CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter is devoted to present the research findings that were drawn from interview and questionnaire and to present discussion of the study. The data analysis served to answer the underlying research question related to the students' responses to reflective writing activity in Introduction To Linguistic Class at UIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

A. Research Findings

In this chapter, the researcher tried to describe the data which have been got from several kinds of data collection technique that relate to this research clearly. Concerning with knowing the students' responses to reflective writing activity of the second semester students of English Education Department, the researcher did two data collection techniques in order to get more than complete data. They were interview and qustionnaire. In interview, researcher interviewed the students with the questions that related to their impression or opinion about the reflective writing activity (see appendix 1). From here, the researcher got the information; the students' responses. By interviewing the students directly, the researcher was able to get the real information of the data that the researcher wanted. There, the researcher was able to face the students directly and knew that the students were able to understand the questions asked by the researcher in easier way by giving them explanations about the questions in detail.

Moreover, the researcher also gave the questionnaire to the students as a more power and detail information about the students' responses. Some questions given to the students were answered after they had interviewed directly in the same time (see appendix 2).

Also, from the interview guideliness and questionnaires the researcher got the conclusion about the correlation or similiarity of the real students' responses with the lecturer's perception about that. Here is the complete information and data got from the two important instruments after the researcher did the research :

1. The Result Of The Interview

The interview to the lecturer was implemented on Wednesday, 17 of June 2015 at 12.17 p.m. and to the students was implemented on Tuesday, 16 of June 2015 at 13.50 p.m.

The first, it talks about the implementation of reflective writing designed by the lecturer based on the information got from lecturer and students. Next, it is about the reason why the reflective writing is implemented. Finally it talks about the students' responses and everything which is probably found.

a) From the lecturer :

The lecturer stated that the reflective writing was suitable for Introduction To Linguistic Class which was theoretical material, the lecturer hoped what the students got was same as the lecturer's expectation. From here, the lecturer could know what the students' problems and difficulties which the lecturer wanted to know as a discourse in the next year. By reflective writing the lecturer also could control their learning.

Based on the information got from interviewing the lecturer and the students, the reflective writing was implemented every meetings. The Introduction To Linguistic Class was implemented on every Monday, it means the reflective writing was also implemented on Monday. However, the students might not to do it directly on that day because the lecturer gave the students three days from the day. In other words, the students could do it in home starting from Monday until Wednesday. The students must post their assignment; reflective writing via Edmodo. Edmodo is a simple M-learning tool using to present the lesson contents, it is common to all operation systems of smartphones; it provides useful tools for students and teachers to interact online outside class anywhere, anytime.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ Khaleel M. Al-Said, "Students' *Perceptions of Edmodo and Mobile Learning and their Real Barriers Towards Them*", (Taibah University : Department of Educational Technology, College of Education, 2015), 168

It eased both the lecturer and the students. They believed that it was effective and effisien (see appendix 3).

The content of reflective writing done by the students was some questions about the material or the lecturer's perfomances in a form. It was similar to what Bronwyn Hegarty mentioned in explanatory reflection which concluded personal, professional, deciding, self-questioning, reactions, learning, stating and goals.⁴¹ The students had to answer regarding their understanding in a reflective form. Here are some questions including in the form of reflective writing :

- What is the topic of the discussion?
- Is the topic interesting for you?
- Have you read the material before yo come to the class?
- When did you start reading it?
- When did you finish reading it?
- Why do you choose to read the text?
- Write a short summary of the text you read!
- What was your impressiom of your reading material?
- By using the example, what are the differences between? (mention the topic on the day)
- What are the problems you have when you discuss the topic?

⁴¹ Bronwyn Hegarty, *Is reflective writing an enigma? Can preparing evidence for an electronic portfolio develop skills for reflective practice?* (New Zealand : Otago Polytechcnic Dunedin, 2011), 585

What are the benefits you can take after studying? (mention the topic on the day).

The students had to answer all of the questions regarding the topic of the day via edmodo. The questions could be same or different in every meeting depended on the material. From here, the lecturer moved the students' answer from edmodo to a document prepared in order to get the database. The students' impression, mind, message, critical thinking and any experiences could be identified.

According to the lecturer's explanation, the lecturer chose the way in applying reflective writing because the class had such limited time that they had to do in the home by edmodo. The other reason was the lecturer could have the document which can be a reference for her to understand the students more. The material of Introduction To Linguistic was very theoretical. It could control more by reflective writing.

The lecturer believed that the method chosen in implementation of reflective writing was suitable for students' need; reading. It was because Introduction To Linguistic included many theories. Indirectly, by doing reflective writing, students had done two activities; writing and reading. As an example, when the question in reflective form was about definition of linguistic, of course the students answered it based on the book they read. It was impossible for them to answer if they did not read the material. That was the lecturer's purpose. More or less the students might read the material before giving feedback in reflective writing.

Based on the lecturer's explanation, at the beginning, the students felt lazy or objected to do reflective writing because they assumed they had many tasks and duties from other lecturers and worried to do in objection. However, after the lecturer gave them deadline in three days, they became enthusiastic and used to do reflective writing. It was proved by their collecting reflective writing on time.

Moreover, the lecturer stated that the students did not feel difficult in doing reflective writing because the questions about their experiences themselves. It gave them beneficial precisely by showing their mind and messages to the lecturer. Furthermore, it was applied without any scoring about grammar or structure. The lecturer only saw the content of their writing. So, there was no reason for the students to feel difficult.

Meanwhile, the lecturer admited she had a lack of implementation of reflective writing that she could not return feedback to the students because there was no time to do it. The class only included 2 SKS (one a half hours) for many theories; starting to phonology until interdisciplinary linguistic. It was impossible to organize her feedback in the limited time with some different problems. The class was only possible to discuss the Introduction To Linguistic materials which concluded many theories. Furthermore, some of their problems were their miss understanding about the topic which was because they did not read the material. On the other hand, it was a problem of lazyness that the lecturer assumed it did not need to lift.

b) From the students :

As the lecturer's explanation about the implementation of reflective writing, the students also gave same information to the researcher. Every meeting was implemented to know the students' problems. In their opinion, the lecturer's reason to give them reflective writing was to know students' understanding and difficulties to the material. They also believed the lecturer's way to instruct reflective writing by edmodo in the home was to get effective and effisien time because the class had limited time and it was impossible to implement reflective writing in the class. However, some of them recognized they had challenges in doing reflective writing; spending internet credit, being bored because of doing it monotonously with the same questions, forgetting not to do because of having many tasks from other lectures, etc. They also stated that they were disappointed because the result of reflective writing was not discussed in the class. Whereas the students needed their problems were solved soon. It was such a waste or useless for them to do reflective writing if there was no solution for their problems.

Although some of them felt disappointed, they still believed by doing reflective writing they could improve their discipline, explore their critical thinking, give new knowledge and add experience in writing. Those became an expectation to them. Moreover, at least they were satisfied because they could convey everything in their mind and some messages to the lecturer.

2. The Result of The Questionnaire

The researcher chose 12 students as a representation of a class. As explanation before, the class included 21 students and the researcher took a half of students in the class. The questionnaire was not held in the class of Introduction To Linguistic Class in order no to disturbe the teaching learning process. The researcher gave the questionnaire to the students directly after the interview implemented on Tuesday, 16 June 2015 at the time.

Here is the result of questionnaire with the definite formula by Suharsimi Arikunto :

The students' responses of one question x 100% The number of students

No.	Questionnaire	Agree	Disagree	Neutral
1	Are you interested in reflective	8	2	2
	writing?	(66,6%)	(16,6%)	(16,6%)
2	Do you agree if reflective writing is	6	2	4
	applied in your introduction to linguistic class?	(50%)	(16,6%)	(33,3%)
3	Do you like your lecturer model to apply reflective writing?	6 (50%)	3 (25%)	3 (25%)
4	Does this reflective writing activity	3	6	3
	burden you in learning process?	(25%)	(50%)	(25%)
5	Are you bored to do your reflective	6	3	3
	writing?	(50%)	(25%)	(25%)
6	Do you agree if reflective writing is	4	4	4
	not used in Introduction To Linguistic learning process?	(33,3%)	(33,3%)	(33,3%)

3. The Students' Responses

From the result of interview and questionnaire, the researcher got conclusion about students' responses in reflective writing activity. They were divided into some chategories.

Actually, more than a half of students (66,6%) investigated recognized that they liked reflective writing because it could explore their critical thinking and give new knowledge and experience in writing. They hoped reflective writing can be applied continuosly as a feedback function. Only few students did not like and feel in doubt. However in the fact, some of them admitted that they were disappointed in doing it. It showed 50% of the students felt bored in doing it. According to them, the questions were not too different in every meeting. It made monotonous. Moreover, there were two students stated they ever did not convey some of their thinking in reflective writing because of missinforming the material. It occured when they could not get the lecturer's explanation comprehensively because the lecturer talked in 100% of English that they did not understand well.

However from all of the data got by the researcher, the researcher concluded the main reason to make students fell disappoint was the lecturer did not return feedback to discuss their problems in the class. It seemed useless and waste to do reflective writing if they did not feel the main advantage. Based on the interview, almost interviewed students who felt disappointed gave same reason. It becomes an evaluation to the lecturer eventhough the lecturer actually realized it was her lack in implementing reflective writing. Whatever the reason was, the problems faced by students were the most important thing which needed to solve in order to get the purpose of feedback.

Although they felt bored, disappointed and lazy, they still hoped and believed in reflective writing activity. A half of the students wanted to do reflective continuosly. It was proved on point 4 that actually the reflective writing did not burden them. It means they liked in doing it but they still did not know exactly how to make it more interesting and make them satisfied. It might return to the first topic that they needed reflective writing discussed in the class in order to solve their problems.

4. The Similiarity Of The Students' Responses And The Lecturer's Perception About It.

From the data got and explanations above, It can be explained that the lecturer's perception about the students' responses was accurate, but not exactly accurate. The lecturer saw the condition globally that the students were used to do reflective writing without any objection anymore. The lecturer believed her giving time in three days to do it could give students more enjoyable and relax time. It could be seen from their task which was collected. Almost students did it by edmodo on time. It was true although only

few students did not collect it. The lecturer also believed her instruction to give reflective writing would make students read more and get more experience in writing. By reflective writing the lecturer knew the students' understanding and difficulties. It was also true. Those were similiar with students' utterances. However, the lecturer forgot the one thing that the high expectation of the students was greater rather than their reflective writing. They wanted their feedback in reflective writing was discussed in the class in order to solve their problems.

Actually the lecturer admitted it was her shortage. According to her, some of her students' problems were simple, for example they did not understand some topics because they did not read. It made the problems did not need to discuss in the class. Moreover, if other students' problems were discussed, it would spend the ordinary time that it was impossible to implement lecturer's feedback. However, she did not realize that the students were very disappointed because of that. They became bored to do reflective writing if their task only stopped in lecturer's hand.

That was a problem which needs a solution. Here, the researcher only finds out the similarity of the students' responses and the lecturer's perception about that. From here, it can be conluded as :

1. Between the lecturer and students had same perception that reflective writing was interesting and needed to implement in Introduction To Linguistic Class. From there, the students mind, message and thinking about the material could be conveyed to the lecturer and they could get new knowledge and experience in writing.⁴²

- 2. The lecturer and students also had same perception that the model designed by the lecturer in applying reflective writing was suitable.
 By edmodo and three days given, it was more effective and effisien.
 It showed 50% of students liked the lecturer method.⁴³
- 3. The lecturer's perception was less of relevant to students' feel in doing reflective writing. The lecturer stated that the students were enthusiastic enough and used to do it every meeting. However in the fact, many students felt bored because of some reasons; monotonous questions of reflective form, no significance differences every meeting, being tired of many tasks from other lectures, etc.⁴⁴
- 4. The students were disappointed to the lecturer who did not return feedback to discuss their problems in the class. Almost students interviewed spoke their main problem up. For them, it seemed useless to do reflective writing if there was no any feedback from the lecturer. As a result, the percentage showed at the same digit when

⁴² The interview students and lecturer on Tuesday, 16 of June 2015 at 13.50 p.m. and Wednesday, 17 of June 2015 at 12.17 p.m. and chart of questionnaire; point 1 and 2.

⁴³ The chart of questionnaire; point 3.

⁴⁴ The result of interview students and lecturer on Tuesday, 16 of June 2015 at 13.50 p.m. and

Wednesday, 17 of June 2015 at 12.17 p.m and chart of questionnaire; point 5

they were asked in point 6 of the questionnaire. It indicated they were confused to decide. Of course, there was no similiarity with the lecturer's perception. The researcher did not get this information from the lecturer. It emerged two assumptions; the lecturer did not know the real condition or the lecturer did not inform to the researcher. However if the lecturer knew, in the fact the lecturer had never talked to the students about the case for explaining the reason and obstacles. Whatever the reason was, it became unsimiliar condition although the lecturer admitted it was her shortage.

5. The Data Display

From the result and interpreting data above, the researcher informed the data display in the form of table below.

THE RESPONSE	THE RESULT OF DATA		
The positive one	Students liked reflective writing and hoped it will be continued		
The negative one	Students felt disappointed because of no		
The negative one	feedback from the lecturer		
The similarity from	The similar things were about the purposes and		
the lecturer's perception	implementation of reflective writing		
The unsimilarity from	The unsimilar things were about the students'		
the lecturer's perception	feeling and disappoinment		

B. Discussion

Here, the researcher tried to match and correlate those results with some related literatures that had been presented in chapter two of the research. The discussion was about the students' responses and the lecturer's perception.

1. The Students' Responses

As explanation above, it indicated there were few kinds of responses. Many of students liked doing reflective writing because it could improve their discipline, explore their critical thinking, give new knowledge and add experience in writing. It is because reflective writing demanded them to think more critically and deeply. They were used to give message, impression and opinion about their lesson or experience by their own sentences, also constructed their new ideas and anyting in their mind showed to the lecturer.⁴⁵ Those were the functions of relective writing as what Professor Wayne Iwaoka had stated.

Whereas, almost students felt disappointed because the lecturer did not return feedback to their reflective writing. Their disappointment was reasonable. It is relevan to Susan M. Brookhart's statement that a good feedback is feedback which can help students to find their motivation in learning and to master their own destiny.⁴⁶ Also, it is relevant to Professor

⁴⁵ Prof. Wayne Iwaoka, *A Guide For Writing A reflective Journal*, (The University of Hawaii at Manoa : Karp-Boss.2007)

⁴⁶ Susan M. Brookhart, "How To Give Effective Feedback To Your Students", (Virginia : ASCD,

^{2008), 113}

Wayne Iwaoka statement about the function of reflective writing; provides regular feedback between students and the instructors and helps to match expectations.⁴⁷ Moreover, Prof. John Bitchener, Dr Helen Basturkmen, Dr Martin East, Dr Heather Meyer formulated in their book "The students wanted supervisors to demonstrate genuine interest in their work, they wish to see the supervisor/supervisee relationship to be constructed in terms of a 'partnership of equals' rather than as a 'manager/employee' relationship.⁴⁸ It is clear that the students expected more to the lecturer's giving feedback.

The implementation of reflective writing in Introduction To Linguistic Class had reached some functions. However, it could not be called successful in 100% because it missed one important function; the lecturer's feedback.

2. The Lecturer's Perception About The Students' Responses

From the data explained before, there were some similarities and were not. It was actually normal and often occured in a teaching learning process. However, the right decision is how to solve the problems; no similarity. It is because a good teacher/lecturer is somebody who has an affinity with the students that they are teaching.⁴⁹ Jeremy Harmer explained successful teacher/lecturer was the person who could be a source of hopes, aspirations and problem solver of students' difficulties when teaching them.

⁴⁷ Prof. Wayne Iwaoka, *A Guide For Writing A reflective Journal*, (The University of Hawaii at Manoa : Karp-Boss.2007)

⁴⁸ Prof. John Bitchener, Dr Helen Basturkmen, Dr Martin East, Dr Heather Meyer, "*Best Practice in Supervisor Feedback to Thesis Students*", (New Zealand : Ako Aotearoa, 2011), 5

⁴⁹ Jeremy, Harmer, "How To Teach English", (New York : Longman, 1998), 2

That the lecturer and the students had some purposes in reflective writing; improve students' discipline, explore their critical thinking, give new knowledge and add experience in writing indicated that the lecturer and students had similarity. They had same expectation and perception. Also by reflective writing students could construct their difficulties and problems which the lecturer wanted to know as a discourse in the next year. It indicated the lecturer could construct the students' hope and aspirations as Jeremy Harmer said before. It became point plus to continue the teaching and learning.

The researcher did noy say the lecturer of Introduction To Linguistic Class did not characterize it. It was only her shortage as human being. Nobody is perfect as the lecturer. Whatever it was, the researcher believed that the lecturer efforded to make the teaching and learning raise the goal. The lecturer tried to understand the students' problems by giving reflective writing which concluded many functions as the researcher mentioned in chapter II.