



DISCREPANCY BETWEEN PERCEIVED AND OBSERVED TEACHING CREATIVITY OF ENGLISH TEACHERS

I Ketut Sujana¹, Luh Putu Artini², Ni Nyoman Padmadewi³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha

Email: sujanaketut11@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study was aimed to investigate the discrepancy that occurred between the teachers' perception and the observed implementation in teaching creativity in the classroom. Embedded mixed method QUAL (quan) was used as the design of the study. The data corpus comprises primary and supportive data, in which the first refers to qualitative data and the later were the supportive data. SMA Negeri 1 Melaya was selected as the research setting and two English teachers were selected as the research subject. The questionnaires and in-depth interview were used as the instrument to collect the data. The data from the questionnaires were analysed quantitatively and qualitatively. Then, data reduction was used to analyse the data from in-depth interview. The result demonstrates that the discrepancy occur between teachers' perception and the observed implementation in the classroom. The teachers perceive themselves as creative, however the observational set data indicate that their teaching mostly focus on using conventional media, deductive learning, teacher centre technique, monotonous teaching activity, using same media in every meeting, rarely conducting innovative activity and integrating the contextual problem as learning material in the class. Their teaching also mainly focused on offline learning and printed media. In addition, they were also hardly found to show effort to redesign old media to be unique and creating attractive activities in the class.

Keywords: Observed Creativity, Perceived Creativity, 21st Century Learning

1. INTRODUCTION

In the 21st century learning, the skills that must be mastered are creativity, critical thinking, communication and collaboration. Those skills must be mastered by students and teachers. Based on Ministerial Regulation No 21, the teachers in this time were suggested to use their creativity in teaching to comply the future need and the golden generation in 2045. The creativity could affect them to create a new thing creatively, make learning materials in different way and integrate technology into learning process. Based on this situation, teachers' creativity must be improved and trained. Zai-toon (1987) in Al-Qahtani, 2016 state that Creativity can be interpreted as an awareness that arises from within to provide a solution to a problem using imagination. Rietzschel, De Dreu, & Nijstad (2009) in Al-Qahtani (2016) found that several countries have also initiated programs on the creativity of their citizens such as Canada, Britain, the Netherlands and Europe. Keh, Ismail, & Yusof (2017) defined that creativity is about create new idea and solve the problem

with creative solution. They believe that when the teachers use their creativity, they can make new learning technique, media and method. Creativity can be interpreted as a teaching that could develop people creative thinking (Ehtiyar & Baser, 2019). Pillana (2019) mentioned that creativity is the effort to make something new from nothing. It could be seen from the learning process conducted by the teachers. When they could implement new learning technique in the class that could make the atmosphere in the class interactive and the students become active it specifies that they could use their creativity in learning process.

Parsa (2017) argued that when people can use their creativity, they will achieve maximum result. Everyone who works with creativity will get maximum result because they can work in new way with new idea and they will be responsible. New idea indicates that the use of different idea from all idea that provided. According to Stojanova (2010) in Al-Dababneh & Al-Zboon (2017) if we want to make students think creatively, then we as teachers must be able to have creativity too. Having creativity for someone is very important. Creative teaching can be interpreted as teaching using imaginative method and technique to make the learning process active and interesting (Ehtiyar & Baser, 2019). Some expert have stated teachers' creativity into several categories, namely create an unique teaching method, use divers strategies, and have strong motivation to promote the students to reach the learning objectives (Arifani & Suryanti, 2019).

The teachers who have creativity always responsible, up to date and use their intelligent and innovative in teaching in the class (Farella, 2010; Hong, Hartzell, & Greene, 2009; Bramwell et al., 2011 in Al-Dababneh & Al-Zboon, 2017). Teachers who teach innovatively and with responsibility are predicted to be able to create effective learning situations. This situation can be observed on how they designed and executed the lesson. Hamza and Griffith (2006) in Al-Dababneh & Al-Zboon (2017) added that teachers who are able to manage the conflicts and problems in the class, are believed have succeeded in using their creativity. Through using their creativity, the teachers are able to create their students think critically and creatively as well as to support the situation in the class tend to be students centred learning.

Based on previous study that have been conducted by Khodabakhshzadeh, Hosseinnia, Moghadam, & Ahmadi (2019) demonstrated that creativity of the teachers has a significant correlation with their teaching effectiveness and there is also any significant differences between gender and teachers' creativity. Another study by Vasudevan (2013) about the influence of teachers' creativity, attitude and commitment on students' proficiency of the English language shows that there is a significant and positive influence of the teachers' creativity, attitude and commitment on students' proficiency of the English language. Those two previous studies mainly

discuss about the effect of teachers' creativity toward teaching effectiveness and students' proficiency of the English language. However, those studies did not discuss about the discrepancy about teachers' perception and facts as observed in the classroom. It could be assumed that the discrepancy about teachers' perception and facts as observed in the classroom are needed to be observed.

Generally, the teachers have their own creativity in teaching in the class. The teachers who facilitated with the technology in their school probably will design learning activity as creative as they can using facility provided such as LCD, speaker or video learning. With those situation, they will claim themselves as creative teachers. However, when the other teachers who are teaching in the peripheral area when the facility is not inadequate, they will teach the students using conventional media such as book and printed media. Then, they will also claim themselves creative since they think it is not they who are not able in integrating technology in the class. It is because of the inadequate facility. So the book and printed media are the only media that they can use as creative as they can. Those two different perspective commonly encountered in the real teaching in the class. From the mentioned problem, this research about the discrepancy between teachers' perception and implementation about teaching creativity was conducted to clarify and identify whether their perception was same as their implementation or not.

2. METHOD

A. Type of Research

This study used embedded mix method. In the embedded design, the data consisted of primary and supportive data (Creswell, 2012). In addition, embedded design indicated that one data would be more dominant than the others (Indrawan & Yaniawati, 2016). Embedded design was planned because one data was used to support and strengthen the other data. In this study, qualitative data were supported and strengthened by quantitative data. Therefore qualitative data were more dominant than quantitative data and quantitative data were used as supportive data.

B. Research Setting

This study was conducted in Bali specifically in SMA Negeri 1 Melaya in a second semester in academic year 2019/2020. SMA Negeri 1 Melaya is located in jalan raya Denpasar Gilimanuk, Melaya. This school was selected as the setting because that school is one of the favourite school in Melaya. In the English subject, the communication that occurred in the class was using English and Indonesia language. Besides that, this school also had used new curriculum that affected all of the teachers had to design the activities that were able to promote 21st century learning such as creativity skill.

C. Research Subjects

Two English teachers were used as the subjects in this study. Purposive sampling was used to gain the sample in this study. According to Etikan, Musa, & Alkassim (2016) purposive sampling is one of the sampling that the researcher discover the subjects who are capable and willing to provide the information that are required in the study. The teachers were coded as T1 and T2.

D. Data Collection Technique

Self-rated questionnaire and observation sheet were used as the instrument to collect the data. Both self-rated questionnaire and observation sheet had the same statements. In the instrument, there are 24 statements that had been developed from theory of creativity by Boden (1998). Boden stated that there were three types of creativity namely exploratory, transformational and combinational creativity. Those three types of creativity were developed into 24 statements. On self-rated questionnaire, the teachers rated their creativity based on their perception.

Meanwhile on observation sheet, the teachers were rated and assessed based on the real situation in the class. In the instrument, there are three learning activities namely pre, whilst and post activity. Therefore the researcher and the teachers selected and put the checklist mark in which part the creativity appeared while teaching in the class. The creativity score was available in the questionnaire. Score 1 was reflected as unlikely creative means that the teachers never use new idea in the class and technology, score 2 was reflected as slightly creative means that the teachers rarely use new idea and technology, score 3 was reflected as moderately creative means that the teachers sometimes use new idea and technology, score 4 was reflected as creative means that the teachers often use new idea and technology and score 5 was reflected as very creative means that teachers always use new idea and technology in the class.

The last is in-depth interview. When there was the discrepancy between self-rated and classroom observation sheet data, in-depth interview was conducted. In-depth interview that used in this study was in form of semi-structured interview. O’Keeffe, Buytaert, Mijic, Brozovic & Sinha (2016) argued that semi-structured interview is the effective and efficient way to collect the information needed. This interview was conducted openly and not straightforward. Semi-structured interview was selected because in this interview the questions used were more open-ended question that could be used to clarify the discrepancy occurred.

E. Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis was completed by looking at the results of the questionnaires and in-depth interview. On self-rated questionnaire, the collected data were analysed quantitatively. 24 statements were divided again into 3 types of creativity. Every score in each type of creativity was calculated to gain the mean score. The mean score was acquired from the ratio of the total mean score in every learning step and total of the learning step. When the score in every type of creativity had been calculated, that score was calculated again to gain the final score that reflected as the result of the score in self-rated questionnaire.

On observation sheet, the collected data were analysed as same as on the self-rated questionnaire. In observation sheet there were some pictures that used to support and strengthen the data. When there was the discrepancy between the self-rated and observation sheet data, the interview was conducted. The criteria score of creativity was designed to interpret the creativity score. The following table indicates the criteria score of creativity.

Table 1. Criteria to Interpret Creativity Score

Criteria of Creativity	Score
Unlikely Creative	$1.00 \leq x \leq 1.50$
Slightly Creative	$1.50 < x \leq 2.50$
Moderately Creative	$2.50 < x \leq 3.50$
Creative	$3.50 < x \leq 4.50$
Very Creative	$4.50 < x \leq 5.00$

In in depth-interview, the interview was conducted by interviewing English teachers in SMA Negeri 1 Melaya. The interview was in form of semi-structured interview. The teachers were interviewed naturally in order to obtain accurate data. After the interview was collected, data reduction by Miles (1994) & Faisal (2003) in Sujarweni (2018) was used to analyse the interview. The interview were changed from audio form into script form to facilitate the researcher in conducting the data reduction.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

The purpose of this study was to identify the discrepancy between teachers' perception and the observed implementation in the real teaching in the class. Therefore, in this section the discrepancy between teachers' perception and the observed implementation in the class were discussed. From the results of the questionnaire, the discrepancy between teachers' perception and

the observed implementation in the classroom occurred. The following table reveals the discrepancy occurred between teachers' perception and facts as observed in the class.

Table 2. Perceived and Observed Creativity

Types of Creativity	Teachers' Perception		Facts as Observed	
	Score	Criteria	Score	Criteria
Exploratory Creativity	3.80	Creative	1.70	Slightly Creative
Transformational Creativity	3.82	Creative	1.70	Slightly Creative
Combinational Creativity	3.91	Creative	1.35	Unlikely Creative

Table 2 shows that the discrepancy occurred. On the teachers' perception column, the teachers rated themselves 3.84 which means they were creative. That score was collected from the result of the mean score between T1 and T2. Consequently, the teachers rated themselves creative in creating various activities in the class, teaching in the class based on lesson plan, designing the class as a group, using inductive learning, integrating technology in delivering the material, inserting contextual problem as the learning material, creating the students to solve their problem using their own prior knowledge, using different media in every meeting, utilising conventional media when it was needed, utilising existed media in the class, designing old media to be unique, creating attractive activity and combining online and offline platform in delivering the material. They also consistently consistent in judging themselves in executing creative activity in the class.

On the facts as observed column, the teachers gained score 1.60 which means they were categorised as slightly creative in teaching creativity in the class. They were also consistently inconsistent in implementing the creativity in every learning step. They mostly executed the activity that reflected as creative activity in whilst-activity. Then, in pre and post-activity, the teachers only executed the activity as usual as what it should. In addition, based on the result of the observation, the teachers were sometimes in creating various activity in the class and rarely taught based on lesson plan since they made the lesson only as an administration. They also sometimes divided the class as a group, used inductive learning and rarely integrated technology

in delivering the material. They only utilised mobile phone as online dictionary and the media to look for additional information of the material. In the class, the teachers seldom used contextual problem and created the students to solve their problem using their own prior knowledge.

Moreover, the teachers repeatedly used same media in every meeting and sometimes used existed media in the class. On the observation, they used conventional media namely whiteboard and board marker inconsistently. They also seldom in designing old media to be unique, creating attractive activity and combining online and offline platform in conveying the material. It was pretty unique since on teachers' perception, the teachers rated themselves in creative criteria in implementing the creativity in the class but based on the observation and the situation in real teaching in the class, they were scored in the slightly creative. There was significantly different score therefore the interview was conducted to clarify the discrepancy.

The discrepancy occurred between those two data therefore the interview was conducted to clarify the discrepancy that occurred. The result of the interview revealed that the teachers mostly taught the students using conventional media since in their school, the facility was limited. There was only one LCD provided. Consequently, they only taught the students through conventional media. They also preferred to teach the students through offline learning because they only used online learning as the media to submit the tasks. They did not desire to use online learning as the discussion section and as the learning media to deliver the material because of the advertisements that suddenly appeared. It caused they mostly used offline learning in the class. In delivering the material, they utilised deductive learning. They also used same media in every meeting. The media that they used was made from the task of the students that was combined as the archive. They did not create their own media. They also created the lesson plan only as an administration and they preferred to use learning scenario during teaching in the class. In addition, they also rarely in creating attractive activities in the class since they had to look into the situation in the class, and students' attitude first. Commonly, they would create attractive activity in the class that had good attitude. Furthermore, they rarely inserting the problem issues into the learning material. They only used the problem issue only in the questions.

B. Discussion

As mentioned previously, the discrepancy between teachers' perception and facts as observed in the class had occurred. According to Boden (1998) the teachers have to use new idea in teaching in the class. Boden (1998) also added that the teachers have to integrate technology into the learning process. Consequently, the teachers claim themselves creative in which they always use new and technology in teaching in the classroom. However, based on the set

observational data, the teachers are rated as slightly creative in which she rarely use new idea and technology into the learning process. The discrepancy occurred since the teachers' perception and their implementation about creativity is dissimilar. From that situation, the discrepancy occurred, therefore the interview was conducted to clarify the discrepancy. After conducting the interview, it was proven that the teachers rated themselves only based on their subjective judgements. The learning facility is also affecting the discrepancy that occurred. In addition, according to Torrance (1999) in Kasmaienezhadfard, Talebloo, Rousta, & Pourrajab (2015) three aspect that could be used while observing the teachers' creativity are creative abilities, skills and motivation. Then, the most important aspect according to Torrance is creative motivation. The teachers who have high degree of motivation will have high creativity and vice versa. The teachers with high degree of motivation will at least try to plan, design and implement all the learning activities as creative as they can. Related to the theory of Torrance (1999), besides the learning facility and the subjective judgement of the teachers, another reason why the teachers in SMA Negeri 1 Melaya were categorised as slightly creative because of their degree of motivation. That was the reason why discrepancy had occurred between teachers' perception and facts as observed in the class.

4. CONCLUSIONS

It could be concluded that the discrepancy occurred between how the teachers perceived their creativity in teaching in the class and how they implemented it in the real teaching in the classroom. On one way, the teachers perceived that they were creative. On the other way, based on the real teaching and the situation in the class, they were categorised as slightly creative in teaching creativity in the class. The discrepancy occurred because of the subjective judgements of the teachers, learning facility and motivation of the teachers.

Moreover, according to the result that had been collected and demonstrated, there were some suggestions provided for the teachers and the further researchers. For the teachers, the teachers are suggested to rate themselves according to their own abilities. They are also suggested to be able to design more activities associated with creative activities in the class to create the learning that reflected as 21st century learning. For the other researchers, they are suggested to expand the field of the study by investigating similar study with different variables such as investigating teachers' creativity in primary school or junior high school. Additionally, they were suggested to investigate the teachers' creativity in international school.

REFERENCES

- Al-Dababneh, K. A., & Al-Zboon, E. K. (2017). Can Teachers' Self-Reported Characteristics And Beliefs About Creativity Predict Their Perception Of Their Creativity Practices In The Classroom?. *International Journal of Special Education*, 723-745.
- Al-Qahtani, A. A. (2016). Do Saudi EFL Teachers Promote Creativity in Their Classrooms?. *English Language Teaching*, 11-23.
- Arifani, Y., & Suryanti, S. (2019). The Influence of Male and Female ESP Teachers' Creativity toward Learners' Involvement. *International Journal of Instruction*, 237-238.
- Boden, M. A. (1998). Creativity and Artificial Intelligence. *Artificial Intelligence*, 347-356.
- Creswell, J. (2012). *Planning, Conducting and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Boston, United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Deniz, & Tican. (2018). Pre-Service Teachers' Opinions about the Use of 21st Century Learner and 21st Century Teacher Skills. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 181.
- Ehtiyar, R., & Baser, G. (2019). University Education and Creativity: An Assessment from Students' Perspective. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 114-132.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 1-4.
- Indrawan, R., & Yaniawati, P. (2016). *Metodologi penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif dan campuran untuk manajemen pembangunan dan pendidikan*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Kasmaienezhadfad, S., Talebloo, B., Roustae, R., & Pourrajab, M. (2015). Students' Learning through Teaching Creativity: Teachers' Perception. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 1-13.
- Keh, L. K., Ismail, Z., & Yusof, Y. M. (2017). Creativity among geomatical engineering students. *International Education Studies*, 43-49.
- Khodabakhshzadeh, H., Hosseinnia, M., Moghadam, H. A., & Ahmadi, F. (2019). EFL Teachers' Creativity and Their Teaching's Effectiveness: A Structural Equation Modelling Approach. *International Journal of Instruction*, 232-250.

- O’Keeffe, J., Buytaert, W., Mijic, A., Brozovic, N., & Sinha, R. (2016). The Use of Semi-Structured Interviews for the Characterisation of Farmer Irrigation Practices. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 1911-1924.
- Parsa, I. M. (2017). Evaluation Study Effect of Allowances and Job Creativity—the Performance of the Teacher in Secondary Vocational School Province of East Nusa Tenggara. *International Education Studies*, 96-107.
- Pllana, D. (2019). Creativity in Modern education. *World Journal of Education*, 136-140.
- Prasetyawati, P. (2016). Analisis proses pembelajaran berbasis student centered learning dalam pendekatan saintifik pada mata pelajaran sejarah di sma negeri se kota palu. *E Jurnal Katalogis*, 130-137.
- Sujarweni, V. W. (2018). *Metode penelitian*. Yogyakarta: PUSTAKABARUPRESS.
- Sugiyono. (2015). *Metode penelitian kuantitative, kualitative dan R&D*. Bandung: ALFABETA,cv.AI