

ADRAGOGICALLY ORIENTED TEACHING METHODS AND VOCATIONAL SCHOOL GRADUATE STUDENTS' TEACHING PRACTICE ACHIEVEMENT

Rismanyanto¹, Fitri Budi Suryani²

¹ English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Muria
Kudus, Central Java, Indonesia

rismanyanto@umk.ac.id

² English Education Department, Teacher Training and Education Faculty, Universitas Muria
Kudus, Central Java, Indonesia

fitri.budi@umk.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This study is aimed at comparing the effectiveness of implementing AOTM and POTM to the students graduating from vocational and non vocational high schools. This is a quantitative study with the population of 87 students joining Speaking for Instructional Purposes (SIP) classes at EED MKU. Teaching practice pre and post tests are used as the instrument of this study. The results indicate that AOTM and POTM give impact to improve the teaching practice achievement of the students both graduating from vocational and non-vocational high schools when comparing the scores of pre-tests and post-tests, but the AOTM and POTM implemented in SIP classes with students graduating from vocational schools and from non-vocational schools do not result in impact on their teaching practice. However, in a certainly different condition the implementation of AOTM and POTM might give more impact to the teaching practice achievement of the students graduating from vocational schools than those graduating from non-vocational schools.

Keywords: *Andragogically oriented teaching methods; teaching practice achievement; students graduating from vocational schools*

An appropriate teaching method is urgently needed to gain good learning achievement. In determining the appropriate teaching method, there are several factors to consider. How old the learners are is one of the factors influencing the selection of the teaching methods; and it divides the learners into the young learners and the adult ones.

Philosophically referring to the age of the learners, there are andragogy and pedagogy as the kinds of teaching method. Andragogy and

pedagogy technically and operationally contribute philosophical orientation to the kinds of teaching method. Andragogy is a philosophically orientated teaching method appropriate for adult learners; whereas pedagogy is the one appropriate for the young ones.

College students go to the category of adult learners, and they are certainly appropriate to be involved in the teaching and learning applying Andragogically Oriented

teaching methods (AOTM). On the contrary, they are frequently still less independent in learning; and this does not fit to the nature of adult learners. Besides, the lecturers also still treat them as if they were young learners, although their syllabus and the lesson plan is claimed to have been oriented to the teaching method for adult learners. This fact also happens to the students of EED MKU, as some schools where they hold teaching practice deliver comment that the students' teaching practice achievement is still low. They add that they also still need to increase their independency and creativity in making up the teaching, in particular in relation with implementing instructional skills of teaching.

This study tries to solve the problems primarily dealing with the problems of students' low independency and creativity of preparing teaching practice as some previous researches revealed good chances of andragogy to be effective teaching method orientation to make the students' achievement especially their of language learning get better.

Christian (1983) adapting from Hadley's (1975) EOQ for civilian-military students sitting in classes at Tinker Air Force Base indicated the distinctions of whether the classes were mandatory or voluntary. He did not do a research on possible relationships between educational orientation, age and gender.

Davenport and Davenport (1985) replicated Christian's (1983) study concerning with the relationship between age, sex, academic achievement, and educational orientation among students at the University of Wyoming. Their study showed that andragogical orientation was better for female students.

Choy and Delahaye (2002) conducted a study on the learning approaches, study orientation, and readiness for self-directed

learning of 266 youth aged 17-24 years old and enrolled in four Technical and Further Education Institutes, and revealed that a predominant surface approach to learning, a preference for an andragogical orientation, and the youth mostly experienced a low level of readiness for self-directed learning.

Wilson (2005), whose research to create a sound psychometric instrument gave insight of andragogy's effect on two student outcomes, learning and satisfaction. The findings revealed adult learners registered in a MBA degree program provided proof of learning and did not effect from andragogy. However, the perception of andragogical teaching behaviors affected the satisfaction with instructor and course.

Deveci (2007) initially did a research on adult learners learning English as a foreign language oriented to andragogy and pedagogy. The objective of the research was to show the orientations of Turkish adult EFL learners to andragogy and pedagogy.

Sealana (2014) did a research and noted the efficacy of methods delivering andragogical instruction compared to delivery methods delivering traditional (pedagogical) instruction to make the methodologies of teaching and training for learning government-mandated course content better.

Deveci together with Tezcan (2017) again stated in his research on Andragogical, Pedagogical and Lifelong Learning Orientations of Freshman Engineering Students in a Project-Based Course that there is a positive correlation between andragogical and lifelong learning tendencies, and a negative correlation between pedagogical and lifelong learning tendencies.

Inspired from those results of the preceding researches on andragogy, this study is a research on andragogy investigating whether AOTM and POTM are effective to get the teaching practice achievement of

students graduating from vocational and non-vocational high schools improved. They did the teaching practice in SIP (Speaking for Instructional Purposes) course. SIP is a course providing the students with preparation of teaching competency before they join Microteaching and Teaching Internship courses in the next semesters. This course trains the students to do teaching practice activities; such as applying media of teaching, practicing instructional skills of teaching dealing with classroom language, and classroom management.

The early concepts on adult education return to the early 1800s, Malcom Knowles popularized “andragogy” in order to distinguish adult education from pedagogy or child education (Pavlova and Sanger, 2016). Andragogy is etymologically a Greek root word built from *Andra* meaning adult and *agogus* which is equal in meaning with to lead; whereas Andragogy is terminologically “the art and science of teaching/leading adults” (Knowles, 1980). Andragogy is an important learning orientation for adult learners (Peterson & Ray, 2013). As a method orientation of teaching, andragogy treats the learner as the centre; while the teacher mainly acts as the facilitator. In addition, andragogy philosophically gets adult learners gain an andragogical experience of self-direction, autonomy, responsibility for decisions, resource of experience, performance of social roles, and immediacy of application or action.

Andragogical orientation of teaching method is recommended by Knowles (1980) to achieve more meaningful outcomes because it reinforces learners to freely select the learning goals, content, and processes. Andragogical orientation gets learners to ask the teacher to give an environment that results in learning, provide some control over the learning process, and ignite higher levels of self-direction (Henry, 2009).

Andragogy is not actually categorized into a teaching method, but it mainly touches the level of philosophical concepts revealing the adult learners involved in the teaching and learning process. The andragogical impacts in teaching can be found through teaching methods. In other words, there are many teaching methods representing and orienting to andragogy or andragogically oriented.

Those kinds of teaching methods are think pair-share or concept tests (also called small group discussion and peer instruction) (Anderson et al., 2005), effective use of clickers (Smith et al., 2011), one-minute paper (Rivard & Straw, 2000), Interactive lecture demonstrations (Sharma et al., 2010), case studies (Preszler, 2009), concept mapping (Yarden et al., 2004), tutorial worksheets (Finkelstein & Pollock, 2005), problem-based learning (Preszler et al., 2007), just-in-time teaching (Marrs & Novak, 2004), analytical challenge before lecture (Schwartz & Bransford, 1998), computer stimulation game (Harris et al., 2009), group tests (Klappa, 2009), problem sets in group (Cortright et al., 2005), random calling (Buck, 1997), writing with peer review (Pelaez, 2002).

Pedagogy also etymologically derives from a Greek root word, *peda* or *paid* which means child. It is terminologically the art and science of teaching children (Knowles, 1980 and Conner, 2004). In pedagogical orientation Students do not need to find the reason of their learning as they rely on their teachers. In other words, in pedagogy the teacher mainly plays a role as the centre of teaching, and the teacher use approval and parental pressures and grades to reinforce the students to study.

Pedagogy is actually not a teaching method, but it touches the level philosophical concepts representing the adult learners' involvement in teaching and learning

process. The pedagogical impacts in teaching can be seen through teaching methods. There are many teaching methods orienting to pedagogy such as direct instructions (Killen, 1998), lecture by teacher (Marsh, 2000), oral question recitation and lecture demonstration (Marsh, 2000), and textbook assignment (Rukmini, 2009).

Summing up from Knowles' opinions (1980, 1987) on pedagogy and andragogy, the following is the comparison of andragogy and pedagogy:

Table 1. Differences of Andragogy and Pedagogy

Andragogy	Pedagogy
Students get themselves to be the teacher to have responsibility for decisions about curriculum, skills acquisition, teaching methodology, and evaluation of learning.	Students get the teacher to have responsibility for decisions about curriculum, skills acquisition, teaching methodology, and evaluation of learning.
It applies a "student-centered" approach	It applies a "teacher-centered" approach
Students' prior experience significantly influences their learning process or outcome.	Students' prior experience does not significantly influence their learning process or outcome.
Students' "readiness to learn" appears mostly due to internal stimuli, such as an increase in salary or advancement of position	Students' "readiness to learn" appears mostly due to external stimuli, such as an increase in salary or advancement of position
Students find interest in learning better than drawing specific educational subjects	Students are "drawn" to specific educational subjects rather than exploring or experiencing interest in learning
Students get negative pressures as a motivation from parents, peers, and professional colleagues	Students get external negative pressures as a motivation from parents, peers, and professional colleagues
It shows an alternative set of assumptions about the way adults learn	It shows a basic ideology
It is oriented to process	It is oriented to content

In spite of the differences of andragogy and pedagogy, the real dichotomy of both concepts has been mostly discussed. Hanson (2010) proves that adults and children have extremely different learning orientations. This happens due to the factors of age and experience play a role, although their significance is possibly overmuch and therefore deluding. Learners with greater age do not guarantee to have more experience, and it makes teachers look at the exclusive natures of every individual learner, the matter of content, the setting of learning, the relationships between learners and teachers, and the learners' peers (Hanson, 2010).

Based on research not all adult learners gain a strong andragogical orientation, and even some of them may have more pedagogical orientation (Deveci, 2007). Teachers can also see that young learners are commonly not patient to use their knowledge soon as adult learners (Nikolova, Malcheva, Stefanova & Boytchev, 2013). Then they consider that the changing from subject-centred learning to problem-centred learning cannot be avoided, and that students are eager to be active in learning. Teachers teaching young learners are demanded to apply active learning circumstance in which students are responsible for their own learning as the concept of learning applying the andragogical approach.

Vocational Education and Language Learning

Students graduating from vocational education are prepared to have more readiness to work right after they graduate than those graduating from non-vocational schools. Vocational education in Indonesia covers the level of secondary education with vocational high school, and the level of higher education with polytechnic institution or academy.

Due to the different purpose of establishing vocational school and non-vocational school, the educational model implemented in each school is not different too. Colak and Kayai (2014) states that vocational high schools teach how to do and to underfocus on the unity of doing and thinking. Consequently, the vocational high schools, compared with non-vocational high schools, apply different learning approach strategies.

However, both in vocational high schools and non-vocational high schools students learn English. The English skills and competences taught are such as listening, speaking, reading, writing, grammar, and vocabulary.

The difference is that vocational school students learn English in particular supporting their jobs (Buchanan, 1990), as accounting, tourism, marketing, mechanics, and other related jobs. In other words, they focus on learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Because of the various jobs, learning English might become a stressful experience for the vocational high school students. Sae-tia and Caromana (2017) added that vocational school students feel suffered from anxiety when learning foreign language. This experience does not happen to the non-vocational high school students as they learn English in general and for university admission.

METHOD

This study uses quantitative method applying factorial design. It also conveys two independent variables, the use of AOTM and POTM; and one dependent variable, the teaching practice achievement of the students joining SIP class. Besides, to apply the factorial design, the dependent variable is detailed into two moderate variables, whether the students joining SIP graduate from vocational and non-vocational schools.

This study is conducted at English Education Department of Muria Kudus University with the sample of 85 students in 2 SIP classes. In the teaching and learning process one SIP class with 47 students as experimental group (8 students graduating from vocational schools and 39 students graduating from non-vocational schools) implemented AOTM, and the other SIP class with 38 students as controlled group (5 students graduating from vocational schools and 33 students graduating from non-vocational schools) applied POTM.

Pre-tests and post-tests of teaching practice are the instrument used in this study. The pre-tests are given whether to the group

of students joining SIP before they are taught by using AOTM or to the other group of students joining SIP before they are taught by using POTM. The post-tests are also given to the group of students after they are taught by using AOTM and to the other group of students after they are taught by using POTM. The description of the teaching practice is that the students: (i) have to do teaching practice with time allocation of 15-20 minutes; (ii) are free to choose the material for teaching practice; (iii) are not necessary to prepare authentic lesson plan; and (iv) have to apply reinforcement, variation, classroom language in their teaching practice achievement of teaching practice is scored based the rubric of teaching practice adopted from Sydney Micro Skills (RPKPS SIP, 2015).

The procedures of collecting data in this study are as the following: (i) preparing the pre-tests and post-test of teaching practice to measure the students' achievement of SIP; (ii) conducting the pre-tests; (iii) applying the treatment of AOTM in teaching SIP to the experimental group and that of POTM to the control group; (iv) administering the post-tests and (iv) interacting the result of the test of the two groups with the moderator variable of student characteristics including the high school program with the category of vocational school and non-vocational school.

The data analysis in this study is done by using non-parametric statistic due to the less than 200 numbers of populations. All the quantitative calculations are done by using SPSS program. The data analysis is done in particular to find the significant difference of the scores of teaching practice pre-tests and post-tests of (i) the group of students of SIP Class graduating from vocational school before and after being taught by using AOTM; (ii) the group of students of SIP Class graduating from non-vocational school before and after being taught by using AOTM; (iii) the group of students of SIP Class graduating from vocational school before and after being taught by using POTM; (iv) the group of students of SIP

Class graduating from non-vocational school before and after being taught by using POTM; (v) the group of students of SIP Class graduating from vocational school before and after being taught by using AOTM and POTM; and (vi) the group of students of SIP Class graduating from non-vocational school before and after being taught by using AOTM and POTM.

FINDINGS

Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Teaching practice	
Z	-5.378 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

This study showed 6 main results: (i) there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from vocational schools before and after being taught by using AOTM; (ii) there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools before and after being taught by using AOTM; (iii) there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from vocational schools before and after being taught by using POTM; (iv) there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools before and after being taught by using POTM (v) there is no significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from vocational taught by using AOTM and POTM; and (vi) there is no significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM. The data analysis of the two groups of students is detailed as follows.

Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post
Test			Test			Test			Test		
1	49,38	73,75	3	51,25	80	5	48,75	75,56	7	48,75	80
2	53,13	86,25	4	48,13	71,88	6	44,38	73,75	8	50,625	80

Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using AOTM

There are only 8 students graduating from vocational schools joining SIP class taught by using AOTM. The detailed data of those 8 students are presented in the following table:

Table 2. Teaching Practice Scores of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using AOTM

The data in Table 2 are then analyzed through SPSS, and the result is as seen in Table 3:

Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Teaching practice taught by AOTM	
Z	-2.524 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.012

Table 3. Test Statistics (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test)

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

The result of SPSS analysis above shows that there is a significant difference of the teaching practice scores of students graduating from vocational schools before and after being taught by using AOTM. Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in Test Statistics of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test shows 0.012, which is lower than 0.05.

The Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Non-Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using AOTM

There are 39 students in SIP class graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM. The detailed data are mentioned in Table 4:

Table 4. Scores of Teaching Practice of Students Graduating from Non-Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using AOTM

Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post
Test			Test			Test			Test		
1	42,5	68,15	11	50,63	70,63	21	49,38	76,88	31	50,625	74,38
2	46,25	74,38	12	51,88	75,63	22	46,88	70,63	32	63,125	88,13
3	50	71,25	13	49,38	68,75	23	55	80	33	47,5	74,38
4	50	73,75	14	51,25	80	24	58,75	80	34	48,125	71,88
5	49,38	71,88	15	54,38	82,5	25	54,38	75	35	48,75	75,63
6	50	71,88	16	51,88	87	26	54,38	82,50	36	48,75	68,75
7	50	73,14	17	60	83,75	27	56,88	85,63	37	46,25	80
8	50	79,38	28	53,75	79,38	28	50	70,63	38	48,15	76,25
9	46,25	73,13	19	53,75	71,25	29	49,38	71,25	39	60,625	81,25
10	50,63	77,65	20	44,38	73,75	30	55,63	85,63			

SPSS then analyzes the data in Table 4 and views the output as displayed in Table 5:

Table 5. Test Statistics (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test)

Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Teaching practice	
Z	-5.378 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 5 above shows that there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools before and after being taught by using AOTM. Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in Test Statistics of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test indicates 0.000 which is lower than 0.05.

The Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using POTM

The scores of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from

vocational schools before and after being taught by using POTM are presented in the following table:

Table 6. Scores of Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using POTM

Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Teaching practice	
Z	-2.023 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.043

Table 7. Test Statistics (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test)

Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post
Test			Test			Test			Test		
1	50,63	63,75	10	61,88	75	19	55,63	55,63	28	68,75	81,88
2	66,25	76,88	11	76,25	91,88	20	58,13	58,13	29	64,38	91,25
3	48,75	68,13	12	53,75	86,25	21	68,75	68,75	30	66,25	86,88
4	46,25	62,5	13	52,5	80,63	22	80	80	31	65	83,75
5	70	94,75	14	64,38	81,88	23	74,38	74,38	32	65,63	77,5
6	62,5	78,13	15	66,88	91,25	24	63,75	63,75	33	61,88	92,5
7	69,38	65,63	16	54,38	85	25	55,63	55,625			
8	70	89,38	17	60	86,88	26	61,25	61,25			
9	67,5	86,25	18	73,13	86,25	27	69,38	69,375			

a. Based on negative ranks.

b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

The result of SPSS analysis above indicates that there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement scores of students graduating from vocational schools before and after being taught by using POTM. Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in Test Statistics of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test shows 0.043, which is lower than 0.05.

The Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Non-Vocational

Schools before and after being Taught by Using POTM

More than half of the total numbers of students joining SIP class taught by using POTM graduate from non-vocational schools as detailed in Table 7 below:

Table 7. Scores of Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from non-Vocational Schools before and after being Taught by Using POTM

Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post	Std	Pre	Post
1	50,63	63,75	10	61,88	75	19	55,63	55,63	28	68,75	81,88
2	66,25	76,88	11	76,25	91,88	20	58,13	58,13	29	64,38	91,25
3	48,75	68,13	12	53,75	86,25	21	68,75	68,75	30	66,25	86,88
4	46,25	62,5	13	52,5	80,63	22	80	80	31	65	83,75
5	70	94,75	14	64,38	81,88	23	74,38	74,38	32	65,63	77,5
6	62,5	78,13	15	66,88	91,25	24	63,75	63,75	33	61,88	92,5
7	69,38	65,63	16	54,38	85	25	55,63	55,625			
8	70	89,38	17	60	86,88	26	61,25	61,25			
9	67,5	86,25	18	73,13	86,25	27	69,38	69,375			

The data of the 33 students available in Table 7 are analyzed through SPSS program, and the result can be seen in Table 8:

Table 8 Test Statistics (Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test)

Pre-Test and Post-Test Scores of Teaching practice	
Z	-4.961 ^a
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.000

- a. Based on negative ranks.
b. Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test

Table 8 shows that there is a significant difference of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools before and after being taught by using POTM. Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) in Test Statistics of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test indicates 0.000 which is lower than 0.05.

The Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools Taught by Using AOTM and POTM

The teaching practice achievement of students graduating from vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM at EED MKU may have significant difference. The table below shows the N-gain of the teaching practice achievement of the two groups of students as a base to find out the significant difference:

Table 9. N-Gain of Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Vocational Schools Taught by Using AOTM and POTM

Std	MV/Method	N-Gain	Std	MV/Method	N-Gain	Std	MV/Method	N-Gain
1	VSAOTM	0.48	6	VSAOTM	0.53	11	VSPOTM	0.52
2	VSAOTM	0.71	7	VSAOTM	0.61	12	VSPOTM	0.44
3	VSAOTM	0.59	8	VSAOTM	0.59	13	VSPOTM	0.51
4	VSAOTM	0.46	9	VSPOTM	0.35			
5	VSAOTM	0.52	10	VSPOTM	0.56			

Note: Std (student); MV (moderator variable)

The analysis of N-gain data in Table 9 is done through SPSS program to prove whether the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM has a significant difference or not as in the following table:

Table 10. Test Statistics ^a		
	Class	
Mann-Whitney U	8.500	a. Not Corrected forties
Wilcoxon W	23.500	b. Grouping Variable: Code
Z	-1.688	
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.091	
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	.093 ^a	

Table 10 views that teaching practice achievement of the students graduating from vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM does not have any significant difference as the level of significance of the teaching practice achievement of both groups of students is 0.093 and it is higher than 0.05.

The Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Non-Vocational Schools Taught by Using AOTM and POTM

The teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM may have significant difference. The N-gain data of the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM is used to probability of that significant difference:

Std	MV/Method	N-Gain	Std	MV/Method	N-Gain	Std	MV/Method	N-Gain
1	NVSAOTM	0.45	25	NVSAOTM	0.45	49	NVSPOTM	0.34
2	NVSAOTM	0.52	26	NVSAOTM	0.62	50	NVSPOTM	0.66
3	NVSAOTM	0.43	27	NVSAOTM	0.67	51	NVSPOTM	0.7
9	NVSAOTM	0.5	33	NVSAOTM	0.51	57	NVSPOTM	0.49
10	NVSAOTM	0.55	34	NVSAOTM	0.46	58	NVSPOTM	0.63
11	NVSAOTM	0.41	35	NVSAOTM	0.52	59	NVSPOTM	0.48
12	NVSAOTM	0.49	36	NVSAOTM	0.39	60	NVSPOTM	0.28
13	NVSAOTM	0.38	37	NVSAOTM	0.63	61	NVSPOTM	0.19
14	NVSAOTM	0.59	38	NVSAOTM	0.54	62	NVSPOTM	0.51
15	NVSAOTM	0.62	39	NVSAOTM	0.52	63	NVSPOTM	0.34
16	NVSAOTM	0.73	40	NVSPOTM	0.27	64	NVSPOTM	0.06
17	NVSAOTM	0.59	41	NVSPOTM	0.31	65	NVSPOTM	0.65
18	NVSAOTM	0.55	42	NVSPOTM	0.38	66	NVSPOTM	0.41
19	NVSAOTM	0.38	43	NVSPOTM	0.3	67	NVSPOTM	0.42
20	NVSAOTM	0.53	44	NVSPOTM	0.83	68	NVSPOTM	0.75
21	NVSAOTM	0.54	45	NVSPOTM	0.42	69	NVSPOTM	0.61
22	NVSAOTM	0.45	46	NVSPOTM	-0.1	70	NVSPOTM	0.54
23	NVSAOTM	0.56	47	NVSPOTM	0.65	71	NVSPOTM	0.35
24	NVSAOTM	0.52	48	NVSPOTM	0.58	72	NVSPOTM	0.8

Table 11. N-Gain of Teaching Practice Achievement of Students Graduating from Non-Vocational Schools Taught by Using AOTM and POTM

	Class
Mann-Whitney U	602.500
Wilcoxon W	1.164E3
Z	-.464
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	.643

Note: Std (student); MV (moderator variable); N (non)

Analyzed by using SPSS the N-gain data in Table 11 indicates whether or not the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM has a significant difference. Table 12 contains SPSS analysis showing the output of the analysis: It is the subheading level one.

Table 12 displays that the teaching practice achievement of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM doesn't have any significant difference for the level of significance of the teaching practice achievement of both groups of students is 0.643, and it is much higher than 0.05.

DISCUSSION

Speaking for Instructional Purposes (SIP), a course at EED MKU, prepares the students to learn things needed in teaching classes, and to practice teaching. Those things include how to prepare teaching, how to use instructional skills of teaching effectively in teaching time, and how to make a sustainable feedback after teaching. This course prepares students to have initial experience of teaching before they also do more real teaching practices in Microteaching and Teaching Internship courses.

The implementation of AOTM in SIP class includes applying the teaching methods oriented to the teaching and learning for adult learners, for example discussion, case studies, and problem based learning; whereas the implementation of POTM in SIP class deals with applying the teaching methods oriented to the teaching and learning for young learners, for example direct instruction, lecture by teacher, oral question recitation, class-work and homework assignments. The students of SIP class, categorized into adult learners, should have to study actively, autonomously, and creatively.

Referring to the results of this study and seeing from the experimental research design by using pre-test and post-test, the implementation of AOTM gave impact to the teaching practice of students graduating from vocational schools as well as from non-vocational schools; and the implementation of POTM also gave impact to the teaching practice of students graduating from both vocational schools and non-vocational schools.

On the other hand, seeing from the experimental design by comparing the

teaching practice of students graduating from both vocational and vocational schools taught by using AOTM as the experimental group and the teaching practice of students graduating from both vocational and vocational schools taught by using POTM as controlled group, the implementation of AOTM and POTM gave no impact to the teaching practice of students graduating from vocational schools as well as from non-vocational schools.

However, the levels of significant differences of the teaching practice of students graduating from vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM and the teaching practice of students graduating from non-vocational schools taught by using AOTM and POTM reach 0.093 and 0.643. It indicates that the teaching practice of students graduating from vocational schools would have probably got more impact of the implementation of AOTM and POTM better than the Teaching practice of students graduating from non-vocational schools if in a certainly different condition the teaching practice of students graduating both from vocational and non-vocational schools has a significant difference. In other words, the students graduating from non-vocational schools would possibly have found fewer difficulties in learning to practice teaching English in SIP classes in particular and learning English in general than the students graduating from non-vocational schools.

This might be in line with what Sae-tia and Coromana (2017) stated that students of vocational schools feel to get suffering from anxiety in the time of studying English and other foreign languages. Buchanan (1990) strengthened Sae-tia and Coromana's statement that students of vocational school study English mainly supporting their jobs, as accounting, tourism, marketing, mechanics, and other related jobs. Thus, they focus on learning English for Specific Purposes (ESP). Because of the various jobs, learning English might be a stressful experience for the vocational high students. This is an

experience the students graduating vocational schools ever got; and that experience might be still in their mind when they studying English in at university, also including practicing teaching English in SIP classes.

CONCLUSION

AOTM (Andagogically oriented teaching methods) projected an appropriate teaching method for adult learners gave impact to the SIP (Speaking for Instructional Purposes) achievement of students graduating from vocational schools as well as non-vocational schools when AOTM was implemented in SIP classes by comparing the scores of the teaching practice pre-test and post-test.

POTM (Pedagogically oriented teaching methods) claimed an appropriate teaching method for young learners also gave impact to the SIP (Speaking for Instructional Purposes) achievement of students graduating from vocational schools as well as non-vocational schools when POTM was implemented in SIP classes by comparing the scores of the teaching practice pre-test and post-test.

The implementation of AOTM and POTM in SIP classes with students graduating from

vocational schools as experimental group and students from non-vocational schools as controlled group did not result in impact on their teaching practice. However, in a certainly different condition the implementation of AOTM and POTM might give more impact to the teaching practice achievement of the students graduating from vocational schools than those graduating from non-vocational schools. This section deals with the conclusion. It is subheading level one. The conclusion section consists of the summary, restatement of the main findings. It should state concisely the most important propositions of the paper as well as the author's views of the practical implications of the result. Tell how your work advances the field from the present state of knowledge. Without clear conclusion, reviewers and readers will find it difficult to judge the work, and whether or not it merits publication in the journal. Do not repeat the Abstract, or just list experimental results. Provide a clear scientific justification for your work, and indicate possible applications and extensions. You can also suggest future research and point out those that are underway.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, W. L., Mitchell, S. M., & Osgood, M. P. (2005). Comparison of Student Performance in Cooperative Learning and Traditional Lecture-Based Biochemistry Classes. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education*, 33(6), 387-93. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bmb.2005.49403306387>
- Buck, H. J. (1997). Maximizing Student Learning with the Use of Random Oral Questioning in the College Classroom. *Florida Journal of Educational Research*, 37(1). Retrieved from http://feraonline.org/fjer/archive/1997/1997_Buck.htm.
- Choy, S. C., & Delahaye, B. (2002, March). *Andragogy in Vocational Education and Training: Learners' perspective*. Paper presented at the 5th Annual Conference of the Australian VET Research Association (AVETRA), Melbourne, Australia.
- Christian, A. C. (1983). A Comparative Study of the Andragogical-Pedagogical Orientation of Military and Civilian Personnel. *Doctoral dissertation*. Oklahoma State University.

Retrieved from <https://shareok.org/bitstream/handle/11244/20245/Thesis-1982D-C555c.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>

Conner, M. L. (2004). Andragogy and Pedagogy. Retrieved from <http://agelesslearner.com/intros/andragogy.html>

<< | 62

Davenport, J., & Davenport, J. H. (1985). Knowles or Lindeman: Would the Real Father of American Andragogy Please Stand Up?. *Lifelong Learning*, 9(3), 4-5.

Deveci, T. (2007). Androgogical and Pedagogical Orientations of Adult Learners Learning English as a Foreign Language. *Journal of New Horizons in Adult Education and Human Resource Development*, 21(¾), 16-28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nha3.10287>

Deveci, T., & Tezcan, F (2017). Andragogical, Pedagogical and Lifelong Learning Orientations of Freshman Engineering Students in a Project-Based Course. *Journal of Education for Life*. 31(1), 65-88.

Finkelstein, N. D., & S. J. Pollock. (2005). Replicating and Understanding Successful Innovations: Implementing Tutorials in Introductory Physics. *Physics Education Research*, 1(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.1.010101>

Hanson, A. (2010). The search for a separate theory of adult learning: Does anyone really need andragogy?. In (Eds.) In R. Edwards, A. Hanson and P. Raggatt (Eds.), *Boundaries of adult learning* (pp 99-108). New York, NY: Routledge.

Harris, M. A., Peck, R. F., Colton, S., Morris, J., Neto, E. C., & Kallio, J. (2009). A Combination of Handheld Models and Computer Imaging Programs Helps Students Answer Oral Questions about Molecular Structure and Function: A Controlled Investigation of Student Learning. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 8(1), 29-43. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.08-07-0039>

Henry, G. W. (2009). *An Historical Analysis of the Development of Thinking in the Principal Writings of Malcolm Knowles*. (Doctoral Dissertation). School of Learning and Professional Studies, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology.

Killen, R. (1998). *Effective Teaching Strategies* (2nd ed.) Australia: Social Science Press.

Klappa, P. (2009). Promoting Active Learning through “Pub Quizzes”— a Case Study at the University of Kent. *Bioscience Education*, 14(1), 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.3108/beej.14.c2>

Knowles, M. (1980). *The Modern Practice of Adult Education: from Pedagogy to Andragogy*. New York: Cambridge Books.

Marrs, K. A., & Novak, G. M. (2004). Just-in-Time Teaching in Biology: Creating an Active Learner Classroom Using the Internet. *Cell Biology Education*, 3(1), 49-61. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.03-11-0022>

Marsh, C. (2000). *Handbook for Beginning Teachers* (2nd ed). Australia: Pearson Education.

Nikolova, N. Malcheva, T. Z., Stefanova, E. and Boytchev, P. (2013). Is it too late to be child? Is it too early to be adult?. *Andragogika*, 1(4), 156-173.

Pavlova, I.V. & Sanger, P.A., (2016). Applying andragogy to promote active learning

in adult education in Russia. *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*.6(4), 41-44.

- Pelaez, N. J. (2002). Problem-Based Writing with Peer Review Improves Academic Performance in Physiology. *Advances in Physiology Education*, 26(3), 174-184. <https://doi.org/10.1152/advan.00041.2001>
- Peterson, C. & Ray, M. (2013). Andragogy and Metagogy: The Evolution of Neologisms. *Journal of Adult Education*, 42(2), 82-85.
- Preszler, R. W., Dawe, A., & Shuster, C. B. (2007). Assessment of the Effects of Student Response Systems on Student Learning and Attitudes over a Broad Range of Biology Courses. *CBE—Life Sciences Education*, 6(1), 29-41. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.06-09-0190>
- Rivard, L. P., & Straw, S. B. (2000). The effect of talk and writing on learning science: An exploratory study. *Science Education*, 84, 566-593. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X\(200009\)84:5%3C566::AID-SCE2%3E3.0.CO;2-U](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-237X(200009)84:5%3C566::AID-SCE2%3E3.0.CO;2-U)
- Rokhayani, Atik. 2015. Rencana Program Kegiatan Pembelajaran Semester (RPKPS) Speaking for Instructional Purposes. Program Studi Pendidikan Bahasa Inggris Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Muria Kudus
- Rukmini, D. (2009). Model Written Texts in the Recommended Senior High School English Textbooks. *TEFLIN Journal*, 20(2), 180-193.
- Schwartz, D. L., & Bransford, J. D. (1998). A Time for Telling. *Cognition & Instruction*, 16(4), 475-522. https://doi.org/10.1207/s1532690xcil604_4
- Sealana, R. K. (2014). Examining the Efficacy of Adult Learning of Government-Mandated Content Using Andragogical Delivery Methods versus Traditional Pedagogical Delivery Methods. San Fransisco: University of San Francisco.
- Setianingrum, D., & Saleh, M. (2016). Classroom Interaction Patterns in Higher Education. *English Education Journal*, 6(2), 10-16.
- Sharma, M., Johnston, I. D., Johnston, H., Varvell, K., Robertson, G., Hopkins, A., Stewart, C., Cooper, I., & Thornton, R. (2010). Use of interactive lecture demonstrations: A ten year study. *Physics Education Research*, 6(2), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevSTPER.6.020119>
- Smith, M. K., Wood, W. B., Krauter, K., & Knight, J. K. (2011). Combining Peer Discussion with Instructor Explanation Increases Student Learning from In-Class Concept Questions. *CBE Life Sciences Education*, 10(1), 55-63. <https://doi.org/10.1187/cbe.10-08-0101>
- Yarden, H., Marbach-ad, G., & Gershoni, J. M. (2004). Using the Concept Map Technique in Teaching Introductory Cell Biology to College Freshmen. *Bioscene: Journal of College Biology Teaching*, 30(1), 3-13.

