



Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan

The British Council



Contract No: CNTR97 2735A

Curriculum Development Centre
Curriculum Capacity Project
Department for International Development

Pusat Pengembangan Kurikulum
Jl. Gunung Sahari Raya No.4, Jakarta 10002
Tel: (021) 350 9022, Fax: (021) 345 3440, e-mail: emsweet@indo.net.id

Curriculum in The Classroom Its Implementation and Preliminary Evaluation

David Yeomans
September 1998

INDUK 17.501/2014
NO. KLASIFIKASI
TGL. TERIMA
T A R

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	2
2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES	3
3. CONTENT	4
4. PROCESSES	7
5. ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION	9
6. OUTPUTS	10
7. EVALUATION	10
8. CONCLUDING COMMENTS	12
9. RECOMMENDATIONS	13
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	14
APPENDICES	15

1. INTRODUCTION

This workshop, which was part of Programme Three: Implementation of Curriculum in the Classroom (see British Council Inception Report) of the Curriculum Capacity Project, opened on 18th August and closed on 4th September (although the LTA will conduct a number of follow-up activities during September). The overall aim of the workshop was to assist Puskur staff to develop skills in the study of the implemented curriculum. The focus was firmly upon qualitative research because while it was accepted that quantitative and mixed methods can also contribute to the investigation of the implemented curriculum it was felt that qualitative methods are particularly appropriate to this task. In addition many Puskur staff are experienced and skilled in quantitative research but are less experienced in qualitative methods.

My involvement in the workshop began on Monday 24th August with briefings from the LTA while my first meeting with the participants was on Tuesday 25th August.

The workshop had 22 participants including one from Puslit and one from Pusinfot. The remaining 20 participants were Puskur staff (a list of participants is provided in Appendix 1). Of these, 16 were chiefly concerned with basic education focusing on TK, SD and SLTP schools. The remaining four Puskur staff were chiefly concerned with SMK schools. The participants from Puslit and Pusinfot integrated well with the whole group and participated fully in the subject-based sub-groups through which much of the workshop was conducted. The Puskur staff concerned with vocational education worked as a group during much of the workshop and while the organisational and curricular differences between basic and vocational education meant that some negotiation was required to adapt particular activities in order to make them relevant to their concerns and on-going work the 'SMK group' were always lively, challenging and constructive members of the workshop. Four of the participants had joined Puskur only a few months prior to the workshop, while others had almost twenty years experience in the organisation. Since I could not speak Bahasa Indonesia the levels of English of the participants were also relevant and these varied from the excellent to the limited, although during the workshop several participants became more confident in their use of English, particularly when consulting with me during group work.

The participants thus came from a range of backgrounds and experiences and from varied organisational locations within and without Puskur. I understand that this reflected the relatively loose organisational structure of Puskur. The Inception Report argues that this organisational looseness and the cross-fertilisation of ideas which it promotes is one of the strengths of Puskur and this was certainly apparent in the workshop through the ways in which the participants were able to work together.

2. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The Terms of Reference for the consultancy are reproduced as Appendix 2. These had been amended slightly in July 1998 and included emphasis on classroom observation as a means of gathering information on the implemented curriculum. As noted above the workshop opened prior to my arrival and the LTA, as well as conducting a needs identification exercise, also revised with the group some of the educational concepts explored during Workshop I and discussed differences between quantitative and qualitative research. This left me free to focus upon Objectives (a) and (b) of the LSTC consultancy, although the differences between quantitative and qualitative research (objective c) were alluded to at many points during the workshop.

While the TOR's provided the framework and basic contract for my work, at a more informal level I was also anxious to provide the participants with reassurance and confidence that they could carry out good quality qualitative research. Prior to my visit to Indonesia I had discussed the workshop with my colleagues at Leeds Geoff Welford and Hywel Coleman who had conducted Workshops I and II and I had also met the LTA during her visit to Leeds in June 1998. From these meetings I gathered that while many of the likely participants were highly experienced Puskur staff with vast knowledge of Indonesian education they were likely to have fairly limited knowledge of qualitative research. Thus during the workshop I wanted to convey the message that while qualitative research is not a soft option and requires intellectual rigour and the application of certain specific skills it is also not so esoteric as many of the standard texts imply and that, in general terms, staff as experienced, knowledgeable and capable as those employed by Puskur would be able to carry out good, reliable qualitative research.

3. CONTENT

The workshop content was designed to progress from the general to the specific and to provide the participants with the confidence and skills to develop and prepare to carry out qualitative research (a breakdown of daily activities can be found in Appendix 3. Prior to my arrival the LTA worked with the participants for four days. She revised some of the educational concepts covered during Workshop I, conducted a needs identification exercise and compared qualitative and quantitative research methodologies.

Of the 20 participants who completed the needs questionnaire 17 indicated that they had conducted research in the last three years comprising 35 different activities. Over half of these activities were classified as being quantitative. However, a substantial minority of research activities were classified by the participants as being wholly or in part qualitative. In addition all respondents had observed lessons at TK, SD or SLTP schools covering seven different subjects. The questionnaire thus revealed a range of experience in classroom-based research which I endeavoured to draw upon at various times during the workshop. However, while there was a range of relevant experience among participants the development of full-blown, if small-scale, qualitative research proposals was new for many, while others had no experience of qualitative research either being new staff within Puskur or having previously worked entirely within the quantitative tradition.

At intervals throughout the workshop discussion returned to certain educational concepts particularly concerning the formulation and reformulation of curricula and I introduced my interpretation of the ways in which curricula are transformed in the process of implementation. Throughout the workshop it was emphasised that qualitative research was one important method through which this recontextualising of the curriculum within different levels and sites could be revealed and explained.

Another recurring theme throughout the workshop was the distinction between qualitative and quantitative approaches and the needs questionnaire showed that the expectation held by the largest number of participants was that they would 'Develop an understanding of qualitative research'. There was a degree of tension here between the requirement to explore the theoretical and methodological differences between quantitative and qualitative approaches

and the imperative to develop the practical skills participants would need to carry out qualitative research shortly after the completion of the workshop. Even on the penultimate day of the workshop one participant showed that he/she was continuing to wrestle with the differences between qualitative and quantitative research. I suggest below that this is an issue which might profitably be revisited once the participants have all had experience of qualitative research and hence are in a position to make comparisons based on personal experience.

The workshop also focused on the development of three specific skills - the development of qualitative research proposals, classroom observation and qualitative data analysis - with some attention also given to qualitative interviewing. Each of these will now be considered in turn.

Research proposals were generated by first considering the kinds of research questions which can be addressed through qualitative research, a discussion which in turn referred back to the educational concepts mentioned above. Following this introductory work participants were divided into groups by the LTA on the basis of their subject expertise. The groups were: Mathematics, Languages (Bahasa Indonesia and English), IPS, IPA, TK and SMK. These groups remained the focus for much of the remaining work. The LTA and the PM then agreed the main parameters of the research task which participants were to undertake and I translated these into specific terms of reference (see Appendix 4). Guidance was then given on the development of research proposals (see Appendix 5) with particular emphasis placed upon the need to achieve a logical progression through the delineation of the research background, the explication of research questions and the specification of the research methodology. The groups then produced draft research proposals which subsequently underwent extensive revision as a result of discussions among the participants themselves and with me. The completed proposals formed the main tangible output from the workshop.

Classroom observation was tackled through first looking at three different approaches: the structured, quantitative approach adopted for the Senior Secondary Education Project Empirical Study of the Implementation of *Curriculum 1994* in SMU's; the semi-structured approach used in the PEQIP project; and my own unstructured approach. Participants were

asked to consider the advantages and disadvantages of each approach. The subject groups were then asked to develop their own observation instruments appropriate to the research questions contained in their research proposals. The observation instruments were tried out firstly with video-taped lessons and then during visits to Jakarta schools. This progression through video-taped and actual lessons accompanied by successive modifications proved highly effective, although the videos used were in some respects not ideal having been produced by the British Council to illustrate one of their funded projects. The classroom activities shown were apparently not typical of those found in Indonesian primary schools and the events did not take place in 'real' time. Live observation in schools was extremely valuable and all of the participants were able to practise their observational and note-taking skills with some producing quite remarkable results. The fully revised observation instruments were attached to the appropriate research proposals and formed the second tangible output of the workshop. Several groups showed considerable ingenuity in designing their observation schedules and I intend to incorporate some of their ideas into my own work. Finally as part of the work on classroom observation I presented to the participants some of my rules for negotiating and maintaining access to classrooms (see Appendix 6) and asked them to consider the relevance of these in the Indonesian context.

Data analysis was introduced using the observational data collected in the schools. I first introduced some general approaches to data analysis stressing the need for researchers to immerse themselves fully in the data (see Appendix 7). This was followed by an explanation of the procedures which I follow when coding qualitative data (see Appendix 8). The participants in their groups were then asked to apply these procedures to their own data thus producing some initial schemes of categorisation. This went more smoothly than I had anticipated, since coding is probably the most technically complex operation in qualitative data analysis, but the participants quickly grasped and were able to apply the main principles and while the categories produced were inevitably tentative and partial they produced much typically lively and thought provoking discussion.

Qualitative interviewing was introduced on the penultimate day of the workshop. A brief introduction was provided to some of its main features and the LTA and I then demonstrated good and bad practice in interviewing techniques. Following this participants practised their

own interviewing skills in groups of three (interviewer, interviewee, observer). This session raised important issues in the practise of qualitative interviewing which the LTA will address further prior to the participants going out for their research in schools.

4. PROCESSES

Three main ways of working were used during the workshop.

(i) I provided some structured inputs, for example on different approaches to classroom observation, on principles and procedures in preparing qualitative research proposals, on maintaining field relations in classroom observation and on analysing qualitative data. Each of these presentations was supported by a handout, partly because the participants had indicated in the needs questionnaire that this was one of their expectations from the workshop and partly because I hoped it would provide those with less facility in English opportunities to study and translate the handouts after the session. In general because of my inability to speak Bahasa Indonesia I decided it was best to limit the number of formal presentations which were given and to keep those which were given fairly short, lasting no more than 30 minutes. The presentations which I did give seemed to be well received and always provoked challenging and relevant questions.

(ii) Much of the workshop was conducted in groups. Initially these were ad-hoc groups formed for the purposes of particular exercises but in the latter part of the workshop the participants spent much of their time in their subject groups. The group work was always lively and productive and as far as I was able to judge was task-related. My role during group work was to circulate and offer advice and suggestions. During the period when the groups were developing their research proposals I also provided written feedback on English summaries of their proposals and discussed these at some length with each of the groups. This was effective and the written feedback provided a good basis for the revision of proposals. The discussions with individual groups were, for me, one of the highlights of the workshop and were, I think, effective in raising the quality of the research proposals. On the basis of my examination of the summaries I was also able to make some general points to the whole group concerning the relative neglect of the role of text books and examinations in

curriculum implementation and the need to be seen to explicitly link research questions and research methods in the proposals.

(iii) Much group work led to group presentations which constituted the third main process used in the workshop. Presentation skills were generally good and as far as I was able to judge participants were fluent and confident in their explanations and handling of questions. In the early stages of the workshop there was a tendency for presentations to be given by a limited number of individuals but as the workshop progressed the work of presenting was shared out more widely and over the whole period all the participants made presentations. Most presentations were supported by OHP transparencies but these were less effective than the oral skills demonstrated by the participants partly because apart from the blue and black pens the OHP pens were not effective. The presentations invariably promoted vigorous discussions in the whole group with presenters being challenged and either defending or modifying their positions. I was hugely impressed by the lively debates which took place, with the humour and banter with which they were imbued and the critical and yet constructive and supportive responses to presentations. I was sometimes concerned that discussions following presentations went on too long but since this was not commented on by participants in their daily comments or on the evaluation sheets at the end of the workshop my fears were probably groundless.

Two other issues require mention in this section. The first concerns language use in the workshop which provided a constant backdrop to all the activities. My lack of Bahasa Indonesia clearly placed limitations on what could be achieved, while as noted in Section 1 the participants facility in English ranged from the excellent to the limited. As noted above, partly as a result of these language difficulties, I decided to restrict the number of structured inputs which I gave and to ensure that those which I did provide were supported by handouts. When making presentations I attempted to speak slowly and clearly and avoid colloquialisms and complex technical terms. I also paused from time-to-time and asked a competent English speaker to translate. For much of the time this seemed to work reasonably well and several participants told me they found it easier to follow my English compared to some other native speakers, but undoubtedly at times I did lapse into speaking more quickly than I should and into the use of inappropriate vocabulary. Group work and presentations were conducted in

Bahasa Indonesia. Each subject group had at least one competent English speaker and so through a mixture of communicating with that person and the use of translation within the group communication with me was generally reasonably effective. During presentations I asked a competent English speaker to translate for me. In this way I was able to follow the general thrust of discussions and was able to intervene at relevant points, while sometimes during discussions the participants would turn to me for an opinion or other contribution. Inevitably however, some of the discussion passed me by and it was my greatest regret that I was not able to contribute more to the vigorous and lively discussions which took place.

Taken overall, while my inability to speak Bahasa Indonesia was a clear disadvantage, the strategies adopted to overcome this worked reasonably well on most occasions and my judgement would be that the language difficulties did not invalidate the usefulness of the workshop.

Finally during the workshop I worked closely with the LTA and we conducted some joint sessions particularly in the early stages of the workshop when I was still finding my feet. Our collaborations were generally effective and I found her support most helpful. There were occasional inevitable differences of emphasis between us on approaches to qualitative research but these did not create any difficulties and perhaps served to remind the participants that qualitative research is an 'open' method of research which allows and encourages individual approaches among researchers.

5. ORGANISATION AND ADMINISTRATION

The LTA and her staff provided excellent administrative support for the workshop and photocopying and printing from disk was done promptly and efficiently. Workshop refreshments were always served punctually. Participants were occasionally called away from the workshop to attend to other duties but particularly during the second week of the workshop groups were sufficiently well established and had generated enough impetus in their tasks for these occasional absences not to significantly affect the progress of the workshop. Of somewhat greater concern was lack of punctuality by some participants at the start of the day and after lunch. I understood that at the commencement of the workshop participants had agreed that sessions should start punctually with all members present but this

agreement was not maintained and sessions frequently started 10 minutes late. Workshop resources were adequate and participants were generally able to obtain access to a computer in order to word process their research proposals and observation instruments. OHP transparencies could sometimes be difficult to read especially when red or green pens were used. Access to the VCR for the video observation sessions required some movement of the equipment between different offices, including that of the director, but this was accomplished without major difficulties.

6. OUTPUTS

The workshop had two linked tangible outputs. (i) Research proposals were formulated by each of the six subject groups. Each proposal consisted of: Background information and rationale for the proposal; a set of research questions; research methodology linked explicitly to the research questions; a timetable for the research; an indication of the outputs from the research. (ii) Attached to each of the research proposals was an observation instrument which would be used for classroom observation when carrying out the research. Each instrument consisted of two main parts (a) a front cover for recording basic information about the observation session and (b) a sheet for recording the events observed during the lesson.

An intangible output from the workshop was the staff development which had been achieved and the enthusiasm and confidence with which the participants looked forward to undertaking their research proposals. As I noted in Section 2 one of my informal aims was to increase the confidence of the participants in their ability to conduct qualitative research as well as equipping them with some of the more specific skills which they will require for the task. It was gratifying to note that as far as I could tell by the end of the workshop all the participants were keenly anticipating their fieldwork and displaying a sense of ownership for, and commitment to, their research proposals.

7. EVALUATION

Two main modes of formal evaluation were used during the workshop. Prior to my arrival the LTA had initiated a system used by Hywel Coleman during Workshop II of asking participants to submit anonymous comments at the end of each day. I maintained this system and found it yielded some very useful information much of which I was able to act upon. For

example on one day one participant noted, quite justifiably, that I had not made sufficient interventions during presentations and discussions as a result of which I resolved to increase my participation. On other occasions the daily comments revealed issues which needed to be reiterated or emphasised and which I was able to return to at the start of the next day.

Summative evaluation was provided through a short questionnaire (see Appendix 9) which participants were asked to complete at the end of the workshop. The comments were generally positive and this reinforced the mostly encouraging informal comments I received during the workshop and my own evaluation of the responsiveness of the participants. It was pleasing to note from their comments that many participants were much clearer about the distinctions between qualitative and quantitative research. The process of producing the research proposals was also seen as a satisfying aspect of the workshop by most participants. Workshop processes and organisation were mainly commented upon favourably, although several participants commented on lack of punctuality and one or two indicated that I should have been stricter on the miscreants. In terms of follow-up several participants emphasised their wish to actually carry out the research they had designed.

Turning to the aspects of the workshop which participants had found disappointing two aspects stood out which require further discussion - report writing and data analysis. Report writing was mentioned briefly during the workshop but there were no structured sessions and it was not within my terms of reference, although it is understandable that the participants should note its absence from the workshop. I could have provided some general guidelines on report writing but probably there is a limit to how much can usefully be taught in a general sense, and in my experience the apprenticeship model i.e. reading and commenting on draft reports, remains the best way of teaching report writing skills. I understand that the LTA and other experienced staff will support the participants during the report writing stage of their research. Of more concern to me was the view expressed by many participants that they had received insufficient training in data analysis. This was part of my brief and therefore is a criticism which needs to be taken seriously. As noted in Section 3, sessions were conducted on data analysis and I provided some general guidance on approaches and also introduced specific techniques for coding qualitative data. Clearly however, this was insufficient for many participants. I think there are two related issues here. The first concerns my ability to

make explicit my own approaches to data analysis and the second participant's perceptions of data analysis in qualitative research. In relation to the first of these I found it difficult to make explicit exactly how I analyse qualitative data and I found myself falling back on what must have seemed to the participants rather unhelpful generalities such as 'Read your data' and 'Think about your data'. In this I was probably reflecting much of the practice of qualitative research where many published accounts tend to be rather coy about the ways in which the researcher made connections between their data and their conclusions or findings. From the participants perspective however, there was perhaps a search for some specific techniques or tests, perhaps analogous to the application of statistical techniques in quantitative research, which could be taught and used. Fortunately, or unfortunately, such established techniques do not exist in qualitative research which relies much more upon the interpretative skills of the researcher. This is clearly an issue which requires further thought in the context of the Curriculum Capacity project where participants will be gathering qualitative data, but I am confident that the workshop participants possess sufficient analytical skills to be able to analyse their data once they have conducted their research. I remain hopeful that once they have been through the entire research cycle they will appreciate that qualitative research (including data analysis) while requiring a great deal of rigour, intellectual honesty and open-mindedness is not reliant upon esoteric technical skills which can be taught in isolation from 'real' data.

8. CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Despite the unavoidable limitations imposed by my inability to speak Bahasa Indonesia and limited knowledge of Indonesian education, my judgement was that the workshop was a success. This was due in very large measure to the responsiveness and receptiveness of the participants and also because the workshop activities were embedded in a very real research task which the participants will undertake and which will contribute significantly to the work of Puskur at a time when Indonesian education, and indeed the wider society, is open to change. All the indications were that during the workshop participants gained knowledge of qualitative research and confidence in their ability to carry out such research. I am confident that the research which they will carry out will be well conducted and will yield significant findings. For the future it is likely that not all participants will wish to continue to conduct qualitative research but I am sure that among the participants there are some who have the

potential to become excellent qualitative researchers and through this to enhance the work of Puskur and the contribution which the organisation makes to Indonesian education.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Puskur should support workshop participants in carrying out their research proposals and ensure that, providing suitable quality control measures are applied, the resulting research reports are widely disseminated within and without the institution.
- Participants should be given opportunities to present their research findings during the regular series of CCP seminars.
- An opportunity should be provided, possibly within the CCP seminar series, for workshop participants and other interested staff to consider again the differences between quantitative and qualitative research and their respective strengths and weaknesses.
- Workshop participants should undertake a thorough and systematic review of the methodology which they employed in carrying out their research proposals, highlighting its strengths and weaknesses and those areas in which further training is required.
- Puskur managers should identify further research tasks based either upon further exploration of the previously identified research questions or upon new questions, which will provide all or some of the workshop participants with opportunities to reinforce and refine their skills in qualitative research.
- Puskur should investigate the possibility of producing a series of videos showing a variety of different kinds of lessons in a range of subjects from Indonesian schools. Such videos as well as providing a valuable training resource for staff planning to undertake classroom observation could also provide a basis for substantive discussions about curriculum and pedagogy.

- Puskur senior managers should strategically consider the likely research demands which will be placed on the institution in the short, medium and long-term and reflect on the mix of quantitative and qualitative research which will be required to respond to these demands.
- Assuming that it is accepted that qualitative research has a role to play in Puskur a cadre of staff willing and able to conduct high quality qualitative research should be identified and staff development programmes initiated to enable them to broaden and deepen their understanding and skills in qualitative research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to:

The Project Manager Bpk Drs Faisal Madani M.Ed who despite his many other duties was supportive and encouraging throughout the workshop.

The LTA Dr Liz Sweeting for her always excellent advice and support throughout the workshop and for her participation in several workshop sessions.

Dr Sweeting's staff for their efficient and friendly administrative support for the workshop.

Ibu Dra Rosfita Roesli MA at the British Council for her administrative work in support of the workshop and her interest in the work itself.

All the workshops participants for their enthusiasm, hard work, humour and patience.

APPENDIX 1 - WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS (in subject groups)

TK Group

Pbk Suherman
Sri Yuniarti
Ibu Yuke Indrati

SMK

Pbk Samsir Rambe
Pbk Djuharis
Pbk Bakri Nasir
Pbk Nur Berlian

Mathematics

Pbk Subardjo
Pbk Ujang Sukandi
Ibu Sri Peryati
Pbk Bunyamin

IPS

Ibu Darmiasti
Ibu Maria Chatarina
Pbk Sapto Aji Wirantho
Ibu Endang

IPA

Ibu Reni
Ibu Hidayati
Pbk Masdjudi

Languages

Ibu Muchlisoh
Ibu Mutiara
Ibu Fachrani
Pbk Suke Silverius

APPENDIX 2

LEEDS SHORT-TERM CONSULTANT (LSTC)

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Programme Three

Curriculum in the Classroom:

Its Implementation and Preliminary Evaluation

Assignment:	In-country trainer - Case study and qualitative research methodology for classroom-based research into curriculum implementation leading to preliminary curriculum evaluation
Duration:	Two weeks
Effective date:	24 August - 4 September 1998 (11 working days including 1 Saturday)
Location:	Puskur
Qualifications:	Advanced qualification in education Experience in running training workshops and seminars for curriculum professionals Experience of working with non-native speakers of English and with poor English speakers First-hand experience of curriculum evaluation Some experience in Indonesia preferable

Background:

The majority of Puskur staff have strong subject knowledge through their first and in many cases second degree. However, very few staff have a solid background in education. Only a few of the staff have hands-on teaching experience, including those who are IKIP graduates. Any teaching experience is generally not recent and rarely at the TK and SD levels, the majority of ex-teachers having worked at the SSE level. First degrees from IKIP only prepare new teachers for working at the secondary level. As yet, there is no first degree for aspiring or in-service primary school teachers.

As curriculum developers, Puskur staff need to be familiar with classroom activities and with the relationship between the curriculum and other factors which influence classroom activities. Such factors include teachers' ideas of the curriculum and their use of it for planning lessons, the availability and use of textbooks, the degree of influence of the term and end-of-year tests on classroom activities, and the incidence of inset and its influence on classroom procedures.

The aim of this research programme is to:

observe implementation of core subjects of the curriculum in primary and junior secondary classrooms, in order to:

- . uncover teachers' interpretation of the curriculum
- . uncover teachers' use of curriculum - directly or through textbooks
- . uncover the extent to which classroom activities are influenced by the end-of-term tests
- . uncover supportive school policies which assist teachers to implement new curriculum
- . uncover relationships between curriculum and other known factors influencing curriculum implementation and classroom activities
- . uncover other unknown factors which influence curriculum implementation and classroom activities
- . uncover the relevance of the curriculum to the needs of SD and SLTP children in both urban and rural areas

so that a methodology for curriculum evaluation can be explored and a preliminary evaluation be undertaken of the curriculum implemented during the research period.

Prior to the fielding of the LSTC, the LTA will lay the foundations for the workshop by

- a) introducing trainees to qualitative research methodology and compare it with the quantitative research paradigm;
- b) revising trainees basic concepts of education, curriculum, textbooks and tests as related to the Indonesian education system.

Objectives of LSTC consultancy:

- a) introduce trainees to qualitative research methods for classroom observation leading to preliminary curriculum evaluation, and provide practice sessions for their try-out and familiarization;
- b) guide trainees in the initial research process, including the identification of research questions to fulfil known research aims, production of a research proposal, the design of instruments for data/ evidence collection, and preliminary design of a strategy for data/ evidence analysis;
- c) discuss appropriateness of the two research paradigms of qualitative and quantitative methodology for the chosen research purposes.

Tasks:

- a) Introduce qualitative research methods for classroom observation leading to curriculum evaluation, and provide practice sessions for their tryout and familiarization;

- b) Discuss alternative research methods - quantitative and qualitative, and their appropriateness the research purposes;
- c) Guide the writing of research proposals;
- d) Strengthen trainees ability to produce appropriate, valid and reliable data collection instruments.
- e) Guide trainees in the preliminary design of a strategy for data analysis.

Reporting:

The LSTC will produce a draft report of the training which will be discussed with the Puskur Project Manager, the LTA and the British Council Field Manager. A final report should follow within two weeks of the end of the consultancy. This could be e-mailed by file attachment to the CCP project office in Puskur, or a hard copy sent to the CCP project office in Puskur via British Council offices in Manchester. The report should follow the standard British Council format, a copy of which is attached. The report should ideally include suggestions for any in-country follow-up to this training assignment which the LSTC feels needs to take place in Indonesia. Any suggestion(s) should include persons who could be involved in any follow-up activity.

The report will have to be cleared by government before payment of the consultancy fee can be enacted. All material produced or acquired during this consultancy period, written, graphic, film, magnetic tape or otherwise, is copyright to the British Council. Only the British Council may publish or disseminate reports arising from this consultancy, unless agreement is given in writing by both the LTA, and the PM, acting for the government. All knowledge and information not in the public domain which may be acquired during this consultancy will be held in strict confidence.

Procedure for Monitoring:

The research proposals and curriculum observation and evaluation instruments developed by Puskur trainees will form the monitoring mechanism.

Tentative timetable for consultancy:

Monday - Thursday: 9.00 - 12.00 (lunch) 13.00 - 16.00

Friday: 9.00 - 11.30 (lunch & prayers) 13.30 - 16.00

- Day 1 [am] Visit primary school in Jakarta
 [pm] Orientation to Puskur and CCP, courtesy visit to Kapus and Kabid, discuss training ideas & programme.
- Day 2 [am] Opening of workshop. Needs assessment conducted.
 Training preparations finalized.
 [pm] Introduce training, discuss trainees' expectations and contributions, and negotiate aims and objectives
- Day 3 Discuss curriculum implementation in classroom and known relationship to other major inputs into classroom activities (textbooks, term tests, end-of-cycle examinations, teacher training).
 Formulate research questions.
 Establish trainees knowledge, skills & experience of classroom observation and curriculum evaluation (quantitative or qualitative, or a mixture).
- Day 4 Establish present knowledge base of qualitative research methodology for classroom observation as a tool for curriculum evaluation
 Produce draft research proposals based on qualitative research methodology (in groups).
- Day 5 Present to group, discuss and revise.
- [Day 6] [Report writing day and preparation for week 2]
Sunday

week 2

- Day 7 Guide production of data collection instruments (in pairs/ groups)
- Day 8 Present to group, tryout, discuss, revise
- Day 9 Tryout revised instruments
- Day 10 Design preliminary strategy for data analysis
- Day 11 [AM] Finalize all instruments for later school pre-testing
 [PM] Wrap-up meeting with Project Manager and BC Field Manager

Planned follow-up:

- a) The LTA will develop trainees ability to express on paper and in speech their research objectives in order to gain access to their chosen research site;
- b) Trainees will pre-test and amend their research instruments in Jakarta schools, supervised by the LTA;
- c) Trainees will carry out their research projects in one province, under the supervision of the LTA.

APPENDIX 3

Daily activities during the workshop.

Monday 24th August	<p>Discussions with the LTA about the revised programme for the workshop and activities undertaken in the previous week.</p> <p>Visit to the British Council to complete administrative arrangements for the workshop.</p> <p>Meeting with the Project Manager who briefed me on recent developments in Indonesian education.</p>
Tuesday 25th August	<p>Visit to Joti Primary School accompanied by workshop participant. Met headteacher and visited all the classes.</p> <p>Met workshop participants. General discussion about characteristics of qualitative research, comparison with quantitative methods and contribution which it can make to work of Puskur.</p>
Wednesday 26th August	<p>Presentations by LTA, workshop participant and myself of three approaches to classroom observation. Discussion in groups of advantages and disadvantages of each method. Presentations to the whole group.</p> <p>TORs for research activity presented to the whole group together with guidance on developing research proposals. Group work on development of research proposals.</p>
Thursday 27th August	<p>Further group work on development of research proposals.</p> <p>Research proposals presented to the whole group.</p>
Friday 28th August	<p>Group work on preparation of observation schedules.</p> <p>Observation schedules presented to the whole group.</p>
Monday 31st August	<p>Detailed written and verbal feedback provided to each group on their research proposals. Further modification of proposals.</p> <p>Observation schedules tried out in groups using British Council videos. Discussed afterwards in groups with LTA and myself.</p>

Tuesday 1st September	<p>Further trial of observation schedules in Jakarta schools. I accompanied IPS group to Rowa Bakat 05 School.</p> <p>Debriefing in groups on classroom observation and modification of observation schedules.</p>
Wednesday 2nd September	<p>Completion of debrief on classroom observation. Presentation and discussion on etiquette of classroom observation.</p> <p>Presentation on analysis of qualitative data.</p> <p>Group work on analysis of data from classroom observation.</p> <p>Group presentations on analysis of data.</p>
Thursday 3rd September	<p>Completion of presentations on analysis of data.</p> <p>Introduction to interviewing in qualitative research.</p> <p>Simulated qualitative interviews in groups of three.</p>
Friday 4th September	<p>Final revision and production of research proposals and observation schedules.</p> <p>Closing ceremony.</p> <p>Party provided by participants.</p> <p>Final discussions with Project Manager and LTA.</p>

APPENDIX 4

CURRICULUM CAPACITY PROJECT

Pusbang Kurrandik - DfID/British Council - University of Leeds

CURRICULUM IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR QUALITATIVE RESEARCH PROPOSAL.

- Each workshop participant will spend **five full days** in **one school** (Tuesday - Saturday) with another day allowed for travel.
- Participants will be **allocated** to specific schools.
- **Observation** should be carried out in **two grades**. The first should be in the **lowest possible grade** e.g. Grade 1 for Maths, Bahasa Indonesia; Grade 3 for IPS, IPA; the second observation should be in a **higher grade**.
- At least **two lessons** should be observed on **each day** (one in each grade).

In addition to observing lessons researchers should:

- **Interview the teachers** whose lessons have been **observed** in order to collect data about their **approach to teaching** in the observed lessons and their **wider perceptions of the curriculum**.
- Interview the **headteacher** about the organisation of the school and his or her perceptions of the curriculum.
- Talk to a **sample of children** drawn from the observed groups about their **experience of the curriculum**.
- Talk to **community members** including a sample of parents and the RT about their perceptions of the school and the curriculum.
- **Analyse any documents** available in the school relevant to the research questions.

The **output** from the research should be an **in-depth case study** which focuses upon your **specialist subject** but places this in the **wider context of the school**. The emphasis should be strongly on the **curriculum** and the ways in which teachers try to develop their pupil's skills. The methodology must be **qualitative**.

The completed case study report must be completed by **31st October 1998**.

SECTION HEADINGS FOR YOUR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Background

Outline why you have chosen to research a particular issue within your subject. *Keep this brief - about half a page should be enough.*

Research questions

List the research questions which your case study will address. *Three or four should be sufficient. They should flow from your analysis of the background to the research in Section 1. Remember that in qualitative research the questions can be quite general.*

Research methodology

Outline the research methods which you will use indicating how each relates to the research questions. *Many elements of the methodology and sampling have been fixed by the terms of reference but you are left with some decisions e.g. how you will sample pupils and parents.*

Timetable

Indicate the points at which particular phases of the research will be completed. *The precise dates on which the school visits will take place have not yet been agreed therefore structure your timetable in terms of Week 1, Week 2, etc. rather than specific dates.*

Outputs

Indicate what outputs will be produced from the research

APPENDIX 6

CURRICULUM CAPACITY PROJECT

Pusbang Kurrandik - DfID/British Council - University of Leeds

CURRICULUM IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

SOME DO'S AND DON'TS OF ETIQUETTE WHEN OBSERVING IN CLASSROOMS.

One of the features of qualitative research is that it is responsive to local cultures so many of the rules of good manners which apply in Indonesian society generally will apply when observing in classrooms. But below are some rules which I try to keep when doing classroom observation which you might find useful.

- Never go to observe a lesson without speaking to the teacher first and explaining the overall purpose of the research and why you would like to observe their lesson. If they show any signs of being seriously concerned about being observed do not go ahead with the observation.
- Be very humble towards the teacher in the classroom, ask them where you should sit and ask permission if you want to do something such as look at pupil's work or talk to individuals or groups of pupils. Generally show that the teacher is in charge in the lesson and that you are a guest. Never show the teacher up in front of the pupils even if you think you are being helpful.
- Be careful about what you write during the lesson. Some teachers will try and read what you have written and it might be embarrassing and damage the research if you have written something negative about them or their teaching, save such comments for later when the teacher can't see them.
- Be prepared for the teacher to ask you at the end of the lesson "How did it go?" or "What did you think?". They will be looking for comments such as: "I thought it was a marvellous lesson". On almost all occasions you will want to make some sort of positive comment but quickly try to steer the conversation away from whether the lesson was good or bad towards trying to get the teacher to explain why they taught in a certain way. Remember as qualitative researchers it is not your main responsibility to decide whether a lesson is good or bad but to try and understand why it is as it is.
- Do not allow headteachers to pump you for information about their teacher's performance in the classroom. If they ask, try to be as bland and non-committal as you can. It is not your job to provide information to headteachers about the competence of their staff. If they don't know whether their teacher's are good or not that is their problem, don't let them manipulate you into giving information.

I have found that by keeping to these rules I can be reasonably fair to teachers and build up trust with them in ways which help the research process.

David Yeomans

APPENDIX 7

CURRICULUM CAPACITY PROJECT

Pusbang Kurrandik - DfID/British Council - University of Leeds

CURRICULUM IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

APPROACHES TO ANALYSING QUALITATIVE DATA

- Make sure that your raw data is kept in a **well organised file** divided into sections so that you can find the bits you need.
- **Read** each piece of data at least three or four times. You need to know your data very thoroughly.
- **Talk** about the data both with your partner in the school and with your subject group once you get back.
- **Code** the data as soon as possible after its collection.
- Look for **patterns** in the data - common approaches, issues and problems across schools, subjects and teacher. Possible examples might include: absence of practical work in science; common perceptions of the 1994 curriculum among teachers; similar attitudes to schooling among parents; similar reported effects of assessment on teaching and learning methods.
- Look for **contrasts** within the data: e.g. suppose 7 out of 8 social studies teachers do not use maps in their teaching but the eighth does, examining the data to try and understand why that teacher uses maps may also help to illuminate why the other teachers do not.
- **Note** down as soon as you can any ideas which you have about the data.
- Start developing a **provisional structure** for the research report.
- Most important of all **think** deeply about the data.

APPENDIX 8

CURRICULUM CAPACITY PROJECT

Pushang Kurrandik - DfID/British Council - University of Leeds

CURRICULUM IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

CODING QUALITATIVE DATA

Coding qualitative data simply means attaching pieces of data to categories or codes. You might develop some categories before you go into your schools based upon your research questions or you might want to use the 'purer' method of not having any formal categories before you start.

Coding data is quite simple. There are several steps:

1. Each section of raw data e.g. interview transcript, observation sheet, test paper, etc. Must be given its own code number. The way I do this is:

Name of School/Int/Subject/Grade/Date/Page No.

/Obs

/Doc

2. Make a photocopy of your data.
3. On the second copy mark out particular pieces of data and write the category to which you want them to belong in the margin or 'Comments' column.
4. Keep a list of all the categories you have used. This is so that when you come to code the next observation sheet or interview schedule you can check whether you already have a category for a piece of data or whether you need to create a new category.
5. Use scissors to cut up the second copy of the data according to the categories you have marked.
6. For each piece of cut data write on the back the code for the observation sheet or interview transcript from which it is taken. This is so that you can easily go back to the original and read the data again in its context.
7. Keep the pieces of data attached to the same categories together e.g. you might store them in envelopes.
8. You will now be able to easily read all the data you have on particular topics e.g. teaching and learning methods; assessment; classroom environment, etc.

APPENDIX 9

CURRICULUM CAPACITY PROJECT

Pusbang Kurrandik - DfID/British Council - University of Leeds

CURRICULUM IN THE CLASSROOM: ITS IMPLEMENTATION AND PRELIMINARY EVALUATION

WORKSHOP III EVALUATION

Please mention up to three satisfying aspects of the workshop.

Please mention up to three disappointing aspects of the workshop

Please comment on the content of the workshop indicating any areas which were insufficiently covered.

Please comment on the workshop processes mentioning any which were particularly effective or ineffective.

Please comment on the organisation and administration of the workshop.

How would you like to see the workshop followed up?

Please add any other comments including suggestions for ways in which future workshops might be improved.

Many thanks. Good luck with your research.

David Yeomans



