

**Premiere Educandum: Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar dan Pembelajaran**

Volume 11 (2) 313 – 329 December 2021

ISSN: 2088-5350 (Print) / ISSN: 2528-5173 (Online)

Doi: 10.25273/pe.v11i2.10419

The article is published with Open Access at: <http://e-journal.unipma.ac.id/index.php/PE>

## Problems met in lesson planning by the pre-service teachers

Joel Ferrer ✉, Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College

✉ [joelferrer1970@gmail.com](mailto:joelferrer1970@gmail.com)

**Abstract:** This study attempted to evaluate the problems met in lesson planning by the pre-service teachers of Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Sta. Maria Main Campus, Philippines during the three consecutive School Years from 2018-2020. The descriptive survey method with the questionnaire constructed by the researcher was the main data instrument with a reliability coefficient of 0.81. Total enumeration was employed with 108 cooperating teachers from six (6) different public elementary schools and 114 pre-service teachers. Findings of the study revealed that respondents find the formulation objectives, selection of subject matter, and implementation stage as slightly serious. On the significant difference in the problems met in lesson planning by the students and the teachers, there exist a significant difference along with the area on Assignment. A correlation between the planning and implementation stage or vice versa was also found out.

**Keywords:** pre-service teaching, lesson planning

**Received** 15 September 2021; **Accepted** 29 November 2021; **Published** 31 December 2021

**Citation:** Ferrer, J. (2021). Problems met in lesson planning by the pre-service teachers. *Premiere Educandum : Jurnal Pendidikan Dasar dan Pembelajaran*, 11(1), 313 – 329. Doi.org/10.25273/pe.v11i2.10419



Published by Universitas PGRI Madiun. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

## INTRODUCTION

In the traditional school, the teacher is an important figure in the classroom. He is the source of knowledge and information. Because of this role, the teacher must be a subject matter expert and should see that s/he gets the desired competency among the children.

When the pre-service teachers are asked about their difficulties in practice teaching are, one of the usual answers given is “making lesson plans”. Some Cooperating teachers complain that the students do not know how to make lesson plans when they should have been taught how and what principles and methods, they’ll use in teaching classes. The purpose of a lesson plan is really to communicate.

Lesson planning starts from the formulation of objectives, it is empirical that they should master the requirement of objectives which stands for the acronym “SMART” and should be suited to the subject matter which also requires the kind of materials to be used in the execution of the plan. It was discovered by (Nwike & Catherine, 2013) that students who were taught using instructional materials performed better than students who were not taught using instructional materials. Exposing the students to the use of instructional materials according to (Effiong & Igiri, 2015) will result in a positive outcome that will improve the effectiveness of the teaching-learning process. According to (Notar et al., 2004), there should be a taxonomy of objectives to help and remind pre-service and full-pledged teachers to avoid relying excessively on just one level such as simple recall of factual knowledge. (Boikhutso, 2010) observed that student-teachers had various challenges in communicating educational objectives. Instructional objectives may also connote the time to complete the learning task, (LW et al., 2001) stated that there is a need to set a time frame for completion and achievement of specific learning objectives. (Hoffman, 2013) stipulated that the objective should be related to the lesson's content, correspond to the practice exercise, and match with the assessment and evaluation. A test/assessment for (Carpenter, 2012) test/assessment can recall knowledge and aid in memory and information retention. (Campbell & Evans, 2000) discovered that pre-service teachers do not adhere to the assessment or evaluation techniques outlined in their plan. A formative assessment is given after the lesson (Black & Wiliam, 1998) is mainly effective but it’s not well understood by teachers and is weak in practice. An evaluation for (ZainSudin et al., 2012) should base on the Difficulty Index (DI) methodology as an additional method for measuring the accomplishments of the learning outcomes.

A good introduction to the lesson can direct the overall focus of the day's lesson. The use of drills, review, and motivation must also be given attention for the mastery of the lesson. An introduction for (*Strategies for Effective Lesson Planning Stiliana Milkova Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, n.d.*) keeps students' attention and concentration on the class and its goals and can persuade them. (Swan & Burkhardt, n.d.) will establish the tone of the session and define the overall structure of the class, the materials required, and the given time. Knowledge in implementing a drill according to (Pensyarah Kanan Pusat Pengajian Umum et al., n.d.) can attain a maximum degree of abilities that ensures learning is retained in memory. For (Kani & Sa’ad, 2015) drilling is a strategy that focuses on skill learning while also

improving students' psychomotor abilities. (Bjork1994, n.d.) states that students need a review lesson because teachers believe that some students perform adequately in the class, may quickly forget the lessons. For (Filgona et al., 2020), learning success is determined by whether or not the learners are motivated. To facilitate the teaching-learning process (Irvine, 2009), lessons must be presented by a speaker or presenter and not just taken entirely from a book or by just simply memorizing the content.

The use of generalization according to (Kent & Mackay, 2008), may be improved in a social skills curriculum by designing lessons that provide specific information on ideas, written words, colors, or objects. According to (Maryani et al., 2017) lack of pedagogical knowledge in teaching skills can impair the capacity to design learning, and considerable efforts must be made to train prospective teachers. However, to (Alger, 2006), possessing a skill does not always entail being able to apply it.

To complete and implement the parts of a lesson, pre-service and full-pledged teachers (Paschal et al., 1984) determined that assigning homework had the greatest impact if completed homework/assignments were credited or given feedback.

Lesson planning in this study is mainly categorized into two phases, the planning, and implementation stages. However, owing to meetings, professional training, and other school events, according to (Emiliasari & Jubaedah, 2019) not all activities provided in the lesson plan may be implemented. (Berke et al., 2006), stipulated that failure to put plans in action has long been regarded as a fundamental impediment to good planning.

As long as students are taking up a degree in Education, there are always pre-service teachers that need to be taught how to logically arrange the teaching and learning processes. Successful mentors are invariably good planners and thinkers. The way to success requires commitment and practice, especially of those skills involved in planning lessons and managing classroom behaviors. Lesson planning is a fundamental skill all teachers must develop.

The knowledge and skills of pre-service teachers particularly on how they plan and implement the teaching-learning process mirror the kind of institution they came from and the kind of teachers who imparted the knowledge to them.

The above-mentioned implications are just but a few problems for considerations to be learned by future teachers.

## **METHODS**

### **Design**

The study is descriptive as it analyzed the problems met in lesson planning by the pre-service teachers as assessed by themselves and their cooperating teachers. Concerning the following areas considered such as in the a) planning stage namely, formulating and developing stage, and selection of subject matter. b) implementation stage such as introduction, drill, review, motivation, presentation and discussion, generalization, application/practice exercise, evaluation, and assignment. The correlation was also utilized to determine the relationship between the planning and implementation stages.

## Participants

The respondents of this study were the pre-service teachers and their cooperating teachers from 2018 to 2020. Total enumeration was employed. There were 114 pre-service teachers and 108 cooperating teachers from six public elementary schools from six different public elementary schools.

## Data Gathering

The research instrument used in this study was a questionnaire constructed by the researcher as the main data instrument with a reliability coefficient of 0.81. The instrument consisted of the planning and implementation stage. The planning stage consisted of formulating/ developing objectives and selection of subject matter while in the implementation were introduction, drill, review, motivation, presentation and discussion, generalization, evaluation, and assignment. In gathering the data, the researcher sought permission from the authorities through channels. Proper coordination with the heads of schools was done during the distribution and retrieval of the questionnaire.

## Data Treatment

After the retrieval of the accomplished questionnaire, responses were presented in table form. The interpretation of data gathered from the questionnaire was based on the following statistical computation, weighted mean, t-test, and Spearman rank correlation were used to treat the data.

## RESULTS

A lesson plan always begins with written specific objectives that lead to the description of a learning outcome. Objectives in a plan direct the students on what should be done to learn. Although objectives are prepared and planned by the teacher it is intended for the learners. For the learners to be developed holistically, objectives should comprise the three domains in learning such as cognitive, affective, and psychomotor.

As shown in table 1, criteria number 3, "Difficulty in simplifying objectives related to student's development" obtained a weighted mean rating of 3.00 (MS). It is noticeable that cooperating teachers agreed to the problems encountered by their pre-service teachers. This connotes that both the respondents perceived the problem that has an impact on the pre-service teachers. This is a common problem because of the so-called language barrier. English is not a mother tongue of the Filipinos, then the outright deficiency is on communication skills. Further, a specific behavioral objective directs what the students should do. (Notar et al., 2004) pointed out there should be a list or taxonomy of objectives to help and remind teachers and pre-service teachers to set a variety of objectives and to avoid relying excessively on just one level such as simple recall of factual knowledge. Criterion number 7 is also described as "moderately serious" with a weighted mean of 2.94. The criteria assess the competency of the pre-service teachers in the formulation of objectives which is related to the expected skills or along with the psychomotor domain. It is true and safe to assume that pre-service teachers have the level of difficulty in using a verb as the core of objectives, that is, objectives using a verb refers to the psychomotor domain of learning. There is a need therefore to expose the pre-service teachers' respondents on the

taxonomy of objectives relating to skills. However, (Boikhutso, 2010) concluded that student-teachers faced numerous difficulties in articulating instructional objectives. The study of (Nwike & Catherine, 2013) found out that students who were taught using instructional materials did better than students who were not taught with instructional resources. Criterion number 8, refers to the actual specification of good objectives embodied in the acronym SMART, where “T” pertains to “Timebound”. A good objective should be formulated with a limit/time specification so that students will learn in a given time. The said criteria got a weighted mean of 1.12 (NP) from the respondents. The findings justify that they were fully oriented in the theory of learning which states that “learners learn during the specific limit of time” hence lesson plans should be well calculated in a manner that those objectives shall be delimited to the span of interest of the learners in a given time. Time-bound learning experiences nurture learner autonomy, make experiences relevant and encourage learners to incorporate new knowledge into existing practices. (LW et al., 2001) stipulated that there is a need to specify a time to complete and achieve and certain learning objectives.

**TABLE 1.** Degree of seriousness of the problems met on planning stage along formulating and developing objectives

Planning Stage	Pre-Service Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	WM	DR
A. Formulating/Developing Objectives				
1. Difficulty in identifying measurable objectives.	1.65	NP 1.95	NP 1.80	NP
2. Difficulty in composition skills (e.g. grammar).	2.05	SS 2.06	SS 2.06	SS
3. Difficulty in simplifying objectives as required in teaching content.	3.00	MS 3.00	MS 3.00	MS
4. Difficulty in identifying objectives related to student’s development	1.37	NP 1.37	NP 1.37	NP
5. Difficulty in constructing objectives which can describe the cognitive domain	1.17	SS 1.18	SS 1.18	SS
6. Difficulty in constructing objectives which can describe the behavior of learners.	1.10	NP 1.13	NP 1.12	NP
7. Difficulty in preparing objectives which can describe skills.	2.93	MS 2.94	MS 2.94	MP
8. Difficulty in preparing objectives which is time bound.	1.10	NP 1.13	NP 1.12	NP
Overall	1.80	NP 1.85	SS 1.82	SS

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

Under Table 2, The findings confirmed that criterion number 4, “Difficulty in selecting instructional materials suited to the subject matter” was described as “Not A problem” with a weighted mean of 1.31. Since the pre-service teachers knew how to classify lessons in the three domains of learning, it’s easy for them already to select the appropriate instructional materials suited for the subject matter especially nowadays that they can surf the internet. The overall weighted average mean along the selection of subject matter was described as

“slightly serious” with an overall mean of 2.02. However, the knowledge of the pre-service teachers along the classifying lessons in the three domains of learning as well as on the selection of instructional materials suited to the subject matter makes them easy to cope with the problems that might be encountered in the planning stage in lesson planning. It is further implied that pre-service teachers’ knowledge in selecting instructional materials can make lessons more effective and provide learners with a variety of learning experiences and activities. The effect of instructional materials in teaching and learning according to (Effiong & Igiri, 2015) that if students are exposed to instructional material during their lesson would reveal a positive achievement result and can enhance effective teaching and learning process.

**TABLE 2.** Degree of seriousness of the problems met on planning stage along with selection of a subject matter

Planning Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
B. Selection of a Subject Matter						
1. Difficulty in classifying lessons in the three domains of learning.	1.69.	NP	1.71	NP	1.70	NP
2. Difficulty in classifying objectives based on the taxonomy of hierarchy about the subject matter.	2.08	SS	2.09	SS	2.09	SS
3. Difficulty in analyzing teaching content. subject matter.	2.901	MS	2.91	MS	2.91	MS
4. Difficulty in selecting instructional materials suited to the subject matter.	1.30	NP	1.31	NP	1.31	NP
5. Difficulty in establishing the logical relationship between objectives, subject matter, and the instructional needed.	1.89	SS	2.28	SS	2.09	SS
Overall	1.97	SS	2.06	SS	2.02	SS

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

In Table 3, the pre-service teachers identified criteria number 1, “Difficulty in introducing the basic idea of the lesson with a mean score rating of 1.65 described as “Not a Problem”. Their cooperating teachers also described this criterion as “not a problem” of the pre-service teachers with a mean score rating of 1.67. Seemingly, pre-service teachers were not hard-up in introducing the basic idea of the lesson. This conveyed the impression that pre-service teachers can present the lesson to the learners with competency. An introduction will set the atmosphere of the lesson, this can be attributed to the fact that pre-service respondents were trained to the so-called “springboard of the lesson with proper motivation.” It is also noted that during their deployment, they were conversant in presenting the basic knowledge of the lesson. Further, pre-service knew the importance of introducing the basic idea of the lesson. An introduction sustains the interest and focus of the students on the lesson and its purposes and convinces them (Strategies for Effective Lesson Planning Stiliania Milkova Center for Research on Learning and Teaching, n.d.) that they will learn from it. She pointed out that to formulate a creative introduction to the lesson that can enhance the focus and encourage thinking, develop an introduction that uses different approaches to involve students in a discussion such as the use of personal anecdote, historical event, thought-provoking dilemma, real-world example, short video clip, practical application, probing question, etc. Criterion number 3 “Difficulty in identifying skills-oriented lesson” was found to be a problem of the pre-service teachers,

with a mean score rating of 2.86, described as moderately serious (MS) which was also attested by the cooperating teacher with a little bit higher mean score rating of 2.89 as compared from the given mean from the pre-service teachers, but still described as “moderately serious”. The problem of identifying a skill lesson that is a part of an art of teaching is normally missing of the pre-service teachers since they were still a beginner. The lack of pedagogical knowledge according to (Maryani et al., 2017), can affect the ability to design learning and there must be extensive efforts to educate prospective teachers with pedagogical understanding about the skills in teaching. However, having a skill according to (Alger, 2006)) does not always imply being able to use it. The overall mean of 2.14 along “Introduction” described as “slightly serious,” may imply that this is just a matter of adjustment of the pre-service teachers. They must be reminded that pre-service teachers may consider the age, background, and interest of the students before introducing the basic idea of the lesson. Therefore, teachers and beginning teachers may carefully plan on how to introduce or demonstrate the topic. An introduction according to (Swan & Burkhardt, n.d.) will set the atmosphere of the lesson and describe the overall framework of the class, the resources necessary, and the time allotted.

**TABLE 3** Degree of Seriousness of the Problems Met on Implementation Stage along with Introduction

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
A. Introduction						
1. Difficulty in introducing the basic idea of the lesson.	1.65	NP	1.67	NP	1.66	NP
2. Difficulty in formulating behavioral objectives which can enhance learner’s interest.	2.05	SS	2.06	SS	2.06	SS
3. Difficulty in identifying skills-oriented lesson.	2.86	MS	2.89	MS	2.88	MS
4. Difficulty in establishing relationship between skills, procedures and practices.	2.24	SS	2.26	SS	2.25	SS
5. Difficulty in demonstrating skill lessons presented.	1.85	SS	1.85	SS	1.85	SS
Overall	2.13	SS	2.15	SS	2.14	SS

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

For Table 4, criterion number 1 “Difficulty in preparing a list of words and statements needed in a drill and criterion number 5 “Difficulty in connecting ideas from a review” with a weighted average mean rating of 1.60 and 1.63 respectively both described as ‘Not a Problem’. In a similar analysis of the problem, pre-service teachers can formulate questions that can solicit the automatic response from the learners. On the other hand, criterion number 5 is a dual ability to determine correctly from a review taken before, the drill question can strengthen the stimulus-response relationship in the mind of the learners. Those findings would reveal that the awareness of the pre-service teachers in preparing the list of words and statements needed in a drill and connecting the ideas from a review may simply agree with the idea of Pensyarah Kanan Pusat Pengajian Umum et al., n.d.) that knowledge in implementing a drill can achieve a maximum level of skills that makes learning remains in memory. For (Kani & Sa’ad, 2015) explains that drilling is a

technique that is commonly used in the classroom to teach various subjects that focuses on skill acquisition and enhance students' psychomotor abilities which are very crucial in education. As a total picture of the said table, the overall mean of 2.01 is still in the negligible level of problem, it being slightly serious but still exists, hence the need to consider by the cooperating teachers and the deploying college to discuss it during a local training session.

**TABLE 4.** Degree of seriousness of the problems met on implementation stage along with drill

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
<b>B. Drill</b>						
1. Difficulty in preparing list of words and statements needed in a drill.	1.59	NP	1.61	NP	1.60	NP
2. Difficulty in using the drill method in teaching.	2.10	SS	2.10	SS	2.10	SS
3. Difficulty in evaluating results of a drill method of teaching.	2.56	SS	2.52	SS	2.54	SS
4. Difficulty in identifying the difference of a drill from a review.	2.09	SS	2.29	SS	2.19	SS
5. Difficulty in connecting ideas from a review.	1.61	NP	1.64	NP	1.63	NP
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1.99</b>	<b>SS</b>	<b>2.03</b>	<b>SS</b>	<b>2.01</b>	<b>SS</b>

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

**TABLE 5.** Degree of the seriousness problems met on implementation stage along with review

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
<b>C. Review</b>						
1. Difficulty in listing items for review.	1.77	NP	1.81	NP	1.79	NP
2. Difficulty in relating the review guide to the present subject matter.	1.94	SS	1.96	SS	1.95	SS
3. Limited materials for review.	1.69	NP	1.70	NP	1.70	NP
4. Difficulty in delimiting time for review.	1.32	NP	1.36	NP	1.34	NP
5. Difficulty in differentiating review from motivation.	1.64	NP	1.68	NP	1.66	NP
<b>Overall</b>	<b>1.67</b>	<b>SS</b>	<b>1.70</b>	<b>NP</b>	<b>1.69</b>	<b>NP</b>

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40



Under Table 5, Out of the five criteria, there were four criteria described as “not a problem”, in which criterion number 4, “Difficulty in delimiting time for review” got the lowest average mean of 1.34. The table manifests that allotting time for review is not a problem on the part of the pre-service teachers. This is also justified by the overall mean of 1.69, not a problem. The findings can be attributed to the fact that the respondents of this study are good teachers with unquestionable knowledge in implementing the plan along with the review. In the same vein, pre-service teachers are aware of the importance of review (Bjork1994, n.d.) states that, if the students perform well in the lesson itself or the class, teachers may think that they also perform effectively, however, students quickly forget the lessons once they left the classroom. With this scenario, it can be concluded that failure for a teacher to conduct a review before every start of classes may result in a decrease in the retention of the knowledge learned. Review connects the current lesson to the previous lesson.

Table 6 manifested that out of five criteria there were three described as “not a problem”. Criterion number 5 was the lowest among them with an average mean of 1.54. This may explain that this criterion is related to the “motive question”. Hence this may prove to the use of Socratic questioning which can simply evaluate their impression regarding the new lesson. This may also connote that the respondents have the competency to introduce the ideas tagged as “motive question”, thus reducing the related problem to a level of “slightly serious”. In summation, an overall mean of 2.15 was reached which justifies that the connecting ideas as “motive question” does not pose a problem at all. It further implies that pre-service teachers are ready to work with young people. For (Filgona et al., 2020) motivation is an influential factor in teaching-learning situations. The success of learning depends on whether or not the learners are motivated. Motivation drives learners in reaching learning goals. It is important to recognize the fact that motivating learning is a central element of good teaching. In the same vein, the result in criterion number 5, pre-service teachers would simply agree on the idea of motivation that if you want to get the attention and get the learners to think, it is for the teacher to plan for it.

**TABLE 6** Degree of the Seriousness of the Problems Met on Implementation Stage Along with Motivation

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	WM	DR
D. Motivation				
1. Limited knowledge in motivating learners.	1.78	NP	1.82	NP
2. Difficulty in motivating learners as far as new lesson is concerned.	2.07	SS	2.08	SS
3. Difficulty in presenting a motivating statement.	2.82	MS	2.85	MS
4. Difficulty in formulating leading questions that will get the attention/interest of the learners	2.50	SS	2.52	SS
5. Limited idea in constructing motive question.	1.53	NP	1.55	NP
Overall	2.14	SS	2.16	NP

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

For Table 7, under presentation and discussion, criteria number 1 and 5 got a weighted mean rating of 1.79 and 1.63 respectively and both were described as “not a problem”. As observed along the criteria considered, pre-service teachers can conquer the attention of the learners while in session. The findings connote a good impression, that respondents are good speakers who can continually motivate the learners to listen to them intently during the presentation of the subject matter. Further, the pre-service teachers were able to show their prowess in oral/written communication. The findings may conform with the idea of (Irvine, 2009) that this is the phase where the pre-service teachers should be excellent presenters to make the teaching-learning process becomes easy and should be planned and practiced that is not merely taken from a book or simply memorized but must be introduced by a speaker or presenter to an audience.

**TABLE 7.** Degree of seriousness of the problems met on implementation stage along with presentation/discussion

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
E. Presentation and Discussion						
1. Limited ability to use motivation as the spring board of the present subject matter.	1.80	NP	1.78	NP	1.79	NP
2. Limited ability in presenting the logical content of the subject matter.	2.07	SS	2.08	ss	2.08	SS
3. Difficulty in attaining objectives during the presentation.	3.04	MS	2.94	MS	2.99	MS
4. Difficulty in constructing thought-provoking questions leading to the discussions of the lesson.	1.99	SS	2.39	SS	2.19	SS
5 Difficulty in getting the full participation of the students/learners	1.61	NP	1.65	NP	1.63	NP
Overall	2.10	SS	2.17	SS	2.14	SS

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

Out of the five indicators in Table 8, there were 3 found to be described as “not a problem”, these were indicator number 1, “Difficulty in soliciting the main idea of the lesson from the students”, indicator number 3, “: Limited techniques in summarizing the main idea of the lessons. and indicator number 5 “Limited knowledge on how to solicit ideas from the learners” with an average mean of 1.45, 1.24, and 1.12 respectively. It shows that it is not a problem on the part of the pre-service teachers to generalize the lesson by getting the main idea from the learners. The generalization part in lesson planning conforms with the meaning of summarizing a lesson. According to (Kent & Mackay, 2008), generalization can be enhanced in a social skills curriculum by designing the instruction to promote it. It may be most useful to consider a three-part plan for generalization, incorporating modifications before instruction, during instruction, and after instruction. The presence of the three indicators described as “not a problem” reduced the overall mean into a mean of 1.82 described as “slightly serious”. It can be simply said that pre-service teachers knew the significance of generalizing/summarizing the

lesson. Generalization can give chances to the students to fully understand the topics discussed which give specific/clear knowledge on ideas, written words, colors, or materials used in the teaching and learning process.

**TABLE 8.** Degree of the seriousness of the problems met on implementation stage along with generalization

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	WM	DR
<b>F. GENERALIZATION</b>				
1. Difficulty in soliciting the main idea of the lesson from the students.	1.44	NP	1.45	NP
2. Difficulty in formulating questions which can summarize the lesson.	2.45	SS	2.47	SS
3. Limited techniques in summarizing the main idea of the lessons.	1.19	NP	1.29	NP
4. Difficulty in deducing correct concept of the lesson	2.87	SS	2.82	SS
5. Limited knowledge on how to solicit ideas from the learners.	1.15	NP	1.09	NP
Overall	1.82	SS	1.82	SS
<b>Legend:</b> Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40				

**TABLE 9** Degree of the Seriousness of the Problems Met on Implementation Stage Along with Application/Practice Exercise

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers	Cooperating Teachers	WM	DR
<b>G. APPLICATION/PRACTICE EXERCISE</b>				
1. Difficulty in making activities for enrichment and remediation.	2.40	SS	2.40	SS
2. Difficulty in connecting objective of the lesson with the practice/exercises.	2.52	SS	2.57	SS
3. Limited idea or knowledge on how to make test questions to reinforce drill learning.	1.89	NP	1.71	NP
4. Difficulty in getting the level of learning covered in the lesson plan.	1.37	NP	1.39	NP
5. Difficulty in evaluating the activities.	1.31	NP	1.31	NP
Overall	1.90	SS	1.88	SS
<b>Legend:</b> Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40				

Under table 9, there were two criteria described as “slightly serious” and criterion number 2 “Difficulty in connecting objective of the lesson with the practice/exercises” got the highest average mean of 2.55. The result would mean that pre-service teachers dealt

with a minor problem on how to link the instructional objective with the application. Pre-service teachers should always remember the significance of instructional objectives to avoid the inconsistency of the topic from the planning stage up to the implementation phase. The objective is very important according to (Hoffman, 2013) which means that the objective should be connected to the content of the lesson, the objective should jibe with the practice exercise, assessment and evaluation should match with the objectives and instructional material used are congruent with the instructional activities. Out of the five criteria, there were 3 described as “not a problem” such as criterion number 3 “Limited idea or knowledge on how to make test questions to reinforce drill learning with an average mean of 1.80; criterion number 4 “Difficulty in getting the level of learning covered in the lesson plan”, 1.38 and criterion number 5, “Difficulty in evaluating the activities”, with 1.31. The findings imply that pre-service teachers do not have a problem with test construction, expected knowledge to be taken in every topic and how to assess learning activities. With these three criteria described as “not a problem” reduced the difficulty of pre-service along this area on application/practice exercise was only described as “slightly used.”

In Table 10, criterion number 2 “Difficulty in establishing the relationship between the objectives of the lesson and the test items” is described as “slightly serious” with an average mean of 2.22. The finding follows the idea as noted in Table 9 that pre-service teachers also reveal a slight problem in connecting the objective of the lesson with the practice/exercises. This implies further those pre-service teachers are consistent in saying that they encountered slight difficulties in getting the connection between objectives and test items /practice exercises as shown in the previous discussions. It is the evaluation or assessment that can strengthen the retrieval of concepts stored in the memory and monitor the progress of students learning. The findings confirm the study of (Campbell & Evans, 2000) when they examined the lesson plan of three hundred, sixty-nine lesson plans and found out that pre-service teachers do not follow the assessment or evaluation practices written in their plan. A formative assessment according to (Black & Wiliam, 1998) is mainly effective but it’s not well understood by teachers and is weak in practice. (Sadler, 1998) likewise confirmed that after several kinds of research conducted, Black and Williams’s statement remains a problem and needs to conduct more researches on how assessment or evaluation interplay with the teaching-learning process. Of the 2 criteria having a description of “slightly serious” criterion number 3 “Identifying the difficulty index of test items” has the highest average mean of 2.57. This would mean that even if it is a teacher-made test it should always be subjected to getting the level of difficulty. Further, the findings also imply that pre-service teachers should be taught how to compute for the index of difficulty. (ZainSudin et al., 2012) stipulated that as a result, an evaluation based on the Difficulty Index (DI) approach is recommended as an adjunct way for evaluating the LOs’ accomplishments. DI can be used to determine the degree of difficulty of each question or task that students are given. DI values were calculated for both objective and subjective forms of final exam questions, as well as any completed assignments and group activities. Even though the “Evaluation” stage was described as “slightly serious” there were 3 criteria described as “Not a Problem”, such as criterion number 1 “Limited ideas on the basic principles in test construction and evaluation, criterion number 4, “Difficulty in making test which is simple and clear” and criteria number 5 “Difficulty in making the directions for a test” with an average mean of 1.55, 1.51 and 1.59 respectively. These findings revealed that pre-service teachers knew how to construct test items and instructional directions simple and clear. It should be recalled that based on the findings of (Carpenter, 2012) test/assessment can retrieve information and facilitate retention of memory and information.

For Table 11, it is interesting to note that along this stage, pre-service teachers did not encounter any problem, therefore, it is clearly understood that all criteria were described as “not a problem”. This simply means the pre-service of the lesson. However, the assignment shall be checked if it is completely and correctly done to enhance students’

performance and develop the study habits of the learners. (Paschal et al., 1984) concluded that setting homework had the best effect if the completed homework/assignments were credited or provided with feedback.

**TABLE 10.** Degree of seriousness of the problems met on implementation stage along with evaluation

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
H. EVALUATION						
1. Limited ideas on the basic principles in test construction and evaluation.	1.67	NP	1.42	NP	.155	NP
2. Difficulty in establishing the relationship between the objectives of the lesson and the test items.	1.99	SS	2.44	SS	2.22	SS
3. Identifying the difficulty index of test items.	2.57	SS	2.57	SS	2.57	SS
4. Difficulty in making test which is simple and clear.	1.24	NP	1.77	NP	1.51	NP
5. Difficulty in making the directions for a test.	1.10	NP	2.07	SS	1.59	NP
Overall	1.71	SS	2.05	SS	1.89	SS

**Legend:** Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80 Slightly Serious (SS) 1.81-2.26 Moderately Serious (MS) 2.61-3.40

**TABLE 11.** Degree of the Seriousness of the Problems Met on Implementation Stage Along with Assignment

Implementation Stage	Pre-Service Teachers		Cooperating Teachers		WM	DR
I. ASSIGNMENT						
1. Difficulty in identifying the given task adapted to the interest and capability of the learner.	1.50	NP	1.49	NP	1.50	NP
2. Difficulty in providing worthwhile activities.	1.49	NP	1.33	NP	1.41	NP
3. Difficulty in setting up definite learning activities to be carried out such as practical exercises, a project, or follow-up activities.	1.38	NP	1.19	NP	1.29	NP
4. Difficulty in making the assignment that relates to the previous lessons.	1.38	NP	2.85	NP	2.12	NP
5. Difficulty in establishing the relationship between the objectives of the lesson and the assignment.	1.33	NP	1.30	NP	1.32	NP
Overall	1.42	NP	1.63	NP	1.53	NP

Legend: Not a Problem (NP) - 1.00-1.80

Table 12 stipulates that of the 9 activities in the implementation stage, it was revealed that there exists a significant difference in the assessed level of seriousness in the assignment with a p-value of 0.000\*\*. The fact that assignment must be properly communicated during its implementation to provide an impact in its urgency for the

students to comply with it. Nevertheless, it is now seldom to see and/or observed teachers today communicating or doing some sort of explanation of the assignment. They just simply write the assignment on the board or give it orally and expect them to have an answer the next day. Giving assignments according to (Thom, 2020) is observed as more effective than just passive forms of learning and presumed learners for their achievement. With these findings, we can conclude that learning will not be completed without assignments. The findings would particularly be described as “Not a Problem” as revealed in table 11, we can see the difference between the mean score of pre-service teachers with 1.42 as against the assessment of their cooperating teachers with a mean score of 1.63. Since pre-service teachers are still considered students, it can be said that assignments can be considered as simply a routine and an insignificant activity of the lesson. (Ramesh & Rao, 2015) observed that few students are serious about doing their assignments and students will just result to copying. This scenario may describe this act as “the answer of one is the answer of all.”

**TABLE 12.** Significant differences on the problems met in lesson planning by the pre- service teachers themselves and their cooperating teachers

Variables	t-comp	p-value	significance
Planning Stage			
Formulating/ Developing Objectives	0.266	0.984	ns
Selection of the Subject Matter	2.285	0.309	ns
Implementation Stage			
Introduction	-0.257	0.917	ns
Drill	0.846	0.354	ns
Review	0.000	1.000	ns
Motivation	0.093	0.907	ns
Presentation and Discussion	1.286	0.284	ns
Generalization	-0.502	0.751	ns
Application/ Practice Exercise	-0.361	0.240	ns
Evaluation	8.711	0.434	ns
Assignment	3.315	0.000	**

\*\* Difference is significant at 0.05 probability level; ns – not significant

**TABLE 13.** Relationship between planning stage and the implementation stage

Implementation Stage	Planning Stage Formulating/ Developing Objectives	Selection of Subject Matter	Overall
Introduction	0.436**	0.118	0.304**
Drill	-0.091	0.006	-0.042
Review	0.487**	0.064	0.282**
Motivation	0.244**	0.070	0.156*
Presentation and Discussion	0.254**	0.070	0.170*
Generalization	0.348**	0.077	0.224**
Application/ Practice Exercise	-0.012	0.008	-0.013
Evaluation	0.246**	0.120	0.196**
Assignment	0.079	-0.170*	0.177**
Overall	0.429**	0.168*	0.320**

\*\* Correlation is significant at 0.01 (2-tailed)\* Correlation is significant at 0.05 (2-tailed)

Table 13, explains that of the 9 stages along with implementation, there were 7 found to be correlated with the planning stage specifically on formulating/developing objectives. The said 7 stages along implementation were Introduction with a p-value of 0.436\*\*; review with a p-value 0.487\*\*; motivation with a p-value; presentation and

discussion with a p-value of 0.254\*\*; generalization with a p-value of 0.348\*\*; and evaluation with a p-value of 0.246\*\*. However, assignment is correlated to the selection of subject matter which is still under the planning stage, Further, the drill is found not correlated to any variables in the planning stage. Looking at the said table, specifically on the overall that indicates a p-value of 0.320\*\* which is found to be correlated at 0.01 simply infers that good planning will result in good implementation or a result of a good implementation can be achieved through good planning. But there are some incidents according to (Emiliasari & Jubaedah, 2019) that not all activities prepared in the lesson plan may not be implemented due to meetings, professional training, and other school activities. It is also said that the implementation of a lesson plan may depend on the kind of planning, (Berke et al., 2006), explained that failure to put plans into action has long been regarded as a fundamental impediment to good planning. Accordingly, the quality of delivery or implementation may depend upon the quality of planning.

## CONCLUSION

The study only focused on the problems met by pre-service teachers in lesson planning where they assessed their issues on the planning, and implementation stages. Based on the findings, the College should plan and implement strategies on how to teach lesson planning rigidly especially during this time of pandemic in which the conduct of classes is online.

This study is purely descriptive that only examined the problems encountered by the pre-service teachers as assessed by themselves and their cooperating teachers. This study may also employ a qualitative part to accommodate other problems or issues they have encountered in lesson planning.

It must be reminded that lesson planning is not optional. It is a skill that should be mastered by the pre-service teachers before they will be deployed or sent to the different cooperating teachers of the institutions. Failure to master the skills in lesson planning on the part of the students may disqualify them to be deployed.

## REFERENCES

1. Alexander, E. R., & Faludi, A. (1989). Planning and Plan Implementation: Notes on Evaluation Criteria. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 16(2), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.1068/b160127>
2. Berke, P., Backhurst, M., Day, M., Ericksen, N., Laurian, L., Crawford, J., & Dixon, J. (2006). What makes plan implementation successful? An evaluation of local plans and implementation practices in New Zealand. *Environment and Planning B: Planning and Design*, 33(4), 581-600.
3. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *International Journal of Phytoremediation*, 21(1), 7–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102>
4. Boikhutso, K. (2010). The theory into practice dilemma: Lesson planning challenges facing Botswana student-teachers. *Improving Schools*, 13(3), 205–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480210385668>
5. Bjork, R.A. (19194). Memory and metamemory considerations in the training of human beings. In J. Metcalfe and A. Shimamura (Eds.), *Metacognition: Knowing about knowing* (pp. 185-205) Cambridge MA: MIT Press
6. Campbell, C., & Evans, J. A. (2000). Investigation of Preservice Teachers' Classroom Assessment Practices During Student Teaching. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 93(6), 350–355. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220670009598729>

7. Carpenter, S. K. (2012). Testing Enhances the Transfer of Learning. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 21(5), 279–283. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412452728>
8. Effiong, O. E., & Igiri, C. E. (2015). Impact of Instructional Materials in Teaching and Learning of Biology in Senior Secondary Schools in Yakurr LG A. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, 62, 27–33. <https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ilshs.62.27>
9. Emiliasari, R. N. (2019). Lesson planning in EFL classroom: A case study in lesson plan preparation and implementation. *Wiralodra English Journal*, 3(2), 367-375.
10. Filgona, J., Sakiyo, J., Gwany, D. M., & Okoronka, A. U. (2020). Motivation in Learning. *Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies*, 16–37. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajess/2020/v10i430273>
11. Hoffman, J. S. (2013). *Instructional Design-Step by Step: Nine Easy Steps for Designing Lean, Effective, and Motivational Instruction*. iUniverse.
12. Irvine, L. (2009). *Orals ain't orals: How instruction and assessment practices affect delivery choices with prepared student oral presentations*. <http://eprints.qut.edu.au/>
13. Kani, U. M., & Sa'ad, T. U. (2015). Drill as a Process of Education. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(21), 175-178.
14. Kent, M., & Mackay, L. D. (2008). Enhancing Generalization of Social Skills: Making Social Skills Curricula Effective after the Lesson. *Beyond Behavior*, 18, 18–25.
15. LW, A., DR, K., PW, A., KA, C., Mayer, R., PR, P., Rath, J., & MC, W. (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*.
16. Nwike, M. C., & Catherine, O. (2013). Effects of use of instructional materials on students cognitive achievement in agricultural science. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3(5), 103-103.
17. Notar, C. E., Zuelke, D. C., Wilson, J. D., & Yunker, B. D. (2004). The Table of Specifications: Ensuring Accountability in Teacher Made Tests. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31, 115–129.
18. Maryani, I., Martaningsih, S. T., & Bhakti, C. P. (2017). Module based on pedagogical content knowledge to increase the engagement and skills of the future teachers in designing a lesson plan. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 11(1), 91-102.
19. Paschal, R. A., Weinstein, T., & Walberg, H. J. W. (1984). The Effects of Homework on Learning: A Quantitative Synthesis. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 78(2), 97–104. (Maryani et al., 2017) <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1984.10885581>
20. Ramesh, R., & Rao, U. R. (2015, April). Investigating the impact of in-class assignments on higher order thinking skills of students in engineering course. In 2015 International Conference on Learning and Teaching in Computing and Engineering (pp. 95-99). IEEE.
21. Sadler, D. R. (1998). Formative Assessment: revisiting the territory. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050104>
22. *Strategies for Effective Lesson Planning Stilian Milkova Center for Research on Learning and Teaching*. (n.d.). [http://www.crlt.umich.edu/gsis/P4\\_4.php](http://www.crlt.umich.edu/gsis/P4_4.php)
23. Swan, M., & Burkhardt, H. (2014). Lesson design for formative assessment. *Educational Designer*, 2(7).
24. Thom, M. (2020). Are group assignments effective pedagogy or a waste of time? A review of the literature and implications for practice. *Teaching Public Administration*, 38(3), 257-269.



25. Zainudin, S., Ahmad, K., Ali, N. M., & Zainal, N. F. A. (2012). Determining Course Outcomes Achievement Through Examination Difficulty Index Measurement. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 59, 270–276. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.09.275>

## **PROFILE**

Dr. Joel Ferrer is a lecturer at the College of Teacher Education and Graduate School of the Ilocos Sur Polytechnic State College, Philippines. He has been in the academe for more than two decades. His research interests include quantitative and qualitative researches on educational management and pedagogy.