

## **CHAPTER IV**

### **FINDING & DISCUSSION**

#### **A. Finding**

This research was conducted on MAN 3 Banjarmasin from 1<sup>st</sup> February – 1<sup>st</sup> April 2019, this school has many achievements, it has been settled as Adiwiyata high school from the government. There are many teachers here and it had four English Literature Program's teachers who had been the object of the research and their difficulties in designing lesson plan based on 2013 curriculum. The writer as the interviewee of this research asked 15 questions or more in open-ended interview and document at least 1 lesson plans from each teacher. The writer gave the name tag with alphabet as the code for every teacher based on their interview time and the curriculum vitae of the teachers can be found on appendices.

There are the findings to answer the research question in chapter 1 from the interview and the documentation:

#### **1. Teacher A**

Teacher A is the one of senior teacher in MAN 3 Banjarmasin, he had been a teacher for 15 years and it has been 2 years to teach English Literature Program in this school. At first he taught the first grade and third grade but it had been changed to the third grade in a year. He absolutely used lesson plan for his teaching-learning process and for his report, but he explained that he did not design the lesson plan by his self from zero; he took the lesson plan from the

textbook first and developed it, he took the rare lesson plan and read all of it, sometimes he developed a little in the material to make sure the students can accept and understand it in the class, after that he arrange the media to support his teaching, it was the steps that he would do to design the lesson plan, he thought that was the easiest way. He thought preparing lesson plan from beginning would make difficulties for him and took a long time.

He claimed that the textbook was really complete and its lesson plan could be perfect for teaching English Literature Program. However, The lack of times was the biggest reason for him to not design the lesson plan by him and he chose to develop the lesson plan that had been existed on the textbook. Based on his experience for designing it, it could take some weeks just for preparing one lesson plan; lack of sources and the understanding of the students were his other difficulties. The lesson plans from textbook were complete, but weather it suitable or not to the students, he claimed that it was not really fit. Because, sometimes the students still do not get the idea of the material that contains in the lesson plan. So, he had to design Plan A and Plan B for teaching in the class, that why he did not teach based on lesson plan completely, he thought it could be too awkward. However, according to Teacher A, he said the objective or the goal of teaching-learning was always reached, as long as the students understand the topic, he measured it from the task that had been done by the students in every meeting and he assumed it was enough.

Even though the lesson plan was taken from the English Literature textbook; which contains more grammar material than the literature itself, the

sources for this lesson plan were not only taken from the textbook but also from Youtube and Google to support it. Then, Teacher A fit his lesson plan based on the students' need, by asking some questions to review the students' understanding in the material. He had ever tried to join the training for designing lesson plan, it was MGMP (*Musyawah Guru Mata Pelajaran*) but actually he said that it did not really influence his lesson plan and even wasted his time.

From the documentary of the lesson plan that had been done by him, a lesson plan was able to use for five meetings. It meant one topic could be taught for five times, but it had different activities.

## 2. Teacher B

Teacher B is the transferring teacher in 2015 from MAN Pelaihari. So, she is fairly new in MAN 3 Banjarmasin as an English teacher. Although she is new, she had been an Islamic teacher since 1996. Then, she became an English teacher from 2003 and English Literature Program's teacher in 2014 at MAN Pelaihari and MAN 3 Banjarmasin. She usually uses lesson plan for teaching-learning process and her report. She designed it by herself at first when it was in Based-task curriculum, after that she made new lesson plan for once, modified it and fit it with new rules in 2013 curriculum, she took her last lesson plan from Based-task Curriculum, she always modify the material, sometimes she tries to mix and match with the Literature itself, not just about grammar and focus on the media and sources, because she thought that it was the important thing to the students activities in the class and made her easier to assess the students. She also took some idea of the lesson plan from textbook and developed it. She had a technique

to make it easier, e.g. join the MGMP (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran*) that is held by Banjarmasin Department of Education and Culture, it was a group of many teachers from different schools, it could shortcut the time of designing lesson plan. They had a routine schedule for gathering and discussing the lesson plan and even the assignment. She assumed that it was very helpful, but even though the lesson plan was designed in this training, she still must modify it to fit it with her students' need in the class. First, she took the lesson plan from the group. Second, she changed the named of school, time allocation, do observation for suitable material and took supporting material from the other source, and appropriate her media and activities to the students and materials. The last, preparing some task to do a spoken evaluation in every meeting and make a rubric for her assessment.

The reason why she just designs it by herself, because she wanted to appropriate the lesson plan to her students' ability and she claimed that if she designs it by herself, she can be easily to find the sources and activities to help the students more active in the class. For the sources and media, she used many things to support her activities, such as magazine, newspaper, song, short-story, novels, article and others. She claimed that she has to give a fun teaching-learning process to make students not to feel bored.

The thing that made difficulty for her was the material and evaluation. In English Literature Program's book, it just explained about grammar and it did not seem like literature concept, for example, storytelling, drama, sing a song, etc. So, adding some material or activities that connected to literature and grammar, it was

kindly difficult. Then, in 2013 curriculum, there are LOTS (Lower Order Thinking Skill) and HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skill) it meant the teacher had to make task for low level until high level to measure the students ability, actually there was no problem in evaluation that appeared on every meeting, which was just for evaluating students' speaking ability, but in final examination that should be evaluated from writing ability, the teachers could not discuss it in MGMP because they had different task in every school and it should be 50 questions in multiple choice. She though it was difficult to choose the questions and type it, it was too much for her to do it by herself.

The objective of her lesson plan also had a time to reach it, because Teacher B had a principle, if the students do not understand the material until the end, she will stop it and just continue it to another material, because she assumed it was the sign that the objective cannot be reached well.

For the documentary of her lesson plan, Teacher B had thick report of it, but it had misplaced for one lesson plan and a little bit confusing because it did not organize in a good way. It had similar character or structure with Teacher A's lesson plan, one lesson plans for 3-4 meetings.

### 3. Teacher C

Teacher C is one of English teacher in MAN 3 Banjarmasin since 2015, she had been taught English Literature Program from the first time until now, she never taught a usual English lesson, she taught all of students in the first grade. She claimed that all of the lesson plans in her desk are designed by herself; she followed the structure of lesson plan that was used in MAN 3 Banjarmasin. Some

of it were renewing lesson plan from the last semester, because she always designs lesson plans at the beginning of first semester, she was one of the teachers who designed lesson from zero without copying on textbooks lesson plan structure, she usually uses the lesson plan structure from the school, she took it as the rare lesson plan, after that she choose the material that she would teach at the class, she still used the material according to the textbook, but she also took some materials from other sources to support her material, search for the media and method that would fit the students activities in the class, made some task for the evaluation in the class, she also added the task in her appendice on the lesson plan and made the rubric for assesing the students ability. She did not have many difficulties, because she thought that designing lesson plan was an obligation for every teacher, but she was confused in one aspect only; that was preparing the teaching activities. She thought, she must appropriate it with the students' condition and situation to make them more interesting and enjoy with the lesson. In this case, she tried her best to prepare some strategies and plans or used a method that focus on the students, like discussion and CLT (Communicative Language Teaching). For the sources itself, she found it from another book, magazine, newspaper, Youtube, Google and others. Then, she assumed that if the students are comfortable with the lesson it meant the lesson plan was suitable for them.

She explained about the objective of learning and the used of lesson plan for her in the class, she said that she tried to teach based on the lesson plan completely, moreover it was not really same. But sometimes, she can do an

improvisation, because she claimed that if she just teaches as same as the lesson plan, she will not focus on teaching but focus on the time allocation or something like that. For reaching the goal, she explained that the lesson plan helped her to achieve or reach it, but it depended on the students, because the goal of learning made students understand and able to apply the material.

She also joined in MGMP (*Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran*) to learn about designing and even for sharing information and syllabus. For her lesson plan, Teacher C was the one who design one lesson plan for one meeting, but when the writer read her lesson plan, she also had a lesson plan for 3 meetings, but all of her lesson plan were almost similar as the new structure in 2013 curriculum and lesson plan from the school.

#### 4. Teacher D

Teacher D is one of the senior teachers in MAN 3 Banjarmasin, he has taught English since 2002 and for three years in English Literature Program. He is still teaching half of second grade and third grade. He said that he used lesson plan for teaching, but he did not plan it by himself, he took it from the textbook and internet. After that, he collected it in a thick binder, it contained some syllabus and all of English Literature Program's lesson plan. He claimed that he had never improved and developed the lesson plan. It was completely from the book, but sometimes he claims that he can use another sources for teaching-learning process, after he took the lesson plan from the textbook he would read it first, he also read the material in the textbook and tried to follow some steps that written in the lesson plan. He just did an improvisation in the class, but he did not

rewrite it or renewing the lesson plan, if there was no change in the material or the textbook, even though it had been in the new semester. He just took it and used it for the report in the last semester or for his certification.

According to his opinion, teaching would not be effective on the class if he just focuses on lesson plan, because it had already existed on the textbook, so the teacher can be free to teach. He explained more that if he has to focus on the lesson plan, he was afraid, he cannot focus on the knowledge that he gives to the students, and it was difficult for him to communicate with the students deeply about grammar, because the students had different levels to accept the material. So, that is the reason why he likes to teach in a simple way.

The other reason, he assumed that this was just a specialization program; it meant if it was not taught in the school, it did not matter. He also stated that this program actually was not suitable for the students in science, social, or religion departments in MAN 3 Banjarmasin, it had a specific department, a language and culture department that would be more suitable to learn it, but because there was an English Literature Program in the 2013 curriculum the school just had to obey it.

For the difficulties themselves, he assumed that he does not have any difficulty, because he thought lesson plans from the textbook were the best lesson plans. In teaching and learning, he wanted to make the students understand the material properly, because sometimes the goal of learning cannot be reached because of the students' lack of understanding about the material.

He also joined MGMP for connecting with others, he usually attended the training and gathering, but he hardly ever became a contributor to design a lesson



plan together, because he felt enough about his lesson plan that take from the textbook. The lesson plan that the writer got as documentary is really thick and it is mixed up with the syllabus and many different structure of lesson plans, it had some meetings for one lesson plan.

## **B. Discussion**

Based on research question in chapter 1 and findings above, the writer finally got the teachers' difficulties and knew how they designed their lesson plan. There were four teachers who had some difficulties and also four different lesson plans. Teacher A had difficulties in time when designing lesson plan, according to Arends (2012) he said that teacher has different period for designing every lesson plan, it depends on the lesson plan that they want to make, and there are kinds of time based on the various lesson plans as the research of Robert Yinger in 1980. First, for daily lesson plan, they need one month or in weeks to design it. Second, for weekly lesson plan, they need two months to design. Third, for unit lesson plan, theme lesson plan and annual lesson plan or syllabus, they need two until four months to design it and make it valid. It could be seen in Table 2.2 (p. 34), all of teacher knew that lesson plan cannot be designed and made in short time, there were some steps that the teacher should complete it based on the structure of a lesson plan. Table 2.3 (p. 37) shown it, the teachers have to find the appropriate indicators for the materials, and it must be connected with Basic Competence (BC) that was written in syllabus. However, the problem in time can be solve if the teachers tried to design the lesson plan little by little but do it day by day as a routine activity.

For Teacher B, she has difficulties in making evaluation for the students. According to Arends (2012) evaluation and assessment are the terms that will be connected until the end, because after evaluation teachers have to make the assessment for grading the students. In his book 'Learning to Teach', he said that teacher can spend the longest time in this period, because they have to make it worth it for the students, from the task until the score that they have to achieve in the end of semester. He claimed that in this period teacher must be focus of the consequences, the reliability and the validity of the task are the important things. In MAN 3 Banjarmasin, the teachers have to make the evaluation for English Literature Program by their selves; it was caused by the differences of teaching-learning process for this program in Banjarmasin. 2013 curriculum that add the new techniques for making a tasks have made teacher to learn more about LOTS (Lower Order Thinking Skills) and HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills). Thomas and Thorne (2009) defined HOTS as the way to think in high level more than memorizing or telling back the story to others. This concept is perfecting the concept of Bloom Taxonomy that categorizes the level of thinking from the lower (LOTS) until the highest (HOTS), it starts from memorizing, understanding, implementing, analyzing, evaluating until making something. Then, in 2013 Curriculum evaluation it has to contain both of it, it happened to make sure the students had done their understanding for the subject. However, the alteration of curriculum in short time has made a problem in the implementation of this decision, the less of socialization for the teacher and the students make it difficult

to apply on the task, because the understanding of the teacher for the subject had different level with the students.

Then, Teacher C claimed that she had difficulties in designing the teaching learning activities and how she managed the class, according to Wong (2009) classroom management was the one of teacher difficulty at the first time they have to teach, because they have to apply their leadership and accompany the students to learn and enjoy the class. This difficulty has been followed by many theories, one of them is reinforcement theory, it focuses on behavioral theory that dominate the motivation of the students in the class, the compliments from the teacher after the students have done their task can make them to be more comfortable in the class. Finding the activities that can make the teacher and the students closer are the other difficulties, it is the reason why every teacher has to analyze and observe the students need first, before designing the lesson plan. Become a creative person is one of the responsibility of a teacher, they have to maintain the class and do something based on the situation, it actually come from the teacher itself, behavior and personal experience can be a good mentor for the teacher in teaching-learning process. However, if the teacher did not have it, learning by reading some books, article or another else can be something needed.

After that, Teacher D who claimed that he did not have any difficulties in designing the lesson plan, because he did not make or develop any lesson plan by himself. However, it actually can be called as the physical and psyches difficulties, because the Teacher D can get the difficulties from his busiest work, it meant that he was exhausted and did not have any chance to design it. On other

hand, the psyches difficulty can give more pressure, it is the laziness. One of the biggest responsibility of a teacher is 'Role Model', many people agree that someone who become a teacher is expected as the best person in their environment, the teacher is known as a person who is knowledgeable, every question can be answered by the teacher (HakiElimu, 2008), but if the teacher still has the laziness or unconfident to show up their leadership and knowledge, they will not be a good 'Role model'. Even though, the lesson plan is not shown up in the class, the teacher still must have a spirit to develop it, the laziness cannot be the reason, because once the teacher is lazy, it will happen for many times. It is getting worst, if the laziness is appeared in the class and influencing the students' learning process.

For the last difficulties, the interaction of teacher and students in the class is the most difficult thing for all of teachers, they agreed that. In the interview one by one the teacher always mentions the students' understanding and ability who receive their lesson. Teacher D has unconfident statement that 'even though the teachers design a lesson plan from the first until the end, but the students cannot get the idea of the lesson, it is just a useless thing' and also Teacher A mentioned that students' has different level to understand the material in the class, it means he cannot follow everything in the lesson plan, because there will be some students who cannot continue their lesson to higher level. Teacher B thought she should develop and change some of the content in her lesson plan to make sure the students can understand it, because she made it in MGMP that has many teachers in different school and different background with her students at MAN 3

Banjarmasin, that focus on religious lesson and have lower interest with foreign language like English and Teacher C has many worries with the students in the class, because the students have not many interests on English and sometimes they will not focus on the lesson, that makes her to think hard about fun activities in the class.

Based on the good component and systematic lesson plan (p. 37) and the law of the lesson plan development (p. 37), the writer found some of mismatch in the lesson plans that were designed by the teachers. All of teachers had a lesson plan for 3-4 meetings, it actually was a mistake because in the Table 2.3 component and systematic lesson plan (p. 37) had shown that a lesson plan should be designed for every meeting, it meant one lesson plan for one meeting, moreover Teacher C had another type of lesson plan for one meeting, she claimed that she also used it. For Teacher A's lesson plan, it was not contained the evaluation and assessment form, actually in the law of the lesson plan development had stated that "Planning of learning process includes syllabus and learning realization planning that cover minimally learning objective, content material, learning method, learning source and evaluation of the result of learning", it was confusing because it was not detail, he should give more explanation and description for the task that he used for evaluation and how he counted the score for the assessment, it seemed like a rare lesson plan that was never improved by the teacher. Teacher B's lesson plan actually had the good component for a lesson plan, it has evaluation and assessment form, but the meeting should be improved because it can be better if a lesson plan is designed

for one meeting only. Teacher C's lesson plan completely followed the rule, because it had not different from the structure of a good lesson plan, she added some appendices to make clear her evaluation and assessment form and even added the material that she would teach in the class, but she has two types of lesson plan and sometimes can use both of it in teaching and learning, Teacher C should be competent, because she has to choose one of the lesson plan that can she use in the class and should pay attention to a better one. The last is Teacher D's lesson plan, it had 3 meetings in lesson plan and it absolutely not appropriate with the good components of lesson plan, but he gave the details in appendices of the material, evaluation and assessment, it can support the lesson plan to be better

According on previous study by Meilana (2017) that suggested MGMP to help the teacher to design the lesson plan, the fact that the writer gets in this case this program did not give any influences for the teachers to design or develop their lesson plan, because all of teacher agree even though it can cut the time in designing lesson plan, it also has a lack such as, different students' ability to understand the material and activities that contain in the lesson plan that made in MGMP, this group sometimes just for a place to meet each other, the teachers still have to improve the materials based on the students' need, and it did not help the teacher who has a difficulties in making assignment or evaluation.