

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This research is a qualitative study with a content analysis research design. Data collection techniques through document analysis and interviews. The main data in this study were obtained from lesson plans designed by fourth semester students of English Language Education Department class of 2023 in the Methodology course and interviews with several students who had designed lesson plans using the PDP (Pre, During, Post) framework.

The documents analyzed in this study amounted to 68 lesson plans designed by these students from classes A-C. Class A had 22 students, class B had 22 students and class C had 24 students. In addition, interviews were conducted with a total of 21 students, with each class having 7 students interviewed.

A. Findings

Based on the analysis of 68 lesson plan documents and interviews with 21 students, the main findings are grouped into two sections, namely student competence in designing readability lesson plans and challenges in designing lesson plans based on the PDP framework.

4.1 Students' competence in designing readability lesson plans in the PDP-framework

The results of document analysis show variations in students' competency levels. This competence is seen from three main indicators, which are understanding the

structure of the PDP, the application of PDP criteria to the content of the lesson plan and the suitability of the selected student level with the learning objectives.

a. Understanding the structure of the PDP

Across the 68 lesson plans examined, a clear trend was observed regarding the structural design. Most students demonstrated an understanding of the sequential nature of lesson planning by dividing their plans into pre-reading, during-reading, and post-reading stages. Despite this structural adherence, a pervasive issue was the absence of detailed activities within these stages, indicating a lack of alignment with the standard PDP framework.

Figure 4.1 Lesson Plan of ST 5 Class A

Name: Aulia Rahman
SRN : 230101030069

PDP READING LESSON PLAN

Student Level: High Beginner
Topic : Healthy Lifestyle
Length of Lesson: 45 Minutes
Lesson Objectives:

- Students can understand the text regarding healthy lifestyle habits.
- Students can identify and describe different ways to maintain a healthy lifestyle.
- Students can practice speaking and listening skills in group discussions.

Timing	PDP Stage	Description of Activity	Materials
5 min	PreReading	Discussion and Vocabulary Introduction: Greetings and introduction to the topic for today, "Healthy Lifestyle." Talk about what the kids think it means to have a healthy lifestyle. - Students can be asked by the teacher: 1. How do you maintain your health on a daily basis? 2. Which nutritious food is your favorite?	Whiteboard and markers

10 min	During Reading	Reading and Answering Questions: Assign students to read aloud a text that discusses several facets of leading a healthy lifestyle, including working out, eating a balanced diet, and obtaining adequate sleep. - To make sure students comprehend the book, provide a few comprehension questions.	Printed paper
10 min	During Reading	Presentation (Main Activity): Every student will tell the class about their healthy behaviors with a companion. - Other students have the opportunity to remark on or ask questions about the presentations made by their peers.	Dictionary, Notebook, and pen
20 min	Post Reading	Presentation (Main Activity): Every student will tell the class about their healthy behaviors with a companion. - Other students have the opportunity to remark on or ask questions about the presentations made by their peers.	Whiteboard, marker, and notebook

b. The application of PDP criteria to the content of the lesson plan

Most students applied the PDP framework criteria to the content of the lesson plans they designed. Each phase has distinctive key activities. However, there are still some students who have not applied the PDP framework criteria.

In the pre phase, most students were blank in the connecting prior knowledge section they only include activities for encouraging student engagement and interest. Example of extract from Class A S7's lesson plan:

In pre phase, the activity is Gallery Walk. Teacher places several pictures around the classroom showing different situations where people have to trust themselves, making decisions, overcoming fear, trying something new. And then, students walk around, observe, and discuss the pictures in pairs.

This statement shows that there is a lack of understanding of the main activities in the pre phase. Activating prior knowledge and encouraging student engagement and interest are 2 different activities that are almost the same if you don't know and understand deeply. In ST 7's lesson plan, she only designed activities for encouraging student engagement and interest.

In the during phase, most of the students make mistakes in designing the activities. Either one of them is skipped or both. Example of extract from lesson plan:

ST 3 from Class A stated that “In during stage, read aloud a short, simple passage (e.g., In the sky, we see the sun in the day. At night, we see the moon and stars. Sometimes, there are clouds. Birds and airplanes fly in the sky). Use gestures and pictures to aid understanding. ST 3 did not design any tasks in the during lesson plan phase.

ST 18 in Class A stated that in during phase, the teacher divided students into small groups, each group is given a worksheet for reading and analyzing the news article. And then, the teacher facilitates a class discussion to ensure that students have understood the content of the news article. ST 18 only designed tasks for general understanding.

In the post phase, students are mostly appropriate in designing this section although there are still those who are not appropriate but not as much as in the pre and during sections. Example of extract from lesson plan:

Class A ST 18 stated that in this phase, the teacher asks students to discuss the content of the news article in groups. The teacher asks students to

share their analysis and discussion results. The teacher facilitates a class discussion to ensure that students have understood the content of the news article.

Class A ST 3 stated that ask students to match words (sun, moon, stars, clouds) with pictures. Play a simple true or false game (e.g., We see the sun at night. True or false?).

c. Readability Lesson Plan of Students

Most of the lesson plans designed by the students were quite easy to read and understand. This was a big help for the researcher when it came time to look through and analyze them. It meant that the researcher could quickly grasp what the students were trying to achieve with their lessons and how they planned to teach.

These clearly written lesson plans also showed a strong connection between their learning goals and the activities they outlined. For example from ST 1 of Class A wrote that his learning goal was for students to use expressions of opinions and agreement or disagreement, the lesson plan would clearly lay out activities like explain that expressions and students made a short dialogue to help achieve that goal within the PDP framework. This alignment meant that everything in the lesson plan made sense together and flowed logically.

However, there were also some lesson plans that were difficult to read. When the researcher encountered these, it became clear that the problems often started right at the very beginning of the design process. It was like the initial blueprint for the lesson wasn't quite right, which then made the whole plan

confusing and hard to follow. This meant the researcher had to spend more time trying to decipher what the student intended, rather than easily understanding it.

Beyond content alignment, the readability of student-designed lesson plans was further evaluated based on their formatting and adherence to the PDP (Pre-During-Post) framework. Deficiencies in these areas were identified as contributors to reduced readability in several instances.

Firstly, variations in formatting significantly impacted legibility. Although differences in font and size were anticipated due to the absence of a standardized template, handwritten submissions presented the most substantial challenge to readability. The inherent uniqueness and frequent illegibility of individual handwriting complicated researcher comprehension, contrasting sharply with the clarity offered by typed documents.

Secondly, the organization and terminology employed within the lesson plans affected their clarity. While the majority of student lesson plans conformed to the structural requirements of the PDP framework, thereby facilitating the analysis of designed phases, some deviations were observed. Specifically, certain students utilized less precise terms such as opening, main, and closing activity instead of the established pre, during, and post phases stipulated by the PDP framework. This departure from conventional terminology marginally diminished the overall readability of the affected lesson plans.

d. Rating the PDP Framework Phases in Student Lesson Plans

To thoroughly analyze the student-designed lesson plans, the researcher assessed student autonomy within each phase of the PDP (Pre-During-Post) framework. This evaluation focused on the extent to which students independently engaged in tasks, exercised critical thinking, and took ownership of activities.

The researcher used a ten-point scale for each PDP phase, where a rate of one indicated high teacher dominance, and a rate of ten represented complete student independence. Higher rates reflected greater student autonomy, while lower rates indicated more teacher control. Specifically, a rate of ten meant the teacher was no longer involved in student activities, allowing students complete creative freedom to develop projects based on teacher guidance.

Ideally, the pre phase should have rates between one and three. This range signifies a period where the teacher maintains a significant role in guiding student engagement with the learning material or topic. The analysis revealed that the majority of the sixty-eight student-designed lesson plans received rates of two or three in this phase. While very few received a rate of one, a small number exceeded three, suggesting less teacher guidance than ideal for initial engagement.

For the during phase, ideal rates range from four to seven. This phase saw most lesson plans receiving rates of four, five, or six, with a notable concentration at five. Additionally, several plans received a rate of seven, and some even reached eight or nine. Rates exceeding seven in this phase are considered less than ideal. This is because excessive student dominance during

the during phase, where the teacher's role in guiding and facilitating learning is crucial, can undermine the effectiveness of instruction.

The post phase ideally falls within rates of eight to ten. In this final phase, students are expected to focus on creating or applying knowledge based on the lesson's topic. The analysis showed that most student lesson plans achieved ideal rates, consistently ranging between eight and nine. However, some plans were less than ideal, with rates of four, five, six, or seven. These lower rates indicate continued teacher dominance in activities, which is more appropriate for the "During" phase rather than the "Post" phase, where student independence and application should be paramount.

4.2 The Challenges in designing lesson plans in the PDP-framework

The interviews highlighted several challenges that students faced:

a. Lack of references for designing activities

In choosing activities for lesson plans that suit the needs of student levels and activities for each phase in the PDP framework, the students felt that they lacked many references. There are still many of them who design activities by remembering activities during language classes on campus, guessing or even searching on AI without further researching the suitability of these activities with student levels.

ST 8 Class A said that,

"I determine the activities for the lesson plan usually modified from the activities during UPB"

ST 12 in the same class also said,

“I prefer to design activities that are anti-mainstream and usually I also adjust them to the students' level.”

ST 22 of Class B said,

“I like using monitoring activity and arrange sentences”

ST 18 and ST 24 of Class C said,

“We just customize based on our subject lecturer”

Interviews showed student teachers use different ways to plan lesson activities. Some student, such as ST 8, modify activities used previously. Other student, for instance ST 12, prefer to create new, unique activities that fit students. ST 22 expresses a liking for specific tasks like monitoring and sentence arrangement. Interestingly, ST 18 and ST 24 simply follow subject lecturer guidance.

In essence, various approaches are employed for activity design, ranging from adapting existing methods to following lecturer instructions or developing original ideas.

b. Misunderstanding about pre activities

In the pre phase, there are main activities namely activating prior knowledge and encouraging student engagement and interest which are quite misunderstood by students in designing the PDP framework. Students just copy the lecturer's example without understanding more deeply or even distinguishing the definitions of the two activities. Most of them understand the pre phase is only for asking stimulating questions or warming up before entering the during phase.

In class A, ST 3 said,

“I don't understand what the concept of this phase activity is for and how”.

ST 13 in class B said,

“I have not been able to distinguish the definitions of the two activities in the pre”

ST 19 in class C said,

“I understand that there are two activities in pre, but I can't distinguish the difference between them”

These answers also represent the opinions of their classmates who were involved in the interviews.

Interview results consistently indicate a significant misunderstanding among student teachers regarding pre-activity components within the Lesson Plan Design (PDP) framework. The majority of student appear to replicate lecturer examples without deeper comprehension or the ability to differentiate between activating prior knowledge and encouraging student engagement and interest.

- c. Lack of understanding to be able to distinguish the types of tasks in the during phase

In the during phase, the results of the analysis from the researcher prove that in this phase there are the most mistakes. In this phase, there is at least one task for general understanding and one task for specific information. In this phase, all the interviewed students said that they could not distinguish the purpose of the two types of tasks. They just follow the example of the lecturer.

ST 20 Class A said,

“I don't know that student assignments have different purposes, depending on the type.”

ST 10 Class B also said,

“I have not been able to distinguish that when designing”

ST 18 Class C said,

“I still don't understand the difference between each task in the during phase”

These responses highlight a widespread inability to differentiate task objectives in the during phase among student teachers.

Interviews reveal a significant lack of understanding among student teachers regarding task differentiation within the during phase of lesson planning. This phase, intended to include at least one task for general understanding and another for specific information, is where the most errors occurred in analyses. All interviewed student admitted they couldn't distinguish the purpose of these two task types, simply following lecturer examples.

- d. Many students find it difficulties to design the pre phase and during phase.

The researcher asked which part was the most difficult in designing the PDP framework. Not a few of the students chose the pre phase and most of them chose the during phase. The difficulty in the during part that they faced was choosing tasks.

ST 24 of class A stated that,

“The difficult phases to design in my opinion are the pre and during phases”.

Five students from class B namely ST 22, ST 13, ST 18, ST 10, and ST 17 they compactly stated,

“The difficult phase is the during phase”

ST 23 from class C also said,

“The most difficult in my opinion is the during phase”

Student teachers consistently found the pre and during phases of lesson plan (PDP) design particularly challenging. When asked about the most difficult sections, a notable number of students identified the pre-phase, but the overwhelming majority struggled with the during phase, specifically regarding task selection.

- e. Lack of understanding and reference for students to align the level to the learning objectives

Most of the students who have been interviewed stated that they did not understand, misunderstood, and some even did not know at all that the level of learners in the lesson plan must be aligned or in accordance with the learning objectives determined by the curriculum.

ST 3 and ST 4 from class A said that,

“We adjust the level and the learning objectives is usually just to figure out if they are in sync or not”

ST 17 from class B said that,

“I asked the AI to help me choose the level and the learning objectives”

ST 7 from class B said,

“I choose a level that is easy for me, an interesting theme and if I feel the learning objectives are appropriate then that is what I use to design the lesson plan”

ST 18 from class C said,

“I was still wrong in understanding the learning objectives that must match the students' level”

Interviews reveal a widespread lack of understanding among student regarding the crucial alignment between learner levels and learning objectives in lesson plan design. The majority of interviewed students either expressed confusion, misunderstanding, or complete unawareness that these two elements must be synchronized with curriculum requirements. These findings collectively demonstrate a significant deficit in students' ability to effectively integrate learner levels with curriculum-defined learning objectives, pointing to a critical area for pedagogical development.

B. Discussion

This part of the research discussed the findings of the study on students' competence in designing readability lesson plans using the PDP framework (pre-during-post). The discussion addresses the research questions, interprets the findings in relation to the existing literature, and explains the implications and limitations of the study.

1. Students' competence in designing readability lesson plans in the PDP-framework

This finding shows that although students have a procedural understanding of the PDP framework format, their conceptual understanding of the activities still contains errors and misconceptions.

In this discovery, the students have understood the sequence of phases in the PDP framework, namely the pre-during-post phase. Each phase has unique activities. The criteria of the pre phase is to activate prior knowledge and encourage students' interest in the topic, in the during phase tasks are given after reading the text, and in the post phase students are asked to create their own work according to their own way and integrate with other skills besides reading or listening (Norhayati & Din, 2024).

Although the students knew and understood the procedures of the PDP framework, there were still misunderstandings and missed activities in each phase. This reflects the findings of the study Achmad et al. (2023), which also found that in designing the lesson plan, the students were able to complete all the components of the lesson plan but there were still some omissions in the content of each component.

In the other hand Most student-designed lesson plans are fairly clear and easy to understand, which helps during analysis. However, issues still arise, particularly with formatting, handwriting, and terminology. Some students use terms like opening or closing instead of the standard pre, during, and post stages, which slightly decreases clarity.

Handwritten plans are sometimes hard to read, which impacts the ease of comprehension.

Other than that, Generally, students tend to have a high level of teacher dependence, especially in the pre and during phases. Students often rely on teacher guidance and instructions rather than taking full ownership of their activities. While this is understandable, it suggests that their independence in planning needs more development. Increasing their critical thinking and creativity is essential for better lesson plan design.

In terms of implications, these findings imply that students need more training to develop detailed, well-structured, and independent lesson plans aligned with PDP. Teachers and instructors should provide targeted guidance to help them understand how to design activities that deepen engagement and understanding, especially on students own. Enhancing their critical thinking and confidence in planning will ultimately improve their competence.

As for limitations, this study focused mainly on the written lesson plans, so it doesn't reveal how well students implement or adapt these plans during actual teaching. Future research should investigate the practical application of their plans in real classroom settings, as well as students ability to modify activities dynamically.

2. The Challenges in designing lesson plans in the PDP-framework

The findings reveal several significant challenges faced by students when designing lesson plans using the PDP framework. These challenges are directly related to the theoretical foundations described in Chapter II, particularly concerning the structure of lesson plans (Maryani et al., 2017; Fadli Wildan Naufal et al., 2024), the specific functions of each PDP stage (Norhayati & Din, 2024), and the complexities of adapting tasks to student needs (Achmad et al., 2023).

First, the lack of references in designing activities shows that students are still dependent on past classroom experiences or tools like AI, rather than consulting structured teaching materials or theoretical frameworks. This reflects a limited application of what Irianti (2019) emphasized as a lesson plan being more than a list of tasks it must be coherent, varied, and well-supported by appropriate resources. Without sufficient reference materials, students struggle to design activities that are both meaningful and pedagogically sound.

Second, in the Pre phase, many students showed confusion between the purposes of activating prior knowledge and encouraging engagement, which are clearly distinguished in the PDP theory (Norhayati & Din, 2024). The activities listed in Table 1 of Chapter II illustrate that the Pre phase involves specific strategies such as predictive inquiries and visual brainstorming. However, students often oversimplify this stage, assuming it only requires a warm-up or general question. This misunderstanding aligns with Achmad et al. (2023), who

highlighted that pre-service teachers often lack clarity in implementing learning stages effectively.

Third, the difficulty in identifying and distinguishing between general and specific tasks in the During phase further emphasizes a gap in students' pedagogical content knowledge. According to the During phase explanation, activities should be scaffolded from general understanding to specific detail. However, the interview data shows that students tended to follow templates or lecturer examples without grasping the rationale behind task sequencing.

Fourth, many students identified both the Pre and During phases as the most difficult parts of the PDP framework. This challenge is understandable in light of the theory presented in Chapter II Section C, where Achmad et al. (2023) and Alanazi (2019) both reported that selecting suitable activities and aligning them with student needs is one of the core difficulties in lesson planning. Inexperienced student teachers, in particular, often lack the practical intuition to select and modify activities to suit different student levels or text difficulties.

Fifth, lastly, most students expressed confusion or ignorance about the importance of aligning students' levels with the learning objectives specified in the curriculum. Some admitted students rely on AI or personal judgment rather than understanding that lesson activities should match the students' abilities and curriculum standards. For example, ST 3, ST 4, and ST 17 admitted they often just choose a level

they think is easy or interesting without proper alignment. This gap indicates a critical need for better guidance on how to synchronize learner levels with learning objectives to ensure lessons are both appropriate and effective.

Overall, the findings demonstrate that while students are introduced to the theoretical structure of PDP and lesson planning, the application remains superficial for many of students. To bridge this theory-practice gap, it is important to integrate more practical modeling, guided feedback, and exposure to a variety of lesson plan examples during coursework.

These findings suggest that students need more comprehensive training and references related to designing activities that suit student levels and phases in the PDP framework. Students also require a deeper understanding of the purpose of each activity, especially in the pre and during phases, and how to differentiate tasks for various learning goals. Moreover, improving students' awareness of aligning student levels with curriculum standards is crucial. Strengthening these skills will help to craft more effective, targeted, and engaging lesson plans.

This study primarily focuses on students' perceptions and students' ability to plan lesson activities based on interviews and self-reports. Further research might be necessary to observe how they implement these plans practically and whether their understanding improves with more targeted interventions.