

Chapter Four

Findings and Discussion

This chapter presents about findings and discussion. The findings report the interview results from the participants. Then, the discussion contains the researcher's discussion of the findings related to the literature review. This chapter reveals the answer of the research question. The research question is what the factors affecting pre-service teachers' success on teaching practicum at the English Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta are.

Findings

In this chapter the researcher present how is the participants answer the question that asked by the researcher to get the research question answer. Therefore, the result from the interview had been categorized by the researcher into some finding. There were 8 findings that would be explained by the researcher. The research has categorized the finding into 3 categorized, which is personal factors, school factors and university factors.

Factors affecting pre-service teachers' success on teaching practicum.

This research was conducted at the English Education Department of Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta. All the participants were from different batch. They were asked by the researcher about their practicum experiences. They answered the researcher in different response. Considering that the first participant has already completed the teaching practicum, it seemed that she had a lot of experiences to tell. She passed the practicum in every stage. She took the

practicum program at the elementary, junior and senior high school. It was different from the second participant. She has not completed the practicum yet. She only taught at an elementary and junior school. Then, the third participant was the youngest among the participants. He took the practicum program only at an elementary school. Thus, his experience was not as much as the elder one. For more information, the data will be discussed below.

Finding 1: Pre-service teacher' stress. This finding reported the result of interview related with stress. There were two participants who were respond this part. They are Rita and Toni. Rita and Toni gave different respond about stress. Rita is female pre-service teacher and Toni is male pre-service teacher. Rita was a bit stressed and Toni was relaxed.

She argued that she was not stressed as she mentioned “No, it is fine. I did not feel stressed” (R.1.26). However, when the researcher clarified her statement, she changes her mind as she said “I feel a bit stressed when I taught at an elementary school. The kids were uncontrolled. They ran everywhere. It was difficult to deliver the topic,” (R.1.27). Then, when having the teaching practicum at a junior high school she felt stressed as well. “It was because the time was limited. I got 3 times only. Usually there should be 4 meetings” (R.1.28). The last practicum was at a senior high school. Rita felt the stress. This time was caused by the students. They were not disciplined. “It was the first meeting. It was too early for them. They ignored the first and second class as usual. Then, the worst was that my class was the first and the second class so that there were 6 students only” (R.1.29). Those are the response from Rita.

The third participant was Toni. He was the only male among the participants. He argued that the practicum was fun. Indeed, he liked it. “I did not feel any stress. It was fine” (R.3.12). He told the researcher that the practicum was fun. “It was fun. Teaching elementary kids was easy but sometime it was difficult too. It was good” (R.3.1).

Those respond reported that they have different feeling about their teaching practicum. Rita was stressed and Toni was relaxed. They also mentioned the reason why she / he is stressed or relaxed. Even Rita has completed her teaching practicum at all level but she was stressed still. This condition is quite different with Toni. He has not completing his teaching practicum at all levels. He was finished teaching practicum at one level only and it was Elementary school.

Finding 2: Mentors. Mentor was second finding. This finding was reported how far mentor was influence on teaching practicum. All participant were responded this section. Rita, Dina and Toni responded this section quite same. All aof them agreed that mentor was quite influence in their practicum.

She said that the mentor was incredible. “The coaching was good enough. The mentor told us how to teach elementary students. The mentor guided us well” (R.1.13). “The mentor was not good enough. The mentor did not observe us while we were teaching. The mentor taught us how to make the lesson plan only” (R.1.14). “The mentor at the senior high school was good. The mentor guided us really well and taught us how to make a good lesson plan as well. The mentor even observed us while we were teaching” (R.1.15). Dina gave a positive

response as well. She said, “The teachers were enthusiastic” (R.2.13). “The relationship with the junior high school was not good. I felt that the mentor was a bit ignoring us” (R.2.16). “The Elementary mentor told us school’s condition, the facilities and the students’ condition as well” (R.3.15).

Those response was reported that mentor was quite influence for teaching practicum. Teaching practicum could be good if the mentor have a good communication and guide pre-service teacher well, but the practicum could be failed if the mentor have bad communication and the pre-service tacher were not guided well.

Finding 3: Location and Background. Location and background was related with school condition, which is rural or regional, accessable or not, facilitated or not. Sometimes the school in rural have limited access and not facilitated as well. The accesible and facilitation were influences on teaching practicum. Accessible school and facilitated school will ease pre-service teacher.

“One of the problems comes from school was that we needed more rooms for practicum” (R.2.9). “The class was outdoor” (R.2.10). “There was not any white board for teaching. Pre-service teachers needed to talk a loud, like screaming, to make the students hear while they were teaching” (R.2.12).

There was one respond from one participants only. She was Dina, second participant. Rita and Toni have no respond about location and background. They do not have any problem, but Dina was mentioned that she was placed in school that have limited roo. It kinds of limited facilitation. She was teaching in outdoor,

without any facilitation. She taught with no white board or other facilitated. This experiences told that if the school facilitated well the teaching practicum could run well. Facilitation was really influence on teaching practicum, teaching practicum could be failed when teaching practicum were did like Dina experiences.

Finding 4: Classroom. This finding reported how was classroom could influence on teaching practicum. This finding were collected by all respond from all participant. Even they have different experiences but,they agreed that classroom was quite influenced on teaching practicum.

“Each practicum gave me different experiences because I taught different students in different batch, teaching at an elementary school, a junior high school, and a senior high school was different” (R.1.1). “Pre-service teachers went around controlling each group of junior high school students” (R.1.6). “I had different experiences. I was teaching at an elementary school for my first teaching practicum and there were so many kids. I taught them in a group. There were about four to five pre-service teachers handling 20 s students at a class. Meanwhile, at a junior high school I taught 10 students only with other 2 pre-service teachers” (R.2.1). “Then, at a junior high school, the students were guidable. But, sometimes they were still hard to be guided. They were busy with their own activity when I commanded them to do a task or when I gave them discussion time which was working in a group. They discussed the other thing out of my topic” (R.1.3). “Teaching kids was fun. The topic should be delivered but

they were still kids. It was the hardest thing but fun” (R.3.2). “The problem was that they liked running and they cannot seat quietly. It was the problem” (R.3.4).

This response were reported that classroom is influence by some factors, such as class management, student’s condition, class experiences and class preparation. This finding is categorized into classroom factors because all caused was happend in a class. From this respond pre-service teacher could learn how to manage the class, the students, and class preparation by the previous experiences. Learn from the experiences and try to do somthing better for the next teaching practicum.

Finding 5: Assignments. This finding reported that assignment could be one of factors in teaching practicum. Thi finding related with pre-service teacher task to attract students in class. The way or the method and teaching material that pre-service prepare before the class is begin.

“Elementary students are happy while playing. I designed the class with singing, playing games, or doing something. Thus, they got the materials while playing. Alhamdulillah, it worked so that I just stressed at the first meeting” (R.1.30). Then, second participant explained, “It might come from us, the pre-service teachers. We should prepare the material better, maybe with ice breaking” (R.2.24).

Assignments actually consist of some tasks that should be done by pre-service teachers. It is about teaching materials, lesson plan and time management. Rita and Dina responded this question by explaining the way she taught in the

class. The teaching practicum could be the success teaching practicum if the pre-service teacher did the assignment well. They could prepared teaching material, lesson plan and managing time a long day before teaching practicum. They could discussed with the mentor first, so teaching practicum could be really help to be success. In other hand, if pre-service teacher could not have a good preparation about the lesson plan, taching material and time management, they could be failed on their teaching practicum.

Finding 6: University Factors. The next finding was how far university influences teaching practicum. This finding was responded by all participants differently. Some of the respond university role in pre-service teacher practicum. There were participants agreed that university was influence on their teaching practicum, and there is one participants who stated that university role was not influences.

“Yes, they did. They did not give any problem actually. It was just about scheduling, the schedule on submitting assignment and the date of practicum” (R.3.16 -17). , “Yes, if university did not exist, we (pre-service teachers) would not teach too. Everything about practicum was taken care by the university such as looking for the school and arranging all licenses. We just came and taught” (R.3.21). “For me, teaching practicum is kind of field experience, University did not have any relation so that it is all on us. We created the lesson plan and taught by ourselves” (R.2.14). “Emhh from university, I think the university did the best. It was good that the university gave coaching and observation” (R.1.12).

Those responds was reported that university has a role in pre-service teacher teaching practicum. The role was to connecting pre-service teacher with school as teaching practicum place. University also facilitated coaching that guided by the mentor from the school. Teaching practicum will be success if the university take this role well, but teaching practicum could be failed if the university did not take this role as connector between school and pre-service teacher.

Finding 7: Communication. This finding was reported about how farcommunication between pre-service teacher, mentor, supervisor and among pre-service teacher as well. This finding collected by responds of all participants. All participants were agreed that communication could be one of factors affecting on pre-service teacher's success on teaching practicum.

. “The communication was really good. The mentor observed us while we were teaching” (R.1.24). “The relationship and communication were fine” (R.2.17). “The junior high school mentor was a bit ignoring us. The mentors did not seem like caring about us. The evaluation was at the end of practicum and the mentor never asked about the problem that we faced during the practicum” (R.1.23). “The communication with the elementary school mentor was not good enough” (R.3.24). “It is because I never got any information by the mentor personally. It was the leader only who got the information” (R.3.25).

“There were four meetings at that time, but I did not know when and where. I guessed that the supervisor would inform if there was a class, but I did not get the information. The schedule was on Saturday. It was like miscommunication. It

happened to not only me but also some of my friends. The supervisor did not explain how coaching looked like and it was only four meeting so that I thought it was not enough for coaching” (R.1.19). , “It was good for me. If the lecturer said there was observation then the lecturer told me where and when the observation was held. I shared the information to others. And, if there was a due date of the task, the mentor told me as well” (R.3.22).

“It was how we scored our practicum. By sharing, I knew that my students were different. It was the result from sharing” (R.2.27). The third participant explained the communication as well. He said, “It was easy, there was WhatsApp. We just typed and sent, and they would read immediately” (R.2.27). Then the third participant said, “If the communication with the school got any trouble, we could not teach. If the school was free and we did not the information but we came to teach, it means we got a problem, right?” (R.3.28-29).

This finding reported that the communication was really affect on their teaching practicum. No matter with the mentor, supervisor and among pre-service teacher the communication was influence on their teaching practicum. They all experienced both of good and bad communication with mentor, supervisor and among pre-service teacher. So, all communication should be good, no matter with the mentor or supervisor even among pre-service teacher as well. All information should be shared as soon as they receive it. If there were a lot of bad communication teaching practicum could be failed.

Finding 8: Teamwork. The following finding was teamwork. This finding was reported who far teamwork is influence on pre-service teacher teaching practicum. All participans were agree that their teaching practicum have done in a group, and they even share all experiences, and solving some problem in discussion.

“There were four pre-service teachers at a class. It was in the elementary and junior high school. In senior high school, there were four pre-service teachers as well, but during class activity there were only two pre-service teachers”

(R.1.16). “For me, Alhamdulillah, I got good friends and good teamwork. We helped each other such as making lesson plan and solving problems together”

(R.1.17). . “It was in the second semester. In the first practicum, we had 4 members that one was the teacher and the others were the controller. If there was a student asking something, it was the controller’s job to answer” (R.2.7). “At the beginning, we made the materials by ourselves, then we met up and discussed which one was better and appropriate for the next teaching, which one was chosen” (R.2.8). “Yes, we shared. But, the result was the same. They shared their experience and they told me that the kids were annoying” (R.3.30).

This finding related with how pre-service teachers teamwork. The way they finish teaching practicum, discussing some problem and shared the experiences. They work as a team and they have a good team. This factors could help pre-service teacher well. But if the teamwork was bad, their relation could be bad as

well. They would work individually and teaching practicum could be failed because their teaching practicum was grouping not individual.

Discussion

Teaching practicum factors. The researcher found the factors affecting pre-service teachers' success on teaching practicum. There are some factors categorized by the researcher. The categories were made based on the responses of the participants. There are personal factors, school factors and university factors

The first factor was about stress. At the beginning, the first participant, who was female, said that she did not get stressed, but when the researcher clarified, she told the researcher that she was a bit stressed because of some problems mentioned on findings. Then, the second participant was female as well. She did not mention any stress. The third participant was male and he totally did not feel any stress. He enjoyed the practicum and teaching. The responses answered the question of how far stress influences their practicum and what the reasons of being stressed are. Those responses were quiet interesting and those responses were in line with Danhere's (2011) findings of stress. He argued that female pre-service teachers are more stressed during practicum than male ones. His study was at Zimbabwe, Ezekiel University with 71 male and 81 female participants.

The second factor is about mentors. Based on participants' responses, all participants experienced that they got a good mentor while practicum at the

elementary school. The mentor guided pre-service teachers well. Pre-service teachers and the elementary school mentors had good relationship and the pre-service teachers were guided well by the mentors. The mentors really helped the pre-service teachers during the practicum.

If we looked back at the literature review, Kell and Forshberg (2014) and Chandler et al. (2013) found that the mentor is the one who is capable of guiding and helping pre-service teachers during their practicum. The mentor can be the one from school side who have already known the school location and condition, and the students so that the mentor helps pre-service teachers to get more information of what and how teaching practicum at that school is.

Mentors can be the professional one, but sometime they act careless about their role as mentors. Finding 2 mentioned that Rita and Dina met a mentor who did not really care about pre-service teachers. They were ignored by the mentor at the junior high school. Tarman (2012) agreed that not only about the positive experience of teaching practicum but also the negative experience can be shared by the mentor during the practicum day and it can affect the pre-service teachers' practicum. Thus, the role of mentor here should be the positive one to help the pre-service teachers get better experiences during practicum.

The third factor is the location and background of the school. The findings showed that the pre-service teachers needed more classrooms and a whiteboard for teaching. Ryan, Jonas and Walta (2012) found that location of the school could influence the practicum success. They argued that rural or regional areas

influence how school facilitates the students and pre-service teachers. Somehow regional areas give some advantages such as more facilities and staffs that are able to support the teaching practicum.

The fourth factor is classrooms. Even though the classrooms are included in school factors, classrooms have some categories on it. There are managing class, classroom experiences, students' condition and class preparation. All participants mentioned those categories in their class experiences. All of them learned and prepared the next class by learning how today's class ran. Barney and Pleban (2006) stated that four relevant keys of practicum are classroom management, classroom preparation, student learning and enjoyable experiences. All the relevant keys were mentioned by all participants.

The fifth factor is assignments. Assignments consist of lesson plan, teaching material, and time management. There are assignments that should be done by pre-service teachers. The first and second participants had the same responses to this factor. They prepared the materials as their assignment for every meeting. It was in line with Rees, Pardo, and Parker (2013) that every pre-service teacher's class, grade and material or topic will affect their experiences.

The sixth factor is university. As mentioned by the participants, Rita and Toni agreed that the university is quiet influencing and has done the best for helping pre-service teachers. Asplin and Marks (2013) said that the university gives pre-service teachers a supervisor to share what they feel about practicum because the supervisor had experienced the teaching practicum.

The seventh factor is communication. The finding has explained the communication among pre-service teachers-the mentor, pre-service teachers – the supervisor, pre-service teachers – pre-service teachers. Finding 7 mentioned that all participants agreed that communication in all sides influence their practicum. They experienced that all kinds of communication with the supervisor, the mentor or other pre-service teachers were trouble.

According to Ryan et al. (2012) communication is one of the important factors for practicum. Being connected among pre-service teachers is a good thing. According to Widen et al. cited in Sokal et al. (2013), strong communication among pre-service teachers, the mentor, and the supervisor will affect positively the result of practicum.

Ssantamu-Nambiru (2010) and Ryan et al. (2012) proved that communication among pre-service teachers and the mentor should be good enough so that they can care of each other. Pre-service teachers can discuss the problems or ask the solution to the mentor. They will have good teamwork with good communication. The mentor can fill the role as a mentor willingly.

The eighth factor is teamwork. All participants experienced the practicum in a group. They taught in a team. They learned how to teach from other groups or classes. They, indeed, shared their experiences and solved the problems by discussion. Tarricone and Luca (2002) defined teamwork refers to some people working together in cooperative environment to achieve a team goal and sharing knowledge and skills. Effective teamwork can influence the successful delivery

and implementation of learning design. One of the characteristics of the successful teamwork is opened communication and positive feedbacks. The participants' experiences are in line with Tarricone's and Luca's statement.

Based on the findings and the theories above, it divided into three categories factor, namely personal factor, school factors and university factors. The first is personal factors. Personal factor consisted of stress. Second is school factors. School factors were consisted of mentor, location and background of the school, classroom, assignment and communication between pre-service teacher and the mentor. The third is university factors. This factors were consisted of university, supervisor, communication between pre-service teacher and the supervisor and the teamwork among pre-service teacher.