

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter provides a detailed description of the methodology used to collect and analyze the data in this study. There are seven sections. Section 3.1 consists of a restatement of the purposes of the study and the research questions. It is followed by section 3.2 for the specific research design and the consideration to choose the design. Moreover, section 3.3 describes the research sites and the participants. Section 3.4 elaborates the instrumentation, such as document analysis, classroom observation and interview. Section 3.5 presents the collecting data procedure which is divided into three phases. In terms of discussion of data analysis, the description presents in the section 3.6 in which it refers to the answers of the research questions proposed. Eventually, in the last section, 3.7, the conclusion of the important points in this chapter is presented.

3.1 Purpose of the Study and Research Questions

As stated in the chapter one, this study aims to ensure whether or not the teachers' lesson plans have met the demand of the 2013 English Curriculum and whether or not the lesson plan have well-implemented in the classroom practice where the main focus is on reading and writing instruction. The effectiveness of the lesson plan can also become one of measurements to determine the successful implementation of the 2013 English Curriculum in Indonesia. In addition, this study used the revised curriculum which is specified in the regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture number 22/2016 as the framework to analyze the teachers' lesson plans. As reference to the aforementioned purposes, this study addresses two research questions, as follows:

1. Do the teachers develop their lesson plans on reading and writing in accordance with the 2013 English Curriculum?
2. How do the teachers implement the lesson plans on reading and writing in classroom practice?

3.2 Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research design aiming at exploring and understanding the issue (Maliek & Hamied, 2016). Moreover, this study utilized descriptive study as its framework viewing that everything is potential to provide a clue that reveals a more comprehensive understanding (Bogdan & Biklen, 2006).

With the purpose of exploring the process of developing and implementing the lesson plan in terms of teaching reading and writing, this study used the term ‘case study’ as strategy of inquiry. Creswell (2009) defines case study as “a strategy of inquiry in which the researcher explores in depth a program, event, activity, process, or one or more individuals” (p. 13). Moreover, Dornyei (2007) offers two points to consider in a case study. Firstly, *analytic generalization*, it can be understood as generalizing to populations or theoretical models which results in analytic generalization. Secondly, *purposive sampling*, it refers to the selection of the particular case. Duff (in press) cited in Dornyei (2007) acknowledges that case selection and sampling are “among the most crucial considerations in case study research” (p. 153).

The case raised in this study was regarding to teaching reading and writing. In this case, the consideration focused on *purposive sampling*. The main figures who contribute the most in teaching reading and writing are the teachers themselves. So, this study selected exemplary teachers as the research respondents.

3.3 Research Sites and Participants

This study was conducted in three senior high schools in Bandung which were chosen purposively. These schools were selected for three reasons. First, the researcher was welcomed warmly by the principal for conducting this research topic, so that this ‘increases the feasibility of the study’ (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998: 54). Second, the access to the research sites was easy since the school was located in central of town. Third, the selected schools have implemented the 2013

Curriculum which is the background of developing and implementing the lesson plan. For those reasons, this research is worth carrying out as the initial step to get complete information on teachers' lesson plan development and its implementation.

In addition, the participants of the study were exemplary English teachers from each school who teach English at the same grade of students which was the second grade (grade 11th). The exemplary English teachers were selected because they were categorized as the ones who were familiar with the used of the 2013 English Curriculum. There are three criteria of choosing the teachers which are (1) the teachers are involved in the 2013 Curriculum's training or workshop; (2) the teachers participate in a seminar/conference based on the topic of curriculum; (3) the teachers involve in MGMP (teachers' forum). From three criteria above, three teachers had been filtered with different standards. T1 previously was a national instructor (IN) of the 2013 Curriculum; he also was the writer of the English textbook which used the 2013 Curriculum as its foundation, and he actively participated in several seminars and workshops in terms of implementing the 2013 Curriculum. T2 was the head of MGMP (teachers' forum) in her school. She was a figure who supported and guided all the teachers in her school to develop the lesson plan. T3 was the secretary of MGMP (teachers' forum) in his school. In addition, all three teachers actively participated in the workshop and/or seminar inside or outside the school in terms of implementing the 2013 Curriculum. Therefore, the participants described aforementioned were optimized to gather the best possible data from multiple methods; document analysis, classroom observation, and semi-structured interview.

3.4 Instrumentations

In this study, three instruments were used in gathering the data to answer the research questions. First, a document analysis checklist was used to investigate what aspects the teachers paid attention when they developed the lesson plan. Second, observation checklist was used to investigate how the teachers implemented the lesson plan, whether or not it was in line with the plan. Third, interview guidelines were used to find out how the teacher developed and

Intan Septia Latifa, 2018

TEACHERS' LESSON PLAN DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2013 CURRICULUM AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

implemented the lesson plans. The elaboration of each instrument is described in the following subsections.

3.4.1 Document Analysis

In this study, the documents referred to three teachers' lesson plans for grade eleven, precisely in the first semester (2017/2018). Three lesson plans became documents that functioned as natural sources that provided real information on lesson plan development and implementation (Nunan and Bailey, 2009). In addition to that, those represented an essential part of 'triangulation' (Holliday, 2005, p, 43).

Moreover, the three lesson plans were different in terms of selected basic competence. The first and second participants (T1 and T2) selected basic competence of *asking and giving advice and offer*, while the third participant (T3) selected basic competence of *hortatory exposition text* as tools in teaching reading and writing.

The lesson plans were analyzed based on its principles and elements in accordance with the Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture No.22/2016 and No.23/2016. There are six principles of a lesson plan which are taken into account; *considering individual differences* (Petrina, 2007; Woodward, 2001), *student participation* (Gedera et al., 2015), *coherence and cohesiveness* (Auerbach, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), *giving feedback* (Popham, 1995), *applying integrated-thematic* (Woodward, 2001), and *using technology-based learning* (Dudley-Evans & Jhon, 2009). Additionally, there are ten elements of a lesson plan used as a foundation in analyzed the lesson plans, which are *title* (McArdle, 2010), *core competence* (Scott & Yreberg, 2000), *basic competence* (Sundayana, 2016), *learning indicators* (Cooper, 1990; Reiser and Dick, 1996; Richard, 2001), *learning objectives* (Allen & Friedman, 2010; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Dave, 1975; Print 1993; Zerwas, 2008), *learning materials* (Richard, 2001; Woodward, 2009), *learning method and media, teaching-learning activities (pre-, core, and post-activity)* (Cooper, 1990; Gagne et al., 1992; McArdle, 2010; Reiser and Dick 1996; Woodward, 2001), *learning assessment*

Intan Septia Latifa, 2018

TEACHERS' LESSON PLAN DEVELOPMENT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE 2013 CURRICULUM AND ITS IMPLEMENTATION

Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia | repository.upi.edu | perpustakaan.upi.edu

(Harmer, 2007; Richard & Rodgers, 2001; Sundayana, 2010) and *sources* (Arends & Kilcher, 2010; Brewster, et al., 2003). To ensure whether the lesson plan had a complete elements, specific measurements were used; (1) a lesson plan is developed based on basic competence or KD, (2) it covers three learning domains, cognitive or knowledge, psychomotor or skills, and affective or attitude (Allen & Friedman, 2010; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Bloom, 1956; Dave, 1975), (3) it considers students' characteristics, (4) it uses ABCD model and action verbs (Rothwell & Kazanas, 2009), (5) it applies scientific approach and/or other supporting learning model which suits students' characteristics (Dyer et al., 2011), and (6) it is divided into pre, core and post activity (Cooper, 1990; Gagne et al., 1992; McArdle, 2010; Reiser and Dick 1996; Woodward, 2001).

Furthermore, *Systematic Planning Model* suggested by Reiser and Dick (1996) also utilized as criterion to ensure the teachers had constructed a complete and systematic lesson plan or not. Concerning the theme of the thesis which was focused on the 2013 English Curriculum, *Systematic Planning Model* used in this study was the one which have been adjusted with the 2013 Curriculum (Sundayana, 2016).

In addition to lesson plan's analysis, observation analysis is necessary to obtain a comprehensive understanding towards the focus of this study. Observation analysis is discussed in the next subsection.

3.4.2 Observation

This instrument was utilized to obtain 'an authentic data and maximize the accuracy of the research reports' in terms of how the teachers implemented those lesson plans in the classroom (Thomas, 2003, p. 63). Moreover, through this instrument, the description of how the teacher demonstrated the lesson plans in teaching-learning activities can be elaborated in detail. This instrument also assisted to picture the implementation of lesson plan in a natural setting where the researcher acted as a complete observer or a non-participant observation who observed classroom, sat in a particular place or used video/tape recorder to record teacher and students in the class (Emilia, 2011; Creswell, 2009).

The observation was done to answer second research questions of this study. In this study, the observation sessions were conducted through observing, recording and transcribing (Lier, 1994). Initially, the researcher employed an observation checklist to collect the data on lesson plan's implementation in three major areas. The first area was *pre-activity* covering gaining attention, informing learners of objectives, stimulating recall for prior learning, as suggested by (Gagne et al., 1992; McArdle; 2010; Reiser and Dick, 1996; Sasson, 2011 cited in Badriah 2013; Sundayana, 2010). The second area is *core-activity* covering five stages of scientific approach; observing, questioning, experimenting, associating and communicating (Dyer et al., 2011; Regulation of Ministry of Education and culture No. 22/2016). The third area is *post-activity*, covering providing feedback, assessing performance, informing material for the following meeting, and providing enrichment and remedy (Cooper, 1990; Woodward, 2009). Furthermore, in order to capture the action of implementing the lesson plan, the researcher used video recorder. The purpose of recording the performance of the teachers during the observation was to examine whether the teachers implemented all the three areas of lesson plan entirely. In terms of specific activities applied in the class, taking notes was added.

The observation was conducted from August to September 2017 with each meeting lasting during 90 minutes. Each teacher was observed three times in three meetings. The observation schedule was arranged as in the table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1
Observation schedule

Meeting	Date		
	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3
1 st Meeting	August 7, 2017	August 8, 2017	August 30, 2017
2 nd Meeting	August 14, 2017	August 15, 2017	September 15, 2017
3 rd Meeting	August 21, 2017	August 22, 2017	September 19, 2017

3.4.3 Interview

This study employed semi-structured interviews to get a clear picture of the topics that need to be covered (Creswell, 2009; Heigham & Croker, 2009;). Kvale (1996, p. 124) states that "... there is openness to chance the sequence and forms of questions in order to follow up the answers given and the stories told by the

subjects”. A semi-structured interview also provides flexibility for the interviewee to respond and describe the concept as well as to gain more information needed (Field & Morse cited in Emilia, 2011). In addition, Fontana & Frey (2000) as cited in Creswell (2009, p, 46) describe semi-structured interview as “one of the most powerful ways in which we try to understand our fellow human being”.

The interview was undertaken individually or also called ‘One-on-One’ interview (Creswell, 2009, p, 218) for about 20 to 30 minutes after the teacher completed the session of teaching-learning activity in the teacher’s room. The questions of the interview were designed in Indonesian language to obtain deeper understanding of the phenomenon. The questions include several themes such as general information of the teacher, teachers’ experience in participating in a training/seminar on lesson plan development, the development and implementation of lesson plans. For about 15 questions were asked to get the data required. Some questions were adopted from previous studies (Zaim, 2017). Some others were created by the researcher in accordance with the data needed in this present study.

In terms of validating the data of the interview, the researcher use validity check. In the interview session, there will be respondent feedback or commonly called “validation interview” which can “contribute to the overall validity argument after proper interpretation” (Dornyei, 2007, p. 61). In addition, the suggested questions also had been checked by editor in terms of selection of the questions, word choice and meaning. Meanwhile, for checking the reliability, the researcher focuses on the sequence of words and questions of each interviewee in order to be understandable (Silverman, 1993 cited Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2007). The procedures of collecting data through this instrument will be elaborated in the following section.

3.5 Data Collection Procedures

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

3.5.1 Before Phase

In this phase, all preparations were prepared, including preparing instrument, the examining instrument, selecting participants and research sites, asking permission to the principal and asking permission of the participants whether or not they wanted to be observed.

In 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 sites and the participants of the study were selected, including asking permission of the principal of the school. After getting agreement from the school by fulfilling the administrative requirements, the researcher asked permission to the teachers, whether or not they were agreed to be observed and interviewed.

Additionally, the participants were explained that the research required their lesson plan document to be analyzed. They were also informed that they would be observed during performing teaching-learning activities to collect the data on the implementation of their lesson plan in three demonstration stages; pre, core, post-activities. Thus, the participants were asked their willingness to do so.

Furthermore, in interview session, the participants were given the interview guidelines to prepare the answer. They also informed that the interview would be recorded and transcribed in which the transcription would be given to them later to ensure their answer. The interview covered four themes which are general information of the teacher, teachers' experience in participating in a training/ seminar on lesson plan development, the development and implementation of lesson plans.

3.5.2 During Phase

In this phase, three lesson plans from three participants were collected and being analyzed based on its elements suggested in the 2013 Curriculum. During analyzing the documents, the teachers were observed in terms of how they implemented the lesson plan in the classroom. The teachers' performances were

recorded using videotape and while implementing the lesson plan, the field notes were taken. The observation was conducted three times in each participant in which every meeting was 90 minutes.

The observation was conducted on August to September 2017. At the first meeting of observation, the teacher informed the whole class that for three next meetings, both teachers and students were going to be observed by the researcher. After the introduction, videotape was set and the researcher took a seat at the back of the classroom. The researcher began to fill the observation checklist at the time when the teachers began their teaching. The observation checklist prepared by the researcher focused on three stages; pre, core, and post-activities. During the observation, the researcher took field notes of both teacher and student activities. Technically, the three observations had the similar procedure to the preceding observation. After three observations were held, the interview was conducted. The transcript of observation and interview can be seen in Appendix.

3.5.3 Closing Phase

After the observation and the interview session were held, the teacher was given the transcript of the interview to ensure whether or not the answer was as they meant. Furthermore, the researcher completed the administrative matters, 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 analysis and interpretation were carried out based on the document in the form of the teacher's lesson plans, the classroom observation and the interview.

To answer the first research question which is whether or not the teachers develop their lesson plans on reading and writing in accordance with the 2013 Curriculum, the data gained from document analysis of the lesson plan. The lesson plans were analyzed based on its principles and elements in accordance with Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture No.22/2016 and No.23/2016. There are six principles of a lesson plan which are taken into

account; *considering individual differences* (Petrina, 2007; Woodward, 2001), *student participation* (Gedera et al., 2015), *coherence and cohesiveness* (Auerbach, 1986; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), *giving feedback* (Popham, 1995), *applying integrated-thematic* (Woodward, 2001), and *using technology-based learning* (Dudley-Evans & Jhon, 2009). Additionally, there are ten elements of a lesson plan used as a foundation in analyzed the document, which are *title* (McArdle, 2010), *core competence* (Scott & Yreberg, 2000), *basic competence* (Sundayana, 2016), *learning indicators* (Cooper, 1990; Reiser and Dick, 1996; Richard, 2001), *learning objectives* (Allen & Friedman, 2010; Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001; Dave, 1975; Print 1993; Zerwas, 2008), *learning materials* (Richard, 2001; Woodward, 2009), *learning method and media, teaching-learning activities (pre-, core, and post-activity)* (Cooper, 1990; Gagne et al., 1992; McArdle, 2010; Reiser and Dick 1996 Woodward, 2001), *learning assessment* (Harmer, 2007; Richard & Rodgers, 2001; Sundayana, 2010) and *sources* (Arends & Kilcher, 2010; Brewster, et al., 2003).

Moreover, in terms of answering second research question that how the teachers implement the lesson plans on reading and writing in classroom practice, the data were obtained from classroom observation. There were three main categories of lesson plan implementation such as pre-activity (Gagne et al., 1992; McArdle; 2010; Reiser and Dick, 1996; Sasson, 2011 cited in Badriah 2013; Sundayana, 2010), core-activity (Dyer et al., 2011; Regulation of Ministry of Education and culture No. 22/2016) and post-activity (Cooper, 1990; Woodward, 2009). The categories aimed to enable the researcher to find out whether or not each element of the lesson plan emerged from the plans.

The data obtained from the interview were analyzed by transcribing, subsequently categorizing, and interpreting them to answer the research questions. During the transcription stage, the teachers' names were replaced with a pseudonym (Silverman, 2005). The recoding of the interviews which was firstly transcribed was sent back to teachers to ensure the answers to maintain the validity (Creswell, 2009). After transcribing, the transcripts were categorized into teacher's view of developing and implementing the lesson plan. Finally, the

transcripts were interpreted in order to answer research questions and provide the data required.

Finally, triangulation was utilized by involving multiple methods, sources or perspectives on a research project and it is also believed as one of the most efficient ways to reduce the probability of systemic bias in qualitative study (Dornyei, 2007).

3.7 Concluding Remark

This chapter had drawn the qualitative study, particularly the case study design, as methodology of the study. Therefore, the data were collected by means of document analysis, classroom observation and interview. Consequently, all the data obtained were analyzed qualitatively to be compared, contrasted, and triangulated to enhance validity. It was in line with Dornyei (2007) who states that triangulation is utilized by involving multiple methods, sources or perspectives on a research project and it is also believed as one of the most efficient ways to reduce the probability of systemic bias in qualitative study.