

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Previous chapters has discussed the background of the study, purposes including the research questions, as well as the theoretical foundations of the study. It describes the literature review about lesson planning, its development, and its implementation in the classroom.

This chapter provides relevant information about a set of methodological approaches which covers the research problems, the research design, data collection, the procedure of collecting data and data analysis.

3.1 Research Problems

This study was conducted in an attempt to address three research questions. Those questions are as follows:

1. How does an English teacher develop lesson plans?
2. How does an English teacher implement the lesson plans in the classroom?
3. What are teacher's problems in designing lesson plans?

3.2 Research Design

This study used qualitative research which was exploring a problem and developing a detailed understanding of a central phenomenon (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992: 33; Thomas, 2003: 2; Heigham & Croker, 2009: 320; Alwasilah, 2011: 60; Creswell, 2012: 16). Linked to this research, qualitative method was utilized to investigate how English teacher developed the lesson plans, to investigate how the teacher implemented it in the classroom, and to identify teachers' problems in designing lesson plans.

In addition, this study can be specified as a case study which the phenomenon was studied in detail, (Silverman, 2005: 126; Heigham & Croker, 2009: 68). The case focused on the development, the implementation, and the

difficulties faced by the participant in planning the lesson. In addition, the researcher acted as non-participant.

Moreover, since this study was a case study design, this study used triangulation methods in collecting and analyzing the data obtained. The methods of data collection will be explained briefly in the next section.

3.3 Research Site and Participant

This study was conducted in a senior high school in Aceh which was chosen purposively. This research site was chosen for two reasons. First, the researcher was welcomed warmly by the principal for conducting this research topic so that this ‘increase the feasibility of the study’ (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998: 54). Second, the access to the research site was easy since the school was located in the central of town. For those reasons, it allows researchers to choose a case because it illustrates some features or processes in which they are interested (Silverman, 2005: 129).

Moreover, one English teacher was chosen to act as participant in the study. He is an English teacher who has more than ten years of experience in teaching English at senior high school. The decision to investigate a teacher with extensive experience is in line with McMillan & Schumacher (2001: 401) and Creswell’s (20012: 523) suggestion to have study participants who are knowledgeable and fully informed about the study investigated.

Therefore, the participant described aforementioned was optimized to gather the best possible data from multiple methods; classroom observation, document analysis, and semi-structured interview.

3.4 Instrumentations

Since this study employed a qualitative approach in which the development, the implementation of lesson plan, and the difficulties of English teacher in designing it are investigated in detail, three instruments were used in gathering the data to answer research questions. First, document analysis checklist was used to investigate what aspects the teacher paid attention to when he

developed the lesson plans. Second, observation sheet was used to investigate how the teacher implemented the lesson plans. Third, interview guidelines were used to find out how the teacher developed and implemented the lesson plans as well as difficulties of the English teacher in designing the lesson plans. The elaboration of each instrument is described in the following subsection.

3.4.1 Document Analysis

To follow Alwasilah (2011: 112) regarding the use of documents in data collection, the researcher analyzed five lesson plans of the English teacher. Those documents provide a rich and natural source of information (Alwasilah, 2011: 112; Creswell, 2012: 233) regarding lesson plan development. Furthermore, at the same time they represented as essential part of triangulation (Holliday, 2005: 43).

Each lesson plan was analyzed by using checklist based on the principles of lesson planning such as knowledge, considering individual differences, variety, coherence and cohesiveness, flexibility, feedback, and ICT integrated as suggested by Husein (1990), Gagne (1992), Jensen (2001), Woodward (2001), and Nation & Macalister (2010). Furthermore, the lesson plans were also analyzed in accordance with its elements proposed by Regulation of Ministry of Education No. 65/2013, i.e. title, core competence, basic competence, learning indicator, teaching objectives, materials, time allotment, teaching method, procedures, assessment, and sources. Lastly, the lesson plans were analyzed based on three essential domains of language learning; cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

The document analysis checklist was constructed based on the theory proposed by Husein (1990), Gagne (1992), Jensen (2001), Woodward (2001), Nation & Macalister (2010), and Regulation of Ministry of Education No. 65/2013 and it was modified in accordance with previous studies (Puspandari, 2008; Badriah, 2013). There were 27 indicators of document analysis checklists based on the basic principles in designing lesson plan. Moreover, 44 indicators provided to analyze the lesson plan based on its elements.

3.4.2 Classroom Observation

This instrument was used to obtain an authentic data and maximize the accuracy of the research reports (Thomas, 2003: 63) in terms of how the teacher implemented those lesson plans in the classroom. Besides, through this instrument, the description of how the teacher demonstrated the lesson plans in teaching-learning activities could be elaborated in detail. Another advantage of classroom observation was the picture of the implementation of lesson plan could be gathered naturally in the setting (Alwasilah, 2015: 123). To follow Alwasilah (2012: 123) and Creswell (2012: 214) the researcher acted as complete observer (non-participant observer) who visited the research site and records notes of implementing of lesson plan without becoming involved in the activities of the teacher.

In conducting classroom observation, there were three steps followed by the researcher as suggested by Alwasilah (2015: 125-126). The first step was preparation. The selection of the research site and participant and the preparation of classroom observation sheets in terms of implementation of lesson plans and video recorder were prepared in this step. The second step was observation where the “action” of observing the demonstration of lesson plans in the classroom was captured by using video recorder. The observation took 45 minutes each meeting and it was held 4 times. The third step was taking notes. In this step, some means or essential points during the observation were taken and written.

The purpose of recording the performance of the teacher during the observation was to examine whether the teacher implemented all the three areas of lesson plans entirely. Meanwhile, the observation sheets were provided as a guide in collecting the data needed and it was used for taking field notes during the observation (Creswell, 2012: 227). Moreover, the observation sheets also contained a column for activity description, in this case, the activity of teacher and students in teaching-learning activity (Alwasilah (2015: 126).

Furthermore, the observation sheets were constructed based on Jensen (2001), Reiser & Dick (1996) and Woodward (2009). It was used to collect the

data on lesson plan's implementation were employed in three major areas. The first area was pre-activity covered: gaining attention, informing learning objectives to students, recall the previous material, as suggested by Jensen (2001), Reiser & Dick (1996) and Woodward (2009). The second area was the main-activity included the materials presentation, teaching strategy, the use of appropriate sources and assessment types, and students' involvement. And, the third area was post-activity covered providing feedback, assessing performance, and informing the material to be given in the next meeting.

3.4.3 Interview

The interview in this present study was conducted in accordance of three purposes (Burgess, 1984: 102 in Heigham & Croker, 2009: 183; Thomas, 2003: 63); to obtain a deeper understanding on how teacher developed the lesson plan, to get more information on how he implemented it in the classroom, and to gather the information of problems faced by the teacher in designing it.

The interview was carried out individually or also called One-on-One interview (Creswell, 2012: 218) because there was only one teacher as participants who was interviewed regarding the data needed (*ibid*). The interview was undertaken for about 15-20 minutes after the teacher completed the session of teaching-learning activity in the teacher's room. The interview format of this study was a semi-structured interview as suggested by Heigham & Croker (2009: 186), Creswell (2012: 218) and Alwasilah (2015: 108) to get a clear picture of the topics that need to be covered. It was considered as the most suitable format to dig and to learn about the teacher's perception toward the development and the implementation of lesson plan as well as the difficulties in designing it (Best, 1981: 166; Stainback & Stainback, 1988: 52). Besides, this semi-structured interview gave the opportunity to express not only the suggestions, but also what the teacher felt as the reason for the difficulties they faced in designing lesson plan (Gafoor & Farooque, 2010: 5). In addition, Fontana & Frey (2000: 645) as cited in Creswell (2012: 46) described semi-structured interview as "one of the most powerful ways in which we try to understand our fellow human being".

The list of questions to be covered was given to the teacher before the interview so that he teacher could provide appropriate answer during interviewing. (The list of interview guidelines can be seen completely at Appendix 6). As suggested by Alwasilah (2015, 113) the question of the interview was asked orally in Bahasa Indonesia for the teacher could answer the question uncontrolledly and unlimitedly (Badriah, 2013: 33). Furthermore, the interviews were held two times according to interview guidelines that focused on certain themes. The themes of this study were general information of the teacher, teacher's view on lesson plan, the development of lesson plan, the implementation of lesson plan, and the difficulties faced by the teacher in developing lesson plan. For about 30 questions were asked to get the data required. Some questions were adopted and adapted from previous studies (Puspandari, 2008 and Badriah, 2013). Some others were created by the researcher in accordance with the data needed in this present study.

To follow Best (1981: 166) this study tried to fulfill the validity and the reliability of the interview. The validity is achieved to ensure that the significant information is elicited. It is done by the selection of questions that can provide appropriated answer toward the investigation. Meanwhile, the reliability is to seek the consistency of response. It is done by evaluating the questions to be asked in slightly different form at the second interview. The repetition of the interview at another time may provide another estimate of the consistency of the response. The procedures of collecting data through this instrument will be elaborated in the next section.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

The procedures of data collection in this present study was divided into three phases; before phase, during phase, and after phase. The following subsection is the elaboration of each phase.

3.5.1 Before Phase

In this part, all preparations for collecting the data of the study were prepared including preparing instruments, examining instruments, selecting

participant and research site, asking permission to the participant whether he wanted to be observed or not, and asking permission to the principal.

For the first step, the instrument for collecting the data were arranged and organized. The instruments were adapted and adopted from the previous study and were modified based on the data needed of the present study. Furthermore, those instruments were examined and validated by the expert to be used in collecting data. During examining the instruments, the research site and the participant of the study were selected including asking permission of the participant to be observed and interviewed. After getting agreement with the teacher, the permission of the principal of the school were asked.

Additionally, the participant was explained that the research required his lesson plan document to be analyzed. He was also informed that he would be observed during performing teaching-learning activities to gain the data needed regarding on how he implemented lesson plan in classroom. Thus, the participant was asked his willingness to do so. He was told the observation focused on three demonstration stages that was pre, main, and post-activity.

Moreover, he was given the interview guidelines as well to prepare the answer. He was also told that the interview would be recorded and transcribed wherein the transcription would be given to him later to ensure that it was indeed what his meant. The interview covered three themes such as teacher's view on lesson plan, how teacher developed lesson plan and implemented lesson plan, and what the barriers faced by the teacher in designing lesson plan.

3.5.2 During Phase

In this phase, for the first step, five lesson plans as document were collected and being analyzed based on its basic principles and elements. During analyzing the documents, the teacher was observed in term of how he implemented the lesson plan in the classroom. The teacher's performances were recorder using videotape and while implementing the lesson plan in teaching-learning process, the filed notes were taken. The observation was conducted four

times regarding the teaching descriptive text in which every meeting was 45 minutes.

The observation was conducted on 7th, 9th, 14th, and 16th September, 2015. At the first meeting of observation, the teacher informed the whole class that for four next meetings both teacher and students were going to be observed by researcher. The introduction took for about 5 minutes and then the researcher took a seat at the back of the classroom. After preparing such as observation sheet and video recorder for about 3 minutes, the observation was begun. Technically, the three other observations had the similar procedure to the preceding observation.

There were three observation sheets prepared by the researcher including the observation sheet for pre, main, and post activity. During the observation, the researcher took field notes of both teacher and students' activities. After two times of observation were held, the first interview was conducted. Meanwhile, the second interview was held after the rest of the observation. The interviews were held two times to get the validity and reliability of the data as suggested by Best (1981: 166). The transcript of observation and interview can be seen in appendix.

3.5.3 Closing Phase

After observing the teacher regarding implementation lesson plan in the classroom and the interviews were held, the teacher was given the transcript from the first interview to ensure whether the answer was as he meant or not. Then, the researcher completed the administrative stuff such as asking the principal's official letter for the document of the research.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data in this study were analyzed before, during, and after the implementation of the lesson plan. The analyses and interpretation were carried out based on the document in the form of teacher's lesson plan, the classroom observation, and the interview. The data from each source was analyzed in steps describe below.

First, to answer research question 1 that how the teacher developed the lesson plans, the data gained from the document analysis of the lesson plan was categorized into seven principles, namely, knowledge, considering individual differences, variety, coherence and cohesiveness, flexibility, feedback, and ICT integrated. Furthermore, the lesson plans were analyzed based on its elements stipulated by Regulation of Ministry of Education No. 65/2013, i.e. title, core competence, basic competence, learning indicator, teaching objectives, materials, time allotment, teaching method, procedures, assessment, and sources. Lastly, the lesson plans were analyzed in their usage of action verbs as enabling indicator.

Second, regarding research question 2 that how the teacher implemented the lesson plans, the data obtained from classroom observation in the form of field note was categorized into three main categories of lesson plans implementation; pre-activity, main-activity and post-activity. The categorization aimed at enable the researcher to find out whether each elements of the lesson plan emerged from the plan.

The last, with respect to all research questions, the data obtained from interviews were analyzed by transcribing, subsequently categorizing, and interpreting them to answer the research questions. The recoding of the interviews was firstly transcribed then the transcripts were given back to the teacher to make sure that it was indeed what he meant in order to maintain validity (Creswell, 2012: 266). After transcribing, the transcripts were categorized into two categories; teacher's view of developing and implementing lesson plan, and teacher's problem in conducting it. Finally, the transcripts were interpreted in order to answer research questions and provide the data required.