

Chapter Four

Research Findings and Discussions

This chapter presents and discusses the findings and discussions of the study. This study is conducted to explore three research questions that are presented in the Formulation of the Problem. The research questions are how pre-service teachers implement their lesson plan, what the problems faced on the implementation of lesson plan, and how pre-service teachers overcome the problems.

How Lesson Plan Is Implemented by EED of UMY Pre-Service Teachers at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta

This part reported the implementation of pre-service teachers' lesson plan. The researcher described some activities based on lesson plan that they have created for each pre-service teacher in each teaching activity (internship program). They were three pre-service teachers in this study. The researcher used pseudonym for them as abbreviation name. They were pre-service teacher A (PSTA), pre-service teacher B (PSTB), and pre-service teacher C (PSTC).

Pre-service teacher A. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) implemented Internship at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta. The researcher observed PSTA twice in the same school and in different day. The first observation was conducted on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS. The second observation was conducted on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA. PSTA taught two classes at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta.

Table 4.1 Observation Checklist of Pre-Service Teacher A (PSTA)					
Setting		Outside classroom of XI IPS (first observation) Outside classroom of XI IPA (second observation)			
Time		12.30 p.m., April 9, 2016 (first observation) 12.30 p.m., April 18, 2016 (second observation)			
Length of Observation		30 minutes (first observation) 45 minutes (second observation)			
*Same lesson plan in two meetings					
Lesson Plan	Planning	Could be implemented well		Could not be implemented well	
		O - I	O - II	O - I	O - II
Objectives of the lesson	Students tell pictorial story.	✓	✓		
	Students re-tell <i>spoof text</i> in front of the class.	✓	✓		
Materials	LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI.			✓	✓
Opening Activity	PSTA gives greetings and takes attendance of the students.	✓	✓		
	PSTA gives motivation to the students then gives a topic and the purpose of the lesson.	✓	✓		
	PSTA asks the students about <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
Developmental Activity	PSTA reveals some questions that stimulates students' knowledge about <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
	PSTA persuades the students to see some examples of <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
	PSTA identifies <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
	The students ask some				

	questions from PSTA related to <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
	PSTA gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	✓		
	PSTA tells pictorial story.	✓	✓		
	PSTA chooses <i>spoof text</i> that are available.	✓	✓		
	The students re-tell the <i>spoof text</i> .	✓	✓		
	PSTA explains about <i>spoof text</i> that has been practiced.	✓	✓		
	PSTA and the students conclude the lesson that has been explained.	✓	✓		
	PSTA gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	✓		
Closing Activity	The students conclude the lesson that has been taught by PSTA.		✓	✓	
	PSTA gives assessment of the activity that has been done by the students.	✓	✓		
	PSTA gives feedback to the students.	✓	✓		
	PSTA gives homework to be finished at home.			✓	✓
Time management	2 x 45 minutes (90 minutes)			✓	✓
Assessment/e valuation	Group assessment/evaluation	✓	✓		

Objective of the lesson. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed two objectives of the lesson plan in two meetings at XI IPS and XI IPA. First, the students were able to tell pictorial story related to spoof text and to retell the story in front of the class. PSTA could implement the objectives of the lesson plan at both of classes. It could be seen when PSTA gave some activities related to the

objectives of the lesson, the students could follow the activities well. The activities were such as rearranging the sentence into a good paragraph and then PSTA asked a student to retell the story in front of the class and then the other students only listened to the student what the student was going to tell. Based on the activities, PSTA had taught writing and speaking skills to the students.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement the objectives of the lesson well in two meetings based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. There was no problem with the objectives. The objectives were appropriate with the lesson plan. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that planning the objective is a crucial thing that must be concentrated when arranging lesson plan, because the objectives will dictate the natural content to be taught to the students.

Teaching aids. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed only a teaching aid to be used during teaching and learning process in the lesson plan. There was *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI*.

In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA used laptop, LCD, and projector although they were not listed in the lesson plan. PSTA could not use the laptop because the HDMI cable was not suitable with her laptop so that there was nothing appeared on the screen (LCD). It happened because of mistake from PSTA. PSTA did not check it first several hours yet. PSTA just checked it when PSTA was going to teach at that time. There was PSTA's friend who brought a laptop. PSTA borrowed the laptop. Fortunately, there was something appeared on the screen (LCD) by using PSTA friend's laptop so that PSTA could start teaching and learning process at the class. Besides, PSTA used hands out in each

activity. The copies of hands out were appropriate with the number of the students.

In the second meeting on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA asked her friend to bring laptop again on the other hand PSTA brought her own laptop. Unfortunately, PSTA's laptop could not work well again so that PSTA borrowed PSTA friend's laptop. Fortunately, it could work well so that PSTA could do teaching and learning process at the class. In the first activity, there was an activity using pictorial cards. In the lesson plan, PSTA did not write pictorial cards as material for teaching and learning process. When PSTA worked in the field, PSTA used pictorial cards as a tool for game challenge whereas that material did not write clearly in the lesson plan. It happened because PSTA changed the material suddenly but PSTA had asked the teacher for changing the material. Besides, PSTA used hands out in the second activity. The copies of hands out were appropriate with the number of the students.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA faced problem in teaching aids. In the first meeting PSTA could not use the laptop so that PSTA borrowed her friend's laptop. In the second meeting PSTA changed one of teaching aid suddenly but the teaching aid that was used running well. In addition, PSTA did not use *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI* in teaching and learning process as attached in the lesson plan. PSTA used some teaching aids that were not written in the lesson plan such as, laptop, LCD, hands out, and pictorial cards. Thus, the implementation was inappropriate with the lesson plan. It was sustained by Burden and Byrd (2010) who investigated that teachers

also should make final decisions in their lesson plans and make sure that the items required will be available on the daytime of the class.

Opening activity. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed the opening activities in the lesson plan. Those activities were greetings, took attendance, gave motivation and delivered topic and aim towards learning the lesson, and asked students about the lesson (*spoof text*). Those activities were same for two classes.

Firstly, in two meetings pre-service teacher A (PSTA) gave greetings to the students by saying “*Bismillahirrahmanirrahim. Assalamu’alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh. Ok, hello everyone!*” PSTA always gave greetings to the students before PSTA started the lesson. By giving greetings in the beginning of the lesson, it could manage the students to learn the lesson. In addition, PSTA took attendance of students in every meeting in the beginning of the lesson. PSTA took attendance by calling the students’ full names. PSTA also asked to the students what their nicknames were so that PSTA could call them in the short name.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement greeting and taking attendance in every meeting based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. There was nothing problems on them. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who highlighted that most of teachers in schools commonly taking attendance in the morning before they start the lesson.

Secondly, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) gave motivation to the students to learn the lesson in two meetings. The motivation was like showing some famous cartoons. It related to learn about *spoof text* in the class. Luckily, the students

were enthusiastic in learning the lesson. They expressed some characteristics of the cartoons happily.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement giving motivation to the students well based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen when the students were enthusiastic in learning about *spoof text* by showing them some famous cartoons. The way PSTA gave motivation was like establishing set. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who mentioned that “motivation to learn draws on the meaningfulness, value, and benefits of the academic task to the learner” (p.190). In addition, it was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who claimed that commonly set induction is the primary activity at the beginning of the lesson and it helps students know what the topic of the lesson is going to learn that is connected with their interests and their own lives.

Thirdly, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) introduced topic and purpose of the lesson in each meeting. The topic and purpose of the lesson were delivered to the students well. The students could understand about the topic and purpose or objectives that must be reached by them. It could be seen from some activities that were finished by them. They could follow the activities well and they could reach the purpose of the lesson (learning objectives).

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement giving topic and purpose of the lesson to the students well based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. PSTA introduced topic and purpose of the lesson as outcome of learning, explained each activity related to the lesson, and evaluated them with some activities in the end. It was reinforced by Burden and

Byrd (2010) who maintained that the beginning of the lesson, teacher should describe to the students about the objectives, activities, and evaluation to be used in the class and those processes can decrease students' anxiety towards the lesson.

The last, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) asked the students about *spoof text*. The questions consisted of what spoof text was, what the characteristics of spoof text were, when spoof text was used, etc. The students could answer the questions individually or assembly.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement asking the students about *spoof text* based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. The students understood about the questions so that they could answer the questions well. It was in line with Haris (1991) as cited in Lestari (2010) revealed that teacher should ask the students one by one to make students more responsible for producing something rather than just giving attention throughout teaching and learning process.

Developmental activity. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed the developmental activities in the lesson plan. Those activities were PSTA revealed some questions that stimulated students' knowledge about *spoof text*, PSTA persuaded the students to see some examples of *spoof text*, PSTA identified *spoof text*, students answered some questions from PSTA related to *spoof text*, PSTA gave a chance to the students for asking, students told pictorial story, students chose one of *spoof texts* that were available, students retold the *spoof text*, PSTA explained *spoof text* that had been practiced, PSTA and the students concluded the lesson that had been explained, and PSTA gave a chance to the students for asking.

In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA asked some questions to the students about *spoof text* in order the students could remember again about *spoof text*. After that, PSTA asked the students to see and read some examples of *spoof text* on the screen. Then, PSTA identified *spoof text*. Moreover, PSTA asked the students again about *spoof text*. Fortunately, the students could answer some questions from PSTA. Besides, PSTA gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to *spoof text*. Furthermore, each student read a sentence until the end. Besides, PSTA asked the students to make group discussion that consisted of two students in each group. The number of group was three groups because many students were absent at that day. Before PSTA distributed the materials (hands out) to the students, PSTA gave some instructions to do the activity related to the lesson. There were some pictures that must be chosen by the students. In addition, the students had to make a story based on those pictures. PSTA gave an example to the students to do the activity and the students paid attention to the example. After that, PSTA distributed materials (hands out) to the students in the form of some pictures and let them to choose one picture for each group. Then, PSTA asked the students to tell the pictures so that they were able to create a story based on the pictures (*first activity*). The time allocation to do the activity was 20 minutes. To create a story was 15 minutes and to practice it was 5 minutes. Besides, PSTA gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to assignment of *spoof text*. After that, PSTA asked the students to tell those pictures to be a short story. They took turns to tell the pictures one another. Moreover, PSTA gave some *spoof texts* and asked the students to choose one only for a student. It was time for students retold the story

in front of the class (*second activity*). Then, one student retold a story.

Furthermore, PSTA gave such appreciation by giving applause to the students who had done those activities well. After that, PSTA delivered the purpose of the activity given to the students. The purpose of the activity was to help the students to think critically. When they saw some pictures, they could create a story. In the last, PSTA conclude the lesson with the students together and gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to the lesson (spoof text).

In the second meeting on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA asked some questions to the students about *spoof text* in order the students could remember again about *spoof text*. After that, PSTA asked the students to see and read some examples of *spoof text* on the screen. Then, PSTA identified *spoof text*. Moreover, PSTA asked the students again about *spoof text*. Fortunately, the students could answer some questions from PSTA. Besides, PSTA gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to *spoof text*. Furthermore, each student read a sentence until the end. After that, PSTA gave an activity that related to the lesson. PSTA asked the students to make two groups that consisted of four up to five students in each group. Then, PSTA showed the tools to do the activity. There were some pictorial cards. PSTA explained the instruction of activity to the students. Each student took a card and illustrated the card until become a funny story or it was called a spoof text (*first activity*). The purpose was to try their imaginations in describing pictorial story. In this activity, PSTA gave 10 minutes for the students to play the game. Then, each group told a story based on the cards. Furthermore, PSTA gave some examples of spoof text to the students and PSTA let the students to choose one of the spoof texts. In addition, PSTA asked a

student as a volunteer to retell the story in front of the class (*second activity*). In the last, PSTA concluded the lesson with the students together and gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to the lesson (spoof text).

Based on observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement the developmental activities well in two meetings based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. The activities were based on the lesson plan. It could be seen from the students who did the good job in each activity. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who mentioned that teacher might choose to change the method of an activity to have students' works in pair instead of individually, or teachers might reduce one activity and increase totally different.

Closing activity. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed some activities in closing activity on the lesson plan. There were students concluded the lesson that had been taught by PSTA, PSTA gave assessment of the activity that had been done by the students, PSTA gave feedback to the students, PSTA gave homework to be finished at home.

In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) faced problem in concluding the lesson in two meetings. It happened because the students did not pay attention to PSTA when PSTA started to give the summary of the lesson. Then, PSTA tried to guide the students to conclude the lesson. Finally, the students could understand what they had learned.

After that, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) gave assessment of students' assignments. It was not transparently so the students had not known their scores. It was only PSTA who knew the scores at that time.

Then, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) gave feedback of the lesson to the students in each meeting. PSTA asked the students about the lesson. Besides, PSTA asked some questions to the students one by one related to the lesson. The students could answer the questions well.

In addition, pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned giving homework in the closing activity. Unfortunately, it could not be implemented because there was an instruction from the teacher of the school. PSTA did not need giving homework to the students because PSTA did not teach at the same class and meet the same students again in the next meeting. Finally, PSTA cancelled giving homework.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement giving assessment and feedback based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. Unfortunately, PSTA could not implement concluding the lesson and giving homework that were written in the lesson plan. It was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that affective teachers plan to discontinue the developmental part of the lesson a few minutes before the end of the class period to convey sufficient time for the content closing and the procedural closing of a lesson. The content closing of a lesson contains a summary of the key points in the lesson.

Time allocation. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed 90 minutes in the lesson plan to teach at each class. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes).

In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA spent 30 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 20 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTA spent 5 minutes for exploration, 15 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation.

While in the second meeting on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA spent 45 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 35 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In fact, in the developmental activity, PSTA spent 5 minutes for exploration, 35 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could not implement the time allocation well in two meetings based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. The implementation was inappropriate with the lesson plan. It was sustained by Burden and Byrd (2010) who pointed that trying to consider time allocation is very important to conduct teaching and learning process. The teachers are able to begin and end the lesson surely on time, diminish movement time between assignments and activities in a lesson, and reduce waste time in an exertion to exploit time on task and student involvement.

Table 4.2

Time Allocation of Pre-Service Teacher A (PSTA)

Pre-Service Teacher (PST) / Observation	Time Allocation	Plan	Implementation
PST-A / Observation I	Opening activity	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	15 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	5 minutes
PST-A / Observation II	Opening activity	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	35 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	5 minutes

Assessment/evaluation. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) listed an assessment / evaluation in each activity in the form of group. It was done to evaluate students' understand about the lesson. Surely, the assessment/evaluation related to the lesson. PSTA used group assessment/evaluation in every meeting.

In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA used essay as kind of assessment / evaluation. Then, the essay should be presented in front of the class. PSTA asked all of students to retell the story in front of the class. The students took in turn one by one. The students could perform well in front of the class but PSTA did not mention about the score. However, PSTA just gave the students such kind of expression of appreciation by giving applause for them.

In the second meeting on April 18th 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA used essay as an assessment/evaluation. Then, the essay should be presented in front of the class. In this XI IPA, PSTA just asked a student to retell the story in front the class. The student could perform well. However, PSTA just gave the students such kind of expression of appreciation by giving applause for them.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTA could implement the assessment/evaluation to the students well based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. The assessment/evaluation was in the form of hand out. The students could perform to retell the story in front of the class perfectly. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that evaluating students are very important in the end of the lesson whether the students can reach the objective of the lesson. Teacher should not have to provide a test or quiz in each class period. Teachers should evaluate their students occasionally. It helps to check students' understanding of the lesson.

Pre-service teacher B. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) implemented Internship at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta. The researcher observed PSTB for twice in the same school and different day. The first observation was conducted on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS. The second observation was conducted on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, too. PSTB taught one class at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta.

Table 4.3				
<i>Observation Checklist of Pre-Service Teacher B (PSTB)</i>				
Setting	Outside classroom of XI IPS (twice observations)			
Time	10.57 a.m., April 21, 2016 (first observation) 13.00 p.m., April 23, 2016 (second observation)			
Length of Observation	33 minutes (first observation) 50 minutes (second observation)			
*Different lesson plans in two meetings				
Observation	Lesson Plan	Planning	Could be implemented well	Could not be implemented well
First Observation	Objectives of the lesson	Students give arguments about a picture.	✓	
		Students re-tell <i>hortatory text</i> in front of the class.	✓	
	Materials	LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA kelas XI.		✓
	Opening Activity	PSTB gives greetings and takes attendance of the students.	✓	
		PSTB gives motivation to the students then gives a topic and the purpose of the lesson.		✓
		PSTB asks the students about <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
	Developmental Activity	PSTB reveals some questions that stimulates the students' knowledge about <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
		PSTB persuades the students to see some examples of <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
		PSTB identifies <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	

		Students ask some questions to PSTB related to <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
		PSTB gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	
		PSTB gives an argument about a picture.	✓	
		Students choose <i>hortatory texts that are available</i> .	✓	
		Students give some arguments about <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
		PSTB explains about <i>hortatory text</i> that has been practiced.	✓	
		PSTB and students conclude the lesson that has been explained.	✓	
		PSTB gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	
	Closing Activity	Students conclude the lesson that has been taught by PSTB.	✓	
		PSTB gives assessment of the activity that has been done by the students.	✓	
		PSTB gives feedback to the students.		✓
	Time management	2 x 45 minutes (90 minutes)		✓
	Assessment/evaluation	Group assessment/evaluation	✓	
Second Observation	Objectives of the lesson	Students discuss the meaning and content from functional text (banner) that read by students.	✓	
		Students find information from functional text (banner) that read by students.	✓	

	Materials	Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI		✓
		Dictionary		✓
	Opening Activity	PSTB gives greetings and takes attendance of the students.		✓
		PSTB gives motivation to the students then gives a topic and the purpose of the lesson.	✓	
		PSTB asks the students related to functional text (banner, poster, and pamphlet).	✓	
	Developmental Activity	PSTB delivers materials of lesson.	✓	
		PSTB shows some picture about <i>banner</i> .	✓	
		PSTB and the students discuss information on the pictures that have been showed.	✓	
		Students read some texts about <i>banner</i> .	✓	
		Students discuss the meaning and content from <i>banner</i> that has been read by them.	✓	
		Students write information from <i>banner</i> that has been read by them.	✓	
		PSTB explains the students' assignments.	✓	
		PSTB and students conclude the lesson that has been delivered.	✓	
		PSTB gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	
		Students make conclusion		

	Closing Activity	about the material that has been explained.	✓	
		PSTB gives assessment of the activity that has been done by the students.	✓	
		PSTB gives feedback toward process and the result of learning of the students.	✓	
	Time management	2 x 45 minutes (90 minutes)		✓
	Assessment/evaluation	Individual assessment/evaluation	✓	

Objective of the lesson. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed two objectives in each lesson plan. There were two different lesson plans in two meetings. PSTB used the lesson plans in the same class but different day.

In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB listed two objectives of the lesson. First, students were able to give argument based on the pictures related to *hortatory text*. Second, the students were able to tell the *hortatory text* in front of the class.

In the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB listed two objectives of the lesson. First, students were able to discuss meaning and content from short functional text (banner). Second, students were able to find information from short functional text (banner).

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement the objectives based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen when PSTB delivered the objectives to the students and gave some activities related to the objectives of the lesson, the students could follow the

activities well. Related to the objectives of the lesson and the activities, PSTB had taught writing and speaking skills to the students. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that planning the objective is a crucial thing that must be concentrated when arranging lesson plan, because the objectives will dictate the natural content to be taught to the students.

Teaching aids. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed some teaching aids to be used during teaching and learning process in the lesson plan. Those were *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA kelas XI*, Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI, and dictionary.

In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB did not use *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA kelas XI* as listed in the lesson plan because the principal of the school asked PSTB to use hands out that were created by PSTB. Instead, PSTB used laptop, LCD, and projector as materials that had been provided by the school to conduct teaching and learning process. Those materials did not list in the lesson plan. Laptop, LCD, and projector could be used well at the class. There was nothing wrong of them so that PSTB could explain the lesson effectively. PSTB used hands out to give some tasks to the students. The copies of hands out were appropriate with the number of students at the class. While in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS class, PSTB and the students did not use Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI, and dictionary as listed in the lesson plan.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB faced problem in teaching aids to conduct teaching and learning process. In the first meeting PSTB did not use *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA kelas XI* and in

the second meeting PSTB did not use Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI, and dictionary as listed in the lesson plan. PSTB used some materials or teaching aids that were not written in the lesson plan such as, laptop, LCD, hands out, and electronic dictionary. Thus, the implementation was inappropriate with the lesson plan. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that teachers also should make final decisions in their lesson plans and make sure that the items required will be available on the daytime of the class.

Opening activity. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed the opening activities in the lesson plan. Those activities were greetings, took attendance, gave motivation and delivered topic and aim towards learning the lesson, and asked the students related to the lesson. Those activities were same in two different lesson plans and different meetings.

Firstly, in two meetings pre-service teacher B (PSTB) gave greetings to the students by saying “*Assalamu’alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh.*” PSTB always gave greetings to the students before PSTB started the lesson. By giving greetings in the beginning of the lesson, it could manage the students to start the lesson. Secondly, in the first meeting on April 21st, 2016. PSTB took attendance of students in the beginning of the lesson. PSTB took attendance by calling students’ full names. Unfortunately, in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 PSTB did not take attendance of the students because PSTB shocked seeing the students that attended the class. There were only 5 students who attended the class at that time. Hence, PSTB did not take attendance of the students because PSTB still remembered the students’ names.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement greetings and taking attendance based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. It could be implemented well. It was maintained by Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that most of teachers in schools commonly taking attendance in the morning before they start the lesson.

Thirdly, pre-service teacher B (PSTB) introduced topic and purpose of the lesson in every meeting. The topic and purpose of the lesson were conveyed to the students well. The students could understand about the topic and purpose or objectives that must be reached by them. It could be seen from some activities that were finished by them. They could follow the activities well and they could reach the purpose of the lesson (learning objectives).

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded PSTB could implement giving topic and purpose of the lesson to the students well based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. PSTB introduced topic and purpose of the lesson as outcome of learning, explained each activity related to the lesson, and evaluated them with some activities in the end. It was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who maintained that the beginning of the lesson, teacher should describe to the students about the objectives, activities, and evaluation to be used in the class and those processes can decrease students' anxiety towards the lesson.

The last, pre-service teacher B (PSTB) asked the students about *hortatory text* in the first meeting. While in the second meeting, PSTB asked the students about *banner*. The questions consisted of what hortatory text and banner were, what the characteristics of hortatory text and banner were, when hortatory text and

banner were used, etc. The students could answer the questions individually or assembly.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement asking the students about *hortatory text* and *banner* based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. The students understood about the questions so that they could answer the questions well. It was in line with Haris (1991) as cited in Lestari (2010) revealed that teacher should ask the students one by one to make students more responsible for producing something rather than just giving attention throughout teaching and learning process.

Developmental activity. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed the developmental activities in the lesson plan. Because of the lesson plans were different in two meetings so the developmental activities were also different. In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 PSTB revealed some questions that stimulated students' knowledge about *hortatory text*, PSTB persuaded the students to see some examples of *hortatory text*, PSTB identified *hortatory text*, PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking, PSTB gave an argument about a picture, students chose *hortatory text* that were available, students gave some arguments about *hortatory text*, PSTB explained about *hortatory text* that had been practiced, PSTB and students concluded the lesson that had been explained, PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking. Furthermore, in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 PSTB delivered materials of the lesson, PSTB showed some pictures about *banner*, PSTB and the students discussed information on the pictures that had been showed, students read some texts about *banner*, students discussed the meaning and content from *banner* that had been read by them, students wrote

information from *banner* that had been read by them, PSTB explained students' assignments, PSTB and the students concluded the lesson that had been delivered, PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking. The implementation of them would be discussed below.

In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB revealed some questions that stimulated students' knowledge about hortatory text. Then, PSTB persuaded the students to see some examples of hortatory text. The students paid attention to the examples. After that, PSTB identified hortatory text. Moreover, the students asked some questions to PSTB related to hortatory text and PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking. Then, PSTB gave an argument about a picture as an example for the students. Formerly, the students chose hortatory texts that were available as an assignment for the students. The students gave some arguments about the hortatory text. Then, PSTB distributed materials (hands out) to the students while giving some instruction about the activity. The activity had to be done in group. PSTB asked the students to make two groups that consisted of three students in each group. After that, to make the students understood about the instruction, PSTB gave one more explanation about the activity in each group. The students discussed the assignment with their friends in a group to give some arguments and identified the characteristics of *hortatory text* (first and second activity). After that, PSTB explained about hortatory text that had been practiced by the students. Moreover, PSTB and the students concluded the lesson that had been explained and learned at the class. In the last, PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to *hortatory text*.

In the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB delivered materials of lesson. Then, PSTB showed some pictures about *banner* related to the real life so that the students could understand well. Moreover, PSTB and the students discussed information on the pictures that had been showed. After that, PSTB distributed materials (hands out) and gave instruction of the activities. PSTB asked the students to read some texts about *banner*. Then, the students wrote information from *banner* that had been read by them. After that, PSTB explained the students' assignments. Then, PSTB and the students conclude the lesson that had been delivered well. In the least PSTB gave a chance to the students for asking some questions related to *banner*.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement the developmental activities in two meetings well based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen from the students who could finish their assignments in each activity. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) that teacher might choose to change the method of an activity to have students' works in pair instead of individually, or teachers might reduce one activity and increase something totally different.

Closing activity. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed some similar activities in the closing activity on the lesson plan in two meetings. There were students concluded the lesson that had been taught by PSTB, PSTB gave assessments of the activity that had been done by the students, and PSTB gave feedback to the students.

In two meetings, the students concluded the lesson that had been taught by pre-service teacher B (PSTB). PSTB gave a summary of the lesson that had been learned. The students could conclude the lesson perfectly.

After that, pre-service teacher B (PSTB) gave assessment of students' assignments. It was not transparently so that the students had not known their scores. It was only PSTB who knew the scores at that time.

Then, pre-service teacher B (PSTB) gave feedback of the lesson to the students in the second meeting. PSTB asked the students about the lesson. Besides, PSTB asked some questions to the students one by one related to the lesson. The students could answer the questions well. Unfortunately, in the first meeting PSTB did not give feedback of the lesson to the students. It happened because PSTB forgot to give a feedback and the students wanted to go home early.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement concluding the lesson, giving assessment and feedback based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. However, PSTB could not implement giving feedback in the first meeting because PSTB forgot about it at that time. It was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that affective teachers plan to discontinue the developmental part of the lesson a few minutes before the end of the class period to convey sufficient time for the content closing and the procedural closing of a lesson. The content closing of a lesson contains a summary of the key points in the lesson.

Time allocation. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed 90 minutes in the lesson plan to teach at both of class in one meeting. Opening activity was 10

minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes).

In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB spent 33 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 3 minutes, developmental activity was 27 minutes, and closing activity was 3 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTB spent 5 minutes for exploration, 20 minutes for elaboration, and 2 minutes for confirmation.

While, in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB spent 50 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 40 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTB spent 5 minutes for exploration, 30 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could not implement the time allocation well in two meetings based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. The implementation was inappropriate with the lesson plan. It was sustained by Burden and Byrd (2010) who pointed that trying to consider time allocation is very important to conduct teaching and learning process. The teachers are able to begin and end the lesson surely on time, diminish movement time between assignments and activities in a lesson, and reduce waste time in an exertion to exploit time on task and student involvement.

Table 4.4

Time Allocation of Pre-Service Teacher B (PSTB)

Pre-Service Teacher (PST) / Observation	Time Allocation	Plan	Implementation
PST-B / Observation I	Opening activity	10 minutes	3 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	20 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	2 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	3 minutes
PST-B / Observation II	Opening activity	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	30 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	5 minutes

Assessment/Evaluation. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) listed an assessment/evaluation in each activity in the form of group and individual. It was

done to assess or evaluate students' understand about the lesson. The assessment/evaluation related to the lesson.

In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB used essay as kind of assessment/evaluation. The essay was about *hortatory text*. Then, the essay should be presented in front of the class. The students could perform in front of the class well. Unfortunately, PSTB did not mention the score transparently.

In the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB used essay and multiple choices as an assessment/evaluation. The essay and multiple choices were about *banner*. Then, PSTB asked the students to answer those questions. PSTB and the students discussed the correct answers. The students could answer those questions perfectly. In the last, PSTB asked the students how many the correct answers that the students got.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement the assessment/evaluation to the students well based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. The assessment/evaluation was in the form of hand out. The students could perform to retell the story in front of the class perfectly. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that evaluating students are very important in the end of the lesson whether the students can reach the objective of the lesson. Teacher should not have to provide a test or quiz in each class period. Teachers should evaluate their students occasionally. It helps to check students' understanding of the lesson.

Pre-service teacher C. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) implemented Internship at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta. The researcher observed PSTC for twice in the same school and different day. The first observation was

conducted on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA. The second observation was conducted on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, too. PSTC taught one class at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta.

Table 4.5

Observation Checklist of Pre-Service Teacher C (PSTC)

Setting	Outside classroom of XI IPA			
Time	12.40 p.m., May 9, 2016 (first observation) 10.20 a.m., May 14, 2016 (second observation)			
Length of Observation	90 minutes (first observation) 70 minutes (second observation)			
*Different lesson plans in two meetings				
Observation	Lesson Plan	Planning	Could be implemented well	Could not be implemented well
First Observation	Objectives of the lesson	Students analyze important information in <i>narrative text</i> that they read.	✓	
		Students analyze moral values of <i>narrative text</i> .	✓	
	Materials	BSE Books Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI.	✓	
		http://englishadmin.com/2015/09/9-contoh-narrative-text-fabel-lengkap.html	✓	
	Opening Activity	Students give greetings to PSTC and pray.		✓
		PSTC takes attendance of the students.		✓
		PSTC and students discuss <i>narrative text</i> that has been read or heard by the students.	✓	
		Students and PSTC discuss purpose and material of lesson.	✓	
			✓	

	Developmental Activity	PSTC delivers materials.		
		Students re-memorize <i>narrative text</i> through discussion together.	✓	
		PSTC explains students' assignments.	✓	
		Students read <i>narrative text</i> in the form of print out.	✓	
		Students recognize important information in <i>narrative text</i> that has been read.	✓	
		Students identify moral values in <i>narrative text</i> that has been read.	✓	
		Students discuss information and moral values in <i>narrative text</i> that can be implemented in daily life.	✓	
		PSTC discusses students' assignments.	✓	
		PSTC and students conclude the lesson that has been delivered.	✓	
		PSTC gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	
	Closing Activity	Students conclude the lesson that has explained.	✓	
		PSTC gives assessment of the activity that has been done by the students.	✓	
		PSTC gives feedback to the students.	✓	
	Time management	2 x 45 minutes (90 minutes)	✓	
Assessment/evaluation	Individual assessment/evaluation	✓		
Second	Objectives of	Students analyze generic	✓	

Observation	the lesson	structure <i>hortatory text exposition</i> that they read.		
		Students analyze important information in <i>hortatory text exposition</i> that they read.	✓	
	Materials	BSE Books Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI.	✓	
		http://englishadmin.com/2015/09/9-contoh-narrative-text-fabel-lengkap.html	✓	
	Opening Activity	Students give greetings to PSTC and pray.		✓
		PSTC takes attendance of students.		✓
		Students and PSTC discuss <i>hortatory text exposition</i> that has been read or heard by them.	✓	
		Students and PSTC discuss purpose and material of the lesson.		
	Developmental Activity	PSTC delivers material of lesson.	✓	
		Students re-memorize characteristics of <i>hortatory text exposition</i> through discussion together.	✓	
		PSTC explains the students' assignments.	✓	
		Students read essay text of <i>hortatory exposition</i> in the form of print out.	✓	
		Students analyze generic structure of <i>hortatory text</i> .	✓	
		Students analyze important information of <i>hortatory text exposition</i> that they read.	✓	
		Students discuss		

		information and knowledge that are contained in <i>hortatory text exposition</i> that can be implemented in daily life.	✓	
		PSTC discusses students' assignments.	✓	
		PSTC and students conclude the material of learning that has been delivered.	✓	
		PSTB gives a chance to the students for asking.	✓	
	Closing Activity	Students make conclusion about the material that has been discussed.	✓	
		PSTC gives assessment of the activity that has been done by the students.	✓	
		PSTC gives feedback toward process of learning of the students.		✓
	Time management	2 x 45 minutes (90 minutes)		✓
	Assessment/evaluation	Individual assessment/evaluation	✓	

Objective of the lesson. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed two objectives in each lesson plan. There were two different lesson plans in two meetings. PSTC used the lesson plans in the same class but different day.

In the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC listed two objectives of the lesson. First, students were able to analyze the important information in *narrative text*. Second, students were able to analyze moral value in *narrative text*. PSTC delivered the objectives to the students and gave some activities related to the objectives.

In the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTB listed two objectives of the lesson. First, students were able to analyze generic structure in *hortatory text*. Second, students were able to analyze the important information in *hortatory text*. PSTC delivered the objectives to the students and gave some activities related to the objectives.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement the objectives based on what PSTC wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen when PSTC delivered the objectives to the students and gave some activities related to the objectives of the lesson, the students could follow the activities well. Related to the objectives of the lesson and the activities, PSTC had taught writing and speaking skills to the students. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that planning the objective is a crucial thing that must be concentrated when arranging lesson plan, because the objectives will dictate the natural content to be taught to the students.

Teaching aids. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed some materials to be used during teaching and learning process in the lesson plan. Those were hands out from BSE Books Inter-language: English for Senior High School Students XI, <http://englishadmin.com/2015/09/9-contoh-narrative-text-fable-lengkap.html>, and <http://www.softilmu.com/2014/07/pengertian-dan-contoh-hortatory.html>.

In the first and on May 9th, 2016 and second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC used those teaching aids that were needed during teaching and learning process. The hands out were appropriate with the number of the students. In these meetings, PSTC did not use laptop, LCD, and projector to support teaching and learning process. PSTC just used oral presentation.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement the teaching aids based on what PSTC wrote in the lesson plan. The implementation was appropriate with the lesson plan. It was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that teachers also should make final decisions in their lesson plans and make sure that the items required will be available on the daytime of the class.

Opening activity. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed the opening activities in the lesson plan. Those activities were students gave greetings to PSTC and pray, PSTC took attendance of the students, students and PSTC discussed *hortatory text exposition* that had been read or heard by them, and students and PSTC discussed purpose and material of lesson.

PSTC did not give greetings in every meeting. Beside that, PSTC also did not take attendance in the beginning of the lesson because PSTC forgot to take attendance of the students. PSTC directly gave hands out for students' assignments. Then, PSTC and the students discussed the lesson (*narrative text* and *hortatory exposition*) that had been read or heard by the students. After that, the students and PSTC discussed purpose and material of the lesson.

Based on the observation, it can be concluded that PSTC could not implement giving greetings, and taking attendance. However PSTC could implement discussing the lesson and introducing the lesson to the students. It was line with Credé, Roch and Kieszczynka who (2010) revealed that “both students and some educational researchers appear to be somewhat skeptical of the importance of class attendance” (p.272). In addition, it was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who maintained that the beginning of the lesson, teacher should

describe to the students about the objectives, activities, and evaluation to be used in the class and those processes can decrease students' anxiety towards the lesson.

Developmental activity. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed the developmental activities in the lesson plan. Because of the lesson plans were different in two meetings so the developmental activities were also different. In the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC delivered material of the lesson, students re-memorized *narrative text* through discussion together, PSTC explained students' assignments, students read *narrative text* in the form of print out, students recognized important information in *narrative text* that had been read, students identified moral values in *narrative text* that could be implemented in daily life, PSTC discussed students' assignments, PSTC and students concluded the lesson that had been delivered, and PSTC gave a chance to the students for asking. Moreover, in the second meeting on May 14th, 2016, PSTC delivered material of lesson, students re-memorized characteristics of *hortatory text exposition* through discussion together, PSTC explained students' assignments, students read essay text of *hortatory exposition* in the form of print out, students analyzed generic structure of *hortatory text exposition*, students analyze important information of *hortatory text exposition* that they read, students discuss information and knowledge that are contained in *hortatory text exposition* that can be implemented in daily life, PSTC discussed students' assignments, PSTC and students concluded the material of learning that had been delivered, and PSTC gave a chance to the students for asking.

In the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC delivered material of the lesson to the students. Then, PSTC asked the students to re-memorized

narrative text through discussion together. After that, PSTC explained the students' assignments clearly so that the students could understand about the instruction of their assignments. PSTC asked the students to read a sentence of *narrative text* by taking turn one by one until the end of the story. When PSTC asked some questions to the students related to the text, some of them could not answer so that PSTC asked the students to read it one more individually. Moreover, PSTC asked the students to recognize important information in *narrative text* and identify moral values that had been read by them. Afterwards, PSTC asked the students to discuss information and moral values in *narrative text* that could be implemented in daily live. Then, PSTC discussed the students' assignments and PSTC and the students concluded the lesson that had been delivered. In the end, PSTC asked the students for asking some questions related to the lesson.

In the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC delivered material of the lesson. Then, PSTC asked the students to re-memorize characteristics of *hortatory text exposition* through discussion together. After that, PSTC explained students' assignments clearly so that the students could understand the instruction of their assignments. Furthermore, PSTC asked the students to read essay text of *hortatory text exposition* in the form of print out. PSTC asked the students to read a sentence by taking turn until the end one by one. Then PSTC asked the students to analyze generic structure of *hortatory text* and important information of *hortatory text exposition* that they read. Afterwards, PSTC asked the students to discuss information and knowledge that are contained in *hortatory text exposition* that can be implemented in daily life. Formerly, PSTC

discussed students' assignments. Then, PSTC and the students concluded the material of learning that had been delivered. In the end, PSTC asked the students for asking some questions related to the lesson.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement the developmental activities in two meetings well based on what PSTC wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen from the students who could finish their assignments in each activity. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) that teacher might choose to change the method of an activity to have students' works in pair instead of individually, or teachers might reduce one activity and increase something totally different.

Closing activity. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed some similar activities in the closing activity on the lesson plan in two meetings. There were students concluded the lesson that had been taught by PSTC, PSTC gave assessments of the activity that had been done by the students, and PSTC gave feedback to the students.

In two meetings, the students concluded the lesson that had been taught by pre-service teacher C (PSTC). PSTC gave a summary of the lesson that had been learned. The students could conclude the lesson perfectly.

After that, pre-service teacher C (PSTC) gave assessment of students' assignments. It was not transparently so that the students had not known their scores. It was only PSTC who knew the scores at that time.

Then, in the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 pre-service teacher C (PSTC) gave feedback of the lesson to the students. PSTC asked the students about the lesson. Besides, PSTC asked some questions to the students one by one related to

the lesson. The students could answer the questions well. Unfortunately, in the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 PSTC was difficult to give feedback of the lesson. PSTB directly closed the lesson.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement concluding the lesson, giving assessment and feedback based on what PSTC wrote in the lesson plan. It was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that affective teachers plan to discontinue the developmental part of the lesson a few minutes before the end of the class period to convey sufficient time for the content closing and the procedural closing of a lesson. The content closing of a lesson contains a summary of the key points in the lesson.

Time allocation. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed 90 minutes teaching at both of class in one meeting in the lesson plan. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes).

In the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC spent 90 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 77 minutes, and closing activity was 3 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTC spent 5 minutes for exploration, 62 minutes for elaboration, and 10 minutes for confirmation.

Meanwhile, in the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC spent 70 minutes to teach at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 60 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the

developmental activity, PSTC spent 5 minutes for exploration, 45 minutes for elaboration, and 10 minutes for confirmation.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement the time allocation well in the first meeting but PSTC could not implement the time allocation well in the second meeting. It happened because the implementation was different with the time that had been listed in the lesson plan. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who pointed that trying to consider time allocation is very important to conduct teaching and learning process. The teachers are able to begin and end the lesson surely on time, diminish movement time between assignments and activities in a lesson, and reduce waste time in an exertion to exploit time on task and student involvement.

Table 4.6

Time Allocation of Pre-Service Teacher C (PSTC)

Pre-Service Teacher (PST) / Observation	Time Allocation	Plan	Implementation
PST-C / Observation I	Opening activity	10 minutes	10 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	62 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	10 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	3 minutes
PST-C/ Observation II	Opening activity	10 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (exploration)	20 minutes	5 minutes
	Developmental activity (elaboration)	40 minutes	45 minutes
	Developmental activity (confirmation)	10 minutes	10 minutes
	Closing activity	10 minutes	5 minutes

Assessment/evaluation. Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) listed an assessment/evaluation in each activity in the form of individual. It was done to

assess or evaluate students' understand about the lesson. The assessment/evaluation related to the lesson.

In the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC used essay as kind of assessment/evaluation. The essay was about *narrative text*. The students had to answer some questions based on *narrative text* that had been provided. Then, PSTC and the students discussed the correct answers together. Most of the students could answer perfectly.

In the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC used essay and true-false as kinds of assessment/evaluation. The essay and true-false questions were about *hortatory text*. Then, PSTC asked the students to answer those questions. PSTC and the students discussed the correct answers together. The students could answer those questions perfectly.

Based on the observation above, it can be concluded that PSTC could implement the assessment/evaluation to the students well based on what PSTC wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen from the kind of assessment/evaluation that related to the lesson. The assessment/evaluation was appropriate for the students so that the students could understand about the lesson. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who argued that evaluating students are very important in the end of the lesson whether the students can reach the objective of the lesson. Teacher should not have to provide a test or quiz in each class period. Teachers should evaluate their students occasionally. It helps to check students' understanding of the lesson.

In conclusion, generally three of pre-service teachers could implement their lesson plan well. The most common problems faced by them were teaching

aids, time allocation, opening activity (taking attendance and giving motivation), and some activities in closing activity (summary of lesson and feedback of lesson). Based on the problems they should do action to overcome those problems.

Problems Faced by EED of UMY Pre-Service Teachers on the Implementation of Lesson Plan at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta

This part reported some problems on the implementation of lesson plan. The researcher found some problems on the implementation of lesson plan. The implementation was not suitable with the lesson plan.

Finding 1: Pre-service teachers did not use teaching aids based on lesson plan.

Two of the participants faced problem in using teaching aids on the implementation of lesson plan. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) and pre-service teacher B (PSTB) faced problem in using teaching aids. PSTA listed teaching aids in the lesson plan such as, *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI*. While, PSTB listed some teaching aids in the lesson plan such as, *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI*, Interlanguage: English for Senior High School Students XI, and dictionary.

Based on the observation, in the first meeting of PSTA's class on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA did not use *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI*. Instead, PSTA used laptop, LCD, and pictorial cards to conduct teaching and learning process. Unfortunately, PSTA could not use her laptop to conduct teaching and learning process. While in the second meeting of PSTA's class on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA changed materials in the activity. PSTA used

pictorial cards to conduct teaching and learning process. It was supported by the interview with PSTA. "...I thought all of the rooms could use HDMI cable. In fact, it could not. The cable could implant to the laptop but it did not connect on the LCD", said PSTA. Moreover, in the second meeting of PSTB's class on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB did not use *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI* and dictionary as teaching aids to conduct teaching and learning process. Instead, PSTB used laptop, LCD, and hands out to conduct teaching and learning process. It was supported by the interview with PSTB. "...then, I did not bring dictionary because of my forgetfulness on the teaching aids..", said PSTB.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA and PSTB could not implement the teaching aids on the implementation of lesson plan. The implementation of teaching aids was not appropriate with the lesson plan. PSTA and PSTB lacked of concern towards teaching aids. It was reinforced by Richards and Renandya (2002) who investigated that dealing with some teaching aids is a challenge. In addition, "teachers might need to have rally with a computer and a program that related to the subject area, unfortunately the computer might already be booked for the day that you were preparing the lesson" (Burden & Byrd, 2010, p.77).

Finding 2: Some activities were not implemented well as written in the lesson plan.

Giving motivation. It was only pre-service teacher B (PSTB) who faced problem in giving motivation to the students to learn the lesson. PSTB planned giving motivation to the students to learn the lesson in the beginning of the lesson in the lesson plan. In the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB did not

motivate the students and PSTB explained the lesson directly. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTB. “Ehm...I faced problem in opening...in the first meeting, I got flat tire on my motorcycle, so I just had a little time...I did not give stimulus to motivate them to learn because I did not understand well with the content of the lesson so that I confused how the way to give stimulus to them...”, said PSTB.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB could not implement giving motivation well based on what PSTB wrote in the lesson plan. Motivating students to learn was difficult for PSTB at that time. PSTB had not understood well about the content of the lesson that would be explained to the students. Hence, PSTB could not give stimulus to motivate them to learn the lesson. It was in line with Richards and Renandya (2002) who revealed that students are learning English in school because it is a must. It creates motivation is extremely difficult part for teacher. In addition, Thornes (2009) argued that “motivation is regarded by experienced and inexperienced teachers alike as a prerequisite for effective learning, and the greatest challenge that many teachers face is to make their students want to learn” (p.44).

Taking attendance. Two of three participants faced problem in taking attendance of the students. There were pre-service teacher B (PSTB) and pre-service teacher (PSTC). PSTB and PSTC planned taking attendance in the beginning of the lesson in the lesson plan. In the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB did not take attendance because the number of the students was a little and PSTB was shocked and confused at that time. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTB. “...in the second meeting, I forgot to take attendance

because the students who came only a few of them. I was shocked and confused when some students left. The others had gone home”, said PSTB. Furthermore, pre-service teacher C (PSTC) forgot to take attendance in every single meeting in the beginning of the lesson. It was supported by the interview with PSTC. PSTC said, “...the lesson was closer to time break. Sometime I was in a hurry because of the materials and I had to prepare the materials first so that I forgot to take attendance...”.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB and PSTC could not implement taking attendance in the beginning of the lesson. They forgot to take attendance in the beginning of the lesson. It was in line with Credé, Roch and Kieszczynka (2010) who revealed that “both students and some educational researchers appear to be somewhat skeptical of the importance of class attendance” (p.272).

Summarizing/concluding the lesson. It was only pre-service teacher A (PSTA) faced problem of summary/conclude the lesson. PSTA planned concluding the lesson in the lesson plan. In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA was difficult to ensure the students toward understanding the lesson. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTA. “E.. One of the problems was like...to conclude and make sure the students whether they did not understand yet for closing. It was caused by students’ attention...”, said PSTA.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA could not implement summarizing or concluding the lesson well based on what PSTA wrote in the lesson plan. PSTA was difficult to summarize or conclude the lesson to the students because the students were less attention to PSTA. It was supported by

Harmer (1998) who mentioned that “teacher needs to get the students’ attention. This can sometimes be difficult, especially when the teacher try to draw a speaking activity to a conclusion” (p. 18).

Homework. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned giving homework as closing activity in the lesson plan in two meetings. Unfortunately, the teacher from the school did not allow PSTA to give homework. It was maintained by the interview with PSTA. PSTA said “Oh.. The reason why was from the principal of the school. Emm.. She said that it did not need to give homework because we had not been sure e.. The material was same and met with the same students again. It was like me, I taught class 10 but I also moved to the other class...”.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA could not implement giving homework to the students because of factor from the principal of school. There was an instruction from the teacher that did not need to give homework for the student. The reason was PSTA had not been sure to teach at the same class and meet the same students again.

Feedback of the lesson. Two of three participants faced problem in giving feedback of the lesson. There were pre-service teacher B (PSTB) and pre-service teacher (PSTC). PSTB and PSTC planned giving feedback in the lesson plan. Based on the observation, in the first meeting of PSTB’s class on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB was difficult to give feedback of the lesson to the students. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTB. “...I did not ask feedback to the students like what we had learned today, what the materials that you got because some of the students asked me to went home early for attending the organization meeting”, said PSTB. Then, in the second meeting of PSTC’s class on May 14th, 2016 at XI

IPA, PSTC was difficult to deliver feedback of the lesson to the students. It was supported by the interview with PSTC. PSTC said, "...sometimes I was pressured by the students like 'Sir, let us be faster' because it was closer to breaking time...".

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB and PSTC could not implement giving feedback of the lesson well based on what they wrote in the lesson plan. It could be seen from the students who asked them to finish the lesson early. It was in line with Duncan (2007) as cited by Ako (2009) who pointed that "students do not pay attention to comments because they don't make sense to them or that they do not understand the purpose of the feedback process" (p.4).

Finding 3: Time allocation was not fulfilled well based on lesson plan.

All of the participants faced problem in time allocation. There were pre-service teacher A (PSTA), pre-service teacher B (PSTB), and pre-service teacher C (PSTC). PSTA, PSTB, and PSTC could not implement time allocation based on the lesson plans.

Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned 90 minutes to teach at each class. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes). In fact, in the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA spent 30 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 20 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTA spent 5 minutes for exploration, 15 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation. While in the second meeting on April 18th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTA

spent 45 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 35 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTA spent 5 minutes for exploration, 35 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation.

Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) planned 90 minutes to teach at both of class in one meeting. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes). In fact, in the first meeting on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB spent 33 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 3 minutes, developmental activity was 27 minutes, and closing activity was 3 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTB spent 5 minutes for exploration, 20 minutes for elaboration, and 2 minutes for confirmation. While in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB spent 50 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 40 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTB spent 5 minutes for exploration, 30 minutes for elaboration, and 5 minutes for confirmation.

Pre-service teacher C (PSTC) planned 90 minutes teaching at both of class in one meeting. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 70 minutes, and closing activity was 10 minutes. Developmental activity consisted of exploration (20 minutes), elaboration (40 minutes), confirmation (10 minutes). In fact, in the first meeting on May 9th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC spent 90 minutes teaching at the class. Opening activity was 10 minutes, developmental activity was 77 minutes, and closing activity was 3 minutes. In the developmental activity,

PSTC spent 5 minutes for exploration, 62 minutes for elaboration, and 10 minutes for confirmation. While in the second meeting on May 14th, 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC spent 70 minutes to teach at the class. Opening activity was 5 minutes, developmental activity was 60 minutes, and closing activity was 5 minutes. In the developmental activity, PSTC spent 5 minutes for exploration, 45 minutes for elaboration, and 10 minutes for confirmation.

In two meetings, PSTA was difficult to manage time allocation. It was maintained by the interview with PSTA. "...the other difficulties might be like time management with the activities...", said PSTA. In addition, PSTA said, "...I thought that when I entered the class I was able to explain the lesson or stimulate the students. However, I waited the students at that time. For example, maybe they would be back to the class 15 up to 20 minutes again. When I entered the class, they were only 2 up to 4 students so I had to wait them". While in the first meeting of PSTB's class on April 21st, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB was difficult to manage the time in understanding the lesson. Besides, PSTB was also difficult to manage the time because of her lateness entering the class. It was maintained by the interview with PSTB who said "I was difficult e.. to manage the time because I usually confused in giving the lesson whether it was too long or not and giving task to the students whether they had understood or not...in the first meeting I suffered calamity on my vehicle so that I taught late enough. My lateness caused teaching and learning process did not work well...time for opening, lesson explanation, exercises for the students, and closing were not appropriate with the lesson plan...in the second meeting, I preferred to give long time for the students to do the tasks." Then, in the second meeting of PSTC's class on May 14th, 2016

at XI IPA, PSTC lacked of time management in teaching and learning process. It was supported by the interview with PSTC. PSTC said, "...because of time allocation in the lesson plan was 90 minutes but sometimes on the implementation was 70 minutes. It happened because there was lack of the activity and I did not add additional activity as another plan...."

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA, PSTB, and PSTC could not implement the time allocation well based on what they wrote in the lesson plan. They suffered many remainder times. It was maintained by Burden and Byrd (2010) who revealed that "Some students may be daydreaming or be off task, so the time spent in learning is less that allocated time. Students often are off task in rather obvious way, such as getting out of their seats, reading notes or materials, or talking to other students. Off-task behavior can often manifest itself in daydreaming or other forms of mental or emotional disengagement that may be difficult to detect" (p.45). In addition, it was supported by Harmer (1998) who pointed that one of many comments is about discipline. The people who dislike bad behavior most are not teacher, but other students who feel their time is being wasted.

The Strategies Used by EED of UMY Pre-service Teachers to overcome the Problems on the Implementation of Lesson Plan at SMA Muhammadiyah 6 Yogyakarta

This part presents and discusses strategies to overcome the problems on the implementation of lesson plan. The researcher found some strategies to overcome the problems on the implementation of lesson plan. The strategies could overcome the problems on the implementation of lesson plan.

Finding 4: Using alternative teaching aids to conduct teaching and learning process.

Based on the observation, two of participants used some alternative teaching aids to conduct teaching and learning process. In the lesson plan pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI* as teaching aids but the teaching aids did not use in conducting teaching and learning process. PSTA used alternative teaching aids to conduct teaching and learning process. In the first meeting on April 9th, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTA borrowed her friend's laptop to conduct teaching and learning process because her laptop did not work well. It was caused by HDMI cable that did not connect to LCD. It was maintained by the interview with PSTA. "...there, I borrowed my friend's laptop and finally it could be used", said PSTA. In addition, PSTA said, "...at that time I did not plan using cards. After I thought and got a new idea to decide using cards. I also had talked with the teacher to change the teaching aid and she said ok." Moreover, in two meetings, pre-service teacher B (PSTB) planned *LKS Kreatif Bahasa Inggris untuk SMA Kelas XI*, Interlanguage; English for Senior High School Students XI, and book dictionary. PSTB did not use those teaching aids at the class. PSTB used laptop and LCD that had been available at the class. PSTB tried to answer some questions of the meaning of some words through electronic dictionary in laptop because PSTB forgot to bring dictionary. Finally, PSTB could answer their questions. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTB "...I tried to answer those questions from the students through electronic dictionary in my laptop and finally I could answer their questions", said PSTB.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA and PSTB could implement alternative teaching aids to overcome the problems of materials or teaching aids on the implementation of lesson plan. Those alternatives materials or teaching aids could be implemented well. It was reinforced by Burden and Byrd (2010) who stated that teachers should list and prepare the materials that will be needed during the lesson such as, textbooks, additional resources books, hands out, filmstrips, videotapes, audiotapes, audio visual equipment, maps, pictures, posters, globes, charts, supplies, laboratory equipment, bulletin boards, and other items. In addition, teacher should make final decision in their lesson plan and make sure that the items required will be available on the day time of the class (Burden & Byrd, 2010). Furthermore, it was in line by Burden and Byrd (2010) that teacher might choose to change the method of an activity to have students' works in pair instead of individually, or teachers might reduce one activity and increase something totally different. In addition, it was reinforced by Zheng and Wang (2016) who stated that "electronic dictionaries have become more and more attractive, accepted and popular to EFL (English for Foreign Language) learners at different levels, using electronic dictionaries in EFL classroom has gradually become an alternative to many. Most recently, electronic dictionaries have become available on mobile devices such as smartphones and tablet computers" (p. 144).

Finding 5: Adjusting some activities that attached in the lesson plan.

Understanding the lesson to motivate the students' learning. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) planned to motivate the students in the opening activity in the lesson plan. Based on the observation, in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016

at XI IPS, PSTB tried to understand the lesson at that time that would be taught to the students so that PSTB could motivate them in learning. It was maintained by the interview from PSTB. PSTB said, “.....I tried to understand the lesson that would be taught. Therefore, I was not confused to motivate the students.....”.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB could implement motivating the students to learn the lesson by trying to understand the lesson itself first. PSTB asked some questions to the students related to the lesson. As the result, the students were enthusiast to learn the lesson.

Taking attendance in the end of the class. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) and pre-service teacher C (PSTC) planned to take attendance in the beginning of the lesson in the lesson plan. Unfortunately, they did not take attendance in the beginning of the lesson but they took attendance in the end of the class. Based on the observation, in the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB tried to be calm and professional after she knew that the students who attended to the class just 5 students. PSTB put their names in the end of the class because still remembered their names. It was maintained by the interview with PSTB. “...I tried to be calm and professional and I took attendance in the end of class because I still remembered their names who attended to the class at that time”, said PSTB. Besides, PSTC did the same thing with PSTB. PSTC took attendance in the end of class by asking the students about their names because PSTC did not remember their names. It was supported by the interview with PSTC. “...before the lesson began, I should prepare the materials well then at that time I took attendance in the end of the class. I asked their names and then I put their names in the attendance list...”, said PSTC.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB and PSTC could implement taking attendance in the end of the class. They put the students' name in the attendance list. It was not in line with any theories because taking attendance must be implemented in the beginning of the lesson not in the end of the class.

Guiding students to summarize/conclude the lesson. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned giving summary or conclusion about the lesson to the students. They faced problem in summarizing or concluding the lesson so that PSTA used a strategy to overcome the problem. Based on the observation, in two meetings, PSTA did some ways to overcome the problem of summarize the lesson, PSTA asked the students to conclude the lesson and then PSTA helped them to conclude the lesson, too. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTA. "I was like guiding them. Ok, today we learned.....", said PSTA.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA could guide the students to summarize or conclude the lesson. As like that, the students were forced to understand what the lesson they had learned. In the end, they could summary the lesson by themselves well. It was in line with Scrivener (2005) who argued teachers sit down and wait for the class to conclude the lesson in its own time, waiting until students show that they are ready for the teacher to begin. In addition, it was supported by Burden and Byrd (2010) who stated effective teachers plan to discontinue the developmental part of the lesson a few minutes before the end of the class period to convey sufficient time for the content closing and the procedural closing of a lesson.

Cancelling to give homework to the students. Pre-service teacher A (PSTA) planned giving homework to the students in the lesson plan. Unfortunately, PSTA canceled the plan of homework in the closing activity because the principal of the school did not allow PSTA to give the homework to the students. It was reinforced by the interview with PSTA. “Yes...the principal of the school asked me to delete the activity of giving homework”, said PSTA. Then, PSTA deleted the activity in the lesson plan.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTA could not implement giving homework to the students. There was an instruction from the teacher that it did not need to give the homework. Due to those reasons, PSTA cancelled giving the homework to the students.

Asking students one by one and making group activity to give feedback of the lesson. Pre-service teacher B (PSTB) and pre-service teacher (PSTC) planned giving feedback of the lesson in the lesson plan. Unfortunately they were difficult to implement giving feedback of the lesson so that they used some ways to be able to give feedback. Based on the observation, PSTB and PSTC did some ways to give the lesson. In the second meeting on April 23rd, 2016 at XI IPS, PSTB come to the students and asked them some questions one by one related to the lesson. Besides, PSTB got firm to the students so that they were willing to wait a minute to give feedback. It was maintained by the interview with PSTB. “...in giving the lesson I asked the students whether they had understood or not...sometimes the students had not understood and they were shy to ask questions so that I came to them for asking some questions one by one”, said PSTB. Besides, in the second activity on May 14th 2016 at XI IPA, PSTC made

group discussion as a way to be able to give feedback. It was supported by the interview with PSTC. “In the closing activity, it could be used interesting activity for example group activity”, said PSTC.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that PSTB and PSTC could implement giving feedback by asking student’s one by one and making group activity could be implemented in giving feedback of the lesson. The students would concentrate if they were asked some question one by one. Besides, by making group activity, PSTC would be easier to give feedback of the lesson to them. It was in line with Harris (1991) as cited in Lestari (2010) who revealed that teacher should ask the students one by one to make the students more responsible for producing something rather than just giving attention throughout teaching and learning process. In addition, it was sustained by Harmer (1998) who highlighted that using pair work and group work with large groups, it is essential to give instruction clearly, to agree how to end the activity and to provide good feedback.

Finding 6: Re-arranging time allocation.

Pre-service teacher A (PSTA), pre-service teacher B (PSTB), and pre-service teacher C (PSTC) overcome problem of time allocation by using some strategies. Based on the observation, two of the participants tried to re-organize the time allocation in each activity. They were PSTA and PSTB. PSTA gave time limitation in each activity. It was maintained by the interview with PSTA. “E...Yes...giving time limitation in each activity”, said PSTA. Besides, it was sustained by the interview with PSTB. “For example, 20 minutes were used to do assignments. After 20 minutes, my students and I directly discussed the assignments in order the time was more organized”, said PSTB. However, PSTC

chose to add additional activities to fill the reminding time by discussing with the students. It was reinforced by the interview from PSTC. "...adding some activities to fill reminding time by doing discussion", said PSTC.

Based on the result above, it can be concluded that listing time allocation could be implemented to overcome the problem of time allocation on the lesson plan. Besides, adding some activities such as discussion between pre-service teacher and the students also could be implemented to overcome the time allocation on the implementation of lesson plan. Those ways were implemented by PSTA and PSTC at the class. It was in line with Burden and Byrd (2010) who highlighted that "consider a 45-minutes class. Within this allocated time, 5 minutes may be spent on taking attendance and making announcements, 5 minutes on describing an activity and giving directions, and 5 minutes for clean-up and preparation to finish the class. That leaves 30 minutes of actual academic time, but students may not even be fully engaged during all the time" (p.45). In addition, it was supported by Scrivener (2005) who investigated that it is like a good method of adding variety to a lesson, sitting in one place for a long time is able to be difficult, getting people to do physical things is able to be a good method of waking up their mental powers.