

## **CHAPTER III**

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

Previous chapter has described the theoretical background of the study. It discusses the literature review about lesson planning, the development of lesson plans, and the implementation of lesson plans.

This chapter discusses a set of methodological approaches which covers the research problems, the research design, the research site, and the participant in the study. It also informs the instruments of research, and the role of researcher. Further, it presents the data collection through the documentation analysis especially the lesson plan, classroom observation, and interview. The conclusion ends this chapter.

#### **3.1 Research Problems**

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

- (1) How do English teachers develop lesson plans?
- (2) Do English teachers implement the lesson plan in their teaching-learning activities?
- (3) What problems are faced by English teachers in developing the lesson plan?

#### **3.2 Research Design**

In line with the research questions above, this study applied a qualitative method in order to understand the phenomenon of lesson planning (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984; Nunan, 1992, p. 81; Travers, 2001; Alwasilah, 2009; Nunan and Bailey, 2009, p. 158; Hood, 2009). The qualitative method was regarded as the most suitable design to understand how teachers develop lesson plans and implement them in the classroom.

Further, this study more specifically can be characterized as a case study design, for it was carried out in “a small scale and a single case” (Nunan and

Bailey: 2009, Freebody, 2003 in Emilia, 2005, p.74; Nunan, 1992, p. 75). The case was focused on the development, the implementation, and the problem faced in the lesson planning where the researcher acted as a non-participant (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984; Holliday, 2005).

Yet in terms of a case study design, this study collected and analyzed the data that were obtained from ‘multiple sources’, i.e. documents analysis, classroom observation, and semi-structured interviews. By doing so, ‘in depth information’ on lesson planning and its implementation (Alwasilah, 2009, p. 154) could be achieved. The multiple data collection techniques employed in this study insure validity of the study (McMillan and Schumacher, 2001, p.407; Holliday, 2005).

### **3.3 Research Site**

This study was conducted at a Senior High School located in Cianjur, West Java. This research site was chosen for three reasons. First, it was related to technical consideration, that is, easy access. Secondly, the researcher was welcomed warmly by the principal for conducting this research topic so that this ‘increases the feasibility of the study’ (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998, p. 54). The third reason was that the research conducted on lesson planning was rare because there was hardly ever anyone who tried to do such research at the site.

For that reasons, this research is worth carrying out as the initial step to get complete information on teachers’ competence in planning and implementing lesson plans (Nunan, 1992) as stipulated in Ministerial Regulation No. 16 year 2007 on teachers obligation to do lesson planning.

### **3.4 Participants**

One teacher was volunteering to act as a participant in the study. She 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 and Schumacher (2001, p. 401) and Creswell’s (2008, p. 523) suggestion to have study participants who are

knowledgeable and fully informed about the study investigated. Besides, the sole participant helped the researcher to fully focus on what the teacher do in lesson planning, and hence, increased the feasibility of the study.

The participant above was optimized to obtain the best possible data from multiple sources i.e. classroom observation, document analysis, and semi-structured interviews. Each of the data collection techniques are discussed below.

### **3.5 Data Collection**

As stated above, this study collected data from various sources such as document analysis, observation, and semi-structured interview. Each of these will be described briefly below.

#### **3.5.1 Document Analysis**

To follow Cohen and Manion (1994) regarding the use of documents in data collection, two types of documents were collected in this study. The first was a sketchy-lesson plan for a curriculum cycle developed prior its implementation and the second was seven scripted-lesson plans developed after its implementation. Those two kinds of lesson plans became documents that functioned as natural sources that provided real information on lesson plan development and its implementation (Alwasilah, 2009; Nunan & Bailey, 2009), and at the same time they represented an essential part of 'triangulation' (Holliday, 2005, p. 43; Rallis and Rosman, 2009).

Lesson plans were analyzed using checklist in accordance with the principles of lesson planning, among others, knowledge, considering individual differences, variety, coherence and cohesiveness, flexibility, and feedback as suggested by Ministerial Regulation No. 41/2007 (see Appendix 1). Further, the lesson plans were also analyzed based on its elements as stipulated by the Ministerial Regulation No. 41/2007, i.e. title, standard of competence, basic competence, performance indicator, teaching objectives, materials, time allocated, teaching method, procedures, assessment, and sources (see Appendix 2). Last but not least, the analysis was also carried out to see whether the cognitive, affective,

and psychomotoric domain were provided evenly (see Appendix 3). The analysis will be presented in Chapter 4.

### 3.5.2 Classroom Observation

Classroom observation was conducted to gain “the authentic data” (Van Lier, 1998; Patton, 2002 cited in Cowie, 2009) on how teacher demonstrated the lesson plan in the teaching-learning activities. Besides, it also enabled the researcher to describe in detail how the lesson plan was implemented in the classroom. In this way, the researcher was encouraged to understand and to know how to implement the lesson plan (Creswell, 2008, p. 223; Nunan and Bailey, 2009) in ongoing and regular class (Van Lier, 1998).

The researcher employed an observation sheet to collect the data on lesson plan’s implementation in three major areas. The first area was *pre-activity* covered: gaining attention, informing learners of objectives, stimulating recall for prior learning, as suggested by Gagné (1992). The examples of observation sheets are in appendix 7. The second area was the *main activity*. It was the materials presentation that covered process of exploration, elaboration, and confirmation. And, the third area was *post activity* covered: providing feedback, assessing performance, and enhancing retention and transfer.

To further understand how to implement the lesson plan, the researcher conducted “field observation” as suggested by McMillan and Schumacher (2001, p. 437) and Holliday (2005). The observation was conducted ten times. The first of the ten observations was conducted to give the researcher a familiar presence while remaining unobtrusive in order to lessen the anxiety on the part of the participant (Creswell, 2008, p. 225). Meanwhile, the rest was devoted to understand on how the teacher implemented the lesson plan. The observations were conducted from October to November 2012 with each meeting lasting in 90 minutes (The schedule can be seen completely on Appendix 4).

During the classroom observations, the researcher did not only take notes on the implementation of the lesson plan but also did the videotaping or recording on the teaching-learning activities. The videotaping implementation was aimed at

examining whether the teacher implemented all the three major components of a lesson plan in its entirety. Furthermore, to be fully aware of what the teacher did in the implementation of the lesson plan, the researcher also did the informal discussion the teacher for about 10 to 15 minutes upon the completion of the lesson by the teacher. Data from classroom observation will be presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

### **3.5.3 Interviews**

The interview was conducted to gain a deeper understanding on how the teacher developed and implemented the lesson plan as well as to understand what problems were faced by the teacher in relation to the lesson planning.

The interview was undertaken with the individual teacher for about 10 to 15 minutes upon the completion of the lesson in the teacher's room. The interview was to get 'in-depth' information about how the teacher developed and implemented the lesson plan, as well as what problems she encountered in developing and implementing it (Taylor and Bogdan, 1984; Holliday, 2005; Marshal and Rossman: 2006). The interview format used was a semi-structured interview as proposed by Stainback & Stainback (1988, p.52), Van Lier (1998), Cohen and Manion (2004), and Dawson (2009). It is regarded as the most suitable format to learn about the perception of the teacher for the questions 'are more flexible worded' (Merriam, 1988, p. 73).

A list of questions to be covered was given to the teacher before the interview. (The list of guiding questions can be seen completely at Appendix 5). Then, in accordance with Kvale's and Dawson's suggestion, interviews were done by asking questions orally, speaking in Bahasa Indonesia and the teacher was told beforehand to train before being recorded. To follow Kvale and Dawson (2009), the interview is conducted according to interview guide that focuses on certain themes and include suggested questions to be transcribed, and the written text together with the recording are material for the subsequent interpretation of meaning' (Interview result can be seen in Appendix 6). The theme of the interview of this study was on how the teacher developed a lesson plan, the

teacher's problem in developing lesson plan, and the teacher's view on lesson plan's demonstration as depicted in table 3.1 below.

Table 3.1 Interview's Themes

No	Elements	Classification
1.	Teacher's perspective on lesson planning	Teacher's problems in developing lesson plan
2.	Fill out the title	Teacher's view on developing lesson plan and its implementation
3.	Develop the teaching objective	
4.	State the teaching material	
5.	Define the teaching method	
6.	Choose the resource	
7.	State the assessment	

In the interview, Bahasa Indonesia was chosen to give the English teacher uncontrolled and unlimited response. The interview was recorded to make the transcription viable and get 'verbatim data' (Marshal and Rossman, 2006; Alwasilah, 2010). Data from the interview will be presented and discussed in Chapter 4.

### 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 the teacher's written and typed lesson plan, the observation, and the interview. The data from each source was analyzed in steps described below.

First, the data gained from the documented analysis of the lesson plan was categorized into six principles, namely, knowing the subject matter, considering individual differences, variety, coherence and cohesiveness, flexibility, and feedback as suggested by Ministerial Regulation No. 41/2007. Further, the lesson plans were also analyzed based on its elements as stipulated by the Ministerial Regulation No. 41/2007, i.e. title, standard of competence, basic competence, performance indicator, teaching objectives, materials, time allocated, teaching method, procedures, assessment, and sources. Lastly, the lesson plans were analyzed in their usage of action verbs as *enabling* indicator.

The data obtained from classroom observation in the form of a field note was categorized into three main categories of lesson plans implementation as suggested by Ministerial Regulation No. 41 year 2007. The categorization was aimed to enable the researcher to find out whether each elements of the lesson plan emerged or deviated from the plan.

The data obtained from the interviews were analyzed by transcribing, subsequently categorizing, and interpreting them to answer the research questions. During the transcription stage, the teacher's name was replaced with pseudonym (Silverman, 1993). Then, the transcripts were given back to the teacher to make sure that it was indeed what she meant. In the effort to maintain validity, the researcher also conducted member checks by 'sending back' (Rallis and Rossman: 2009; Creswell, 2008, p. 266; Kvale, 1996) the transcripts of interview results to the participant who had been interviewed to ensure that the results were appropriate with her given responses. After that, the transcripts were condensed into briefer statements by rephrasing them into shorter ones (Kvale, 1996, p. 192). Finally, data were coded and categorized by applying thematic data analysis in line with the focus of this study such as the teacher's difficulties in developing the lesson plan and the deviation of implementing the lesson plan.. The results were interpreted in Chapter 4 of this research.

At last, all of the data obtained from documentation analysis, classroom observation, and interviews were triangulated by making comparison and contrast to get 'in depth information' to enhance validity and to gain accuracy of the conclusion of this study (Marshall and Rossman, 2006).

### **3.7 Concluding Remark**

This chapter had drawn the qualitative study, particularly the case study design, as the methodology of the study. Therefore, the data were collected by means of the documentation analyses, the classroom observation, and the interview. Consequently, all the data obtained were analyzed qualitatively to be compared and contrasted or triangulated to enhance validity.