



Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

Ramadoni

Universitas PGRI Sumatera Barat, Ramadoni.100393@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Calculus is one of the branches of mathematics which is often deemed difficult by students, indicated by students' weak conceptual understanding and low self-efficacy in calculus-related courses. Thus, innovative learning needs to be encouraged to overcome this problem. This study compares the effectiveness of whether a conventional or peer-teaching method is better at increasing students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy in flipped classroom teaching practices. A descriptive quantitative method was used in this study. This research was conducted in two classes in the calculus course at a teacher education program at a university in West Sumatra. The first class was taught in a Conventional Flipped Classroom (CFC) with 34 students. The second class took place in a Peer Teaching Flipped Classroom (PTFC) with 36 students. Pre-test, post-test, self-efficacy questionnaires, and field notes were used for data collection. Data analysis techniques were performed using graphs. Results indicate that students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy by peer teaching were better in the flipped classroom than in the conventional flipped classroom. Also, students' academic background was found to be influential to students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy. We reveal that the student's previous level of achievement in a peer-teaching flipped classroom influences their conceptual understanding and self-efficacy. This study suggests that future researchers and practitioners may implement peer-teaching flipped classroom in advanced calculus. It is recommended that the group division should also consider the students prior achievement level.

Keywords: *Conceptual Understanding; Self-Efficacy; Flipped Classroom; Peer Teaching Flipped Classroom*

Pengajaran Konvensional dan Pengajaran dengan Tutor Sebaya dalam *Flipped Classroom*: Mana yang Lebih Baik dalam Meningkatkan Pemahaman Konseptual dan Self Efikasi Siswa?

ABSTRAK

Kalkulus merupakan salah satu cabang dalam matematika yang diketahui sering dianggap sulit oleh siswa, yang terbukti dari pemahaman konseptual dan self-efficacy siswa yang rendah pada kelas-kelas kalkulus. Kalkulus merupakan salah satu cabang matematika yang sering dianggap sulit oleh mahasiswa, ditunjukkan dengan lemahnya pemahaman konseptual mahasiswa dan self-efficacy yang rendah dalam mata kuliah yang berhubungan dengan kalkulus. Dengan demikian,

pembelajaran inovatif perlu didorong untuk mengatasi masalah ini. Penelitian ini membandingkan keefektifan metode konvensional atau *peer-teaching* yang lebih baik dalam meningkatkan pemahaman konseptual dan *self-efficacy* siswa dalam praktik *flipped classroom teaching*. Metode kuantitatif deskriptif digunakan dalam penelitian ini. Penelitian ini dilakukan di dua kelas pada mata kuliah kalkulus pada program pendidikan guru di sebuah universitas di Sumatera Barat. Kelas pertama diajarkan di *Conventional Flipped Classroom (CFC)* dengan jumlah siswa 34 orang. Kelas kedua berlangsung di *Peer Teaching Flipped Classroom (PTFC)* dengan jumlah siswa 36 orang. Kuesioner pre-test, post-test, *self-efficacy*, dan catatan lapangan digunakan untuk pengumpulan data. Teknik analisis data dilakukan dengan menggunakan grafik. Hasil menunjukkan bahwa pemahaman konseptual dan *self-efficacy* siswa dengan *peer teaching* lebih baik di *flipped classroom* daripada di *flipped classroom konvensional*. Juga, latar belakang akademik siswa ditemukan berpengaruh terhadap pemahaman konseptual dan *self-efficacy* siswa. Kami mengungkapkan bahwa tingkat prestasi siswa sebelumnya dalam kelas membalik *peer-teaching* memengaruhi pemahaman konseptual dan *self-efficacy* mereka. Studi ini menunjukkan bahwa peneliti dan praktisi selanjutnya dapat mengimplementasikan kelas terbalik *peer-teaching* dalam kuliah kalkulus. Disarankan bahwa pembagian kelompok juga harus mempertimbangkan tingkat prestasi siswa sebelumnya.

Kata kunci: *Pemahaman konseptual; Self efikasi siswa; Flipped Classroom; Pengajaran dengan tutor sebaya pada flipped classroom.*

1. Introduction

Calculus is one of the branches of mathematics which is usually taught at the university level especially in the mathematics education department. However, research found that students have low conceptual understanding and *self-efficacy* in calculus courses [1], [2], [3]. Although the number of studies of flipped classrooms is increasing, they are primarily focused on home videos through design heuristics that enable students to think critically about individual math problems before engaging in learning. and the curricular components of the flipped classroom have addressed the effectiveness of such approaches on student outcomes. in tasks in a collective school environment [4]. Researchers discuss implications and recommendations for mathematics education, especially calculus [5]. The researchers concluded that the video-assisted flipped classroom learning model was effectively applied to mathematics learning [6].

Recently, many researchers have implemented flipped classrooms and peer teaching flipped classrooms in an effort to improve students' conceptual understanding and *self-efficacy*. The flipped classroom is students read and view important lecture material before class so that more time can be spent using engaging, interactive learning techniques in the classroom. Hence, students come to class prepared and can engage students more actively and understand concepts well [7]. Flipped classroom is a technology-based approach in student center learning [8], [9], [10], [11], [12], [13]. This approach is considered capable of improving students' conceptual and students' *self-efficacy*. [14] contends that peer teaching flipped classroom influenced conceptual understanding. In line, [15] stated that peer teaching flipped classrooms can increase students' conceptual understanding and *self-efficacy*.

Peer teaching in cooperative learning teams are: (1) Assignments: assign each student to different teams to plan a class teaching session of selected content areas, charge to develop cases and questions to stimulate class discussion. (2) Preparation: allow a time peer week for team preparation of their teaching session. (3) Each class session: team teaching of selected content, using cases to involve class discussion and teacher

mentoring by discussing detail left out. (4) Evaluation: stimulate student to keep up-to-date and feedback for their progress and teacher evaluation of team-teaching sessions [16]. Peer teaching flipped classroom is to integrate peer teaching into the flipped classroom [17]. The flipped classroom learning model affects conceptual understanding [18], [19], [20]. Self-efficacy in addition to affecting students' achievement also affects interest and intention [21]. Student background influences student self-efficacy [22].

Previous researchers have attempted to compare traditional flipped classrooms and peer-teaching flipped classrooms using statistical methods and have found that peer-teaching flipped classrooms are superior to traditional flipped classrooms. [23], [24]. However, this study was not tested using a statistical approach but was analyzed based on descriptive analysis.

In this study, research would be conducted using flipped classrooms and peer-teaching flipped classrooms in improving students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy. This research also investigates the correlation between conceptual understanding and self-efficacy in the categories of students' prior knowledge (high, medium, and low).

2. Methods

This research used descriptive quantitative method. This research conducted on calculus courses in two classes at an educational college in West Sumatra. The first class was taught using conventional flipped classroom (CFC) with 34 students. The second class was conducted using peer teaching flipped classroom (PTFC) with 36 students. In line with our department's goal of training mathematics teachers in secondary schools. By gender, the number of female students in the conventional flipped classroom was 25 females and 9 males. On the other hand, there were 30 female and 6 male students in the Peer Teaching Flipped Classroom.

The instruments used in this study were pretests and posttests to learn more about the students' conceptual understanding in learning calculus. Questions were used in the form of essays validated by two experts. Self-efficacy was also assessed using student-filled questionnaires and self-efficacy sheets. Data analysis techniques have been carried out using graphs. Data were analyzed descriptively with a quantitative approach.

A pretest was a test conducted before giving treatment to students. And post-test was a test run after providing treatment to students. Both tests contained ten questions to test students' conceptual understanding. The procedure that the researcher did to compile the initial proficiency test were: a) made a question grid for each ability according to indicators, b) made questions that fit the grid, c) content validation through two experts using a validation sheet. The results of the test validation given by the expert can be seen in the following table:

TABLE 1 The results of test questions validation for conceptual understanding.

Unit	No. of Days Taught	Weight	Keywords	% of the Topic	No. of Items per Topic	Item Placement
------	--------------------	--------	----------	----------------	------------------------	----------------

Unit 1: The real number system and functions; natural numbers, rational numbers, integers, and irrational numbers.	1	20%	Explain	20%	2	1a-1b
Unit 2: The real number system and functions; inequality, absolute value, and square root.	1	20%	Prove	20%	2	2a-2b
Unit 3: The real number system and functions; coordinate systems, straight line, equation graph, distance, circle and line equation formula, understanding function, range and domain.	1	20%	Determine	20%	2	3a-3b
Unit 4: The real number system and functions; type of function, functional function and trigonometric function.	1	20%	Apply	20%	2	4a-4b
Unit 5: Limit and Continuity; introduction of limit, definition of limit and in-depth study of limit.	1	10%	Estimating	10%	1	5a
Unit 6: Limit and Continuity; properties of limit, continuity of function, limit at infinity and infinite limit.	1	10%	Estimating	10%	1	5b
Total	6	100%		100%		

TABLE 2 The validation results of test.


Validation Unit	Expert 1	Expert 2	Average	Criteria
Unit 1	4	4	4	Very Valid
Unit 2	4	3	3,5	Very Valid
Unit 3	3	3	3	Valid
Unit 4	3	3	3	Valid
Unit 5-6	4	3	3,5	Very Valid

After validating the test questions with the expert and making revisions according to the suggestions, a valid test question is obtained. Revision of test questions has been carried out based on the expert's advice, and the following changes have been made to the

Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

test questions.

TABLE 3 The questions for conceptual understanding test.

	Before Validation	After Validation																																																				
Question S	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Summative Test</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Name :</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Department :</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Student ID :</td> <td>Score You Expect :</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Duration of Time for Study before Test:</td> </tr> <tr> <th colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Questions:</th> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1. Simplify the following equation!</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">a. $(2x - 6)^4$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">b. $\frac{x^2 - 5x + 6}{x^2 + 2x - 8}$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">2. Solve the following inequality!</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">a. $2x - 5 \leq 6 - 6x \leq 3x + 6$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">b. $2x - 5 < x + 4$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">3. a. Determine the equation of the line through the point A (-2, 3) and parallel to the line $y = -x - 5$</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">b. Determine the area of origin and the area from $f(x) = -\sqrt{625 - y^4}$</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">4. If $f(x) = \frac{1-x}{1+x}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Determine:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">a. $(f + g)(x)$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">b. $(f \cdot g)(x)$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">5. Determine the value of the limit below:</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">a. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sqrt{2x+1} - \sqrt{x+5}}{4-x}$</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding-left: 20px;">b. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{3x + \sin 4x}{5x - \tan 2x}$</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Summative Test		Name :	Department :	Student ID :	Score You Expect :	Duration of Time for Study before Test:		Questions:		1. Simplify the following equation!		a. $(2x - 6)^4$		b. $\frac{x^2 - 5x + 6}{x^2 + 2x - 8}$		2. Solve the following inequality!		a. $2x - 5 \leq 6 - 6x \leq 3x + 6$		b. $ 2x - 5 < x + 4 $		3. a. Determine the equation of the line through the point A (-2, 3) and parallel to the line $y = -x - 5$		b. Determine the area of origin and the area from $f(x) = -\sqrt{625 - y^4}$		4. If $f(x) = \frac{1-x}{1+x}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Determine:		a. $(f + g)(x)$		b. $(f \cdot g)(x)$		5. Determine the value of the limit below:		a. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sqrt{2x+1} - \sqrt{x+5}}{4-x}$		b. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{3x + \sin 4x}{5x - \tan 2x}$		<div style="text-align: center;">  <p>Sekolah Tinggi Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan STKIP PGRI Sumatera Barat Institusi Terakreditasi B dan Program Studi terakreditasi A & B Alamat: Jl. Gunung Panglun Padang, 7053828 Telp: (0751) 7053731 - Fax (0751) 7053828 E-Mail: admin@stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id stkip_pgripadang@yahoo.co.id Website: http://www.stkip-pgri-sumbar.ac.id</p> </div> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">MIDTERM EXAMINATION ODD SEMESTER 2020/2021</p> <table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Course :</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Calculus Differential</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Date :</td> <td>November 24th, 2020</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Time :</td> <td>150 Minutes</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Grade/Class :</td> <td>1/A&B</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Questions Type :</td> <td>Essay</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Department :</td> <td>Mathematics Education</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Lecturer :</td> <td>Ramadol, M.Pd.</td> </tr> </table> <hr/> <p>Hint:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pray before answering the questions. 2. Write your name, student ID, class, gender, majors background at high school, score prediction for this test, time duration to study calculus for 8 weeks (how many hours). 3. Read the questions carefully and answer according to the instructions given. 4. Using the calculator during the exam is prohibited. <hr/> <p>Questions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Simplify the following equation! <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. $\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2x-6}\right)^{-4}$ b. $\left(\frac{x^2-5x+6}{x^2+2x-8}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}$ 2. Solve the following inequality! <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. $3x - 5 \leq 6 - 6x \leq 3x + 6$ b. $2x - 5 < x + 4$ 3. a. Find the equation of the line through the point A (-2, 3) and parallel to the line $y = -x - 5$ <li style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Determine domain and range from $f(x) = -\sqrt{625 - y^4}$, and sketch the graph of the function. 4. If $f(x) = \frac{1-x}{1+x}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Determine domain and range from: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. $(f + g)(x)$ b. $(f \cdot g)(x)$ 5. a. Determine value of this limit: $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sqrt{2x+1} - \sqrt{x+5}}{4-x}$ <li style="padding-left: 20px;">b. Find the values of a and b such that g(x) is continuous in real numbers, where: $g(x) = \begin{cases} ax + b, & x \leq 0 \\ x^2 + 3a - b, & 0 < x \leq 2 \\ 3x - 5, & x > 2 \end{cases}$ <p style="text-align: right;">GOOD LUCK</p>	Course :	Calculus Differential	Date :	November 24th, 2020	Time :	150 Minutes	Grade/Class :	1/A&B	Questions Type :	Essay	Department :	Mathematics Education	Lecturer :	Ramadol, M.Pd.
Summative Test																																																						
Name :	Department :																																																					
Student ID :	Score You Expect :																																																					
Duration of Time for Study before Test:																																																						
Questions:																																																						
1. Simplify the following equation!																																																						
a. $(2x - 6)^4$																																																						
b. $\frac{x^2 - 5x + 6}{x^2 + 2x - 8}$																																																						
2. Solve the following inequality!																																																						
a. $2x - 5 \leq 6 - 6x \leq 3x + 6$																																																						
b. $ 2x - 5 < x + 4 $																																																						
3. a. Determine the equation of the line through the point A (-2, 3) and parallel to the line $y = -x - 5$																																																						
b. Determine the area of origin and the area from $f(x) = -\sqrt{625 - y^4}$																																																						
4. If $f(x) = \frac{1-x}{1+x}$ and $g(x) = \frac{1}{x}$. Determine:																																																						
a. $(f + g)(x)$																																																						
b. $(f \cdot g)(x)$																																																						
5. Determine the value of the limit below:																																																						
a. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 1} \frac{\sqrt{2x+1} - \sqrt{x+5}}{4-x}$																																																						
b. $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{3x + \sin 4x}{5x - \tan 2x}$																																																						
Course :	Calculus Differential																																																					
Date :	November 24th, 2020																																																					
Time :	150 Minutes																																																					
Grade/Class :	1/A&B																																																					
Questions Type :	Essay																																																					
Department :	Mathematics Education																																																					
Lecturer :	Ramadol, M.Pd.																																																					

The following are the question items from the distributed questionnaire for self-efficacy:

TABLE 4 The Questionnaire for self-efficacy.

No	Items
1	Do you often miss the excitement?
2	Do you often need an understanding friend to cheer you up?
3	Are you the typical carefree person?
4	Do you find it very difficult to take no for an answer from other people?
5	Do you think everything through before doing anything?
7	If you say you're going to do something, do you always keep your word, no matter how uncomfortable doing it is?
8	Does your mood fluctuate?
9	Do you usually do and say things quickly without stopping to think?
10	Have you ever felt 'unhappy/depressed' for no apparent reason?
11	Would you do almost anything for a challenge?
12	Do you suddenly feel shy when you want to talk to an attractive stranger?
13	Do you occasionally lose your temper and get angry?
14	Do you often do things on the spur of the moment?
15	Do you often worry about the things you do or say?
16	Do you prefer reading to meeting people?
17	Are you the type who is easily hurt/offended?
18	Do you like traveling?
19	Do you sometimes have thoughts that you don't want others to know about?
20	Are you sometimes very excited and sometimes very sluggish?
21	Would you prefer to have few but special friends?
22	Do you daydream a lot?

-
- 23 When people yell at you, do you yell back?
 24 Do you often have feelings of guilt?
 25 Are all your habits classified as good and much desired by others?
 26 Can you like go and have fun at a merry party?
 27 Are you the type who is often nervous about doing something?
 28 Do other people find you very passionate?
 29 After you do something important, do you walk away feeling that you could have done it better?
 30 Are you mostly quiet when you are with other people?
 31 Do you like to gossip?
 32 Do you like to think so you can't sleep?
 33 If there's something you want to know, would you rather look it up in a book than talk about it with someone?
 34 Are you one of those people who often get excited when doing something?
 35 Do you like the types of activities that require your attention?
 36 Are you one of those people who often shake?
 37 Will you always report your obligations, even though you know you'll never be caught?
 38 Don't you like being with a crowd of people joking around?
 39 Are you an easily offended person?
 40 Do you like to do things where you have to act quickly?
 41 Are you worried about bad things that might happen?
 42 Are you slow and unhurried in your actions?
 43 Have you ever been late for an appointment?
 44 Do you often have nightmares?
 45 Do you really like talking to people, including talking to people you don't know?
 46 Are you bothered by any illness?
 47 Would you be very unhappy if you couldn't see many people throughout the day?
 48 Are you a nervous person?
 49 Of all the people you know, are there some people you don't like?
 50 Are you a fairly confident person?
 51 Are you easily hurt when others blame you for your work?
 52 Do you find it difficult to enjoy a lively party?
 53 Are you bothered by feelings of inferiority?
 54 Are you having trouble enjoying a party?
 55 Do you sometimes talk about things you know nothing about?
 56 Are you worried about your health?
 57 Do you like pranking other people?
 58 Do you suffer from sleeplessness?
-

3. Results and Discussions

The purpose of this research is to examine the effect of flipped classroom methods in calculus courses on college students. This research compares conventional flipped classrooms and peer-teaching flipped classrooms.

3.1 Comparison between PTFC and CFC Methods

In this section, we will discuss in more detail the students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy, which is carried out every week (self-formative test).

TABLE 5 All of the students in PTFC method.

Average PTFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	

Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

SBC	39.17	76.96	58.57	90.90	62.86	79.38	92.12	
PBC	64.39	65.00	66.29	76.36	63.42	71.26	72.50	
PTBC	48.60	32.25	32.55	55.05	36.75	29.70	28.65	
SIC		87.78	80.29	96.66	69.14	93.94	95.00	80.11
PIC		80.00	78.48	74.82	75.00	85.80	84.38	76.57

SBC= Score Before Class,

PBC= Prediction Before Class,

PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),

SQIC= Score In-Class,

PIC= Prediction In-Class.

TABLE 6. All of Students in CFC Method.

Average CFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	41.76	88.82	87.35	92.36	46.66	69.70	84.38	
PBC	79.32	82.22	82.26	80.00	77.50	78.76	78.70	
PTBC	40.20	14.10	24.15	32.55	35.10	28.35	29.55	
SIC		91.34	73.44	79.38	83.76	95.62	97.24	75.68
PIC		81.30	80.00	76.12	73.76	78.12	80.68	85.71


SBC= Score Before Class,

PBC= Prediction Before Class,


PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),

SIC= Score In-Class,

PIC= Prediction In-Class.



Picture 1 All Students in Conventional Flipped Classroom



Picture 2 All students in peer teaching flipped classroom.

Using the PTFC method shows that students' quiz scores after applying the PTFC method in class always experienced an increase from the quizzes held before class. Although it appeared that there was an increase and decrease in student scores every week because the level of difficulty of the material in learning calculus every week was different. Moreover, this is line with the consistent of students' self-efficacy, which always increases. This means that students still had more predictions about the after-class quiz than before class. Based on the analysis carried out, this was caused by an increase in students' conceptual understanding of several wrong things in the previous quiz to evaluate themselves and improve their answers. Referring to the time and student scores always followed the same pattern from quiz to quiz 4, for quizzes 5 and 6 they still

Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

experienced an increase in scores even though students experienced a reduction in learning time. In the early meets, the more time students spent, the higher the score obtained, and different from the time at the end, they have managed themselves well and made the best use of their time. So that with less time they were able to maximize their learned.

In this PTFC method, we see a consistent increase between the before class quizzes and in-class quizzes. It means that the process of in-class learning activities provides a deeper understanding of student understanding. It also happens with student self-efficacy. If we compare students' predictions before class and in-class, we see that it is always a constant increase. The results are in line with hypotheses 1 and 2 results, and there is a significant increase in conceptual understanding and self-efficacy with students in the PTFC method.

The possible explanation is that students with the PTFC method had more mental effort. During before the class, the students provided video explanations and feedback that made them learn more deeply than just capturing the concept from watching videos and taking notes. The PTFC method offered students' opportunities to speak up in class, more interactive, and had the chance to peer-teaching to other students, making them learn more deeply to understand concepts more than the CFC method.

If we look at the relationship between the score (conceptual understanding) and the students' prediction (self-efficacy), we see that the students' ability to predict their scores during the pretest fluctuates. Simultaneously, in-class, there is only one intersection of results because the material at the meeting was indeed tricky for students to understand. It can be seen from the students' comments when they made conclusions on the Mentimeter application. In addition, almost all the students' scores during the quiz in-class exceeded their predictions. It means that the results they got exceed their expectations.

Whereas in the CFC method, based on the graph above, the student's score from pretest to posttest does not always increase. It happened at weeks 2 and 3 where students experienced a decrease in their score. It happened because students were not careful in answering questions in the classroom. Due to the similarity between the quiz questions given before class and after applying the CFC method, they always used the same answers and were reluctant to answer again. Judging from the time they spent each week was relatively the same, and time did not reflect the student score. Students spent a lot of time on difficult material, however the extra time they use has not been able to make their score better than easy material. The students' predictions were relatively the same every week. Moreover, students' quiz predictions before class and in class were almost the same.

This data shows that there was an inconsistency in the students' scores before class and in-class. Sometimes the student's score at the pretest was better than the in-class score. There was a big gap between the students' scores before class and in-class. This means that by using the CFC method, in-class learning is essential for students to improve their conceptual understanding. Meanwhile, if we monitor students' self-efficacy, they continuously provided predictions before class and in-class. This is inversely proportional to their conceptual understanding, which experienced a very drastic increase and decreases.

3.1 Comparison between PTFC and CFC Methods in Self-Efficacy in Term of High Ability

Table 7 All of Students with High Ability in PTFC Method.

Average High Ability of PTFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	53.33	78.18	66.36	90.00	63.34	80.00	91.66	
PBC	70.33	81.80	80.83	76.00	73.34	86.66	88.34	
PTBC	38.10	31.35	34.35	60.00	31.95	30.60	28.80	
SIC		95.00	85.00	98.34	73.34	98.34	95.00	86.50
PIC		65.00	63.64	76.00	68.34	78.18	81.66	82.50

SBC= Score Before Class,

PBC= Prediction Before Class,

PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),

SIC= Score In-Class,

PIC= Prediction In-Class.

Table 8 All of students with high ability in CFC method.

Average High Ability of CFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	54.16	93.34	90.00	90.00	56.66	68.34	91.66	
PBC	79.75	83.34	82.00	80.00	81.66	80.00	81.80	
PTBC	56.85	12.45	21.75	28.65	38.1	31.95	31.35	
SIC		96.36	76.36	85.46	89.10	100.00	100.00	80.58
PIC		81.80	80.00	80.00	74.54	81.82	82.00	87.50


SBC= Score Before Class, PBC= Prediction Before Class,

PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),


SIC= Score In-Class,

PIC= Prediction n-Class.

Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?



Picture 3 All of the high ability peer teaching flipped classroom



Picture 4 All of high ability conventional flipped classroom.

Examining in-depth about students who had high abilities in the PTFC method, this was almost the same as the whole class. After class, the students' quiz scores after applying the PTFC method always increased from quiz before class. The student prediction who increased after class always decreased from the quizzes held before class. Referring to the time, it appears that time did not represent the student score. In the beginning of meets, the more time students spent, the higher the score obtained, and different from the time at the end, they have managed themselves well and made the best use of their time. So that with less time they were able to maximize their learned.

For high ability students in the PTFC method, there was an increase in student scores from before class to in-class. This is inversely proportional to their self-efficacy, which has decreased from before class to in-class. If we look at it, almost all the students'

predictions before class were higher than their scores. As for in-class, their score exceeded the predictions they gave. This happened because students had high confidence in the mastery they got before class. After they learn in-class, they knew that there were some things wrong with the concept, so they could improve the concept and reduce their predictions.

Whereas in the CFC method with high abilities, it is almost the same as the total, based on the graph above, the student's score from pretest to posttest does not always increase. The classrooms are practically the same. Judging from the time they spent each week is relatively the same, and time did not reflect the student score. Students spent a lot of time on difficult material, however the extra time they use has not been able to make their score better than easy material.

Students' understanding of concepts did not always increase by using the CFC method from before class to in-class. Meanwhile, their self-efficacy remained the same. If we look at the students' predictions before class and in-class, the scores they got tend to fluctuate.

The finding gave a clear explanation that students with the PTFC method had more mental effort due to the provided feedback during the flipped classroom made them more involved and engaged. Furthermore, using this approach enabled students to evaluate their understanding before class. Students also had the opportunity to speak in class, be more interactive, and had the chance to teach other students, which made them also have a role in evaluating other students so that they can assessed themselves and measured the extent. Thus, they had good self-efficacy abilities and could predict themselves in the PTFC method.

One possible explanation is that during the class, students believed that they can learn well because used PTFC made them more active and interactive in learning, so they had many opportunities to discuss and ask many things they did not know, and they were also much involved in the learning process. Students were sure that they could carry out the learning they got outside of the classroom and in the future because students had implemented peer-teaching, so they did not hesitate to enforce it at a later date.

The results showed that there was an insignificant difference for the assignment dimension of students in the two classes, this was possible because students used the conventional flipped classroom were also given control before class by made a summary of the videos they did, so that they could still be supervised and still under control. This also had an impact on their anxiety about the grade they would get to be reduced. This also occurred in the in-class dimension, students were asked to do group problem solving activities, so that those who were taught in the conventional flipped classroom also still believed that they would be able to learn well in-class.

3.2 Comparison between PTFC and CFC Methods in Self-Efficacy in Term of

Conventional versus Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

Medium Ability

Table 9 All of students with medium ability in PTFC method.


Average Medium Ability of PTFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	39.39	75.00	56.67	90.90	78.34	72.72	96.00	
PBC	64.09	63.34	65.83	76.36	63.34	70.90	70.00	
PTBC	85.95	37.50	32.70	60.00	43.65	29.25	27.90	
SIC		86.66	76.67	93.34	41.18	92.72	96.36	78.25
PIC		80.00	78.18	74.00	74.54	89.10	85.46	74.55

SBC= Score Before Class,
PBC= Prediction Before Class,
PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),
SIC= Score In-Class,
PIC= Prediction In-Class.


Table 10 All of students with medium ability in CFC method.

Average Medium Ability of CFC	Pretest	Week						Post-test
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	40.28	90.00	91.67	98.34	41.82	80.00	76.36	
PBC	85.83	92.72	83.64	80.00	74.54	76.36	72.72	
PTBC	25.95	16.05	23.85	33.75	36.15	28.65	28.65	
SIC		92.72	71.67	81.80	83.64	96.36	94.54	73.92
PIC		80.00	80.00	76.36	70.90	76.36	78.18	84.17

SBC= Score Before Class,
PBC= Prediction Before Class,
PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),
SIC= Score In-Class,
PIC= Prediction In-Class.



Picture 5 All of High Ability Peer Teaching Flipped Classroom.



Picture 6 All of Medium Ability Conventional Flipped Classroom.

In detail, students who had medium abilities in the PTFC method, the student's quiz score after applying the PTFC method after class had increased from the quiz held before class, but not in quiz 4. Indeed, students admitted that the material about determining domain and codomain. This meeting was a material that was difficult for students to understand. Even though it had been taught in class and discussions, students still experienced difficulties in some concepts. The researcher reviewed several essential things at the beginning of the meeting afterward. For student prediction, the students mostly increased after class, continuously rising

Conventional Vs Peer Teaching in Flipped Classroom: Which is Better at Increasing Students' Conceptual Understanding and Self-Efficacy?

from the quizzes held before class. Referring to the time, it appears that time did not represent the student score. In the beginning of meets, the more time students spent, the higher the score obtained, and different from the time at the end, they have managed themselves well and made the best use of their time. So that with less time they were able to maximize their learned.

Students' understanding of concepts almost always increases by using the PTFC method from before class to in-class. Likewise, their self-efficacy tends to increase. But in contrast, the relationship between the predictions and the score they get tends to fluctuate.

Whereas in the CFC method, the medium ability is almost the same as the total CFC method, based on the graphic above, this can be seen that the students' score from pretest to posttest does not always increase, namely at the beginning of the meeting until the 4th meeting. In terms of students' predictions, every week is relatively the same. Also, students' predictions of quiz before class and after class are almost relatively the same. Judging from the time they spent each week is relatively the same, and time did not reflect the students' score. Students spent a lot of time on difficult topics, however the extra time they use has not been able to make their score better than easy topics.

Students' understanding of concepts was not always improved by using the CFC method from before class to in-class. In contrast to their self-efficacy, which tended to be constant. There was also a big gap between the scores before class and in-class. Using the CFC method, the in-class activity provided a significant effect on students' conceptual understanding.

3.3 Comparison between PTFC and CFC Methods in Self-Efficacy in Term of Low Ability

Table 11 All of students with low ability in PTFC method.

Average Low Ability of PTFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	34.72	78.00	53.33	92.00	65.44	86.00	98.00	
PBC	59.08	66.66	69.17	78.00	58.18	64.00	64.00	
PTBC	26.55	28.20	30.00	40.65	38.20	29.10	29.10	
SIC		81.66	79.09	98.34	54.54	90.00	84.00	75.58
PIC		78.34	76.00	74.28	77.78	80.00	77.78	71.38

SBC= Score Before Class,

PBC= Prediction Before Class,

PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),

SIC= Score In-Class,


PIC= Prediction In-Class.

Table 12. All of students with low ability in CFC method.


Average Low Ability of CFC	Pretest	Week						Posttest
		1	2	3	4	5	6	
SBC	28.67	81.82	78.18	87.28	40.00	58.18	84.00	
PBC	71.00	80.00	80.91	80.00	74.00	80.00	82.00	
PTBC	36.20	13.80	25.95	33.75	28.50	22.50	27.00	
SIC		84.44	73.00	69.00	80.00	90.90	97.78	71.80
PIC		82.22	80.00	72.72	74.54	76.36	82.22	85.40

SBC= Score Before Class,

PBC= Prediction Before Class,
 PTBC= Preparation Time Before Class (units in 4 minutes),
 SIC= Score In-Class,
 PIC= Prediction In-Class.



Picture 7 All of low ability peer teaching flipped classroom



Picture 8 All of low ability conventional flipped classroom

In detail, students who had low abilities in the PTFC method, the quiz scores of students after applying the PTFC method after class had increased from the quizzes held before class at meetings 2, 3, 4, and 6, but not at meetings 5 and 7. Indeed, students admitted that the material on determining domain and codomain at this meeting was difficult for students to understand. Whereas at the 7th meeting about the limit theorem, students tried to answer the questions quickly and carelessness occurred in answering the questions. Students always experienced an increase in after class for student prediction, continuously increasing from the quizzes held before class. Referring to the time, it appears that time did not represent the student score. In the beginning of meets,

the more time students spent, the higher the score obtained, and different from the time at the end, they have managed themselves well and made the best use of their time. So that with less time they were able to maximize their learned.

Students' understanding of concepts was almost always increased by using the PTFC method from before class to in-class, in line with their self-efficacy, which increases. However, the gap in the scores of students before class and in-class was not too big. This indicates the importance of before class learning for low ability students in the PTFC method. The relationship between students' conceptual understanding was almost always above their predictions for low ability students in the PTFC method.

Whereas in the CFC class with low abilities, it is almost the same as the total CFC method, based on the graph above, the students' score from pretest to post-test does not always increase, namely at the 1st meeting to the 4th meeting. In terms of students' predictions, every week was relatively the same. The students' predictions before class and after class were almost relatively the same. Judging from the time they spent each week was relatively the same, and time did not represent the students' score. The more time students spent, the higher the score obtained.

Students' understanding of concepts was not always increased by using the CFC method from before class to in-class contradicted to their almost constant self-efficacy. However, there was a big gap between the scores of the students before class and in-class. This indicated that the magnitude of the effect of in-class learning for low ability students in the CFC method. Students could not predict their conceptual understanding well because it always tended to be constant while their scores experience a drastic increase and decrease.

Calculus self-efficacy assesses a student's ability to understand concepts and solve problems [25]. What students experience each time they perform a calculus task influences their calculus self-efficacy [26], [27]. Moreover, self-efficacy provides positive messages about student performance and assessment feedback [28]. In addition, calculus self-efficacy was a predictor of achievement and enhanced students' conceptual understanding [29].

Another thing that is essential to increasing the success of a peer teaching flipped classroom is the student background. It is important to think about this in order to make the group/class students more developed and more active. Students help each other understand the material and solve math problems. Peer teaching helps foster diversity of student backgrounds and prior knowledge, making them easier to integrate [30]. Furthermore, Students' background influences student self-efficacy [31]. Additionally, self-efficacy and its impact on student performance also influence interests and intentions [32], [33].

4 Conclusion

The results showed that students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy using peer teaching flipped classroom perform better than conventional flipped classrooms. Students background affects conceptual understanding and self-efficacy. The results showed that the students' prior achievement level in peer teaching flipped classroom influence students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy. Based on the conclusions and research implications above, the authors provide the following suggestions: the implementation of peer teaching flipped classroom in advanced calculus. Mathematics teachers can practice it in learning. Where to provide concepts through videos before class and provide practice questions according to the level of student ability and background in class. It is recommended that the group division must

consider the students prior achievement level.

5 Acknowledgments

Thank you to all parties involved and have helped from the research stage to the writing of this article.

6 References

- [1] P. W. Thompson & G. Harel, "Ideas foundational to calculus learning and their links to students' difficulties," *ZDM–Mathematics Education*, vol. 53, no 3, pp. 507-519, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-021-01270-1>
- [2] C. Rasmussen, K. Marrongelle & M. C. Borba, "Research on calculus: What do we know and where do we need to go?" *ZDM*, vol. 46, pp. 507-515, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-014-0615-x>
- [3] H. P. Koirala, "Teaching of calculus for students' conceptual understanding," *The Mathematics Educator*, vol. 2 no. 1, pp. 52-62, 1997.
- [4] M. Voigt, H. Fredriksen, & C. Rasmussen, "Leveraging the design heuristics of realistic mathematics education and culturally responsive pedagogy to create a richer flipped classroom calculus curriculum". *ZDM*, vol. 52, pp. 1051-1062, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11858-019-01124-x>
- [5] J. D. Spotts & A. P. Gutierrez de Blume, "A pilot study on the effect of the flipped classroom model on pre-calculus performance", *SAGE Open*, vol. 10, no. 4, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244020982604>
- [6] A. F. Jafar, et al., "The effectiveness of video-assisted flipped classroom learning model implementation in integral calculus", *Journal of Applied Science, Engineering, Technology, and Education*, vol. 2 no. 1, pp. 97-103, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.35877/454RI.asci2144>
- [7] B. W. Bequette, "Innovations in Process Control Education: A Flipped Classroom/Studio Approach", *Computer Aided Chemical Engineering*, vol. 44, pp. 63-70, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-64241-7.50007-0>
- [8] C. Adams, "Flipping calculus: the potential influence, and the lessons learned," *The Electronic Journal of Mathematics and Technology*, pp. 154-164, United States: Radford University, 2016.
- [9] C. L. Lai & G .J. Hwang, *A Self-Regulated Flipped Classroom Approach to Improving Students' Learning Performance in A Mathematics Course*. Computers & Education: 100, pp. 126–140, 2016.
- [10] C. K. Lo, C. W. Lie & K. F. Hew, *Applying "First Principles of Instruction" as a Design Theory of the Flipped Classroom: Findings from a Collective Study of Four Secondary School Subjects*. Computers & Education, 118, 150-165, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2017.12.003>
- [11] S. Sergis, "Investigating the impact of flipped classroom on students' learning experiences: A self-determination theory approach", *Computers in Human Behavior*, vol. 78, pp. 368-378, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.08.011>
- [12] Z. Araujo, "Mathematics teachers' motivations for, conceptions of, and experiences with flipped instruction", *Teaching and Teacher Education*, vol. 62, pp. 60-70, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2016.11.006>
- [13] Z. Sun, K. Xie, L. H. Anderman "The role of self-regulated learning in students' success in flipped undergraduate math courses", *The Internet and Higher*

- Education*, vol. 36, pp. 41-53, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2017.09.003>
- [14] L. H. Sukma, Ramadoni & M. Suryani, "The implementation effect of peer teaching flipped classroom on student's understanding of mathematical concepts in learning mathematics". *Alifmatika Jurnal Pendidikan dan Pembelajaran Matematika*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 150-165, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.35316/alifmatika.2022.v4i2.150-165>
- [15] Ramadoni, & M. Mustofa, "Enhancing flipped classroom with peer teaching to promote students' conceptual understanding and self-efficacy in calculus courses," *Pegem Journal of Education and Instruction*, vol. 12 no. 3, pp. 154–168, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.47750/pegegog.12.03.17>
- [16] S. Ramaswamy, H. Harris & U. Tschirner, "Student peer teaching: An innovative approach to instruction in science and engineering education," *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 165-171, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1009421231056>
- [17] R. M. Tan, R. T. Yangco & E. N. Que, "Students' conceptual understanding and science process skills in an inquiry-based flipped classroom environment", *Malaysian Journal of Learning and Instruction*, vol. 17 no. 1, 159-184, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.32890/mjli2020.17.1.7>
- [18] M. D. Putri, D. Rusdiana & D. Rochintaniawati, "Students' conceptual understanding in modified flipped classroom approach: An experimental study in junior high school science learning," *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 1157(2), 022046, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1157/2/022046>
- [19] R. H. Ristanto, E. Kristiani & E. Lisanti, "Flipped classroom–digital game based learning (FC-DGBL): enhancing genetics conceptual understanding of students in bilingual programme". *Journal of Turkish Science Education*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 332-352, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.36681/tused.2022.124>
- [20] S. Schallert, Z. Lavicza & E. Vandervieren, "Towards inquiry-based flipped classroom scenarios: a design heuristic and principles for lesson planning," *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, vol. 20, pp. 1-21, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-021-10167-0>
- [21] M. Cevikbas & G. Kaiser. "Student Engagement in A Flipped Secondary Mathematics Classroom," *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, vol. 20, pp. 1455–1480, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10763-021-10213-x>
- [22] X. Wei, et al., "Effect of the flipped classroom on the mathematics performance of middle school students," *Educational Technology Research and Development*, vol. 68, pp. 1461-1484, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11423-020-09752-x>
- [23] S. Grigg, et al., "Relations among math self-efficacy, interest, intentions, and achievement: a social cognitive perspective," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 53, pp. 73-86, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.01.007>
- [24] E. L. Usher, H. N. Perera, P. McIlveen, Z. Svetleff, "Sources of Math and Science Self-Efficacy in Rural Appalachia: A Convergent Mixed Methods Study," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 57, pp. 32-53, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.10.003>
- [25] A. Bandura, *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: Freeman, 1987.
- [26] E. L. Usher & F. Pajares, "Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature and future directions". *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 78, no. 4, pp. 751-796, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308321456>

- [27] F. Pajares & E. L. Usher, E. L., “Sources of Self-Efficacy in Mathematics: A Validation Study”. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 34, no.1, pp. 89–101, 2009. [https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.ecedpsych.2008.09.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecedpsych.2008.09.002).
- [28] G. Joeët, E. L. Usher & P. Bressoux, “Sources of self-efficacy: An investigation of elementary school students in France”, *Journal of Educational Psychology*, vol. 103, no. 3, pp. 649–663, 2011. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024048>
- [29] F. Pajares & M. D. Miller, “Mathematics self-efficacy and mathematics performances: The need for specificity of assessment”, *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, vol. 42, no. 2, pp. 190-198, 1995. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.42.2.190>.
- [30] D. E. Chubin, G. S. May & E. L. Babco, “Diversifying the engineering workforce,” *Journal of Engineering Education*, vol 94, no. 1, pp. 73-86, 2005. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2168-9830.2005.tb00830.x>
- [31] Ellen L. Usher, C. J. Ford, C. R. Li, B. L. Weidner, “Sources of math and science self-efficacy in rural appalachia: A convergent mixed methods study”, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 57, pp. 32-53, 2019, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.10.003>.
- [32] S. Grigg, H. N. Perera, P. McIlveen, Z. Svetleff, “Relations among math self-efficacy, interest, intentions, and achievement: A social cognitive perspective”. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, vol. 53, pp. 73-86, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2018.01.007>
- [33] R. Ramadoni & K. T. Chien, “Integrating Peer Tutoring Video with Flipped Classroom in Online Statistics Course to Improve Learning Outcomes,” *Infinity Journal*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 13-26, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.22460/infinity.v12i1.p13-26>