

Lecturers' and Students' Perception on Learning Model of Contextual-Based Academic Writing

A Rofii^{1,2}, F Murtado³, A Rahmat⁴

¹Universitas Batanghari Jambi, Kota Jambi, Indonesia

^{2,3,4}Universitas Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta Timur, Indonesia

{affrofii_lt15s3@mahasiswa.unj.ac.id^{1,2}, fathiaty_Murtadho@unj.ac.id³, aceng.rahmat@unj.ac.id⁴}

Abstract. This paper aims at studying the perceptions of lecturers and students on the learning model of contextual-based academic writing. It is a part of the research and development of the model through modules at Batanghari University Jambi. Survey was used to collect the perceptions of lecturers on the model. There are 6 components the lecturers and the students to assess according to Joyce, Weil & Calhoun: learning structures, social system, reactive principle, supporting system, instructional and accompanying impacts. A questionnaire is used in collecting data. The respondents are 35 consisting of 7 lecturers and 28 third-semester students of the Study Program of Indonesian Language and Literature Education, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Batanghari University Jambi. Data are analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. The results showed that the lecturers and students share a same assessment of the models developed with very good category. It was reflected from the average score of the perceptions of students and lecturers on the model respectively 4.25 and 4.39 with a very good category.

Keywords: *Lecturer And Student Perception, Learning Model Of Academic Writing, Contextual Teaching Learning*

1 INTRODUCTION

Writing skill is one of four language skills that must be mastered by students. The writing skill is a skill that we need in every aspect of life in expressing our wishes, our desires, our thoughts, in providing information to others, celebrations, keeping records of our memories and knowledge [1, p.351]. Meanwhile, Yundayani et al. [2] argue that writing is principally communicating ideas or feelings indirectly through written communication. Writing is also a process of thinking which is put on paper. But different from process of thinking which can jump from a point or one idea to another, writing should be done one word by one word in correct order. Saputro [3] suggests that writing is a very important language skill for learners. Furthermore, according to Al Mubarak [4] and Hamouda [5], writing appears to be the most important, yet challenging, academic skill for university students to learn. It concerns on the academic writing. Academic writing be a prerequisite for students to graduate. Rofii et al. [6] said "University is required to make a scientific work, either produced by the lecturers or the students. This scientific work is developed through academic writing activities". Furthermore,

Oktarina et al. [7] said writing activity is inseparable aspect in entire learning process in higher education. According to Soleh "Writing skill in the final assignment of students is a skill that must be mastered. The skill of writing scientific work must be done and focused on higher education." [8]

Yundani et al. (2018) [9] stated that writing skills for academic purposes can be seen as a form of disclosure in language skills that aims to convey messages, ideas or feelings and can be understood by readers. Gillet [10] defines academic writing as a form of writing with a particular audience and with a specific purposes and a clear structure. A writer is required to have various abilities at once, related to what will be written and how to convey it in good and correct written language. Gaith [11] states that academic writing is a type of formal writing activity to be delivered to the readers in a critical academic sphere based on scientific knowledge as well as on scientific ideas and arguments. Academic writing is a language activity carried out in writing for academic purposes or to convey ideas; fulfill assignments in study; discuss ideas in a scientific meeting; or to disseminate science and research results scientifically.

Students are required to produce a well academic writing. In fact, it was found that there were still many problems students experienced in academic writing activities. Muhammad said the majority of the learners' face significant challenges in the areas of mechanical, grammatical, and sentence formations [12]. In line with this opinion, Akhadiah [13] says that many students are difficult in using written language. The difficulties include the use of various levels of written language, namely: word choice (diction), sentence organization, paragraph development, writing development and grammar usage. In writing for academic purposes, the majority of students experienced several grammatical problems, logical organization, cohesion, and paragraph coherence; rhetorical difference; produce and express ideas; including writing a thesis [14].

The interviews and temporary observations carried out on the 3rd-semester students of Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Batanghari University, Jambi, revealed that: Firstly, the learning process of academic writing is dominated by lecturers using the lecture method. Secondly, lectures concern more on material mastery rather than students' skills in writing. Thirdly, the RPS used as a guide in academic writing learning is made by lecturers without a specific approach. Fourth, learning resources used are limited. Fifthly, examples of text used are not contextual (far from student life). From some of the problems raised, it can be concluded that the learning model used is not appropriate, resulting in low student skills in academic writing. Motivation determines students' success in academic writing [15 p.15]. Abidin et al. [16] said that one of the reasons for the low writing skills is that the existing model of writing learning is not appropriate. Khuzaemah and Herawati said that the low writing skills of students require serious action from various parties [17].

There are many strategies that can be implemented to improve academic writing, including developing a learning model. The teaching and learning process can be said to be successful if the material adequately is supported by learning infrastructure and the method or learning model is effective [3]. Furthermore, Joyce, Weil & Showers define a model of teaching *as a plan or pattern that we can use to design face-to-face teaching in classrooms or tutorial setting and to shape instructional materials-including books, film, tapes, computer-mediated programs, and curricula (long term course s of study). Each model guides us as we design instructional to help students achieve various objectives* [18]. The learning model is a guide for teachers planning learning activities in the classroom, starting from preparing learning devices, choosing media and tools, to evaluation tools that lead to achieve the objectives of the lesson.

Based on the problems described above, a needs analysis has been carried out to determine the characteristics of students. Rofii and Franscy [19] says analysis of learners aimed to investigate the characteristics of students who are the subject of research. This activity was carried out as an initial step in an effort to develop an academic writing learning model that fits the students' needs and characteristics. According to Soleh [8, p.278], the learning model of writing scientific work must encourage students to be skilled in literacy supported by critical and creative thinking skills, and the ability to solve problems. In this case the learning model developed integrates the seven main components of the contextual approach (CTL). According to Johnson [20, p.24] *CTL is a holistic system. It consists of interrelated parts that, when interwoven, produce an effect that exceeds what any single part could achieve... Each of these distinct elements of the CTL system contributes to helping students make sense of schoolwork. Taken together, they form a system that makes it possible for students to see meaning in, and retain, academic material.* Satriani et al. [21, p.10] say that CTL has the following benefits: (1) engaging students in the writing activity; (2) increasing students' motivation to participate actively in the writing class; (3) helping students to construct their writing; (4) helping students to solve their problems; (5) providing ways for students to discuss or interact with their friends; and (6) helping the students to summarize and reflect the lesson.

Before applying the learning model been developed in the class, it is necessary to first assess the lecturers and students to obtain information about their perceptions on the developed model. Assessment is done using a perception questionnaire. The perception results of lecturers and students were used as a consideration to enhance the contextually based academic writing learning model developed. The developed model to be assessed by lecturers and students consist of 6 components [18], namely: learning structure (syntax); social system; principle of reaction; support system; instructional impact and accompaniment impact.

1.1 Research Method

This study aims to describe the perceptions of lecturers and students on the developed learning model of contextual-based academic writing. It is a research and development. The product development is carried out according to the steps of research and development called the R & D cycle [22, pp. 772-775]. It uses qualitative and quantitative approaches. This study involved 71 third-semester students of Indonesian Language and Literary Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Batanghari Jambi University and 7 lecturers of writing skill course. Respondents were determined by purposive sampling technique. Data was collected through survey techniques using questionnaire as an instrument. The data obtained are analyzed then summarized in table. In addition, semi-structured interview was applied to collect information about students' and lecturers' perceptions on the model developed. Yundayani et al. [2] the interview was applied to identify the problem more openly by asking for opinions and ideas from respondents. The data from questionnaires in numbers were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while the data in the form of inputs and suggestions were analyzed qualitatively. Qualitative data analysis is an interpretive process, researchers reflect on their personal viewpoints and how they shape their interpretations of the data [23, p.364].

1.2 Result and Discussion

A questionnaire was administered to find out the perceptions of lecturers on the learning model developed. The questionnaire was distributed to seven lecturers of Indonesian Language and Literature Education Study Program, FKIP, Unbari Jambi. They were asked to assess the model consisting of six main components: learning structure (syntax); social system; principle of reaction; support system; instructional impact and accompaniment impact. The results are explained in the following table.

Table 1. Lecturers' Perception on the Developed Learning Model

No	Components	Score					Percentage					Ans wers	Ave.	Cat.
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5			
1.	Learning Structure	0	0	0	82	170	0	0	0	32.5	67.5	525	4.67	VG
2.	Social system	0	0	0	13	43	0	0	0	23.2	76.8	56	4.76	VG
3.	Principle of Reaction	0	0	0	33	107	0	0	0	23.6	76.4	140	4.76	VG
4.	Supporting System (RPS)	0	0	0	39	101	0	0	0	27.9	72.1	140	4.72	VG
	Supporting System (Module)													
	a. Objective and approach	0	0	0	33	53	0	0	0	39.3	60.7	84	0	0
	b. Material design and organization	0	0	0	44	12	0	0	0	78.6	21.4	56	4.21	VG
	1) Content feasibility	0	0	0	56	21	0	0	0	72.7	27.3	77	4.27	VG
	2) Material presentation	0	0	0	17	11	0	0	0	60.7	39.3	18	4.39	VG
	3) Language suitability													
	4) Graph	0	0	0	13	1	0	0	0	92.8	7.2	14	4.07	G
	a) Cover	0	0	0	46	10	0	0	0	82.1	17.9	56	4.17	G
	b) Layout	0	0	0	30	5	0	0	0	85.7	14.3	35	4.14	G
	c) Typography	0	0	0	76	8	0	0	0	90.5	9.5	84	4.09	G
	d) Illustration	0	0	0	57	20	0	0	0	74.1	25.9	77	4.23	VG
	e) Content typography	0	0	0	33	2	0	0	0	94.3	5.7	35	4.05	G
	f) Illustration of content design													
	c. Type of Information	0	0	0	56	126	0	0	0	30.8	69.2	182	4.69	VG
	d. Type of Paragraph	0	0	0	45	32	0	0	0	58.4	41.6	77	4.42	VG
	e. Type of Practice/Activity	0	0	0	96	16	0	0	0	85.7	14.3	112	4.14	VG
5.	Instructional impact	0	0	0	18	24	0	0	0	42.8	57.2	42	4.57	VG
6.	Accompanying impact	0	0	0	18	31	0	0	0	36.7	63.3	49	4.63	VG
	Overall Average												4.39	VG

Note:

Respondents : 7

Score : 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly agree, 4= agree, 5 = strongly agree

Ave : average

Cat : category

G : good

VR : very good

The table above presents the average score of the lecturers' perceptions on each component detailed as follow: *First*, the learning structure is 4.67, the highest percentage of

answers which is *strongly agree* at 67.5% (VG). *Second*, the social system is 4.76 *strongly agree* as the highest answer 76.8% categorized *very good* (VG). *Third*, the principle of reaction is 4.76 with *strongly agree* as the highest answer 76.4% in *Very Good* category (VG). *Fourth*, the supporting system: 1) the objective and approaches are 4.60 with 60.7% *strongly agree* in *very good* category (VG); 2) the organizational design material in the aspect of content feasibility is 4.21 with 78.6% *agree* in *very good* category (VG); the material presentation is 4.27 with 72.6% *very agree* (VG); the score of graphics for cover, layout, typography, illustration, content typography, and content design respectively are 4.07 with 92.8% *agree* (G), 4.17 with 82.1% *agree* (G), 4.14 with 85.7% *agree* (G), 4.09 with 90.5% *agree* (G), 4.23 with 74.1% *agree* (VG), and 4.05 with 94.3% *agree* (G); 3) the type of information is 4.69 with *strongly agree* at 69.2% (VG); 4) the paragraph type is 4.42 with 41.6% *agree* (VG); 5) the type of exercise/activity is 4.14 with 85.7% *agree* (G). *Fifth*, the instructional impact is 4.57 with 57.2% *strongly agree* at very good category (VG). *Sixth*, the accompanying impact is 4.63 with 63.3% *strongly agree* (VG). *The last*, the score for all components is 4.39 at *very good* category (VG).

The details above identify that the average scores of lecturers' perception based on components are: First, the learning structure is 4.67 with *very good* category (VG). Second, social system is 4.76 in *very good* category (VG). Third, the reaction principle is 4.76 in *very good* category (VG). Fourth, the supporting system is 4.26 in *very good* category (VG); Fifth, the instructional impact is 4.57 in *very good* category (VG). Sixth, the accompanying impact is 4.63 in *very good* category (VG). These findings share similar result with study conducted by Sholeh [8] that suggested that if the scores are at intervals ≥ 4.2 , it can be concluded that the learning model is classified as a *very good* category. These results show that the lecturers' perception on the learning model developed is considered to *very good* (VG) category for all components of learning structure, social system, principle of reaction, supporting system, instructional impact and accompanying impact. This is confirmed by the average score of the overall perception of the lecturers on all components is 4.39 in *very good* category (VG). In other words, the learning model developed is considered to *very good* (VG) qualification based on the lecturers' perception.

To find out the students' perceptions of the learning model developed, they were asked for a questionnaire. The questionnaire was distributed to 28 students of the Indonesian Language and Literature Education Study Program, FKIP, Unbari Jambi. The results are explained as follows.

Table 2. Students' Perception on the Developed Learning Model

No	Components	Score					Percentage					Answers	Ave.	Cat.
		1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5			
1.	Learning Structure	0	0	47	700	261	0	0	4.66	69.44	25.89	1008	4.21	VG
2.	Social system	0	0	11	160	53	0	0	4.91	71.43	23.66	224	4.0	G
3.	Principle of Reaction	0	0	24	391	145	0	0	4.28	69.82	25.89	560	4.21	VG
4.	Supporting System/Module													
	a. Objective and approach	0	0	7	238	91	0	0	2.08	70.83	27.08	336	4.25	VG
	b. Material design and organization	0	0	4	161	59	0	0	1.78	71.87	26.33	224	4.24	VG
	1)Content feasibility	0	0	2	226	80	0	0	0.64	73.37	25.97	308	4.25	VG
	2)Material presentation	0	0	2	74	36	0	0	1.78	66.07	32.14	112	4.30	VG
	3)Language suitability													
	4)Graph	0	0	2	46	8	0	0	3.57	82.1	14.1	56	4.11	G

a) Cover	0	0	7	157	60	0	0	3.13	70.1	26.8	224	4.24	VG
b) Layout	0	0	1	91	48	0	0	0.71	65	34.3	140	4.34	VG
c) Typography	0	0	1	37	18	0	0	1.79	66.1	32.1	56	4.3	VG
d) Illustration	0	0	1	194	85	0	0	0.36	69.3	30.4	280	4.3	VG
e) Content layout	0	0	3	204	101	0	0	0.97	66.2	32.8	308	4.32	VG
f) Content typography	0	0	1	103	36	0	0	0.71	73.6	25.7	140	4.25	VG
g) Illustration of content design													
c. Type of Information	0	0	11	501	216	0	0	1.51	68.8	29.67	728	4.28	VG
d. Type of Paragraph	0	0	2	199	107	0	0	0.65	64.6	34.7	308	4.34	VG
e. Type of Practice/Activity	0	0	5	313	130	0	0	1.11	69.87	29.01	448	4.28	VG
5. Instructional impact	0	0	1	119	48	0	0	0.59	70.83	28.57	168	4.28	VG
6. Accompanying impact	0	0	1	142	53	0	0	0.51	72.45	27	196	4.27	VG
Overall Average												4.25	VG

Note:

Respondents : 71

Score : 1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree, 3 = slightly agree, 4= agree, 5 = strongly agree

Ave : average

Cat : category

G : good

VR : very good

The table above describes the average score of student perceptions on the model. The following are presented the average score for each component. *First*, the learning structure is 4.21 where 69.44% answered *agree* and categorized into *very good* category (VG). *Second*, the social system is 4.0 where 71.43% answered *agree* at the *good* (G) category. *Third*, the reaction principle is 4.21 where 69.82% answered *agree* in *very good* (VG) category. *Fourth*, the supporting system/module detailed as follows: (1) the objectives and approaches is 4.25 and 70.83% agreed at *very good* category (VG); (2) the material design and organization: the content feasibility of is 4.24 with 71.87% answered *agree* and is classified into *very good* (VG) category; the material presentation is 4.25 with 73.37% answered *agree* *very good* (VG) category; the graphic aspects are as follows: the cover is 4.11 and 82.1% agreed with *good* category (B); the layout is 4.24 and 70.01% answered *agree* with *very good* (VG) category; the typography is 4.34 and 65% *agree* with *very good* (VG) category; the illustration is 4.3 where 66.1% answered *agree* with *very good* (VG) category; the content design illustration is 4.25 where 73.6% answered *agree* with *very good* (VG) category; (3) the type of information is 4.28 in *very good* (VG) category with 68.8% answered *agree*; (4) the type of paragraph aspect is 4.34 in *very good* (VG) category with 64.6% answered *agree*; (5) the type of exercise/activity is 4.28 in *good* (G) category with 68.8% answered *agree*. *Fifth*, the instructional impact is 4.28 where 69.87% *strongly agree* with *very good* (VG) category. *Sixth*, the accompanying impact is 4.27 with *very good* (VG) category where 72.45% answered *agree*. *Seventh*, the score of overall components is 4.25 with *very good* (VG) category.

The description above recognizes the student perceptions on the model developed. The scores of all components in details are: *First*, the learning structure is 4.21 at a *very good* category (VG). *Second*, the social system is 4.0 at a *good* (G) category. *Third*, the reaction

principle is 4.21 in *very good* (VG) category. *Fourth*, the supporting system is 4.26 at a *very good* (VG) category. *Fifth*, the instructional impact is 4.28 with *very good* (VG) category. *Sixth*, the accompanying impact is 4.27 with *very good* (VG) category. The findings share similar result with the study conducted by Sholeh [8] that suggested that if the scores are at intervals 3.4 to 4.2, it can be concluded that the learning model is classified as a *good* category. If the score is at interval ≥ 4.2 , it can be concluded that the learning model developed is classified into *very good*. Thus, the students' perception confirmed that the developed model consisting of learning structure, principle of reaction, supporting system, instructional impact and accompanying impact is considered to be a *very good* classification, while the social system is considered into a *good* classification. In addition to the overall score of the students' perception on the model for all component is 4.25 which is at a *very good* category. In other words, based on the students' perception, the learning model developed is considered to *very good* (VG) qualification.

2 CONCLUSIONS

The findings show that the lecturers and the students share similar perception on the model developed categorized *Very Good*. It is indicated in their average score, 4.39 (very good) and 4.25 (very good) respectively. Therefore, it can be concluded that the learning model of contextual-based academic writing is qualified as excellent and can be applied in academic writing class to overcome the problems occurring in academic writing learning at Language and Literature Education Study Program, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Batanghari University Jambi.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ş. D Dilek B B & Mediha G 2018 *Int. J. Instruction* **11** 351-368 doi: <http://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11224a>
- [2] Audi Y, Emzir and Zainal R 2017 *Engl. Rev.: J. Engl. Education* **6** 59-70 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v6i1.771>
- [3] Agung N S 2017 *J. Indonesian Lang. Education and Literature* **2** 192-202 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v2i2.1199>
- [4] Amin A A Mubarak 2017 *Engl. Rev.: J. Engl. Education* **5** 175-188 doi: <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v5i2.533>
- [5] Arafat H 2018 The effect of blended learning on developing saudi english majors' writing skills *Int. J. Engl. Education* **7** 40-84
- [6] Afif R, Fatia M and Aceng R 2018 *Engl. Rev.: J. Engl. Education* **6** 51-60 doi: <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v6i2.1242>
- [7] Santi O, Emzir and Zainal R 2018 *Engl. Rev.: J. Engl. Education* **6** 69-76 doi: <https://doi.org/10.25134/erjee.v6i2.1256>
- [8] Khabib S 2014 *Jurnal Dialektika* **1** 277-296 doi: <https://doi.org/10.15408/dialektika.v1i2.6291>
- [9] Audi Y, Emzir and Zaenal R 2018 The Effectiveness of Task-Based Instructional Materials on Students' Writing Skills for Academic Purposes. *Int. J. Engl. Education* **7** 1-10 Retrieved from: http://ijee.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/1.5125059.pdf
- [10] Andy G 2010 Using English for academic purpose: a guide for students in higher education. Retrieved from <http://www.uefap.com/writing/writfram.htm> (Accessed on

November 5 2016)

- [11] Ghazi G 2002 Writing In Nada's ESL Island, February 2002. Retrieved from: <http://nadabs.tripod.com/ghaith-writing.html> (Accessed on November 5, 2016)
- [12] Anas S M and Subadrah M N 2017 *Int. J. Instruction* **10** 255-272 doi: <http://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2017.10116a>
- [13] Sabarti A 2008 *MK. Penulisan ilmiah* (Jakarta: PPs Universitas Muhammadiyah Prof. Dr. Hamka)
- [14] Phiphawin S S et al. 2016 English Language Difficulties of Non-Native English Postgraduates Students in an English for Academic Purposes at A Thai University. *Proceedings of CLaSIC* 2016. Retrieved from: https://www.fas.nus.edu.sg/cls/CLaSIC/clasic2016/PROCEEDINGS/srikrai_suphawat_phiphawin.pdf
- [15] Surastina and Fransisca S O D 2018 Examining Academic Writing Motivation of Prospective Indonesian Language Teachers Using Exploratory Factor Analysis *Int. J. Instruction* **11** 15-24 doi: <http://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.1122a>
- [16] Yunus A, Tita M and Hana Y 2017 Developing literacy learning model based on multi literacy, integrated, and differentiated concept at primary school. *Cakrawala : jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan* **36** 156-166 doi: <http://doi.org/10.21831/cp.v36i2.13283>
- [17] Emah K and Lilik H 2017 Pembelajaran Menulis Esai Menggunakan Model Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) Berbasis Life Skills *Journal Indonesian Language Education and Literature* **2** 148-162 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24235/ileal.v2i2.1360>
- [18] Bruce R J, Marsha W and Emily C 2016 *Models of teaching* (Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar)
- [19] Afif R and Franscy 2016 The development of contextual-based textbook on morphological process in faculty of teachers training and education Batanghari university jambi. *Asian EFL Journal, Profesional Teaching articles Indonesian International Conference Edition* Volume 1. <https://www.asian-elf-journal.com/wp-content/uploads/AEJ-Special-Edition-Desember-2016-TESOL-Indonesia-Conference-Volume-1-1.pdf>
- [20] Elaine B J 2002 *Contextual teaching and learning* (California: Corwin Press, Inc.)
- [21] Intan S, Emi E and Handi G 2012 Contextual Teaching and Learning Approach to Teaching Writing *Indonesian J. Appl. Linguist* **2** 10-22 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17509/ijal.v2i1.70>
- [22] Walter R B dan Meredith D G 1983 *Educational research: an introduction* (New York: Longman Inc.)
- [23] Vicki L P C and John W C 2015 *Understanding research: A consumer's guide, 2nd Ed* (NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.)