International Journal of Advanced Studies in Education and Learning (IJASEL)
Vol. 99, No. 1, 2099, pp. 1~1x
ISSN: 1234-5678 DOI: 10.12233/ijasel.v99i1.paperID

CSAS
Center for Studies in Advanced Science

Paper's title should be the fewest possible words that accurately describe the content of the paper (Center, Bold, 16pt)

Mustajib[1,2], **Doni Saputra**[3], **Naseehah Hajido**[4]

Received month dd, yyyy ■ **Revised** month dd, yyyy ■ **Accepted** month dd, yyyy ■ **Published** month dd, yyyy

Article Info

[1]Faculty of Education, Faqih Asy'ari Institut Kediri, Indonesia.

[2] Centre for Studies in Advanced Science, Indonesia

[3] Faculty of Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia

[4]Education Faculty, Northern College, Thailand

Keywords:

First keyword;
Second keyword;
Third keyword;
Fourth keyword;
Fifth keyword

ABSTRACT (10 PT)

An abstract is often presented separate from the article, so it must be able to stand alone. A well-prepared abstract enables the reader to identify the basic content of a document quickly and accurately, to determine its relevance to their interests, and thus to decide whether to read the document in its entirety. The abstract should be informative and completely self-explanatory, provide a clear statement of the problem, the proposed approach or solution, and point out major findings and conclusions. **The Abstract should be 100 to 200 words in length.** References should be avoided, but if essential, then cite the author(s) and year(s). Standard nomenclature should be used, and non-standard or uncommon abbreviations should be avoided, but if essential they must be defined at their first mention in the abstract itself. No literature should be cited. The keyword list provides the opportunity to add 5 to 7 keywords, used by the indexing and abstracting services, in addition to those already present in the title (9 pt).

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

Correspondence:

Doni Saputra
Faculty of Education, Universitas Islam Negeri Maulana Malik Ibrahim Malang, Indonesia
Email: donisaputra@uinmalang.ac.id

1. Introduction (11 PT)

The main text format consists of a flat left-right columns on A4 paper (quarto). The margin text from the left and top are 2.5 cm, right and bottom are 2 cm. The manuscript is written in Microsoft Word, 1,15 space, Time New Roman 11 pt, and maximum 12 pages for original research article, or maximum 16 pages for review/survey paper.

A title of article should be the fewest possible words that accurately describe the content of the paper. The title should be succinct and informative and no more than about 12 words in length. Do not use acronyms or abbreviations in your title and do not mention the method you used, unless your paper reports on the development of a new method. Titles are often used in information-retrieval systems. Avoid writing long formulas with subscripts in the title. Omit all waste words such as "*A study of ...*", "*Investigations of ...*", "*Implementation of ...*", "*Observations on ...*", "*Effect of.....*", "*Analysis of ...*", "Design of…", etc.

A concise and factual abstract is required. The abstract should state briefly the purpose of the research, the principal results and major conclusions. An abstract is often presented separately from

the article, so it must be able to stand alone. For this reason, References should be avoided, but if essential, then cite the author(s) and year(s). Also, non-standard or uncommon abbreviations should be avoided, but if essential they must be defined at their first mention in the abstract itself. Immediately after the abstract, provide a maximum of 7 keywords, using American spelling and avoiding general and plural terms and multiple concepts (avoid, for example, 'and', 'of'). Be sparing with abbreviations: only abbreviations firmly established in the field may be eligible. These keywords will be used for indexing purposes.


Indexing and abstracting services depend on the accuracy of the title, extracting from it keywords useful in cross-referencing and computer searching. An improperly titled paper may never reach the audience for which it was intended, so be specific.

The Introduction section should provide: i) a clear background, ii) a clear statement of the problem, iii) the relevant literature on the subject, iv) the proposed approach or solution, and v) the new value of research which it is innovation (within 3-6 paragraphs). It should be understandable to colleagues from a broad range of scientific disciplines. Organization and citation of the bibliography are made in APA style (Glynn & Winter, 2004). The terms in foreign languages are written italic (*italic*). The text should be divided into sections, each with a separate heading and numbered consecutively (Adeyemi, 2012; Grassl, R. & Mingus, 1996). The section or subsection headings should be typed on a separate line, e.g., 1. Introduction. A full article usually follows a standard structure: **1. Introduction, 2. The Comprehensive Theoretical Basis and/or the Proposed Method/Algorithm** *(optional)***, 3. Method, 4. Results and Discussion, and 5. Conclusion.** The structure is well-known as **IMRaD** style.

Literature review that has been done author used in the section "Introduction" to explain the difference of the manuscript with other papers, that it is innovative, it are used in the section "Method" to describe the step of research and used in the section "Results and Discussion" to support the analysis of the results (Reichert et al., 2021). If the manuscript was written really have high originality, which proposed a new method or algorithm, the additional section after the "Introduction" section and before the "Method" section can be added to explain briefly the theory and/or the proposed method/algorithm (Ocak & Yamaç, 2013).

2. Method (11 PT)

Explaining research chronological, including research design, research procedure (in the form of algorithms, Pseudocode or other), how to test and data acquisition (Li & Zheng, 2018; Pintrich et al., 1991; Zimmerman & Moylan, 2009). The description of the course of research should be supported references, so the explanation can be accepted scientifically (Roick & Ringeisen, 2018), (Ocak & Yamaç, 2013) Figures 1-2 and Table 1 are presented center, as shown below and cited in the manuscript (Li & Zheng, 2018), (Bandura, 1985; Cleary & Kitsantas, 2017; Dent & Koenka, 2015; Pintrich, 2000; Pressley, 1995; Vonkova & Hrabak, 2015). The Student responses based on their region of origin has been illustrated in Figure 1(a) and mastery of regional languages has been illustrated in Figure 1(b).



(a) (b)

Figure 1. Student responses based on their (a) region of origin and (b) mastery of regional languages

Table 1. Internal consistency reliability of biology test

SN	Indicator	Value
1	Number of Item	60
2	Kuder Richardson (KR-20)	0.620
3	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	0.617
4	Mean Item Difficulty	0.56
5	Mean Item Difficulty	0.4




Figure 2. The schema of character education and disaster in hidden curriculum

3. Results and Discussion (11 PT)

In this section, it is explained the results of research and at the same time is given the comprehensive discussion. Results can be presented in figures, graphs, tables and others that make the reader understand easily (Baier et al., 2019), (Flanagan et al., 2020). The discussion can be made in several sub-sections.

3.1. Sub section 1

Equations should be placed at the center of the line and provided consecutively with equation numbers in parentheses flushed to the right margin, as in (1). The use of Microsoft Equation Editor or MathType is preferred.

$$E_v - E = \frac{h}{2.m}(k_x^2 + k_y^2) \quad (1)$$

All symbols that have been used in the equations should be defined in the following text.

3.2. Sub section 2

Proper citation of other works should be made to avoid plagiarism. When referring to a reference item, please use the reference number as in (Kleij, 2019) or (Brockett & Hiemstra, 2020) for multiple references. The use of ”Ref (Hiemstra & Brockett, 2012)...” should be employed for any reference citation at the beginning of sentence. For any reference with more than 3 or more authors, only the first author is to be written followed by *et al*. (e.g. in (Geng et al., 2019)). Examples of reference items of different categories shown in the References section. Each item in the references section should be typed using 8 pt font size (Creswell & Clark, 2011; Fraenkel et al., 2012; Honey & Marshall, 2003; Ismayilova & M.Klassen, 2019; Mahvelati, 2021; McQuarrie & Krueger, 1989).

3.2.1. Subsub section 1

yy

3.2.2. Subsub section 2

zz

4. Conclusion (11 PT)

Provide a statement that what is expected, as stated in the "Introduction" section can ultimately result in "Results and Discussion" section, so there is compatibility. Moreover, it can also be added the prospect of the development of research results and application prospects of further studies into the next (based on result and discussion).

Acknowledgements (11 PT)

Author thanks ... . In most cases, sponsor and financial support acknowledgments.

References (11 PT)

The main references are international journals and proceedings. All references should be to the most pertinent, up-to-date sources **and the minimum of references** are **25 entries** (for original research paper) and **50 entries** (for review/survey paper). References are written in **APA style**. Use of a tool such as **EndNote**, **Mendeley**, or **Zotero** for reference management and formatting, and choose **APA style**. Please use a consistent format for references-see examples (10 pt):

[1] Journal/Periodicals

Basic Format:

Author, J. K. (year). Title of paper. *Abbrev. Title of Journal/Periodical*, *Vol(Issue), xxx-xxx.* doi: *xxx*.

Examples:

- Reichert, F., Lange, D., & Chow, L. (2021). Educational beliefs matter for classroom instruction: A comparative analysis of teachers' beliefs about the aims of civic education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *98*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103248

[2] **Conference Proceedings**

Basic Format:

Author, J. K. (year). Title of paper. *Proceeding of Abbreviated Name of Conf.*, (location of conference is optional) (pp. *xxx–xxx*).

Examples:

- Park, S., Song, K., & Kim, S. (2015). EEG analysis for computational thinking based education effect on the learners' cognitive load, *Proceedings of the Applied Computer and Applied Computational Science (ACACOS'15)* (pp. 38–43).

[3] Book

Basic Format:

Author, J. K. (year). *Title of the book*. Abbrev. of Publisher.

Examples:

- Pressley, M. (1995). *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers*. HarperCollins College Publishers.

*In the reference list, however, list all the authors for up to six authors. Use *et al.* only if: 1) The names are not given and 2) List of authors more than 6. *Example*: J. D. Bellamy *et al.*, Computer Telephony Integration, New York: Wiley, 2010.

See the examples:

REFERENCES

Adeyemi, S. B. (2012). *Developing Critical Thinking Skills in Students : A Mandate for Higher Education in Nigeria*. *3*(2), 155–161.

Baier, F., Decker, A.-T., Voss, T., Kleickmann, T., Klusmann, U., & Kunter, M. (2019). What makes a good teacher? The relative importance of mathematics teachers' cognitive ability, personality, knowledge, beliefs, and motivation for instructional quality. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *89*(4), 767–786. https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12256

Bandura, A. (1985). *Prentice-Hall series in social learning theory. Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Brockett, R. G., & Hiemstra, R. (2020). *Self-direction in adult learning: Perspectives on theory, research, and practice*. Routledge.

Cleary, T. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2017). Motivation and self-regulated learning influences on middle school mathematics achievement. *School Psychology Review*, *46*(1), 88–107.

Creswell, J. W., & Clark, V. L. P. (2011). Choosing a mixed methods design. In *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research* (pp. 53–106). Sage Publications, Inc.

Dent, A. L., & Koenka, A. C. (2015). The relation between self-regulated learning and academic achievement across childhood and adolescence: a meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, *28*(3), 425–474. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-015-9320-8

Flanagan, A. M., Cormier, D. C., & Bulut, O. (2020). Achievement may be rooted in teacher expectations: examining the differential influences of ethnicity, years of teaching, and classroom behaviour. *Social Psychology of Education*, *23*, 1429–1448. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-020-09590-y

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. McGraw-Hill.

Geng, S., Law, K. M. Y., & Niu, B. (2019). Investigating self-directed learning and technology readiness in blending learning environment. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, *16*(17), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-019-0147-0

Glynn, S. M., & Winter, L. K. (2004). Contextual Teaching and Learning of science in elementary schools. *Journal of Elementary Science Education*, *16*(2), 51–63. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03173645

Grassl, R. & Mingus, T. (1996). Using Technology to Enhance Problem Solving and Critical. *Mathematics and Computer Education*, *31*(3), 293–300.

Hiemstra, R., & Brockett, R. G. (2012). Reframing the Meaning of Self-Directed Learning: An Updated Modeltt. *Adult Education Research Conference Proceedings*, 155–161.

Honey, M., & Marshall, D. (2003). The impact of on-line muti-choice questions on undergraduate student nurses' learning. *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Conference of the Australasian Society for Computers in Learning in Tertiary Education (ASCILITE)*, 236–243.

Ismayilova, K., & M.Klassen, R. (2019). Research and teaching self-efficacy of university faculty: Relations with job satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *98*, 55–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2019.08.012

Kleij, F. M. van der. (2019). Comparison of teacher and student perceptions of formative assessment feedback practices and association with individual student characteristics. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *85*(1), 175–189.

Li, S., & Zheng, J. (2018). The relationship between self-efficacy and self-regulated learning in one-to-one computing environment: The mediated role of task values. *The Asia-Pacific Educ. Res.*, *27*(6), 455–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-018-0405-2

Mahvelati, E. H. (2021). Learners' perceptions and performance under peer versus teacher corrective feedback conditions. *Studies in Educational Evaluation*, *70*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stueduc.2021.100995

McQuarrie, E. F., & Krueger, R. A. (1989). Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *26*(3), 371. https://doi.org/10.2307/3172912

Ocak, G., & Yamaç, A. (2013). Examination of the relationships between fifth graders' self-regulated learning strategies, motivational beliefs, attitudes, and achievement. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice*, *13*(1), 380–387.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Chapter 14 - The Role of Goal Orientation in Self-Regulated Learning. In *Handbook of Self-Regulation* (pp. 451–502). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012109890-2/50043-3

Pintrich, P. R., Smith, D. A. F., Duncan, T., & Mckeachie, W. (1991). *A manual for the use of the motivated strategies for learning questionnaire (MSLQ)*.

Pressley, M. (1995). *Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers, and policymakers*. HarperCollins College Publishers. http://www.lib.muohio.edu/multifacet/record/mu3ugb2619716

Reichert, F., Lange, D., & Chow, L. (2021). Educational beliefs matter for classroom instruction: A comparative analysis of teachers' beliefs about the aims of civic education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *98*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103248

Roick, J., & Ringeisen, T. (2018). Students' math performance in higher education: examining the role of self-regulated learning and self-efficacy. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *65*, 148–158.

Vonkova, H., & Hrabak, J. (2015). The (in) comparability of ICT knowledge and skill self-assessments among upper secondary school students: The use of the anchoring vignette method. *Computers & Education*, *85*, 191–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.03.003

Zimmerman, B. J., & Moylan, A. R. (2009). Self-regulation: where metacognition and motivation intersect. In *Handbook of Metacognition in Education* (pp. 299–315).