



EMBRACING THE ROLE OF THE GROUP IN YOUR CLASSROOM: A LESSON OF A LESSON STUDY

Petra Kristi Mulyani

Semarang State University, Indonesia

A lesson study was introduced and implemented in six first-grade elementary school teachers from six schools, supervised by a university faculty. The focused subject of the lesson study was *Bahasa Indonesia* (Indonesian language). The teacher participants chose guided reading to solve their shared students' difficulties in reading. The lesson study consisted of three main phases. They were the *plan*, *do*, and *see*. In the *planning* phase, the faculty introduced the concept of lesson study and strengthened the details of guided reading. There was a discussion to make the lesson plan, to schedule the *do* and *see* phase, and decide the role of each teacher in the *do* phase. In the *do* phase, one teacher implemented the lesson plan while the others were observing. The *see* phase discussed the result of the implementation. This article describes teachers' perspectives and analysis on the instructional decision, and the university faculty observation throughout the lesson study. Although the teachers admitted that they perceived lesson study positively to develop their instruction quality, they tended to be indecisive and less confident when making a plan, analyzing the problem, and providing feedback. The discussion mostly initiated by the university faculty. The teachers requested inputs for every decision they wanted to make. One factor assumed to cause the attitude was related to the newness of the lesson study approach for these teachers. Limited opportunities to share problems, advice, and feedback to other teachers from other schools could be another factor. The article also describes the ups and downs throughout the process. Future recommendations are given to university faculty for supervision and for teachers to conduct the lesson study.

Keywords: Lesson study, Guided reading, Elementary school teacher, University faculty supervision.

Introduction

Teacher influence on student achievement is debated for decades. Some research and experts argued teacher performance as one of the critical supporting system in student performance (Wagner & Dipaola, 2011; OECD, 2011; Charner-Laird, Kirkpatrick, Szczesiul, Watson, & Gordon, 2016; Behrstock-Sherratt, Bassett, Olson & Jacques, 2014; Public Education Network, 2003; Bakar, 2018; Kyung Ryung & Eun Hee, 2018). Teacher qualities start to develop in the teacher education. The teacher qualities like professionalism, belief, perception, efficacy, collaborative work, characteristics, critical thinking, or leadership are claimed to define teacher performance that determines student performance. Possessing teacher qualities is argued to control student achievement.

As many suggested the influence of teacher qualities to student performance, other findings show otherwise (Wiseman & Al-bakr, 2013; Buddin & Zamarro, 2008, Kyung Ryung & Eun Hee, 2018; Public

Education Network, 2003). The teacher qualities cannot determine teacher success in the classroom. A certified teacher might not have the same level of experience. High level of education also cannot assure the teacher success in the classroom. In addition, teacher licensure test scores do not have any relation to the teacher success. There are various influential variables that the teacher factor alone is not necessarily a determinant factor in student achievement.

The different views and findings on the influence of teacher to student achievement suggest that every teacher encounters different conditions. Every classroom experience is unique. It is unique because it might not have a specific and exact duplicate among teachers. Even when general themes occur in their experiences, they are not identical. Because providing an identical condition to elicit same classroom success is impossible, the teachers at least have a dialog about their experiences. Dialoging experiences offer an opportunity of a collaborative work in understanding, analyzing, and predicting the past, present, and future experience (Public Education Network, 2003; OECD, 2011; Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014; Freire, 2005; James, Kobe, Shealey, Foretich, & Sabatini, 2015; Murphy, 2015; Charner-Laird, Kirkpatrick, Szczesiul, Watson, & Gordon, 2016). The new or experienced teacher will benefit from the dialog process about the classroom experience. Every class is unique in that every teaching experience will be different. They will find generative themes (Freire, 2005) through the dialog to elicit critical thinking in analyzing the conditions. Teachers will be able to get ideas for solutions of instructional problems through dialog within the collaborative work.

The dialog in a collaborative work provides support, relief, inspiration, and solution to the teachers (Public Education Network, 2003; OECD, 2011; Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014; James et al., 2015; Charner-Laird et al., 2016). Results of studies showed the positive impact of lesson study for teacher professional development (Cajkler & Wood, 2016; Lawrence et al., 2016; Meng & Sam, 2013; Liu, 2016; Dotger, 2015; Regan et al., 2016; Benedict, Park, Brownell, Lauterbach, & Kiely, 2013). This study will describe the lesson study introduction process to the elementary school teacher participants. The description of the phases provides evident lessons to the teacher participants and the university faculty.

Literature Review

The Role of Teacher on Student Achievement

The teacher becomes one of the defining factors in student performance (Wagner & Dipaola, 2011; OECD, 2011; Charner-Laird et al., 2016; Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014; Public Education Network, 2003; Bakar, 2018). It is essential because teacher qualities have been associated with elements of professionalism, efficacy, collaborative skill, leadership, belief, perception, etc. The components are further categorized as “teacher knowledge, teacher qualifications, and teacher practice” (Public Education Network, 2003, p. 5). In a report on the high-quality teaching profession, OECD (2011) suggested that the learning outcome “requires teachers to contribute as the architects of change, not just its implementers” (p. 53). Teacher professionalism influences the student achievement through mastering these components (Bakar, 2018). Some elements of teacher professionalism are like curriculum, instruction, resources, administration, certification, student, parent, environment, and diversity. Because teacher and student background impact the student performance, teacher professionalism components, by involving student motivation, will support student achievement (Buddin and Zamarro, 2008).

Student achievement is related to the teachers’ belief and perceptions about their colleagues and schools. Research showed that “teachers’ beliefs and perceptions about themselves, their colleagues, and their schools could provide important insights into the school’s collective belief about instruction, learning, and student achievement” (Wagner & Dipaola, 2011, p. 893). The teachers understanding of themselves leads to teacher academic optimism. It leads to insights in creating a quality classroom instruction and enforcing a positive learning atmosphere that ultimately leads to the student achievement.

Although findings show the influence of teacher performance on student achievement, other research found otherwise. Different results prove that the teacher does not have a consistent relationship to student

achievement (Wiseman & Al-bakr, 2013; Buddin & Zamarro, 2008). The quality of the teacher like efficacy, professionalism, and certification cannot assure student achievement (Wiseman & Al-bakr, 2013; Buddin and Zamarro, 2008; Kyung Ryung & Eun Hee, 2018; Public Education Network, 2003). The fulfillment of certification requirements by every teacher shows an inconsistent relationship to the student achievement (Wiseman and Al-bakr, 2013). Teacher professionalism (Buddin and Zamarro, 2008) and efficacy (Kyung Ryung & Eun Hee, 2018) show a small effect on student performance. A weak relation was demonstrated between teacher experience and student achievement. In addition, there is no significant relationship between the student achievement with the teaching degree and licensure test score. It is because they do not necessarily represent teacher success in the classroom. Besides teacher quality, other factors contributed to the student achievement.

Different findings on teacher influence on student achievement suggest that different characteristics are involved in the teacher success. Different characteristics enforce different success of a teacher. Teacher success is defined by a lithe formula, depending on various factors. Because different success stories depend on different conditions, a dialog is needed to enrich understanding and experience (OECD, 2011; Freire, 2005). Teachers dialog provides abundant knowledge, analysis, and prediction on ‘why,’ ‘how to,’ and ‘what if,’ past, present, and future classroom state. According to Freire (2005), the dialog is “an instrument of liberation” (p. 8). It has the essential content of education as the practice of freedom within the human-world relationship. Dialog builds critical consciousness when there is an investigation process to elicit generative themes. Throughout the dialog process, teachers obtain generative themes to understand, analyze, and predict the outcome of their instruction.

Teacher Collaborative Work

Throughout the process of understanding themselves, the teachers can reflect that their personal belief, perception, passion, motivation, and ability to facilitate instruction in the classroom are affected by their colleagues and schools. The different roles of teacher require responsibility that can be accomplished through not only professional development but also collaborative work with colleagues (OECD, 2011; Brown, Taylor, & Ponambalum, 2016). Working collaboratively and actively dialoguing with colleagues provide equal opportunity for every individual teacher to grow together; no matter whether it is a success or unsuccess instruction story. “Dialogue can involve conversations both within national professional bodies and among local groups of professionals” (OECD, 2011, p. 56). The process helps the teacher to understand, analyze, and predict the situation. They help each other to find the solution to a problem. OECD (2011) called it consultative and participatory processes. It provides opportunities to engage in the debate about classroom instruction, classroom management, or even educational reform. Teacher engagement in the dialog contains the possibility of a local change at the school level.

The dialog in a collaborative work provided support, relief, inspiration, and solution when overwhelming responsibilities burdened a less experienced teacher (Public Education Network, 2003; OECD, 2011; Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014; James et al., 2015; Charner-Laird et al., 2016). One cannot merely measure the quality of a teacher by the length of teaching or the level of education. Although teacher education prepares teaching strategies through different scenarios for classroom success and student achievement (Behrstock-Sherratt et al., 2014), a new teacher might need time to adjust when meeting the demanding profession (Charner-Laird et al., 2016). Collaborative dialog offers an opportunity for a new teacher to receive support from colleagues. The nature of the dialog in the collaborative work is “strikingly and refreshingly unique ... to grow in response to evolving needs and relationships” (James et al., 2015, p. 57). Every teacher respectfully contributes their expertise and experience to complete each other’s understanding of a particular condition in the classroom. Dialog enriches teacher understanding to essential profession matters like school culture, political influence, neighborhood, parents, mindfulness, diversity, authorship, etc. The dialog is an exploratory talk in a collaborative work that inspires the teacher to maintain the social pattern, change in practice, and shift ideologies towards the student benefit (Murphy, 2015). Teachers empowerment through the dialog provides a solution to a problem without every teacher being in each other’s place. In different opportunities, the teachers play different roles

throughout the collaborative exploratory dialog like leading, inspiring, summarizing, pointing, or listening. Every function provides different learning and understanding point of views, which are all critical to establish ample experiences. The different teacher might perceive the process differently. One teacher might benefit and apply it individually. Although every teacher can have a different decision whether or not implementing the result of the collaborative work in their classroom, the exploratory dialog provides lessons for the teachers to study different classroom instructions, characteristics, conditions, and experiences.

Lesson Study

Lesson study is an approach that provides an opportunity for teachers to do collaborative work and dialog for their professional development (Lewis, 2002; EEF, 2017; Brown et al., 2016). It is an approach to improve teacher instruction by working together. Formerly used in Japan; lesson study involves a small group of teachers. They are usually teaching the same grade of the same subject or the same interest. There are several phases of lesson study (Lewis, 2002). They are the *plan*, *do*, and *see*. In the *plan*, the teachers do a collaborative work to plan a lesson. They share experiences to have a shared teaching-learning goal related to their students. The formulated learning goals are used to prepare the lesson. In the *do*, one teacher teaches the lesson while the others are observing. In the *see*, feedback, and analysis are discussed to improve the lesson and develop a further implementation. The cycle provides an opportunity to do planning, implementation, reflection, and planning (Robinson & Leikin, 2012; Regan et al., 2016).

Studies showed positive results of lesson study for teacher professional development (Cajkler & Wood, 2016; Lawrence et al., 2016; Meng & Sam, 2013; Liu, 2016; Dotger, 2015; Regan et al., 2016; Benedict, Park, Brownell, Lauterbach, & Kiely, 2013). Collaborative work and dialog in the lesson study develop active and creative teaching skills, knowledge, and confidence (Cajkler & Wood, 2016) to help teachers identify and evaluate the current standards (Lawrence et al., 2016). It supports both in-service but also pre-service teachers to promote teaching quality (Meng & Sam, 2013; Liu 2016; Benedict et al., 2013; Roberts, Benedict, Kim, & Tandy, 2018) because “teachers engaged in a continued process of disequilibrium and reflection as they clarified learning objectives and determined effective instructional strategies” (Won, 2017, p. 58). Throughout the lesson study process, they develop teaching by sharing common goals, expertise, and teaching experiences. “Lesson study is a process that links standards, teacher learning, curriculum materials, and instructional enactment together to facilitate student learning” (Dotger, 2015, p. 349).

Although many studies resulted in the success of the lesson study, some showed no correlation to student performance (EEF, 2017). The teachers admit the positive opportunity to work collaboratively with their colleagues. They can make a productive dialog, plan, observe, and analyze problems in their classroom. Lesson study also gives a balance through self-reflection on personal teaching and learning practice. However, it does not show a direct impact on the student achievement.

The different results on the success and failure of lesson study as support to student achievement suggested the different characteristics of the settings when implementing the lesson study. Various factors make lesson study results differently. However, one thing that concluded from the studies is that the teachers admitted the positive impact of the lesson study to their professional development. They had the opportunity to develop their skills in working and dialoguing collaboratively. The teacher quality provides a better possibility to support student achievements.

Guided Reading

Guided reading is a reading teaching strategy where students are grouped into different levels of reading comprehension to receive different activities (Burkins & Croft, 2010; Kreul, 2018; Green, 2018). It is an attempt to provide students with the assistance they need based on their reading comprehension difficulties. Guided reading is part of a classroom reading hour where teachers offer different activities for the intended group and the other students in the class. Because there is only one teacher in every

classroom, the teacher prepares specific guided activities for the intended small group and independent activities for the rest of the other students in the class. The steps of the guided reading vary according to the needs of the students (Green, 2018). Usually, it includes a small group of students with the same reading comprehension level and works in the same text levels (Burkins & Croft, 2010). In the guided reading, students have more opportunities to read, listen to others reading, discuss the text, and receive or repeat intended reading strategies with the teacher. The focused reading strategies can be letter knowledge, word structure, context clues, etc. The steps of the activities vary depending on the needs of the students and the goals of reading (Kreul, 2018). The general steps include *before*, *during*, and *after* reading activities. The *before* reading activities can be a discussion of the intended strategies; strengthened in the *after* reading activities. The *during* reading activities focus on students reading to discuss and implement the reading strategies.

This study will describe the on the introduction of the lesson study approach to develop the teacher quality. It describes the process of six first-grade elementary school teachers from six schools in their effort to know, understand, and implement lesson studies. The subject focus is the Indonesian language. The teachers chose guided reading as the solution to their problems. The author will describe the process through analyzing the recording, observation, note taking, and documentation throughout the lesson study phases.

Methodology

The participants of the study were six first-grade elementary school teachers from the same province in Indonesia. The schools had been the practicum schools for pre-service teachers from the university where the author works. The schools were involved in the training program in a literacy program, a collaboration between the university and USAID. Several teachers from the six schools participated in the literacy program. The six participant teachers were the participant of the past literacy program.

With the consent from the university, the author offered six schools to follow the lesson study introduction program. The author sent an offer letter to the school principal. The letter explained the program details, the definition of lesson study, program duration, participation, benefit in participating, and consent form. The letter requested the principals to permit one of the teachers in their school who joined the past university literacy program. The program had introduced the importance of collaborative work and literacy program. They also received some training related to literacy teaching strategies, including guided reading. The teacher participants were expected to have had the understanding of the importance of literacy, guided reading, and collaborative work. Thus, the author could focus on introducing lesson study to the teachers in an attempt to support the success of their school literacy program. The teachers submit the form of consent. They either were a volunteer or suggested by their principals to participate.

The study investigated the process of introducing a lesson study to the first-grade elementary school teachers. A descriptive method was employed to analyze data obtained from teacher discussions; teachers focus group interview and author observation throughout the phases of the lesson study. The data recorded with the video recorder, voice recorder, note-taking, and documentation. Every teacher also filled in forms during planning, observing, and reflection.

The university faculty as the researcher recorded data on the teacher discussions throughout phases of lesson study. The teachers focus group interview was recorded every phase of the *plan*, *do*, and *see*. The questions of the interview were:

1. What do you think of this phase of the lesson study?
2. What do you get from this phase of the lesson study?
3. How do you want to make this phase better?

The researcher recorded the observation through note-taking and documentation.

There were four kinds of meetings in several sessions throughout the lesson plan process:

1. The first meeting was the *plan*. It took two times sessions. In the first meeting, the university faculty introduced the lesson study approach. The teachers discussed their shared instruction goals. Then, they translated the goals into a lesson plan. Meanwhile, the faculty strengthened their understanding of guided reading they had received in the past literacy program. In the second meeting, they detailed and finished the lesson plan. After the *plan*, the university faculty focus group interviewed the teachers.
2. The second meeting was the *do*. It took a one-time session. One teacher taught the lesson plan. One classroom was used based on their agreement. The other teachers and the university faculty observed the implementation.
3. The third meeting was the *see*. It took two sessions. The first meeting was right after the implementation of the lesson plan. They shared what they observed. The second meeting discussed what the teachers wrote in their observation form and what they had not mentioned in the previous session. The university faculty focus group interviewed the teacher after the second meeting.
4. The fourth meeting was replanning. It took one session. The teachers discussed what they could revise or do better in the future implementation to more support student achievement. After the meeting, the university faculty focus group interviewed the teacher.

The positionality of the author was as the researcher, in this case, was the university faculty mentioned in the study. The author had the opportunity to train the teachers during the past university literacy program for the schools, before the research. Different kinds of data were collected to build the trustworthiness because the author acted as the researcher and the writer of in this study.

Discussion

Plan Phase

The teacher participants of the study were six first-grade elementary school teachers from the same province in Indonesia. They were all from a public school. It meant that they had the same curriculum, same government textbook, and most probably same lesson plan made by the local teacher association. Every teacher shared their problems with students reading.

At the beginning of the first meeting, the *plan*, the teachers were asked to share their current issues with students reading. Before the meeting, the teachers were inquired to make an inventory of students' reading difficulties and then bring the Indonesian language subject lesson plan. Different students' backgrounds were assumed to be the reason for the different students' inputs. Some students entered the elementary schools with the ability to read letters. Some could read words. Many did not know how to read at all. The different students' ability in reading when they started the elementary school was the most apparent problem they discussed. The condition was that every class had about thirty students with only one teacher.

Some research showed student backgrounds as nonrelated factors to influence student performance (Sanna & Valpreda, 2017; Lauc, Bago, & Kisicek, 2011). Other study revealed the significant influence of student backgrounds on the teaching and learning success (Tom & Cooper, 1986; Akbulut, 2010) and challenges (Boghikian-Whitby & Mortagy, 2008). The teacher shared their experience about the significant influence of student backgrounds in their reading competencies. Students exposed to various digital literacy and printed materials at home showed their comprehensive skills in reading. Students who did not receive support from their parents reading stories before bed or exposing reading materials at home showed more reading difficulties than students who did.

The university faculty stopped the discussion on the teachers' shared problems in student reading by introducing the lesson study. Two teachers heard the term before. However, all teachers did not

understand the meaning and how to implement lesson study. Collaborative work and dialog were essential throughout the explanation of the lesson study. After explaining about the purpose of lesson study, the university faculty explained that all six of them would work collaboratively to do the lesson study.

Having introduced to the phases of the lesson study, the teachers made a schedule for all phases. Then, they re-discussed the shared problems with the students reading difficulties as part of the *planning* phase. Based on the observation, one by one the teacher showed their leadership skills. Many times, they tended to ask the university faculty to initiate the discussion. Some encouragements from the faculty for the teachers to confidently start the discussion came to no avail.

The faculty observed and analyzed from the interview that the personal matters became the dominant factors more than professional issues. It resulted in the awkwardness during the collaborative dialog and the collaborative work. The teachers did not know personally each other before. Although they were in the participants of the past university literacy program, there were tens of other participants from all over islands in Indonesia who joined in the program. Also, they usually sat and worked with colleagues from their school. They came from schools with entirely different ranks on the national exam. Some participant schools were core schools. Some participant schools were sub schools who usually had to learn from the core schools regarding school management, student performance, facilities, and human resources. The teacher participants had different length of experience in teaching. Some had taught for tens of years and retired in less than ten years. The others taught less than ten years.

In some cases, knowledge was not the measurement of one teacher's value than the seniority (Atawne & Hoz, 2012). The phenomena in the discussion during the beginning sessions of the lesson study showed the influence of seniority to the atmosphere of the decision making and opinion sharing. The faculty observed the older teacher tended to be more dominant in decision making than becoming the actor of implementation. On the other hand, the younger teacher tended to listen to the different opinions more than providing reasoning to agreement or disagreement on why a decision was made. There is positive and negative age stereotype of older teacher related to the historical philosophy among Asian (Chen & Wang, 2012). The negative stereotype thought that older teachers were less motivated to learn and not open to change. The positive stereotype thought that older teachers could be the role model to learn professional teaching skills for the young teachers (Santoro, Pietsch, & Borg, 2012). The university faculty noted during the discussion that the stereotype influenced the beginning sessions of the lesson study. However, the openness and respect among the younger and older teacher participants were evident throughout the lesson study towards the last sessions.

The different backgrounds of teachers added to the newness of lesson study to the participants. The discussion dynamic during the plan was growing smoother as the teachers understand more of each other after the first meeting. They agreed that the shared students reading the problem in their classroom were the different reading competencies of the students. It became their shared goal to serve students of the different reading competencies based on their needs. Then, the participants tried to find a solution based on their experience. Every idea offered could not get full agreement from every member. For example, a solution of inviting parents during the school hour to support school literacy program could not work with students in the sub school because some parents could not leave their work during office hours. It could work, but it could be difficult sometimes to have a regular schedule.

The university faculty observed the discussion dynamic. The same teachers initiated or dominated other teachers. However, the execution plan of the initiative was detailed and executed by the same other teachers. After a lengthy discussion in trying to find the solution, one teacher asked for the faculty suggestion. The faculty suggested the teachers review their training in the past literacy program. There were different teaching reading strategies they could implement to help solve the problem with the different competency levels of the students reading. After a lengthy discussion where the faculty helped to track and review the strategies, they decided guided reading to the most suitable approach to address the differences. While implementing guided reading, the teacher could ask for the parents supports at home or outside the school hours.

In the guided reading, the students were grouped into their levels to get different reading activities in a specific allotted time so that they could catch up with the other students of higher reading competence.

The students' problems were explicitly addressed to their needs so that other students could advance based on their competencies as well. The teacher participants made a lesson plan with guided reading activities. The participants decided the youngest teacher to be the one who taught the lesson. The other teachers were the observers.

The focus group interview up to this point showed the same pattern of answers to the questions. The teachers perceived the lesson study positively. They felt it helped them develop their professional skills, primarily related to reading instruction. They hoped to have more free time away from their teaching responsibilities at school while focusing on the lesson study activities. Their answers tended to be the normative ones. The faculty hoped they would try to be more open telling about their personal or group struggle in the discussion and decision dynamic.

Do Phase

Before the implementation of the lesson plan, the faculty reminded the teacher participant to pay attention not merely to the teaching, but mostly to the program, they made together. They needed to pay attention to whether it worked well or not because it was essential for their feedback and analysis for future implementation. During the implementation of the lesson plan, the teachers observed the details of the application conscientiously. Only a few of them paid attention to fill in the observation forms during the implementation. Many of them wrote the observation forms after the observation. It made the faculty questioned the accuracy of what they saw and what they only remembered.

When discussing the observation results, teachers who made notes while observing could analytically address the success or failure of the plan. The teachers who wrote the form after the observation tended to talk about the way their partner taught. Instead of discussing how their plan worked or not, they managed to consider what the teacher should have done to make the teaching better. The content of the discussion tended to blame and critique the way of teaching the lesson. On the other side, the teacher who taught the lesson plan felt that she just implemented what had been agreed and planned in the team. No one wanted to teach, so she accepted when the others pointed.

The focus of discussion in the teaching style instead of the teaching plan invited a tense atmosphere between the teacher who taught the lesson and the teacher who observed. After a long back and forth talk, the faculty refocused the participant's discussion back to the essence of the implementation. The implementation was meant to be useful to check whether it worked to help the students reading difficulties or not. It helped the team to figure out the better way to do it in the future. It was not the way to critique the teaching style of the other participant who had tried to implement the agreed lesson plan by the team. Suggestions for the betterment of the future implementation were not evident. The teachers who critiqued the teaching style of the teacher who taught the lesson could not provide evidence of themselves implementing the critique. The teachers who offered ideas for future implementation, could not provide examples for the betterment. For example, a teacher suggested for the team to use a personal blog to provide different sources for different groups of students reading comprehension level, or to provide different lesson plans for the parents to view their students planned activities based on their groups. However, no one ever had the experience of developing a blog. The teacher who had the idea to share the lesson plan with the teacher before every week's lesson for the parents to support classroom teaching, could not provide the lesson plans. The teacher admitted not having the decent lesson plans.

The faculty provided another meeting to discuss the observation result. It helped to settle down the tense situation and change it to a professional analysis towards the instruction implementation. After the second analysis, the teacher participants resulted in more real points on how to make better of the future application. They had ideas about grouping the available storybooks in the classroom or libraries, to help the students and the teachers during the guided reading activities. They had ideas about scheduling some minutes on certain days to do guided reading activities with the students. Several other evident activities were possible for them to implement. The focus group interview also showed that every participant showed a more careful, respectful appreciation, but critical analysis to others' inputs, objections,

agreements, or praise; no matter of the different backgrounds as indicated in the first meeting and focus group interview.

Lesson study provided teacher participants with a unique dynamic of working and dialoguing collaboratively. Different backgrounds of teachers could influence the way the team accomplished. Senior versus junior, core versus sub, experience versus less experience, and various other disparities could destroy the lesson study. However, the teacher participants chose to move on to the right decision. They learned in every phase of lesson study to work and dialog collaboratively. It ended with a good result where they had ways with guided reading to solve their shared student reading difficulties.

The study had a lack of time to implement another circle of lesson study. The future studies suggested for at least two circles of lesson study with more than one researcher to catch and write the comprehensive data. The data collected can focus both on teachers and students experience and achievements to give a more in-depth and vivid description of the impact of implementing the lesson study approach. Instead of offering the school through the principal to join the program, the program can be offered directly to the teacher participants who wanted to volunteer and or develop their professional teaching skills by working and dialoguing collaboratively through lesson study. Voluntarily participation provides a better description of the teacher motivation. Thus, the result of the program can also be connected to the beginning motivation of every participant.

Conclusion

Professional development programs provided by the government, school, or self-initiative were limited to these participant teachers. The university initiative to introduce lesson study was well-welcomed. The teachers admitted that lesson study was new for them. Before the program, the participants had the experience of working collaboratively with other teachers inside or outside the school. However, they never experienced planning, implementing, and reflecting a lesson with their colleagues inside or outside their schools. Planning, implementing, observing, and analyzing the lesson with other colleagues provided experience in working collaboratively within the same agreed direction of planned-instruction. Every teacher had different points of observation, interpretations, and future solutions from the executed-instruction. Although the teachers tended to ask and follow my opinion, which I did not endorse, the teachers had moved to the level where they felt more comfortable sharing problems, suggestions, expertise, and analysis to their colleagues from other schools. They started to try to put the students' achievement above their thoughts on what the other colleagues think about themselves. The academic atmosphere should put students above personal or school image. The teachers were open to the others' inputs for instruction decision. Lesson study provided the teacher's lessons to work and dialog collaboratively for the teaching quality to support the development of the student's performance.

Acknowledgments

This project is made possible by the initiative of literacy program between the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and Semarang State University, Indonesia. The authors would like to thank the elementary school teachers and principals who made the lesson study possible.

References

1. Akbulut, D. (2010). WCES-2010: The effects of different student backgrounds in basic design education. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2(2010), 5330-5338. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.868
2. Atawne, A., & Hoz, R. (2012). The relations between elementary teacher's didactic knowledge and their preservice specialization, seniority in teaching, and school system. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46(2012), 1051-1055. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.05.247

3. Bakar, R. (2018). The influence of professional teachers on Padang vocational school students' achievement. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(1), 67-72. doi: 10.1016/j.kjss.2017.12.017
4. Behrstock-Sherratt, E., Bassett, K., Olson, D., & Jacques, C. (2014). From good to great: Exemplary teachers share perspectives on increasing teacher effectiveness across the career continuum. Center on Great Teachers and Leaders.
5. Benedict, A., Park, Y., Brownell, M., Lauterbach, A., & Kiely, M. (2013). Using Lesson Study to Align Elementary Literacy Instruction Within the RTI Framework. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 45(5), 22-30.
6. Boghikian-Whitby, S., & Mortagy, Y. (2008). The effect of student background in e-learning: Longitudinal study. *Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology*, 5, 107-126. <https://doi.org/10.28945/999>
7. Brown, C., Taylor, C., & Ponambalum, L. (2016). Using design-based research to improve the lesson study approach to professional development in Camden (London). *London Review of Education*, 14(2), 4-24. doi: 0.18546/LRE.14.2.02
8. Buddin, R., & Zamarro, G. (2008). Teacher quality, teacher licensure tests, and student achievement. Washington, DC: RAND.
9. Burkins, J.M., & Croft, M.M. (2010). *Preventing misguided reading: New strategies for guided reading teachers*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
10. Cajkler, W., & Wood, P. (2016). Adapting 'lesson study' to investigate classroom pedagogy in initial teacher education: what student-teachers think. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 46(1), 1-18. doi:10.1080/0305764X.2015.1009363
11. Charner-Laird, M., Kirkpatrick, C. L., Szczesiul, S., Watson, D., & Gordon, P. (2016). From collegial support to critical dialogue: Including new teachers' voices in collaborative work. *Professional Educator*, 40(2), 1-17.
12. Chen, H., & Wang, Y. (2012). Age stereotypes of older primary teachers in Taiwan. *Educational Gerontology*, 38(5), 362-371. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2011.559839
13. Dotger, S. s. (2015). Methodological understandings from elementary science lesson study facilitation and research. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, 26(4), 349-369.
14. Education Endowment Foundation (EEF). (2017). Lesson study: Evaluation report and executive summary. London, England: London School of Economics.
15. Freire, P. (2005). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
16. Green, K. (2018). *4 tips for guided reading success*. Retrieved from <https://www.scholastic.com/teachers/articles/teaching-content/4-tips-guided-reading-success/>
17. James, J. H., Kobe, J., Shealey, G., Foretich, R., & Sabatini, E. (2015). Authentic collaborative inquiry: Initiating and sustaining partner research in the PDS setting. *School-University Partnerships*, 8(2), 53-61.
18. Kreul, M. (2018). *Guided reading in the primary classroom*. Retrieved from <https://www.scholastic.com/teachers/articles/teaching-content/guided-reading-primary-classroom/>
19. Kyung Ryung, K., & Eun Hee, S. (2018). The relationship between teacher efficacy and students' academic achievement: A meta-analysis. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 46(4), 529-540. doi:10.2224/sbp.6554
20. Lauc, T., Bago, P., & Kisicek, S. (2011). Using quantitative methods for a student study activity analysis in a virtual learning environment concerning different students' backgrounds. Proceedings from MIPRO 2011: *The 34Th International Convention*, 1222-1225. Opatija, Croatia: MIPRO.
21. Lawrence, M., Yang, L., Briggs, M., Hession, A., Koussa, A., & Wagoner, L. (2016). Breathing life into engineering: A lesson study life science lesson. *Science Activities*, 53(4), 137-146. doi:10.1080/00368121.2016.1211079
22. Lewis, C. (2002). *Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional change*. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.
23. Liu, S. (2016). Development of lesson study approach in three rural elementary schools of Taiwan. *Asia-Pacific Social Science Review*, 16(2), 101-111.
24. Meng, C. C. & Sam, L. C. (2013). Developing pre-service teachers' technological pedagogical content knowledge for teaching mathematics with the geometer's sketchpad through lesson study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 2(1), 1-8. doi: 10.5539/jel.v2n1p1.
25. Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). (2011). *Building a high-quality teaching profession: Lessons from around the world*. Paris: OECD.
26. Public Education Network. (2003). The voice of the new teacher. Washington, DC: Public Education Network.
27. Regan, K. S., Evmenova, A. S., Kurz, L. A., Hughes, M. D., Sacco, D., Ahn, S. Y., & ... Chirinos, D. S. (2016). Researchers apply lesson study: A cycle of lesson planning, implementation, and revision. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 31(2), 113-122. doi:10.1111/ldrp.12101
28. Roberts, C. A., Benedict, A. E., Kim, S. Y., & Tandy, J. (2018). Using lesson study to prepare preservice special educators. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 53(4), 237. doi:10.1177/1053451217712974
29. Robinson, N. N., & Leikin, R. (2012). One teacher, two lessons: The lesson study process. *International Journal of Science & Mathematics Education*, 10(1), 139-161.

30. Sanna, A., & Valpreda, F. (2017). An assessment of the impact of a collaborative didactic approach and students' background in teaching computer animation. *International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education*, 13(4), 1-4. doi: 10.4018/IJICTE.2017100101
31. Santoro, N., Pietsch, M., & Borg, T. (2012). The passion of teaching: Learning from an older generation of teachers. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 38(5), 585-595.
<https://doi-org.proxy.lib.siu.edu/10.1080/02607476.2013.739796>
32. Tom, D., & Cooper, H. (1986). The effect of student background on teacher performance attributions: Evidence for counter defensive patterns and low expectancy cycles. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(1), 53-62.
33. Wagner, C. w., & Dipaola, M. F. (2011). Academic optimism of high school teachers: Its relationship to organizational citizenship behaviors and student achievement. *Journal of School Leadership*, 21(6), 893-926.
34. Wiseman, A. W., & Al-bakr, F. (2013). The elusiveness of teacher quality: A comparative analysis of teacher certification and student achievement in Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries. *Prospects*, 43(3), 289-309. doi: 10.1007/s11125-013-9272-z
35. Won, N. (2017). Inner-city teachers' perceptions in a lesson study for critiquing mathematical reasoning. *Professional Educator*, 42(1), 58-79.