

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents the findings of the observation in Interpretive Reading and Argumentative Writing class D and the interview with the participants from the class which has been observed. The findings were categorized based on the research construct and also supported by the related theories. In addition, the researcher analyzed the data and categorized the teaching methods implemented in the classroom.

Teaching Methods Implemented by Lecturers of English Education Department UMY to Develop Students' Critical Thinking.

From the interview and observation, the research found teaching methods that was implemented in English Education Department in Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. The first was about the characteristics of deep dialogue method implementation in the classroom. The second was about the characteristics of Socratic Method implementation in classroom. The last was about the characteristics of Collaborative Learning Method.

Deep Dialogue. Based on the interview with the participants, they said there was interaction in the dialogue between students and lecturer in learning process. The lecturer described the interaction happened while the lecturer giving up question for students. The lecturer created good interaction in class likes friend. The Close communication between the lecturer and the students in class, it became easier the lecturer to know about the students' problem in learning process. The lecturer could be easier to apply teaching methods in class and it correlated with the characteristic of deep dialogue methods. It was proved by the statements below. "As a lecturer I didn't want them to be not good students, I wanted them become a good students, and I wanted they became responsible adults"(Translated from the original interview

R.1). Another participant stated the same point below. “When we had done a dialogue with Mrs. Fani, we got new information and knowledge from the dialogue section” (Translated from the original interview R.2).

From the data above, supported by (Hizrah, Darmadi, & Werdhiana (2013), based on learning deep dialogue in critical thinking was using constructivism with way deep dialogue or interaction to make students more critical in learning process. It meant that, the interaction done by the lecturer must encourage the students to think critically. According to Institute (2001), Deep dialogue method had a characteristic such as: the lecturer and the student active in class focus on mental, emotional, and spiritual, optimize the potential of students, using deep dialogue approach: the students and the lecturer became a listener, speaker and a good thinker.

Socratic Method. The interviewed and the observation data also showed the characteristic of Socratic Method used by the lecturer. In classroom activity the lecturer asked the students’ assumption. Especially in close book journal activities, the lecturer gave questions for students related the topic in journal. The respondents gave their responds as following statements: “ In my opinion when the students read the journals and wrote their arguments and opinions it’s making the students more critical” (Translated from original interview R.1).

Another participant started the same point. “The learning activity in class was close book journal, the students should read journal every week and then we should share the opinions or arguments in piece of paper during 20minutes”(Translated from original interview R.2).

In the classroom, the lecturer asked the students to read the journal about “Relationship”. The close book journal lasted for 20 minutes. In this activity the lecturer asked the students to write their argument in paper. After that the lecturer corrected their assignment. In these activities the lecturer wanted the students to improve their mind to think critically through the

close book journal. Besides, in other activity after the students had done the close book journal. The lecturer asked the students to share their mind and creativity in drawing anything based on their mind. This activity lasted for 40 minutes. There were students drawing about heart, view, car, mom and dad, and etc. After the students finished to draw anything, the lecturer asked about the meaning of the picture. Here, the students should to tell their picture based on their arguments and should support their arguments. The students had been willing responsibility to telling their pictures with their rational argument. In this section the students were very interesting to tell their picture. There was one student who drew their mom and dad, and the student should show their argument why she was drawing about her mom and dad. Then, she should to support her picture with telling more about her parents.

On the other hand, here the student's showed their mind by drawing anything object on their mind, then the lecturer saw about students' performance in telling the picture with their support arguments or sometimes the lecturer were giving the question based on the picture to create the interaction could make the students more explore their mind or more explore their arguments. Those things were proven by the statements below: "I gave them follow up question to make the students active to explore their argument or to encourage the students to support their arguments. (Translated from the original interview R.1). Another participant stated the same point. "While the lecturer asked to the students, the students should give the theoretical reasons or specific reasons why or how"(Translated from the original interview R.2).

From the data above, it was supported by According to chapman (2006), the Socratic methods was a dialogue between teacher and students initiated by the repeated interested questions of the teacher, in a determined effort to explore the underlying beliefs that shape the students views and opinions. Looking at the entire results above, in frequently exercising the

Socratic Method, the students should become independent learner with curiosity and sensitivity toward new information, and regularly developed a mental habit and critical thinking and the important thing with the socratic method in this class the lecturer was successful to develop students' critical thinking with step by step in learning activities.

Collaborative Learning Method. The interview data also showed the characteristic of collaborative learning method implemented in the classroom. In fact, the lecturer usually applied small group discussion in learning process. Based on the information while the students had to finish their assignment, the lecturer usually asked the students to make group discussion to discuss the topic. The respondents gave their responds as following statements: “After did close book journal activities in class, the lecturer usually asked the students to make a group three till four members. The lecturer gave the topic and we should discuss it together” (Translated from Original Interview R.2). Another participant stated the same point. “ In my class the students should work in individual assignment. After that, the students worked in group or made small group learning”(Translated from the Original Interview R.1).

Subsequently, from the data above, it was also stated by Jeune (2003), there were characteristics of collaborative learning method including: a common task or activity, small group learning, cooperative behavior, interdependence, individual responsible, and accountability. From collaborative learning the students could develop effective teamwork and communication including interpersonal and cross cultural awareness skill, and the students could learn multiple views to deepen knowledge and promote critical thinking. It was indicated by statements from the respondents below. “While the students discussed about something, automatically the students forced to think and share their ideas”(Translated from original interview R.2).

Additionally, in group discussion, the students could be active in group and there were students passive in group but more students' active than passive while they were did discussion. That statement supported by lecturer and students, it was proven by the statement below. "Students could be active and passive, but not of all passive in discussion, almost of the students could actively share their arguments"(Translated from original interview R.2). Another participant stated in the same point. "My first aim was encouraging all of them speaking English. My second aim was to try them to explore their arguments"(Translated from original interview R.1).

Hence, from group discussion the student was trying to manage the conflict in differences opinion from their friends and students learned to accept them by negotiated together in group. Those things were proven by the statements below. "I believed in teaching if you worked in group you would get a lot of inputs, a lot of opinions and you could build your argument" (Translated from original statement R.1). Another participant stated the same point. "From group discussion the students should share their ideas. In fact the students would explore their ability to think critical" (Translated from Original statement R.2).

Besides, in sharing session which was one part of group discussion, they shared their opinions each other to have group agreement on the questions that they should answer. From sharing session, absolutely it was found that there were different perspectives and different points of view from each member in group which might cause group conflict. Hence, they had to listen to each opinion from their friends and had some ways to discuss and conclude all those different opinions to be a group deal. So, this activity proved the collaborative learning method was considered as high order of critical thinking because it included aspect (analyzing, evaluating, and creating).