

## A Case Study of Beginning EFL Teacher in Planning Lesson at Public Senior High School in Makassar, Indonesia

Yunitari Mustikawati\* Muhammad Amin Rasyid Muh. Basri Wello Haryanto  
English Education Department, State University of Makassar Jalan Borneo Langkasa, Makassar 90222, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

### Abstract

The study aims at discovering the beginning EFL teacher's competence in planning lessons in terms of the way he articulates clear learning objectives for the lesson, the way he selects teaching materials related to the objectives to be achieved, and the way he selects assessment related to lesson objectives. This study is a qualitative research with a case study. The study was conducted at SMAN A in Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. The subject was one beginning EFL teacher who taught English of the first year students in a public senior high school in Makassar. He has an undergraduate certificate (S1 Sarjana degree or equal to B.A.) in English Education and had been teaching one year in SMAN A. The data collections were obtained through the questionnaire, semi structured interview, on-site lesson plan observation, and documentation. Data then was analyzed descriptively. The results of the study reveal that Muhlis (pseudonym), the beginning EFL teacher, stated general learning objective which was difficult to be observed and measured, he organized learning material from the easiest to the most challenging material which he took mostly from the textbook, and he used his feeling when assessing his students. He did not even acknowledge grading system. The result also shows that Muhlis did not make formal written lesson plan. He has mind lesson plan due to his prior experiences and routine teaching of lower grade in first-year senior high school students.

**Keywords:** lesson planning, beginning EFL teacher

### 1. Introduction

It is no doubt true that there are several components contributing to the failure and success in learning and teaching languages. Stevens (in Long and Richards, 1987, p.15-23), for example, mentioned four basic components: the community, the profession, the teacher, and the learner. In my personal view, however, the teacher is the key component because the teacher has a major influence in creating the learning to produce qualified learners. The quality improvement in education then should start from a teacher.

Teacher competence gives impact on the quality of students' learning. Jalal et.al. (2009, p.7) stated that "good quality of teachers can produce good quality of students, and then the poor quality of teachers can contribute to the poor achievement of students". Bailey (2006) defined competence as "statements about what novice teachers are supposed to know and be able to do" (p.210). The government of Indonesia has introduced the Law No.14 of 2005 concerning teacher competence. Article 1 Clause 10 stated that competence is a set of knowledge, skills, and behaviors a teacher or lecturer must have, fully comprehend and master to perform his/her professional tasks. Thus, teacher competence is demanded in education as it leads to the failure or success of student achievement.

The process of learning will be effective if the teacher plans the lessons carefully. Hunter (1994, p.3) stated that skill in planning is acknowledged to be one of the most influential factors in successful teaching. Jalongo, et.al (2007, p.12) stated that "effective planning is an essential element of good teaching and of promoting student achievement". The importance of planning the lessons is also mentioned by several scholars (Schoenfeldt & Salsbury, 2009; Skowron, 2006; Richards, 2002; Nunan & Lamb, 1996; Nunan, 1991; Clark & Yinger, 1987; Taylor, 1970; Tyler, 1949). Planning the lessons is a process that tries to provide teaching for students' learning. Thoughtful decisions are made when a teacher plans a lesson which based on the knowledge and skills of the teacher (Schoenfeldt and Salsbury, 2009, p.6). Therefore, planning demonstrates a teacher's competence.

Early studies concerning teacher planning were carried out years ago. Tyler (1949) introduces the model of planning which has four steps that organize sequentially, namely specify objectives, select learning activities, organize learning activities, and specify evaluation procedures. Decisions about objectives are made first because objectives "become the criteria by which materials are selected, content outlined, instructional procedures are developed, and tests and examinations are prepared" Tyler (1949, p.3).

Taylor (1970), who conducted a study of teacher planning in British secondary school, discovered that teachers focused more on students' interests and needs (in Farrell, 2002). The results also revealed that the order of importance when teachers planning were factors associated with the context of teaching such as materials and resources, pupils' interest, aims and purposes of teaching, and evaluation. Thus, teachers begin their planning by selecting the activities first, rather than deciding the objectives as proposed by Tyler. Several studies confirmed Taylor's findings that teachers' decisions on planning do not always begin their planning by first deciding about

objectives, most teachers plan activities instead (Zahorik 1975; Yinger 1980). In order to anticipate problems or to develop initial notions, teachers mentally rehearse the plans (McCutcheon, 1980; Yinger, 1980). They may consider the sequential steps during planning; however, they do not begin with objective first (Brown, 1990; McCutcheon, 2002).

McCutcheon and Milner (2002, p.90) conducted a case study to a high school English teacher who taught British literature. The study revealed that the teacher did not plan on a day-to-day basis, but in what McCutcheon said 'long-range pre-active planning' instead. He developed interconnected themes for the course, selected the piece of literature to use, and developed curriculum materials and employed them with technology. The study also suggested that it was necessary to understand the teacher's background to understand the pedagogical knowledge and practical knowledge, the knowledge teachers have of his own situations. In addition, Carter (1990, p.300) believed that practical knowledge is shaped by "teachers' personal history, which includes intentions and purposes, as well as the cumulative effects of life experience".

All the aforementioned studies investigated about experienced teachers. Very few studies have attempted to examine planning practices by beginning teachers. Two studies have compared the planning practices of expert and novice teachers (Livingston and Borko, 1989) or experienced and less experienced teachers (Richard, 1998). The study conducted by Borko and Livingstone (1989) revealed that the planning of novices was less efficient than the experts and the novices had more problems in conducting the lessons when unexpected events interfered with the set plan. Richard (1998) conducted a study on experienced and less experienced language teachers in planning lesson. The study indicated that the experienced teachers rarely made lesson plans than the inexperienced teachers, the experienced teachers made greater use of mental plans than written plans, and their plan was much briefer that merely included less information in the plan. The less experienced teachers made fully elaborated plans, tended to follow the plan closely, and dropped activities mainly due to the time factor. On the other hand, the experienced teachers made brief outlines, used the materials as the plan, and improvised when they taught. Both experienced and less experienced teachers reported the usefulness of planning in teaching; however, the experienced teachers tended to make more use of improvisation in teaching than less experienced teachers.

Brown (1993) studied two novice secondary teachers planning the lessons. She investigated planning practices of a social studies teacher and a math teacher from student teaching through their first year of teaching. The study focused on how these novice teachers changed over time -related to the models of planning used and the factors affecting planning practices. The study revealed that the first-year teachers developed knowledge of teaching in the first year on the aspects of integrating their plans with those of other teachers, planning with the school schedule in mind, selecting materials to supplement the textbook, making plans to accommodate student needs, and becoming socialized into the role of teacher.

Studies on English lesson plan in senior high schools particularly in Indonesia context are scarce to discover. Several of scholars who investigated concerning the subject were Prajas (2009) and Pujiono (2013).

Prajas (2009) conducted a study to describe the development of teachers' lesson plan in grade 1 English speaking class based on school-based curriculum (KTSP) at public senior high schools in Malang. The subjects of the study were six English teachers from six different public high schools in Malang. Each one of English teachers provided one English speaking lesson plan that the teachers considered as best the lesson plan. The researcher analyzed merely the document of English lesson plans particularly speaking skills using the checklist as the instrument. The result was presented descriptively. The conclusion of the study revealed that the lesson plans for grade 1 English speaking class developed by the English teachers of public senior high schools in Malang were considered as well-developed, meaning that the teachers did not have difficulties in constructing lesson plan for English speaking skills.

Pujiono (2013) conducted a qualitative study of lesson plan by the English teachers of senior high schools in Kudus in the academic year 2012/2013. Six lesson plans were collected from six English teachers from different senior high schools in Kudus. The results of the study revealed that four out of six English teachers were in fair category, one English teacher was in a good category, and the other one was in the excellent category in planning English lessons. In general, the English teachers were in a good category.

The similar study was conducted by the researcher as her preliminary study determine the benchmark of the lesson plan of beginning EFL teachers in public senior high schools in Makassar in May 2014. From eleven schools visited, only three schools have the beginning EFL teachers. Each school has one beginning EFL public senior high school teachers. The three respondents, one male, and two female were graduated from S1 (equal to Bachelor Degree) English Education Program of X University (pseudonym), one of the prominent universities in Makassar, all within the duration of zero to five years of experiences. The instrument used was adapted from Department of National Education 2008 and Teacher Performance Instrument for lesson planning and validated by two experts. The result indicated that the benchmark of the beginning EFL public senior high school teachers in Makassar was in a Good category with the mean score 3.33 (category 1-4).

The previous studies (Praja, 2009; Pujiono, 2013; Yunitari, 2014) concerning English lesson plans

which conducted in senior high schools in Indonesia show similar findings that all senior high school English teachers are in good categories in constructing English lesson plans. The studies were analyzed based on the ready-made (formal) lesson plan documents which were submitted to the school as well as to the researchers. However, the studies did not investigate further in terms of making the on-site lesson plan to examine the comprehension of English teachers in planning their lessons. In addition, there is yet to be discovered a research concerning beginning English teacher planning their lessons, particularly in public senior high schools Indonesia, as studies from other countries are needed to be able to conduct a comparative analysis of problems of beginning teachers in different countries (Veenman 1984, p.168). Thus, the researcher needs to investigate the beginning EFL teacher of a public senior high school in Makassar plan the lessons. This research specifically asks the following questions: How does beginning EFL teacher in Public Senior High School (SMAN A, pseudonym) in Makassar plan his lesson in terms of articulating clear EFL learning objective for the lesson, organizing learning material aligned with learning objective, and assessment used that aligned with learning objective? and Why. The beginning EFL teacher in this study is classified as the one who has zero to five years of teaching experience maximum in school. In Indonesia, teachers would usually get formal teacher development program conducted by the center and/or local government after the fifth year (or more) of teaching based on a queuing list made by the school.

## 2. Teacher's Knowledge

Pedagogical knowledge of a teacher plays an important role in language teaching. Based on the teacher's understanding and the depth of comprehension on his/her pedagogical knowledge, he/she will decide how to create the desired lesson plan which leads to an effective teaching. Teaching is effective when the objective of the lesson is achieved.

In term of teachers' knowledge, theorist and researchers have developed the concepts useful for thinking about planning. Pedagogical content knowledge deals with the way teachers understand the subject matter and how that knowledge is to be translated into curriculum decisions, how it is to be used in planning (McClutcheon, 2002, p.90).

Rovegno (2003, p.426-449) defined teachers' knowledge as practical, personal, complex, and situated. She stated that as teachers develop their knowledge, it becomes more connected and detailed. Pedagogical content knowledge develops as a result of teachers' connecting, organizing, and making sense of what they know. She also discussed knowledge of expert teachers that experts have more knowledge and know more details about the concept that they understand. Experts are able to make more connections on broad issues. They also have situated knowledge because their decisions are based on clues that arise in the context. Experts know about their subject and they know how to teach it as well. Their knowledge is influenced by their prior knowledge, prior experiences, and school context. Rovegno (2003, p.307) stated that the ability to understand "the big picture... develops over time and is a sign of expertise".

Several scholars addressed practical knowledge, the knowledge teachers have of their own situations. This important concept concerns the knowledge teachers have of their classroom situations and the practical dilemmas they face in carrying out the action in those settings (Carter, 1990, p.299). Teachers make complicated interpretation and decisions under conditions of inherent uncertainty (Doyle, 1986). Thus, to plan, teachers engage in practical thinking that leads to an action appropriate to the particular situation. Carter (1990, p.300) believes practical knowledge is shaped by "teachers' personal history, which includes intentions and purposes, as well as the cumulative effects of life experience". Clandinin (1992, p.125) believes that teachers' personal practical knowledge is constructed through "the person's past experience, the person's present mind-body and the person's future plans and actions". It takes into consideration of a person's prior knowledge and it is highly situational.

## 3. Method

This study suited with a qualitative research with a case study approach because it examined a phenomenon focusing on a specific case; it examined in-depth of a phenomenon in its natural context; it helped to understand context characteristics of the issue and discovered what could be learned from the case, and it was based on etic and emic perspectives of the study (Merriam, 1988; Stake, 1994; Gall, et. al. 2005).

### 3.1 Participants of the study

In selecting the samples, the study employed criterion-based selection (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993) to obtain rich information concerning planning EFL lessons. The characteristics of the participants are: first, the participants are beginning EFL teachers who teach in public senior high schools in Makassar. Second, they have zero to a maximum of five years of teaching experience in public senior high schools. Third, they have an undergraduate certificate (S1 Sarjana degree) especially in English Education, and fourth, they graduated from X University (pseudonym) in Makassar. Gender, age, social status, and working status (permanent and non-

permanent) are not considered for recruiting participants in this study. Based on those characteristics, the criterion based technique was appropriate to be applied in this study as the samples have particular features that allow detailed exploration and understanding of the issues.

Finding beginning EFL teachers in public senior high schools as the participants were not easy as expected. From eleven public senior high schools visited, only three schools have the category of beginning EFL teachers. Each of those three schools has only one beginning EFL teachers. Two out of three participants were willing to take participation in the study. During the research, one of the teachers could not continue because she moved to teach English out of town in a different school that can only be reached by plane for transportation so it was difficult logistically. Thus, one beginning EFL teacher called Muhlis (pseudonym) was the subject of the study. Muhlis has met the four characteristics presented beforehand: he is a beginning EFL teacher who teaches in public senior high school; he teaches less than one year in public senior high school; he has an undergraduate certificate in English Education; he graduated from X University in Makassar.

Other supporting participants were Ardanti and Ranti (all pseudonyms) and the vice-principal where Muhlis works. Ardanti and Ranti graduated from the same X University and from English Department. They revealed their experiences in taking courses related to planning lessons and their experiences in conducting Teaching Practice Program (called PPL) during their study. The vice-principal would share the information on the situation in SMAN A (pseudonym) concerning lesson plan.

### *3.2 Research Site*

This study was conducted in SMAN A. The school is one of prestige high schools with an accreditation located in the northern part of Makassar, South Sulawesi Province. The school is surrounded by several public schools, two public senior high schools and one public junior high school within close distance. The school has eighteen extra-curricular activities and has won numerous competition conducted by the local government such as English debate and Basketball Competition.

### *3.3 Data collection procedure and data analysis*

This study employed document analysis, interviews, and observation as a data process.

#### *3.3.1 Document Analysis*

Samples of Muhlis' lesson plans (the printed ones are taken from the school and the handwriting one taken from him after conducting observation on making a lesson plan on the spot) were reviewed based on the standard used for this study to examine the way beginning EFL teacher constructed their lesson plans. Any instructional materials used by the beginning EFL teacher were studied as well as the samples of students' work in class to examine whether the objectives have been achieved or not. All the written and visual sources were collected to complete the data to answer the research questions.

#### *3.3.2 Questionnaire*

The questionnaire was employed to gather data on demographic information, information about the classes taught by the beginning EFL teacher, teaching and learning experience, professional development, and lesson planning information.

#### *3.3.3 Interview*

Interviews were conducted to the beginning EFL teacher in SMAN A about the three elements of planning lessons: (1) articulating clear EFL learning objective for the lessons, (2) selecting EFL learning materials, and (3) selecting assessment aligned with the objectives to be achieved. Interviews were also conducted to the vice principal of SMAN A and two alumni graduated from the same X University who took English Education program to obtain rich data and the 'big picture' of the matter as data validation. The format of the interviews was in semi-structured interviews. The semi-structured interview questions were prepared ahead of time and allowed questions emerge during the interview sessions. All interviews were conducted in face to face. The interviews were conducted until data was saturated.

#### *3.3.4 Observation*

The observation on making lesson plan was conducted a day before teaching to gain information on the formulation of the lesson plan whether the objective of the lesson was clear, the materials were aligned with the objective, assessment used was aligned with the objective, and whether the objective had been achieved.

#### *3.3.5 Data analysis*

The qualitative data analysis was conducted by organizing the data collection, elaborating and coding the data into a unit, organizing them into patterns, positioning the data, and drawing conclusions.

### *3.4 Trustworthiness*

The trustworthiness of the study was divided into three parts, namely triangulation, thick description, and member checks.

### 3.4.1 Triangulation

Multiple data collection methods and data sources were utilized to check the findings of the case study as evidence of truthfulness (Merriam, 1998, p.207). Multiple data sources were taken from several informants. Apart from the subject himself, the required information was also gathered from other informants such as two alumni graduated from the same Teacher College and the vice principal of the school.

Multiple data collection methods were conducted in several techniques of data collection. Information was obtained through interview supported by the result of observation or document analysis. Likewise, the result of observation was also supported by the result of interview or document analysis.

### 3.4.2 Thick description

This study provided a rich, thick description of the phenomenon that what Gall et.al (2005, p.306) illustrated the “situation and its context and give readers a sense of the meanings in that situation.”

### 3.4.3 Member check

The researcher checked the participant’s perspective by member checking, where the subject reviewed the statements in the researcher report for accuracy and completeness. It is an essential procedure to ensure a deep understanding of teacher planning EFL lessons and the accuracy of the findings. Member checking may reveal factual errors that can be corrected. It is possible that EFL teacher may recall new facts about his situation when reading the report. Therefore, the report was re-written to obtain additional information as needed (Gall et.al, 2005; Merriam, 1998).

## 4. Discussion

This section is constructed to answer the research question: How does beginning EFL teacher in Public Senior High School in Makassar plan his lesson in terms of 1) articulating clear EFL learning objective for the lesson, 2) organizing learning material aligned with learning objective, and 3) assessment used aligned with learning objective? and Why

4.1 Articulating clear EFL learning objective for the lesson:

### 4.1.A. *The beginning EFL teacher articulates general, unobservable, and immeasurable EFL learning objective for the lesson.*

Muhlis submitted the written lesson plan document that he made in observation session a day before teaching the class. The learning objective was formulated: *to make students review the lessons taught previously, the use of to be, present tense, adjective, noun, article, apostrophe, and matching words.* (Lesson plan document based on observation).

Based on his understanding in articulating lesson objective, Muhlis wrote general or unspecific lesson objective by stating to review. He did not use specific action verbs. So, what he stated in his objective was difficult to be measured and observed. This empirical evidence shows that Muhlis has a lack of sufficient knowledge in understanding how to state clear objective in the lesson plan. He did not employ the theory of Bloom’s Taxonomy, in this matter the cognitive domain. If Muhlis understood, he could write it as “*at the end of the lesson, students should be able to answer the questions by having 30 correct answers as a review of previous lessons of the use of to be, present tense, adjective, noun, article, and apostrophe*” as the example of applying Bloom Taxonomy. The example given used the operational verb “able to answer the questions,” it was measurable and also observable “by having 30 correct answers.” As Gronlund (2000, p.4) stated that “at the end of the lesson students be able to demonstrate that they have learned what was expected of them” and it should be measurable and observable of students’ performance. Thus, a properly constructed learning objective needs to apply action verbs which are observable and measurable of students’ performance. The students must perform to demonstrate that the objective has been mastered (Bloom et.al, 1956; and Gronlund, 2004).

Muhlis lacks understanding of knowledge in formulating specific learning objective of the lesson is also supported by his revelation when he was asked by the researcher whether he knows how to formulate lesson objective and his answered was, “*Ooh, to tell the truth, no.*” (interview 1).

He even categorized himself as “*Less Competent*” from the four options provided in the questionnaire: incompetent, less competent, competent, and extremely competent when assessing himself in articulating clear learning objective in the lesson plan.

Lack of understanding of knowledge and also lack of practice to make lesson plan, which will be shown in the following information, are based on Muhlis past experiences, among others are: 1) Muhlis stated that he did not learn how to make lesson plan in X University, 2) Muhlis just copied his lesson plan from senior student of English to be submitted to tutor-teacher when conducting his Teaching Practice Program during his study time in X University, 3) Muhlis teaching experiences in English subject in Islamic Boarding School and English Course did not require him to make and submit lesson plan to the institutions where he works, 4) the lesson plan Muhlis submitted to the school where he works now at public senior high school in Makassar is made by his colleague.

4.1.A.1) Muhlis revealed that he did not learn how to make lesson plan in X University.

Muhlis recalled taking Curriculum and Material Development Course:

*"... because in university we just studied, if I'm not mistaken, just the purpose of curriculum, yeah, we use a foreign book, we use English book and just focus on that. We just doing the translation. So we just translate, how to say, the lecturer just wants us to translate the book, not focus on what the book mean. I mean, what the books want. I mean, not quite understanding about the book, just translation. Yeah, just like that"* (interview 1).

*"Maybe a little, we get a little about, the basic, the basic of curriculum, the purpose. But about the lesson plan, no. Yeah, no practice [in making lesson plan]"* (interview 2).

*"You know, uh, there is a curriculum that made by the government. I forgot if I still keep the book. She [the lecturer] said this is a curriculum of 2004, only that. So, no practice making that, I mean maybe she, she just wanted us to know, oh this is the curriculum, this is the curriculum like. This is the lesson plan like, maybe. She, she just show us. No further explanation about [how] to make indicator like this. Maybe she just wanted to show us this is the curriculum 2004 and this is the format like this, nothing like that. That's all, as I recall, yeah"* (interview 3).

*"Yeah, we just using English book and translate it to Bahasa Indonesia"* (interview 3).

In order to obtain in-depth information on Curriculum and Development Course, the researcher gets two volunteer subjects, Ranti and Ardanti, alumni from the same English Department and the same X University.

Muhlis' view is echoed by Ranti, an alumnus from the same X University. Ranti recalled her experience as:

*"We just studied the theory [in Curriculum and Material Development Course]. You know, the theory that we use in Indonesia, but we never practice to make a lesson plan. The theory I mean the history [history of curriculum in Indonesia]. And then, uh, what is, um, the purpose of the curriculum, but we never make it in a form of a lesson plan."* (interv. 1)

While the other alumnus, Ardanti, recalled her experience as:

*"At the time, the lecturer taught us how to design Standard Competence and Basic Competence from the curriculum. Then to write the objective of the lesson; then, um the steps of the lesson in the classroom, But, if I'm not mistaken the lecturer didn't teach us uh step by step like okay the first this and then this. Actually when I become a teacher finally I know. I didn't know at that time."* (interview 1)

*"When I was at the university, I didn't understand. I didn't really comprehend about the lesson plan. The, how to say, the steps, making the elements for the lesson plan; but finally now when I am a teacher, now, uh, I know that this is something that we have, we need to put in the lesson plan."* (interview 1)

Muhlis recalled taking the TEFL Courses:

*"There is TEFL 1 and TEFL 2, and, uh, there's many methods actually. Mostly the methods. No, no lesson plan in TEFL"* (interview 2) remembering when he took TEFL Courses

*"We have TEFL. The subject named TEFL, and then on that subject, we teach our friends, I mean our friends act like, uh, students and we act like a teacher, so I think this is called peer teaching. So I had peer teaching in my university"* (interview 3)

*"Yeah, no practice [in making lesson plan]"* (interview 3)

Ranti:

*"At the time the subject was delivered by, um, TEFL I and TEFL II delivered by [pseudonym] and at the TEFL I it is, um, more about the theory of the objectives, you know? standard competence and basic competence, and then the purpose of, what is? to put the objectives on the lesson plan, yeah, and then in TEFL II, it is more about the practice how to make the lesson plan is. Yeah. Well, I can say that in TEFL I is more about the theory, yeah, about what is, about, what is, can be put in the lesson plan, the element of the lesson plan. In TEFL I also there is a presentation but it is more about our knowledge of the theory of the element of lesson plan"* (interview 1)

*"When I was at the university, I haven't uh, really understand about the standard competence and basic competence, so we just make based on the book. We also have to practice to teach in front of our friends yeah, peer teaching, you know? Yeah, we also make the lesson plan and the objective but at the time our teacher, our lecturer, my lecturer doesn't really check the lesson plan, I mean maybe he checked it, but, um, he didn't give uh, comment, feedback, yeah"* (interview 1)

Ardanti:

*"I could not remember. I couldn't remember anything in TEFL concerning with lesson plan. I couldn't remember"* (interview 1)

Those three alumni from the same university have similarities when taking the courses. They lack understanding the knowledge, specifically in making lesson plan, although they obtained the knowledge of curriculum, syllabus, and element of the lesson plan, but still they could not comprehend it. It is also discovered that they lack practice in making lesson plan during their study in X University. Lack of comprehension and lack of practice will surely make them as a less competent teacher in creating the lesson plan. These findings make us realized that lecturers in university that produce EFL teachers, need to give a more elaborate explanation on lesson plan specifically, such as using action verbs when formulating learning objective because it is observable and measurable when assessing students' performances. As well as give more practice to students to make them well prepared as EFL teachers.

- 4.1.A.2) Muhlis just copied lesson plan from English senior student's Final Report to be submitted to an SMA (senior high school) teacher where he was conducting Teaching Practice Program (practice teaching in school) during his study in X University,

*"The first time I knew lesson plan, I just copied from senior's book [final report], because there's lesson plan in senior's report so we just studied from that. You know there is a Teaching Practice Program and if you do it, you have to make a report? Uh, there is a report every year [lesson plan was included in it]. So, we imitate from the previous year. Report. I just copied from the senior's [report]"* (interview 1)

Ardanti had a similar experience with Muhlis during her Teaching Practice Program. She submitted a "copy-paste" lesson plan to the tutor teacher before teaching the class.

*"Preparing lesson plan, I didn't know how to make it. I copy it from my friends [laugh]. Yeah, that's it. I just copied it"* (interview 1)

Ranti, on the other hand, made her own lesson plan, in her own version. Sometimes she did not submit the lesson plan before teaching the class because the tutor teacher did not ask for it.

*"Um, yeah, I actually find a little bit difficult [making lesson plan] because when I was in, in university, uh, I focused on children, so I made the lesson plan for the elementary school. But, uh, when I was [conducting] Teaching Practice Program, I teach in senior high school. So, I have to learn again about how is the form of lesson plan in senior high school, so, uh, yeah [laugh], because my, uh, tutor teacher not really checked my work [laugh], yeah, no problem [still laugh]"* (interview 1)

*"It's not so strict there [the school system, not submitting lesson plan before teaching]. Sometimes, I just, I just prepare the material that I have to bring that I have to teach, and only the steps, the steps how to bring the material, but I actually didn't make in the form of a complete lesson plan like there's a standard competence, basic competence, and then there are objectives, yeah, not really complete, only material and the steps"* (interview 1)

The aforementioned findings reveal that there is no guidance to the student-teacher from the tutor-teacher in making lesson plan before teaching the class in senior high schools. The student-teacher find their own ways by copying the lesson plan from senior student's work or friends knowing that the tutor-teacher will not pay much attention to their lesson plans made. Even Ranti is not worried about having her brief lesson plan because she is sure that it is okay not to submit her lesson plan to the tutor-teacher before teaching.

The system of Teaching Practice Program between the X Univeristy and senior high schools in Makassar needs to be improved to enhance teachers' ability in making EFL lesson plan. The program supervisor needs to ensure that the student-teacher receives proper guidance from the tutor-teacher because the student-teacher will substitute the tutor-teacher in class temporarily during the Teaching Practice Program or the program supervisor needs to provide guidance directly when there is no assistance from the tutor-teacher. Letting the student-teacher walking in the darkness with their confusion when preparing their lesson plan before teaching will lead to the easiest solution for them,

which is ‘copy-paste’ from other people’s work. In fact, the idea of conducting Teaching Practice Program to student-teacher is to provide them the opportunity to apply what they have learned in courses they have taken and to put it into practice. They definitely need proper guidance for planning the lesson to develop their competence.

- 4.1.A.3) Muhlis’ EFL teaching experiences (at Islamic Boarding Schools: PonPes Al Irsyad, and PonPes Al Hadramaut) did not require him to make lesson plan

*“Yeah, I like teaching English in general. I like in my err how to say, private school err boarding school. You know the Principal there asked [told] me, you know the language is not important, I mean the way it’s not important. What is important is what we mean what we have. And then he said to me that just give the students err topic every week, you just discuss it. That’s [what] I like”* (interview 1)

Again, the data indicates that the knowledge of making lesson plan is not applied in his past teaching experience. He gets encouragement from the principal of Islamic Boarding School to just give the topic to be discussed every week. So, Muhlis did not make any lesson plan for teaching preparation. The important aspect in the Islamic Boarding school is the students are able to communicate with the English language.

- 4.1.A.4) Muhlis’ lesson plan submitted to the school where he works now at public senior high school in Makassar was made by experienced English teacher, who is also his relative.

Every semester in public senior high school, all teachers need to submit the lesson plan, including Muhlis. He was handed the complete lesson plan by his colleague, an experienced English teacher, as well as his relative to submit the lesson plan to the vice-principal of SMAN A.

This finding indicates that Muhlis did not make his own formal lesson plan required by the school. In fact, the preliminary study conducted by the researcher stated in introduction section indicates that Muhlis is in Good Category based on his formal lesson plan submitted to the school that he submitted to the researcher as well. Thus, qualitative study such this study is indeed needed to check, to complement, or even to provide further comprehension on the previous study. On-site observation on making lesson plan was conducted in this study to discover the beginning EFL teacher plans his lesson. His ‘mind’ lesson plan will be elaborated in the next section.

Muhlis reveals that he did not ask his relative to make the lesson plan for him.

*“I don’t ask. I’ve never asked”* (interview 4)

Muhlis informs the procedure of lesson plan submission. He is given the lesson plan by his relative the night before. He is merely asked to sign the lesson plan before submitting it to the Vice Principal. On the next day, Muhlis handed his lesson plan to the Vice Principal of Curriculum Affairs. The Vice Principal just checks the teacher’s signature in the lesson plan. He makes sure it is signed. Muhlis never gets feedback. The Vice Principal brings all teachers’ lesson plans to the Principal’s room to be signed. That is it (interview 4).

Similar information obtained from the Vice Principal where Muhlis works. The Vice Principal explains the system to submit the lesson plan. Every teacher must submit a year lesson plan (two semesters) to the Vice Principal of Curriculum Affairs. Right now, the school still applies 2006 curriculum and will soon change to the newest 2013 curriculum. After receiving the lesson plan, the Vice Principal will sign the collection of the lesson plan and submit them collectively to the principal. In the following year, when teachers are assigned to teach the same level of the previous year, teachers do not make new lesson plans although they will teach different students. They will use the same lesson plan and will submit it again because their lesson plans have been approved in the previous year (interview).

There is no revision from teachers and no inputs or comments from the principal.

*“No, nothing so called revision. After [the lesson plan was] submitted to the principal, no more, it’s done, not checked”* (interview 1).

Talking about checking each teacher lesson plan, the vice principal reveals:

*“If control, they are remained controlled; however, the control is simply to see the composition [sequence]. [For it] to be in detail, it is impossible because the person who checks it is not from all the subject departments, right? Because only one person who does the controlling, only the Curriculum Department. Meanwhile, the Curriculum (Vice Principal of Curriculum Department) does not master all subjects. Only checks the outlines of the composition, for instance, this part comes first, this one comes first, this after that, the sequences. That’s it”* (interview 1)

Based on the evidence, it shows that the system does not run well in the school to check whether the beginning EFL teacher has mastered in making the lesson plan. So, beginning EFL teacher like Muhlis will still have problems in making lesson plan because of the school, in this case, the vice



principal of curriculum affairs merely concerned about the sequences of the lesson plan, the completion of the lesson plan formats, including the signature. The lesson plan is considered as the vice principal stated as, “*just for administration [completeness of the administration]*” (interv. 1). Thus, it is understandable when Muhlis considered his ability in making lesson plan as ‘less competent’ teacher because the school lacks supporting the beginning teacher's needs.

The four past experiences of Muhlis explained above show that lack of the comprehension in formulating lesson plan, lack of practice, and not having guidance to make lesson plan will lead him to less competent EFL teacher in planning lesson. The strategy that Muhlis applied in fulfilling the obligation to submit his lesson plan when he was conducted Teaching Practice Program organized by the X University was by copying his senior lesson plan which was included in the senior’s final report. The school tutor-teacher only received the lesson plan without any feedback or guidance concerning the lesson plan. So, his development in making lesson plan can be said as having no improvement. Thus, when he taught in Islamic Boarding School, the encouragement he received from the principal was giving only the topic to be discussed by the students each week and he would be fine as long as the students were able to communicate. No obligation of making the lesson plan and submitting it to the school. This will also lead to creating Muhlis’ habit of not making written lesson plan. It turns out when he becomes EFL teacher in a public senior high school in Makassar, he does not make his own lesson plan either. His colleague who is also his relative made it for him. The school accepted the two-semester lesson plan almost at the end of the second semester, so no lesson plan check-up conducted from the school. The lesson plan is only a matter of administrative fulfillment.

The SMAN A, where Muhlis works, needs to provide EFL supervisor, not general subject supervisor, to give advice and assistance to beginning EFL teachers. The EFL supervisor needs to give inputs for the lesson plan made, to observe and check whether the objective, materials, assessment are related and the learning objective is achieved. The EFL supervisor needs to ask EFL teachers especially beginning teachers to submit their lesson plan before teaching. The EFL supervisor needs to provide regular consultation schedule for EFL beginning teachers to discuss problems experienced by them. This process will build new habits for beginning EFL teachers to make their own lesson plan and having direct guidance from EFL supervisor will gradually improve beginning EFL teachers’ professional development.

#### 4.1.B. Muhlis ‘mind’ lesson plan

When he was asked whether he has planned before teaching, he said,

*“Of course I have any plan, but I didn’t follow exactly from the lesson plan. I just see the general because in lesson plan the general thing is we must, for example, teach present tense, teach past tense. So I just follow that, but I didn’t follow the, how to say, the specific things, like students must be able to, students, I don’t follow that. I just, present tense, ah this is present tense. I explain I give some exercise, any questions? That’s all”* (interview 1).

He continued by saying,

*“You know if you mean the formal lesson plan, maybe I didn’t know. I mean I don’t know exactly how to make the formal lesson plan. Just like in lesson plan book. But if you say the informal lesson plan, just the lesson plan by myself [lesson plan that he has in his mind]. I don’t make [written] lesson plan. I mean, for example, I teach present tense tomorrow. I already know the present tense. I already know the, how to say, the pattern, the structure, how to teach this, how to give questions. Maybe I just prepare some questions, maybe I take from the internet”* (interview 1).

Muhlis shared his thought about the importance of making objective:

*“...knowing the objective is uh, very important because if there’s no objective what will you teach? I mean, there’s nothing you teach and it’s, it’s unorganized if you just come to the classroom and what cross your mind and you teach them at that moment, what is cross your mind at that moment, oh, today I will teach this. Yeah. But, but, I mean, it’s better if you organize them at, at the beginning, you know your purpose, you know the objective, then you can provide it. Then it’s, it becomes, it becomes better than if you go to classroom unprepared”* (interview 2).

He also revealed to the researcher the function of lesson plan by saying,

*“the function is to know what should be taught. And also to guide where it leads to, what, all as a process, right? Where to go”* (interview 2).

He further revealed:

*“I already have in my mind [the plan]. Oh, I will teach present tense, and I take a glance at the book, take a look a little bit, oh, this is [exercise], oh, this is.*

*Sometimes I make questions. For me, that is a lesson plan. So, tomorrow I go to the class, I'm, I'm not blank. I mean, I'm not waiting. What will we study today? No. But I have a plan, right? I mean, I have material that I prepare before. Yeah, because you know, just um, I teach present tense so many times. I mean, mostly I don't teach the high level, mostly I just teach the first (year) class, the second (year) class" (interview 4).*

The way Muhlis planned his lesson in his mind instead of having written lesson plan was acknowledged by Harmer (2007, p.365) as "teachers do some kind of vague 'corridor planning' in their head as they walk towards the class." Muhlis knew what to do because he had the plan in his mind in terms of what to teach in class, what activities would he gave the students by looking at the textbook. He believed that he could deliver the lesson well because he taught only for the first year students, meaning that the materials presented were easy to be taught, he knew the materials well.

The characteristics of Muhlis in planning his lesson in his mind was similar to what Richard's (1998) study; however, Richard found the characteristics in the experienced language teachers, that they made greater use of mental plans and brief outlines. This study complements earlier research findings of Richard's study with the argument that beginning teachers have the confidence to use mental plan when they understand well about the materials to teach. As Muhlis said, "I teach present tense so many times, I mean, mostly I don't teach the high level, mostly I just teach the first (year) class..." and continued "...but you know I said to you that just I, I glance at the, oh this material, oh yeah, I know, I know, oh yeah, I think that's count for lesson plan". Muhlis understood well about the materials because he taught only the lower level of English language, in this case, the first year public senior high school students. He taught, for instance, simple present tense repeatedly to three classes, so he did not think he needed to have written lesson plan because he had the plan in his mind as the mental plan (Richard, 1998) and he knew well about the materials because he repeatedly delivered them to students, so Muhlis has strong confidence to conduct the lesson using the plan in his minds. Moreover, the evidence here supports Schoenfeld and Salbury (2009, p.89) theory that the better a teacher knows the lesson's content, the more confident he will be. The evidence implies that not only experienced teacher plans his or her lesson in mind, but also the beginning teacher as long as he or she comprehends the materials (content) well. Thus, based on the evidence, the experienced and beginning teachers are both able to plan a lesson in his mind as long as they understand well about the material (content).

Although Muhlis, the beginning EFL teacher, is able to plan his lesson in his mind, the quality of his lesson plan will be different with an experienced teacher. Good planning is not simply about having series of activities, knowing what to do with the activities, and what will be achieved by the students. Planning lessons need lots of practice and having adequate knowledge on how to determine the objective, why we choose certain activities, certain assessments aligned with the set objective. Skill in planning is considered by Hunter (1994) as one of the most influential factors in successful teaching because the objective is carefully determined, the material must be aligned with the objective, the instructional procedure should be developed, and the assessment must be aligned with the objective. Well-thought planning will lead to better learning for students (Hunter, 1994, p.3). Thus, in this case, as beginning EFL teacher, it is a compulsory to make a written lesson plan. What Muhlis demonstrates based on his past experiences is what Carter (1990) perceived as practical knowledge. Carter (1990, p.300) believes that it is shaped by teachers' personal history which includes intentions and purposes, as well as the cumulative effects of life experience.

#### 4.2 Organizing learning material aligned with learning objective

##### ***The beginning EFL teacher organizes learning materials from the easiest to the most difficult activities taken from the textbook***

Muhlis made his lesson plan in observation session. The lesson plan stated in learning materials section:

The materials consisted of 8 types of exercises, copied from the teacher's textbook:

Exercise 1 is to complete the sentences with the correct form of the Present Simple. Ex.2 is to complete the sentences with the correct form of to be is(n't)/are(n't).

Ex.3 is to complete the sentences using possessive adjective or possessive pronoun. Ex.4 is to complete the sentences with the articles of a, an, or the.

Ex.5 is to complete the sentences with the correct prepositions.

Ex.6 is to put in apostrophes where necessary.

Ex.7 is to complete the table of nouns and adjectives.

Exe.8 is to match the words of correct compound nouns.

(Lesson plan document based on observation when Muhlis made his lesson plan which would be applied

in class X.1 and class X.3)

Muhlis revealed that:

*"We must choose [from the book] the most important one and you organize [the materials], yeah"* (interview 1)

*"I took the most important one and then something that the student must know uh, I mean essential for the material, and then the second is less important, and the next is uh, just like that"* (interview 2)

*"I know the, I know the objective first. And the second I take from, from the book first. I take some from the book and yeah, sometimes I add some from the internet. Yeah, only that."* (interview 2)

The findings reveal that Muhlis organized the material mostly taken from the textbook as it is shown the material example above. He took directly exercise 1 until exercise 8 from the textbook which indicates that the varieties of material were still lacking which caused boredom in the classroom and his students even revealing openly to him in class (interview 4). The media he employed was taken from the textbook most of the time and sometimes from the internet as other sources particularly for listening skill (interview 4). These imply that Muhlis has limited knowledge and skills. This empirical evidence is in line with Rovegno's concept that pedagogical content knowledge develops as a result of teacher's connecting, organizing, making sense of what they know. Expert teachers are able to make more connections. Muhlis is still a beginning teacher so he has limited knowledge, skills, and is not able to make sense to connect and organize what he knows. If he is able to make a connection and able to make sense of the issues, he will provide a variety of activities in a lesson from different sources as well as the use of teaching aids or the media (Schoenfeldt and Salisbury, 2009), to avoid boredom in class as what his students felt.

Having exercises or making questions for learning material is considered a lesson plan for Muhlis:

*"I already have in my mind [the plan]. Oh, I will teach present tense, and I take a glance at the book, take a look a little bit, oh, this is [exercise}, oh, this is. Sometimes I make questions. For me, that is a lesson plan. So, tomorrow I go to the class, I'm, I'm not blank. I mean, I'm not waiting. What will we study today? No. But I have a plan, right? I mean, I have material that I prepare before."* (interview 4).

This is again shown as previously explained, that he knows what he is doing, teaching the same material, present tense, he knows how to teach the present tense, he knows the pattern. He does not have the need to write down his lesson plan because it has become a routine for him that he already does it repeatedly. He knows the content subject well, he has the material, and he knows what to do. That is what a lesson plan for Muhlis. He has less consideration on the objective that refers to the school's syllabus, only his setting objective based on the textbook; less consideration to students' interest because students felt boredom when he taught them as the students told Muhlis directly that it is boring (Schoenfeldt and Salisbury, 2009). Those are several of the aspects that Muhlis lacks in the selection of learning materials from textbook

#### 4.3 Assessment used aligned with learning objective

##### ***The beginning EFL teacher assesses the students focusing on grammar***

The researcher needed to understand how he usually planned the evaluation for his students, and he answered, *"I don't understand why we have to plan the evaluation"* (interview 2). The researcher then asked how he acknowledged that his students mastered the lesson, he said that by the rule or grammar they used when they speak. When he was asked whether he used his own grading system, he responded, *"What do you mean grading system?"* (interview 2). Then continued, *"Oh no, just by feeling maybe [laugh], to tell you the truth [laugh]"* (interview 2). Later, he made the clarification that evaluation in speaking is not about grammatical, it is about expressing the idea clear, *"Yeah, the ideas, I get the ideas clear. Uh-huh. Especially speaking, yes"* (interview 2). As for writing skill, he revealed that he taught basic things based on grammar and believed automatically they know how to write but not as a professional one. Only the positive and negative sentence, and one simple paragraph. He evaluated based on correct grammar (interview 2).

Looking at the material prepared for reviewing, the researcher asked him how he is going to evaluate his students based on the prepared material. He responded that he is evaluating by seeing the true or false of the correct answers. Then, he was asked if his students would achieve the lesson objective, he said,

*"Yeah, of course. Yes. Yeah, mostly I, I get, because mostly students uh understand, you know this is not the difficult material, just the basic, yeah, mostly students uh,*

*how to say, have, have the ability to do this. It's, it's not really complicated like you teach the higher level of English or advance"* (interview 5).

He was asked again how he acknowledged that the students have learned what he intended them to learn, he responded,

*"... Uh, if, if I found out that they are making many mistakes, so that means, they don't understand. Yeah, and I will explain again, but if, if I found out that, yeah, they uh, they make correct answer, just a little bit false, a little bit incorrect, that's a indication that they understand"* (interview 5).

Muhlis lacked comprehension in evaluation system because he said he did not understand why the evaluation should be planned. He did not even acknowledge the grading system. He just used his feelings when assessing his students as he admitted to the researcher. In speaking skills, he evaluated by looking at clear idea delivered. In writing skills, he evaluated based on correct grammar used. Yet, no grading level was made.

The findings imply that Muhlis has limited knowledge and skills about language assessment, in fact, the assessment is a very important part in lesson planning to improve student learning (Brown & Abeywickrama, 2010; Harmer, 2007; Nunan, 1989). Through the assessment, the teacher could examine whether the students have achieved the intended lesson objectives and the teacher could measure the development of the students in each of the lesson. Thus, the teacher could make some adjustment based on the assessment taken when planning the next lesson. This concept should be understood by the beginning EFL teachers. His prior experience certainly gives a contribution to his inability of making an assessment when teaching for many years in two Islamic Boarding schools. He did not use the proper assessment as the principal told him not to worry about what to teach as long as Muhlis made the students able to talk in English. Through times the habit he learned from Islamic Boarding schools were carried out. Thus, he did not have the awareness that planning the evaluation in the lesson plan is important. That is why he automatically came up with *"I don't understand why we have to plan the evaluation"*. This also explains why Muhlis relied more on his feeling when assessing his students which are merely based on his personal experience. The integration of his limited knowledge, skills, and experience where he taught at Islamic Boarding schools was applied in his planning practice in SMAN A. The aforementioned description again indicates that the school needs EFL supervisor to provide assistance in overcoming Muhlis' problems by sharing various resources in assessing different skills for speaking, reading, writing, and listening, as well as suggesting Muhlis to join workshops conducted by universities or Education Quality Assurance Council in Makassar to develop his competence.

## 5. Conclusion

It is important to remember that this study could not necessarily be generalized as the study employed qualitative research with the limited subject which stresses on in-depth information to make the meaning. However, it does not mean that the result of this study cannot be applied to other sites. The generalization in the qualitative study is called transferability, meaning that the findings can be applied to other sites when the condition and the context attached to it are similar to this research.

The beginning EFL teacher, who teaches in a public senior high school in Makassar, lack knowledge in understanding lesson planning as well as a lack of practice which leads to less competent EFL teacher in planning EFL lessons. His inability of formulating proper lesson plan, which is unable to articulate clear learning objective, unable to organize learning material aligned with a learning objective, and unable to use assessment aligned with a learning objective, is due to his prior experiences. His practical knowledge is obtained from the cumulative effects of his life experiences. Thus, he makes mind lesson plan before teaching. His repetition of teaching in his school with the same lesson focusing merely on grammar, such as simple present and past tense, to the first year students makes him understand well the lesson content. He knows the objective of the lesson, he knows the material well, and he knows to assess the students by seeing the correct and false answers when students completing the test. He applies the material mostly from the textbook. The lesson plan made by the beginning EFL teacher is far from careful plan. That is why it is a compulsory for a beginning EFL teacher to make written lesson plan before teaching.

The solutions of the problems based on the context are: the public senior high school needs to provide EFL supervisor to give advice and assistance to beginning EFL teacher. Lesson plans need to be discussed whether the objective uses action verb, whether it is observable and measurable, whether the material chosen is well organized and related to the objective, and whether the assessment used is appropriate with the objective. Lesson plans also need to be submitted before teaching to EFL supervisor to build a good habit for beginning EFL teacher. Well preparation will lead to better outcomes. As for the university that provides English Education Program, the university needs to provide adequate practice for students who will become prospective EFL teachers. Equal theory and practice will provide broader capacity of students to comprehend better knowledge

and better skill in this case planning EFL lessons. Better cooperation between the university and the school to conduct Teaching Practice Program is also important aspect because it is the actual tryout to put the theory the students have learned into practice in real situation in the classroom. Thus, guidance provided from the university up to the work place will lead to better development of planning EFL lessons of beginning EFL teachers.

## References

- Bailey, M.K. (2006). *Language teacher supervision: A case-based approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Badan Standar Nasional Pendidikan. 2006. *Panduan Penyusunan Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan Jenjang Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah*. Jakarta.
- Bloom, B.S. et.al. 1956. *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain*. New York: David McKay Company Inc.
- Brown, G. 1975. *Micro Teaching. A Programme of Teaching Skills*. London: Harper and Row
- Brown, H. D., and Abeywickrama, P. 2010. *Language Assessment: Principles and Classroom Practices*. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown, H. D. 2007. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Pearson Education
- Brown, J.D. 1995. *The Elements of Language Curriculum. A Systematic Approach to Program Development*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle
- Callahan, J.F, Clark, L.H., and Kellough, R.D. 2002. *Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools*. (7<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Pearson Education.
- Callahan, J. F., and Clark, L. H. 1988. *Teaching in the Middle and Secondary Schools: Planning for Competence* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition). New York: MacMillan
- Cangelosi, J.S. 1992. *Systematic Teaching Strategies*. New York: Longman.
- Clandinin, D. 1992. Narrative and story in teacher education. In T.Russell & H. Munby (Eds.), *Teachers and teaching: From classroom to reflection* (p.124-137). London: Falmer.
- Clark, C. M., and Yinger, R. J. 1987. *Teacher Planning*, In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* (p.84-103). London: Cassell.
- Clark, C. M., and Peterson, P. 1986. *Teachers' Thought Processes*. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition) (p.255-296). New York: Macmillan
- Cresswell, J. W. 2004. *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. (3rd Edition).
- Gall, J. P., Gall, M. D., and Borg, W. R. 2005. *Applying Educational Research: A Practical Guide*. (5<sup>th</sup> Edition). Boston: Pearson Education.
- Gay, L.R., Mills, G.E, and Airasian, P. (2006). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Jalan, F., Samani, M., Mae, C.C., et. al. (2009). *Teacher certification in Indonesia: A strategy for teacher quality improvement*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Harmer, J. 2007. *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4<sup>th</sup> Edition). New York: Pearson Education
- Hunter, M. (1994). Mastery teaching. In Black, J.H. Everson, S.T. and Guskey, T.R. (Eds.), *School Improvement Programs* (p.181-204). New York: Scholastic.
- \_\_\_\_\_. (1992). *Mastering teaching: Increasing instructional effectiveness in secondary schools, colleges, and universities*. California: TIP Publication.
- Jalongo, M. R., Rieg, S. A., and Helterbran, V. R. 2007. *Planning for Learning: Collaborative Approaches to Lesson Design and Review*. New York: Columbia Univ.
- Kurinasih, I., and Sani, B. (2014). *Implementasi kurikulum 2013. Konsep dan penerapan*. Surabaya: Kata Pena
- Livingstone, C. and Borko, H. 1989. Expert-Novice Differences in Teaching: A Cognition Analysis and Implications for Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 40 (4), 36-42.
- McCutcheon, G. and Milner, H.R. 2002. A Contemporary Study of Teacher Planning in a High School English Class. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 8(1), 81-94. Carfax publishing.
- Merriam, S. B., et al. 2002. *Qualitative Research in Practice: Examples for Discussion and Analysis*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education: Revised and Expanded from Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *Case Study Research in Education: A Qualitative Approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mulyasa, E. (2006). *Kurikulum yang disempurnakan: Pengembangan standar kompetensi dan kompetensi dasar*. Bandung: Rosda
- Nunan, D. 1989. *Designing Tasks for the Communicative Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, D. and Lamb, C. (1996). *The self-directed teacher: Managing the learning process*. New York:

- Cambridge.
- Nunan, D. (1992). *Designing Tasks for the communicative classroom*. New York: Cambridge.
- Poerwati, L.E., and Amri, S. (2013). *Panduan memahami kurikulum 2013. Sebuah inovasi struktur kurikulum penunjang masa depan*. Jakarta: Prestasi Pustaka
- Prajas, A.A.H. 2009. Analysis on the Lesson Plan of English Speaking Class based on School-based Curriculum at Public Senior High Schools in Malang. [online], <http://letsseesky.wordpress.com/2009/04/04/analysis-on-the-lesson-plan-of-english-speaking-class-based-on-school-based-curriculum-sbc-at-public-senior-high-schools-in-malang> accessed June 10th 2013 P.M
- The Praxis Series, Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers. 2001. *Praxis III: Classroom performance assessments, orientation guide*. New York: ETS (Educational Testing Service).
- Pujiono. (2013). The Analysis of Lesson Plan by the English Teachers of Senior High Schools in kudu in the Academic Year 2012/2013. [online], <http://eprints.umk.ac.id/1710/1/Hal.pdf> accessed February 13th 2014 08:25 P.M
- Reynolds, M.C. 1989. *Knowledge Base for the Beginning Teacher*. New York: Pergamon.
- Richard, J. C. and Renandya, W. A. (2002). *Methodology in language teaching: An anthology of current practice*. New York: Cambridge.
- Rovegno, I. 2003. Teachers' knowledge construction, In S. Silverman & C. Ennis (Eds.) *Student learning in physical education: Applying research to enhance instruction*, (pp.295-310). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Schoenfeldt, M.K. and Salsbury, D.E. (2009). *Lesson planning: A research-based model for K-12 classrooms*. New Jersey: Pearson Education.
- Skowron, J. (2006). *Powerful lesson planning: Every teacher's guide to effective instruction* (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition). California: Corwin.
- Stevens, P.D. (1987). The nature of language teaching. In Long, M. H., and Richards, J.C. (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A book of reading*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
- Tyler, R.W. 1949. *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 Tentang Guru dan Dosen*. 2006. Jakarta: CV. Eko Jaya
- Uno, H.B. 2010. *Perencanaan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.