Education and Society Conference* (pp. 1-4). Copenhagen, Denmark: Centre for Researh in Learning Mathematics.

Fazio, L.K., Kennedy, C.A., & Siegler, R.S. (2016). Improving children's knowledge of fraction magnitudes. *PloS One, 11*(10), e0165243.

Fitri, N.L., & Prahmana, R.C.I. (2019). Misconception in fraction for seventh-grade students. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1188*(1), 012031.

Fraenkel, J.R., & Wallen, N.E. (2009). *How To Design and Evaluate Research in Education (7th Ed)*. New York: Megraw-Hill.

Gabriel, F. (2016). Understanding magnitudes to understand fractions. *Australian Primary Mathematics Classroom, 21*(2), 36-40.

Gottardis, L., Nunes, T., & Lunt, I. (2011). A synthesis of research on deaf and hearing children's mathematical achievement. *Deafness & Education International*, *13*(3), 131-150.

Gravemeijer, K. (2008). RME theory and mathematics teacher education. In *The Handbook of Mathematics Teacher Education: Volume 2* (pp. 283-302). Leiden: Brill Sense.

Horner, R.H., Carr, E.G., Halle, J., McGee, G., Odom, S., & Wolery, M. (2005). The use of single-subject research to identify evidence-based practice in special education. *Exceptional children, 71*(2), 165-179.

Karaca, S.Y., & Özkaya, A. (2017). The effects of realistic mathematics education on students' math self reports in fifth grades mathematics course. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, *9*(1), 81–103.

Khairunnisak, C., Maghfirotun, S., & Junia, A.D. (2012). Supporting fifth graders in learning multiplication of fraction with whole number. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *3*(1), 71-86.

Kritzer, K.L. (2009). Barely started and already left behind: A descriptive analysis of the mathematics ability demonstrated by young deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education, 14*(4), 409-421.

Lang, G.H., & Steely, D. (2003). Web-based science instruction for deaf students: What research says to the teacher. *Instructional Science*, *31*(4-5), 277-298.

Lestari, S.A., Saragih, S., & Hasratuddin. (2018). Developing learning materials based on realistic mathematics education with malay culture context to improve mathematical communication ability and self-efficacy of students in SMPN 2 Talawi. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *6*(11), 1473-1480.

Markey, C., Power, D., & Booker, G. (2003). Using structured games to teach early fraction concepts to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. *American Annals of the Deaf, 148*(3), 251-258.

Martin, T. (2009). A theory of physically distributed learning: How external environments and internal states interact in mathematics learning. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 140-144.

Maulydia, S.S., Surya, E., & Syahputra, E. (2017). The development of mathematics teaching material through realistic mathematics education to increase mathematical problem solving of junior high school students. *International Journal of Advance Research and Innovative Ideas in Education*, *3*(2), 2965-2971.

Misquitta, R. (2011). A review of the literature: Fraction instruction for struggling learners in mathematics. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, *26*(2), 109-119.

Mousley, K., & Kelly, R.R. (2018). Developing deaf students fraction skills requires understanding magnitude and whole number division. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *7*(2), 12-20.

Mujahid, F.N., Choiri, A.S., & Sunardi. (2017). Single subject research: Increasing mathematics learning outcomes of the additive fractions using fractional block media toward students with visual impairment. *European Journal of Special Education Research*, *2*(2), 89-104.

Nasution, M.F., Putri, R.I., & Zulkardi. (2018). Rowing sport in learning fractions of the fourth grade students. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 69-80.

Nunes, T. (2014). Deaf children, special needs, and mathematics learning. In: Lerman S. (eds), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 141-143). Dordrecht: Springer.

Pagliaro, C.M. (1998). Mathematics reform in the education of deaf and hard of hearing students. *American Annals of the Deaf*, *143*(1), 22-28.

Pitsi, M.E. (2016). Identifying common misconceptions and associated errors the grade 9 learners make when adding and subtracting common fractions. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Johannesburg: University of Johannesburg.

Prahmana, R.C.I., & Suwasti, P. (2014). Local instruction theory on division in Mathematics GASING. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 5*(1), 17-26.

Prahmana, R.C.I., Zulkardi, & Hartono, Y. (2012). Learning multiplication using Indonesian traditional game in third grade. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 3*(2), 115-132.

Putri, R.I.I., & Zulkardi. (2017). Fraction in shot-put: A learning trajectory. *AIP Conference Proceedings, 1868*(1), 050005.

Ramadhani, T.H., & Tarsidi, I. (2017). The implementation of realistic mathematical approaches to improve fraction counting ability in class V SDLB for deaf students [in Bahasa]. *JASSI ANAKKU*, *18*(1), 55-61.

Reys, R., Lindquist, M., Lindquist, M.M., Lambdin, D.V., & Smith, N.L. (2014). *Helping Children Learn Mathematics*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.

Saleh, M., Prahmana, R.C.I., Isa, M., & Murni. (2018). Improving the reasoning ability of elementary school student through the Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *9*(1), 41-54.

Sarama, J., & Clements, D.H. (2009). "Concrete" computer manipulatives in mathematics education. *Child Development Perspectives, 3*(3), 145-150.

Schick, B., De Villiers, P., De Villiers, J., & Hoffmeister, R. (2007). Language and theory of mind: A study of deaf children. *Child Development, 78*(2), 376-396.

Sembiring, R.K. (2010). Indonesian Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME): Its development and challenges [in Bahasa]. *Journal on Mathematics Education, 1*(1), 11-16.

Shanty, N.O., Hartono, Y., Puri, R.I.I., & Haan, D.D. (2011). Design research on mathematics education: Investigating the progress of Indonesian fifth grade students'

learning on multiplication of fractions with natural numbers. *Journal on Mathematics Education*, *2*(2), 147-162.

Siegler, R.S., Thompson, C.A., & Schneider, M. (2011). An integrated theory of whole number and fractions development. *Cognitive psychology, 62*(4), 273-296.

Stafylidou, S., & Vosniadou, S. (2004). The development of students' understanding of the numerical value of fractions. *Learning and Instruction, 14*(5), 503-518.

Sunanto, J., Takeuchi, K., & Nakata, H. (2005). *Introduction to Research with Single Subjects*. University of Tsukuba: Center for Research on International Cooperation in Education Develpment (CRIED).

Thompson, J. (2010). *The Essential Guide to Understanding Special Educational Needs.* Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Warsito, Nuraini, Y., & Muhtadi, D. (2019). The design learning of fraction with realistic mathematics education in elementary school. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1180*(1), 012110.

Profile Artikel dalam database Scopus.



Scopus

Search Sources Lists SciVal

KK

Document details

1 of 1

Text export Download Print E-mail Save to PDF Save to list More...

View at Publisher

Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists Open Access
Volume 7, Issue 2, June 2019, Pages 299-321

Learning fraction using the context of pipettes for seventh-grade deaf-mute student (Article)

(Open Access)

Jannah, A.F.[a] Prahmana, R.C.I.[b]

View additional authors Save all to author list

[a]Mathematics Education Department, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia
[b]Master Program on Mathematics Education, Graduated Program, Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

View additional affiliations

Abstract

The deaf-mute students have limited communication and knowledge, which result in their limitations in learning mathematics. This study aims to determine the development of the deaf-mute student in learning mathematics, especially about a fraction. The research method used is the Single Subject Research (SSR) by implementing the Indonesia Realistic Mathematics Education (IRME) approach by using the context of pipettes. The research subject consisted of one deaf-mute-male student in seventh grade at the special education public school 2 in Bantul, Indonesia who got handling in the learning process using IRME approach. The research subject was purposively chosen based on the character of a research subject who have difficulty in understanding the topic of the fraction. The research subject received eight treatments, three meetings for the baseline phase and five meetings for the intervention phase, during approximately two months. This research instrument uses videos to see the learning process and when students work on the given problems, photos to refer the results of student work, and written test in worksheets to get the data on student's work. The data analysis technique used is analyzed in conditions and between conditions with A-B research design to describe the development of student who has special characteristic in the fraction learning process. The research results show that the implementation of IRME approach using the pipette context can improve the understanding of fraction concepts and the learning outcomes of the deaf-mute student. © 2019 Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists.

Author keywords

Deaf-mute student | Fraction | Indonesia realistic mathematics education approach | Single subject research

Funding details

1

We would like to thank Universitas Ahmad Dahlan for providing facilities and opportunities to develop this research to completion, especially to Drs. Sunaryo, M. Pd., and Drs. Aris Thobirin, M. Si., as the validator for our research instruments and also Uswatun Khasanah S. Si., M. Sc., as the head of mathematics education department who support this research to completion. Then, we thank for SLB N 2 Bantul and their teacher for allowing us to carry out the research.

ISSN: 2149360X
Source Type: Journal
Original language: English
DOI: 10.17478/jegys.576234
Document Type: Article
Publisher: Journal for the Education of Gifted Young Scientists

References (44)

View in search results format

All Export Print E-mail Save to PDF Create bibliography

1 Adler, H., Jacob, B., Kurz, K., Kusha, R.
Undergraduate research in mathematics with deaf and hard-of-hearing students: Four perspectives
(2014) *A Journal of Mathematics*, 7 (3), pp. 247-264. Cited 3 times.

2 Avcu, R.
A cross-national comparison of Turkish and American mathematics textbooks in terms of fraction division task contexts
(2018) *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 10 (4), pp. 88-106.

3 Brown, M.C., McNeil, N.M., Glenberg, A.M.
Using concreteness in education: Real problems, potential solutions
(2009) *Child Development Perspectives*, 3 (3), pp. 160-164. Cited 41 times.
doi: 10.1111/j.1750-8606.2009.00098.x

View at Publisher

Metrics

View all metrics

11 Citations in Scopus

Field-Weighted Citation Impact

Cited by 11 documents

Ethnomathematics: Disclosing mathematical concept in batak toba traditional house
Hidayat, E. , Ratnaningsih, N. , Sunendar, A.
(2020) Journal of Physics: Conference Series

Students' environment awareness through scientific approach in mathematics instruction
Murnu, J. , Prahmana, R.C.I. , Sabariah, V.
(2020) Journal of Physics: Conference Series

Learning reflection through the context of Central Java historical building
Nursyahidah, F. , Saputro, B.A. , Albab, I.U.
(2020) Journal of Physics: Conference Series

View all 11 citing documents

Inform me when this document is cited in Scopus:

Set citation alert

Related documents

Find more related documents in Scopus based on:

Authors Keywords

Profile Jurnal di Website Scopus