

## **CHAPTER V**

### **CLOSURE**

#### **A. Conclusion**

Based on the analysis of 68 lesson plan documents and interviews with 21 students, this study concludes that students' competence in designing readability-focused lesson plans within the PDP framework remains largely procedural rather than conceptual. While students generally followed the structural sequence of Pre, During, and Post phases, many demonstrated a lack of deep understanding regarding the distinct purpose of each phase. Common misconceptions included the inability to differentiate between activating prior knowledge and stimulating interest in the Pre phase, as well as challenges in designing both general and specific comprehension tasks in the During phase. These findings indicate a gap between theoretical knowledge gained in coursework and students' ability to apply it meaningfully in practice, particularly in crafting coherent, purposeful, and learner-centered lesson plans.

In regard to the challenges faced, students reported difficulties in selecting appropriate activities, aligning lesson goals with student proficiency levels, and justifying their instructional choices. Many relied heavily on prior classroom experiences, examples from lecturers, or generative tools like AI, without critical evaluation of task suitability. Furthermore, there was limited awareness of the importance of aligning

lesson objectives with CEFR-level expectations, indicating a need for clearer integration of curriculum standards in the planning process. These findings underscore the necessity for enhanced pedagogical training that focuses not only on format and compliance, but also on critical thinking, decision-making, and conceptual clarity. Bridging this theory-to-practice gap will enable students to design more effective, readable, and contextually relevant lesson plans using the PDP framework.

## **B. Suggestions**

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, several suggestions are proposed to enhance students' competence in designing readability lesson plans using the PDP framework. First, teacher education programs should provide more structured and practical training that focuses on deepening conceptual understanding of each PDP phase. Lecturers are encouraged to emphasize the purpose and characteristics of activities in the Pre, During, and Post stages, particularly the differentiation between general and specific tasks and how these relate to reading comprehension goals. This can be supported through modeling, guided workshops, peer review sessions, and the use of annotated examples that illustrate both correct and flawed implementations.

Second, students should be guided to critically engage with curriculum standards—such as CEFR levels and learning objectives—in order to ensure that their lesson plans are pedagogically appropriate and aligned with learner needs. The use of reference materials, teaching rubrics,

and constructive feedback from lecturers can help reduce reliance on unverified sources or AI-generated suggestions. Moreover, encouraging students to reflect on their lesson design decisions and to justify their choices based on theory and learner profiles will foster greater autonomy, creativity, and accountability in their teaching practice. These improvements can contribute to closing the theory-practice gap and preparing student teachers for more effective instructional planning in real classroom settings.