DEVELOPMENT OF NON-TEST INSTRUMENTS FOR LEARNING INDEPENDENCE AND LEARNING ANXIETY IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL MATHEMATICS

Helfra Durasa

Ganesha University of Education

helfra@undiksha.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The purpose of developing this research instrument is to obtain a valid, valid and reliable instrument of learning independence and mathematical anxiety before being used in research. Proving the validity and reliability of the research instrument was carried out through content validity, construct validity and reliability tests. The content validity test was carried out by 2 research experts and construct validation based on instrument testing. The research method uses research and development by using the steps of preparing the questionnaire instrument developed by Purwanto. The trial was conducted at SMP Negeri 13 Satarmese involving 42 research samples from a total of 86 research populations. Determination of the trial sample is done by random sampling technique. This study uses a non-test instrument in the form of a questionnaire. Data collection techniques used non-test techniques and were analysed using analytical techniques developed by Aiken, namely the ratio of content validity of Aiken's V items in content validity testing. While the analysis technique in testing the validity of the construct using Bivariate Pearson correlation and reliability testing were performed using the Cronbach Alpha formula. The results showed that 1) the results of developing the instrument obtained 40 statements of learning independence and 40 statements of mathematical anxiety, 2) the results of content validity testing of the 40 items of statements of learning independence instruments and the 40 items of statements of mathematical anxiety instruments showed that all of them were valid, 2) the results of the construct validity test, there are 30 valid learning independence instrument statements and 10 invalid statements, and 3) there are 30 valid mathematical anxiety instrument statements and 10 invalid statements. In addition, the results of the instrument reliability test showed that the reliability level of the student learning independence questionnaire was in the high category, namely 0, 829 and the level of reliability of the students' mathematical anxiety questionnaire was in the high category, namely 0.887. Thus, the instrument items are valid and reliable, suitable for use in research.

Keywords: mathematical anxiety; independent learning; content validity; construct validity

INTRODUCTION

Nowadays scientific research is needed in human life. The implementation of scientific research is based on human efforts to find answers to various questions. There is a gap between what happened (*das sein*) and what should have happened (*das sollen*). Therefore, "research is a process of investigating or searching for something (facts and principles) that is carried out systematically, carefully, critically (critical thinking) and must be done seriously" (Mudjia, 2010). One of the determinations of the quality of a study is determined by the level of validity and reliability of the research instrument. Therefore, the development of good quality research instruments must be proven by the results of the validity and reliability test of the instrument. The validity of the instrument used lies in its functioning to measure what should be measured, so as to provide information in accordance with real conditions (Arikunto, 2019). While the reliability of the instrument lies in the consistency of the measurement results if the measurement is carried out twice or more on the same symptoms using the same measuring instrument (Sugiyono, 2019).

As a research instrument, the development of a non-test instrument for learning independence and mathematical anxiety really needs to be tested for the validity and reliability of the instrument. The development of the instrument in this discussion is based on the indicators of learning independence put forward Sumarni & Sumarmo (2016) and Efendi et al. (2018) and indicators of mathematical anxiety proposed by Cavanagh & Sparrow (2010).

Learning independence is a person's behaviour that comes from self-awareness will utilize the ability to take initiative, ability to solve problems, awareness of selfconfidence, responsibility to be able to do things on their own without depending on others (Nurfadilah & Hakim, 2019). Asrori (2020) said that an independent student is a student who is confident and has principles in his life so that he will be quite able to carry out learning activities without having to depend on others. Some of these indicators include: 1) Learning initiatives; have a willingness that comes from within students to learn, seek information, and carry out useful activities to increase their knowledge and skills. 2) Learning needs; determine what is needed to obtain the objectives to be achieved in learning activities. 3) Determine learning objectives; determine the results to be obtained in learning activities. 4) Seeing difficulties as challenges; confident in the ability to complete tasks that have difficult criteria and require high accuracy and are influenced by motivation that comes from within or from other parties (teachers, friends, parents, and others). 5) Utilize and seek relevant sources; determine and use learning resources (print, online, or other learning resources) adapted to the material. 6) Select and establish a strategy: determine alternative strategies/methods that make it easier for students to achieve the learning objectives/tasks to be obtained. 7) Evaluating the process and learning outcomes: conduct an examination of the implementation of learning activities that are adapted to the plans and strategies that have been set, as well as learning outcomes that are in accordance with learning needs (knowledge, skills, and attitudes). 8) Selfefficacy.

In addition to independent learning, the Canadian Mental Health Association (2015) defines anxiety as a normal emotional reaction in humans to various external events that occur in everyday life. Anxiety is seen as one of the early warning systems that humans have of dangers and threats from outside themselves (Christianto et al., 2020). Amam et al. (2019) defines math anxiety as a feeling of tension, anxiety or fear that interferes with math performance. As a result, students tend to avoid situations where they must learn and do math.

Cavanagh & Sparrow (2010) explain the indicators of mathematical anxiety into 3 aspects, namely 1) attitudinal aspects; 2) cognitive aspects; 3) somatic aspect. More broadly Cooke et al. in Sudarwati & Nurhayati (2020) illustrates that a person's math anxiety can be identified from 4 indicators, including: 1). Attitude (sociological). Attitude is an indicator of mathematical anxiety related to student behaviour in learning mathematics. Viewed from the perspective of student attitudes, students tend to feel afraid and panic when asked to solve problems in front of the class. This fear and panic arise because they are embarrassed to be laughed at by their friends if they are not able to solve the problem correctly. Students are not confident in their own abilities. 2) Somatic (physiology). Somatic is an indicator of mathematical anxiety related to changes in the condition of the human body. In utility, this indicator cannot be fully carried out by observation through observation, because changes in the condition of the human body cannot be fully observed with the eye. For example, uncomfortable, worried, or anxious. Some aspects that can be observed from changes in student body conditions, such as sweating bodies, dry mouth, fast heartbeats caused by something that affects them. 3) Cognitive (psychological). Cognitive indicators are related to changes in students' cognition when learning mathematics. This indicator of mathematical anxiety is more directed to students' concentration when studying in class, such as not being able to think clearly, easily forgetting and giving up Mathematics hope. 4) knowledge/understanding (mathematical knowledge). This indicator of mathematical anxiety arises related to his limitations in understanding mathematical knowledge.

However, there are some difficulties that will be encountered in measuring

mathematical anxiety and student learning independence as described by Lawrence in relation to self-esteem (Setyawati, 2018), such as (1) the lack of awareness that have students in understanding themselves, (2) the language used can be interpreted differently by students, and (3) students often give responses that are in accordance with what the teacher expects but do not reflect the actual situation. Lawrence also revealed several types that were suggested to measure a person's level of learning independence and mathematical anxiety, including: Behavioural Checklist, Questionnaire, Rating Scale, Adjectival Discrepancies and Semantic Differential, Q-sort, Projective Technique, and Personal Interview.

Based on the description above, objective facts show that researchers often do not talk about the data collection tools used are valid and reliable. Without this information, the reader is not sure whether the data collected really describes the phenomenon to be measured. Therefore, for the results of the research to be scientifically justified, information regarding the validity of the measuring instrument must be conveyed in detail.

METHODOLOGY

The design of this research is in the form of research & development of non-test instruments for learning independence and mathematical anxiety. The steps in compiling the research instrument are carried out as developed Purwanto (2018) as follows. 1) identify the variables that will be the object of research, 2) find/determine the indicators of each research variable, 3) compose statement items for each research variable indicator, 4) determine the research scale score, 5) determine where the items are placed, 6) to test the instrument, 7) use the instrument to collect data.

These instruments were tested for validity through content validity and construct validity and reliability testing. The content validity of the instrument was carried out by involving 2 lecturers with doctoral degrees (Dr.) from the research educational evaluation and master's University program at Ganesha of Education. The validation process from the panellists used a Likert scale, namely 1) very irrelevant, 2) irrelevant, 3) less relevant, 4) relevant, and 5) very relevant. The process of determining the validity is carried out using an analytical technique developed by Aiken, namely the ratio of the content validity of Aiken's V with the following formula (Azwar, 2016).

$$V = \frac{\sum s}{n(c-1)}$$

Information:

- V : Coefficient value Aiken's V
- s : Score assigned every ratter minus the lowest score in the category used (r - lo)
- lo : The lowest rating score (eg 1)
- c : Highest rating score (eg 5)
- r : The score given by the assessor

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n\left(\sum XY\right) - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{n\left(\sum X^2\right) - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{n\left(\sum Y^2\right) - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}$$

Information:

X = item score

Y = total score

n = many respondents

The criteria for determining a statement item are declared valid if the Pearson value $(r_{count}) > r_{table}$ at a significance level of 5% (db = N-2). Besides being able to be determined by comparing the value of r_{count} with r_{table} , it can also be seen from the value of Sig <0.05, the statement item is declared valid.

In addition to the validity test, the

The criteria used in determining the validity of the statement items is the value of V > 0.60. This technique is used to measure the degree of agreement of the experts from one item and which can express the level of instrument validity.

In addition, construct validity was carried out based on data from trials conducted at SMP Negeri 13 Satarmese. West Satarmese sub-district, Manggarai Regency. The trial was conducted by involving 42 research samples from a total of 86 research populations. The scale model developed adopts the model developed by Likert with five alternative answers, namely Very Appropriate (SS), Appropriate (S), Not Appropriate (TS) and Very Unsuitable (STS) so that the distribution of respondents' attention to the answer options is not too broad so that the suitability of the choice is more realistic.

Testing the validity of the instrument items using Bivariate Pearson correlation (Pearson Moment Product), with the Product Moment Correlation formula as follows:

instrument reliability test was carried out using the Alpha Cronbach formula because the research instrument was in the form of a stratified scale. Cronbach's Alpha formula is as follows.

$$r_{11} = \left(\frac{n}{n-1}\right) \left(1 - \frac{\sum S_i^2}{S_t^2}\right)$$

Helfra Durasa

Information:

| r ₁₁ | = instrument reliability |
|-----------------|----------------------------|
| n | = many items |
| $\sum S_i^2$ | = number of item variances |
| S_t^2 | = total variance |

The criteria for determining a test item are declared reliable are adjusted to guidelines draw conclusions from the following calculation results:

| 0.00 - 0.20 | degrees of reliability is very |
|-------------|--------------------------------|
| low | |
| 0.21 - 0.40 | degrees of low reliability |
| 0.41 - 0.70 | degrees of moderate |
| reliability | |
| 0.71 - 0.90 | degrees of high reliability |
| 0.91 - 1.00 | degree of reliability is very |

high

In this study, the provisions set for a test item are declared reliable if they have an alpha value > 0.7.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Learning Independence Questionnaire Instrument

Learning Independent Instruments Grid

Based on the results of the development of the learning independence instrument, the lattice of the learning independence instrument was obtained as follows.

| | Indicator | | | Item Num | lber | Amount |
|----|------------------------------|-------------|-----|-------------------|------------|----------|
| | Indicator | | | + | - | - Amount |
| 1) | Study initiative | | | 1, 2, 3, 4 | 5, 6 | 6 |
| 2) | Study needs | | | 7, 8, 9 | 10, 11 | 5 |
| 3) | Determining learning goa | ls | | 12, 14, 25, | 13 | 4 |
| 4) | Seeing adversity as a cha | llenge | | 15, 16 | 17, 18, 19 | 5 |
| 5) | Utilize and look for releva | nt sources. | | 20, 21 | 22, 23, 24 | 5 |
| 6) | Choose, and set a strateg | У | | 26, 27,28 | 29, 30, 31 | 6 |
| 7) | Evaluating learning outcomes | processes | and | 32, 33 | 34, 35 | 4 |
| 8) | Self-efficacy | | | 36, 37, 38, 39 | 40 | 5 |

Content Validity Analysis of Independent Learning Instruments

The assessment data of the experts above were analysed using the analytical technique developed by Aiken, then it is obtained, for Item 1 (n: 2, c: 5)

$$V = \frac{\sum s}{n(c-1)} = \frac{(4-1)+(4-1)}{2(5-1)} = \frac{6}{8} = 0,75$$
 (Valid because V > 0.60).

Overall, the value of V for each item can be presented in the following table.

| | Item | | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | em |
|-----------|------|---|-----|-----|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|---|-----|----|-----|----|
| Validator | 1 | | 2 | 2 3 | | 4 | | 5 | | 6 | | 7 | | 8 | | 9 | | 10 | | |
| | r | s | r | S | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | S | r | S |
| Judges 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |

| Judges 2 s V | s 6 V 0.75 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 5 7 0.8 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 4 6 0.7 | | 3 5 0.6 | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|--|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| V standard Note. | 0.6 Vali | | 0.6 Val | | | 0.60 Valid | | 50 lid | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Va | | 0.6 Val | |
| Item Validator 11 r s | | | | em .2 s | Item 13 r s | | | Item 14 r s | | Item 15 r s | | Item 16 r s | | em .7 s | | em .8 s | | em 9 s | | em 20 s |
| Judges 1 Judges 2 s V | dges 1 4 3 dges 2 3 2 s 5 | | 4 4 0.7 | 3 3 | 4 3 5 0.6 | 3 2 | 4 3 | | 4 4 6 | - | | $ \begin{array}{r} 4 & 3 \\ 4 & 3 \\ 6 \\ 0.75 \end{array} $ | | 3 3 75 | 4 4 6 0.7 | 3 3 | 4 4 0.7 | 3 3 | 4 5 7 0.8 | 3 4 |
| v standard Note. | | | 0.6 Val | | | 0.60 Valid | | 50 lid | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Va | | 0.6 Val | |
| Validator | Item alidator 21 r s | | Ite 22 r | | Item 23 r s | | Ite 24 r | | Item 25 r s | | Item 26 r s | | Item 27 r s | | | Item 28 r s | | m) s | Ite: 30 r | |
| Judges 1 Judges 2 s V | 4 5 7 0.8 | | $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | | 3 3 | 4 4 6 0.7 | 3 3 | 4 5 7 0.8 | 3 4 | 4 5 7 0.8 | 3 4 8 | 4 5 7 0.8 | 3 4 8 | r 4 3 5 0.6 | 3 2 3 | 4 3 5 0.6 | 3 2 3 | | | |
| V standard Note. | 0.6 Vali | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Vali | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | |
| Validator | | | 3 | em 2 | 3 | em 3 | 3 | em 4 | Ite | 5 em | | 6 | Ite 3 | 7 | 3 | Item 38 | | em 9 | Ite 4 | 0 |
| Judges 1 Judges 2 s V V | r 4 4 6 0.7 | | r 4 4 0.7 | | r 4 4 0.7 | | $ \frac{r}{4} \\ 4 \\ 6 \\ 0.7 $ | | r 4 4 0.7 | | r 4 4 0.7 | <u>s</u> 3 3 5 | r 4 4 0.7 | | r 4 4 0.7 | s 3 3 5 | r 4 4 0.7 | | r 4 4 0.7 | <u>s</u> 3 3 5 |
| standard 0 Note. Va | | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | | 0.6 Val | |

Based on the results of the validity test above, it can be concluded that the learning independence questionnaire item has a value of V > 0.60, meaning that the 40 learning independence questionnaire items can be used in research.

Construct Validity Analysis of Learning Independence Questionnaire Items

The research data were analysed using Bivariate Pearson correlation (Pearson Moment Product), with the Product Moment Correlation formula as follows:

$$r_{xy} = \frac{n\left(\sum XY\right) - \left(\sum X\right)\left(\sum Y\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{n\left(\sum X^2\right) - \left(\sum X\right)^2\right\}\left\{n\left(\sum Y^2\right) - \left(\sum Y\right)^2\right\}}}.$$

Calculation of the correlation coefficient of Item (X) to the total score (Y) can be assisted by using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 application program. Based on the calculation of the correlation coefficient of Item (X) to the total score (Y) and converted to r_{table} (N: 40) of 0.312, then the validity of the questionnaire is obtained as follows.

| Item Number | , Rxiyi | Criteria | Decision | Item Numbe | r ^{rxiyi} | Criteria | Decision |
|----------------|---------|----------|----------|---------------|--------------------|----------|----------|
| 1 | 0.443 | Valid | Worn | 21 | 0.190 | Invalid | Not used |
| 2 | 0.185 | Invalid | Not used | 22 | 0.432 | Valid | Worn |
| 3 | 0.169 | Invalid | Not used | 23 | 0.323 | Valid | Worn |
| 4 | 0.396 | Valid | Worn | 24 | 0.436 | Valid | Worn |
| 5 | 0.560 | Valid | Worn | 25 | 0.479 | Valid | Worn |
| 6 | 0.175 | Invalid | Not used | 26 | 0.463 | Valid | Worn |
| 7 | 0.467 | Valid | Worn | 27 | 0.338 | Valid | Worn |
| 8 | 0.354 | Valid | Worn | 28 | 0.013 | Invalid | Not used |
| 9 | 0.406 | Valid | Worn | 29 | 0.329 | Valid | Worn |
| 10 | 0.423 | Valid | Worn | 30 | 0.363 | Valid | Worn |
| 11 | 0.440 | Valid | Worn | 31 | 0.460 | Valid | Worn |
| 12 | 0.411 | Valid | Worn | 32 | 0.014 | Invalid | Not used |
| 13 | 0.168 | Invalid | Not used | 33 | 0.265 | Invalid | Not used |
| 14 | 0.261 | Invalid | Not used | 34 | 0.365 | Valid | Worn |
| 15 | 0.401 | Valid | Worn | 35 | 0.318 | Valid | Worn |
| 16 | 0.381 | Valid | Worn | 36 | 0.326 | Valid | Worn |
| 17 | 0.347 | Valid | Worn | 37 | 0.493 | Valid | Worn |
| 18 | 0.370 | Valid | Worn | 38 | 0.274 | Invalid | Not used |
| 19 | 0.353 | Valid | Worn | 39 | 0.346 | Valid | Worn |
| 20 | 0.363 | Valid | Worn | 40 | 0.391 | Valid | Worn |

Based on the test results above, it can be concluded that there are 30 items of mathematical anxiety questionnaire statements that have a value of $r_{count} > r_{table}$. This means that there are 30 items of learning independence questionnaire statements that are valid and can be used in research.

Learning Independence Questionnaire Reliability Testing

The results of the analysis showed that the level of reliability of the student learning independence questionnaire was in the high category, namely 0.829.

| Reliability Statistics | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | N of | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cronbach's Alpha | Items | | | | | | | | | | |
| .829 | 30 | | | | | | | | | | |

Mathematical Anxiety Questionnaire Instrument

Grid - Mathematical Anxiety Questionnaire Grid

Based on the results of the development of mathematical anxiety instruments, the lattice of independent

learning instruments is obtained as follows.

Helfra Durasa

| | | | Iter | n Number | Amoun |
|----|---------------------------|--|---------------|-----------------------|-------|
| No | Indicator | Sub Indicator | | | t |
| | | | + | - | |
| 1) | Attitudinal | Distrust of yourself | 1,2 | 3, 4, 5 | 5 |
| | | Don't want to do something that should be done | 6 | 7, 8 | 3 |
| | | Expectations about difficulty in doing something | 9, 10 | 11 | 3 |
| 2) | Somatic | Difficulty breathing | | 12, 13 | 2 |
| | | Heart pounding | | 14, 15, 16, 17 | 4 |
| | | Uncomfortable feeling | 18 | 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 | 6 |
| 3) | Cognitive | Feeling worried | 24 | 25, 26, 27 | 4 |
| | | Empty mind | | 28, 29, 30, 31, 32 | 5 |
| 4) | Mathematics knowledge/ | Fear of not understanding enough of the subject matter | 33, 34, 35 | 36, 37 | 5 |
| | understandi ng | Fear of not being able to do the problem | 38, 39 | 40 | 3 |

Content Validity Analysis of Mathematical Anxiety Instruments

The process of proving content validity is carried out using an analytical technique developed by Aiken, namely the ratio of the validity of Aiken's V items with the following formula(Azwar, 2016). Based on the calculation of content validity, it is obtained, for Item 1 (n: 2, c: 5) $V = \frac{\sum s}{n(c-1)} = \frac{(4-1)+(5-1)}{2(5-1)} = \frac{7}{8} = 0,88 \text{ (Valid}$ because V > 0.60). Overall, the value of V for each item can

be presented in the following table.

| Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | em |
|------|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | ŀ | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 3 | ç |) | 1 | 0 |
| r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| 7 | | 6 | , | 6 | , | 6 | 1 | 6 | | 7 | | 7 | | 6 | | 7 | | 7 | , |
| 0.8 | 8 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.8 | 38 | 0.88 | | 0.75 | | 0.8 | 38 | 0.8 | 38 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.6 | 0 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.60 | | 0.60 | |
| Vali | d | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Val | lid | d Valid | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ite | em | Ite | em | Ite | em | Ite | Item | | Item | | Item | | em | Ite | em | Ite | em | Ite | em |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 8 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 20 |
| r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 |
| | 1 r 4 5 7 0.8 0.6 Vali Ite 1 r 4 | 4 3 5 4 7 0.88 0.60 Valid Item 11 r s 4 3 | $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | $\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ |

| 180 | The Second International | Conference on Humanities, | Education, Language | , and Culture |
|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------|
|-----|--------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------|

| S | | |) | 6 |) | 6 |) | 6 |) | 7 | | 7 | | 7 | , | 7 | , | 7 | • | |
|-----------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----|-------|----|-------|----------|-------|-----|-------|-----|-------|----|
| V | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.8 | 88 | 0.8 | 88 | 0.8 | 38 | 0.8 | 38 | 0.8 | 38 |
| V | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| standard | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 |
| Note. | Val | lid | Val | lid | Val | Valid | | Valid | | lid | Val | id | Val | id | Valid | | Valid | | Val | id |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Ite | em | Ite | em | Ite | em | Item | | Item | | Ite | em | Ite | em | Item | | Item | | Ite | em |
| Validator | 2 | 21 | 2 | 22 | 2 | 23 | 2 | 24 | 2 | 25 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 28 | 2 | 29 | З | 80 |
| | rsrS | | | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | s | r | S | r | s | |
| Judges 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Judges 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| S | 7 | | 7 | 7 | | 7 | |) | 6 |) | 5 | | 5 | | 5 | ; | 6 |) | 6 |) |
| V | 0.8 | 38 | 0.8 | 38 | 0.88 | | 0.7 | 0.75 | | 75 | 0.63 | | 0.63 | | 0.63 | | 0.75 | | 0.75 | |
| V | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| standard | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 |
| Note. | Vali | id | Val | lid | 1 Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Val | id | Val | id | Val | lid | Val | lid | Val | id |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | Item | | m | 3 | 5 | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ite | m | Ιte | em |
| Validator | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | Ite | m | 30 | б | 3' | 7 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 0 |
| | r | s | r | S | r | s | r | S | r | S | r | S | r | S | r | s | r | S | r | S |
| Judges 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| Judges 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| S | 6 | • | 6 | | 5 | | 7 | | 6 | • | 6 | | 6 | | 6 |) | 6 | | 6 |) |
| V | V 0.75 | | 0.7 | 75 | 0.6 | 53 | 0.8 | 88 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | '5 | 0.7 | ′5 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 | 0.7 | 75 |
| V | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| standard | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.6 | 50 | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.60 | | 0.6 | 50 |
| Note. | Note. Valid V | | Val | id | Val | id | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | | Valid | |

Based on the results of the validity test above, it can be concluded that the 40 items of the learning independence questionnaire statement have a value of V > 0.60, meaning that the 40 items of the learning independence questionnaire can be used in research.

Construct Validity Analysis of Mathematical Anxiety Questionnaire Items

The research data were analysed using Bivariate Pearson correlation (Pearson Moment Product), with the Product Moment Correlation formula as

follows:
$$r_{xy} = \frac{n(\Sigma XY) - (\Sigma X)(\Sigma Y)}{\sqrt{\{n(\Sigma X^2) - (\Sigma X)^2\} \{n(\Sigma Y^2) - (\Sigma Y)^2\}}}$$

The calculation of the item correlation coefficient (X) to the total score (Y) can be assisted by using the IBM SPSS Statistics 25 application program. The results of the calculation of the mathematical anxiety questionnaire correlation coefficient and converted to a r_{table} (N: 40) of 0.312, the validity of the questionnaire is obtained as follows.

| No. | R _{xiyi} | Criteria | Decision | No. | r_{xiyi} | Criteria | Decision | |
|-----|-------------------|----------|----------|-----|------------|----------|----------|--|
| | | | | | | | | |

| Item | | | | Item | | | |
|------|-------|---------|----------|------|--------|---------|----------|
| 1 | 0.057 | Invalid | Not used | 21 | 0.481 | Valid | Worn |
| 2 | 0.088 | Invalid | Not used | 22 | 0.583 | Valid | Worn |
| 3 | 0.442 | Valid | Worn | 23 | 0.574 | Valid | Worn |
| 4 | 0.530 | Valid | Worn | 24 | 0.028 | Invalid | Not used |
| 5 | 0.332 | Valid | Worn | 25 | 0.529 | Valid | Worn |
| 6 | 0.636 | Valid | Worn | 26 | -0.040 | Invalid | Not used |
| 7 | 0.411 | Valid | Worn | 27 | 0.358 | Valid | Worn |
| 8 | 0.218 | Invalid | Not used | 28 | 0.468 | Valid | Worn |
| 9 | 0.068 | Invalid | Not used | 29 | 0.478 | Valid | Worn |
| 10 | 0.124 | Invalid | Not used | 30 | 0.499 | Valid | Worn |
| 11 | 0.331 | Valid | Worn | 31 | 0.448 | Valid | Worn |
| 12 | 0.482 | Valid | Worn | 32 | 0.558 | Valid | Worn |
| 13 | 0.453 | Valid | Worn | 33 | 0.440 | Valid | Worn |
| 14 | 0.456 | Valid | Worn | 34 | 0.342 | Valid | Worn |
| 15 | 0.400 | Valid | Worn | 35 | 0.352 | Valid | Worn |
| 16 | 0.051 | Invalid | Not used | 36 | 0.487 | Valid | Worn |
| 17 | 0.433 | Valid | Worn | 37 | 0.498 | Valid | Worn |
| 18 | 0.451 | Valid | Worn | 38 | 0.437 | Valid | Worn |
| 19 | 0.583 | Valid | Worn | 39 | -0.007 | Invalid | Not used |
| 20 | 0.116 | Invalid | Not used | 40 | 0.565 | Valid | Worn |

Based on the test results above, it can be concluded that there are 30 items of mathematical anxiety questionnaire statements that have a value of $r_{count} > r_{table}$. This means that there are 30 items of mathematical anxiety questionnaire statements that are valid and can be used in research.

Testing the Reliability of the Mathematical Anxiety Questionnaire

The results of the analysis showed that the level of reliability of the students' mathematical anxiety questionnaire was in the high category, namely 0.887.

| Reliability Statistics | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|
| | N of | | | |
| Cronbach's Alpha | Items | | | |
| .887 | 30 | | | |

CONCLUSION

Instrument validation has become a prerequisite in conducting research. The validity of the instrument greatly determines the quality of research data which has an impact on the quality of research. Based on the results of the development of the instrument obtained 40 items of learning independence statements and 40 items of mathematical anxiety instruments. In addition, the results of the instrument analysis show that 1) based on the content validity test of the statement items of the learning independence instrument and the mathematical anxiety instrument, the 40 statement items of the learning independence instrument and the 40 statement items of the mathematical anxiety instrument are appropriate to be used in research. This is evidenced by iken's V content validity ratio value > 0.60. 2) based on construct validity testing through Bivariate Pearson correlation analysis (Pearson Moment Product), there

are 30 valid learning independence instrument statements and 10 invalid statements, and 3) there are 30 valid mathematical anxiety instrument statements and 10 invalid statements valid.

Thus, the results of the development of non-test instruments for learning independence and mathematical anxiety showed that there were 30 statements of learning independence instruments and 30 statements of mathematical anxietv instruments which were declared valid and reliable. On that basis, this instrument can be used to collect data in research. This is in line with Purwanto (2018) which says that after the validity and reliability are met, the new research instrument can be used to collect data.

REFERENCES

- Amam, A., Darhim, D., Fatimah, S., & Noto, M. S. (2019). Math anxiety performance of the 8th grade students of junior high school. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1157(4). https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1157/4/042099
- Arikunto, S. (2019). *Dasar-Dasar Evaluasi Pendidikan* (3rd ed.). Yogyakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Asrori. (2020). Psikologi Pendidikan Pendekatan Multidisipliner. Jawa Tengah: CV. Pena Persada.
- Azwar, S. (2016). Konstruksi Tes Kemampuan Kognitif. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Christianto, L. P., Kristiani, R., Franztius, D. N., Santoso, S. D., Winsen, & Kecemasan Ardani, A. (2020). Mahasiswa di Masa Pandemi Covid-19. Jurnal Selaras : Kajian Bimbingan Psikologi Dan Konseling Serta Pendidikan. 3(1),67-82. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3 3541/Jsvol2iss1pp1

Efendi, A., Napitupulu, E. E., & Sinaga, B. (2018). Developing Learning Materials Based on Problem-Based Learning to Improving Students Mathematical Problem Solving Ability and Self-Regulated Learning at MAN Hutagodang Labuhanbatu Selatan. Journal of Education and Practice, 9(7), 89–99.

https://iiste.org/Journals/index.php /JEP/article/view/41614

- Mudjia, R. (2010). Penelitian dan Pengembangan Ilmu Pengetahuan. GEMA: Media Informasi Kebijakan Kampus.
- Nurfadilah, S., & Hakim, D. L. (2019). Kemandirian Belajar Siswa dalam Pembelajaran Matematika. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Matematika Dan Pendidikan Matematika Sesiomadika*, 1214–1223. http://journal.unsika.ac.id/index.ph p/sesiomadika
- Purwanto. (2018). Teknik Penyusunan Instrumen Uji Validitas dan Reliabilitas Penelitian Ekonomi Syariah. Magelang: StaiaPress.

- Setyawati, R. D. (2018). Instrumen Angket Self-Esteem Mahasiswa Ditinjau Dari Validitas Dan Reliabitas. *Phenomenon : Jurnal Pendidikan MIPA*, 7(2), 174–186. https://doi.org/10.21580/phen.2017 .7.2.1932
- Sudarwati, N., & Nurhayati, D. (2020). Case Study of Student Anxiety in Solving Break-Even Point Ouestions Based on Gender in Indonesia. Indonesian Journal of Learning Education and Counseling, 2(2), 172-182. https://doi.org/10.31960/IJOLEC.V 2I2.318
- Sumarni, C., & Sumarmo, U. (2016). Penalaran Matematik dan Kemandirian Belajar Siswa. *Edusentris Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 3(3). https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1 7509/edusentris.v3i3.239