

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHOD

A. Research Design

Having the research problems that to what extent the pre-service English teachers' ability in designing lesson plan, including the quality of their lesson plans, what the strengths and the weaknesses are, and what the causes of those strengths and weaknesses are, means that the design of this study is *descriptive qualitative research*. *Descriptive research* is to describe or to get information about the current condition of certain objects. Therefore, it includes describing, taking notes, analyzing, and interpreting the existing facts.¹ Arikunto states that descriptive research is not aimed at testing a certain hypothesis, but only describes the phenomenon, situation, and condition that happen during the research.²

As stated by Sugiyono, Bogdan and Biklen propose several characteristics of qualitative research as follows:³

1. Qualitative research has the natural setting as the direct source of data and researcher is the key instrument

¹ Mardalis, *Metode Penelitian*, (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara, 1995), 26.

² Suharsimi Arikunto, *Prosedur Penelitian*, (Jakarta: Rineka Cipta, 1996), 10

³ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*, (Bandung: Alfabeta, 2009), 13

2. Qualitative research is descriptive. The data collected is in the form of words or pictures rather than numbers
3. Qualitative research is concerned with process rather than simply with outcomes or products
4. Qualitative research tends to analyze their data inductively
5. “Meaning” is not essential to the qualitative approach.

Therefore, this study attempts to find out to what extent the pre-service English teachers’ ability in designing lesson plans is. It is explained in three sub-descriptions, including the quality of the lesson plans, the strengths and the weaknesses, and the causes of those strengths and weaknesses. This research presents the description, analysis, and interpretation of the existence of the lesson plan developed by the pre-service English teachers taking PPL 2 year 2012, IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya.

B. The Subject of The Research

The subject of this study was the lesson plans designed by the pre-service English teachers taking Internship Program year 2012, IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya. In this research, purposive sampling was applied. Trochim explains that purposive sampling means that the researchers sample with a

purpose in their mind.⁴ In this proposed study, the researcher took the sample based on the Microteaching class (PPL1).

The determination of the subject of study which was based on the classes of Microteaching was because that all preparations of Internship Program, including learning how to develop a good lesson plan, are learned on Microteaching class. Furthermore, the researcher chose class A and B as the subject of the study because compared to other classes, the lecturer was quite strict on the case of designing lesson plan. The students were not only trained to design the lesson plan based on the format which is used at schools, but also to design a very detailed lesson plan. The condition happened since very detailed lesson plan was considered much better to guide the students to do teaching practices. Furthermore, the students were expected to design lesson plans easily if they got used to design the detailed one. There are 17 students in this class.

C. Data of The Research

The data of this study consisted of the result of checklist and interview. The data were functioned as follows:

1. The checklist which is the compilation between a lesson plan analysis rubric set by National Ministry of Education and the one developed based

⁴ William M.K. Trochim, *The Research Methods Knowledge Base 2nd edition*, 56

on Harmer's theory of formal plan was used to answer the research problems 'how is the quality of the lesson plan designed by the pre-service English teachers?' and 'what are the strengths and the weaknesses of the lesson plan designed by the pre-service English teachers?'

2. Interview which was conducted with the pre-service English teachers was used to answer the research question 'what are the causes of those strengths and weaknesses?'

D. Data Collection Technique

The techniques for collecting data in this study were *documentation* and *interview*. They are described as follows:

1. Documentation

Nana describes documentation as a technique to collect the data by assembling and analyzing the documents, either written documents, pictures, or electronic ones.⁵ In this study, documentation was used to collect the data for both the research problems 'how is the quality of the lesson plan designed by the pre-service English teachers?' and 'what are the strengths and the weaknesses of the lesson plan designed by the pre-service English teachers?'

⁵ Nana Syaodih Sukmadinata, *Metode Penelitian Pendidikan*, (Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya, 2007), 221

The documents needed in this study were obtained from the pre-service English teachers who are the students of English Education Department, IAIN Sunan Ampel Surabaya, taking Internship Program year 2012. The documents were the lesson plans which they designed during the Internship Program. The documents were collected from 17 pre-service English teachers. They actually designed several lesson plans during the internship program, but the researcher only took a lesson plan from each pre-service English teacher. It was because every single pre-service English teacher had the same format for his/her all lesson plans. Therefore, there were 17 lesson plans being analyzed in this study. These documents were analyzed so that the two research problems were answered.

2. Interview

As stated by Sugiyono in his book, Esterberg defines interview as a meeting of two people to exchange information and idea through questions and responses, resulting in communication and joint construction of meaning about a particular topic.⁶ In this study, interview was used to collect the data for answering the research question ‘what are the causes of those strengths and weaknesses?’. In addition, the interview was also used to confirm the result of the analysis which the researcher did.

⁶ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*, 231

The interview used in this study was *unstructured interview*. It is the free interview in which the interviewer does not use any interview guidance completely and systematically.⁷ The guidance used is only the outline of the problems which need to be asked (see appendix 3). This kind of interview was used in this study because the researcher had not exactly known yet what data she would get.

The interview was done with 17 pre-service English teachers who designed the lesson plans analyzed. They are the students of English Education Department of State Institute for Islamic Studies Sunan Ampel Surabaya who took the Internship Program year 2012.

E. Research Instrument

Mardalis explains that research instruments are tools used by researchers for either collecting data or its measuring.⁸ This study used *checklist* and *human instrument*.

1. Checklist

In this study, the compilation between two kinds of lesson plan analysis rubric was used. The first one was the lesson plan analysis rubric from “Teacher Certification Program” set by National Ministry of Education. The second one was the lesson plan analysis rubric developed

⁷ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*, 233

⁸ Mardalis, *Metode Penelitian*, 60

from Harmer's theory of formal plan. Since the lesson plans were Indonesian teacher-made and those pre-service English teachers might become in-service ones, it is considered that the lesson plan analysis rubric from "Teacher Certification Program" by National Ministry of Education was appropriate and important to apply as the parameter.

The following is the compilation between lesson plan analysis rubric set by National Ministry of Education and the one developed based on Harmer's theory of formal plan:⁹

Table 3.1

Lesson Plan Analysis Rubric

| No. | Indicators | | Score* |
|-----|--|---|-----------|
| 1. | Kejelasan perumusan tujuan pembelajaran (tidak menimbulkan penafsiran ganda dan mengandung perilaku hasil belajar) | The clarity of instructional objectives formulation (they do not cause double interpretation and contain the behavior of the result of the study) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. | Pemilihan materi ajar (sesuai dengan tujuan dan karakteristik peserta didik) | The selection of the instructional materials (is in line with the instructional objectives and the characteristics of the students) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. | Pengorganisasian materi ajar (keruntutan, sistematika materi, dan kesesuaian dengan alokasi waktu) | The organization of instructional materials (sequenced in correct order, systematized, and suitable) | 1 2 3 4 5 |

⁹ Masnur Muslich, *Sertifikasi Guru Menuju Profesionalisme Pendidik*, 129; and Jeremy Harmer, *The Practice of English Language Teaching*, 313-316

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|-----------|
| | | with the time allocation) | |
| 4. | Pemilihan sumber/media pembelajaran (sesuai dengan tujuan, materi, dan karakteristik peserta didik) | The selection of learning source and teaching media (suitable with the instructional objectives, materials, and the characteristics of the students) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. | Kejelasan skenario pembelajaran (langkah-langkah kegiatan pembelajaran: awal, inti, dan penutup) | The clarity of learning scenario (the steps of learning activity: pre-, whilst-, and post-) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 6. | Kerincian skenario pembelajaran (setiap langkah tercermin strategi/metode dan alokasi waktu pada setiap tahap) | The detail of learning scenario (each step reflects the strategy/method and the time allocation) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 7. | Kesesuaian teknik dengan tujuan pembelajaran | The techniques used match with the instructional objectives | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 8. | Kelengkapan instrumen (soal, kunci, dan pedoman penskoran) | The completeness of assessment instrument (questions, answer key, and scoring) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 9. | Adanya deskripsi tentang kelas, termasuk karakteristik murid, informasi tentang kategori murid pandai dan lemah, serta penanganan terhadap mereka. | The presence of class description, including students' characteristics, fast and slow learners, as well as how to handle them | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 10. | Adanya "timetable fit" (deskripsi tentang apa yang sudah dipelajari di pertemuan lalu, yang akan dipelajari hari ini, dan yang | The presence of timetable fit (the description of what the class has learned in the previous meeting, what they will learn today, and next | 1 2 3 4 5 |

| | | | |
|-------------|---|--|-----------|
| | akan dipelajari di pertemuan selanjutnya) | meeting) | |
| 11. | Adanya informasi tentang interaksi yang berbeda yang akan terjadi di kelas (antara individu dengan individu, antara individu dengan guru, antara individu dengan semua siswa di kelas, antara kelompok dengan kelompok, antara kelompok dengan guru, dan antara kelompok dengan semua siswa di kelas) | The presence of the information about the different interaction which will take place in the class (between a student and a student, a student and the teacher, a student and the class, a group and a group, a group and the teacher, as well as a between a group and the class) | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 12. | Adanya perkiraan tentang masalah-masalah yang mungkin muncul di kelas beserta solusinya. | The presence of the anticipated problems and possible solutions | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| Total Score | | | |

*Note:

- 1 = very poor
- 2 = poor
- 3 = fair
- 4 = good
- 5 = very good

In the lesson plan analysis rubric above, point 1 to 8 are adopted from the lesson plan analysis rubric set by the National Ministry of Education. Meanwhile, the other 4 points were adopted from Harmer's theory of formal plan. The scoring for each indicator above will be based on the following criteria:

Table 3.2

Scoring Rubric for Each Indicator of Good Lesson Plan

| Indicator | Criteria | Score |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructional objectives do not cause double interpretation, contain the behavior of the result of study, and are developed from the basic competence which is in the curriculum. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructional objectives are developed from the basic competence, but there is one of the instructional objectives which causes double interpretation, does not contain the behavior of the result of study. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructional objectives are developed from the basic competence, but there are more than one of the instructional objectives which cause double interpretation and do not contain the behavior of the result of study. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructional objectives are not developed from the basic competence, and there are more than one of the instructional objectives which cause double interpretation and do not contain the behavior of the result of study. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The instructional objectives are not developed from the basic competence. All the instructional objectives cause double interpretation and do not contain the behavior of the result of study. | Very Poor |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All materials selected are in line with the objectives and the characteristics of the students. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All materials selected are in line with the objectives, but not clear enough if they are matched with the characteristics of the students. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All materials selected are in line with the objectives, but they are not matched with the characteristics of the | Fair |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| | students. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some materials which are not in line with the objectives and the characteristics of the students. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All materials are not in line with the objectives and the characteristics of the students. | Very poor |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The materials are sequenced in correct order, systematized, and can be achieved in the time allocated. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The materials are sequenced in correct order and systematized. They seem too many but are still possible to achieve in the available time. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The materials are sequenced in correct order, systematized, but too many and quite hard to achieve in the available time. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The materials are not sequenced in correct order, not systematized, but can be achieved in the available time. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The materials are not sequenced in correct order, not systematized, and impossible to achieve in the available time | Very Poor |
| 4 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learning source and teaching media are suitable with objectives, materials, and the characteristics of the students. They are described in detail. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The learning source and teaching media are suitable with objectives, materials, and the characteristics of the students. They are not described in detail. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are some learning source and teaching media which are not suitable with the objectives, materials, and the characteristics of the students. They are not described in detail. | Fair |

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All learning source and teaching media are not suitable with the objectives, materials, and the characteristics of the students. They are not described in detail. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no learning source and teaching media used | Very Poor |
| 5 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning procedure is divided into pre-, whilst-, and post-teaching and explained in detail and clearly. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning procedure is divided into pre-, whilst-, and post-teaching, but the explanation of the steps are confusing. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning procedure is divided into pre-, whilst-, and post-teaching, but not explained in detail and clearly. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The learning procedure is not divided into pre-, whilst-, and post-teaching, and not explained in detail and clearly. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no learning procedure. | Very Poor |
| 6 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each step reflects the the learning approach, methods and strategies used. The learning approach, methods and strategies are relevant to achieve the objectives. The proportional time is given for each stage. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each step reflects the the learning approach, methods and strategies used. The learning approach, methods and strategies are relevant to achieve the objectives, but the time in each stage is not specified. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The steps do not reflect the the learning approach, methods and strategies used. The learning approach, methods and strategies are relevant to achieve the objectives. but the time in each stage is not specified. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The steps do not reflect the the learning approach, methods and strategies used. The learning approach, methods and strategies are not relevant to achieve the objectives. but the | Poor |

| | | |
|---|--|-----------|
| | time in each stage is not specified. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no learning procedure. | Very Poor |
| 7 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The techniques used are matched with the objectives. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is one of the techniques used which is not matched with the objectives. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are more than one techniques used which are not matched with the objectives. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All the techniques used are not matched with the objectives. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no information about the techniques used. | Very Poor |
| 8 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All assessment instruments (questions, rubric, and answer key) are attached. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All assessment instruments (questions, rubric, and answer key) are attached, but they are only the examples. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is one of the assessment instruments (questions, rubric, or answer key) are not attached. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are more than one assessment instruments (questions, rubric, or answer key) are not attached. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no assessment instrument attached. | Very Poor |
| 9 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a class description which explains the characteristics of the students, the fast and slow learners, and the way to handle them. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a class description which explains the characteristics of the students, the fast and slow learners, but there is no explanation how to handle them. | Good |

| | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a class description which explains the characteristics of the students without any information about the fast and slow learners, and explanation how to handle them. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The is a class description, but very general. It cannot give a picture for the readers about the class clearly. | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no class description. | Very Poor |
| 10 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable fit describes what the class has learned and the activities in the previous meeting, what they will learn today and next meeting clearly and in detail. | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable fit only describes what the class has learned and the activities in the previous meeting, what they will learn today and next meeting at a glance. | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable fit only describes what the class has learned in the previous meeting, what they will learn today and next meeting. | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timetable fit only describes what the class has learned in the previous meeting and what they will learn today | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no timetable fit. | Very Poor |
| 11 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are many different interactions shown in the learning procedure (between a student and a student, a student and the teacher, a student and the class, a group and a group, a group and the teacher, as well as a between a group and the class) | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are only three different interactions shown in the learning procedure (between a student and a student, a student and the teacher, a student and the class, a group and a group, a group and the teacher, as well as a between a group and the class) | Good |

| | | |
|----|---|-----------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are only two different interactions shown in the learning procedure (between a student and a student, a student and the teacher, a student and the class, a group and a group, a group and the teacher, as well as a between a group and the class) | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is only one interaction shown in the learning procedure | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no information about different interactions which will take place in the class | Very Poor |
| 12 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anticipated problems and solutions are matched each other and they have high possibility to occur during the lesson | Very Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anticipated problems and solutions are matched each other, but they have low possibility to occur during the lesson | Good |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anticipated problems and solutions are not matched each other and they have low possibility to occur during the lesson | Fair |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The anticipated problems and solutions are not matched each other and they have no possibility to occur during the lesson | Poor |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no anticipated problems and possible solutions | Very Poor |

The table above shows how to score the lesson plan based on each indicator. The left column is the number of the indicators which are in the lesson plan analysis rubric. Then, it is continued to the description of the score (very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor) for each indicator.

2. Human Instrument

Since this study used the qualitative approach, the researcher was the key instrument. The qualitative researcher as the *human instrument* is to determine the research focus, to choose informant as the data source, to collect the data, to assess the quality of data, to analyze data, to interpret data, and to conclude all the findings of the research.¹⁰ Therefore, in this study, the researcher acted as the human instrument and did all of those related to the study, such as deciding the research focus, determining informant as the data source, collecting data, assessing the quality of data, analyzing data, interpreting data, and concluding all of the research findings.

F. Data Analysis Technique

In this study, the researcher obtained the data through documentation and interview. The data collected from those techniques are described as follows:

1. Documentation

As stated before that a checklist which was the compilation between lesson plan analysis rubric set by the National Ministry of Education and Harmer's theory of formal plan was employed in this study. The checklist

¹⁰ Sugiyono, *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*, 222

was to answer both the research problems ‘how is the quality of the lesson plan designed by the pre-service English teachers?’ and ‘what are the strengths and the weaknesses of the lesson plan designed by the pre service English teachers?’

The data collected from the checklist were analyzed through the following steps:

- a) Analyzing the components of the lesson plans based on the indicators in the rubric.
- b) Calculating the total score
- c) Calculating and interpreting the result of the total score as the following

formula:

$$\text{Result} = \frac{\text{Total Score}}{12}$$

The result of the calculation was interpreted based on the following scale:

1,00 – 1,89 : very poor

1,90 – 2,69 : poor

2,70 – 3,49 : fair

3,50 – 4,29 : good

4,30 – 5,00 : very good

- d) Determining the strengths and the weaknesses of the lesson plans based on the result of the analysis
- e) Giving further explanation and interpretation for the result of the analysis

2. Interview

The data collected through interview was also analyzed deeply and thoroughly. Each answer of the interviewees was interpreted by connecting it to the real condition of both Microteaching class (PPL1) and the internship program (PPL2). It also will be analyzed based on the Harmer's theory concerning the formal lesson plan which is explained in the previous chapter. The result of the interview which was conducted with 17 pre-service English teachers was presented and interpreted so that the third research problem was answered. The result of the interview shows the causes of the strengths and the weaknesses of the lesson plans designed by the pre-service English teachers.