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Abstract

The need of information is a basic need that is required to understand every moment in life. This is in accordance to the definition of information as an urge to overcome uncertainties or problems and to find solution and improvement. The need of information, be it a psychological, affective, or cognitive need, led someone to undertake an act of information seeking, known as information seeking behavior. The development of information seeking behavior nowadays expands into interdisciplinary study. One of them is using cultural dimension to have a better sight on the research. This paper discusses the information seeking behavior of the santri of the Madrasah Aliyah (Upper Secondary School students) Pondok Pesantren Jakarta, using the information seeking behavior Big Six Skill model from Eisenberg- Berkowitz, and two of Hofstede national cultural dimensions; Indonesian score of Power Distance and Individualism. This research will explore the uniqueness of Pondok Pesantren as one of typical Indonesian educational institution in coloring their students’ information seeking behavior.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Information is a basic humans’ need which is used to understand and to comprehend every actions and events that happened. In literal sense, information means enlightenment, announcement, reports or news about something (KBBI Daring), while in the context of information science, information is defined as any stimulus that affects one’s certainty, which makes a person aware of the need and create a change in certain level or degree (James Krikelas, 1983). In explaining the discipline of information science, Vickery stated that the discipline of information science focuses in every aspect of the chain of information transfer activities, but the heart of its interest is search; how series of information transferring process works and specifically the searching process (Robinson & Bawden, 2011).

There are several models of information seeking steps, each emphasize different aspects. James Krikelas (1983) stressed the aspect of needs and divided the information seeking stage into 4 steps: Perceiving a need, the search itself, finding the information, using the information. The other model was developed by Eisenberg and Berkowitz which is known as the Big Six Skills model: task definition, information seeking, implementation, use, synthesis, and evaluation (Weiler, 2005). This model has several advantages, such as involving critical thinking and problem solving dimensions, able to explain the information seeking process which is not always linear/resolute in its steps, and ideal to use in increasing integrated skills of one curriculum subject’s area (Hayden, n.d.). This model also often used in students’ research. Those are the reasons we use Big 6 Skills model for this research.
As mentioned above, Krikelas (1983) emphasized the aspect of need which start the process of information seeking. This model clearly explains the process of a person’s information seeking behavior may be affected by the surrounding’s limit, whether it’s interpersonal or personal (Wilson, 1994). In Wilson’s model, we can see the firm relation between information seeking behavior and other disciplines, especially the psychological, economical, and sociological aspects, and cultural elements attached in environment and society (Wilson, 1994). This idea is developed by Komlodi and Carlin (2004) by reviewing the cultural aspect of information seeking behavior. In one of their article titled “Identifying cultural variables in Information-Seeking” they explained the relation between information seeking behavior and information seeker’s culture. The research identifies one of Hall’s (message velocity continuum, context, time concept, information flow, action chains) and Hofstede’s (power distance, collectivism/individualism, femininity/masculinity, uncertainty avoidance) cultural dimensions with the most to least significant impact in information seeking process. Departing from Komlodi and Carlin’s research above, we are interested in analyzing deeper by applying one of Hofstede’s cultural dimension units on one specific case study. In this initial research, we are going to observe the information seeking behavior of santriwati (female students) in Madrasah Aliyah Pondok Pesantren Jakarta.

A. Pondok Pesantren Jakarta

Pondok Pesantren Jakarta was established in 1984 and rapidly developed until it has numerous branches. This pesantren (an Islamic boarding school) is sorted into khalafiyah pesantren type, which merges the formal education with Islamic education such as the study of Qur’an, hadith, and other kitab kuning (islamic scholars books). With the presence of this formal education, the management is led by a school principle which answers to the Kiai (a religious leader) as the highest leader of pondok pesantren. In December 2014, Madrasah Aliyah Jakarta acquired an A for its accreditation (graded 92.69) from BAN-S/M. This modern pesantren, which is located in the middle of the city, has several characteristics identical to common pesantren, such as the separation of activities between male and female students, the strict discipline, the obligation to master two foreign languages, and the mastery of religious knowledge which is combined with formal educational activities and various extracurricular activities.

This pesantren also has certain policies on information sources and tools such as television, computer, and cellphone. These policies are appropriated with the needs and achievement strategy of educational program for students of the pondok pesantren. Based on that condition, our research team is interested in observing the behavioral pattern of information seeking of the santri in Pondok Pesantren Jakarta. This research will also analyze two of Hofstede’s cultural dimensions that can be applied in the condition and situation inside the pesantren. One is Power Distance dimension, to see the power relation that is centered on the administrators of madrasah and pesantren. Two is Individualism dimension which is centered on the behavior of the santriwati.

B. Hofstede’s Cultural Dimension

Geert Hofstede dedicated himself to do researches on cross-cultural communication, which explains how a culture in a society influence an individual and their behavior. Hofstede had conducted a research on a multinational company with branches in various countries to, generally, see the influence of culture and working behavior in it. This cultural dimension at first is consisted of four dimensions; Power Distance, Individualism, Masculinity, Uncertainty Avoidance. In its development, two other dimensions are added, Long Term Orientation (1991), and Indulgence (2010) (Hofstede, 2011). These cultural dimensions are studied based on the calculation to national culture. Hofstede published his research’s result to numerous countries. The following chart shows Hofstede’s cultural dimension score for Indonesia:

---

1 Not the real name, as requested by the school principle.
2 source: interview and school’s documentation
Indonesia scored 78 on Power Distance, which shows a very strong power relation and causes a high hierarchical pattern. While on Individualism, Indonesia scored 14, which shows a very low individualism behavior (high collective inclination). These two dimension will help analyze the findings on information seeking behavior of santriwati in Pondok Pesantren Jakarta.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

Several studies on information seeking behavior in Islamic boarding schools have been conducted, among others: khoirul Azizi (2008) entitled Perilaku Santri dalam Menelusur Informasi di Perpustakaan A. Wahid Hasyim Pondok Pesantren Tebuireng Jombang, skripsi UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, and Ihsan (2016) entitled Perilaku Santri dalam Menelusuri Informasi di Perpustakaan Pondok Pesantren Darul Aman Gombara Makasar, skripsi UIN Alauddin Makassar. Those research analyzed santri’s information seeking behavior by focusing on the position of the library as the primary source of information in the pesantren. However, both of these studies have not considered the cultural dimensions in analyzing santri’s information seeking behavior. In this paper, santri’s information seeking behavior will be analyzed by taking into account Hofstede’s cultural dimension.

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The approach in this research is qualitative by way of distributing questionnaire which contains questions adapted from information iteration model Big-6 then later on associated with two of Hofstede’s cultural dimension, power distance and individualism. The population of this research is every santriwati in Madrasah Aliyah Pondok Pesantren Jakarta. Samples are determined by randomly choosing 2nd and 3rd grade Aliyah santriwati. Information iteration questionnaire will be distributed to 50 santriwati. There are 38 valid questionnaires returned.

IV. DISCUSSION

In every model of the BIG 6 Skill we use, we propose several questions regarding the behavior of respondents in that step. In this paper, we would be focusing on the data display of two main topics. The first one is, the question that would be able to present our discovery while observing the information seeking behavior of the santriwati of Pesantren Jakarta. The second one, is the question which measures the value of individualism and power distance.

1) Step 1: Task Definition

The first step is the first indicator of santriwati’s competence in defining needs and in comprehending the kind of information required to fulfill those information needs. In this step, the possibility of media socials’ advantages and the the involvement of teachers in deciding a topic for papers/assignments are also questioned. Questions regarding brainstorming is also associated with the values of individualism and power distance in pesantren. The followings are several of our discoveries. The statement ‘I can easily have a discussion with teachers and librarians in deciding/receiving a topic of an assignment’ shows the following result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, the majority of santriwati (63%) rarely have a discussion with teachers. 26% of santriwati often consult the teachers when deciding topics or when receiving assignments/papers. From there, we can see that most santriwati rarely have a
discussion with teachers when receiving an assignment or when deciding a topic. Furthermore, we can gather several possibilities as to why this behavior occurs. First, is that most santriwati already understood the instructions given to them. Second, is that the santriwati are already sure with their topic. Third, is that the santriwati feel reluctant or afraid to question the assignments they are given or to question the topic which will be studied. The first and second possibility shows a high level of effectiveness in relaying information, while the third possibility might occur because of the high power distance level between the santriwati and the teachers in pesantren’s environment. The consistency of the third possibility must be confirmed by observing related results regarding the relationship between santriwati and teachers in the next steps. The statement, ‘I have a discussion with friends and seniors (in groups, collectively) in deciding a topic for papers.’ yield the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The previous table shows that 89% of santriwati are often and very often have a discussion with friends in working on papers or assignments. The other 11% rarely do and there is none who has never been having a discussion with friends in deciding a topic for papers or assignments. What’s interesting is that, in another statement, which is ‘I decide a topic for papers independently’, the result shows 53% often decide on a topic independently, and 44% rarely decide on a topic independently. None of the respondents stated that they never decide on a topic independently. Here, we can conclude that while most santriwati are able to work individually, but when offered the possibility to work collectively, then they’ll choose to work collectively rather than to work individually. The low score of individualism (in Hofstede cultural dimention) and the togetherness shaped while living in pondok pesantren is strengthening the collectivism values, which in turn made the santriwati work together even though they are able to finish by themselves.

Another important finding to display is the utilization of social media in information seeking process.

I utilize social media (facebook, twitter, Instagram) to gain inspiration in deciding a papers’ topic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the table above, we can see that 73% or more than a half of the respondents often and very often use social media to find inspirations for papers’ topic. Only 37% rarely use it, and none of them never do. What’s interesting from this, is that even though the pondok pesantren limits the ownership of mobile phone and the time for internet access to only available in IT class, santriwati keep showing that they exist in the same time as other students outside the pesantren who also use internet, or in this case social media, as information and inspiration source in accomplishing assignments. This finding also shows the openness of pondok pesantren to information technology, by not repressing, but instead controlling it. This finding is confirmed by the next step, the information sources used.

2) Step 2: Information Seeking Strategies

The next step in The Big 6, is information seeking strategies. This step is divided into two activities, deciding the information sources used and deciding whether the search is done independently, or with the help from teachers or other people. Based on our findings, the majority of santriwati often (61%) and very often (32%) seek information collectively rather than individually. This finding confirm the explanation in step 1, that santriwati are able to seek information independently, but choose to do it collectively if possible.

Furthermore, the majority of santriwati also stated that they involve teachers in information seeking process, with 46% often do and 16% very often do. Only 37% santriwati rarely have a discussion with
teacher regarding information seeking and almost none of them never do. This is different from the result of step 1, where santriwati don’t have questions or have discussions with teachers in receiving assignments or deciding topics. In this step, which is the process of seeking and compiling information, most santriwati are asking question to teachers and having discussions with them too. Judging from the high level of power distance, this finding turns into an interesting outcome, because it negates the supposed condition of high level power distance. The difference between the responses of step 1 and step 2 could be the context of situation where santriwati can choose whether they want to have a discussion with the teachers or not. Furthermore, in the next inquisition, it can be said that the power distance inside the pesantren varies, there are relation between santriwati and Kiai and his family, santriwati and leaders of pondok pesantren, santriwati and headmaster, and santriwati and teachers in a formal class. In our observation while conducting surveys, there’s a significant different between said relations where santriwati look more open in formal school environment.

Other findings regarding information media can be observed through the following statement:

I’m aware that the information I need to finish my assignment can be found on sites on the internet.

TABEL 4. UTILIZATION OF INTERNET IN FINDING INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the table above, we can see that 47% of santriwati stated that they often use the internet and the other 37% very often do. Only 16% of them rarely use the internet and none of them never use the internet at all. This tendency to use the internet support the findings explained in step 1.

3) Step 3: Location and Access

The statement in this step is divided into three parts, which is how santriwati conduct their information seeking, whether they choose the location and access of information independently, collectively, or with the help of teachers, and whether they choose library of internet sites as information source.

Based on the result of our research, the majority of santriwati choose to decide on information source access collectively (66%) rather than individually. This condition shows the consistency where santriwati prefer to do things collectively rather than individually, even if they’re able.

When the santriwati asked about the involvement of teachers, 61% said they rarely have a discussion with teachers. The other 34% said they often do and the last 5% very often do. This result is consistent with the result of when they receive an assignment and choose a topic in step 1 but inconsistent with the process of information seeking in step 2. We can conclude that santriwati don’t involve teachers in the process of information location and access seeking. Taking that conclusion into consideration, we can also say that the possibility of santriwati don’t discuss with teachers is caused by the high level of power distance is small. This is supported by the fact that in other condition, they are able to converse with teachers.

For information sources, the research’s result shows that most of santriwati, which is 84%, rarely use library as a place to look for information. Other statement shows 58% of santriwati often use a search engine (internet) to gain the information they need, and 29% of them very often do. This shows that library is not the main information source anymore, even for santriwati living in pesantren environment. This finding is consistent with and supporting other results regarding internet in this research (step 1 and 2), which shows that santriwati see internet access as their main information source.

4) Step 4: Information Use

This step will be explained by dividing it into two sub steps, extract relevant information, and teachers’ involvement in comprehending the information used. Based on the research, most of santriwati often (55%) and very often (5%) have a discussion with teachers to extract and filter information. This supports the finding stating that santriwati are able to have a discussion with teachers when they need to.
From other question, we found out that most santriwati (57.9%) use discussion with friends as a way to extract and filter relevant information. Judging from this result, we can conclude that the main method in the process of extracting and filtering information is by a discussion with friends. Again, we can see the characteristic of collectivism here.

5) Step 5: Synthesis

In this step, we will observe how santriwati conduct a synthesis regarding the result of information seeking they received. This step is divided into three sub steps, which is rewriting information by santriwati, whether the information is used individually or collectively, and the involvement of teachers in the process of comprehending information.

According to the result found, 55% santriwati often synthesize information with friends, which shows the consistency of the higher collectivity values. Although the majority of santriwati who synthesize the information independently show that they are actually able to do it by themselves.

Based on the result, we also found that 58% of santriwati stated that they often and very often have a discussion with teachers. None of them have never ask questions to or have a discussion with teachers in the process of comprehending information. This outcome shows that the communication happens between santriwati and teachers in class has a lower level of power distance than between santriwati and Kiai, his family, and pesantren’s leaders.

6) Step 6: Evaluation

In this step, students are asked to answer several questions regarding the evaluation of information seeking conducted.

We found out that 60% of santriwati rarely conduct a self-evaluation. While other statement shows 55% santriwati often conduct a group evaluation. Every santriwati has conducted group evaluation. There’s a difference here compared to the previous results. This step clearly shows that santriwati are unable to conduct a self-evaluation and that they need other people to evaluate their information. This is very reasonable, seeing that evaluation process is generally more effective if done by or together with other people. The key finding of this outcome is that it confirms the statement that santriwati always choose to do everything collectively.

The next part is having a discussion with teachers in evaluation process, which shows 45% of santriwati rarely do, 31% often do, 14% always do, and 10% never do. Seeing that there’s no dominant result which shows 50% or more percentage, we can conclude that there’s a variety of discussing with teachers for evaluation process in santriwati. This finding weakens the high level of power distance between santriwati and teachers. Santriwati are able to discuss with the teacher and it is the needs of santriwati that urge them to have (or not to have) a discussion with teachers.

V. CONCLUSION

As part of educational process, Santriwati is expected to complete their school works critically and chronologically. The result from our research and analysis shows that santriwati of Pesantren Jakarta has conducted information litera
tion activities, especially the Big 6 literacy model, successfully. Although the information seeking process isn't always a success.

As mentioned in the preface, Wilson (1994) explained that there are three main factors that affect a successful information seeking process which is personal, social, and environment. In our hypotheses, these factors are determined by Hofstede’s cultural dimension value of Indonesia, in general, and of pesantren as an educational institution with Indonesia’s characteristics, in particular.

With a low mark for individualism and a superior mark for power distance, we suspect the relationship between teachers and santriwati will be a deciding factor in santriwati’s information seeking process. But our research shows an interesting outcome. In individualism and collectivism factor, the outcome is in accordance to our hypotheses, in which there’s a consistency from step 1 to 6 that shows a high level of collectivity. Santriwati choose to conduct the information seeking process collectively, even though they are able to do it independently. While the power distance factor shows a different outcome from our hypotheses, which is high level of power distance will result in santriwati’s hesitance in discussing their problem with teachers, our research’s outcome shows santriwati’s willingness to discuss matters with
teachers or opting not to if they don’t see it needed. This outcome is verified by the following relational pattern:

Step 1: The majority of santriwati (63%) rarely have a discussion with teachers regarding work assignment and topic appointment.

Step 2: The majority of santriwati (47%) often have a discussion with teachers regarding information seeking.

Step 3: The majority of santriwati (61%) rarely ask about information’s location and access.

Step 4: The majority of santriwati (55%) often ask about the selection of information type to teachers.

Step 5: The majority of santriwati (50%) often ask for teachers’ opinion.

Step 6: The majority of santriwati (45%) rarely have a discussion for an evaluation with teachers.

In steps where santriwati feel the need to have a dialog and discussion, then they will initiate it. Santriwati also interact with teachers and friends in the writing process of papers. Therefore, we can conclude that there is no obstacle in discussion and in high power relation between santriwati and teachers. This finding also brings us to the next observation, that in a pesantren khalafiyah, where a formal school (madrasah) is a part of pondok pesantren, the power distance between santriwati and other components of pesantren can be different. The relationship between santriwati and Kiai, or santriwati and Kiai’s family, or santriwati and leaders of pesantren, may be more distant, if compared to the relationship between santriwati and teachers in a formal class. This outcome is confirmed by a field observation in Pondok Pesantren Jakarta, where the santriwati are visibly more ‘relaxed’ in a formal school environment.

By analyzing the perspective of information seeking behavior, we can conclude that, aside from text books, santriwati also use, and even prefer, the internet. Furthermore, library is yet to be the main source in information seeking. Santriwati also expressed their dissatisfaction to lack of information in their environment. There are several possibilities that may cause it, such as, insufficient text book collections, overused and outdated text books, and utilization of the internet that they feel is much easier and more up-to-date. Those possible causes can be taken into consideration for the management of pesantren in order to enhance the quality of the library’s service and collection.
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