Recontextualization of Professional Development: Bureaucratization of Lesson Study in a Junior Secondary School in Java

Kanako Kusanagi

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

UCL Institute of Education
June 2019
I, Kanako Kusanagi, declare that the work presented in this thesis is my own. Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this has been indicated in the thesis.

The thesis, not including bibliography and appendices, is 75,641 words.
Acknowledgments

Firstly, I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Paul Dowling for his continuous guidance and intellectual challenges in completing this thesis. I also extend my appreciation to my first supervisor Professor Roger Slee for his support during the first two years of my study.

I would like to thank those teachers and school leaders of SMP Sari who let me into their schools and allowed me to become part of the community. The motivation for this study was based on my experience of working as a consultant for the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) from 2005-2007. I thank the JICA project team members at the time, especially the team leader, Dr. Norimichi Toyomane. I am also grateful to JICA for providing me with project data. During the fieldwork, Professor Ariswan Ronosudirjo, Professor Paidi Hawe, and Professor Yosaphat Sumardi from Yogyakarta State University generously became local sponsors and provided guidance. Many thanks to Pitrawati for her friendship and support.

My sincere thanks also go to those who have provided feedback and encouraged the development of this work: Professor Manabu Sato (Gakushuin University), Professor Sumar Hendayana (Indonesia University of Education), Professor Masami Matoba (Tokai Gakuen University), Professor Mohammad Reza Arani Sarkar (Nagoya University), Mr. Ryo Suzuki, and Mr. Kimio Takemori. I would also like to thank Professor Andrew Brown (UCL Institute of Education) for his valuable comments, and my language partner Dr. James Wright for his language support.

I also want to express my gratitude to Dr. Fumiko Takahashi, Professor Ryoko Tsuneyoshi, and Dr. Yuto Kitamura from the University of Tokyo who provided me with a great working environment and support for my study. I am also grateful for financial support from the Joint Japan/World Bank Graduate Scholarship Program.
for sponsoring the first three years of the study, and the British Council Japan
Association for sponsoring the fieldwork in Indonesia.

The beginning of my Ph.D. journey coincided with the beginning of our marriage.
Finally, I would like to thank my husband Daisuke and my daughter Tsumugi for
always being there.
Abstract

Lesson study, a professional development approach originated in Japan 150 years ago, has been widely considered to be one of the best practices for collaborative professional development and practiced in over 40 countries. Since lesson study is considered an effective approach in improving student performances, it has been transferred as a remedy for shortcomings of schooling in foreign countries. There is an underlying assumption that when "the best practice" in Japan is transferred to another country, it will generate a similar effect and will improve the quality of schooling. However, there is a fundamental problem with such pedagogic transfer.

This thesis discusses the problem of pedagogic transfer through examining the "recontextualization" of pedagogic practice or what happens when lesson study, which originated in Japan, was introduced into foreign contextual settings. Since pedagogic practice is socially constructed, the meaning of educational practice is always open to interpretation within the local setting of the receiving country. This is especially true for schools in developing countries which may operate differently from those of industrialized countries.

This study provides a sociological analysis of recontextualization of lesson study based on the review of the literature and an ethnographic style study of its implementation in a Javanese school. Since professional accountabilities are negotiated and contested within existing social relations, the practice—lesson study—transforms as it moves between contexts, across sociocultural contexts and also between policy and practice. The purpose of this study is not on the applicability of findings themselves across contexts but to analyze conceptually how the sociocultural settings shape teachers’ practice and influence their choice of pedagogy. As explored in the thesis, due to the strong bureaucratic accountability, lesson study in the Javanese junior high school, SMP Sari, was implemented as a bureaucratic project.
Impact Statement

This thesis discusses the problem of pedagogic transfer through examining the “recontextualization” of pedagogic practice or what happens when lesson study, which originated in Japan, was introduced into foreign contextual settings. There are mainly three implications from this study that could impact both academia and outside academia.

Firstly, using the ethnographic approach, this study examined pedagogic practice as patterns of cultural practice shaped by social relations within the institution at the school. This enabled me to examine the problems in the pedagogic transfer not as merely success/failures but as the gaps in contextual settings as well as the gaps in policy and practice. This suggests that policymakers (both local and international) and school leaders need to take measures to fill the gaps between policy and practice and consider ways to embed professional learning in teachers’ daily work lives.

Secondly, this study examined the practice of teachers beyond individual competencies and choices, and as strategies within the community. While the failures of professional development were often attributed to individual teachers’ competence, this study suggested that teachers’ choice of pedagogy was influenced by the organizational setting. From the analysis of the Javanese school, responsibility for professional development constitutes merely one of the multiple and conflicting accountabilities. Teachers were constrained by bureaucratic responsibilities and social norms and hierarchy of the community; both of these accountabilities worked negatively toward working to support student learning.

Thirdly, this study addressed how bureaucratic control on teachers’ practice could result in the “de-professionalization” of teaching and professional development. A key problem is a way in which the role of the teacher is constituted institutionally worked to prioritize bureaucratic rather than pedagogic responsibilities. The
bureaucratization of schooling is not a unique phenomenon in the Javanese school of this study but policymakers and practitioners in other parts of the world share similar issues. Thus, in realizing student-centered pedagogy, the responsibility to support student learning should be embedded in the school structure, and in a way, for teachers to collectively share the responsibility for student learning and also to support one another for professional development.

These findings are especially of interest to researchers and practitioners of lesson study communities in the world; but also of interest to those outside of the lesson study communities. The sociological analysis and understanding of pedagogic practice provided in this study are relevant to any effort to introduce a new approach into teaching and learning and those who are concerned of improving the quality of teaching and learning. I have presented some parts of this research in international conferences such as the World Education Research Association (WERA) and World Association of Lesson Study (WALS) and workshops for Japanese and Indonesian teachers. I will continue to disseminate the findings and implications through publications and interacting with policymakers, researchers and teachers in conferences and teacher workshops.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Ever since the emergence of international assessments—especially the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2000, there has been a tremendous interest to compare different educational systems and to learn from the practice of better-performing ones. Lesson study, a professional development approach originated in Japan 150 years ago, has been widely considered to be one of the best practice for collaborative professional development. It is now practiced in over 40 countries.

In “developing countries,” there has been also efforts to “export” best practice by donor countries, aimed to improve the quality of teaching and learning. Since the 1990s, the international donor agencies have been introducing various constructivist approaches in teaching and learning such as student-centered pedagogy (SCP) in Asia and Africa. In line with this effort to support the quality reform, lesson study has been “exported” by the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) as one of the best practices for teacher training.

However, there have been questions about the effectiveness of such transfer of “best practice” from one context to another—whether it really contributed to improving the quality of schooling. Transfer of pedagogy from one context to another requires careful examination since the meaning of pedagogical practice is socially-constructed. In fact, the appealing features of lesson study—bottom-up

---

1 The term “developed country” and industrialized country may suggest that some countries are industrialized while other countries are not yet “developed.” Also, categorization fails to acknowledge the diversity within these countries (Phillips & Schweisfurth, 2006). But other terms such as the Third World or the South equally have problems; thus developing countries will be used in this thesis (Hope, 1996; Toye, 1993). One should also note that the implication that besides the well-being of “developing countries overseas aid is used as a tool for foreign diplomacy and economic development (Hope, 1996). While acknowledging the problematic nature of the term developing countries, I will eliminate the use of double quotations in the rest of the thesis.
2 There are other terms such as Learner-centered pedagogy, child-centered pedagogy, student-centered learning, child-centered learning, which are used as interchangeable terms within student-centered pedagogy.
3 Throughout this thesis, the problematic nature of best practice will be discussed. Although I discontinue using double quotation marks for best practice, it is my assertion that best practice in one context may not be replicated in another context.
initiatives, collaborative learning of teachers, and its focus on student-learning—are not the product of lesson study itself. Rather, the practice was nurtured by sociocultural contexts unique to Japanese schooling.

Lewis (2002) acknowledges the contextual dependent-nature of lesson study and warns it should not be understood as a recipe or fixed best practice to be imitated. Rather, she suggests, it should be understood as a “flexible learning system” adaptable to the local contextual setting:

Rather than “aspirin” or “recipe,” lesson study might better be regarded as a flexible system for learning from practice that requires particular supporting materials and knowledge, conditions, habits of mind, and institutional structures to flourish. This flexible learning system interconnects intimately with many local structures, both adapting itself to them and is also transforming them (Lewis, 2002a, p. 13).

This study provides sociological analysis of pedagogic transfer by examining an issue of “recontextualization” or what happens when lesson study originated in Japan was introduced into a different context of Javanese school4. According to Dowling (2014), recontextualization is defined in the following way:

Recontextualization refers to the contention that texts and practices are transformed as they are moved between contexts of their reading or enactment (p. 526).

The introduction of pedagogic practice requires careful examination of the contextual settings in which it is being introduced. This is especially true for schools in developing countries which may operate differently from those of industrialized countries. Often the scope of investigation in professional development does not extend beyond the target program. However, the gaps between the realities of classroom/school and what was promoted through the professional development program often cause a failure in altering teachers’ practice or sustaining such change.

4 I use a “Javanese” school rather than an “Indonesian” school as the title of this thesis since Indonesia is an ethnically diverse country with each region having distinctive sociohistorical background. My examination of recontextualization is relevant to distinctive Javanese culture in Central Java. I discuss this issue further in Chapter 5.
In order to explore the issues of recontextualization in pedagogic transfer, and I present an empirical study of a Javanese junior high school—SMP\textsuperscript{5} Sari. By exploring the continuities and discontinuities between professional development and the institutional setting, I examine teaching as a social practice shaped within a particular contextual setting. Based on the ethnographic data, the problems of recontextualization will be discussions at two levels in this thesis.

1. **The first level is the problem of recontextualization in the transfer of education practice from one setting to another.**

2. **The second level is the issue of recontextualization from policy into practice. When new pedagogic practice is introduced as a result of the professional development program, what change does it bring to the classroom settings?**

This study situates the practice of teachers within the social relations of a particular institutional setting and examines their engagement with lesson study practice as a cultural form. In the professional development literature, the distinction between social and cultural are not always clear; the terms are often used synonymously. However, in this study, such a distinction is important. The social is concerned with the system of relations between individuals and groups realized in the form of alliances and oppositions and fluidity within this system. On the other hand, cultural refers to representation/patterns of practice that render the alliances and oppositions visible. For example, often the negative impact of “bureaucratic school culture” is attributed to what hinders the collaborative learning among teachers. But the interpretation here is that it is the social relations of the bureaucratic school system that regulates the daily responsibilities, actions, and interactions among managers, teachers, and students. Thus, the bureaucratic school culture, such as a lack of dialogue among teachers and superficial engagement in professional development, is shaped by the system of relations. This means that innovation in practice without innovation in relations is likely to result in superficial or temporary compliance with the initiative and this is what is found in the research presented here.

\textsuperscript{5} SMP is the abbreviation for Sekolah Menengah Pertama which means junior high school in Indonesian.
Through Chapter 2 to 4, I provide literature reviews that help understand issues in recontextualization in the pedagogic transfer.

In Chapter 2, I present efforts for pedagogic transfer across countries were motivated by the emergence of international surveys and global discourse on education quality. However, the justification for such quality discourse and pedagogic transfer is based on the ambiguous ground. I examine the problematic nature in the transfer of best practice from one setting to another and how the meaning of educational practice is always open to interpretation against the local setting of the receiving country.

In Chapter 3, I step back and explore the historical development of lesson study in Japan and examine sociocultural contexts that have supported its development. This will enable readers to understand the dynamic of lesson study and how lesson study has transformed and developed variations in response to the changing educational contexts.

In Chapter 4, I will review the cases of importing/exporting lesson study in various countries and explore the forces behind such transfer of lesson study, as well as examine the issue of “recontextualization” in each case. This will enable me to present how the meaning of practice is always reinterpreted against the local educational context.

In Chapter 5, I will provide the justification for my methodological approaches—especially the ethnographic approach—in examining the recontextualization of lesson study. In addition, the contextual background of the study will be provided in order to familiarize readers not only the setting of SMP Sari—the school setting of this study—but also the issues in professional development and the history of lesson study in Indonesia.

In Chapter 6, based on empirical data, I examine the institutional setting of SMP Sari and how teachers’ responsibilities were structured under the system of social
hierarchy. Teachers were accountable for both bureaucratic responsibility and social obligation owed to the community. I present the coping strategies of teachers in order to show how teachers negotiated these contesting demands. I examine how pursuing the professional interest to teach and work for students in relation to this accountability to the teachers’ community.

In Chapter 7, I examine the pedagogic practice of teachers in SMP Sari beyond their personal choice and as pedagogic strategies shaped by the institutional setting. Teachers interpreted teaching responsibility bureaucratically, and this had little relevance to the ability to work with students. In addition, I will provide analysis recruiting the extant sociological concepts (Bernstein, Vygotsky, and Dowling). By this, it becomes clear how the teaching practice and the claim for teacher expertise are strongly influenced by the bureaucratic institutional setting.

In Chapter 8, I provide a sociological analysis on the implementation of lesson study in SMP Sari. The analysis examines teachers’ practice in lesson study as the patterns of cultural practice within the bureaucratic institutional setting. Not only will I present what took place in open lessons and the post-lesson discussions, but I compare this with the daily practice of teachers. By examining the continuities and discontinuities between daily activities and lesson study activities, I present how it was implemented as an enactment of the bureaucratized project.

In Chapter 9, I extend my scope beyond the empirical case of lesson study in Java and provide a theoretical understanding of lesson study as the educational transfer of liberal pedagogy. I do this by comparing the empirical analysis in Java against the setting in Japan relying on secondary sources. By situating the meaning of pedagogic practice within a particular sociocultural context, I present how lesson study was “recontextualized” and implemented to fulfill the bureaucratic accountability in the setting of SMP Sari.
Finally, in Chapter 10, I will discuss the main achievements of this thesis, its limitation and constraints, and the implications for policy and practice as well as for the subsequent research.

The discussions in this thesis provide a theoretical understanding of the issues of transferring liberal pedagogic approaches in teaching and learning. I present such issues by providing cases of “recontextualization” in lesson study based on the review of the literature and sociological analysis of the empirical setting in the Javanese school. I argue the practice of teachers need to be examined as a social practice within particular sociocultural settings of the schools where they work. Thus, the practice of lesson study is also always recontextualized to provide new meaning in the setting where the practice is introduced.
Chapter 2: Global education reform and pedagogic transfer

2.1 Introduction

The emergence of international surveys had a significant impact on the global discourse on schooling quality. It has accelerated comparison of education quality and diversification of education transfer. Lesson study was also motivated by the global comparison and transfer of the best practice to improve the quality of education. While in the past, the target of “education borrowing” has been on Western models, Finland and some of the Asian countries became the sources of education transfer due to their success in international surveys. Also, not only “education borrowing” took place, the successful performers in PISA began to export their educational practices. The definition of education transfer provided by Beech (2006) represents the diversified nature of education transfer:

“the movement of educational ideas, in situations or practices across international borders” (p. 2).

The Finnish government has been promoting education export as a national strategy (Schatz, 2015). In Singapore, to accommodate the demands of foreign governments, the National Institute of Education offers specialized training courses for foreign educators (Interview with the NIE International, August 25, 2016). In Japan, led by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology (MEXT), a public-private initiative called EDU-Port was established in 2016 for the purpose of disseminating Japanese-style education overseas (MEXT, n.d.).

This chapter will explore different issues in pedagogic transfer linked to the global education reform. This will set the contexts for discussing the issues of “recontextualization” in education transfer in prior to discussing different issues in lesson study transfer that will be discussed in the following literature review chapters and the analysis chapters. I will examine the following questions.

• Is it legitimate to set universal standards to assess education quality and to compare different education systems around the world?
• What are justifications behind the transfer of the best practice of industrialized countries—such as constructivist approaches—to developing countries?
• What are the issues in transferring student-centered pedagogy in developing countries?

Firstly, I will discuss the global discourse on education quality focusing on the impact of PISA as the motivation behind education export. Secondly, I examine the justification behind the transfer of best practice from industrialized countries to developing countries. Thirdly, I will discuss the impact of such pedagogic transfer by introducing the cases of implementing student-centered pedagogy (SCP) in the settings of developing countries.

2.2 Global discourse on the quality of education

The Impact of the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)

The emergence of international surveys, especially PISA in 2000, had a significant impact on the global education discourse. PISA is an international survey conducted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) “which aims to evaluate education systems worldwide by testing the skills and knowledge of 15-year-old students” (OECD, 2016a). With over seventy countries participating and represented in the league table, it has triggered international competition and also motivated governments to learn from other nations in search of effective schooling (Lingard, 2010; Takayama, 2008). As Sahlberg (2011a) puts it, “Due to the acceptance of international student assessment surveys such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) as criteria of good educational performance, reading, mathematical, and scientific literacy have now become the main determinants of perceived success or failure of pupils, teachers, schools, and entire education systems” (pp.177-178). Consequently, the PISA ranking has been used as an indicator for the success or failure of education systems (Forestier & Crossley, 2015; Takayama & Apple, 2008).
As the number one educational system in the world, there was a surge of interest to learn from Finland. This significant attention from the rest of the world was described by Takayama, Waldow, and Sung (2013) who noted “the small Nordic nation has become a Mecca for foreign researchers, policy-makers and journalists from around the world who make the pilgrimage to the country in search of the secrets of its outstanding PISA achievement” (p. 307). The outstanding performances of Asian systems—Hong Kong, Japan, Shanghai, Singapore, and South Korea—in PISA 2009 and PISA 2012, also attracted attention to their educational systems (Matsushita, 2010; Sellar & Lingard, 2013; Takayama, Waldow, & Sung, 2013; Waldow, Takayama, & Sung, 2014). On the other hand, Germany experienced “PISA shock” when it was discovered that their ranking was lower than that of the US (Phillips, 2009). Historically, there has been international interest in borrowing from the German education system which was believed to be superior (Phillips, 2009). For the first time, the effectiveness of the German education system was called into question because of mediocre performance of students and the lowest level of social equity in education among all OECD countries (Waldow, 2009).

Despite the significant interest to learn from better-performing countries in PISA, there is no clear evidence of why successful countries performed better than the others. In fact, OECD clearly stated PISA cannot identify the success factors but can merely provide guidance on national policy and practice of school reforms (OECD, 2016c).

\textit{PISA is an ongoing programme that offers insights for education policy and practice, and that helps monitor trends in students’ acquisition of knowledge and skills across countries and in different demographic subgroups within each country. [...] The findings allow policymakers around the world to gauge the knowledge and skills of students in their own countries in comparison with those in other countries, set policy targets against measurable goals achieved by other education systems, and learn from policies and practices applied elsewhere. While PISA cannot identify cause-and-effect relationships between policies/practices and student outcomes [my emphasis], it can show educators, policymakers and the interested public how education systems are similar and different – and what that means for students.}
Nevertheless, the PISA data are often claimed as a legitimate evidence to justify educational reforms (Wiseman, 2013). The features of these reforms coincide with what was identified by Sahlberg (2011a) as the trends of education reforms under globalization, or “Global Education Reform Movement (GERM)”:

- curriculum development, student assessment, teacher development, technology-assisted teaching and learning, and proficiency in basic competencies (i.e., reading, mathematical, and scientific literacy) have become common priorities in education reforms around the world (p. 176).

There is little evidence of GERM leading to improving student performance. In fact, Finland was the one country that did not promote these reforms but presented a constant high performance on the PISA (Sahlberg, 2011a, 2011b; Silander & Välijärvi, 2013). Actions in the United States, England, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, and Japan, which promoted neoliberal reforms—such as promoting more accountability on student performance and competitions between schools—appear to have had negative effects onto the performances of students (Sahlberg, 2011a, p. 181).

Research suggests the PISA results and the crisis debate have been often tactically used to push local political agendas (Morris, 2015; Takayama, 2008; Takayama & Apple, 2008). For example, Japan experienced “the PISA shock” when major newspapers extensively covered the worrisome performance of Japanese students when its ranking dropped\(^6\) in 2003. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the results of PISA 2000 and PISA 2003 (Takayama, 2008). The crisis debate was instrumentally used to reconsider the educational reform of yutori kyoiku\(^7\), an implementation of relaxed and lighter curriculum policy. In fact, there was a discrepancy between the domestic and

---

\(^6\) The results of PISA 2000 and PISA 2003 revealed a drop in Japan’s ranking from 1st to 6th in mathematical literacy, from 8th to 14th in reading literacy, maintaining second place in scientific literacy and 4th place in the newly created category of problem-solving literacy (Takayama, 2008).

\(^7\) Yutori kyoiku or “low-pressure” education is described as education that will allow children “room to grow” “there was an assumption that the extremities of the entrance examination were negatively pressuring children’s lives and that a significant number of children from elementary to secondary school were unable to keep up with their classes” (Tsuneyoshi, 2004).
“external” evaluation of the Japanese education system (Tsuneyoshi, 2004). Despite the domestic criticism, OECD identified Japan as a “constant high performer” in PISA (Breakspear, 2014; Schleicher, 2009). In fact, there are often contradictory interpretations of the PISA results and reasons for good/bad performances. A study by Steiner-Khamsi (2014) suggests how Germany, Japan, and Korea each provided different interpretations of the Finnish students’ success in PISA in order to justify the controversial domestic agendas of the respective countries.

**Controversies over PISA and standardization of education quality**

The criticisms of PISA are based on three grounds. Firstly, there was a question, is PISA really measuring what OECD claims it to be measuring? While OECD claims to be measuring 21st-century skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration in conjunction with a student-centered approach, the success of East Asian countries, traditionally known for rote learning and exam-oriented teaching, suggests other factors such as study habits have a strong influence over the strong performance in PISA (Sellar & Lingard, 2013; C. Tan, 2012). The researcher argued that non-school factors such as education received outside of school, home environment, and other cultural factors were not considered even though they might affect the performance of students (Meyer & Schiller, 2013; Morris, 2015).

Secondly, there have been criticisms of PISA for standardizing education quality to narrowly defined, short-term goals, and for its emphasis on economic growth as the objective (Meyer & Benavot, 2013). The most famous incident was an open letter addressed to Andreas Schleicher, a director of the OECD’s PISA, published in *The Guardian* in 2014. The letter was signed by one hundred and twenty academics from twelve countries who urged the suspension of PISA 2015. They claimed that PISA may “distort the curriculum, reduce teachers’ autonomy and increase children's stress levels” (Wilby, 2014, para. 2) and harm education by “killing ‘the joy of learning’” (Andrews et al., 2014, para. 22).
Thirdly, it was also pointed out that the PISA ranking ignores sociocultural differences and economic gaps among the participating countries (Meyer & Benavot, 2013). These controversies over PISA point to the ambiguity of the ideological foundation and methodological justification of such an international survey. Nevertheless, PISA has a significant impact on the global educational reform and the motivation behind the education transfer.

2.3 Pedagogic transfer of best practice in developing countries

Concern for the quality of schooling in developing countries

In developing countries, there has been a growing concern for the quality of schooling. In the 1990s, the focus of the international development goals, such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the World Declaration on Education for All, was mainly on improving the access to education. For example, in the MDGs Goal 2 it was stated:

*Ensure that, by 2015, children everywhere, boys and girls alike, will be able to complete a full course of primary schooling* (United Nations, 2008, p. 12).

Succeeding remarkable improvement in access to education, the quality of schooling remained a challenge (Kitamura, Okitsu, & Yamazaki, 2017). As described below, in the post-2015 international development goals, such as Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and Education 2030, there is a clear emphasis on the quality of education.


In shifting the focus of the target from quantity to quality of education, additional complications arise, such as defining the goals, effective methods, and the measurement of output. While there were universally set goals and indicators for MDGs, the goals and indicators of SDGs are to be set nationally according to each country’s policy priorities and conditions (Kitamura et al., 2017). In addition,
these post-2015 goals are set universally for both developing countries and industrialized countries. This means that developing countries are now working toward common goals with industrialized countries despite significant differences in historical and economic backgrounds.

**Low-quality education discourse**

In the 1990s, the increasing number of developing countries began to participate in international assessments. Unlike higher income countries that voluntarily participate in PISA, developing countries joined international assessments with the external support of the international donor agencies. Due to the accountability concerns, international donors became interested in monitoring student performances. The World Bank has utilized the results of international assessments, TIMSS and PISA, in policy dialogue with developing countries and also as an instrument to decide funding and assessment of projects (Lockheed, Prokic-Bruer, & Shadrova, 2015). A review of the World Bank projects from 1998-2009 showed that over 75% of the projects supported some type of assessment and one-third of these supported large-scale international assessments (included 19 projects that supported PISA).

International surveys have an impact on educational discourse in developing countries in several ways. Firstly, the impact of PISA and other international surveys on policy and curriculum formation suggest that the goals set by international organizations have become the definition of a “good quality” of schooling worldwide. In the past, education was defined as a basic human right and the influence of international agencies such as UNICEF/UNESCO and the World Bank was limited to setting a framework of achieving Education for All and the Millennium Development Goals (Kellaghan, 2001). However, the increased dominance of PISA in quality discourse suggests that the purpose of education is increasingly geared toward economic competitiveness rather than as human rights (Auld, Rappleye, & Morris, 2018).
Once developing countries joined international surveys, they needed to compete on equal standing with “industrialized” countries despite the disadvantages of economic resources (Addey & Sellar, 2017). As one might expect, there has been an apparent disparity in student performance between industrialized and “developing” countries. According to the Global Monitoring Report (2009), “PISA 2006 showed that over 60% of students from Brazil and Indonesia scored at or below the lowest level in science, compared with fewer than 10% in Canada or Finland” (IMF & World Bank, 2009, p. 12). These low performances of students in developing countries have been used as evidence to criticize the national education systems and to urge reforms.

Indonesia is one of the few developing countries which has been participating in PISA since 2000. Indonesia ranked 64th out of 65 countries in PISA 2012 and has been labeled as a bottom-ranking country (OECD, 2014). The poor results in PISA have been repeatedly cited in the media as evidence of low quality in schooling. The newspaper headlines presented the crisis in the education system as “Indonesia as Lowest Education Quality in the World” or “As many as 75 percents of schools in Indonesia are not meeting the standards” (Sari, 2013; Wahyuni, 2014). In PISA 2015, Indonesia ranked 64th in science, 65th in mathematics, and 66th in reading performance among 72 countries (Indoriani, 2016; Sheany, 2017). While OECD acknowledged Indonesia as the fifth-fastest improving education system among the 72 participants (OECD, 2016b), the fact that it remains on the bottom tier of the ranking conveys a more powerful message to the public. It imposes the sense of urgency and that there are many challenges to overcome in ensuring the quality of education in Indonesia.

As late-comers, developing countries have an incentive to introduce those skills encouraged by OECD in order to catch up and survive in a global economy (Akiba, 2017; Schweisfurth, 2013). This has exerted pressures both domestically and externally for developing countries to reform curricula, national assessment, and teacher training policies to align with the PISA competencies (Lockheed et al., 2015). According to Akiba and LeTendre (2017) “In developing countries, scholars
have documented the influences and pressures brought to bear by international donor agencies such as the World Bank, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and Department for International Development (DFID) to adopt certain best practices” (p.5) such as SCP, teacher education, and certification reforms. (Akiba, 2017, p. 5). The concern for meeting the international standards could work negatively toward social and cultural variations in education such as developing countries’ choices in determining how to raise their citizens.

Transfer of constructivist approaches as best practice

The global trends in educational reforms—the introduction of competency-based curricula, outcome-based education, and interactive teaching approaches—are influenced by constructivist theory (Guo, 2013; Sulfasyah, Haig, & Barratt-Pugh, 2015; Tanaka, 2008). These trends are also reflected in the policies of international development assistance and how they discuss ways to improve the quality of education. The preference for constructivist pedagogic approaches, especially student-centered pedagogy (SCP8) is clearly present in the policy papers of international organizations. In Article 4 of the World Declaration on Education for All published in 1990, it was stated that “Active and participatory approaches are particularly valuable in assuring learning acquisition and allowing learners to reach their fullest potential” (World Conference on Education for All, 1990, pp. 2-7). Similarly, in the “Dakar Framework for Action” in 2000, the active learning pedagogy was emphasized (Ginsburg, 2010). In the Global Monitoring Report (UNESCO, 2007, p. 131) it was indicated that there is

a trend to revise curricula to make classroom interactions more responsive and centered on the child. There is a move away from traditional ‘chalk and talk’ teaching to more discovery-based learning and a greater emphasis on outcomes that are broader than basic recall of facts and information.

8 Learner-centered pedagogy, child-centered pedagogy, student-centered learning, child-centered learning, are used as interchangeable terms with student-centered pedagogy.
In this way, the terms relevant to SCP such as active learning, a participatory approach in learning, and the movement away from “chalk and talk” teaching began to appear in policy papers since the 1990s.

One prominent example of the transfer of constructivist approaches was the introduction of SCP in Asia and Africa (Sriprakash, 2010). There are several justifications behind the introduction of SCP in developing countries. Firstly, the introduction of SCP in developing countries was seen as desirable for building a democratic society and preparing students for a knowledge-based society (Schweisfurth, 2013). Such was considered to be a precondition for economic and social development. Within the framework of a decentralization policy, SCP was preferred as a more democratic pedagogical approach to classrooms: the case of Madagascar (Antal & Easton, 2009); the case of Cambodia (Ogisu, 2014); the case of Nambia (O’Sullivan, 2004); the case of Indonesia (Bjork, 2006). Secondly, student-centered pedagogy was perceived as modern, progressive, and effective in improving student achievements (Altinyelken & Sözeri, 2017). This was often linked to the teacher quality and transforming teaching practice as Altinyelken & Sözeri (2017) describe:

…SCP is linked to improving teacher quality by transforming teachers’ autonomy, roles, and responsibilities within the classroom. The assumption was, that through SCP, teachers will acquire new strategies and techniques, and will eventually make an important difference in student learning outcomes (Altinyelken & Sözeri, 2017, p. 255).

The issues in transferring SCP and its impact on the quality of education will be discussed in the next section. This move to promote SCP is closely linked to the introduction of lesson study abroad since its introduction abroad was motivated by the interest to shift teachers’ pedagogy from a didactic approach to a student-centered approach. Nevertheless, the transfer of pedagogy cannot guarantee the improvement in the quality of teaching and learning.
2.4 Transfer of student-centered pedagogy in developing countries

Transferring of SCPs as best practice

While the introduction of SCP seems to be on legitimate grounds as stated in the previous section, in reality, there is ambiguity over what constitutes SCP and the effectiveness of such practice. While the ideas from the West were introduced as a solution in developing countries, a positive outcome was not guaranteed.

Firstly, there is no clear definition of what constitutes SCP. SCP has been used almost synonymously with terms such as “progressive education, problem-based or inquiry-based learning, constructivism, and child-centered learning” but each term may signify a different meaning and different implications for the goals of learning (Schweisfurth, 2013, p. 9). Thus, Schweisfurth (2015, p. 262), citing Harber and Davies (1997), described SCP “as a ‘hooray’ term: one that invokes all sorts of positive and applaudable things while remaining a relatively empty signifier” (p.262).

Secondly, while SCP was offered in developing countries as unquestionably accepted and practiced in the West, there is no clear justification for promoting SCP. Even in the West, it is a much-contested pedagogy and there are challenges in its implementation (Altinyelken, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2005).

Thirdly, there were also criticisms that the promotion of SCP is political interference by foreign/international donor agencies. Tabulawa (2003) said the promotion of SCP is part of the “democratization project” and “representing a process of Westernisation disguised as quality and effective teaching” (p.7). Some argue that education “borrowing” is a part of the process of Westernization or it is a form of colonialism or cultural imperialism (Guthrie, 1990; Lam, 2009; Nguyen, Elliott, Terlouw, & Pilot, 2009; Tabulawa, 2003). When SCP is introduced as a universal remedy to improve the quality of schooling, it could potentially marginalize local wisdom and knowledge (Tabulawa, 2003).
Fourthly, researchers suggest there are many challenges in implementing SCP in the context of developing countries. Although SCP was introduced to developing countries as best practice, its effectiveness largely depends on the local contextual setting. These challenges in SCP form the topic of discussions in the next section.

**Transfer of SCP and the Politics of Curriculum**

While the focus of this thesis is on the transfer of pedagogy, I would like to point out some issues concerning the politics of knowledge and the school curriculum. While often the discussion on the content of the curriculum is neglected—especially in the context of donor assistance—because of political concerns. However, the quality of education depends on what is being taught as well as how it is taught. I would like to raise three points here.

Firstly, what is being taught as the school curriculum is selective and political in nature. For example, the history taught in Japanese classrooms is different from the history taught in Korea or in China. Each state has its own agenda in educating its citizens with its own interpretation of history. There is no curriculum that is politically neutral.

Secondly, SCP itself cannot be politically neutral as pedagogy is impacted by the social structure of schooling institutions. In Chapter 5, I will discuss—with reference to the study by Sharp and Green (1975)—how liberal pedagogy was intended to provide better learning opportunities for students, but it merely masked the marginalization of some students in their learning. On the same note, teachers are also not neutral in evaluating who are “good” students. Studies show that middle class teachers indentify favorably with the children whose social backgrounds are close to their own (Sharp & Green, 1975; Heath, 1986; Youdell, 2006; see also Rist, 1970.)
Thirdly, there is a fundamental flow in expecting students to be critical of the existing curriculum or pedagogy when teachers do not teach them necessary “powerful knowledge” (Young et al. 2014). Without being taught critical facilities, children have no access to the tools they need to overcome social inequalities and to realize social justice.

These points relevant to the politics of curriculum are not the focus of this thesis; however, I recognize that these are crucial issues and there is a problem in concentrating exclusively on the technical aspects of pedagogic transfer as effective in improving the quality of classroom teaching and learning.

**Issues in transferring of SCPs as “recontextualization”**

**Constraints of facilities and resources**

The challenges in educational transfer are well described by Vulliamy and Webb (2009):

*To have a good chance of success, educational policies or innovations, whether initiated by national policymakers or by international organizations, need to be in tune with the everyday realities of the classroom and the motivations and capabilities of ordinary teachers (p. 400).*

In this section, I will examine the challenges in introducing SCP in the contexts of developing countries as the issues of recontextualization. Firstly, the most obvious challenges in implementing SCP in developing countries are the constraints on resources. SCP requires more resources in terms of space, materials and intensive student-teacher interactions; however, teachers in developing countries work with large class sizes with limited classroom space and teaching resources (Altinyelken, 2011; S. Johnson, Hodges, & Monk, 2010; Nguyen-Phuong-Mai et al., 2012; Schweisfurth, 2013). A case from Uganda suggests that the success in implementing a problem-solving approach depended not on teachers’ correct understanding but rather on the surrounding contextual factors which reflected the setting of school and society (Sikoyo, 2010). Constraints of time and resources, low student proficiency in English, and large class sizes made it difficult for
teachers to design a lesson and to solicit student participation as expected in a problem-solving approach.

**Teacher qualification and training**
The second issue is that the implementation of SCP puts more demands on teachers compared to didactic methods of teaching from textbooks. In order to design their own curriculum and respond flexibly to meet the diverse needs of students, teachers need high levels of knowledge, skills, and experience (Altinyelken, 2011). However, often teachers in developing countries are unqualified or lack proper training to implement SCP. Thus, in order to implement SCP, professional development needs to make up for the lack of basic skills and knowledge (O’Sullivan, 2004; Schweisfurth, 2013). However, training for SCP in developing countries is not specifically learner-centered; it is often too short, too theoretical, and lacking in practicality (Schweisfurth, 2011). These training focused on transferring knowledge and skills and rarely addressed the challenges teachers may face in real classroom settings (Nykiel-Herbert, 2004; Schweisfurth, 2011). Without proper knowledge and facilitation, SCP fails to provide meaningful learning opportunities (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Nykiel-Herbert, 2004).

**Preference for didactic methods for exam preparation**
Thirdly, since the evaluation system in developing countries is examination-oriented, teachers favor a didactic approach of lecturing, memorization, and drilling (Altinyelken, 2011; Vavrus, 2009). In Uganda, the pressure to cover the curriculum within a given time-frame and over-populated classrooms work negatively to take the individual approach promoted in SCP (Sikoyo, 2010). The cases from sub-Saharan African countries cited similar challenges of implementing SCP due to the anticipation of parents and students to prepare for high-stakes exams (Samoff, 2003; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2012). In the case of rural Indian primary schools, learning was equated with assimilating the syllabus through didactic teaching and “joyful” components promoted by SCP were separated from serious learning (Sriprakash, 2010). Thus, even when teachers
understood the benefits of SCP, the existing school structure made it unrealistic for teachers to put SCP into practice.

Social relations reflecting societal norms and values

Fourthly, the practice of SCP may fail or result in a superficial implementation when there is a discrepancy between newly implemented policy/curriculum prescribed in SCP and the existing social norms (Brodie, Lelliott, & Davis, 2002; Sikoyo, 2010). The cultural factors in developing countries such as teachers acting like the ones in authority and “collectivist” cultures worked in opposition to the approaches promoted by SCP (Schweisfurth, 2011). In India and South Africa, it was reported that students resisted SCP because they felt unprepared to learn independently and preferred to be taught by the ones in authority (D. Johnson, Hayter, & Broadfoot, 2000; Sriprakash, 2010). In order for students to actively engage with subjects of learning and interact with peers and teachers, they needed to act outside the prescribed norms of conduct. However, such conduct may be difficult since it could undermine the teacher’s authority or due to the group conformity pressure. For example, in a case in Namibia, critical skills which required students to question adults contradicted the expected conduct of students to be respectful and obedient (O’Sullivan, 2004). Similarly, the study by Altinyelken and Sözeri (2018) presented how some of the teachers in Turkey were concerned that SCP would promote individualistic values among students which are against the collectivist norms in the Turkish society (p.262).

Furthermore, a flexible learning approach promoted by SCP could potentially widen the academic gaps among students. Due to the stratified societies and schools in developing countries, teachers may assume some students had greater potential and this may deprive the learning opportunity for low achieving students (Schweisfurth, 2011). These studies suggest that the implementation of SCP requires teachers to reconceptualize learning and reconsider the divisions of roles between teachers and learners (Nguyen-Phuong-Mai et al., 2012; O’Sullivan, 2004).
Pedagogic transformation as teacher strategies

Even when teachers have sufficient resources, knowledge, and skills to implement SCP, teachers may not apply SCP in their classrooms. Watson and Manning (2008) explain that “the range of pedagogic strategies that teachers use in their classrooms is selectively retained because they survive in particular classroom conditions” (p. 706). In transforming pedagogy, it is essential to examine the practice of teachers as teacher strategies within a social learning system or “communities of practice” (Wenger, 2000). In the case of Botswana, the whole-classroom and didactic approaches had been consistent over time because they were “reinforced both by surface rules and by less formalized norms, socialization processes, and ritualized practices which together shape what 'good teaching' means to the typical teacher” (Fuller & Clarke, 1994, p. 153).

These difficulties of transferring SCP convey that the adaptation of best practice depends on whether it matches with the local sociocultural contexts which shape teachers' preference on a certain pedagogy. Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect a radical change induced by SCP. Research suggests, it is more realistic and beneficial to search for the ways to improve the practice within the existing structure (S. Johnson et al., 2010; O’Sullivan, 2004). There is a better chance of pedagogic transformation if teachers’ voices are reflected in the curriculum and pedagogic reform process (Altinyelken & Sözeri, 2017). Thus, SCP is always reinterpreted and the new meaning is given within the local setting. Without acknowledging contextual differences, the implementation of SCP may have a little or even negative impact on the quality of student learning.

2.5 Conclusion

In this chapter, it was discussed how the emergence of international surveys motivated an international comparison of the quality of education and efforts to transfer best practice. International assessments such as PISA have been playing a significant role in defining what constitutes “good quality.” Despite the controversial nature of PISA, it has a standardization effect on education quality.
and this has impacted education policy and curriculum reforms in both industrialized countries and developing countries. In developing countries, there is a growing concern since 2000 for education quality after having successfully improved access to education. Due to the accountability for donors and quality assurance, developing countries also participate in various international assessments. The poor performance of students in developing countries in international surveys often promoted a crisis debate and drastic policy and curriculum reforms.

The pressure to improve the quality of schooling has driven developing countries to alter their policies and practice to align with what donor agencies regard as desirable approaches. Consequently, the constructive approaches were supported by international donors as the best practice and the transfer of SCP was promoted as an effort to improve the quality of schooling. However, the discussions on the cases of SCP suggest that there is a fundamental issue in such pedagogic transfer: the meaning of educational practice is socially constructed and always open to interpretation against the local contextual settings. Thus, the best practice is always deemed to be reinterpreted within a given sociocultural setting when transferred. The introduction of lesson study is also one case of transferring the best practice in a globalized world. In the next chapter, the historical development of lesson study in Japan will be discussed in order to understand the contextual background that has supported its dynamic development.
Chapter 3: Development of Lesson Study in Japan

3.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present the origins and historical development of lesson study\(^9\) in Japan in order to understand the sociocultural contexts that have supported the dynamics of lesson study in Japan. Lesson study is generally known as a form of Japanese professional development that has characteristics of bottom-up initiatives and collaborative learning of teachers focusing on improving student-learning (Arani, Fukaya, & Lassegard, 2010; Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; Lewis, 2002a; Stigler & Hiebert, 2009). Lesson study is often perceived as “an effective approach” for professional development or best practice to improve students’ academic achievement. However, lesson study is not based on a particular theory or methodology and there is no agreed definition. Rather it is a dynamic system that has been reformulated through exchanges of practice and has been influenced by various educational theories, approaches, and ideologies, both domestically and abroad (Asanuma, 2012). The following definition by Matoba (2017) grasps this complexity and the multiple roles of lesson study:

...a series of research on lessons collaboratively conducted by teachers to plan, implement, observe, discuss, and evaluate and improve the lesson for the purpose of lesson improvement, professional development, the building of school culture, or basic research conducted by researchers (p. 167).

Lesson study began due to the establishment of the modern school system. Originally, it was an instrument to experiment and disseminate “modern” teaching methods from the West. Over time, lesson study has created variations accommodating to sociocultural conditions and the needs of practitioners, policymakers, and researchers. Lesson study can be used as an approach for lesson analysis, curriculum development, practice-oriented research, demonstration lessons, or various forms of professional development. Lesson

\(^9\) Sometimes lesson study is called research lessons but research lessons have a connotation of “model lessons” for the teachers from other schools to learn from and they are distinguished from in-house lesson study.
study has endured over its history due to its flexibility in adapting to the local system as the practice is socially constructed and context dependent. Lewis (2002) described it as “a flexible system for learning from practice that requires particular supporting materials and knowledge, conditions, habits of mind, and institutional structures to flourish” (p. 13). This flexibility and adaptability also make it difficult to understand lesson study. However, understanding the social and context-dependent nature of lesson study is especially important for foreign practitioners/researchers. Challenges in implementing lesson study abroad are often caused by the absence of the necessary supporting conditions.

This chapter presents how the development of lesson study over one-hundred and fifty years has been supported by unique educational contexts in Japan. As will be revealed in this chapter, there are mainly three forces that have contributed to the dynamic development of lesson study:

1) Top-down initiatives by policymakers to standardize lessons and bottom-up initiatives of practitioners to experiment with innovative practice.
2) Governmental efforts to institutionalize professional development as the effort for quality assurance and teachers’ efforts to work collaboratively to pursue their educational ideals in order to guarantee students’ learning.
3) Scientific inquiries to establish effective learning based on universal theory or methodology and a holistic approach to understanding learning as a personal and contextualized experience.

By understanding these unique educational contexts that have supported lesson study in Japan, we are able to understand the underlying philosophies and assumptions behind the practice.

### 3.2 Origins of Lesson Study

Lesson study was born subsequent to the establishment of the modern Japanese educational system. Following the Meiji Restoration (1868), one of the great
turning points in Japanese history, Japan underwent a drastic modernization process. As part of the process of modernization, the Ministry of Education was established in 1871 and the first ordinance to establish a national education system was promulgated in 1872. The Education System Order of 1872, or Gakusei, stipulated a plan for a national education system modeled on those of western nations (Duke, 2009). Prior to this, education was provided mainly through two channels. The first category was fief schools, in which the children of elites were educated in the Chinese classics; the second category comprised temple schools (terakoya), in which the children of ordinary families were taught basic literacy (reading, writing, and arithmetic) and the practical needs of daily lives (Duke, 2009; JICA, 2004). In both these types of school, students' learning was based on a tutoring system such that students seek out their masters to receive lessons. With the introduction of the western schooling system, lessons were taught in the style of classroom teaching for the first time. Since the concept of "lesson" was totally new to the teachers, training to prepare teachers for classroom teaching was needed. A teacher training center was set up at the Tokyo Higher Normal School in 1873 by educators who had studied in the West. Lesson study was first practiced there as a way of experimenting and disseminating modern teaching methods imported from the West (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996).

By the 1890s, lesson study was widely practiced in elementary schools nationwide. It was used as a top-down effort to disseminate the modern curriculum and methodologies and to standardize classroom instruction (Asanuma, 2012; Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996; M. Sato, 2015). The education policies were greatly influenced by the philosophy of the Swiss pedagogue Pestalozzi and the systematized teaching process of the German educator Herbart (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996; Matoba, 2013). In particular, the government used five steps (preparation, presentation, association, generalization, and application) and the Herbart approach as an effort to control the quality of teaching (M. Sato, 2015). While previous books had focused on the content of teaching, around this time teachers began to exchange practical techniques gained from their classroom
experience. In the book *Kyodanjo no Kyoshi* (Teachers on Platform) published in 1908, an elementary school teacher, Suekichi Kato, shared practical techniques, such as how to present a topic, ways of working with students using a blackboard, and how to monitor student activities within the whole class (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996; M. Sato, 2015). This exchange of practice among teachers is an important feature of lesson study; nevertheless, at this point, lesson study was merely used as an instrument to disseminate “effective” teaching techniques and pedagogic practice.

3.3 Lesson Study as teachers’ initiatives

In the 1920s, under the political period known as the Taisho Democracy, there was a new approach to lesson study, experimenting with an innovative practice that was different from the previous dissemination of “effective” teaching. The New Education Movement (the 1920s to 1930s) was led by teachers who were critical of the government’s move to standardize teacher-centered pedagogy and to treat children as passive subjects. Influenced by John Dewey and other western philosophers, these educators established private experimental schools based on a child-centered ideology.

One such school, the Seijo Elementary School, was opened in 1917 based on a vision of respecting individual differences and the unique characteristics of each student (M. Sato, 1996). While lesson study was previously undertaken for the purposes of directly importing western teaching, Seijo pursued its own educational ideals and conducted lesson study as a laboratory school and published its results (M. Sato, 1996; Yamazumi, 1987). Another progressive school, *Ikebukuro jido no mura shogakko* (the Ikebukuro Students’ Village Elementary School), was established in 1924 with a utopian philosophy. In this school, children had the freedom to choose their teacher, curriculum and lesson time (M. Sato, 1996; Yamazumi, 1987). These and other progressive schools held lesson study and documented these lessons in order for teachers in other schools to learn from them (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). However, such bottom-up initiatives in lesson
study had limited impact since only privileged private schools implemented such progressive practices. In the majority of state schools, teachers taught to deliver the state-designated curriculum (Yasuhiko, 2009).

Two important “narrative” traditions originated in the new education movement and have continued until today. The first was Daily Life Writing (Seikatsu tsuzurikata), “an educational practice in schools aimed at developing guidance on how to live, through the process of children writing compositions inspired by their own lives” (Kawaji, 2017, p. 109). This practice was initiated by the teachers in the previously mentioned Ikebukuro Students’ Village. In 1929 they launched a new monthly journal called Composition Life and in 1935 they began a new journal entitled Life School in which they published the works of children and narrative descriptions of classroom experiences (Asai, 2019). These teachers were critical of the government for treating students as passive learners. Thus, they designed a flexible curriculum in which children could take control of their own learning and express themselves using their own words.

While Daily Life Writing allowed students to express their lives as a learning experience, it was the second tradition, jissen kiroku or “narrative records of teaching,” that allowed teachers to reflect on the process of teaching practice and record their experiences in a narrative style. Asai (2008) describes the characteristics of jissen kiroku as: 1) the use of the first person “I”; 2) the specific names of students were mentioned in the record; 3) the events between “I” (teacher) and students were described in narrative descriptions. Asai (2019) points out that jissen kiroku allowed teachers to pursue their educational ideals and discover the meaning of their practice in their interactions with students. Katsuta (as cited in Asai, 2016, p. 51) wrote that jissen kiroku was distinct from scientific generalization or theorization since its purpose was to connect teachers by sharing common educational ideals and practical issues.

Seikatsu tsuzurikata and jissen kiroku reflect the long-standing traditions of Japanese teachers in understanding learning as a holistic experience grounded in
practice. These features of a shared understanding of learning are summarized as follows:

- Learning is grounded in close student-teacher relationships.
- Learning is understood as closely linked to life experience and as a holistic experience.
- There is an emphasis on the process of learning and inner reflection.
- There is an emphasis on the unique experience of individual students and the autonomy of learners.
- Learning is recounted in the narrative form with the use of the first person and as personal experience.
- Learning is interpreted and situated within contexts.

These views of teaching have motivated Japanese teachers to reflect on their practice and build what Shimahara (1998) called “craft knowledge.” Japanese teachers understand “teaching is learned, transmitted, and reformulated as a craft in Japan, and Japanese teachers commonly view craft knowledge as embedded in teacher-generated experience and knowledge—a form of professional expertise based on the accumulation of pedagogical wisdom” (Shimahara, 2002, p. 24). This continues to be a strong tradition among Japanese teachers distinct from that of researchers’ scientific and theoretical inquiries.

### 3.4 The New Education Movement and lesson study

These teacher’s efforts to record learning narratively and to exchange practice through such documentation has paralleled the practice of physically holding lesson study activities (Asai, 2019). These narrative teaching records were written, “to be shared with other teachers, for the development of their teaching ability, curricula, teaching methods, and teaching materials” (Asai, 2019). M. Sato (2015, p. 94) noted five impacts of the New Education Movement on lesson study. First, the target of investigation in lesson study shifted from instructional techniques to the learning experiences of students. Second, the concept of educational practice emerged as well as the method of jissen kiroku to accumulate records of lessons.
in a narrative style. Third, the style of lesson study based on the cycle of observation, recording, and discussion was established. Fourth, the style of reflecting practice and conducting research in a narrative style with the use of the first person was established. Fifthly, lesson study reports and research using narratives (such as seikatsu tsuzunikata and jissen kiroku) were published widely and promoted the exchange of practice among teachers. These characteristics of lesson study have continued to the present day. However, in the pre-war climate in the 1940s, grass-roots and self-initiated movements of teachers disappeared temporarily as the government strengthened control to promote a nationalistic ideology and militaristic education. During the pre-war and wartime periods, the aim of education was to raise children “to become loyal subjects of the Emperor” (JICA, 2004, p. 18).

In the post-war era of the 1940s and 1950s, Japanese education went through a series of reforms for democratization. One such was the decentralization effort that gave schools autonomy to design curricula and select textbooks based on local needs. Although the first Course of Study (equivalent to the national curriculum) was issued in 1947, it was noted as a “draft” and only served as a reference (Yamazumi, 1987). When authority was granted to schools, there was a revival of the New Education Movement from the 1920s to develop a child-centered approach and curricula to prepare children for a democratic society. Based on a nationwide survey conducted in 1951, seventy percent of elementary and middle schools engaged in developing school-based curricula (M. Sato, 1996, p. 39). In response to this great interest in curriculum design, many reports on research lessons were published in the 1950s (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996; Yasuhiko, 2009).

3.5 Promulgation and Stagnation of Lesson Study

Under the influence of the Cold War, there was a shift away from democratic and autonomous practices of schools in the post-war period towards strengthening of government control over education (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). In 1958, the word
“draft” was dropped from the Course of Study and it began to function as the national curriculum. Under such circumstances, lesson study was used as an instrument to train teachers to teach the national curriculum. Accordingly, there were moves to systematize lesson study.

Until the 1960s, the practice of and research on lesson study had been implemented by teachers and bureaucrats and the interest of academics had focused on the development of the curriculum (Asanuma, 2012). After the introduction of foreign research and theories on lesson analysis and pedagogy in the 1960s, academics began conducting research on lessons. Based on different theoretical backgrounds, five universities, Hiroshima University, Kobe University, Nagoya University, Tokyo University, and Hokkaido University, began conducting research on lessons (M. Sato, 1996, 2009a). This marked the beginning of researchers’ collaboration with schools. In 1962, the National Council of Lesson Study (Zen kokujyugyou kenkyukyogikai) was born out of collaborative research projects between researchers in these five universities and elementary and junior high school teachers (Fujiwara, 2009). Such collaborative research was motivated by the interest in using scientific methods to develop “teacher-proof” teaching materials (M. Sato, 2015).

One research topic, pursued by Kiyoshi Sunazawa in the National Council of Lesson Study, was the investigation of “how students think and learn in a classroom community.” This was the origin of the tradition in Japanese lesson study of examining how students learn from dialogues in a classroom community (Fujiwara, 2009). As part of the effort to seek a scientific approach to lessons and pedagogy as a discipline, a magazine, Lesson Study, was first published in 1963 (M. Sato, 1996). In the following year, the National Association for the Study of Educational Methods (NASEM) was established to support the interest of researchers in teacher pedagogy.

These researchers developed unique methods for analyzing lessons in order to share the findings with teachers. For example, Takayasu Shigematsu of Nagoya
University and colleagues used fieldnotes and other media as an effort to understand the lesson as the relationship among children, teachers and instructional materials (Akita, 2012; Matoba, 2017). Lesson study led by researchers is distinct from lesson study as previously conducted by teachers. The narrative, descriptive, and subjective reflection on practice was taken over by the objective and quantitative analysis of teachers’ and students’ actions in lessons (Akita, 2012).

The second systematization of lesson study occurred through in-service teacher training systems. In the 1960s, local training institutions/centers for in-service teacher training were set up by the government and these continue to exist today. These centers provided obligatory training in a lecture style with the teachers playing the roles of passive learners and they tended to lack practical application of knowledge in the classroom (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). In addition, the system of “designated research schools” was first established in 1964. In this system, schools participate to conduct research on a particular theme for 2–3 years, for example on ICT or human rights. Lesson study is commonly used in this research school scheme and since all schools take a turn participating in the scheme, lesson study has become standardized practice (M. Sato, 1996). The systematization of lesson study has resulted in its goal being identified as the pursuit of teacher-proofed “good practices” rather than promoting dynamic discussions to share innovative practices (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). As a result, in some cases, lesson study has become ritualistic, involving quasi-obligatory activities rather than being a voluntary activity for teachers.

Besides these efforts to systematize lesson study in the 1960s, there was also a grass-roots effort to further lesson study under the movement called minkan kyoiku undou or Popular Education Movement. Teachers initiated voluntary subject study groups. These subject groups were often critical of the national curriculum and worked with the teacher’s union. Thus, they conducted lesson study as a way of developing their own teaching materials and published periodicals (M. Sato, 2009a).
In the 1980s and 1990s, Japanese schools faced various challenges that led to stagnation in lesson study. In the period of high economic growth, the competitive examination system put tremendous pressure on students (M. Sato, 2000). However, after the oil crisis, entering a good school no longer guaranteed the pathway to high social and economic status (Murase, 2018). In addition, excessive competition wore students out and they focused on passing the exams and they lost their will to learn (M. Sato, 2000). Consequently, Japanese schools increasingly faced social problems such as school violence, non-school attendance, delinquency, and bullying (Akita, 2012; M. Sato, 1996). Lesson study initiatives by teachers and researchers both deteriorated during this period. The fragmentation of teachers’ unions weakened their power and this resulted in the wakening of bottom-up initiatives of teachers concerning lesson study (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). Also, there was a lack of momentum of researchers to engage in research on lesson study. While various approaches to lesson analysis, such as ethnomethodology, qualitative research, participant observation, critical theory, social constructivism, cognitive science, and activity theory, were introduced in the 1990s, there was no agreed approach to analyzing lessons (Matoba, 2013; M. Sato, 2009a).

In the 1990s, in addition to the continuation of social problems in schools from the 1980s, teachers had to cope with the revision of the Course of Study (Akita, 2012). Teachers became too busy handling disciplinary issues and dealing with administrative work to do much else. Under such conditions, the teachers lacked time for lesson study and some regarded it merely as a burden. It was at this time that the new approach to lesson study was born, which will be discussed in the next section.

### 3.6 Lesson Study as a Learning Community

In the 1990s, a new movement in lesson study, which aims to reform schools by creating a “learning community” (Dewey, 1938) was initiated. This movement was
advocated by the prominent scholars in Japan, Yutaka Saeki, and Manabu Sato. Not only schools were in need to reform to deal with social problems, but there was also interest to move away from standardized teaching under the New Course of Study (新学習指導要領) (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). Under this educational climate, lesson study as a learning community or the school as a learning community (SLC) initiative started. According to M. Sato (2018), SLC is not a technical approach but a set of three components – vision, philosophies, and activity systems. It redefines the school of the 21st century as a “learning community,” where students learn together, teachers learn together for professional development and even parents learn together through active participation in school reform. SLC is inspired by Dewey’s democratic philosophy (Dewey, 1916), Vygotsky’s theory on collaborative learning (Dewey, 1916, 1938), Schön’s (1983) reflective practitioners (Murase, 2018; M. Sato, 2018). Based on the public mission to realize the human right of learning for all children,” SLC proposes three pillars for school reform (International Network for School as Learning Community, n.d.):

1. school is a public sphere in which all teachers should open their classrooms (public philosophy).

2. school is managed based on a democratic principle such that students, teachers, parents, and the community all participate in “a way of associated living” (Dewey) (democratic philosophy).

3. the school pursues excellence in teaching and learning.

The first pilot school based on the philosophy of SLC—the Hamanogo elementary school—was created in 1998 (M. Sato, 2012). This was initiated by the former education officer in Chigasaki City Education Council, Toshiaki Ose, who became the first principal of Hamanogo. Mr. Ose worked with Manabu Sato (a professor at the University of Tokyo at the time) to try out a new style of schooling based on the philosophy of a learning community. This was a rare example of a public school challenging the existing schooling system and building a new type of school based on the shared vision of the democratic school and learning community.
Based on this experience, Ose and Sato later published a book entitled *Establishing a School – The Birth and Practice of Hamanogo Elementary School* (Ose & M. Sato, 2000). The book provided detailed accounts of the experiences of building the learning community in the school. This included first-hand descriptions by the teachers of the difficulties of adapting the new approach and how they overcame such challenges. Hamanogo was a public school located in a suburban area and was ordinary in terms of teacher qualifications and student demography. The fact that such an ordinary school was able to create a learning community attracted the attention of schools nationwide, especially those in poverty areas, facing similar challenges (M. Sato, 2018). The case of Hamanogo attracted hundreds of teachers, who came from all over Japan and even from abroad to observe the school in action every year even today.

Table 3.1: The comparison of regular lesson study and lesson study in school as a learning community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Regular Lesson Study</th>
<th>Lesson Study in School as Learning Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aim</strong></td>
<td>Lesson improvement for effective lessons</td>
<td>Ensuring the rights of every child to learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improving the academic performance of students</td>
<td>Creating high-quality learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training competent teachers</td>
<td>Development of thoughtful teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Building collegiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic schools and classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Study of materials, lesson plans, and lesson techniques</td>
<td>Relationship and activities of student learning, authentic learning, and collaborative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The frequency of Open Lessons</strong></td>
<td>Around 3 times a year</td>
<td>More than 30 times a year</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (M. Sato, 2015, p. 102), translated by the author

Sato distinguishes traditional lesson study from SLC as shown in Table 3.1. The new lesson study approach, SLC, was developed as a dialogue between the western philosophies and longstanding Japanese teacher traditions. The concept of SLC was developed under the influence of “reflective practice” by Donald Schön (1983), an approach in which teachers develop through reflecting on and
exchanging their own practice. Inagaki and M. Sato (1996, p. 20) call this restructuring the classroom into a “discourse community” (ディスコース・コミュニティ), with the members valuing diversity and individual differences and being enabled to explore unique experiences and meanings of learning. The ultimate objective of a lesson was reconsidered to be ensuring a high quality of student learning based on the study of individual cases. The focus of lesson study shifted away from the pursuit of generalized teaching models dominant since the 1960s and instead reverted somewhat to the earlier movement of the 1930s for teachers to experiment with practice (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996; M. Sato, 1996).

According to M. Sato (2018), around 1,500 elementary schools, 2,500 junior secondary schools, and 300 senior secondary schools in Japan engage in SLC. There is now a national network of lesson study as a learning community, the Japan Network for School as Learning Community (http://school-lc.com/). SLC spread widely, mainly in the domain of compulsory education (primary and junior secondary schools), although it was not widely taken up in high schools. This may have been due to the strong influence of university entrance exams and the popular use of the teacher-centered approach in high schools in contrast to the student-centered approach commonly used in primary and junior secondary schools (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; LeTendre & Rohlen, 1996).

The extent of penetration by these reform movements is difficult to assess since their development did not follow the same procedures and the accounts are told in narrative forms. Nevertheless, it is clear that SLC had a significant impact on schools in Japan. One explanation behind this rapid expansion of SLC was that it matched the needs of teachers who were desperately looking for an alternative approach to education as they faced challenges. Teachers were struggling with declining achievement levels and working with those students who had lost the motivation to learn (M. Sato, 2012). There were also problems with decreasing the autonomy of teachers as a result of increasing bureaucratic control (Murase, 2018). SLC was appealing to teachers to “redefine the concept of formal education as the basis of a democratic society” (Murase, 2018, p. 17).
3.7 Lesson study today

Today, lesson study is implemented in various forms as listed in Table 3.2. There is government-sponsored teacher training, regional study groups organized by teachers, in-house lesson study at the school level, and various other forms of lesson study. The most common practice of lesson study is in the form of konaikenshu or in-house workshops (Shimahara, 1991, as cited in Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004).

According to a survey by the National Education Policy Research Institute in 2011, 99 percent of Japanese elementary schools, 98 percent of junior high schools, and 90 percent of public high schools conduct lesson study (Lewis & Lee, 2017). However, while almost all schools conduct in-house lesson study, there are different degrees of participation and even cases of superficial implementation (M. Sato, 2009a, 2015). Yufu (2007) attributed the deterioration of lesson study to a lack of shared vision and motivation among teachers and the changing teacher culture. The introduction of teacher performance evaluation—which promotes individualism and competition—and the generation gaps between senior and young teachers exerted a negative effect on the established system for collaboration in lesson study. Therefore, while lesson study is still widely practiced today, one cannot generalize the types of lesson study, let alone the commitment to and quality of lesson study.
## Table 3.2: Types of lesson study in Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Hosted by</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-house workshops</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Implemented based on shared vision and purpose; implemented as continuous professional development throughout the year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefectural or municipal training</td>
<td>Local boards of education</td>
<td>Often examine lessons using video and lectures; focus on effective instructional methods and acquisition of skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated research school</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Implemented for a particular topic of research; the implementation period is usually a few years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public lessons by university attached schools and collaborative research projects between schools and universities</td>
<td>University researchers and principal</td>
<td>Through the collaboration with researchers, theoretical and academic analysis of the lesson is possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training provided by teacher unions</td>
<td>Teacher Unions</td>
<td>Rather than an investigation of lessons, more emphasis is placed on overall educational issues and labor issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary teacher study groups</td>
<td>Teachers with shared interests and goals</td>
<td>Teachers get together based on the common interests and discuss freely; however, recently there has been a decreasing number of participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events, seminars, or curriculum/material development hosted by companies, newspapers, or Non-Profit Organizations (NPO)</td>
<td>Private companies, newspapers, or NPOs</td>
<td>Implemented based on specific interests such as the acquisition of IT skills or collaboratively developing teaching materials</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Akita (2012, p.46) translated with minor modification by the author.

### 3.8 Conclusion

Based on the discussions of the historical development of lesson study so far, it is apparent that the sociocultural setting in Japan is conducive to and has facilitated
the dynamic development of lesson study. In this section, I will conclude by summarizing the characteristics and underlying philosophies of lesson study.

**Student learning as a social and holistic experience**

First, there is a shared understanding among Japanese teachers that their role is to support students’ learning experience for their long-term development. Lesson study is rooted in this understanding of learning as a social experience and interest in developing children as autonomous learners. This is reflected in how the daily responsibilities of teachers are structured around supporting students (LeTendre & Rohlen, 1996). Due to this emphasis on students’ holistic development, teachers in Japanese junior high schools are organized by grade levels rather than by subject of teaching. Also, teachers in public schools rotate to teach across grade levels in order to foster understanding of the long-term development of students. In this way, teachers’ responsibilities are strongly structured with the goal of nurturing children and this motivates teachers to engage in cross-subject lesson study. This sense of shared responsibility for developing student learning among teachers is rooted in and forms the basis for collaborative professional development.

**Teacher-initiated inquiry**

Second, lesson study is rooted in a professional culture that supports teacher-initiated inquiry centered on student learning (M. Sato, 2015). For example, Japanese teachers carefully observe lessons and see lessons from the students’ perspectives and this has helped to develop “the eyes to see students” (Lewis, 2002a, p. 12).

*During research lessons, teachers scour the classroom for evidence of student learning, motivation, and behavior – everything from how children’s thinking about levers changed over the lesson, to whether the quietest children spoke up, to whether children’s “eyes were shining” as they investigated pendulums (Lewis, 2002a, p. 21).*

Similarly, *kyozai kenkyu* – the study of teaching materials – requires not only deep understanding of subject teaching, but also requires teachers to develop
strategies anticipating student’s thinking. This contributes to improving teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (Yoshida & Jackson, 2011). Foreign researchers have pointed out that the concise curriculum and standardized textbooks facilitated such sharing of teaching materials and practice (Lewis, Perry, & Hurd, 2004; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). This sense of shared interest in working with students has contributed to building teachers’ knowledge bases.

**Teacher-generated knowledge and professional knowledge base**

Third, over the history of lesson study, Japanese teachers have developed accumulated tools, language, and artifacts and this has supported teacher-initiated professional learning in lesson study. Exchange of practice in the form of *jissen kiroku* is still popular among Japanese teachers. Teachers record their practice to reflect on teaching and the learning process of individual students. Inagaki and M. Sato (1996) describe “contextualized reasoning” as the expertise valued in lesson study as reflective practice, distinguishing this from technical expertise. Lesson study has developed as a way of exchanging the personal accounts and narratives of students and as a way of understanding students’ holistic learning experiences. Thus, the discussions in lesson study are often not limited to goals in particular lessons, but include the development of students, envisioning the future.

The established culture for teachers as researchers is evident from the fact that there are more publications by teachers than researchers in Japan (M. Sato, 2015). Lesson plans, records of lessons, and research papers are shared not just between schools but across schools. This includes resources developed for curriculum study and *kyozai kenkyu* or the study of teaching materials (Lewis, Perry, & Friedkin, 2011; Watanabe, Takahashi, & Yoshida, 2008). Such teacher-generated knowledge is also evident from the context-specific vocabularies used among Japanese teachers. Words such as *kikan-shido* (between desks instruction), *neriage* (polishing students’ ideas through discussion), and *yusaburi* (challenging students’ ideas and thinking) are difficult to translate into a foreign language (Clarke, 2013; Lee & Ling, 2013; Takahashi, 2009). These vocabularies
imply that particular teacher-student social interactions are presumed in lesson study.

**A flexible learning system**

Fourth, described as “a flexible learning system” by Lewis (2002), lesson study is adaptable in meeting different needs in terms of its forms, implementers, and the focus of inquiry. As in the case of SLC, which was born out of the need to reform schools for the 21st century, there is always the possibility that a new approach to lesson study will emerge, driven by the educational issues of the time. Importantly, lesson study developed as a bottom-up resistance from schools and teachers to governmental control and the standardization of pedagogic practice. Thus, it has been used as a way to seek unique pedagogical approaches and a mean to realize educational ideals. Whether based on theoretical grounds or practical needs, lesson study provided a platform to share practice, to reflect on teaching and learning, and to learn from others.

**Practitioner–researcher dialogue and collaboration**

Fifthly, lesson study has contributed to the culture of dialogue and collaboration between researchers and teachers. This, of course, does not mean that researchers and practitioners have always agreed on the purpose or approach of investigating lessons. There have been different contributions by researchers and teachers (M. Sato, 1997): an objectified language on the part of researchers and narrative accounts from teachers; scientific and theoretical investigation by researchers; and personalized and contextualized reflective practice among teachers.

M. Sato (1997) also warns that the hierarchical relationship between researchers and teachers could undermine the professional autonomy of teachers; thus, he advocates that teachers as professionals should be at the center and act as the agents of lesson study. If technical terms in research dominate pedagogic inquiry, this could result in disrespect for the practice-oriented inquiries and narrative
approaches used in lesson study. Therefore, researchers should not be the advisors of teachers, but rather they need to learn from teachers’ practice, to support teachers’ inquiries in teaching, and to “live” lessons as insiders with teachers and students (M. Sato, 2009b, p. 126). Kaneta (2010) also considers that action research in lesson study provides a new form of collaboration between teachers and researchers to engage in “reciprocal learning.” She claims that by participating in lesson study, they participate in cultural practice and dialogue, such that they both contribute to creating a lesson and connecting this with theory beyond the practice. Another example of researcher-practitioner collaboration is the use of lesson analysis by the researchers at Nagoya University as a means of investigating discourse in lessons and supporting the professional development of teachers (Matoba, Shibata, & Arani, 2007; Shibata, 2007).

The discussion in this chapter has illustrated the unique historical, social, and cultural contexts of Japanese schooling that have supported the dynamic development of lesson study in Japan. The shared understandings, tools, knowledge, visions, and philosophies among Japanese teachers are embedded in the practice of lesson study. These supporting conditions underpinning the practice of lesson study may not be immediately visible, especially when one only focuses on lesson study as best practice or as a form of professional development. However, as the now abundant literature on the implementation of lesson study abroad suggests, it is clear that lesson study cannot be replicated “as is” in foreign settings in which the supporting conditions are not necessarily present. As a “flexible learning system,” lesson study will surely adapt to accommodate the receiving educational contexts and will continue to develop in new variations. Such foreign development of lesson study is the discussion of the next chapter.
Chapter 4: Development of Lesson Study Abroad

4.1 Introduction

Over the past two decades, lesson study has gained popularity around the world and came to be known as the first well-known Japanese education models (Tsuneyoshi, 2017). Lesson study was introduced to the U.S. and Hong Kong in 1999, South Africa in 2000, Australia and the UK in 2001, Sweden and Thailand in 2002, Malaysia in 2004, Singapore in 2004, Vietnam and Indonesia in 2006, Brunei in 2008, and the Netherlands in 2009 (Lee, 2011). Since then, it has spread to numerous other countries. The establishment of the World Association of Lesson Study (WALS) in 2007 and the first publication of the International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies in 2011 by Emerald, represents a significant interest in lesson study. The WALS Conference 2017, held at Nagoya University, attracted 893 attendants from 35 countries (the WALS 2017 organizing committee, personal correspondence, December 23, 2017).

In this chapter, the following questions are explored:

• What are the forces, both pull and push, behind importing and exporting of lesson study?

• What are the issues in such import/export of educational practices?

Unlike the situation in Japan, lesson study abroad was artificially implemented, by researchers and agencies at least at the onset, into sociocultural contexts that were different from Japan. Through the review of the literature, various cases of “recontextualization” of lesson study will be discussed. As discussed in Chapter 1, recontextualization involves a transformation of the practice and its meaning

10 Learning study is a variation of lesson study, born out of a collaboration of researchers in research projects in Hong Kong. This project aimed to examine classroom practices with a research orientation and improve them based on evidence (Lo, 2009). By incorporating Variation Theory into lesson study, learning study is implemented as an experimental lesson designed with a clear objective in student learning (Lo, 2009; Marton & Ling, 2007). It is now widely practiced in Hong Kong, Sweden, and has transferred to other countries as well.
against the social conditions of the receiving context. This may result in an emphasis on the one aspect of lesson study or even alteration of the meaning of the practice. One example of such recontextualization is how the implementation of lesson study in foreign countries concentrated on the area of mathematics and science but not in other subjects. This reflects the motivation behind the engagement to lesson study—the excellent academic achievement of Japanese students in mathematics and science. In this chapter, different cases of lesson study implementation in abroad will be presented. This will familiarize readers with the issues of “recontextualization” and set the contextual background for the subsequent analysis chapters.

4.2 Foreign attraction to lesson study

The global trends in educational reform have contributed to the attraction to lesson study. Firstly, the emergence of international surveys such as PISA and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) resulted in an increasing interest to learn from educational systems of high performing countries (Owens, 2013). One of the reasons behind the attraction to lesson study was due to the high performance of Japanese students in these surveys, especially in mathematics and science. Secondly, due to the preference for a social constructivist approach to teaching and learning, teachers have been required to shift their pedagogy from a didactic approach to a student-centered approach. Not only that, but they are also expected to continuously engage in professional development to accommodate the changing needs of students (Day & Sachs, 2005). These new demands triggered an interest in professional learning communities (PLCs). This is due to the recognition that teachers need organizational support to alter their pedagogy and to sustain such change to continuously engage in professional development (Bolam & Stoll, 2005; DuFour, 2007; Little, 1982; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006). Lesson study was considered an effective approach in bringing these pedagogical changes to accommodate the new challenges in teaching and learning for the 21st century.
While it is impossible to compile a comprehensive list of lesson study implementation abroad, I will introduce some cases in order to present various cases of “recontextualization.” I will first introduce a case from China and present the development of lesson study based on a different tradition from Japan. Secondly, I will explore the development of lesson study in the U.S., which triggered the other countries’ interest in lesson study. Thirdly, I will introduce cases from Asia. Namely the implementation of lesson study in Singapore, and School as Learning Community (SLC) efforts in Korea and Taiwan. Lastly, the cases of lesson study “export” in developing countries will be discussed. The discussions of these cases enabled me to explore how the pedagogic transfer does not occur in a uniform fashion but varies the meaning of the practice across contexts.

4.3 Parallel Development of Lesson Study in China

Historical development

In China, lesson study has a unique tradition that is different from Japan. While lesson study in Japan was initially a bottom-up initiative, lesson study in China was bureaucratically structured in the school system (Bush & Qiang, 2002). In 1902, the Chinese Association of Education was established for the purpose of providing teacher research (Chen & Yang, 2013). Consequently, research committees on teaching were organized within schools in 1935, and there was also an established system of holding public lessons especially in pre-service teacher training in universities (Guo, as cited in Chen & Yang, 2013).

Teaching Research Group (TRG; or jiaoyanzu) was established at every school in 1952 when Provisional Regulation for Secondary Schools (draft) mandated subject-based research groups to be established in every school (Yang, 2009). TRG is organized “to study and improve the way of teaching” and national, provincial, and school level networks were formed (Ministry of Education, as cited in Yang, 2009). The systematic cooperation of teachers was structured under

\[\text{SLC is also referred to as “Lesson study as learning community” (LSLC) in other literature such as Saito & Atencio (2015) and Saito et al. (2014).}\]
TRGs; offices were set up for teachers to meet regularly and to spend after school hours together (Chen & Yang, 2013).

The decentralization policy and the curriculum reform in 2001—which emphasized active participation of students based on the constructivist ideal of learning—motivated the spread of lesson study at the national-level (Chen & Yang, 2013). For the first time, the schools were responsible for developing a school-based curriculum (Guo, 2013; Nanzhao et al., 2007). Various training opportunities were organized both by the governments and by schools to implement the new curriculum (Guo, 2013). TRGs were used as an instrument to translate curriculum reform into practice (Fang, 2017). According to Zhong (2006), the biggest challenge for teachers was to meet conflicting demands to incorporate more interactive teaching methods on the one hand, and to ensure educational quality measured by the tests on the other.

Lesson study is embedded in the daily work of Chinese teachers. Since all teachers are required to conduct and observe open lessons, they engage in different types of lesson study activities depending upon their career stage (Pang & Marton, 2017). According to Fang (2017), “the TRGs have been fundamental school organs in running the teaching-research activities in addition to monitoring teaching content, scheduling and pacing for teaching and examinations” (p. 295).

Features of Chinese lesson study

Chinese TRGs share similar features with lesson study such as its cycle of planning, public lesson, and post discussion but there are also differences. Firstly, TRG is a subject study group which places an emphasis on how to teach specific subject content (R. Huang, Fang, & Chen, 2017). This process is supported by teacher research specialist (Yang & Ricks, 2011). Based on an ethnographic study of TRGs, Han and Paine (2010) identified three contributions

---

12 Elementary school teachers in China teach a single subject although there are some exceptions in rural areas.
of lesson study in improving instructional practices as “designing mathematical tasks for students, understanding and instructing difficult mathematical ideas and using the appropriate mathematical language” (pp. 526-536). These points show how teacher instruction is directly linked to student mastery of the subject content. Ma as cited in Yang (2009) points out the activities of TRG contributed to developing a profound understanding of fundamental mathematics by Chinese teachers. While the pre-service courses in the universities tend to focus on theories such as pedagogy and child psychology, lesson study provided teachers opportunities to gain hands-on practice, practical skills, and knowledge in teaching (Chen & Yang, 2013). However, there is limited literature on how TRG contributed to this (Cai, Lin, & Fan as cited in Han & Paine, 2010, p. 519).

The second difference was, discussions in Chinese lesson study focus on the improvement of teacher behavior and teaching approach while the Japanese discussions focus more on student learning (Chen & Yang, 2013). According to Yang as cited in Yang & Ricks (2011), there are three key themes for discussions; (1) the lesson’s key point, (2) the lesson’s difficult point, and (3) the lesson’s critical point. Thirdly, lesson study in TRG has been practiced to disseminate best practice of expert teachers by holding demonstration lessons for other teachers to imitate and adapt to their own teaching contexts.

These features of lesson study indicate that the purpose of lesson study in China is to enhance teacher’s subject expertise, to improve teacher instruction, and to disseminate best practice. Consequently, there is more emphasis on the repeated cycles of lesson study to refine one lesson and it is common for teachers to conduct several cycles of lesson study of the same lesson (sometimes lessons were rehearsed for large-scale public lessons) (Han & Paine, 2010; Yang, 2009). Recently, there are new movements of lesson study outside of bureaucratic and systematic lesson study and to pursue bottom-up professional inquiries. This was motivated by the philosophies of SCL and the advocates of SCL such as Professor Chen Xianming of Peking University (Manabu Sato, personal communication, June 14, 2018).
4.4 Lesson Study in the U.S.

Background

Although lesson study has been practiced in Japan since the 1870s, it was not “discovered” by the international community until 2000s when English publications on lesson study became available by American researchers (Tsuneyoshi, 2017, p. 23). In 1997, Catherine Lewis and Ineko Tsuchida published the first article on lesson study in English. They attributed research lesson (now popularly called lesson study) as what produced the remarkable shift in science teaching in Japan from “teaching as telling” to “teaching for understanding” (Lewis, 2002a; Lewis & Tsuchida, 1997; Lewis & Tsuchida, 1998). In 1999, other American researchers, Stigler and Hiebert (1999), published Teaching Gap where they described lesson study as what has contributed to the high performance of Japanese students in TIMSS. They presented how the image of teaching patterns (which they called teaching scripts), significantly differed in each country and proposed lesson study as a useful strategy to produce “the cultural change” needed to improve teaching gradually over the long term.

The attraction to lesson study was also underlined by the domestic criticisms of the American schooling system. This was a time when the public was concerned by the underachievement of American students after the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Subsequently, the U.S. Department of Education commissioned studies on foreign education systems including the Japanese system. The Japanese studies were conducted by prominent researchers in the field such as Harold Stevenson, Catherine Lewis, and others, and their studies laid the ground for the interest in lesson study (Rappleye & Komatsu, 2017). For example, the book published by Stevenson and Stigler, The Learning Gap: Why Our Schools Are Failing and What We Can Learn from Japanese and Chinese Education (1992), discussed the superiority of mathematics instruction in Japan. This book is often referred to as what triggered the interest in lesson study in the U.S. The urgency for
education reform grew when the low performance of American students in the first TIMSS results in 1995 disturbed the public (Tsuneyoshi, 2004).

Another factor that contributed to the interest in lesson study was a paradigm shift in professional development approaches. Due to the interest in learning organizations and PLCs, there was a move away from short-term and individual approaches and interest in more collaborative approaches (A. Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990; Louis, Marks & Kruse, 1996; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006; Senge, 1991; Wenger, 2000). Collaborative and continuous professional development was considered key to improving teaching and learning. Under such domestic educational discourse, lesson study was recognized as a preferred approach for professional learning: in enhancing pedagogic content knowledge; organizing teachers’ collaborative and bottom-up professional inquiry; increasing teacher efficacy; and shifting understanding of teaching to based more on student inquiries and ideas (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; Murata, 2011; Puchner & Taylor, 2006).

**Progress and diversification of lesson study in the U.S.**

The first public research lesson\(^{13}\) in the U.S. was held in 2000 at Paterson Public School 2 in Paterson, New Jersey, with support from the researchers from Teachers College, Columbia University (Lewis, 2002a). The same year, the state level and national level lesson studies were initiated (Matoba 2008). At the initial stage, lesson study in the U.S. was implemented on an informal and voluntary basis by researchers, administrators, and teachers. In particular, the teachers played a big part in the spread of lesson study in the U.S. (Lewis, 2015). Over the years, larger-scale initiatives—district and state-level efforts—of lesson study were initiated (Akiba & Wilkinson, 2015; Lewis et al., 2011). For instance, Florida State decided to introduce lesson study as a statewide teacher professional development model to meet the state standards in line with the Common Core.

\(^{13}\) Research lesson, public lesson, and open lesson among other terms are used to describe the phase of lesson study where teachers open their lessons for other practitioners or researchers.

There were multiple forces behind the spread of lesson study. At the initial stage, there were at least three groups of researchers with a different focus who had contributed to the development of lesson study in the U.S. (Matoba et al., 2006; Matoba et al., 2007). The first group, Stigler and others, were interested in the content of lessons and to reveal how to build “cultural routines” of effective teaching (Stigler & Hiebert, 2016). The second group, Fernandez and others, focused on the role of teachers with an emphasis on research and curriculum as well as effective methods and tools (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004). The third group, Lewis and others, were interested in the holistic learning of students and the collaborative culture of teachers (Matoba et al., 2006; Matoba et al., 2007). The American practitioners who implement lesson study may not be fully aware of these differences. Nevertheless, these different developments laid the ground for the multi-layered motivation and implementation in lesson study in the U.S.

Another factor behind the rapid expansion of lesson study in the U.S. was the establishment of supporting mechanisms which facilitated the transition of lesson study into the U.S. contexts. In the early to middle 2000s14, various English papers, reports, and guidebooks15 were published which introduced the principles of lesson study and described the experience of implementing lesson study in the American settings. Various networks of lesson study16 were also formed. They

---

14 For example, see Brown, McGraw, Koc, Lynch, and Arbaugh (2002); Chokshi and Fernandez (2004); Fernandez (2002); Lesson Study Research Group (2004); McGraw, Arbaugh, Lynch, and Brown (2003); National Research Council (2002); North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2002); Perry and Lewis (2004); Richardson (2004); Stepanek (2001, 2003); Wang-Iverson and Yoshida (2005); Watanabe (2002); Wilms (2003).


16 Some of the lesson study networks in the U.S. are: Columbia Lesson Study Research Group (http://www.tc.columbia.edu/lessonstudy/), Lesson Study
became platforms to share resources, to exchange practice, and to seek advice. For instance, Lesson Study Group at Mills College (https://lessonresearch.net/) offers lesson study videos and Global Education Resources (http://www.globaledresources.com/) sells products related to lesson study such as mathematics textbooks, workbooks, DVDs and other teaching resources. Also, both American and Japanese researchers have played the role of external resource persons and worked with regional practitioners. Lesson study resources in English facilitated the further spread of lesson study not only in the U.S. but also to other countries.

According to Lewis et al. (2011, pp. 78-83), there are now the following types of lesson study in the U.S.: (1) a small voluntary group of interested teachers, (2) a summer institute, (3) a school professional development program, (4) a school-wide lesson study, (5) groups of coaches or specialists to enhance their expertise, (6) mentoring for new teachers, (7) pre-service education, and (8) public lessons as part of a regional and national conference.

**Contextual gaps in lesson study**

In implementing lesson study in the U.S., there were practical challenges. Since professional development was not structured within the daily responsibilities of teachers, how to secure time for lesson study was an issue in American schools. It often required an external fund to pay for stipends and in addition, to hire substitute teachers in order to free teachers from teaching obligations (Akiba, 2016; Bocala, 2015; Lewis, 2008; Perry & Lewis, 2009; Puchner & Taylor, 2006).

However, more fundamental challenges involved the gap in understanding between what lesson study promoted and how American teachers interpreted the practice. This led to the superficial implementation of lesson study (Akiba & Wilkinson, 2015; Stigler & Hiebert, 2016). Especially at the early stage of importing ____

lesson study, there was a tendency of American practitioners to focus on short-term and measurable goals, which were in conflict with the long-term and holistic process proposed by lesson study (Lewis, 2002a; Matoba, 2008). Similarly, American teachers interpreted lesson study merely as a tool to implement new teaching methods and curriculum standards without understanding the overall approach (Akiba, 2016). Some American teachers felt they did not have sufficient content knowledge or ability to present “extraordinary” lessons, and protested they were not culturally fit to open their lessons to other teachers (Chokshi & Fernandez, 2004). These challenges point out that the merely introducing lesson study may bring structural and conceptual conflicts that may hinder the effective implementation.

**Local adaptation**

While the reported challenges were often attributed to the cultural differences, empirical studies suggest that local adaptation of lesson study was possible if time and efforts were spent to overcome conceptual gaps (Murata, 2011; Perry & Lewis, 2008). In fact, its adaptability to local educational settings was pointed out as the strength of lesson study. The research by Perry and Lewis (2008) presented how teachers gradually developed their understanding of lesson study. As teachers practiced small components of lesson study and built them into the existing practice, they began to value different aspects of lesson study such as “developing a lesson rationale and documenting their own learning” (p. 387).

Similarly, Lieberman (2009) examined the case of lesson study in a middle school mathematics department over seven years and showed how it was able to alter the norms of teaching. Through participating in lesson study, teachers were able to overcome the traditional norms of teaching described by Lortie (1975)—the norms of individualism (unwillingness to share practices), presentism (focus on short-term goals), and conservatism (unwillingness to take risks). Lieberman (2009) wrote:

*Teachers develop and re-develop their professional identity by participating in a learning community with norms of openness,*
collaboration and experimentation […] Teachers learned that teaching is not a passive endeavor, but a collaborative effort to design courses—to critically assess curriculum materials and to actively find, interpret, adapt and use outside resources (p. 96).

Thus, in successful cases of lesson study, the goal is not limited to improving lessons but altering human relationships among teachers in a school and building a collaborative community among teachers (Lewis, 2015).

In fact, the lesson study experience may not be the same within a professional community since teacher learning develops over time. The study by Bocala (2015) presented how the participants from the same community benefitted differently from the lesson study experience depending on their familiarity with lesson study and the experience of teaching. The novice practitioners focused more on specific features of lesson study and recounted benefiting from observing other teachers’ lessons or getting ideas from other teachers. The experienced practitioners and who were familiar with lesson study routines expressed how they reconceptualized the role of teachers and students and, reconsidered their pedagogy to elicit student thinking. For them, lesson study was a useful approach to gather evidence of how students learn or how they understand mathematics.

These cases present to us that it takes time and both conscious and unconscious process of adaptation is needed in order for lesson study to take root in local settings.

4.5 Lesson Study in Asia

Curriculum reform under globalization

It was the low performance of American students in international surveys motivated the introduction of lesson study in the U.S. In contrast, the Asian countries such as China (Shanghai), Taiwan, Singapore, and South Korea had performed relatively well in the international surveys such as TIMSS and PISA. It was a changing international climate and globalizing trends in education reforms
that supported the spread of lesson study in these countries. In the late 1990s to the early 2000s, a series of curriculum reforms took place in Asia: “Basic Education Curriculum Reform Outline (2001)” in China (Guo, 2013; Schweisfurth, 2013); “Thinking Schools, Learning Nation (1997)” and “Teach Less, Learn More (TLLM) initiative (2005)” in Singapore; the “Seventh Curriculum (1997)” in Korea; and the “Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum (2002)” in Taiwan. These Asian countries shared a common interest to accommodate the changing needs in education for the 21st century and to transform pedagogy (Kennedy & Lee, 2007; M. Sato, 2015).

Governments and university researchers introduced lesson study to bridge the gap between policy and practice and to facilitate curriculum reform (Chen & Yang, 2013; Lee & Ling, 2013; Tan-Chia, Fang, & Chew Ang, 2013). Due to the need to shift away from the traditional exam-oriented approach to a more interactive and student-centered approach, lesson study gained popularity in Asia. Moreover, the government proposed the building of a professional learning community of teachers to facilitate this transition of implementing the new curriculum. There is a limitation in this literature review in Asia due to the scarcity of English and Japanese literature especially in the cases of Korea and Taiwan. Despite this limitation, the review will present the commonality behind the motivation to engage in lesson study and the variations in actual implementation across contexts.

**Singapore**

**Historical development**

Singapore provides an informative case due to its relatively long history in implementing lesson study since 2004. Lesson study in Singapore was implemented as a part of a larger government initiative to transform classroom pedagogy for 21st-century learning (Saravanan & Ponnusamy, 2011). The government policies such as “Thinking Schools, Learning Nation (1997)” and “Teach Less, Learn More (TLLM) (2004)” were initiated to reform the curriculum and pedagogy from teacher-centered pedagogy to more student learning (Hairon & Dimmock, 2012; Lee & Lim, 2014). In the midst of these reform movements,
Lesson study was first introduced in 2004 by an American researcher, Catherine Lewis, at an international conference on Cooperative Learning (Lee & Lim, 2014).

The first engagement with lesson study was initiated in 2004 as a small pilot project in a primary school (Edmund Lim, personal communication, January 8, 2018) and then, between 2006 and 2007, a pilot study was implemented within the Cooperative Learning Programme (Lee & Lim, 2014). In introducing lesson study, researchers from the National Institute of Education played a key role and worked in cooperation with the Ministry of Education. These researchers took resources from the U.S. to train Singaporean teachers. In addition, they made some modifications borrowing from the components of other foreign implementations such as the use of Variation Theory\textsuperscript{17} in Hong Kong and “critical incidents” in China (Fang & Lee, 2015). In addition, these researchers also integrated original elements to their lesson study. This included adding a short discussion by the observers with the observed students at the end of the research lesson so as to gain a better understanding of the students’ thinking and learning.

Lesson study in Singapore was implemented mostly as subject study groups under the existing professional development structure—usually of less than 10 teachers (Cheng & Yee, 2011/2012; Fang & Lee, 2015; Lawrence & Chong, 2010; Y. Tan, 2014). The teachers found collaborative planning and the post-lesson discussions (PLDs) to be especially useful in acquiring deeper subject understanding and in understanding how to facilitate students’ learning (Fang & Lee, 2010). Lesson study was accepted as an effective approach to strengthening teachers’ pedagogical content knowledge (Shulman, 1986) and to develop school-based curricula (Fang & Lee, 2010).

\textsuperscript{17} According to Lo (2009), “Variation theory argues that the way one understands something depends on the critical features on which one focuses. In the education context, the failure of students to learn an object of learning may be explained as their failure to discern all of the critical features required for the particular way of understanding the object of learning intended by the teacher. Therefore, to help students appropriate an object of learning, the teacher must first study that object in depth to tease out its critical features” (p. 170).
There was also a case of one secondary school engaging in school as a learning community (SLC). The interest in SLC emerged after a keynote speech by Manabu Sato in 2011 at the Singapore Lesson Study Symposium (Lewis & Lee, 2017). The school established the interdisciplinary team and the evidence provided that teachers’ focus was beyond subject specialty and more on student management (Lee & Lim, 2014). While the traditional lesson study in Singapore focuses on collaborative planning and curriculum-study, SLC focuses on observations and reflections on student learning.

The spread of lesson study in Singapore was made possible with government support for professional development. In 2005, the Ministry of Education (MOE) mandated each school to provide one hour for teachers to engage in school-based curricular development and innovation (MOE 2005 as cited in Hairon and Dimmock, 2012). In 2009, the MOE introduced the vision to turn schools into PLCs (Lee & Lim, 2014). With the belief that the teachers should be at the center of reform, lesson study was supported by the national government as one form of building professional learning communities (Lawrence & Chong, 2010). Lesson study coincided with what the government promoted three big ideas—focus on student learning, collaborative culture, and data-driven outcome—and practice guided by critical questions relevant to student learning (Yeap, Foo, & Soh, 2015). Consequently, the number of participating schools rose from 59 in 2009 to 112 in 2010 since lesson study was popularly selected as a tool to build PLCs (Lee & Lim, 2014). Based on a survey of all principals, 58% of elementary and junior high schools in Singapore are exposed to lesson study in some way (Lee, 2015). In this way, the collaborative learning of teachers was structured top-down as a school-based professional development program.

**Benefits and Challenges in Singapore**

The following were cited as benefits of lesson study implementation in Singapore (Lim, Lee, Saito, & Syed Haron, 2011; Yeap et al., 2015):

- Professional development focusing on students’ learning and outcomes.
- Enhancement of teachers’ subject matter knowledge and pedagogical knowledge.
- Helping teachers to design curricula.
- Stronger collaboration and network among teachers and with external resource persons (university researchers and the officials from the Ministry of Education).

On the other hand, there were challenges in embedding the practice within the wider educational context. Often the biggest challenge in lesson study was addressed as a lack of time (Lim et al., 2011; Yeap et al., 2015). However, this was more the matter of whether teachers perceived it was worthwhile to engage in lesson study. Since Singaporean schools emphasized educational goals with a short-term orientation, teachers had difficulty in seeing interconnectedness across subjects or grade levels. Consequently, school-wide engagement in lesson study constituted an aggregate of subject groups rather than a school-wide initiative (Fang & Lee, 2010). They also lacked the focus of the lessons as a unit and failed to connect their practice with long-term goals such as school or curriculum goals (Lee & Lim, 2014). Under the circumstance, some teachers considered the iterative process of planning—which is the characteristic of kyozai kenkyu (the study of instructional materials)—to be time-consuming (Lee, 2015). Also, some teachers considered it was not worthwhile to spend time for lesson study and felt it was an additional burden (Lim et al., 2011).

In addition, the competitive and hierarchical school structure worked negatively in terms of collaborative professional learning. There was pressure to conduct a perfect lesson rather than learning from a lesson (Lee & Lim, 2014). Also, there was a tendency for teachers to rely on external expertise (university experts or the Ministry) out of concern of doing lesson study properly instead of teachers setting up personal research themes in lesson study (Lim et al., 2011). In addition, there was limited involvement of outside experts due to teachers’ skepticism towards them (Cheah, 1998 as cited in Lim et al., 2011; Lee & Lim, 2014). These conditions made it difficult for teachers to collaborate in their professional learning.
Since lesson study was recommended by the government as a form of professional development, this top-down implementation allowed the significant diffusion of lesson study in Singapore. However, it requires more than government support to overcome the challenges addressed in terms of continuous and collaborative learning intended in PLC. Lee and Lim (2014) described, “the implementation of lesson study in Singapore has much support in terms of forms and structures, but is lacking in the spirit and substance of jyugyo kenkyu [lesson study]” (p. 58). These issues could not be resolved by merely going over the cycle of lesson study but considerations need to be attended to the local meaning of the practice. This suggests the adaptation required a broader approach attending to the school climate beyond the scope of professional development. When lesson study is not linked to overall education goals, embedded in daily school structure, and does not fit the needs and interests of teachers, it could lead to “superficial” implementation similar to the cases reported in the U.S.

**Lesson Study: School as a Learning Community in Asia**

There has been a rising interest in “school as learning community (SLC)” in Asia (which was first advocated by Professor Manabu Sato discussed in Chapter 3), as an initiative to reform schools of the 21st century based on democratic principles. Since 2000, SLC has been practiced in countries such as China, South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Thailand among others (M. Sato, 2018). These Asian countries share the challenge to reform school away from the traditional model emphasizing competition and paper examinations motivated by the curriculum reforms (M. Sato, 2000). Therefore, there was an interest to learn from the example of school reforms in Japan and a framework and vision for the 21st-century schools presented in the translated books of Manabu Sato. The engagement in SLC was motivated by criticism against neoliberal policies and the negative consequences of such policies on public schooling (M. Sato, 2018).
In this section, I will introduce the cases in Korea and Taiwan where a considerable number of schools have been engaging with SLC\textsuperscript{18}. The SLC movements in these countries were supported by both grassroots initiatives of schools and top-down government policy and distinguished from the systematized government-sponsored professional development in Singapore.

**South Korea**

In South Korea, the spread of SLC in the 2000s was linked to the government’s effort to reform education in the 1990s. It was driven by a domestic criticism of public schools for their heavy emphasis on the university entrance examination. The Korean educators were facing similar challenges to those in Japan such as truancy, bullying, and lack of motivation in learning as negative consequences of the high stakes examination system (Shin, 2016). The first Korean translation of Manabu Sato’s book was published in 2001 (Shin, 2010). The philosophies and principles of SLC were appealing to the Korean teachers who were worn out by top-down reforms and the authoritarian school environment. With the support of a research team from Pusan National University, one public school in Pusan City became a research school in 2005-2006 and tried out SLC as a government-sponsored project (Shin, 2008, 2016). However, this ended as soon as the project and funding ended (Shin, 2014). The end of SLC with the end of the government-sponsorship suggests that it was an add-on project rather than incorporated into the Korean school system.

More sustainable efforts of SLC started with a movement to establish alternative schools (代案学校) in the late 1990s. These schools were born out of criticisms of the exam-oriented public schools and aimed to provide new and different learning experiences for students (Shin, 2010). One of these schools implemented SLC as a way to build grass-roots reform to create a learning community in 2006. However, a teacher of this school recounted there were challenges in sustaining

\textsuperscript{18} While I am focusing the cases of SLC on Korea and Taiwan in this chapter, there are obviously other types of lesson study implemented in these countries. For example, refer to J. Pang (2016) for various types of lesson study in Korea.
SLC even within a progressive atmosphere of the alternative school. Because the school was established as the new model for public schooling, there was pressure for teachers to improve students’ performance in a short period and there were concerns from parents to whether the new teaching approach was effective to prepare students for the university entrance examination (Shin, 2014).

SLC was introduced as the part of the government’s effort to reform schooling based on bottom-up and democratic principles. In 2009, seventeen out of 15 superintendents of district education offices in South Korea introduced “innovative high schools” where bottom-up school reforms were encouraged in order to promote creativity, diversity, and a democratic atmosphere in the school (Shin, 2014). SLC had a high affinity for innovative schools since it pursues a more democratic approach to education centered on student learning (M. Sato, 2018; Shin, 2010, 2014, 2016; So, Shin, & Son, 2010). As a result, a significant number of schools engaged in SLC. Currently, there are around 500 schools engaging in SLC.

In 2010, the Korean Institute of School as Learning Community was established under the leadership of Dr. Woojung Son. Son was a former graduate student of Professor Manabu Sato and had translated several of Sato’s books into Korean. She has been a charismatic leader and contributed to the SLC movement in Korea (M. Sato, 2018). The Institute held 3,600 members in 2016, and its annual conference was attended by a thousand participants (M. Sato, 2018; Shin, 2016).

One characteristic of SLC in South Korea is that 90% of schools engaging in SLC are at the secondary school level due to its link to innovative schools. The other characteristic is that there are few partnerships with university researchers. For example, the members of the Korean Institute of School as Learning Community are mostly teachers who also visit schools to play the role of external resource persons. In other countries, these roles are mainly played by university researchers.
When SLC philosophy contradicted the expectation of societies and teachers, it often posed a challenge. For example, the addressed challenge was to build a “listening relationship” since it contradicts the expectations of students in Korean schooling where they were encouraged to actively speak up in lessons. In addition, there were also challenges in the lack of pedagogic methods, skills, and experts to support schools to implement SLC (Shin, 2014).

In this way, SLC in South Korea is uniquely supported by both bottom-up initiatives of teachers and top-down efforts of the government to democratize schooling.

**Taiwan**

The announcement in 2012 to extend the compulsory education to 12 years and the abolishment of the university entrance examination by 2019 altered the landscape of education in Taiwan. This posed a substantial challenge to the teachers who had identified their responsibility to prepare students for the high-stakes examination (E. Huang, 2014). According to the survey conducted by Tien Xia’s Family magazine in 2012, 95% of 3,000 teachers surveyed answered that both school and lessons needed reforms but half also answered they did not know how to achieve this (E. Huang, 2014).

The teachers’ interest in SLC was triggered by the curriculum reform and rising interest to build professional learning communities. SLC was first introduced in an interview article with Manabu Sato in Tien Xia’s Family magazine in 2012 (Chen, Chen, & Chen, 2014). In the same year, a Mandarin translation of the compilation of Sato’s books on SLC titled “Revolution of Learning” was published. Sato’s book won popular coverage by the media and due to the popularity of the book, it was awarded runner-up in the Best Insights into Asian Societies (non-fiction) of the Asian Publishing Awards 2012 (ACN Newswire, 2012).

The number of schools implementing SLC grew as the government began to show support for SLC as a desirable approach to move away from traditional
teaching to inquiry-oriented teaching (M. Sato, 2018). Professor Sato was invited by the universities and local authorities and gave a speech about SLC. The city education offices of Taipei, Hsinchu, New Taipei, and Taichung expressed their support for SLC (Chen et al., 2014). By 2013, of the 273 surveyed schools, 33% chose SLC as an important research theme (Chen et al., 2014).

SLC was supported by the initiatives of teachers, who were inspired by Sato’s book, and formed voluntary study groups to implement SLC (Kusanagi, 2017). One characteristic of SLC in Taiwan is that most of the implementation was not a school-wide initiative. This was partly due to the large size of the schools. According to Stigler, Lee, & Stevenson (1987), the average number of students in Taipei schools was 2,790. Instead, smaller study groups were formed by self-motivated teachers who shared a common interest in professional learning. This posed a challenge in implementing school reform since not all teachers were involved in SLC activities and shared the same vision. Also, the frequent examinations hindered teachers to spend the time to support individual students in their learning (M. Sato, 2012). In addition, there is the support of university researchers such as Ou Yung-Sheng, past president of the National Taipei University of Education, and Chen Li-Hua, professor of Tamkang University behind the SLC movement (M. Sato, 2018). There is also a Facebook community for SLC practitioners and researchers (E. Huang, 2014).

The experiences of lesson study in Asia discussed so far show that the engagement into lesson study was motivated by the global trend in curriculum reforms. Lesson study has been used as an instrument to facilitate a shift in pedagogy and to meet the changing needs of education in the 21st century. In Singapore, lesson study was introduced as a top-down recommendation to build PLCs and as a way to enhance pedagogic content knowledge. In Korea, public criticisms of the existing schooling system and excessive emphasis on the university entrance examination system led to the reform movement and this supported the SLC movement as a way to incorporate democratic approaches to teaching and learning. In Taiwan, SLC was supported by the interest in forming
PLCs and the need to redefine the professional identity of teachers after the drastic curriculum reform and the decision to abolish the university entrance examination. These cases of lesson study in Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan suggest, implementation is not uniform but is unique reflecting the contextual backgrounds of respective countries.

4.6 Lesson Study in developing countries

Introduction of lesson study in developing countries.

While lesson study in the U.S. and Asia was imported by local educators of the respective countries, lesson study was initially exported to developing countries in the form of a foreign development program\textsuperscript{19}. Since the early 1990s, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has been introducing lesson study in more than 27 countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa (Matachi & Kikuchi, 2015). The export of lesson study in developing countries was motivated by three interconnected forces: 1) the Japanese government’s policy to provide support for mathematics and science education; 2) the growing concern to improve the quality of education in developing countries, and; 3) the curriculum reforms that necessitate the adoption of student-centered approaches in teaching and learning.

Firstly, lesson study fitted well within the overall framework of the Japanese government to support teacher training in the area of mathematics and science education. Since the first declaration of the official support to improve the quality of the basic education of developing countries in 2002 at the G8 Kananaskis Summit, the Japanese government has identified mathematics and science education as Japan’s strength (JICA, 2006; Kuroda & Hayashi, 2015; MOFA, 2015).

\textsuperscript{19} In principle, Japanese ODA is on a request basis, which means that priority of donor assistance is determined by the requests of developing countries (Sunaga, 2004). In reality, however, the Japanese government or firms have influence over the project formation and generally reflect the interests of Japanese companies (Sunaga, 1988) and this has been criticized.
In the 2010 policy paper, JICA describes there is “high demand” for assistance in mathematics and science education in the following way:

To foster researchers and high-level human resources who can lead innovations in science and technology, it is important to improve science and mathematics education at the primary and secondary levels and expand the human resource base with sufficient scientific knowledge and up-to-date technical skills. Because Japan has a comparative advantage in this sector, the expectation for Japan’s assistance is high. In response to this enormous demand, JICA will intensify its support to science and mathematics education (JICA, 2010, p.5).

The second motivation behind the export of lesson study was the increase in concern for the quality of education in developing countries by the international community. While the Millennium Development Goals focused on improving access to schooling, Sustainable Development Goals emphasize improving the quality of education as the prioritized agenda (Kitamura et al., 2017). Often the governments of developing countries were criticized for the low rankings in international surveys such as TIMSS and PISA (discussed in Chapter 2). This put additional pressure on these countries to improve the quality of schooling. Thus, lesson study was exported as a way to improve the quality of schooling by learning from Japanese best practice (Steiner-Khamisi, 2006).

Thirdly, lesson study was motivated by international trends of curriculum reform that required a shift from teacher-centered learning to student-centered learning. Similar to the cases of the Asian countries’ engagement into lesson study discussed, developing countries have been facing the challenge of transforming didactic styles of teaching into more interactive teaching methods. This coincided with the decentralization efforts in education reform, which require bottom-up initiatives from schools. In Vietnam, a new curriculum was introduced in 2002 with a focus on child-centered education (JICA, 2004; Saito & Tsukui, 2008; Tanaka, 2008). In Indonesia, Competency-based Curriculum (KBK) was introduced in 2004, and School-Based Curriculum in 2006, which both require more initiatives at the school level (Sulfasyah et al., 2015; Tanaka, 2008). In South Africa, the introduction of Outcomes-Based Education (OBE) and Curriculum 2005 posed a
challenge for teachers to shift their pedagogy to learner-centered pedagogy (Bantwini, 2010; Ono & Ferreira, 2010).

Features of JICA lesson study

JICA identified lesson study as one of three major approaches to improve the quality of teachers. In “Japan’s Assistance in Science and Mathematics Education: JICA’s Activities and Achievements,” JICA described these three approaches as:

- (1) To introduce a learner-centered approach that engages learners in practical activities and encourages them to think and solve problems by themselves instead of providing them with prescribed knowledge through teachers;
- (2) to equip teachers with skills and knowledge of lesson planning; and
- (3) “lesson study,” which is an approach widely used in Japan to improve the quality of lessons as a collaborative action by teachers (JICA, 2006, p. 3).

In JICA projects, lesson study has been used mainly in large-scale training targeted onto mathematics and science teachers where local administrators, researchers, and Japanese experts serve as trainers. As shown in Table 4.1, the design of JICA projects reflect the three approaches described above. For instance, in Zambia, a lesson study project was aimed to improve primary and secondary mathematics and science instruction (Robinson, 2015). In South Africa, lesson study was introduced as one component of a province-wide project “aimed to improve the quality of mathematics and science education by enhancing the teaching skills of in-service teachers” (Ono & Ferreira, 2010, p. 65; T. Ozawa, 2013). In Indonesia, lesson study was introduced to junior secondary schools as a part of in-service teacher training, mainly for mathematics and science teachers (Saito, Harun, Kuboki, & Tachibana, 2006). In this way, lesson study has been used mainly as an instrument in the in-service professional development of teachers.
Table 4.1: Examples of the JICA projects that introduced lesson study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name / Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of Mathematics and Science in Secondary Education Project (SMASSE) / 1998-2008</td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Improvement of mathematics and science education through In-service Training (INSET) for teachers.</td>
<td>All 71 districts in Kenya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Mpumlanga Secondary Science Initiative (MSSI) / 1999-2006 | South Africa    | Phase 1: 1) To improve the quality of teaching in mathematics and science in the province through enhancing educators’ teaching skills and subject knowledge; 2) Establish a school-based in-service training system in the Mpumalanga Province.  
Phase 2: To establish and maintain school-based training systems for grades 8-12 mathematics and science teachers in Mpumalanga Province through cluster workshops. | 540 schools in 1 province |
| Project for Strengthening Cluster-based Teacher Training and School Management / 2004-2007 | Vietnam         | Developing a system to improve teaching methods targeted at teachers in the pilot province  
-Developing a system to support the improvement of teaching methods targeted at principals and local education officers in the pilot province.  
-Preparing for the application of the model to other provinces. | 1 province               |
<p>| Strengthening In-Service Teacher Training of Mathematics and Science Education (SISTTEMS) / 2006-2008 | Indonesia       | Improvement of education quality at junior secondary level by reorganizing and vitalizing subject working groups for mathematics and science.                                                              | 3 districts              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Phase Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Mathematics, Science, and Technologies in Education Project (PREMST) / 2007-2015</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>To strengthen the capacity of teachers by improving their pedagogical practices in mathematics and science in primary school.</td>
<td>Phase 1: 3 provinces Phase 2: 14 provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education (SMASTE) School-Based Continuing Professional Development Program (SBCPD Program) Phase 1 and 2 /2005-2011</td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Improving teaching and learning at classroom level through activities of lesson study in target provinces.</td>
<td>3 provinces (140,000 teachers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program for Enhancing Quality of Junior Secondary Education (PELITA) / 2009-2013</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Quality of junior secondary education is enhanced through lesson study and participatory school-based management extensively in the nation.</td>
<td>6 districts and 3 cities in 7 provinces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lesson study was considered as a practical approach compared to the past professional development programs. Firstly, lesson study exposed teachers to new teaching methods and teaching resources—such as group work, hands-on activities, and student worksheets—and this contributed instructional improvement (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito et al., 2006; Saito, Imansyah, Kubok, & Hendayana, 2007). Secondly, it offered an opportunity for teachers to study subject teaching (e.g. Kyozai kenkyu in Zambia) and this benefited the teachers in deepening their subject content knowledge (Sibunimba, 2015). This was, in fact, the most cited benefit of lesson study in the context of developing countries. Thirdly, lesson study helped the teachers to build a new network that could potentially support their professional learning. While previously, the teachers rarely had chances to interact with others outside of school, participation into government-sponsored workshops gave an opportunity for them to interact with teachers from other schools and to learn from resource persons such as university lecturers and government officials (JICA, 2007; Saito et al., 2006; Saito et al., 2007). In this way, lesson study offered a structure for systematic training where teachers gained knowledge in subject content, experimented with new methods, and had an opportunity to interact with others.

However, rather than having a clear definition of lesson study, lesson study has been used in the JICA projects as a flexible approach. In the 2005 policy paper, JICA defined lesson study as “a methodology involving the principle of Plan-Do-See for improving classroom lessons through peer collaboration, whereby teachers work together to study teaching materials to be used, deliver a lesson with such materials, and review it to discuss how to improve the lesson” (JICA, 2007, p. 12). JICA also acknowledged that the variations in lesson study and it is more appropriate to call its approach “training method based on lesson study” rather than lesson study (JICA, 2007, p.14):

*The kind of lesson study adopted in M&S [mathematics and*
Education projects supported by JICA is essentially the same in concept as the one widely practiced in Japan. Yet what form it takes and how it is practiced vary depending on the situations and conditions of the partner countries and to what extent it is introduced and entrenched. Such various forms are collectively referred to as ‘lesson study’ in this paper, although it is more precise to refer to them as the ‘training method based on lesson study.’

In a more recent policy paper, JICA (2015) stated that lesson study has become an established approach for mutual learning and “a collaborative practice among teachers, schools and regional and global actors, to promote professional communities for providing solutions for educational challenges” (p. 6). Thus, there are indications that the application of lesson study by JICA has also evolved over the years reflecting the various application of lesson study in the projects.

**Challenges in JICA Lesson Study**

While the formalistic aspects of lesson study—such as changing instructional methods—were easier to incorporate, the quality and sustainability of lesson study depended on local settings where it was introduced. There were challenges in providing meaningful learning opportunities through lesson study. For example, teachers engaged in lesson study activities without setting clear learning objectives and little attention was paid to the process of student learning although these were essential in lesson study activities (Miyazaki, 2016; Saito et al., 2006; Saito & Tsukui, 2008). The challenges were reported due to the discrepancies between what lesson study promoted and daily routines and priorities of teachers.

Firstly, despite the introduction of student-centered approaches by lesson study, teachers continued to use didactic approaches in daily lessons. Since the teachers identified their roles as the deliverer of the curriculum, the target of lessons was set on the preparation for standardized tests (Bjork, 2005; Kusanagi, 2014; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito et al., 2007;
Saito & Tsukui, 2008). In order to cover the voluminous curriculum contents where the focus of lessons was on memorizing vocabularies, terminologies, and formulas, didactic methods were preferred. Similarly, the introduction of student activities did not alter the way teachers worked with students or students worked with their peers and students merely engaged in superficial exchanges such as checking one another’s answers. Without an adequate problem setting or appropriate teacher facilitation, student activities failed to achieve the intended results (Miyazaki, 2016; Saito et al., 2007; Saito & Tsukui, 2008).

Secondly, due to bureaucratic and hierarchical institutional settings of schools in developing countries, lesson study did not function as a place for teacher dialogue (Kusanagi, 2014; Ono & Ferreira, 2010). Teachers were often reluctant to open their lessons to other teachers to observe out of fear of being evaluated. The post-lesson discussions focused on the effectiveness of teacher instructions, whether the lesson was implemented as planned or the students achieved the expected output, rather than how students learned (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito et al., 2006; Saito et al., 2007; Saito & Tsukui, 2008). Also, there was a tendency of teachers to evaluate teachers and students based on assumptions rather than discussing lessons based on careful observation and shared concerns (Jita, Maree, & Ndlalane, 2007; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito & Tsukui, 2008). Rather than exchanging practice, lesson study was often used to disseminate government policies or new curricula.

Thirdly, the challenges of ownership and sustainability were addressed. Although lesson study was hoped to be a grass-roots and a continuous initiative, lesson study was introduced as a large-scale project with external funding with external resource persons (Hashimoto, Tsubota, & Ikeda, 2003; Minamoto & Nagao, 2006). Thus, it was difficult to sustain without external support (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010).
Implications for pedagogical transformation

The studies suggest that a pedagogical transformation may require an alternative approach which works to address these contextual gaps that large-scale training failed to do. The cases of Vietnam by Saito and Tsukui (2008) presented how a long-term process was needed to adjust structural, conceptual, and relational gaps in order to reform schools as learning communities. Their claim is that continuous dialogue between Japanese experts and local participants supported the teachers to gradually overcome barriers to professional learning such as resistance to collaborative professional learning, altering the existing views toward student learning, and building collegiality among teachers.

Similarly, H. Ozawa, Ono, and Chikamori (2010, p. 138) presented how the experience of participating in training in Japan had a significant impact over how South African teachers understood lesson study and teaching in general. Previously, the teachers focused on individual components of lessons, such as including hands-on material, making a hypothesis about students’ outputs, and appropriateness of instruction. However, after extensive exposure to lesson study in Japan, the teachers were able to interconnect these different components of lessons with the coherence of the lesson in mind. In effect, teachers began to facilitate student learning paying attention to various aspects of learning such as prior knowledge of students and interconnection with the topic to be covered in the next lesson. Although both of the cases in Vietnam and South Africa were presented as cases in progress, they raised an important point that shedding light on the process of adaptation is essential for pedagogic transformation.

20 There are also reported cases of more “successful” lesson study that were conducted not as donor initiated projects (Gutierrez, 2016; Ronda, 2013).
In sum, lesson study offered in developing countries was effectively implemented as top-down professional development programs. It provided an opportunity for teachers to experiment with teaching methods and to discuss subject instructions. On the other hand, the findings suggest that there were challenges in moving away from a didactic style of teaching, building collaborative professional learning among teachers, and to sustaining such efforts for professional development. Going over the lesson study cycle generally reinforces the existing values and priorities. Thus, lesson study cannot alone produce a shift in pedagogy or collaborative learning among teachers. These issues point to the significance of the “recontextualization” of lesson study in foreign aid assistance.

### 4.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the various cases of foreign implementation of lesson study were examined. The commonality among these cases was the engagement with lesson study was motivated by global trends in curriculum reform and the need to introduce constructive approaches in teaching and learning. However, the actual implementations of lesson study in these countries were by no means uniform but the practice in each country is unique reflecting the local contextual setting. These cases show how pedagogic transfer is always “recontextualized”—the practice is adapted to and its meaning is interpreted against the new setting.

As the discussions in this chapter suggest if what was promoted by lesson study was not consistent with the local educational settings, the change in practice may not occur, be temporary or at a surficial level. This resulted in formalistic, fragmented (only some components), or modified implementation of lesson study. Or, if the practice was at odds with the contextual settings, even if lesson study is initiated, it is difficult to sustain the effort. Taylor, Anderson, Meyer, Wagne, and West (2005) reported the
case in the U.S. while lesson study “empowered” the teachers and motivated bottom-up professional development, but at the same time they became frustrated by the constraints of external demands placed on them. Also in the UK, despite the positive impact of lesson study on student learning, “many school leaders are put off using LS [lesson study] by the disruption they perceive will be created to the school timetable, staff cover system and supply teacher budget—not to mention the headache of convincing reluctant staff and governors that LS is rewarding and effective” (Dudley, 2013, p. 120).

In concluding this chapter, I would like to raise two issues in pedagogic transfer from the cases of importing/exporting of lesson study. Firstly, while lesson study was introduced as an “effective” form of professional development, what is considered “effective” largely depends on the local contexts. Lesson study could offer a structure for teachers to collectively engage in professional development. However, it was the teachers who reinterpreted the imported/exported practice against the schooling environment and the reality of classroom settings. As the practice moves between contexts, “recontextualization” occurs where teachers reinterpret the meaning of practice against the organizational setting. Consequently, some aspects of lesson study were emphasized or altered during the adaptation process. For example, the majority of lesson study initiatives abroad were organized under subject study groups. This reflects the strong professional identity to subject expertise. Also, the implementation of lesson study in foreign countries concentrated on the area of mathematics and science but not on other subjects. This reflects the motivation behind the engagement into lesson study—the excellent academic achievement of Japanese students in mathematics and science.

Secondly, while lesson study was used to facilitate policy and curriculum reform—especially in promoting student-centered learning and bottom-up and collaborative learning of teachers—the engagement in lesson study
did not induce such a change automatically. Going over the lesson study cycle generally reinforces the existing values and priority rather than producing a shift in pedagogy or inducing collaborative learning. Student-centered approaches in teaching and learning and dialogical discussions among teachers are only meaningful if they fitted the existing structures of schooling and met the concerns of teachers. More successful cases of lesson study suggest extensive time and effort could ultimately expand the roles of teachers and their understanding of student learning. However, the majority of foreign implementations of lesson study have been implemented as short-term professional development projects. This could pose a challenge when what was promoted by lesson study contradicted the existing structure of schools and norms of teachers. These issues in the pedagogic transfer were discussed in Chapter 2 and the issues in professional development programs will be discussed in Chapter 5.

By exploring the issue of “recontextualization,” lesson study is examined as the contextual gaps between what lesson study promoted and the daily concerns of teaching and learning, and as a negotiation of existing contexts and newly imported practice. As discussed in Chapter 3, lesson study has emerged and developed in Japan due to the unique historical, social, and cultural contexts of Japanese schooling that are supportive of such collaborative learning among teachers. In contrast, the cases of importing/exporting of lesson study in foreign countries showed how these supporting conditions were not necessarily present in overseas settings. Since the philosophy and assumptions behind the practice of lesson study were taken for granted, the absence of these conditions became apparent only after the practice was transferred to a foreign setting. In fact, the international attention given to lesson study triggered the revival of interest in lesson study in Japan. This was motivated by a need for foreign educators to provide theoretical justification and scientific evidence behind the practice of lesson study and to investigate why it works in Japan. In the past two decades, Japanese scholars started to publish books and
journals of lesson study targeted at foreign audiences reexamining the
meaning and the impact of lesson study (Isoda, Stephens, Ohara, &
Miyakawa, 2007; National Association for the Study of Educational
Methods, 2011; Saito, Murase, Tsukui, & Yeo, 2014; Tsukui & Murase,
2018).

These cases of implementing lesson study abroad discussed in this
chapter as well as the literature review provided in Chapter 2 and 3
presented the problem of “recontextualization” in the pedagogic transfer.
This sets the contextual background for the following analysis chapters,
“recontextualization of lesson study” in a Javanese school.
Chapter 5: Methodological discussions

5.1 Introduction

This study employed an ethnographic approach to examine the implementation of a foreign initiative of professional development, lesson study, into an Indonesian junior high school. In order to examine the issues involving recontextualization, I situated the practice of teachers as “cultural and social practice” and examined the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study and daily routines of teachers. Ethnography has its root in cultural anthropology, the aim of which was to study culture or society. Over the last fifty years, the ethnographic approach has been widely adopted in the field of education. My understanding of ethnography follows Davies (2012) “broad interpretation of ethnography as a research process based on fieldwork using a variety of mainly (but not exclusively) qualitative research techniques but including engagement in the lives of those being studied over an extended period of time” (pp. 4-5). As an anthropologist, Zaharlick (1992) stated ethnography is beneficial in understanding schooling processes due to “its inherent sensitivity to people, culture, and context [that] offer one approach to providing valuable new insights that can contribute to educational improvement and reform” (p.122). By participating in the school activities as a participant observer for seven months, I became familiar with the daily routines of teachers and this has enabled me to interpret their practice within the particular sociocultural context. I see culture as a representation of local meaning following the definition provided by Spradley (1979, p. 5) “the acquired knowledge that people use to interpret experience and generate social behavior” [emphasis in original]). Thus, the ethnographic approach treats culture as something contested and negotiated, acknowledging power relations and fluidity within it (Mills & Morton, 2013). Therefore, the aim is to provide rich contextualized data or “thick description” (C. Geertz, 1973) in order to
understand what people do and how people make sense of particular phenomena or events (Fife, 2005; Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007).

In this study, the ethnographic approach allows for discussion of pedagogic practice as generated, maintained, and contested meanings within specific cultures. Such recognition for multiple meanings of practice is essential in examining the recontextualization of lesson study for the following reasons: 1) the ethnographic approach provides interpretations of pedagogic practice as the patterns of cultural practice shaped by social relations; 2) its multi-method approach allows for flexibility suited to examine the process of schooling as a cultural/social system; and 3) it enables to discuss teachers’ practice as strategies within a community and for negotiation of competing demands.

5.2 Methodological Approach

Teaching as Cultural/Social Practice

In the past, anthropologists often used ethnographies in order to describe how societies of developing countries operate differently from Western societies (such as Malinowski, 1922; C. Geertz, 1973 among others). On the other hand, ethnographies and the ethnographic approach have not been widely used in developing countries in the field of educational studies. Educational studies on developing countries generally used economic and statistical analysis and took the form of large-scale quantitative assessments. This is because they were generally conducted to assess the efficiency and effectiveness of policy/programs on behalf of governments and international aid agencies (Sawamura, 2005, 2008). The microanalysis at school/classroom level including ethnography has not been a preferred method since it was considered as time-consuming and costly. Only in the past few decades, aid agencies have begun to incorporate, has an ethnographic approach been incorporated into their research on aid agencies and their interventions to supplement other
methods. It was believed ethnographic methods could add by providing context-specific data and cultural sensitivity to analysis (Van Donge, 2006; Adato, 2008; Sawamura, 2005, 2008; Bell & Aggleton, 2012).

By examining educational practice as cultural/social practice, the ethnographic approach enables the provision of interpretive and context-specific analysis. As discussed in Chapter 2, there have been criticisms of the standardizing of education quality and measurements such as PISA based on narrow definitions of standards in student performance. The context-specific analysis of the ethnographic approach can provide an alternative understanding of the universalist view—narrow, technical and decontextualized interpretations—of pedagogy. Local interpretations based on consideration of socio-cultural contexts are essential for the understanding of the meanings of complex educational practice. An ethnography of a Japanese junior high school by Sakai (1998) presented how the professional roles of Japanese teachers extended far beyond academic teaching. He described how any interactions with students were interpreted as “educational” and meticulous tasks were embedded in the daily routines of teachers as their responsibilities. Thus, teachers were constantly busy guiding students in every aspect of their schooling experience and this resulted in the burnout of teachers. This suggests the boundaries of professional responsibilities and types of interactions between teachers and students are also culturally (socially) dependent.

Another example presented by Spradley (1979) suggests that, depending on how education is defined, the same children can be categorized as both intelligent and deprived/underachieving. He described how Indians, Blacks, Chicanos, and other racial and ethnic groups were regarded as underachieving in schooling in the 1960s, but ethnographic studies provided totally different perspectives. They revealed, how these children “have elaborate, sophisticated, and adaptive cultures which are simply different from the ones espoused by the educational system” (Spradley,
1979, p. 11). Similarly, Street recognizes the variety in literacy practice (Street, 1984, 1995, 2016) and understood it as a social practice embedded in the contexts of communities. He claims that “an ethnographic perspective can be helpful in addressing the local uses and meanings of literacy”—what people are actually doing with reading and or writing in specific social contexts” (Street, 2016, p. 338).

**Multiple perspectives to examine the process of schooling**

The multi-methods approach in ethnography is beneficial in analyzing the process of schooling. It provides a holistic understanding of schooling experience within the cultural/social system; just as anthropologists provided interpretations on how the foreign communities/societies operate (Rohlen, 1983; Fukuzawa, 1994; LeTendre, 2000; N. Sato, 2003; Bjork, 2005; Sakai, 1998). As Delamont and Galton (1986) phrased it, the ethnographic study “focus[ed] on many previously taken-for-granted, familiar, aspects of schooling and treat[ed] them as anthropologically ‘strange’” (p. 241). For example, ethnographies in the UK and the US have raised the issues of social inequality in schooling by describing how working class and minority students were deprived of learning opportunity (Ball, 1981; Burgess, 1983; Delamont & Galton, 1986; D. Hargreaves, 1967; Lacey, 1970; Willis, 1977; Woods, 1979; Youdell, 2006). There are also ethnographic studies focusing on the experience of students which enabled us to understand how social and gender inequality permeated the schooling process and was reproduced through subcultures (D. Hargreaves, 1967; Willis, 1977; Hammersley & Woods, 1984; Abraham, 1995).

The advantage of the ethnographic approach is it can present the explicit and implicit meaning of the schooling process by providing contextualized accounts of the educational experience. The study by Sharp and Green (1975) revealed the contradiction between the intended and actual outcome of progressive pedagogy. The use of child-centered methods
was intended to provide more freedom to meet the various needs of students. However, the social/cultural background of teachers influenced how they assessed students’ abilities, and this worked negatively in assessing students of different cultural background, usually those with low ability. Another example is the comparative study between the schools in Australia and England by Youdell (2006). Based on ethnographic data, she shed light on the experiences of individual students in schools and addressed the issue of exclusion relevant to student identities. She revealed how being a “good student” and an “acceptable learner” brings conflict with other cultural/social/gender identities and hindered students from developing (Youdell, 2006).

While most of the sociology of education is concerned with the issue of social inequality, the target of my study is not lined with the issue. Rather, my adoption of an ethnographic approach is based on my interest to examine the process of schooling as “anthropologically strange” (Delamont & Galton, 1986) and this is especially beneficial in examining schools in developing countries. Crossley (1990) points out that ethnographic studies into schooling processes can be beneficial to policymakers and practitioners in developing countries since they provide local narratives and such local and contextualized accounts perspectives and have “explanatory power” (p.43). As discussed in Chapter 2, merely changing policies and curriculum does not guarantee pedagogic transformation. However, there has been little attention paid to the process of pedagogic transformation.

The ethnographic study of Indonesian junior high schools by Bjork (2005) examined the issue of policy translation in the implementation of the Local Content Curriculum under the decentralization reform. He concluded there was no impact of the reform at the school level. Although the new policy provided freedom for teachers to act as professional and autonomous educators, the strong bureaucratic accountability and identity as dutiful
civil servants worked negatively. The result was that “teachers almost always placed a higher priority on conforming to the norms that guided the activities of government employees” (Bjork, 2005, p.161). I provided an analysis of lesson study in a Javanese junior high school and further investigated this bureaucratic accountability pervasive in Indonesian schools (Kusanagi, 2014). I presented how the implementation of lesson study was contextualized by the Javanese school setting where the scope of responsibilities of teachers, the nature of collegiality, and the pedagogic strategies of Mathematics teachers were different from those in Japan where lesson study originated. In the setting of Java, the teachers were not held accountable for collaborative professional development or to support the process of student learning. Since the priority of Javanese teachers was on the transmission of knowledge for high-stakes testing, they employed a didactic style of teaching and there were few personalized interactions with students. My study demonstrated how pedagogic transfer of best practice is always reinterpreted within the new sociocultural setting and these factors are often beyond the scope of professional development programs.

**Pedagogic Practice as Teacher Strategies**

Another advantage of an ethnographic approach in educational studies is that it enables me to address teachers’ practice as ongoing negotiations within a community. This study has examined the practice of teachers as a form of “social learning” system or “communities of practice” (Wenger, 2000). In another word, teachers were guided by both the norms of the community and by their individual interests. Furthermore, these concerns could be relevant or not to professional responsibilities. In the past, the target of professional development has been mainly on increasing the competence of individual teachers. Increasingly, there is a recognition that the meaning of professional development can only be understood within the community of practitioners and because of this, the concept of PLC has attracted interest. The concept of “teacher strategies” is useful in order
to describe how teachers negotiated competing demands when faced with the dilemma. This is important since even when teachers want to pursue educational ideals, contextual constraints could work against this, and they could be socialized to the existing norm. Lacey (1977) discussed how new teachers were socialized into the teaching profession and such accommodation sometimes required sacrificing personal ideals in education. His “social strategy” distinguished those teachers who merely complied with the institution at the surface level from others who complied with it with personal commitment.

The concept of teacher strategies is also useful in understanding the contradiction between the new policy/pedagogy—such as progressive methods—and concerns in daily teaching. Woods (1977) focused on “survival strategy” and how the limitation in resources and large classroom sizes resulted in undermining instructional goals and the professional commitment of teachers due to their concern for personal survival. D. Hargreaves (2010) focused on the impact of occupational culture on teaching by describing “coping strategies” which acknowledges how the institutional constraints limit the choices of teachers to employ creative methods. In fact, Scarth (1987) argued that it is impossible to distinguish the strategies of teachers from their instructional intentions so that survival/coping strategies were synonymous with teaching. Therefore, in examining the pedagogic practice of Javanese teachers, I will explore it within the institutional setting and how contextual factors impact teachers’ choice of pedagogy.

5.3 Research Design

Selection and Access to the School

My first entry to SMP Sari (pseudonym) was in 2006 when I was working as a consultant for the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA). The school was one of the target schools for the lesson study program
provided by JICA and the Ministry of National Education. However, when the program was about to start in 2006, it was affected by the Central Java Earthquake. As a JICA team member, I had brief contact with the school when I visited the school to monitor relief activities. Later in 2007, the school became one of two pilot schools in the region for implementing school-based lesson study. In 2008, I visited three schools including SMP Sari to conduct interviews for my Master’s dissertation. Since the purpose of the current research has been to examine how lesson study was recontextualized in the Indonesian school setting, the selection of school was not based on the successful implementation of lesson study. Rather, it was because SMP Sari had been engaged in school-wide lesson study and teachers were familiar with lesson study activities. Since the majority of lesson study activities in Indonesia were provided in the form of regional and subject-based workshops/training, the case of SMP Sari was a rare case of implementing school-based lesson study at the time.

At the time of fieldwork in 2008, the principal of SMP Sari suggested that she would welcome me if I return the school to conduct data collection for my Ph.D. Arranging fieldwork in Indonesia was challenging because of the limitation in communication means without face-to-face contact at the time. Prior to my entry into the field in December 2009, I received a confirmation by an email from the principal to conduct research in SMP Sari. Gaining access via the principal was important as Indonesian schools are strongly characterized as bureaucratic organizations with strong top-down leadership. The principal of SMP Sari was doing her master’s degree as a part-time student and was planning to conduct fieldwork herself. Thus, she was relatively open to research and supported my study. Originally, I planned to conduct the fieldwork from September to June. But because of a delay in the issue of my research permit, my fieldwork was delayed by three months. The fieldwork was conducted from December 2009 to June 2010 for a period of seven months.
Data collection

As a participant observer, I followed the events of the school as much as possible. The total number of field visits amounted to sixty-three between December 2009 and June 2010. I observed over sixty lessons of a total of forty teachers. When I was not observing the lessons or school activities, I spent time following the social activities of teachers and talking to the teachers mostly in the staff room. Especially during the initial stages, I tried to visit the school as much as possible in order to re-familiarize myself with the setting and, more importantly, in order to get to know the teachers. In the first month of fieldwork, I conducted unfocused observation (Fife, 2005), limited myself to asking general questions relevant to the events at hand and avoided sensitive topics including discussing teachers’ professional competencies. Generally, teachers were receptive from the outset. For the first two weeks or so, I was treated as a special guest of the principal, and I was welcomed in the principal’s office. After the second week, I felt free to enter the staff room without greeting the principal first. The teachers suggested that I sat at an empty desk where a former English teacher who had been transferred to another school used to sit. The original plan was that I would participate in school activities as an assistant English teacher. I planned this since I thought it would enable me to participate in school activities as a member of a community and be less perceived as an outsider. However, as I spent extensive time with the teachers, it turned out that as long as I joined their activities, they treated me as the member of the community and whether I taught or not was less of a concern. Also, the decision not to teach was based on an ethical concern. When I taught an English lesson, the original teacher asked me if she could skip the class to take care of her personal business. I considered it as a potential disruption to daily routines and might undermine her professional responsibility. Accordingly, I decided not to teach but remain as a researcher who joins their daily activities as a participant observer. Throughout the process of fieldwork, I consulted with the principal although at times it was difficult since she wanted me to
provide an evaluation or advice on lessons in general or on lesson study activities, which I felt would have compromised my study.

The main method of data collection was note taking. I recorded daily observations and conversations in fieldnotes. I took fieldnotes mostly in English although when Japanese or Indonesian terms were more suited, I took notes in these languages. I had a working knowledge of Indonesian but sometimes Javanese, the local language, was used mixed with Indonesian. I was not familiar with Javanese; however, the use of Javanese was limited to a few occasions since not all teachers were fluent in Javanese. Since Javanese is a highly stratified language, it required both parties’ familiarity with the language and careful consideration to a person’s age and status. Thus, the teachers generally used Indonesian with one another, especially in my presence.

At the beginning of my fieldwork, I explained the purpose of my study and answered teachers’ questions at a staff meeting. I conducted formal interviews only towards the end of my fieldwork since I simply wanted teachers to be familiar with my presence as an observer. I did not want the teachers to have preconceptions about my views about teachers, lesson study, or the purpose of my study before they got to know me. The teachers knew that I was conducting research and in most situations, there was no conflict in writing fieldnotes in front of others. On rare occasions, when the conversation involved gossiping about other teachers or criticisms of the school management, I felt uncomfortable taking notes in the presence of teachers. In such cases, I took memos after I came back to my desk. I typed up my fieldnotes on the same day whilst my memory was still fresh. When this was not possible, I tried to type it up within the same week. After typing fieldnotes, I compiled a memo for the preliminary analysis of my data, noting, in particular, my interpretation of the events and those aspects that I would like to investigate further. This helped to increase the reflexivity of the study to make sure that my
interpretations would be grounded in data and that I produced appropriate categories for future fieldwork and analysis.

Toward the end of my fieldwork, from May to June, I conducted the interviews and administered a survey, directly relevant to my research question. I conducted semi-structured interviews with seven teachers regarding their understanding of lesson study. After explaining the purpose of the study as well as how the data would be used, oral consent was gained from the interviewees at the beginning of interviews. The interviews were digitally recorded with the teacher’s consent and were transcribed. Two additional interviews were conducted prior to this when informal conversations turned into formal interviews with the oral permission of the interviewees. A teacher survey was administered once towards the end of the fieldwork period. Its purpose was to gain an overall understanding of teachers on their views on teaching in general and on lesson study in particular. The survey questions were negotiated with the principal and also a local university professor to assess the appropriateness of wording and to avoid political insensitivity of the questions. The survey was distributed to all forty-nine teachers at a staff meeting. Thirty-eight returned the survey.

Research Ethics

Being a participant observer inevitably landed me in a complex web of social and power relations. This has significance in terms of the validity of my data and also required me to work through ethical issues. I will describe the potential risks involved in the data collection and the ethical issues of privacy and the risk to participants. Since I gained the entry to SMP Sari through the principal, there was an implication in my presence, of being a guest of the principal. As described, the school management was top-down, thus, my presence was legitimized formally by the approval of the principal. While the teachers were generally friendly, some of the teachers preferred to keep some distance from me, especially in the initial
stage of the fieldwork. There were also teachers who seemed reluctant to let me observe their classrooms; in these cases, I did not persist. Gradually, as I became close to some of the teachers, more teachers engaged in conversations with me. But I was also aware that it was difficult for the teachers to say no when I asked them if I could observe their classrooms since I was there with the permission of the principal. When the teachers asked for my opinion about their lessons, rather than talking about their teaching, I discussed my findings on the students’ learning. To the principal, I made it very clear at the beginning of fieldwork that I would not be able to disclose any personal information about the teachers and I was very careful not to talk about individual teachers with the principal. When the principal asked me for my opinion about the school or lesson study, I shared some general findings like the difference from Japanese schools. Even then, there were few moments of tension with the principal since the school was going through a period of transition from the management style of the previous principal. Similarly, I avoided discussing other teachers’ classrooms with the teachers since the teachers were very sensitive about talking about others, especially in negative terms.

The teachers were generally reluctant to provide any kind of evaluation on each other. In the interviews and the survey, the majority of teachers avoided giving a specific name even when referring to who could be examples of “good teachers.” Because of this sensitivity, I wanted to avoid the potential risk of being seen as evaluating teachers’ performance. Consequently, I decided not to conduct interviews with students to ask about their teachers or lessons. On a casual occasion, I interviewed some of the parents but they specifically avoided discussing teachers and told me to ask their children directly (Fieldnotes, May 10, 2010). Also, possibly because of the conformist nature of society, I found a number of duplicated responses to some of the questions that I asked in the teacher survey. Their responses matched word for word as if some teachers consulted with each other on these questions. For example, in response to
the question, “In your opinion, what are the characteristics of a good teacher?,” there were two identical responses: “Teachers who can run their main job as teachers and also function as teachers.” I am aware of the risk to the validity of the data; however, since I was not generalizing survey responses and the survey was not the only data source, I believe it was a minor issue.

By clarifying the purpose of my study and gaining consent as necessary, I made efforts to minimize the potential of exploiting the participants and not to make them engage in something that they were not aware of. Even then, there was the possibility that they did not fully understand what I was doing there since qualitative research methods were not popular in the local setting of the fieldwork. Moreover, the ethnographic approach was rare in educational research since local researchers commonly used interviews or surveys. At one point, a professor from the local Islamic university, who came to supervise the national examination, told me that the vice principal had asked him what kind of research I was conducting and why I only observed and did not conduct interviews. Even though I tried to be transparent and fair as possible, this kind of uncertainty in informing participants still remained as an issue. I used pseudonyms for the sub-district and the school name, to keep the anonymity of the school. However, the school might still be identified by anyone having access to the JICA reports, as it is one of only two schools in the Bantul district, which conducted school-based lesson study at the time. I explained the risk to the principal. The general practice at the time of the fieldwork was that local researchers used either pseudonyms or the real names of research participants. However, ensuring the anonymity of research participants is the international standard practice and more Indonesian universities are following this practice, I avoided the risk of the school and teachers being identified as far as possible.
Reflexivity

From the naturalist or realist point of view, ethnography has been criticized for underestimating the influence of the researcher in the setting so that it should not be considered to be a truly “natural setting” (Hammersley, 1992). In fact, ethnography does not necessarily claim the neutrality of the researcher. Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) state that such an attempt is impossible and acknowledging reflectivity is a more productive approach. I accept this view: researchers cannot escape from making decisions on how to approach research based on their previous experience and methods of investigation. Reflexivity should not be taken as something detrimental but should be valued as providing guidance to the study. The interpretative nature of this ethnographic approach allowed me to make use of my previous experience of working in Indonesia as an aid worker in NGO and JICA-supported projects. I worked with the schools and the communities both in Java and outside Java (Sumatra and West Timor). I have witnessed various donor-assisted projects in the field and am familiar with the potential risk and benefit of such assistance. Also, I have observed lesson study activities in both Indonesian and Japanese schools on numerous occasions. This experience, together with my reading of research accounts of lesson study in practice, enabled me to compare the two settings of lesson study and use such comparison as an instrument for analysis. I also consulted with two lecturers from Yogyakarta State University (UNY: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta) and shared my findings with them. They had worked with the schools in Bantul as the lesson study experts. Their views were helpful in ensuring that the focus of my data collection and analysis was legitimate from a local viewpoint.

The central theme of the investigation was to understand how lesson study worked in a totally different setting from its indigenous setting in Japan. Through observing school routines in the Javanese school, I was able to challenge my own assumptions on how the school operates and what constitutes the official responsibilities of teachers, how they interact
with students, and how teachers worked with one another. I was able to think of these in relation to lesson study operation. In this way, I was able to challenge common sense for both the Indonesian setting and what is assumed in the operation of lesson study in the literature. By going back and forth between two settings of the realities in Javanese school and what was presumed about the Japanese school setting of lesson study, I was able to question assumptions and to observe two settings with unfamiliar eyes. This perspective guided me to set a focus making sense of the teachers’ worlds. Exposure to the setting enabled me partially (although not completely) to avoid treating teachers as objects, which has been a criticism of foreign experts for failing to overcome the dichotomies of an expert of professional development program/receivers of the program and “industrialized country”/”developing country.”

The difference in contextual settings was not only across cultures but was observed even within the Indonesian setting. I was struck by the difference between the lessons that I had observed as a consultant and the daily lessons that I observed once I began my fieldwork. The lessons I had observed previously took place within a special setting of professional development with the presence of outside experts, university lecturers, and personnel from the education office. The noise level, time frame, the structure of lessons, the equipment being used, the seating arrangements, and the mode of instruction by teachers, were all different. These surprises and findings in the field directed the investigation into making sense of what teachers did in their daily classroom teaching and what was different in the setting of professional development.

In developing countries, teachers are experiencing rapid changes in society as well as education policy reforms. Also, the teachers are experiencing various kinds of challenges that threaten their daily survival (financial and life threats caused by diseases, conflicts, and natural disasters, although there were little life threats in the context of SMP Sari)
and prevent them from committing to their job. These constraints are also relevant to setting social norms and what is expected of teachers in daily survival. Thus, the knowledge and skills they acquired through professional development may increase their choices of pedagogy, but this does not necessarily guarantee the implementation of new pedagogy. In these situations, the strategies of teachers may operate differently from those in industrialized countries where the society and working environment of teachers are more stable and very different in other ways as will be revealed in the following chapters.

**Data analysis**

For the aim of examining the pedagogic practice of teachers in SMP Sari, my approach to analysis is sociological and concerned with continuities and discontinuities in terms of the social relations and cultural practices obtaining in different settings (Dowling, 2009). In generating conceptual frameworks, the data analysis of this study was loosely guided by aspects of grounded theory—namely, open coding, constant comparison, theoretical sampling, theoretical saturation, and memo writing (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The process of analysis first involved immersion in the data—fieldnotes, interview transcripts, and survey responses from the Indonesian school, in order to identify continuities and discontinuities of pedagogic practice both in the daily setting and lesson study setting. During an initial period of immersion in the setting, the focus of the investigation was mainly on teachers’ daily teaching practice in classrooms in order to answer the original research question regarding how lesson study was recontextualized in the Javanese school setting. I paid particular attention to the key characteristics of their pedagogy: the structure of lessons, teaching materials being used, type and frequency of activities, and what kind of interactions took place between teachers and students. I was struck by the similarity in the style of teaching across individuals and subjects and also the difference from the lesson study lessons that I had observed. Gradually, my focus has shifted to
understand the social interactions between teachers in the staff room naturally, since this was the place where the teachers spent the majority of their time in the school. In this way, the data analysis has concurrently occurred during the data collection process, actively seeking the topic of investigation and selectively observing and questioning in order to pursue the research question (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). During the data collection process, I wrote down reflective comments and memos in the field as well as during the process of rewriting the fieldnotes at home. These memos and fieldnotes were helpful in the process of open coding and constant comparison. The questions that emerged included the following:

- What constituted the teachers' responsibilities?
- What did the teacher prioritize in their daily school activities?
- How were their pedagogic practices similar/different from one another?
- How did teachers work with one another?
- What constituted the identity of teachers?
- What were the continuities and discontinuities between the daily practice of teachers and open lessons in lesson study?

In the process of open coding, I went through the data to assign appropriate codes and categories of the events and conversation that took place. I focused on the difference in the responsibilities of teachers, their pedagogic practice, and how the teachers worked with one another. For instance, the teachers mentioned the consideration for other teachers hindered them to carry out tasks in the way they wanted. This suggested the existence of boundaries and the potential for conflicts similar to the "coping strategies" described by D. Hargreaves (2010). The process of constant comparison allowed me to conceptualize the responsibilities of the teachers in terms of responding to various accountabilities. By comparing the data from different incidents and different teachers, I was
able to make sure that the developed theoretical framework was
legitimately conceptualized to the point of theoretical saturation.

As well as categories emerging from the data I also recruited extant
sociological concepts (Bernstein, Vygotsky, and Dowling). Rather than
directly applying the concepts to data, I recontextualized these sociological
categories and used them only when they appropriately represented my
data in the contexts of my research setting. This is to prevent forcing
concepts on data but making use of these concepts while remaining
sensitive to data (Glaser, 1992). In discussing pedagogic strategies of
teachers, I distinguished the pedagogic strategies of teachers borrowing
the term from Bernstein’s restricted and elaborated codes (1961). But I
used them very differently from how he defined them. While Bernstein
distinguished the language used as a representation of social class, I
borrowed his terms to distinguish the difference in pedagogical practice. In
addition, I used the regulative and instructional discourses of Bernstein
(1990) to describe how pedagogic practice differed among teachers
depending on their pedagogic strategies. I also extended Vygotsky’s “zone
of proximal development” (1978) to discuss how learning of students was
mediated or scaffolded (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976), or not mediated in
relation to teachers’ pedagogic strategies. At the institutional level,
drawing from these analyses of pedagogic practice, I recruited Dowling’s
modes of authority action (2009) to present how their claims for expertise
(Dowling’s term: claims for authority) were similar to “survival strategies”
(Woods, 1977) or “coping strategies” (D. Hargreaves, 2010). The scheme
is useful in examining the kind of expertise shared (or not shared) and
reproduced (or not reproduced) in the school. This ultimately leads to
understanding how the institutional culture permeated teachers’ pedagogic
strategies and their decisions in daily lessons. In Chapter 8, based on the
empirical findings, the implementation of lesson study was examined in
terms of continuities and discontinuities of pedagogic practice and
organizational culture. This allowed me to understand the significance of
lesson study to the teachers in SMP Sari. In Chapter 9, the theoretical understanding of lesson study as the educational transfer of liberal pedagogy will be discussed. By “recontextualizing” and applying the works of Bernstein, Vygotsky, and Dowling, this study examined the patterns of social interactions/practice of teachers through theoretical lenses. Although Bernstein (1990) uses the same term “recontextualization”, I have used it differently from how he used as one of the rule of the pedagogic device (evaluation and distribution being the other two sets of rules). Here, Bernstein was specifically referring to the recontextualizing of a practice in the field of production (Bernstein offers the example of carpentry) to its representation in the field of reproduction (i.e., education, in which carpentry becomes (according to Bernstein’s example) woodwork). Rather, I am using it to refer to a move from any socio-cultural context to any other, which is to say, how one social activity ‘sees’ another, following Dowling (2014, the discussion on the page 15).

5.4 The Research Setting

Education reforms for quality improvement in Indonesia

In this section, the background information on the socio-cultural context of SMP Sari is presented. Before presenting the scene of SMP Sari, I will discuss the larger contexts of Indonesia and its education reform attempts at the time of the fieldwork in 2009-2010. Also, the issues in professional development and background history of lesson study in Indonesia will be discussed.

Indonesia is an ethnically diverse country (350 ethnic groups and over 700 dialects; Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, 2016) with 55 million students, 3 million teachers, and 236,000 schools (MoEC, 2013, as cited in Tobias, Wales, Syamsulhakim, & Suharti, 2014). Since the introduction of nine-year compulsory education in 1994, access to schooling has improved significantly. The net enrollment was 95.81% for primary schools
and 71.79% for secondary schools in 2008 (UNESCO, 2016). However, securing qualified teachers to accommodate the growing number of students has been a major issue (MONE, 2007) and improving the quality of education has been even more challenging. In 2014, the newly appointed Minister of Education and Culture, Anies Baswedan, called the condition of education in Indonesia as being in a state of emergency, stating that seventy-five percent of schools in Indonesia were not meeting the minimum standards. He cited various evidence including that the average competency scores of teachers were only 44.5 although the passing score was 75, and Indonesia ranked 64 out of 65 countries in PISA 2012 and the stagnated PISA performances in 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2012 (Gabrillin, December 1, 2014). Thus, seen from the domestic view, there seemed to be little change over the years in terms of student achievement21.

The Indonesian government has prioritized the reforms on the teaching profession within an overall strategy to enhance the quality of education (Tobias et al., 2014). The professionalism of teachers was often discussed by policy papers as a crucial issue since the high rate of absenteeism amongst teachers was damaging to the quality of schooling; the national average for absenteeism among teachers was 14.1 in 2008 and the rate was even higher in rural areas—23.3 % for teachers and 20.4 % for principals (World Bank, 2010).

In 2005, the Teacher Certification Program (promulgated by the Teacher Law (UU/14) in 2005) was introduced which required teachers to meet academic qualifications and in return, their salaries were doubled once they were certified (Tobias et al., 2014). This was intended to redress the

21 Similar to the contradiction between domestic and international discourse discussed in Chapter 2. According to ODI (2014), “OECD (2012) highlights that Indonesia was one of the few countries to simultaneously achieve improvements in PISA reading performance over 2000-2009, while also narrowing gaps between the best and worst-performing students.”
low economic and social status of teachers and improve the quality of teachers at the same time. At the time of the introduction of this program, only 40% of teachers met the requirement to hold the minimum of a four-year diploma or an undergraduate degree (World Bank, 2010). While the certification program improved the living standards of teachers, the study suggests there was no impact on the actual performance of students (Fahmi, Maulana, & Yusuf, 2011). Another study on teacher absenteeism in Papua and West Papua by UNICEF (2012) suggests that the certification program was not effective in decreasing teacher absenteeism. There have been criticisms that the form of assessment in the certification, portfolios, has little relevance to subject knowledge, pedagogic skills, or to the actual practice of teachers (Chang et al., 2013). Moreover, the manipulation of evidence in portfolios was reported (Chang et al., 2013).

**Decentralization and teacher autonomy**

Since the 1990s, the Indonesian government has promoted a series of decentralizing reforms. In terms of the education policy, the government has promoted decentralization measures in the 2000s to delegate more authority to the district and school levels to support local decision-making. The government implemented school-based management (SBM) in 2003 which promoted “SBM as a management model that grants autonomy to local schools to promote school independence and initiatives in managing and empowering the available resources, to encourage school stakeholders’ participation in decision making, to increase school public accountability, and to promote healthy competition among schools for improved quality (2004)” (Jawas, 2014, p.11). In 2006, school-based curriculum (KTSP) was introduced. The curriculum reform was intended to move away from rote learning to include more student-centered activities targeted at the acquisition of competency-based knowledge and skills (Tobias, et al., 2014). These reforms were intended to give schools more autonomy to accommodate local needs, also for teachers to move away from traditional teaching and act as facilitators to support student learning.
(Sulfasyah et al., 2015). However, these decentralization efforts have not been proven effective. For example, the evaluation of SBM suggested that it further deepened the resource gap amongst schools (Toi & Muta, 2006) and the community involvement did not increase the accountability of schools (Vernez, Karam, & Marshall, 2012). Also, there was no significant change in the practice of teachers resulting from the curriculum reform. Partly this was attributed to the low quality of training where large numbers of participants attend as audiences without follow-up (Tobias, et al., 2014). This is the recurrent theme suggested by the study by Bjork (2005) on the local content curriculum. Bjork suggested that, despite the autonomy given to the teachers, the bureaucratic attitudes of teachers became an obstacle. The teachers were concerned to accommodate the expectations of the state and there was little motivation to change practice. In order to implement a new practice, the Indonesian teachers needed to redefine their role with the new sets of behaviors and attitudes. Thus, the recurrent issue in the professional development of teachers in Indonesia is how to bring about a change in actual teaching practice in order to provide quality learning for students.

The National Examination

In Indonesia, the quality of education is generally understood as measured by the performance of students in the national examination (UN). UN is held at the end of primary (grade 6), junior secondary (grade 9) and secondary school (grade 12) as the requirement for graduation. Studies suggest that the teachers’ pedagogy is influenced by their concern to prepare students for the national examination and they preferred direct methods of teaching to the tests (Chang et al., 2013; Tanaka, 2011). Since the performance of schools in the UN is stratified in a league table, the schools are under pressure to perform well. If a school performs poorly, it would have difficulty attracting high achieving students and would receive a minimum budget allocation from the government. However, there has been a controversy over the UN concerning whether it is fair to obligate
students to pass the UN as the graduation requirement when there are big regional and social disparities among schools. It has been pointed out that the UN is disadvantageous for schools in rural and under-resourced areas or private schools with little funding (Kusanagi, forthcoming). Moreover, the national examination (UN) is often criticized for its unfair administration—answer key leakage, cheating, fraud, and corruption—and its legitimacy is being questioned (Tobias et al, 2014). In 2006, a group of students and parents filed a lawsuit against the government and demanded the abolition of the UN. They claim that it is undermining the right of citizens for education. The court granted the request in 2009 and ordered the government to improve teacher quality, school facilities, and infrastructure, as well as to provide access to complete information before issuing the policy to implement the UN (Kompas, 2009). However, despite the court ruling, the Ministry of National Education defended the UN, and it continues to be used as a requirement for graduation and an indicator for educational success.

Failures of Professional Development Programs

Numerous large-scale professional development projects were implemented by the Indonesian government since the 1990s with the support of foreign aid agencies. These initiatives shared a similarity with lesson study as they incorporated learner-centered approaches such as in the Cianjur project and ALPS Project by the British government and the Primary School Teacher Development Project (PEQIP) by the World Bank (Nielsen, 1998). In these projects, cluster-based working groups were formed as supporting networks and primary school teachers met several times a year to discuss problems related to classroom teaching and management. However, the evaluation by the DFID concluded that, although there were some cases of success, there was little change in
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From 2015, the national examination was no longer used to determine graduation but graduation is determined by school administrators and final school exam grades (Jakarta Post, 2014).
actual teaching practice. It suggested that teachers misunderstood the concept of “active learning,” teachers lacked knowledge and confidence, and there was limited financial support from the local government as reasons (Malcolm, McLean, Tanuputra, & Harlen, 2001). Similarly, the evaluation by the World Bank recognized that the cluster model used in PEQIP provided a diluted impact because of the large number of participants and a lack of practice at classroom levels (World Bank, 2004; Nielson, 1998). Both DFID and the World Bank acknowledged the training to be too theoretical and trainers’ lack of local knowledge as part of the problem.

Moreover, there were indications that the failures of these programs were also caused by factors beyond the scope of professional development programs. For example, the study on an in-service teacher development project funded by the World Bank suggests that while the project exposed science teachers to student-centered methods and they saw potential benefits, there was no incentive to implement these methods in daily teaching (Thair & Treagust, 2003). This is because the teachers were more concerned with drilling the students for the UN. These challenges in professional development in Indonesia share a commonality with the issues in transforming pedagogic practice in developing countries discussed in Chapter 2: sociocultural contexts shape the teacher's choice of pedagogy—whether or not to practice liberal pedagogy.

In the past literature on professional development in developing countries, the discussions tended to focus on issues directly relevant to teaching. However, in the setting of developing countries, the introduction of liberal pedagogy requires a radical change since there is “a legacy of hierarchical or top-down models of education management from colonial days” (Fullan & Watson, 2000, p. 461). Thus, “Not only do those in authority at central and middle levels of management have to give up control, but also those
at the school and community level have to be willing and capable of operating in new ways” (Fullan & Watson, 2000, p. 461).

Background of Lesson Study in Indonesia

Lesson study was introduced to Indonesia through a series of JICA projects in collaboration with the Ministry of National Education (now the Ministry of Education and Culture) to improve the quality of education (MONE, 2007; Saito et al., 2006). It was first introduced to the faculties of mathematics and science in three universities in Java: the Indonesia University of Education (UPI) in Bandung, the State University of Yogyakarta (UNY) in Yogyakarta, and the State University of Malang (UM) in Malang as part of the Indonesian Mathematics and Science Education Project (IMSTEP and IMSTEP follow-up; 1998-2005) as shown in Figure 5.1 (IDCJ, 2008; Karim, 2006). The main target of the project was to enhance the capacities of teachers through pre-service and in-service teacher training. Towards the end of this project, lesson study was introduced to the teachers of secondary schools as a small-scale pilot project (Marsigit, 2015).
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**Figure 5.1: JICA lesson study projects in Indonesia**

In 2006, another JICA project Strengthening In-Service Teacher Training of Mathematics and Science Education (SISTTEMS) project (2006-2008) was implemented, which targeted 295 junior high schools in three provinces on the Java Island (MONE, 2007). The objective of SISTTEMS was “to improve education quality at junior secondary level by reorganizing and vitalizing the district-level subject teacher forum called MGMP.
Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran for mathematics and science” (IDCJ, 2006). MGMP was established in 1994 as a professional forum for subject teachers but had failed to function as the intended teacher support network (Hendayana, 2015; Saito et al., 2007). In the JICA projects, MGMP was divided into smaller clusters consisting of 5 to 7 neighboring schools and training was provided as cluster-based activities (JICA, 2006; MONE, 2008).

In addition to these cluster-based activities, two schools from each of the three provinces were selected as pilot schools to implement “school-based lesson study” (LSBS: Lesson Study Berbasis Sekolah). The purpose of LSBS was to establish “learning communities” by the schools engaging in lesson study activities across subjects as entire school efforts (IDCJ, 2006). SMP Sari was selected as one of these six pilot schools and received additional funding and technical support from the JICA experts in 2007-2008. At the time of my fieldwork (2009-2010), another lesson study project called PELITA (2009 to 2013) was ongoing. Although the JICA members visited another school in the Bantul District where SMP Sari is located during my fieldwork, they did not visit SMP Sari. Thus, the external support for SMP Sari at the time was limited to the occasional support from the local university, Yogyakarta State University (UNY: Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta).

Now lesson study is popularly practiced in Indonesian schools nationwide. Various efforts have contributed to the growth of lesson study in Indonesia. Lesson study was supported by the government as one strategy for professional development and was disseminated through various projects: Better Education Through Reformed Management and Universal Teacher Upgrading (BERMUTU) program in 2005 with the support by the World Bank; the Induction Program for Novice Teacher (PIGP: Program Induksi Guru Pemula) in 2010; and the Lesson study Dissemination Program for Strengthening Teacher Education in Indonesia
(LEDIPSTI) project in 2008 which aimed to improve the quality of pre-service trainers (Chang et al., 2013; IALS, 2017; Ibrohim, 2012). In addition, there were workshops and training that used lesson study as “socialization (introductory) activities” to prepare teachers for implementing the new school-based curriculum or Curriculum 2004 (Marsigit, 2015). There have been numerous self-initiatives at school/district level and also significant numbers of the schools participated in the programs through the private sponsorship of the Sampoerna Foundation.

Since their involvement to IMSTEP, three universities in Java—the Indonesia University of Education (UPI) in Bandung, the State University of Yogyakarta (UNY) in Yogyakarta, and the State University of Malang (UM) in Malang—have been playing major roles in the dissemination of lesson study in Indonesia. They have published guidebooks on lesson study and played advisory roles in disseminating lesson study. In 2012, these universities along with other partner universities established the Indonesian Association of Lesson Study (ALSI: Asosiasi Lesson Study Indonesia). ALSI was established due to the concerns of the researchers that despite the wide dissemination, most lesson study seemed to be implemented at a superficial level of understanding (Ibrohim, 2012). ALSI was expected to be a network organization which enables exchange of information and practice among its members as well as to offer consultancy services in lesson study (Ibrohim, 2012; ALSI, 2016). Since then, an annual conference of ALSI, the International Conference on Lesson Study is held every year hosted by different universities in Indonesia.

Indonesia has also become a major player in the international community of lesson study. Professor Sumar Hedayana is a council member for World Association of Lesson Study (WALS; discussed in Chapter 4) and the annual conference was held in 2014 at the Indonesia University of Education (Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia: UPI) participated by 400
educators worldwide. In addition to international participants, many local teachers and researchers participated and presented their practice and research.

In Indonesia, lesson study has been generally interpreted as a cycle of three steps: “Plan (making a student-centered lesson plan); Do (carrying out instructional activities or “open class” according to the plan); See (‘reflection’ on the effectiveness of instructional activities to revise the activities)” (Hendayana, 2015; MONE, 2007, p. 120). The methodological aspects of lesson study were often emphasized as systematized procedures for teaching improvement or the introduction of new methods in teaching. For example, lesson study has been described as introducing: student cooperation, the contextual approach in teaching and learning, life-skills and hands-on activities, and curriculum, syllabi, or teaching materials development, and enhancing the autonomy of teachers and students (Marsigit, 2015, p. 231). However, as was discussed in Chapters 3 and 4, lesson study is not merely a method but could serve different purposes. In fact, the JICA experts saw that there had been some misunderstanding of lesson study. The points suggested by the JICA experts were: lesson study is not a teaching method; the aim was not for teachers to carry out a lesson as exactly as the lesson plan; teachers can use lectures if needed; teachers do not always have to use a worksheet, group activity, or ICT (IDCJ, 2011).

As the number of cases of lesson study has increased, variations have developed in Indonesia just as the dynamic development of lesson study in Japan discussed in Chapter 3 (Kusanagi, 2019). One aim of this new movement, for example, is to promote lesson study as a professional learning community. Rather than a static cycle of Plan-Do-See, lesson study is understood as:

*a specific activity system of inquiring teaching and learning conducted collaboratively and continuously by teachers along*
with other educators and school leaders. The primary aim of lesson study is to improve the quality of lessons to support upbringing children in educational settings (ALSI, 2016).

The Research Setting: SMP Sari

The school, SMP Sari, is located in Bantul District adjacent to the city of Yogyakarta in a special district of Yogyakarta (DIY) on the Java Island. Yogyakarta used to be the Indonesian capital during the Indonesian National Revolution from 1945 to 1949 and is now known as the “city of education” or the “city of students” due to a large number of universities. I use the term “Javanese” rather than “Indonesian” school since Javanese is known for having distinctive historical and cultural tradition such as the rigid hierarchical social system (Mas' oed, Panggahean , & Azea, 2001). Having a local king still ruling the region as a regional governor, Central Java is known as “high” Javanese culture compared to other parts of Java (Mas' oed et al., 2001).

Bantul is also known for the high educational level of its citizens and the governor’s commitment to education at the time (interview with an educational officer in Bantul, 2007). The achievements in DIY are generally higher than the national average. In the 2013/14 academic year, the national average score was 6.52 and DIY was 6.82. Also, the implementation of the UN is known to be transparent and fair in the DIY (Antara News, 2016). As explained, the schools in Bantul have been engaged in lesson study activities since 2006 but there were some delays in the original plan due to the damage caused by the Central Java earthquake on 27 May 2006 (IDCJ, 2008). Bantul was located at the epicenter of the earthquake and over 6,000 citizens were killed.

At the time of the fieldwork in 2009-2010, SMP Sari had been implementing LSBS for three years, with the strong leadership of the management. The principal and the curriculum head (a senior
Mathematics teacher) had participated in two-week training in Japan to learn about lesson study in 2008 and 2007 respectively. SMP Sari is the biggest public school in the sub-district of Purinegara (pseudonym) with 680 students and 51 teachers. SMP Sari ranked within the top ten rankings in the national examination in the Bantul district and is well equipped in terms of funds, facilities, and human resources. The school had been accredited as a “national standard school” based on meeting government-set criteria for the qualification of teachers, school facilities, and good academic achievements. SMP Sari started to implement bilingual classes since 2008 as an initiative to move towards passing the certification as an “international standard school.”

The main participants in the study were 51 teachers and the principal; however, the data-focused more on the teachers of four subject areas—mathematics, science, Indonesian, and English—together with several teachers responsible for running lesson study program. In the school, the teachers of these four subjects formed school-based subject study groups called *Musyawarah Guru Mata Pelajaran Sekolah* (MGMPS)—the school version of district-based MGMP—and lesson study was implemented as part of the MGMPS activities. My previous study (Nozu, 2008) examined the impact of lesson study on individual teachers’ professional development and was based on interviews. However, in the present study, the scope of the investigation was on how the sociocultural context impacted the way lesson study was interpreted and implemented by the teachers.
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5.5 Conclusion

In order to investigate the research question, how is lesson study recontextualized in a Javanese school setting, I chose an ethnographic approach to understand teachers’ practice as embedded in the setting of the school. By examining lesson study as a cultural practice and understanding its meaning within a social institution, I can explore the issue of teaching beyond professional development and provide “thick description” needed for local interpretations of data. Also, by understanding pedagogic practice as a socially constructed practice, I was able to analyze teaching as situated within larger socio-cultural contexts.
and as ongoing negotiations of various, sometimes conflicting demands. This enabled me to examine the practice of teachers as artifacts of social relations and cultural practices responding to various demands and negotiating their teacher identities.

I have also discussed the methods of my data collection and how I drew on the analytic strategies of grounded theory for data analysis in order to generate conceptual frameworks in order to understand the professional responsibilities of teachers and their pedagogic practice within the larger contexts. I also drew on the extant theories of Bernstein, Vygotsky, and Dowling and recontextualized them in order to examine the strategies and pedagogic practice of teachers as social practice reflecting institutionally-set norms. Finally, the background information on the research setting was presented. In doing this, I have provided not only the facts about SMP Sari but also the relevant history of educational reforms, challenges in professional development initiatives, and the historical development of lesson study in Indonesia. This is to situate teaching and lesson study practice in SMP Sari within the larger context, which is essential in understanding the analysis unfolding in the subsequent chapters.
Chapter 6: Teacher Community and Coping Strategies in SMP Sari

6.1 Introduction

In order to understand how teachers interpreted and implemented lesson study requires careful examination of the contextual setting. In developing countries, schools may operate based on different assumptions from those of industrialized countries (as discussed in Chapter 2). Based on empirical data, the following two chapters not only examine the practice of teachers as cultural representation but also examine how their practice was influenced by social relations within the institutional setting. I examine teaching as a social practice and explore the continuities and discontinuities between actual classroom practice and the professional development of teachers. Bjork (2005) described in his book Indonesian Education that Javanese schools in East Java are bureaucratic organizations and the bureaucratic culture is a challenge against the autonomous practice of teachers. In this study, I investigated beyond “bureaucratic culture” and examined teachers’ pedagogic practice as a social activity and as ongoing negotiations within a community. The sociological understanding of practice is essential since when pedagogic practice such as lesson study is transferred to another setting, its meaning is always interpreted against the local contexts. In this chapter, I present various obligations and responsibilities that fall on teachers in SMP Sari. This enables me to show how being a teacher means negotiating various demands which could support or be in conflict with fulfilling professional responsibilities. In the setting of SMP Sari, being a teacher meant being a “family” member, which entailed responsibilities under the patriarchal community. These various responsibilities could conflict with each other and sometimes required teachers to make impossible choices. For instance, being a loyal member of the community
could mean very different from being a “good teacher.” The aim of this chapter is to understand the following:

1) What does it mean to be a teacher in SMP Sari? What kind of accountabilities are involved in being a member of the teachers’ community in SMP Sari?

2) How do teachers work together in SMP Sari? How are they held accountable and negotiate different responsibilities for school operation?

3) How are these various responsibilities relevant (or irrelevant) to accountability for teaching and to students?

6.2 Overview of the teachers’ community

As briefly described in the previous chapter, SMP Sari is located in Bantul District just outside the city of Yogyakarta. It was accredited as “national standard school” and known for excellence in terms of the academic achievement of students, and good facilities and human resources. The vision of the school was “To become an international standard school which excels in achievement and under the faith and piety of the Indonesian character.” In the year of my fieldwork, SMP Sari ranked 5th in the district and 24th in the province for the UN ranking. All students had passed the UN—another indicator for a successful school—although a few students failed for the first time and retook the exam.

There were approximately 680 students and 51 teachers in the school. As it will be explored in this chapter, the teachers were governed by the common interest to maintain a harmonious relationship which is the feature of Javanese society. Such community harmony was maintained by the system of social stratification. Forty-nine teachers held permanent employment status as civil servants (PNS) and are listed in Table 6.1. Two teachers not listed in the table were honorarium teachers (an ICT teacher and a science lab assistant) who were hired directly by the school rather
than by the Education Office. The PNS teachers had an average of 18 years of teaching experience. The majority of teachers chose to teach in SMP Sari due to its proximity to the city and the privileged status of the school. Around the half of teachers in SMP Sari had been working in the school for over 10 years.

Most of the teachers held the position of either 3D or 4A in the civil service ranking (CSR) as shown in Table 6.1. Teachers were paid according to CSR. This paid them around 3-4 million rupiahs (the equivalent of GBP 170-250) a month. At the time of my fieldwork, 36 teachers out of 49 PNS teachers had already passed the certification scheme and certified as “professional teachers” (Fieldnotes, December 20, 2009). In Indonesia, absenteeism by teachers has been a major issue. Although absenteeism was generally not a major issue in SMP Sari, there were a few teachers who were tardy or missed lessons occasionally. While it was officially prohibited, it was common practice for teachers to have side jobs after school.

While teachers participated in social activities organized both inside and outside the school, the degree of participation in these activities varied among teachers. Since the school was located in a predominantly Muslim area, school events and rituals followed a mixture of Javanese and Muslim rituals. Consequently, four Christian teachers opted out from participation.

In this Chapter, I will focus on the teachers of the four UN subjects to a greater extent since lesson study activities in SMP Sari took place under the MGMPS. Since passing the national examination (UN) was considered the most important goal in schooling, there was a clear emphasis on the four subjects of the UN. The teachers of PE, ICT, Javanese, Home

23 If a teacher successfully passed the certification, they were to receive additional compensation from the national government which would result in a doubling of their salary.
Economics, Art, and Music were less involved and I rarely saw them at the School Anniversary Festival or Teacher Gatherings.

**Table 6.1: Teachers in SMP Sari**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>CSR*</th>
<th>Other Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Umar</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Curriculum (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Edi</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>UN committee (H)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Arum</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hani</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faud</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fima</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prastiiwi</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Joko</td>
<td>Science (Physics)</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Science Dept. (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Halim</td>
<td>Science (Physics)</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Student Affairs (S)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bella</td>
<td>Science (Biology)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wahyuni</td>
<td>Science (Physics &amp; Biology)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>Science (Biology)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Puji</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Endarto</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gia</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sugini</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Basuki</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Anggita</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Student Affairs (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Wibobbo</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td>English Dept. (H)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Tuti</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Amel</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Citra</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Ismi</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Danar</td>
<td>Social Science (Economics)</td>
<td>7, 8, &amp; 9th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Usmiwatun</td>
<td>Social Science (Economics)</td>
<td>7, 8, &amp; 9th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Dewi</td>
<td>Social Science (Geography)</td>
<td>7A, 8, &amp; 9th</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Vice principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Risma</td>
<td>Social Science (Geography)</td>
<td>7 &amp; 8th</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Arfan</td>
<td>Social Science (History)</td>
<td>7, 8, &amp; 9th</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Danar</td>
<td>Social Science (History)</td>
<td>7 &amp; 9th</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4A Human Resources (H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ditya</td>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Janur</td>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>7th and 8th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Ahmad</td>
<td>Civics</td>
<td>7th and 8th</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Beni</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4A Vice principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Nardi</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Dita</td>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Priyo</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>8th and 9th</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4A Facility (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Subagyo</td>
<td>PE</td>
<td>7th and 9th</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mira</td>
<td>Culture and Art (Painting)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4A Principal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Angga</td>
<td>Culture and Art (Painting)</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Elita</td>
<td>Culture and Art (Painting)</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Nina</td>
<td>Culture and Art (Dance)</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Handoko</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4A Human Resources (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Galih</td>
<td>ICT</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Andri</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)</td>
<td>8th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ismawati</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fira</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Ema</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Home Economics)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Beti</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Home Economics)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 9th</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Irfan</td>
<td>Local Content Curriculum (Gamlen)</td>
<td>7th &amp; 8th</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4A Facility (H)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers are evaluated and paid according to Civil Service Ranking (CSR)*

**(H): Head; (S): Secretary**
6.3 The Familism System

Memberships under the familism system

Being a teacher in SMP Sari meant being a “family” member in the teachers’ community which a vice principal, Mrs. Dewi, described as “getting together in sadness and happiness.” One of the first rituals I encountered when I started the fieldwork was an extensive morning greeting among teachers.

As the teachers arrived at the school on motorcycles (only a few teachers drove cars) and on the way to the staff room, they greeted their colleagues. They exchanged a word of “Good morning,” a smile and a handshake. Some of them would engage in casual conversations in the parking lots or hallways if they were not pressed for time (This episode was written based on accumulated Fieldnotes December 12-29, 2009).

On a day-to-day basis, the teachers spent significant time socializing with one another. When the teachers were not teaching, the teachers spent their time socializing with one another in the staff room. I always encountered small groups of teachers engaging in chitchat about food, family, vacations, and mostly gossip here and there. Some teachers stayed after school to “hang out.” One of the teachers told me that he preferred to hang out with friends after school rather than going back to an empty house (Fieldnotes, December 23, 2009). This sense of fraternity signified an interdependent relationship among teachers which extended beyond that of professional roles.

The “family” signified a deeper meaning in the Indonesian political/social system. Takashi Shiraishi (1992, 1997) described how the ideology of familism was used as an effective model of patronage under the Suharto regime. Under familism, the organization is maintained via two mechanisms: “the bureaucratic state”—which operates under bureaucratic rules—and “the family state”—personal favors relying on the generosity of leaders. Under this patronage system, “bapak” (father/leader) governed his “anak” (child/subordinate) through: 1) formal authority

24 According to Government Regulation No. 26 Year 2007 as cited in Holfelt (2008), 3C teachers are paid around 500,000 IDR monthly (equivalent to 27 GDP); 3D teachers around 1 million IDR (equivalent to 54 GDP) and 4A IDR 1.3 million (equivalent to 71 GDP), and 4B around IDR 2 million (equivalent to 108 GDP).
(as president), and 2) informal authority by acting as a generous father (of the nation). This enabled the leaders to govern subordinates through both official responsibility and debts of personal gratitude. Even bribery was systematized and justified in the familism of the regime as long as the wealth was distributed among the family members and not monopolized by leaders. Since the state salary was not sufficient to support living, anak relied on bapak for financial and personal favors (T. Shiraishi, 1992). Since the Suharto regime, this model has transcended various levels of bureaucracy and is still present today (T. Shiraishi, 1997). The ideology of familism was perpetuated in the institutional setting of SMP Sari. Being a “family” had two meanings: being a member of the civil service community and being a member of the patriarchal community. A relaxing and harmonious work environment in SMP Sari was ensured by maintaining the right balance under the familism system.

Two layers of reality

Indonesian teachers frequently address themselves as “PNS,” an abbreviation for Pegawai Negeri Sipil or civil servants. This formal status signifies guaranteed job security as government “family” (Bjork, 2005). Once they enter the civil service, there is no system to sanction poorly performing teachers (World Bank, 2009). It was often said that contract-based teachers worked hard to be PNS but once they became PNS, they could relax. Since almost all teachers in SMP Sari were PNS teachers, they were not under pressure to prove themselves. Even Mr. Edi, a teacher regarded as a “good teacher” by his peers in SMP Sari (elaborated further in Chapter 7), said that he preferred teaching in a public school over a private school because a civil servant teacher could relax (Fieldnotes March 10, 2010). For example, while the official working hours in SMP Sari were between 6:30

---

25 This also signified the privileged status of the school. Since the school was located near the city and was one of the best schools in the region, teachers want to be transferred to SMP Sari. Consequently, PNS teachers ended up being in the school.

26 This coincides with the finding of a study on government bureaucrats in 1970 by Oostingh as cited in Bjork (2005, p.86) that the principal attractions of a career in the civil service were job security, undemanding work, short working hours, and lifetime employment. In the public sector, teachers are less accountable for the output of their work.
13:00, most of the teachers came to the school only for their scheduled teaching. They came in right before the lessons and went home shortly after the lessons. There was little to hold teachers in the school besides being physically present to teach lessons. The community norm worked to loosen bureaucratic rules and this was legitimized as long as it did not undermine the overall accountability of the school to the bureaucratic system.

The above example of working hours represents how the familism system worked to resolve two conflicting demands: fulfillment of bureaucratic obligations (at least in terms of the paperwork) and protecting the interest of the community to maintain a relaxing and harmonious work environment. It meant the school operation was based on the coexistence of two layers of discourses. The first one is the official discourse guided by bureaucratic obligations, and the second one is the unofficial discourse responding to social norms of the community. While the official discourse regulated what should be done (on paper), it was the unofficial discourse, or internal codes of practice, which actually governed the conduct of its members. For example, in terms of documentation, the school operated by the working hours set by the bureaucratic regulations but the teachers only came in to teach lessons.

This resembles how teachers used the code-switching between two languages. While Indonesian was the official language of instruction at the school, the majority of teachers spoke the local language—Javanese—at home. The teachers switched between the two languages depending on the situation: Indonesian was used in classrooms whereas Javanese was used in the staff room. Indonesian is more egalitarian whereas Javanese is much more complex since “social and political hierarchy is encoded and expressed in Javanese” (Woodward, 2010. p. 15). In speaking Javanese, speakers need to change the formality of the language depending on to whom they are speaking. However, it enables speakers to express intimacy and respect in the way Indonesian cannot. Thus, the teachers preferred to use Javanese in informal settings. In this sense, two
layers of discourse aligned with the code-switching between the two languages, one official and the other unofficial.

6.4 School management and leadership

Paternalistic leadership

In this section, I will describe how school was managed effectively under the familism system. The school at the official level operated as a bureaucratic organization with the top-down management style. In reality, leaders needed to attend to two kinds of responsibilities—official and unofficial—under the familism system. This was described as “The boss, whether in government or in business, has to find a right balance between his [sic] role as an executive responsible for running a modern bureaucratic organization and his role as bapak (leader) responsible for taking care of his anak (subordinates) and keeping his family-organization happy and harmonious” (S. Shiraishi, 1997, p.97). Irawanto, Ramsey, and Ryan (2011) called this kind of leadership dominant among Javanese civil servants as “paternalistic leadership.” I will first describe how the school was managed under the leadership of Mrs. Mira and then discuss two distinctive kinds of leadership represented by two vice principals in SMP Sari.

Principal: Mrs. Mira

Mrs. Mira was regarded as a competent principal. Since she became the principal of SMP Sari four years ago, she had attracted more funds from the government, initiated new programs (such as bilingual classes and lesson study) and built new facilities (such as a new language lab and a media lab). While Mrs. Mira was a charismatic leader, gaining the support of teachers was essential in school operation, especially in implementing school reforms. Generally, these reforms were welcomed by the teachers since it offered more programs to students but moreover, participating in these programs brought additional honoraria for teachers.
At the same time, there was a conflict between the style of her school management and the existing social hierarchy. One of the reforms she implemented was holding a public election for managerial positions. The vice principals, the curriculum head, and the secretariats for school programs were chosen based on popular vote. As a result, two senior teachers lost their managerial positions. Customarily, these positions were reserved for senior teachers\textsuperscript{27}, some of the teachers felt they were deprived of privileges that they were entitled to (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010; Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010).

In fact, Mrs. Mira was well aware that there was a limit on how far she could push the reform. One day, I had a discussion in the principal’s office regarding one of the new “reading time” programs. The program was intended to prepare students for lessons by making them read books of their preference for a few minutes before the first period. However, without supervising teachers, there were very few students who actually read books. When I asked Mrs. Mira why the teachers were not in the classroom, her response was that we needed to be patient since “time and process were needed” to make a change (Interview, February 6, 2010). According to her, the previous principal did not provide guidance, the teachers were not used to being closely supervised. This narrative conveys how Mrs. Mira was concerned about exerting too much control over teachers since she knew their support was essential for the day-to-day operation of the school. This required Mrs. Mira to balance the responsibility to run the school efficiently and to fulfill the role of a generous and benevolent leader of her staff.

At the official level, it seemed that Mrs. Mira held sovereign power over the school operation. All official documents produced in SMP Sari—from students’ report cards, letters to parents, to the reports of individual teachers—required the signature of the principal before submitting them to the education office. However, the approval was merely procedural since it was impossible for the principal to assume control of everything happening in the school. Consequently, under the

\textsuperscript{27} Seniority used in this context is the older teachers with working experience of 20 years or more.
paternalistic leadership, leaders made the decisions at the official level while the actual operation was left up to the staff.

**Symbolic leadership: The case of Mr. Beni**

Two vice principals in SMP Sari exhibited two distinctive kinds of leadership that were both important. The first vice principal, Mr. Beni exhibited a symbolic leadership while the second vice principal Mrs. Dewi exhibited operational leadership. Their leadership represents how teachers negotiated two layers of accountabilities under the familism system.

The first vice principal, Mr. Beni, is an Islamic Religion teacher in his late fifties who had been working in SMP Sari for over twenty years. Mr. Beni was an exemplary Muslim and was considered as a perfect moral and religious leader. He had been to Mecca several times, and occasionally gave a sermon to the local communities. Religion played an important role in education. In any formal event, speech started with the prayer of “*assalamualaikum warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh* (Peace be upon you and may God bestow on you his blessing in Arabic greeting).” There was a mosque inside the school building where teachers and students went to pray. His peers evaluated him as a good teacher based on the moral grounds that he was religious, honest, disciplined, and fair (from the Teacher Survey). These characteristics were in alignment with the Javanese values of *alus*—polite, calm or soft behavior—who value harmony and would repress one’s own feelings at the expense of minimizing conflict (H. Geertz, 1961; Irawanto et al., 2011).

While Mr. Beni was highly regarded by his peers, there was nothing extraordinary about the competence of his teaching or success in his career. The teaching style of Mr. Beni was conventional. Mr. Beni himself admitted that he needed to try more interactive approaches (Interview, June 10, 2010). He used didactic approaches and the majority of lessons consisting of students reciting the Qur’an (Fieldnotes, January 19, 2010). However, his approach was not authoritative like other senior teachers. Mr. Beni talked to the students affectionately and did not get
upset even when the noise level rose with students chattering. He simply kept on reciting the Qur’an with the students who were listening. Nevertheless, Mr. Beni believes, “if teachers are religiously strong, they are better teachers” because they would work diligently to fulfill their responsibilities as teachers (Interview, June 10, 2010). In fact, Mr. Beni was one of very few teachers who came to the school and stayed at the school as prescribed by the government guidelines. As for his career, while Mr. Umar—the curriculum head—passed the exam, Mr. Beni did not. His explanation was that Mr. Umar was expert with government policies and regulations (Interview, June 10, 2010).

In fact, being a good leader in the Javanese society involved devotion and self-sacrifice. However, this did not necessarily match the image of a competent school leader. One of the reasons why Mr. Beni was elected as a vice principal was that he never owed a debt to the cooperative (Interview, June 10, 2010). The majority of the teachers were struggling with financial issues, and they borrowed money from the cooperative28 for paying loans for their houses and motorcycles and tuition fees for children. For example, a senior history teacher, Mr. Danar, told me “Miss Kanako, teachers are stressed today. Because it’s the end of the month and they (teachers) don’t have money” (Fieldnotes, December 24, 2009). Despite the fact that Mr. Beni had the power to take advantage of his position as the head of the cooperative, he never did. Thus, he was respected since Javanese are “motivated by a general ethos of selflessness and concern for the common good” (Bowen, 1986, p. 546).

In terms of school management, Mr. Beni had little authority over the decision-making or in actual school operation. He spoke in public only when invited to do so by the principal and refrained from making personal statements of any kind. His speech merely confirmed what the principal had just said or conveyed moral/religious messages. Nevertheless, his ability to do well with anyone in the community was the most admirable character in the “familism” system.

28 In the Indonesian civil service, there is a system of microfinancing organized under the cooperative.
Bureaucratic leadership: The case of Mrs. Dewi

The second vice principal, Mrs. Dewi, is a geography teacher in her thirties who had an outstanding career. Unlike Mr. Beni, she played an active role in school decision-making and was known as the right-hand woman of the principal. She held the civil service rank of 4B, which was the highest among the teachers—even higher than the principal—in SMP Sari (as shown in Table 6.1). Considering her age, she was on a fast-track career path. She had won several distinguished awards including a national award for teaching excellence. As prizes for these awards, she had been to Turkey and Japan to attend short-term training programs. At the time of my fieldwork, Mrs. Dewi had just started her Ph.D. at a local state university sponsored by the district government.

Her peers described her as a good teacher who was knowledgeable, creative, innovative, smart and having brilliant ideas (from the Teacher Survey). These attributes were reflected in her practice. While the majority of teachers in SMP Sari taught lessons without any preparation, she prepared a teaching scenario every week. In fact, Mrs. Dewi told me that it was an obligation on teachers to prepare for lessons (Interview, June 12, 2010). Her lessons were well-structured, started promptly and finished on time with a summary of the day’s lesson and an announcement of the next lesson.

Mrs. Dewi’s successful career was made possible by aligning her practice with bureaucratic requirements. While many teachers had expressed bureaucratic requirements merely as burdens, Mrs. Dewi found ways to apply them in practice. In the interview, Mrs. Dewi explained her strategic career move in this way:

*Teachers often care about credit points. But you don’t have to go outside of the school (to earn the points). If you want to get promoted from 4A to 4B, you need twelve points. If you conduct research in your classroom, you can earn 4 points. I got points by making teaching material that is a compilation of student worksheets. I also conducted two research studies on PTK (classroom action research) and published them in journals. While I only needed 14 (points to get promoted to 4B), actually I got more. I got a total of 17 points for that (Interview: June 12, 2010).*
On the other hand, there was a negative consequence to her successful career. In contrast to the popularity of Mr. Beni, Mrs. Dewi was somewhat alienated from the rest of the teachers’ community. There was a symbolic episode representing her isolation. In a workshop on professional competency, Mrs. Dewi presented her experience of creating a compilation of student worksheets and how teachers could earn additional credit points needed for a promotion (Fieldnotes, January 22, 2010). In explaining professionalism, she encouraged her colleagues to spend ten percent of their salary for professional development since they had a pay raise after being certified. When she recommended that her colleagues buy books or attend seminars paid for out of their own pockets, this invited disapproving murmuring from the floor. As a consequence, the teachers lost interest in her lecture and started to engage in chatting with one another. There was a clear distance between Mrs. Dewi and the teachers’ community. While Mr. Beni kept a low profile and was seen as a selfless and devoted community member, her accomplishments were visible. This won some respect among her colleagues but she was also seen as individualistic and authoritative.

The impossibility of balancing two accountabilities

In order to gain trust as a leader, principal and vice principal were held accountable for two different responsibilities. As a charismatic leader, Mrs. Mira needed to attend to not only to bureaucratic requirements but also to act as a generous leader. Even then, being a principal required sacrifice in the eyes of teachers. Once an English teacher told me that she preferred having friends over being a principal and being lonely. The vice principal, Mr. Beni, was not alienated from the community compared to Mrs. Mira and Mrs. Dewi. However, this was possible because he internalized community values and acted as a moral example. Such choice was only possible by withdrawing himself from taking an active leadership role and pursuing a personal interest. In contrast, Mrs. Dewi internalized bureaucratic values by acting as the one in authority. While this granted her power and high status in the bureaucratic hierarchy, she was alienated from the rest of the community. As the cases of the principal and two vice principals presented, the teachers needed to negotiate two seemingly
6.5 Teachers’ responsibilities and cooperation under the familism system

In this section, I will discuss the different responsibilities of teachers in day-to-day school operation and how these responsibilities were distributed and shared. As it will be revealed, tasks to carry out bureaucratic administration was structured under the familism system as the community responsibility which ensured efficient cooperation. However, teaching was not structured as collective responsibility. Moreover, while bureaucratic work was linked to career advancement, it had little relevance to the responsibility to students. Mr. Edi—who was regarded as a competent teacher by his peers—described this dilemma as:

“I’m really sad. Often I see my friends here…why they do not think of things that are actually their responsibility. I never think of getting promoted […] a teacher is a teacher. Not a businessman. That’s what I think. Why are many fighting for the position?” (Mr. Edi, Fieldnotes: June 2, 2010).

In order to understand what he meant by this, we need to understand the nature of teachers’ work and how teachers prioritize certain responsibilities over others.

School programs as collective responsibilities

At SMP Sari, any important activities—from the selection of newly entering students, middle, end of term examinations, mock examinations, to extracurricular programs—were run as school programs. The majority of programs were funded by the government and a few programs such as the UN preparation lessons were funded by the fees paid by parents. The administrative work associated with the implementation of these school programs were called tugas (literally means duty or tasks) and engaged as the highest priority. For participating in these programs,
teachers were compensated by honoraria\textsuperscript{29}. Thus, some teachers told me that nowadays teachers worked harder for these programs than for teaching (Fieldnotes, May 10, 2010)\textsuperscript{30}. While I never saw teachers preparing for their lessons, I often witnessed the teachers busily engaging in different \textit{tugas}: going around asking colleagues to sign an attendance list or teachers calculating for financial reports. The priority ascribed to this bureaucratic work and the use of public space and time in the staff room suggest the justified nature of work as the collectivist interest. Whenever there was an event hosted by a school program, food—such as lunch boxes or boxes containing snacks—was provided. This was a symbolic gesture of sharing with the community similar to how villagers are served food in a local wedding ceremony.

The smooth implementation of the school program was facilitated by the familism system. Different work for these programs was distributed among four committee groups called “\textit{timbok}” (\textit{tim bekerja kelompok} or group work team). The teachers belonged to one of four \textit{timbok} and each group was responsible for running different school programs. There was never a discussion about how to divide responsibilities since the tasks were assigned based on the social hierarchy within the \textit{timbok}. The discussion on how to run the programs was also generally unnecessary since the teachers simply followed the guideline produced by the District Education Office. Younger teachers were assigned time-consuming work such as making program reports. This involved producing timetables for activities, creating a list of participants, collecting signatures from participating teachers, collecting receipts, and calculations for financial reports. The younger teachers were fit for the work since making reports required computer skills and they were financially compensated for the extra work.

\textsuperscript{29} For example, for participation in supervising mock tests, teachers were paid IDR 25,000 each.  
\textsuperscript{30} Getting funds for these programs constituted an important role for the principal. The administrators were also rewarded financially for taking the role of supervisors which involving checking implementation and reporting.
However, the appointment based on the social hierarchy occasionally created a problem. Mr. Halim told me such an account when Mr. Angga (an Art teacher) was unable to fulfill his responsibility as a note taker. The quality of his work was inadequate and Mr. Angga could not handle transferring of data using a computer. Although Mr. Halim had tried to teach Mr. Angga, he was not able to learn these skills. Mr. Angga was described as “A typical teacher who had difficulty improving himself” (Interview, Mr. Halim, June 9, 2010). Nevertheless, Mr. Angga was not held accountable for his performance. In the end, Mr. Halim replaced him with another young Science teacher.

This episode illustrates how teachers are protected from individual evaluation under the familism system. As long as teachers followed the existing institutional norms and worked toward the community interest, they were collectively held accountable for performance. As a consequence, when a problem occurred, the issue was resolved quietly as a shared responsibility of the community—rather than holding individuals accountable for their performance. The members of the “family” were emotionally and morally committed to supporting one another (the unofficial discourse) and there was a clear interdependency among teachers.

Teaching to deliver the curriculum and to pass the national examination

Daily teaching was not structured as school programs; neither was it recognized as prioritized work or collective responsibility of the community. Then how did teachers understand their responsibility to teach? It is clear from the conversations in the staff room that the teachers rarely discussed their teaching or students in the way they discussed tugas.

In Indonesian junior schools, the goal of schooling was generally understood as the passing of the national examination or UN (Ujian Nasional) held at the ninth grade. Not only was passing a requirement for the graduation for students, but the quality of schooling is also evaluated by the UN scores and the league tables. In the interview with an officer in the Education Office, he provided the names of six
Consequently, the aim of teaching was understood as to prepare students for the UN; thus, teachers equated their responsibility with the delivery of materi. The word materi is often used in daily conversations to describe—the curriculum, teaching materials, or subject topics—anything associated with preparing students for the UN. The significance of an emphasis on materi was that the teachers interpreted teaching as the bureaucratic obligation but this had little to do with accountability to students. This accountability for teaching will be discussed further in Chapter 7.

While there was an overall concern for the performance of the school in the UN, individual teachers were rarely held accountable for student performance. It was considered as the responsibility of the managers to ensure the school performs well which was essential in attracting high-level students and also advantageous in attracting more funding from the Education Office for school programs. In order to be ranked at the top of the league table, “additional lessons” (they called it “tajam,” an abbreviation for “les tambahan jam” [additional lessons]) or the UN preparatory lessons were provided after school. Mr. Faud, a young Mathematics teacher, complained that “now the world is upside down (dunia terbalik)” because “additional lessons” were offered not because they were requested by parents or students but because the managers were concerned with school reputation (Fieldnotes, May 10, 2010).

Obligations as “professionals”

At the time of fieldwork, some of the teachers were going through the process for the Teacher Certification Program. Once teachers were certified, their salaries nearly doubled (discussed in Chapter 5). This, of course, was a matter of great concern for teachers. The intention of the program was to acknowledging teachers as “professionals” by strengthening their economic and social status. In reality, the certification process was also influenced by factors other than the
competency of teachers. For instance, since there was a limitation to the number of teachers who could join the program from one school, senior teachers were prioritized.

Moreover, teachers’ conversations revealed that “professional” also had two layers of discourse. Fulfillment of official (bureaucratic) requirement was discussed separately from the actual performance of teachers. For instance, Mr. Beni (the vice principal) commented, “Although Mr. Basuki was certified, he is always late to classes. If already certified, the teacher should be professional” (Interview, June 10, 2010). In this way, “professionals” merely signified as having fulfilled the qualifications but had little relevance to “professional” conduct or practice.

Generally, teachers were reluctant to take up the responsibility to work with students. For example, teachers were generally unwilling to be homeroom teachers and younger teachers were pushed by the curriculum head to be homeroom teachers (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010). It was because they considered additional responsibilities such as making report cards or taking care of problematic students as a burden. However, sometimes teachers were motivated externally to take up the responsibility to students. Due to the certification program, some of the senior teachers became homeroom teachers to earn additional credits associated with the responsibility. However, this had little impact on how they worked with students; teachers continued to engage minimally with students. In fact, the certification program has been criticized for having little impact on the actual performance of teachers (Chang et al., 2013).

In Section 6.3, it was discussed how SMP Sari was governed by two discourse: the official discourse guided by bureaucratic obligations, and the unofficial discourse guided by bureaucratic obligations. However, if unsuccessful at the portfolio some additional training would be required at a two-week workshop to be held at the certifying university (Group B in the table below); (iii) Those with 25+ years of experience; or a 4a civil service ranking are eligible for immediate submission of a portfolio whether S1/D4 or below S1/D4 (Group C in the table below);” (p.78)
discourse responding to social norms of the community. It was also discussed while the official discourse regulated what should be done (on paper), it was the unofficial discourse, or internal codes of practice, which actually governed the conduct of its members. In terms of the performance of teachers, it was also regulated by social obligations to the community.

The recount below indicates how “professional” discipline was also interpreted as a social obligation to the community.

Mrs. Dita is always late or often skips her classes. I had already talked to her several times. She cried when I told her to improve. But after that, […] it just returns to usual…Mrs. Dita has difficulty in improving herself. […] I told her several times, “you have to set an example for other teachers” but she is not communicative and let students work by themselves. She gives tasks, sits down, and just reads a magazine (irrelevant to the lesson). Maybe she has problems at home but I do not know because she never talks about it. (Interview, June 10, 2010)

While the bad conduct of Mrs. Dita was not acceptable by both bureaucratic regulation and code of conducts of the teachers’ community, Mr. Beni chose to use peer pressure to redress her conduct. Rather than encouraging her to adhere to the teaching schedule (bureaucratic regulation), he reminded Mrs. Dita her obligation to set an example as a senior Islamic Religion teacher. This method of appealing to conscience by the use of shame is commonly used by Javanese parents in disciplining their children (H. Geertz, 1959). When Mrs. Dita did not change her behavior, Mr. Beni attributed her disciplinary problem to her personal (and possibly a personality) problem. Without fulfilling her obligation to the community, Mrs. Dita was marginalized from the community. Thus, the problem was no longer an issue for the community but it became a personal problem of Mrs. Dita.

Pursuit of Professional Interests as Personal Choice

In the above example, Mrs. Dita was alienated from the community by her “unprofessional” conduct. However, it was equally risky to be seen as an outstanding teacher. The strong sense of belonging to the community discouraged teachers from differentiating oneself from others.
Living in the Javanese society should be characterised by ‘rukun’ (harmonious unity) […] Rukun can be achieved with the belief that the person should put emphasis on the group interests instead of the interests of the individual (Santoso, 2012, p. 226).

Since teachers generally considered teaching as their individual responsibility, they rarely discussed their teaching or about their students. Consequently, excellence in teaching was not discussed as the community obligation but attributed to personal commitment and even personal sacrifice. Although good teachers were recognized for their ability to work with students (will be discussed further in Chapter 7), they were considered as exceptional. This sometimes worked negatively toward pursuing ones’ professional interest.

One day, I was talking with Mr. Irfan (Gamelan Music teacher), Mr. Angga (Art teacher), Mr. Edi (Mathematics teacher), and Mr. Basuki (Indonesian teacher). Mr. Basuki told me that the obstacle for lesson study was a lack of funds. He said:

\textit{It took me IDR 50,000 to photocopy worksheets for the students and observers (in the open class). If it is for every day, it is impossible. Especially for someone like me who is lazy (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010).}

For this, Mr. Edi said in an uncritical tone that even in his daily lessons he spent his pocket money to photocopy worksheets for students. He said that it was okay because he was happy to see the students with the improved UN results (June 2, 2010). To this, Mr. Basuki explained that although he would like to improve himself, his family situation—having a baby at home—hindered him from engaging in professional development. Mr. Basuki said, “I am having a headache thinking about financial problems.” In this way, a professional commitment was talked about as a choice rather than an obligation\textsuperscript{32}. This kind of discussion about teaching was rare in SMP Sari and it was only possible because there was no conflict of interests among these teachers. Mr. Angga and Mr. Irfan were teachers of non-academic subjects, Mr. Basuki exempted himself by labeling himself as lazy. Mr. Edi was regarded as an outstanding teacher who successfully prepares students for the UN.

\textsuperscript{32} On the contrary to his self-evaluation, Mr. Basuki was described as a problematic teacher by Mr. Beni (page 127).
Especially when teachers are rewarded with personal gain, they face the risk of being seen as selfish. In the case of Mr. Edi, he was compensated financially for his ability to teach well. Being assigned as head of the committee for the UN preparation lessons allowed him to gain the compensation of IDR 200,000 (the equivalent of GBP 13). In addition, when three of his students got perfect scores in the UN (which was extremely difficult), he was also rewarded IDR 75,000 (IDR 25,000 for each student, and equivalent to GBP 5). Although Mr. Edi had extensive experience as a private tutor and had won a good reputation in teaching, some teachers felt his additional income to be unfair (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010). While the amount was small, by differentiating himself from the rest of the community, he disrupted the existing institutional hierarchy and social harmony.

In fact, some of “good” members of the community tactically avoided seen as individualistic by sharing their personal gain to the community. They showed a symbolic gesture of sharing and a token of appreciation by treating everyone. During my fieldwork, there were two such occasions. The first instance was when a senior Indonesian teacher, Mrs. Sugini, passed the certification and the other was when Mrs. Dewi was promoted to the civil service ranking of 4B. They both provided lunch boxes to all the staff members as a celebration. Such sharing of wealth among the community was important for teachers in order to avoid jealousy. Mr. Edi was also aware of this sharing gesture of giving back to the community. In the interview, he told me that he gave half of his additional honorarium (IDR 100,000) to choremens who helped teachers with miscellaneous tasks such as copying or making tea. It was common practice to tip low paid workers. However, it was uncertain whether other teachers considered this a contribution to the community.

This symbolic gesture of sharing was not mandatory since it could impose a significant economic burden on the teachers. There were other teachers who had

33 In Indonesia, it is customary to treat others on the occasion of one’s own birthday. Some people hide their birthdays because of this burden.
been certified at the same time as Mrs. Sugini, but she was the only one to give out lunch boxes. In some cases, the teachers hid their personal success. When Mrs. Ismi opened a restaurant with her sister, she kept it secret from other teachers. She secretly invited me to an opening reception and told me that if she invited only some of her friends it would not be fair (Fieldnotes, May 23, 2010).

Prioritized work under the familism

In this section, the different responsibilities of teachers have been discussed. While school programs and other bureaucratic administrations were prioritized as a collective responsibility under the familism system, teaching was not part of this collective responsibility. Also, teaching was interpreted as a bureaucratic requirement to deliver the curriculum for the UN preparation. In neither of these responsibilities, teachers were held accountable for the quality of their performance.

When teachers went beyond the bureaucratic obligation and social norms of the community, their competence was attributed to a personal commitment and choice. Those teachers who lacked discipline were punished for the inability to fulfill the social obligation to the community. Equally, when teachers were acknowledged for their professional competence, they were also at risk of being alienated from the community for jeopardizing the existing hierarchy and community harmony. While the hierarchical structure of SMP Sari facilitated the smooth school operation, it discouraged teachers from pursuing their own professional interest. This means, being a responsible member of the community could be in conflict with being a good teacher. In the next section, how the teachers negotiated such contesting demands will be explored.
6.6 Coping strategies of teachers

Negotiations between a “good” family and a “good” teacher

In this section, the coping strategies of teachers are presented as teachers’ negotiations within the setting of SMP Sari. As discussed in the previous section, the school was efficiently managed under the familism system where bureaucratic work was prioritized as collective responsibility among the community members. While there was a pressure to maintain the existing social hierarchy, the teachers were increasingly held accountable for their individual performance as seen in the certification program. Firstly, there was an obvious conflict between the existing social hierarchy and the actual competencies of teachers. Secondly, as new programs began to emerge, the top-down division of tasks and school management was becoming less effective. Thirdly, the school environment was increasingly becoming competitive and teachers were held accountable for their individual performances under the bureaucratic evaluation system.

This creates situations in which the teachers needed to negotiate between the existing social hierarchy and the emerging forces that held teachers accountable for their performance. In this section, my discussions were mainly in the case of Science teachers and relied mainly on the interview data of Mr. Halim. Since this kind of discussion was politically risky, only a few teachers revealed the inside knowledge. However, I believe this does not undermine the validity of my analysis since the purpose was to describe dilemmas rather than to provide accurate accounts of the events.

Seniority as privileged status

In SMP Sari, senior teachers were entitled to many privileges based on their high status in the social hierarchy. One of such privilege was that the senior teachers were exempted from their bureaucratic requirements or reduced their workload. Younger teachers were expected to carry a greater workload while senior teachers held the privileged positions which required little work. For example,
while it was obligatory to teach 24 hours per week, Mr. Umar, the curriculum head, taught only 12 hours per week. It was possible since he earned the extra hours (or points) for being the head of the lab, head of the curriculum, and head of the computer lab (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010).

Since these privileges were given based on the social hierarchy, the actual ability to take up the responsibility to perform the task was not called in question. For instance, a newly installed language lab had never been used. Apparently, the head of the laboratory, Mrs. Gia, a senior Indonesian teacher, did not know how to operate the equipment. This was never problematized in public although some teachers were frustrated. Mr. Halim said in the interview, “When seniority was not accompanied by ability, it is problematic” (Interview, June 8, 2010). Again, there were the official and unofficial discourses: those teachers were responsible in name only but they were not reliable for actual implementation.

**Understanding of teaching competence**

There was ambiguity in how teachers assess one another’s competence while senior teachers were often described in negative terms. For example, some teachers said that senior teachers were old and not motivated to improve themselves or they were too authoritative toward students or younger teachers (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010; Interview with Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). A senior English teacher, Mrs. Ismi, provided an alternative explanation. She said for many senior teachers, it was not their first choice to be teachers but they became teachers because there were only a few career options. However, these days, motivated younger teachers began to join the profession with increasing salaries. She said, younger teachers in this school, such as Mr. Faud and Mr. Halim, were interested in developing their professionalism (Fieldnotes, May 11, 2010).

In fact, there were different interpretations of the relationship between seniority and professional competency. The senior teachers tended to legitimatize their higher status with their longer experience in teaching. For example, the curriculum
head (and the senior teacher) Mr. Umar supported the institutional hierarchy, claiming the appointments to teach ninth grade was not purely based on seniority but also based on competence.

*Mr. Umar told me those who taught ninth graders had better ability compared to other teachers. He said that is why Mr. Umar and Mr. Edi (both in their fifties) taught ninth grade Mathematics while Mrs. Hani (in the forties) taught seventh grade. Also, Mrs. Astuti, a science teacher (in her forties and older than Mr. Halim or Mrs. Bella who taught ninth grade), was not good so she taught 8th grade. Also, Mrs. Ditya (in her forties) taught 9th grade for Civics while two male teachers, Mr. Janur (in his fifties) and Mr. Ahmad, (in his thirties) were still new, and so not as good, taught 7th and 8th. (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010).*

Teaching ninth grade, especially for the four subjects of the UN, was considered as involving greater responsibility since they were directly relevant to the preparation of the UN. On the other hand, when I asked Mr. Umar how he knew which teachers were good, he simply said it was visible in daily activities. He gave an example when the bell for lesson rang: those committed professionally moved immediately from their seats while those who were not continued to chat with other teachers (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010).

**Hidden competition**

While it was a taboo for teachers to discuss one another’s competence in public, there was often a hidden rivalry between senior and younger teachers. Mr. Halim recounted how Mrs. Bella compared the performances of students between the classes she and Mr. Halim taught with the classes taught by a senior teacher, Mr. Joko (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010). The classes taught by Mr. Halim and Mrs. Bella (9D, 9E, 9F, and 9G) had higher scores compared to the classes taught by Mr. Joko (9A, 9B, and 9C). Mr. Halim said the students in 9B were the smartest ones when they entered the school (based on their scores on the elementary school graduation results), but that the classes that they taught were doing better than 9B.

…*the strange thing is the Mathematics scores of students between Mr. Umar and Mr. Edi, they were not different. […] The abilities of students across classes were the same. This means that the capital, their ability, is really equal. But how come in science like that (referring to the*
The above narrative indicated the performances of students were used as an indicator to imply that younger teachers were more competent than senior teachers. This was clearly in contrast with what Mr. Umar recounted on the previous page. These different accounts of senior and younger teachers suggest that there was a clear conflict between the existing social hierarchy and the evaluation of teachers based on their competence. However, this competition was kept hidden and never surfaced in public.

**Patronage and good cooperation**

Although younger teachers occasionally complained about senior teachers’ patronizing attitudes, these conflicts never surfaced. Rather, they were resolved quietly in order to protect community harmony. Mr. Halim recounted how he handled the situation. When Science teachers complained that “Mr. Joko (the head of Science subject group) always wants to check everything,” Mr. Halim told them to “Just keep quiet and let him, it’s nothing” (Interview, June 6, 2010). He explained, “Previously, I had difficulty accepting Mr. Joko. Because Mr. Joko was always menggurui (patronizing) me” (Interview, June 6, 2010). The word menggurui means “to patronize” and signified arrogant behavior counter to the Javanese value of good conduct. But Mr. Halim resolved the issue quietly saying that once he understood the personality of Mr. Joko, he learned to accept who he was. He said that the best solution was to let the problem go since had he confronted Mr. Joko, it would only have prolonged the problem.

Even though Mr. Halim played a significant role in the school as the secretary for the Lesson Study Program and also for Student Affairs, he wisely chose not to confront Mr. Joko. Mr. Halim chose to dismiss the matter as a personal difference rather than sabotaging his good relationship with Mr. Joko. This suggests the existence of strong pressure to maintain the existing hierarchy and social harmony. While this ensured good cooperation among teachers, it could also
hinder any change in school management (and reform). In this way, it was difficult to pursue a professional interest or to hold a constructive discussion since social obligation was prioritized under the hierarchical institutional setting.

In fact, maintaining a good relationship with other members of the community is indispensable qualification as a teacher. Mr. Halim told me that Science teachers had better relationships compared to English teachers or Mathematics teachers (Interview, June 8, 2010). Driven by the Javanese conduct to maintain social harmony and to respect those in authority, good cooperation was essential. The teachers strongly identified themselves as subject experts (will be discussed more in Chapter 7) and having a good relationship with other teachers of the same subject was important. Due to this concern, the teachers avoided acting out of place. Younger teachers occasionally used the phrase that they were afraid of menggurui others or did not want to be menggurui.

The blurring of bureaucratic boundaries

As the school offered more programs under the new management of Mrs. Mira, the division of responsibilities was not always clear. The blurring of bureaucratic boundaries resulted in a confrontation between teachers at times. Mrs. Ema—a science teacher in her thirties—reported to me an incident within the team for the bilingual class.

As handing me the schedule for the UN preparation lessons, Mrs. Ema told me she had made it. At that time Mr. Faud joined the conversation and told me the trouble Mrs. Ema had with the team of bilingual classes. The team for the bilingual class was offended that the “tajam” (the UN preparation lessons) team had made a schedule for bilingual classes and had replaced the new schedule made by them (Fieldnotes, February 22, 2010).

Since the bilingual program had started two years ago, the division of responsibilities was not always clear. Mrs. Ema attributed the issue to bad coordination between the two timbok teams, which was eventually the responsibility of the principal. According to her, the principal should have checked before signing the schedule. Since the responsibility rested on the management,
the incident was recounted as an uncomfortable experience beyond the control of Mrs. Ema. In this way, issues in the school operation were often treated as an authority issue rather than a professional issue.

In fact, the introduction of bilingual classes brought in another ambiguity in conflict with social hierarchy. At least some parts of the Mathematics and Science lessons (in fact a very small portion was taught in English) for bilingual classes (7A and 8A) were expected to be taught in English. In the following year, 9A would also be a bilingual class. While senior teachers generally taught the ninth grade, they were not willing to teach a bilingual class. Thus, it was decided that younger teachers, who had some knowledge of English, would be assigned to teach the 9A. This disrupted the existing hierarchy and threatened the privileged status of senior teachers. In the interview (May 24, 2010), Mr. Umar was skeptical of the appointment of a young Mathematics teacher, Mr. Faud, as a ninth-grade teacher. Although Mr. Faud was recognized as a young competent teacher (for example the remark by Mrs. Ismi on page 143), Mr. Umar said that he was keen to assess the performance of Mr. Faud’s students.

As suggested by the case of the bilingual program, the emergence of new forces motivated a change in the system and disrupted the existing hierarchy. In the past, the teachers were evaluated based on their loyalty to the civil service system rather than their performance as teachers (Bjork, 2005). However, the teachers were increasingly held accountable for their individual performance under the bureaucratic gaze. For senior teachers, this could be considered as a threat to their privileged status while younger teachers saw it as a potential opportunity.

**Coping Strategies**

The discussion so far in this chapter reveals how the institutional setting could discourage the teachers from pursuing their professional interests where it was in conflict with the community values and norms. If teachers acted upon their professional interest, there was a risk that they would be seen as individualistic or even selfish. This motivated most teachers to adhere to social norms and
maintain social harmony. This is summarized in Table 6.2 as Coping Strategies for Teachers.

Table 6.2: Coping Strategies for Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Individual (Choice)</th>
<th>Collective (Obligation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unofficial Discourse: Social Accountability</td>
<td>Successful moral leader</td>
<td><strong>Good members</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Internalization:</strong> Setting a moral example or making generous contribution to the community</td>
<td><strong>Conformity:</strong> Prioritizing the collective good and maintaining social harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Discourse: Bureaucratic Accountability</td>
<td>Successful Career</td>
<td><strong>Good civil servants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Externalization:</strong> Effort to align conduct with government-set standards</td>
<td><strong>Compliance:</strong> Carrying out school activities by the distribution of tasks among members and complying with government-set guidelines</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internalization:
The conduct of Mr. Beni falls into the category of “internalization.” He acted as a moral example by internalizing community ethics as his own choice. This enabled him to win high recognition within the community but this had no direct relation to his ability to teach or manage the school. He presented moral and symbolic leadership.

Conformity and compliance:
The majority of teachers in SMP Sari fall into this category. They worked to fulfill the collective responsibility both as a member of the bureaucratic institution and the social community. The significance of this strategy is that there were two layers of discourse, and social norms worked to loosen bureaucratic control. As a result, it was a social obligation that actually regulates the conduct of teachers while bureaucratic obligation was interpreted merely as rules on paper. In most cases, the conformity and compliance strategies co-existed. The teachers were accountable for complying with both official and unofficial discourses by maintaining the existing institutional hierarchy.
Externalization:

Bureaucratic accountability obliges the teachers to align their practice with the externally-set bureaucratic criteria. While the social norms usually worked to stretch bureaucratic rules, the teachers employing this strategy nevertheless adhered to the bureaucratic regulations. Thus, there were no longer two layers of discourse, but teachers’ actual conducts aligned with bureaucratic requirements. This strategy was employed by teachers at times, for example, when there was a visit by a school supervisor. However, most teachers only used the strategy temporarily. Teachers who mainly employed this strategy would be rewarded with career advancement but they also faced the risk of alienating themselves from the rest of the community. More importantly, as discussed in this chapter, this strategy merely signifies the fulfillment of bureaucratic standards and did not guarantee having the ability to teach well.

6.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have presented what it means to be teachers in SMP Sari and how certain responsibilities were emphasized and prioritized under the social hierarchy of the familism system. Firstly, I presented how the school operated under the two (official and unofficial) layers of reality which enabled to fulfill bureaucratic requirements and also to protect a relaxing and harmonious working environment. Secondly, I examined how teachers’ work and rewards were distributed based on the hierarchical system which ensured the smooth school operation. Thirdly, while the bureaucratic responsibilities were prioritized under the familism system, teaching responsibility was interpreted as the delivery of the curriculum and did not encompass the responsibility to support students. Moreover, the interest to protect the community at times undermined professional accountability to teach and work for students.

I presented the “coping strategies” of SMP Sari and explored teachers’ choice as the negotiation of contesting demands placed on them. This showed how the
institutional structure of SMP Sari worked to prioritize the collective interests of the community. There were strong incentives for teachers to protect community interest since they were protected by the community under the familism system. On the other hand, the accountability for teaching and supporting students was not part of the community interest and was considered as a matter of personal choice. This made it difficult for teachers to pursue their professional interests especially when it disrupted the social hierarchy of the community. While we often examine professional development focusing on “professional responsibilities” that are directly relevant to teaching and responsibility to students, the discussions in this chapter have presented how the institutional structure hold teachers accountable for both official and unofficial obligations. In the next chapter, I will examine the teaching practice of teachers in SMP Sari in relation to the institutional accountability discussed in this chapter.
Chapter 7: Teachers’ pedagogies, strategies, and authority

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will present the teaching practice of the teachers in SMP Sari and examine this as the patterns of cultural practice within social relations under the familism system. In particular, I will present how the choice of pedagogy is influenced not only by the bureaucratic institutional settings but also by social responsibility owed to the community. Various conceptual frameworks are introduced to help understand how teachers define and carry out their responsibilities that are shaped by the institutional setting.

In order to understand teaching responsibility in SMP Sari, one needs to know the word *materi*. There was variation in the use of the word depending on the contexts—as it could mean actual teaching materials, topics to be taught, or the curriculum itself. The word *materi* signifies both an obligation and the challenge associated with the preparation of the national examination (UN). A common complaint among teachers was that there is too much *materi* to cover with limited time for its delivery. In this way, the word *materi* was associated with teaching responsibility which was equated with the presentation of *materi*. In addition, *materi* had a connotation that work must be prioritized similar to the usage of *tugas* (duty) described in Chapter 6.

While *materi* represented an obligation in teaching (associated with the UN preparation), it was clearly distinguished from “good” teaching. The majority of teachers in SMP Sari said there was no difficulty in teaching. On the other hand, one respondent in the teacher survey wrote, “There is no good teacher in this school. Most teachers are only chasing *materi.*” Another teacher described bad teachers as, “Teachers who just give *materi* and do not pay attention to students.” These descriptions—only covering *materi* or only chasing *materi*—suggest that
the presentation of the curriculum was understood merely as a minimum obligation, but not sufficient for good teaching practice.

Then what constituted good teaching? In the same survey, good teachers were described as follows:

- **Teachers who can make students understand materials that they give.**
- **Teachers who can explain materials as easy as possible and in a way acceptable to students.**
- **Teachers who do not only teach or transfer materials but who also train and educate students.**
- **Teachers who can understand situations and conditions as well as the characteristics of students. They are really important.**

These comments suggest good teachers were understood as those who support students’ acquisition of *materi*. In order to distinguish “good” teaching and mere teaching, I will employ the concept of Zone Proximal Development (ZPD) by Vygotsky (1978). Vygotsky described students’ development as participation in a social activity where the students gain support by interacting with others and called this space the ZPD:

*The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential problem solving as determined through problem-solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more able peers* (Vygotsky, 1978, p. 86).

While Vygotsky actually discussed ZPD as cognitive development, in this study ZPD is reinterpreted to constitute a social space in which mediation for learning takes place. I follow the case of Panofsky and Vadeboncoeur (2012) for reconceptualizing ZPD as a social rather than that a psychological zone. They described how parents could negotiate ZPD (they called it as a triadic ZPD). By fostering a better understanding of their children, parents managed to reduce the relational distance between students and teachers. I follow their example and treat ZPD as a social space where student learning was mediated.

---

34 The transmission or presentation of curriculum material described in the setting involved merely delivering the curriculum without concern for acquisition.
In this chapter, firstly, I present two different pedagogic strategies of teachers based on whether or not the practice of teachers opened a social space to provide scaffolding within ZPDs (Wood et al., 1976). Secondly, the features of teachers’ practice will be explored using these pedagogic strategies. I will examine teachers’ practice as a social representation of the institution. Thirdly, cases of “good teachers” are presented to show how their practice extended beyond bureaucratically-set boundaries and how these teachers shared learning responsibility with students. Lastly, the practices of teachers are analyzed by employing the schema of Authority Strategies by Dowling (2009) and explored as ongoing efforts to legitimatize their expertise (authority claim) in relation to the institutional culture. The purpose of the analysis is not to evaluate individual teachers’ practice nor to generalize the practice of Javanese teachers. Instead, the analysis is intended to present teaching practice as a social activity the boundaries of responsibilities and priorities being shaped by the institutional setting which has an impact on individual choices.

7.2 Pedagogic strategies

Restricted Pedagogic Strategy

I first introduce two lessons in SMP Sari and present the two distinctive modes of pedagogic strategy. The first lesson is a Mathematics lesson for the seventh grade taught by Mrs. Hani and Mrs. Fima (Fieldnotes, January 15, 2010). The lesson was team teaching by Mrs. Hani and Mrs. Fima. Mrs. Hani, a teacher in her forties, was standing in front of the classroom. Mrs. Fima, a younger teacher in her thirties, took a seat at the back of the classroom near where I was sitting. Mrs. Hani explained briefly what was covered in the previous lesson and then explained what they would do in that day’s lesson. Then, she told the students to open the textbook to page 32 and wrote the following on the whiteboard:

\[
\text{Himpunan kosong} \rightarrow \{ \} \text{ dan } 0
\]

35 Newly inaugurated the certification program required teachers to teach 24 hours per week. Since some subjects had a surplus of teachers, some of the classes were taught using team teaching. The issue of team teaching will be discussed in section 7.5.
By this point, I could hear some of the students were chatting. Mrs. Hani asked the class, “What are the examples?” and went on to explain the difference between \( \{ / \} \) and \( \{ 0 \} \). The tone of her voice was soft and her talk was directed toward those sitting in front. Meanwhile, those students sitting toward the back continued to chat. She continued to explain for another ten minutes and then told the students to do the exercises. Mrs. Hani then sat down and filled in an attendance book.

While the students were working on the exercises, Mrs. Hani walked around between the desks. Some students seemed to be struggling. But there was no interaction between students and teachers. After seven minutes had passed, the teacher said, “Do it in 10 minutes.” and to this, the students expressed their discontent. As time passed, the noise level of the class rose.

In this lesson, activities were clearly divided into two parts. The first part was where the teachers didactically transferred the curriculum content directed to the whole class. The second part consisted of students working on the exercises. This suggests that the roles of teacher and student were clearly divided, with the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge/skills and students as receivers of knowledge. Teachers did not intervene in the process of the problem-solving or give warning to the chattering of students. No interaction meant that there was no space to mediate the knowledge acquisition by students. In other words, the responsibility for acquisition lay entirely on student. I categorize this practice as the restricted pedagogic strategy (RPS). In RPS mode there is no establishment of a ZPD, rather, the development is presumed to be identical to the unmediated pedagogic text. As will be described in this chapter, the RPS practice was a common teaching practice in SMP Sari.

Elaborated Pedagogic Strategy

In the seventh-grade Biology lesson, Mrs. Ema employed much more interactive methods and displayed a different pedagogic strategy compared to the first teacher (Fieldnotes, January 14, 2010).

In starting the lesson, Mrs. Ema said, “All right, let’s go on to the material.” She said that she would give a point to those who spoke up in class, presumably in an effort to get students to participate in the lesson.
Mrs. Ema wrote on the whiteboard, “Chapter 4, Ecosystem.” She then asked the students, “What is an ecosystem?” A girl provided an answer and Mrs. Ema noted a point on the attendance list. A boy and another girl also answered and she marked their points as well. But it seemed that their answers were not sufficient. Mrs. Ema asked the students, “Are you confused?” The students replied, “Yes, yes.” She wrote “eco” and “system” and explained eco means environment and environment has two types: biotic and abiotic. When she asked for examples of biotic and abiotic, some of the students called out some examples. Then Mrs. Ema said, “You are in a class. What is the environment here?” The students called out a list: “desks, chair, tree…” (The lesson continued…)

In this lesson, teaching was no longer one-way, presuming a direct transfer of the text. Mrs. Ema used an interactive method and made attempts to facilitate students’ knowledge acquisition. While the majority of teachers provided the definition straight from the textbook, Mrs. Ema elaborated on the scientific terms and linked them to the actual classroom environment. In this way, the topic was presented not as abstract knowledge but was mediated and contextualized through teacher-student exchanges. In this mode, a ZPD was established and the teacher operated in this zone. This practice is categorized as an elaborated pedagogic strategy (EPS). The roles of teachers and students were not clearly divided as in RPS since teachers shared responsibility for the acquisition by students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Restricted (RPS)</th>
<th>Elaborated (EPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning responsibility</td>
<td>Divided</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between teachers and students</td>
<td>Table 7.1: Pedagogic strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>One-way</td>
<td>Interactive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Knowledge                   | Universal and    | Socially situated |.poi
|                            | authorized       | and mediated     |
| Teacher’s role              | Instructor       | Facilitator      |
| Student’s role              | Recipients       | Active participants |
| Authority                   | Teacher is in    | Possibility for negotiation |
|                            | control          | between students and teacher |

In Table 7.1 the difference between two pedagogic strategies is described. The distinction between these two pedagogic strategies is useful in understanding the commonalities and variations of practice among teachers. However, they are
merely analytical. None of the teachers employed either RPS or EPS exclusively but the teachers employed both strategies to varying degrees. These analytical concepts are useful because they allow to distinguish the practice of teachers in relation to the support provided to students.

In the next section, I will present the common features of teaching at SMP Sari. The practice of teaching at SMP Sari was predominantly in alignment with RPS. I will describe how due to the strong bureaucratic accountability, teaching was interpreted as the delivery of the curriculum and functioned to standardize teachers’ practice. In fact, there was a remarkable similarity in the style of teaching among the teachers. However, this bureaucratic responsibility held teachers accountable for what to teach but not necessarily how to teach. Thus, it was possible for the minority of teachers to go beyond the minimum requirement in teaching and to extend their support to mediate student learning. These issues of pedagogic choice will be discussed in the subsequent sections in relation to the bureaucratic institutional setting.

7.3 Features of teaching practices in SMP Sari

Presentation of materi as standardized texts

As discussed at the beginning of the chapter, the responsibility in teaching was equated with the presentation of materi. There was a consistency in the focus on curriculum delivery regardless of whether RPS or EPS was being deployed. I present two lessons to describe how teachers taught their lessons focusing on curriculum delivery.

A Civics lesson of 7E (An excerpt from the Fieldnotes, January 23, 2010):

Mr. Subakti urged students to insert a word to complete sentences such as:

Mr. Subakti: Children are not supposed to work. This is the right of…
Students: Children!

A few rounds of similar exchanges took place. The tone of students...
sounded enthusiastic. But when Mr. Subakti asked, “Do you have any question?” Nobody responded. The teacher urged them again, “Please ask a question. You need to ask a question if you are mature.” However, there was no response. Mr. Subakti then continued, “Are you clear? Really? Clear?” The students responded “yes.”

Generally, teachers presented the content of the textbook directly as it was using a didactic style: lecturing, recitation, and prompting to finish a sentence with a correct word as Mr. Subakti did.

Another popular activity was reviewing assignments given as homework or from previous lessons. An Indonesian lesson by Mr. Endarto in 7A (An excerpt from the Fieldnotes, January 25, 2010) represented this:

*The lesson started by going over the worksheet from the previous lesson that the students had worked on in pairs. Each pair of students received an answer sheet to correct their classmate’s answers. The worksheet contained a list of vocabularies with grammatical mistakes commonly made and the students were supposed to correct them.*

*Mr. Endarto went over the questions on the worksheet and gave out correct answers while writing down the grammatical rules and correct spellings of vocabulary on the whiteboard.*

In this lesson, the students were evaluated on their application of the grammatical rules that Mr. Endarto presented. Students were expected to learn by correcting the mistakes on their classmates’ answer sheets.

In both of Mr. Subakti and Mr. Endarto’s lessons, the exchanges in the classroom were regulated by the Initiation-Response-Evaluation (IRE) structure (Mehan, 1979). The teacher controlled the pace and sequence of learning, and students were allowed to take part only when invited by the teachers to answer a question. This type of support enabled the teachers to focus on the knowledge that was directly relevant to the preparation of the UN. The aim of lessons was for teachers to present the curriculum to the classroom as a whole and for students to reproduce it. Consequently, the sequences of lessons were routinized to the IRE structure. The students were so used to this routine interaction that even when Mr. Subakti went outside the IRE structure and offered support, students remained
silent and did not seem to benefit from this opportunity.

The type of teacher intervention

Another shared feature of teaching practice among teachers in SMP Sari was that the support provided to students was kept impersonal and minimized. In the following description of an English lesson in 7B (Fieldnotes, January 11, 2010), the role of a teacher was limited to that of instructor and evaluator.

Mrs. Ismi asked the students to make a sentence asking for service. She instructed students to first think of a sentence in Indonesian. While the students were working, she said the following:

"Please discuss with your friends how to say in English."
"Write down your sentence in your notebook."
"Finish in five minutes."

She was waiting at her desk for the students to finish writing. Then she picked random names from the attendance list and told the students to write down their sentences on the board.

(A boy wrote on the board) "Please, accompany me to the market!"
(Another boy wrote on the board) "Get me a glasses, please!"
Mrs. Ismi corrected "a glasses" to "a pair of glasses."

(A girl wrote) "Take the book on the table, please!"

(A boy wrote) "Accompany me" then Mrs. Ismi said, "We already used that one, please pick another word. Go back and think, and you will come back to write down."

A girl wrote, "Open the window, please."

Mrs. Ismi said, "if it's already there (looking toward the board), don't repeat it!" (about using the same verb).

In RPS, there was no construction of the ZPD; thus, students were expected to work on their own without teacher support. Thus, prior to working on the assignment, the only instruction given to students was “to make a sentence asking for service.” They looked up vocabulary in the dictionary and constructed a sentence on their own. The lesson was divided into the following three steps.

The first step: teachers provide instructions and assignments (input);
The second step: students work on assignments (process);
The third step: teachers evaluate student work (output).
It was common that once given an assignment, students were left to work on their own for a considerable amount of time (in the range of ten minutes to forty minutes). While students were working on assignments, most teachers sat down at their desks and waited until the students finished. Only a few teachers went around the classroom to check the progress of students. This signifies how the responsibility for acquisition rested entirely with the students. In fact, Mrs. Ismi told me that being able to work independently was important since students could consult with others in lessons, but they could not do that in examinations.

There was a minority of cases where teachers employed EPS and shared responsibility for acquisition with students. In such cases, while the teaching style was similarly teacher-centered, there was some mediation in the knowledge-acquisition. In the Biology lesson previously described (pp. 157-158), Mrs. Ema encouraged students to provide specific examples from the classroom environment based on students’ personal understanding of “ecosystem” and to link textbook knowledge to everyday knowledge. In this way, a ZPD or social space was established which enabled the teacher to accommodate the students’ level of understanding. As will be unfolded in this chapter, the majority of teachers’ practice in SMP Sari did not constitute the construction of a ZPD. This will be examined in relation to how teachers were not held accountable to support the process of student learning under the institutional setting of SMP Sari.

**Pedagogical concerns in RPS**

As described so far, the teachers employing RPS align their practice to meet externally defined standards. Since a social space to mediate learning was absent in RPS, the roles of teachers and students were divided. The role of teachers was understood as a direct transfer of texts as prescribed in the curriculum and the role of students as to reproduce the authorized knowledge. As a result, the focus of teachers is regulating students through instruction and evaluation. There was no mediation in the process of acquisition. This results in teachers to be concerned about “what should be happening” rather than what was happening. The following description of a Dance lesson represents this concern for meeting the standards.
In 8F, the lesson was for each group to perform a dance formation while classmates conduct peer evaluation.

The first group was reluctant to get started. Mrs. Nina told them to hurry up and start but the students did not move. The teacher explained to me, “They are not ready.” As we were waiting, she said to me, “8D is good and they can do it.” Mrs. Nina explained to me that she provided a booklet of formations to students and had asked them to practice in groups in their own time.

When the teacher started the music, the group was perplexed and did not start dancing. After a while, the group gradually started to dance with awkward movements, trying to dance as best as they could remember (Fieldnotes, January 27, 2010).

In this lesson, it was obvious that there was a lack of practice. However, without the construction of a ZPD, there was no space to intervene in the process of mastering the dance moves. The teacher merely instructed students to “hurry up.” Later in the lesson, the music suddenly stopped due to a blackout. Even then, the teacher called out firmly, “Whatever happens, you must finish.” In this way, contextual information such as the level of student performance or mechanical difficulties were factored out and not treated as pedagogical issues. When the focus of the teacher was on what should be happening, filling the gap between actual performance and expected performance was not an issue. The comment by the teacher that another class (8D) could perform well implies that she has done her part and the performance of 8F was up to taking responsibility themselves.

This division of responsibility is represented in how teachers concluded her lesson.

At the end of the lesson, the teacher simply said: “There is nobody who got 75, so we must do it again.” “You must be more prepared next time.”

Then the teacher asked the students, “What do you think you lack?” To this, the students replied, “unprepared” and “lacked in concentration.” Mrs. Nina commented, “Be serious.” She continued, “I want to add one more thing you lack. You should not laugh when you made a mistake” (Fieldnotes, January 27, 2010).

The teacher asked students to reflect on their performance and to find out what they lacked. The discourse was evaluative and the feedback provided by Mrs.
Nina involved reprimanding and reminding the students what they should have done. It is clear from these conversations that the responsibility of teachers was to hold students accountable for their performance but not for sharing the responsibility to support mastering of moves. Her conclusion was that the students had to perform again because they did not reach the passing mark. Without the construction of a ZPD, filling the gap between the current and the expected performance was not the responsibility of the teacher and was not problematized as a pedagogic issue.

**Class management**

When the accountability to teach was on what to teach (the delivery of the curriculum), and teacher intervention was minimal, how did teachers manage their classrooms? The teachers generally took a *laissez-faire* and *en masse* approach. Here is an example of the Economics lesson (8D) by Mrs. Usmiwatun (Fieldnotes, February 20, 2010).

> As going over the homework, Mrs. Usmiwatun called on students by their attendance numbers. When a student was unable to answer, she urged the appointed student to answer several times. When he was still unable to answer, she appointed another student. The girl who was appointed had not been paying attention and she failed to answer, Mrs. Usmiwatun told her to get serious. This quieted down the whole class. At one point, Mrs. Usmiwatun lightly slapped the hand of a boy who was not paying attention. In response, the boy just laughed.

In this extract, when a student failed to answer, the teacher simply moved on to the next student. From this, it is clear that the focus of the lesson was on presenting correct answers (*transmission*) to the class (*en masse*) and not supporting individual students.

As evident from the fact that teachers used attendance numbers rather than names to appoint students, the teachers had little personal knowledge of individual students. The majority of teachers in SMP Sari admitted that they remembered the names of only some students. In fact, there was little personalized interaction with students. Thus, the disciplinary issue was tolerated as long as it was not obstructive to the whole class and only dealt with when it was
disruptive to the whole class. As the case of Mrs. Usmiwatun, often this involves a verbal warning to “get serious” or a physical admonishment by light slapping.

This illustrates that the teachers did not bear responsibility for individual students’ performance or disciplinary issues. However, this made class management very difficult for some of the teachers. This was the case with the biology lesson by Mrs. Wahyuni, as in the following excerpt.

*Toward the end of the biology class, the students were getting uncontrollably noisy. Although Mrs. Wahyuni told students to be quiet and even banging the whiteboard, students ignored her. The teacher became angry and lectured students, “You cannot be behaving this way.” She told them how it was shameful to be behaving this way, it will be known by the principal, and it will give this school a bad reputation, the students finally became quiet.*

*As Mrs. Wahyuni and I were walking back to the staff room, she said “I am embarrassed” referring to what just happened (Fieldnotes, January 15, 2010).*

By the time Mrs. Wahyuni tried to maintain classroom order, it had already become out of her control. While it was a taboo for the teachers to get emotional, she was apparently angry. In urging the students to behave well, she had to bring in external authorities—the principal and the reputation of the school. This reliance on the external authorities shows that issues in class management were treated as a challenge to authority. Thus, the issue was not treated as a pedagogic problem that could be mediated by the teacher. Rather, it was the students who failed to fulfill their responsibility because they were not obedient or respectful to their teacher.

In fact, some of the teachers attributed the disciplinary problems of students to their home environments and situated them outside the boundary of their professional responsibility. This is apparent in how Mrs. Ismi (English teacher) described problematic students in the following extract.

*Five students in 9E are naughty. They even smoke and drink sometimes. They cannot listen well because, in their neighborhood, there are gangs. There are two students in this class (9A) who have a problem. If there are only 2 students, I can handle. But if there are five, I cannot handle. It is a problem in their home environment so the*
guidance teacher can work with them. It is not the English teacher’s job since we do not have enough time. It is probably caused by the poor education of the parents, so they cannot handle their children. At the age of 15-18, the students should be handled carefully and they need to choose friends. With whom they hang out is important. I often tell my children to be careful whom they hang out with (Fieldnotes, December 28, 2009).

The comment that Mrs. Ismi made, that she could handle two problematic students but not five implies that deviant behavior was problematized as an obstruction to class instruction en masse. Although the teachers owed responsibility for the delivery of the curriculum en masse, dealing with disciplinary issues was not their responsibility. Her statement “It is not the English teacher’s job since we do not have enough time” suggests teachers are not responsible for providing personal care. Generally, the issues that required individual treatment were regarded as the responsibility of counseling teachers and/or parents that needed to be taken care of outside the classroom.

**Teaching to the test**

Since passing the UN was a prerequisite for graduation, it was the biggest concern for teachers and students in SMP Sari just like the rest of Indonesia. The teachers teaching ninth grade inevitably shouldered greater responsibility. Mr. Umar described teaching ninth grade as follows:

> The preparation (for the exam) for the ninth grade is different since there is very little materi to teach. The eighth grade has the most materi. In the ninth grade, lots of it is to solve exercises (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010).

While teaching ninth grade was not different from teaching seventh and eighth grades in terms of the way teachers interacted with students, there was less curriculum delivery. Instead, the majority of lesson activities consisted of test drilling and evaluation. Here is a description of lessons for the ninth grade given by Mrs. Ismi (Fieldnotes, December 28, 2009).

> Mrs. Ismi gave students thirty minutes to work on the worksheet (although she said she would give forty minutes, she did not have enough time since she arrived late to the class). When the time was up, she asked them to exchange their worksheets with their neighbors, and they started to check each other’s answers. Mrs. Ismi asked the students, “What is the type of this text? What is the purpose of this text?”
Only a few students responded. After announcing the correct answer, “It’s alpha, a” she asked the students, “who got the correct answer? Raise your hands.” When the only handful of students raised their hands, she said to the students “only half of you got the correct answer. Only half of you understand. What is the matter?” […] she said, “you must think hard. If you cannot do this, what will happen to you in the UN?” She then continued to lecture how the students should be serious and about the importance of the UN for them for about two minutes.

The sequence of the lesson above was typical for the UN subject lessons for ninth grade. Rather than presenting materi, the role of teachers was to present the standards of assessment in the form of evaluation. The declaration of pass/fail by Mrs. Ismi suggests that the responsibility for the acquisition was not shared with the teacher. Rather, her responsibility was to hold students accountable for their performance. When only half of the class got the correct answer, Mrs. Ismi commented, “What is the matter?” Since SMP Sari was one of the top schools in the region, it was believed that passing students in the UN was comparatively easy. Thus, by exposing students to failing experiences, as the case of Mrs. Ismi’s lesson, students were reminded it was their responsibility to pass the UN.

Variations in the lesson format

While most lessons were taught in a didactic style, there were some exceptions. Especially for those subjects outside the four subjects of the UN, there were attempts to include student activities. Nevertheless, despite the difference in the format of the lesson, there was continuity in the nature of student-teacher interaction; thus, the practice was still categorized as RPS.

In the 9E Economics lesson by Mr. Wibobo and Mrs. Usmiwatun, each group of students presented the topic of “Money and Financial Institutions” in groups (Fieldnotes, March 10, 2010).

The lesson took place in the media room. The students were given the topic “Money and Financial Institutions.” According to the teachers, students were given two weeks to prepare a PowerPoint presentation outside the class. A group of four girls first presented about “Bank Century corruption scandal” which was a hot topic at the time. The girls read the text projected on the screen while operating PowerPoint.

Some of the audience, mainly the boys, were talking in an undertone
while the presentation proceeded. The presenting group was speaking in a soft voice despite Mr. Wibobo urged them to speak up several times. I asked Mrs. Usmiwatun if there was any time limit and she said there was none since each group varied in the amount of material they prepared.

After the group presentation finished, the audience asked some questions to presenters and marked scores on the evaluation sheet. A girl sitting by the computer typed the question, the score, and answers to the questions onto a new slide in PowerPoint. Mrs. Usmiwatun asked for the attendance number of students who had asked the questions. The class finished with the bell. The teachers announced following seven groups were to present two weeks later after the exam.

While the lesson style was different from the didactic approach, there was a consistency in social interactions between teachers and students. While the students had the freedom to choose what and how to present the given topic, the emphasis of the presentation was placed on the requirement—the format of presentation and the use of PowerPoint. Just as how teachers were concerned with the delivery of the curriculum taken from the textbooks, the students reproduced the facts taken from media sources and presented them. There was no evidence of personal elaboration of these facts in their presentation. Similarly, in the question and answer session, the questions asked were mere confirmations of facts. Nor was there any feedback or elaboration by the teachers on the content of the student presentation. The only instruction provided by Mr. Wibobo was to speak up. The audience was given points for asking questions and the presenters were given points for answering regardless of whether or not they answered appropriately. Thus, the emphasis was on the format of the activity rather than its content. Therefore, it was treated as a separate activity from covering matter. This is probably why these “creative” methods were more common in non-UN subjects such as Social Science and non-academic subjects.

In some lessons, some of the teachers attempted to go beyond the IRE structure and to solicit the active participation of students. However, even when teachers asked an open question to students, they were unable to benefit from it. Here is an example of this in the Art lesson:

Mr. Angga picked up a painting of a student and asked the class, “What do you think of this painting?” A student said it is a house. Then the
teacher asked “Compared to this painting (another student’s work of what looks like a pot), how is it? Who can tell me the interpretation of these paintings?” Nobody responded. He then asked the student who painted the work and asked, “What do you think?” Then the student said it was not a house but a painting of a market but she had not finished yet (The lesson continued and Mr. Angga continued to ask about the next painting, Fieldnotes, January 22, 2010).

Similar to the case of Mr. Subakti (pp. 159-160) who urged to ask a question in the Civics lesson, there was no response from students when Mr. Angga asked to provide interpretation on their classmates’ artworks. His intention was to encourage students to openly exchange ideas on the paintings, the discussion centered on the “correct” interpretation of paintings. Since the students were regularly evaluated within the IRE structure, there was little incentive for students to provide a personal interpretation of paintings. In this way, despite the change in the lesson structures, social interactions between teachers and students remained the same.

The pedagogic scope and challenges in RPS

Since teaching consisted of reproducing what was prescribed in the curriculum, the majority of teachers did not feel any challenge in daily teaching. Mrs. Risma said, there was no difficulty in teaching as long as she was teaching the subject she majored in university (Interview, June 9, 2010). However, there were some teachers who recounted challenges in their classrooms. Mrs. Citra confided issues in her classrooms as the following.

… some children have difficulty working on worksheets. Sometimes, lazy children…they cheat (copy an answer) …” (Interview, June 21, 2010).

Here, while the behavior of some students was problematized, these issues were attributed to “laziness” as their lack of effort. This means, even when the teachers encountered challenges in classrooms, they were discussed as something outside the pedagogic scope. Thus, the difficulty in learning was not linked to how to teach. An English teacher, Mrs. Citra, recounted how it was difficult for students to memorize vocabularies.

I asked each student to make a list of 10 vocabulary words and write
In the above quote, students’ inability to memorize vocabulary was problematized but again not linked to how they learn. Mrs. Citra concluded, “they should remember.” While Mrs. Citra used less authoritative and flexible approach compared to her colleagues, her practice did not involve working with students nor filling the gap between their current level and the expected level of achievement. This is because, in the RPS practice, there was no ZPD in which to mediate the acquisition by students. Thus, these challenges did not motivate teachers to support students to resolve the issues they were facing.

The lack of social space to mediate student learning, how students learn was a black box.

They bring a dictionary but they do not want to open the dictionary […] I was also surprised how come…often I tell like this, “When you do not know (a word), open a dictionary, don’t leave it, open a dictionary.” They still do not want to (Interview, Mrs. Citra, June 21, 2010).

The teacher was truly puzzled as to why the students would not use a dictionary despite her recommendation, and she asked me why. I suggested it might be that the students did not know how to select from the range of words suggested in the dictionary. Her response was that they have been using a dictionary since they were in elementary school and should know how to use it. Again, the discourse focused on what students should do or supposed to able to do, rather than how to support their learning. Although Mrs. Citra was attentive to students’ responses, the pedagogic strategy did not motivate her to support finding an appropriate word in a dictionary. In the next section, I will present the practice of teachers who employed EPS and worked to fill this gap of understanding.

7.4 “Good” teachers and their pedagogies

So far, the dominant teaching practice of teachers in SMP Sari has presented. Generally, the teachers’ responsibilities were equated with the transmission of
materi and presenting the standards for the UN. While the teachers employed RPS and did not mediate in the process of students’ learning acquisition, there were a few teachers who engaged in a different mode of practice. In this section, I will focus on two teachers who were regarded as “good teachers” by their colleagues. One survey question asked for an example of good teachers in the school. A Mathematics teacher, Mr. Edi, and a Science teacher, Mr. Halim were named as a “good teachers” and described as presented in Table 7.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of “good teacher”</th>
<th>Respondents’ comments in the survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edi</td>
<td>He makes students who are not good become good or able to master lesson material, patient, and disciplined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He gives a chance for smart students and he cares for those who lack or are weak and work with them patiently</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He transfers his knowledge in detail and in the way that is easy to be understood by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discipline and smart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You can see from the daily teaching-learning process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halim</td>
<td>Disiplined, charismatic, outgoing, creative, and friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As will be explored in this section, these two teachers discussed their teaching as a set of strategies to work with students. This shows the construction of ZPDs and was clearly distinguished from the dominant practice of teachers in SMP Sari. While the structure and style of lessons were similar to the practice of RPS, these two teachers were able to mediate student learning and to fill the gap in the acquisition.

**Mr. Edi**

Mr. Edi is a Mathematics teacher in his fifties who received the most nominations as a good teacher by his colleagues. In the teacher survey (as shown in Table 7.2), he was recognized for supporting students regardless of their abilities. The activities in his lessons followed the common routines in the ninth grade. He gave out exercises for students to work on and appointed students to solve them in
front of the class. However, when a student failed to answer, Mr. Edi did not move on to the next student. Instead, he encouraged the students to solve the problem and provided support. Mr. Edi told me in the interview that he often told his students, “Don’t say I cannot, but say I cannot yet” (Interview, June 2, 2010).

Mr. Edi said that he made a lower ability student solve a problem in front of the class in order to push them to think and to work hard. He called it a “semi-private” lesson. This way, he said, the students could not cheat and copy from other students (Interview, May 24, 2010). However, it was not clear how successful the scaffolding was since the teacher mostly did the work for students. Nevertheless, Mr. Edi provided step-by-step and personal support in problem-solving.

Mr. Edi told me it was his experience as an after-school private tutor for twenty-one years where he gained the expertise in working closely with students36. Some of the “good teachers” in SMP Sari, including Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim, were hired by parents as private tutors for the UN preparation outside of school hours. At the time of the interview, Mr. Edi said that he tutored twenty-two students (Fieldnotes, March 10, 2010). Mr. Edi said he taught school lessons similarly to how he taught tutoring lessons. He said those students who were taught by other teachers came and asked for help because the way he explained was easy to understand. He described his “secrets in teaching” as: his ability to predict the topics of UN questions; ability to convey material based on an individual student’s situation; and technique in providing support for those students with lower abilities (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010). He classified the students into three ability levels and provided adequate support according to their levels. In this way, Mr. Edi’s teaching clearly opened ZPDs to provide scaffolding in order to fill the ability gaps among students.

36 Just as with supplementary lessons outside school hours, a private tutor was paid by parents. In the case of Mr. Edi, he was paid between IDR 30,000 and 50,000 (the amounts are about £2-3) for 1.5 hours of lessons. Since the teachers earned around IDR 2 million to 3 million a month, this could add up to 10-20 percent of Mr. Edi’s salary.
There was also a difference in how Mr. Edi managed the classroom from the common practice of RPS. He told me creating a good classroom atmosphere was important for students to learn well. According to Mr. Edi, his students were used to a tense atmosphere and were surprised by his effort to make a fun and relaxing classroom (Interview, June 2, 2010). He was the only teacher who mentioned the importance of being liked by students (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010). In fact, the ninth graders voted him as their “favorite teacher” which he proudly recounted to me, “the students said that ‘Mr. Edi never gets upset, is funny, and his class is interesting.’” He compared himself to a celebrity, in that if students like a teacher, they also like the subject that the teacher teaches (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010).

For Mr. Edi, accommodating the needs and interests of students clearly constituted his responsibility as a teacher. This required applying personal and contextual knowledge. Thus, he was motivated to reflect on and improve his practice. He analyzed the exam questions and made his own worksheets, supported the students, and was able to provide helpful feedback. In fact, Mr. Edi was quite successful in that three students obtained a perfect score in the actual UN (Fieldnotes, May 7, 2010).

**Mr. Halim**

Mr. Halim, a Physics teacher in his early forties, was another teacher who was recognized for his ability to support students. In a lesson that I observed (Fieldnotes, February 10, 2010), Mr. Halim used a computer and projected exercises on a whiteboard as a screen. While the sequence of the lesson was similar to those of other ninth-grade teachers, he used the media effectively to accommodate students’ level and needs. For example, when lots of students failed to answer a problem, he projected a similar exercise for them to solve. In the interview, Mr. Halim told me that the use of media helped students to focus on the relevant topics rather than covering broad topics and making them lose concentration.
In his class management, Mr. Halim generally took an *en masse* approach, but he mixed it with an individualized approach as needed. In going over exercises, Mr. Halim was attentive to students' behavior and paid attention even to those sitting at the back of the room. When the concentration of students was declining, he threw in interesting personal stories. When he noticed that there was a girl who had not been paying attention, he directed a question to her. He effectively presented his authority not by punishing students but by regulating their participation. This is in contrast to the practice of Mrs. Usmiwatun who responded by slapping the hand of an inattentive student (p. 164). Mr. Halim told me that he usually takes pedagogic measures to ask a noisy student to work on a problem in front of the classroom where he could supervise them closely. As with Mr. Edi, Mr. Halim deployed strategies to work with students (which constituted EPS) and was concerned with *how to* work with students.

Just as Mr. Edi cited his out-of-school experience of tutoring as where he developed his strategies to work with students, Mr. Halim said that he gained his ability to manage student activities through the boy scouts’ activities. Mr. Halim told me that other teachers were often surprised with his skills at managing the student government to organize events by themselves (Fieldnotes 15 March 2010). The majority of teachers interacted with students only inside classrooms, Mr. Halim spent time with students outside the classroom as the secretary of student affairs. He supervised students in the morning assembly and acted as an advisor for student government activities. The way Mr. Halim worked with students reflected his view to educate students holistically. He said that education was not just for enhancing the academic ability of students but also for developing their characters, social skills, and moral values. For example, he told me that dressing correctly was important, and also told me that he had asked students to pick up trash in the classroom before the exam (Fieldnotes, February 25, 2010). He told me that his colleagues often judged students by their IQ but he tried to enhance the strength of students including social and artistic skills (Interview, 8 June 2010).
Mr. Halim’s approach in teaching resembled Mr. Edi’s in some ways but there were some differences. Mr. Halim analyzed his students in the following way.

_The students of 7B, they are smart but they lack communication skills. When I showed them how to solve problems, they could work, and they could finish. However, when I asked them to come to the front (to solve a problem), nobody volunteered. So, this is actually typical for students based on my observation, so…even though they are smart, they are not brave enough to come to the front. Now, what strategy should a teacher take in order for a student to be brave? But the students of 8D are different from 7D. 7D, communication is good. When I asked them to work, they could work well but after the quiz (laugh). The result was not the best. So the differences between classes like this, we need to consider. “The class is like this, what do I do? Now the average ability class, what do I do?” Like that (Interview, Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010)._

Mr. Halim differentiated the ability of his students just as Mr. Edi did. However, this differentiation was made for classes rather than among individual students. This suggests that Mr. Halim’s strategies were targeted to the class as a whole. Also, another difference was he was concerned not just the academic ability but also the social skills of students such as to communication skills. This suggests that he practiced EPS where he opened a ZPD with consideration to the contextual factors such as students’ characters and abilities to fill the gap between their current performance and standards required by tests. In fact, he said that since those who entered SMP Sari were above average students (because the school only takes in those students who scored highly in the elementary school graduation exams, the ability of students was not a problem but teachers lacked the strategies to work with them. He said “Although students had potential, we (teachers) did not give them a chance or guide them” (Interview, 8 June 2010).

The practice of “good teachers”—Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim—presented the construction of ZPDs, how they developed strategies on how to teach, and how they shared responsibility with students for the acquisition of materi. However, their colleagues did not share this responsibility to mediate learning. They considered supporting students was outside the pedagogic scope and “good teachers” to be exceptional. This is relevant to how both Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim recounted that they gained the skills to work with students out-of-school experience. Mr. Edi accumulated experience of working with students in private
tutoring, while Mr. Halim gained experience from supervising students in non-academic activities. In the setting of SMP Sari, the ability to work with students did not constitute teacher obligation. The difference in expertise of these two teachers will be further discussed in 7.6 using the scheme of Authority Strategies.

7.5 Pedagogic strategies and the pedagogic discourse

Bernstein (1990, 1996) defines pedagogic discourse as “an ensemble of rules or procedures for the production and circulation of knowledge within pedagogic interactions” (Singh, 1997, p. 6). The significance of Bernstein’s theory is that it enables us to examine teachers’ practice as the representation of social practice within a particular institutional context. Pedagogic discourse comprises two discourses: the instructional discourse (ID) and the regulative discourse (RD) (Bernstein, 1990; 2000). ID concerns the content of teaching while RD concerns the social order of classrooms. Since ID is embedded in RD, RD “translates the dominant values of society and regulates the form of how knowledge is transmitted” (Morais, 2002, p. 560). I have used the expressions “restricted pedagogic strategies” (RPS) and “elaborated pedagogic strategies” (EPS) to refer to pedagogy that opens up a zone of proximal development (ZPD after Vygotsky, 1978)—EPS—or that fails to do this—RPS. These terms are clearly inspired by Bernstein’s (1971) work on speech codes as well as Vygotsky, but they are very different: elaborated (speech) code constitutes an orientation to universal meanings and so tends to produce explicit language use, whereas restricted (speech) code constitutes an orientation to local meanings that tend to be represented more tacitly. These codes are distributed on the basis of social class. EPS involves an attempt at explicitness within the zpd, whereas RPS is silent on the connection to curricular knowledge, but neither are related, in my analysis, to social class and these are not, unlike speech code, psychological constructs.

In SMP Sari, there was continuity in ID between RPS and EPS. In both RPS and EPS, the teachers were concerned with the transmission of the curriculum content and the preparation for the UN. This suggests strong institutional regulation in
terms of the curriculum and examination standards. However, there were variations between RPS and EPS in terms of how the teachers maintained the order of their classroom (RD). While the majority of teachers intervened minimally to maintain classroom order, there were also teachers who took pedagogic measures to discipline students. This indicates that while bureaucratic rules regulated the practice of teachers in terms of the content of teaching (ID), there was flexibility in how the teachers managed their classrooms (RD). In fact, the reputation of teachers was often based on their ability to manage the classroom. For example, Mrs. Wahyun was considered incompetent (p. 165) since other teachers could hear the excessive noise from her classrooms.

In Table 7.3, pedagogic strategies of teachers (RPS/EPS) are presented in relation to the pedagogic discourse (ID/RD).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RPS (One-way support)</th>
<th>EPS (Scaffolding or considerations for ZPDs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Transmission of the bureaucratically set content</td>
<td>Transmission of the bureaucratically set content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>En masse and laissez-faire</td>
<td>Individualized support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In RPS, teachers transferred the curriculum relying on a hierarchical structure of the classroom. The teachers acted like the ones in authority and the role of students was to follow teacher instructions. Since the content was transferred as it was in the textbooks, this required little skills for teachers to elaborate the curriculum or to engage in personalized interactions with students. Since the role of students was interpreted as obeying the teacher’s instruction, disciplinary issues were understood as a challenge to the teacher’s authority rather than a pedagogic issue. This is why the teachers adopted an en masse and laissez-faire approach and did not intervene in disciplinary problems unless they were disruptive to the whole class. Because students were expected to be passive recipients of knowledge, students did not take up the opportunity to go beyond their prescribed roles. Even when they were given a chance to take part in an
open exchange, they were not able to benefit from it. In the Art lesson (pp. 168-169) or Civics lesson (pp. 159-160) described earlier, students were not motivated to express their ideas or opinions. This is because they are used to responding to a question asked by a teacher and not used to interaction outside of the IRE structure. Thus, in RPS, the participation of students was limited and there was little intervention by teachers especially in terms of RD.

On the other hand, those teachers who employed EPS were recognized as “good teachers” by their colleagues due to their ability to mediate student learning. The comments below suggest that both feel responsible to support student learning.

*Mr. Edi told me that he told his students “Don’t say I cannot, but say I cannot yet” (Interview, June 2, 2010).*

*Mr. Halim said, “Although students had potential, we (teachers) do not give them a chance or guide them” (Interview, 8 June 2010).*

This means, not only did the teachers take into consideration the current level of students in lesson design but also envisioned their future development as the target of scaffolding. This enabled these teachers to open a ZPD and to develop strategies to fill the gap between the current level and expected level of performance. They adjusted the pace and level of teaching in order to provide individualized support within ZPDs. Consequently, they regulated RD in relation to ID in order to extend support to students.

The pedagogic discourse explains how social interactions of teachers and students are a representation of the institutional setting. The variation in RPS and EPS suggests that the opening of a ZPD was not motivated by the bureaucratic institutional setting. The opening up of a ZPD also relevant to the purpose of teacher evaluation. In RPS, the evaluation was provided to hold students accountable for their own performance but in EPS the evaluation was provided in order to give feedback and afford an opportunity to seek support.

Even within the practice of EPS, there were variations in terms of the support provided in relation to RD. While the interventions of Mr. Edi concerned focusing
purely on the acquisition of the curriculum content, the practice of Mr. Halim showed the opening of ZPDs in both ID and RD. For example, Mr. Halim directed a question to a student who was not paying attention to the lesson. The significance is not this difference but what this variation implies. This variation suggests that the EPS practice was motivated personally rather than institutionally. Mr. Edi provided support to improve academic performance while Mr. Halim was also concerned with developing students’ characters.

7.6 Teacher Expertise and Authority Strategies

The discussion in this chapter has presented how teaching responsibilities in SMP Sari were bureaucratized; thus, teachers were motivated to align practice with prescribed contents and standards. The classroom interactions were regulated by the IRE structure and implemented as “bureaucratic protocols” which require little mediation in student learning. Since teachers were not accountable for how students learned, the teacher intervention was kept to a minimum and depersonalized instruction was preferred. The dominant RPS practice did not open a ZPD to mediate student learning as this was not a pedagogic concern for the majority of teachers. This was why Mr. Edi faced a dilemma when other teachers did not share his interest to develop strategies to work with students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practice</th>
<th>Practitioner</th>
<th>Open</th>
<th>Closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 7.1: Authority Strategies (Adapted from “Modes of Authority Strategy” Dowling, 2009, p.53)*

In this section, a conceptual framework is introduced to examine how teachers’ understanding of “professional responsibilities” is relevant to ongoing efforts to maintain or strengthen their authority in a particular contextual setting. Dowling’s Authority Strategies (2010; Figure 7.1) recontextualized the concepts of the ideal typology of leadership by Weber (1964) and provide a useful analytical framework
to understand how teachers legitimatized their expertise (authority claim) in relation to the institutional culture. Dowling explains:

_The value […] lies in its facility to describe sociocultural contexts in a consistent manner precisely so as to reveal continuities and discontinuities between them and, at least potentially, to indicate where attention needs to be paid to the innovation, to the context of reception or both” (Dowling, 2010, p.19)._

The schema enables us to situate teaching within a particular context and understand it as institutionalized practice—whether there is a coherence in what and how teachers teach. The first dimension of Dowling’s schema concerns what to teach—the open/closed-ness of the practice. Despite the variations in pedagogic strategies (RPS and EPS), the continuity in the responsibility to deliver the curriculum in SMP Sari suggest, there was a strong force to close down the practice as what was prescribed in textbooks and to align the criteria of the UN. This was reflected in how the teachers discussed the expertise as equated with familiarity with _materi_. Contrasting with this open practice constitutes the content of teaching as flexible and open. This was rarely observed in the practice of teachers in SMP Sari. When it did happen in a few cases—such as the student presentations in the Economics lesson (pp. 167-168) or an open discussion in the Art lesson (pp. 168-169)—the attempt to open practice failed since students adhered to providing “correct” answers based on the authorized texts: despite the teacher’s effort to open the practice, the students closed it down again.

The second dimension in the authority schema is the openness/closed-ness of the practitioner. A closed practitioner means the professional expertise is legitimatized by a claim to the embodiment of expertise in the practitioner (teacher). Crucially, this is an authority claim, a strategy, and does not refer to the actual state of embodiedness or otherwise. Alternatively, in an open practitioner mode, the practice is not legitimatized by the specificity of the practitioner, but by the nature of the practice: practitioners are interchangeable. In the case of SMP Sari, the practice of teachers was strikingly similar across subjects and among teachers as discussed earlier. This indicates that professional expertise was not
legitimatized by the unique practice of practitioners themselves. Each of these four modes of Authority Strategy will be described in the following section with specific examples.

The teachers of SMP Sari predominantly deployed the **bureaucratic mode** of Authority Strategy. This is characterized by the interchangeability of practitioners and fixed practice. As discussed in section 7.5, the practice of teachers was strongly motivated to align with bureaucratic requirements (closed practice). In this mode, teachers acted as delegates of authority and their practice was legitimatized by the fulfillment of bureaucratic regulations. A good example of this is how the teachers responded to policy changes ordinated by the Education Office. Once teachers passed the certification, they were obligated to teach 24 hours per week. As a result, to cope with a surplus of teachers in since some of the subjects, some lessons were taught as team teaching by two teachers. However, most of the time, there was no change in what or how the lesson was taught from that by a single teacher. Only in a very few lessons did two teachers take turns to teach or to support one another.

In the **traditional mode** of Authority Strategy, both the alignment of practice to closed standards and the embodiment of such skills/knowledge by the practitioner legitimatize the professional expertise of teachers. The teachers abided by the required protocols just as in the bureaucratic mode of authority. However, the teachers employing the traditional mode of authority were recognized for their embodied expertise (irrespective of whether or not they actually embodied this expertise). The curriculum head, Mr. Umar often wrote exam questions for the province-wide mathematics examination and the vice principal, Mrs. Dewi—who had won the national teacher award—was often invited to be a speaker on training courses and these citations supported their claims to embodied expertise. Again, these claim to embodiment are merely strategies and not states; thus, it merely means that knowledge and skills are claimed as unique to the practitioner. Thus, these teachers had been acknowledged as “experts” by internalizing
bureaucratic rules and policies. Thus, it makes sense that this mode was the most advantageous in terms of career advancement.

In the charismatic mode of Authority Strategy, teachers opened their practice relying on their pedagogic judgments and acted beyond the bureaucratically set standards. The “good teachers” (Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim) were also acknowledged by their peers for providing the effective support for students. This required the opening up of a ZPD to accommodate the needs and levels of students. In this way, their practice was distinguished from the one-way presentation of curriculum exhibited by the bureaucratic protocols. In EPS, teachers mediated student learning to fill the gap between the current level and the expected level of acquisition within ZPDs (EPS). This requires developing strategies which both Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim emphasized in the interviews.

So far, three modes of Authority Strategies by Dowling have been presented, which leaves the fourth one, the liberal mode of Authority Strategy. In the liberal authority mode, both the practice and practitioner are open. Under strong pressure to close down the field of practice, the opening of content and authorship—characteristics of the liberal mode—was not realistic in SMP Sari. Although I observed this practice in one Indonesian lesson, it was not intentional but caused by the teachers’ inability to deliver the curriculum. The teacher almost completely left it up to his students what to do in the lesson. After instructing students to write down the summary of interviews they had conducted, students wandered around even outside the classroom. Even when student-centered activities were carried out, they were formalistically implemented. In another word, they were treated separately from curriculum acquisition. Therefore, this type of lesson was conducted as a special activity and there was little continuity from daily lessons.

Using these four modes of Authority Strategies that I have laid out, I will depict how teachers legitimized their expertise in relation to the institutional culture and how there was little to motivate teachers to take up responsibility for student
learning. While the practice of “good teachers”—Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim—fails in the category of the charismatic mode, their embodied expertise in supporting students encouraged them to work outside the bureaucratic requirement. This has some risks. The majority of teachers considered the expertise in curriculum knowledge was sufficient to fulfill their role to deliver the curriculum from the textbooks. For the teachers who exhibited RPS, teaching was relatively easy and they taught lessons without any preparation. Mrs. Risma said in the interview that there was no difficulty in teaching and it was normal for some students to be naughty (Interview with Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). Her comments suggest that routinized teaching as the delivery of materi (RPS) did not require the embodiment of practice, thus, the teachers were not in need of developing strategies to work with students. By examining teaching expertise with reference to the modes of Authority Strategies, we are able to understand there is no best way to teach but how they teach simply reflects how their practice was legitimatized by the different modes of authority.

Career advancement (traditional versus bureaucratic)

The teachers often complained bureaucratic administration was a burden that had little relevance to the ability to work with students. However, those teachers who were successful in their careers and held management positions employed the traditional mode of Authority Strategy and aligned their practice with bureaucratically-set rules. They were familiar with the curriculum and government policies and acted as the ones in authority. The practice of both Mr. Umar (the curriculum head) and Mrs. Dewi (the vice principal) showed that there as a strong emphasis on hierarchical relationship and they exerted more authority in classrooms. They controlled the lesson pace, and student responses and behavior, to a greater extent compared to the majority of teachers who acted to delegate authority (the bureaucratic mode of authority action).

By internalizing bureaucratic authority, these teachers were able to climb the bureaucratic ladder but were evaluated negatively by their peers. They were often criticized for being authoritative by their colleagues. While the teachers did not
publicly discuss other teachers in the same school, some of the teachers made negative comments about successful teachers in general. Some of the teachers told me that award-winning teachers were not good at working with students. For example, Mrs. Nina said that one teacher in her previous school was evaluated highly by the government; but students were afraid of this teacher and whenever she entered the classroom, students froze in shock (March 15, 2010). In an interview, one teacher told me that Mr. Umar was not close to students and that students were afraid of him (Mr. Halim, Interview, June 8, 210). Thus, there were conflicting evaluations between bureaucratically set standards and internal recognition of what constituted “good teachers.” In Chapter 6, the distinction between official discourse and unofficial discourse was made and how the social norms of the community overruled the bureaucratic rules. By acting as the ones in the authority, these teachers adhered to bureaucratic rules; thus, they were alienated from the rest of the community.

Responsibility to students (bureaucratic versus charismatic)

Depending on the mode of authority claims, the meaning of teaching practice differs. When teachers employed the charismatic mode, they understood and claimed expertise in terms of the application of embodied knowledge and skills. On the other hand, teachers resorting to the bureaucratic authority strategy understand their role as a delegation of authority. These different meaning attached to the same practice will be examined in the following case. One day when Mrs. Bella complained about a lack of discipline in one of her class, Mr. Halim suggested allowing him to teach that class. It was a Biology lesson in one of the bilingual class (7A).

Mr. Halim opened the lesson by talking to the students in English and instructed them to take out their notebooks and put everything else into their bags. His English instructions seemed to surprise the students and quietened down the class. Mr. Halim projected exercises for students to work on. When Mr. Halim asked a girl to come to the front, she was reluctant. Even after Mr. Halim said, “Mr. Halim will help you, come up to the front,” the girl would not come until she confirmed her answer with her friends.

After going several rounds of solving and explaining exercises, Mr.
Halim said, “If you can solve these, you will have no problem in the UN. Who can do this?” To this, nobody responded. Mrs. Bella told the students, “You can open the textbook” but Mr. Halim immediately dismissed this and said, “you don’t have to open the textbook.”

[...]

During the lesson, Mrs. Bella was surprised by the students’ good behavior and said, “Today, many things are special” with a resigned tone. Mr. Halim asked a boy who was known as a noisy student, “Why are you different today?” The boy replied, “Because it is interesting” (Fieldnotes, May 27, 2010).

After the lesson, both Mr. Halim and Mrs. Bella agreed that the students were well-behaved. However, the reason for this was interpreted differently. The use of English, responding to noisy students, offering to support when a student failed, could all be considered as strategies for working with students. On the other hand, Mrs. Bella told Mr. Halim that the students told her that they were quiet because they were afraid and confused since there were too many formulas presented by Mr. Halim. Mr. Halim told me that he disagreed with her and said that the students were not afraid since they were willing to respond when he asked them questions (Interview, June 8, 2010). In fact, when Mr. Halim asked a boy in the lesson why he was behaving differently, the boy’s reply was “because it is interesting.”

What matters was not whose account being more accurate but how the two teachers interpreted the same events differently. Mrs. Bella considered that the presentation of authority made a difference in classroom management (bureaucratic mode) while Mr. Halim considered it was his pedagogic measures (charismatic mode) that made the difference. In fact, in the above lesson, there was a moment when a difference in opinion became apparent. When students were stuck, Mrs. Bella suggested looking in the textbook. Mr. Halim immediately dismissed this and encouraged students to think without resorting the textbook. Reference to the textbook indicates the bureaucratic mode of claim to expertise, while encouraging students to think on their own (embodied knowledge) indicates the charismatic mode. However, as in the case of the female student in the episode above, an attempt to provide support for students often failed. Since students were accustomed to the IRE structure in RPS, they interpreted the
teacher's intervention as evaluation rather than facilitation. Thus, even when support was offered, they hesitated to get help from the teacher.

What these cases suggested was that the teachers did not share the interest to support student learning under the institutional setting in SMP Sari. By pursuing their interest to support student learning, the teachers went beyond both the social norms of the teacher community and the minimum bureaucratic requirement to transfer the curriculum.

7.7 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the practice of teachers beyond individual choice and understand how teachers' responsibilities for teaching were defined and shaped by the institutional settings of SMP Sari. Firstly, the practice of teachers was described in terms of two pedagogic strategies. In EPS, there was the opening of a ZPD, and this social space enabled the teachers to share responsibility for learning with students. On the other hand, in RPS, teachers focused on the transmission of the curriculum; thus, the responsibility for learning rested with the students. Throughout the chapter, various episodes in SMP Sari were presented to illustrate how bureaucratic accountabilities regulated the teachers' practice for curriculum delivery but not necessarily for mediating student learning and presenting "good teaching" practice.

This is because the institutionally set responsibilities held teachers accountable for what to teach (ID) but not necessarily how (RD). Unless personally motivated otherwise, bureaucratic accountability regulated teacher-student interactions in the IRE structure. Teachers kept their interventions minimal and impersonal, applying en masse and laissez-faire approach. “Good teachers” were personally motivated to go beyond the bureaucratic boundaries to embody the expertise of working with students (the charismatic authority strategy). Therefore, mediating student learning was not the main concern of teachers who concentrated on responding
to bureaucratic accountability to deliver the curriculum (the bureaucratic authority strategy).

When this bureaucratic accountability to teach for the test was absent, teachers presented more flexible approaches. In some of the non-academic subjects, I observed teachers supported students step-by-step. In Gamelan lessons, the students received individualized support on how to play the instruments. In a Cooking lesson, each group received instructions on how to follow the correct procedures for cooking a cake. These teachers accommodated themselves to the level of students rather than adhering to the standards of expectation (EPS). But this close interaction with students was evident only in non-academic lessons. This suggests, without the weakening of the bureaucratic force to close down the practice (to align with the bureaucratic standards for the UN), the open practice (the charismatic authority or liberal authority) was difficult.

By employing the scheme of Authority Strategies, it was shown how the institutional setting of SMP Sari motivated teachers to align with bureaucratically set standards (the bureaucratic mode of Authority Strategy). It was open to teachers to extend support for student learning beyond the prescribed bureaucratic obligations, but there was no motivation for teachers to do this. In addition, employing the charismatic strategy involved deviating from the social hierarchy. This is potentially risky since such the practice was unlikely to be rated favorably and might result in alienation from the rest of the community.

Thus, under an institutional setting where responsibilities are defined bureaucratically, the content and procedures of pedagogy are routinized as protocols (RPS). Therefore, there was little motivation to embody professional expertise. Consequently, issues in the classrooms were treated as authority issues or personality issues rather than pedagogic issues. The different pedagogic strategies and modes of Authority Strategies are relevant to teachers’ understanding of “professional expertise.” This influences how teachers discussed
what happened in classrooms in lesson study activities which are the topic of discussion in the following chapter.
Chapter 8: Enactment of lesson study as a bureaucratic project

8.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the implementation of lesson study in the context of SMP Sari and how it was implemented as a bureaucratic project. The analysis of lesson study in this chapter is built on discussions from the previous two chapters and an understanding of teachers’ practice as the patterns of cultural practice shaped by social relations within the institution. In order to understand how the teachers incorporated a new pedagogic practice—lesson study—into the existing system, the practice of teachers is sociologically analyzed by examining the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study and daily teaching.

From the discussions in the literature reviews, I pointed out how it is impossible to replicate “the best practice” as it was in the original context. The practice is transformed to various degrees in a new setting. Also, it was discussed how the meaning behind the practice is socially constructed: how teachers interpret the practice is relevant to their understanding of professional accountability and the goal of schooling. As discussed in Chapter 6, the teachers in SMP Sari responded to policy changes by accommodating to changes only at the level of official discourse and there was little change in actual practice. Also, the predominant mode of Authority Strategy (how teachers legitimatize their professional expertise) —bureaucratic—suggests the teacher expertise was legitimatized by bureaucratic regulations. However, this was distinguished from “good teaching” in which the teacher extended their support to the process of learning. The following questions will be answered in this chapter:

- What was implemented as lesson study activities?
- How is the teachers’ practice in lesson study different from daily teaching?
- What was discussed in the PLDs?
- What were the continuities and discontinuities in teacher discourse between lesson study and daily teaching?
- What did lesson study mean to the teachers of SMP Sari?
8.2 Bureaucratization of lesson study

Lesson study as a school program

In SMP Sari, lesson study was implemented as one of the school programs funded by the Bantul Education Office. Thus, it was structured within the existing work assignment among other government-funded projects. The responsibility was structured under the familism system, and this facilitated the smooth implementation. While there was no specific guideline for its execution, its implementation generally followed what had been advised in the past training sessions by the JICA experts and local university lecturers.

Table 8.1: Schedule for Lesson Study Activities in SMP Sari (2009-2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original Schedule</th>
<th>Actual Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 12</td>
<td>Indonesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 19</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 12</td>
<td>Painting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10</td>
<td>Civics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 21</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1</td>
<td>Javanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 29</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>Islamic Religion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OC: Open Class

As shown in Table 8.1, while nine lesson study activities were originally scheduled in the academic year of 2009-2010, only four lesson study activities actually took place. According to the principal, because the UN schedule moved up a month,
the school needed to prioritize the UN preparation37 (Fieldnotes, March 10, 2010). In fact, the change of dates of the UN in the middle of the academic year caused some confusion and the school calendar was adjusted. School activities, including regular teaching and special activities such as lesson study, were rescheduled in order “not to disturb those students taking the exam.” It was unclear how the school decided which lesson study schedules to be canceled. But the canceled ones included the one by the principal, Mrs. Mira.

The operation of lesson study program was the responsibility of two teachers. The head of the curriculum, Mr. Umar, set the lesson study schedule, and Mr. Halim was coordinating the program. The model teachers, who held open lessons, were selected based on the discussion among the subject teachers and Mr. Umar. The participants (observers of the open lessons) were invited by invitation letters signed by the principal. Mr. Umar explained that in the beginning, any teacher could participate as observers. However, this resulted in many teachers wanting to participate in lesson study instead of teaching their lessons. In the end, the number of observers was limited to 10 at any time, prioritizing the teachers of the same subject and those teachers who did not have a teaching schedule at the time of open class (Interview, Mr. Umar, May 24, 2010).

As discussed in Chapter 6, there were hidden competitions and hierarchy in terms of teaching competencies. In the first year, those teachers who were considered competent by their peers served as “model teachers” (teachers who conduct open class lessons for other teachers to observe). By the time of my fieldwork, it was the third year and those teachers who had not conducted open classes (OCs) were pressured to be “model teachers.” The day before Mrs. Hani’s open lesson, I witnessed her complaining to Mr. Halim about being a model teacher (Fieldnotes, May 28, 2010).

37 Whereas the UN 2008/2009 took place from April 27 to 30, the UN 2009/2010 took place from March 29 to April 1.
Their reluctance and lack of confidence are evident from the opening remarks that these model teachers made in the PLDs (it was one of the protocols in lesson study to start with the reflections of model teachers).

*I was not sure if I could do it since I am sometimes lazy and there are things missing in my teaching. I welcome comments for improvement (Mr. Basuki, OC1).*

*Students of 8E are problematic but I still tried. I welcome inputs from friends (Mrs. Arum, OC2).*

*I was nervous. Thank you for giving this opportunity. Whether I want to or not, I had to want to do lesson study (Mrs. Citra, OC3).*

*I prepared because I had been told there would be an Open Class on Saturday so I tried. I did not have enough time. I feel that I didn't achieve the target. There is a lot that I lack. I thought it would be easy but on reflection, I did not have enough time (Mrs. Hani, OC4).*

Since it was the first time for teachers to share their lessons with their peers, it posed tremendous pressure on model teachers especially when they were not confident. Nevertheless, the teachers implemented lesson study as *tugas* or bureaucratic obligation.

**Lesson study as bureaucratic protocols**

Once structured into school programs, lesson study was implemented as a top-down bureaucratic project in SMP Sari. What significance does this have on its implementation? I will first introduce how the implementation of lesson study was interpreted as a set of protocols and how this impacted teachers’ practice.

**Cycle of plan-do-see**

The teachers of SMP Sari generally understood lesson study as carrying out a cycle of Plan (making a lesson plan)—Do (carrying out a research lesson or “open class,” which is a commonly used term in Indonesia)—See (the post-lesson discussion). Here is how the vice principal, Mr. Beni, described lesson study (Interview June 10, 2010).

*In planning, teachers prepare, they make lesson plans and there are teaching materials to be used which are later evaluated [my emphasis]. For the second step, in do, teachers deliver the material and evaluate*
According to the plan, then the observers are able to know how much material students are able to understand. Since teachers act as moderators, teachers are interested to know the students’ abilities and what students thought and presented in order to deepen students’ understanding. In the third step, do, the evaluation [my emphasis] is carried out on how the lesson went, whether it was already good or not.

These descriptions suggest there was an emphasis on “evaluation” for every step of the lesson study. The teachers use an observation sheet to record what they observed for the PLD. This sheet was first introduced by experts from JICA and local experts (from a local university). The sheet contained the following questions:

1. Were students learning the lesson topic at the time?
2. Who were the students who were not learning the lesson at the time?
3. Why do you think these students were not learning at the time?
4. To enable students to learn, in what way and what tools were used by the model teacher? Was it working?

In observing OC lessons, these questions were intended to help observers to pay attention to the process of student learning as well as their individual differences in order to support their learning. However, as discussed in Chapter 7, the teachers’ accountability was not structured to support student learning. This discrepancy is apparent in the description of lesson study by Mr. Beni. While the teachers were expected to be “moderators” to deepen student understanding, they were evaluated on whether the lesson was good or not. In section 8.4, I will examine this issue further.

Introduction of student activities
Lesson study promoted the introduction of student-centered approaches. As illustrated in Table 8.2, all teachers included group work for their OCs and three out of four teachers used hands-on activities. This was distinguished from daily lessons discussed in Chapter 7 where the teachers mainly employed didactic methods and relied on textbooks and drill. Even students’ seating arrangements were different in OCs. They were arranged in groups of four students of mixed gender (as recommended by JICA experts previously) to facilitate group work whereas, in daily lessons, the students chose their own seats. This generally
resulted in girls and boys sitting separately—girls on one side of the classroom and the boys on the other side.

**Table 8.2: Subjects and Contents of Open Class for Lesson Study in SMP Sari (2009-2010)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Class (OC) #/ Date</th>
<th>Model teacher</th>
<th>Subject/ (Class)</th>
<th>Lesson topic</th>
<th>Summary of lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OC1 Feb. 12</td>
<td>Mr. Basuki</td>
<td>Indonesian Language (8F)</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td>Reading a poem, discussing the different styles of poetry and their objectives, and writing a poem as group work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC2 Feb. 19</td>
<td>Mrs. Arum</td>
<td>Mathematics (8E)</td>
<td>Nets of a cube</td>
<td>Students were assigned to work in groups to conduct hands-on activities to understand the different shapes of a cube. They presented the results. Then the students worked on worksheets relevant to the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC3 May 11</td>
<td>Mrs. Citra</td>
<td>English (7D)</td>
<td>Descriptive texts</td>
<td>Asking questions about pets, reading texts about pets and going over vocabulary, and working on worksheets in groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC4 May 29</td>
<td>Mrs. Hani</td>
<td>Mathematics (7F)</td>
<td>Trapezoid</td>
<td>Explaining about trapezoids followed by activities to understand trapezoids and to fill in worksheets, and presenting the results of group work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*OC3 was different because it was implemented as MGMP (district-level subject teacher forum) activities participated in by English teachers from neighboring schools. The remarks made by the teachers from other schools were not included in the analysis.*
Extensive preparation
The teachers in SMP Sari often mentioned that lesson study required "lots of preparation." While there was almost no preparation in daily lessons, the teachers extensively prepared for lesson study which was considered a burden (Interview, Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010; Interview, Mrs. Citra, June 21, 2010).

Mrs. Risma (a Geography teacher in her thirties) explained this in the interview as follows:

KK (the author): how was the experience of lesson study?
Risma: Yeah...because it was the first experience, the preparation was a bit (problematic)...I consulted with friends and I could prepare in the end. Then from the implementation to reflection, everything went well...Alḥamdullāh. Children were able to follow and enjoy the lesson. They were able to understand what I told them.

KK: So the preparation was different from the daily lesson?
Risma: Yes, of course, it was much more. Because in lesson study students are supposed to be active so that we have to prepare everything that it takes [to make that happen].

KK: What did you need to prepare?
Risma: Lesson plan, student worksheet, also media. In fact, the last time I prepared a sketch of the region. The topic was to research the local area. Before that, I gave students homework to draw a map from their home to school. Then I asked them to measure the distance. So I needed to prepare a map. Then I asked them to identify physical and social objects on the map (Interview, Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010).

In fact, Mr. Beni commented that one of the benefits in lesson study was that the presence of observers pushes the teachers to try a new approach and try their best. He said, apart from a few exceptional teachers, the teachers were not motivated to challenge and adhered to the didactic style of teaching (Interview, June 10, 2010).

8.3 Lesson study implementation

Indonesian Language open class by Mr. Basuki

In this section, I will introduce one of the OCs and present a conflict between the student-centered approach promoted by lesson study and understanding of
“effective teaching” by the teachers in SMP Sari. The model teacher, Mr. Basuki, is an Indonesian Language teacher in his forties. The vice principal, Mr. Beni, described him as a problematic teacher who lacked professionalism (Interview, June 10, 2010). On the other hand, Mr. Basuki was well-liked by students and one of the few teachers who knew the names of almost all students. When I observed his daily teaching (Fieldnotes, February 15, 2010), his approach was unconventional. There was no evidence of the delivery of materi. The only instruction Mr. Basuki provided to students was to discuss and to write up the results of their homework (interviews) in groups. There was no attempt to control the lesson, which was left up to learners. The students took advantage to enjoy chatting and some of them even ran out of the classroom pretending to conduct the interview.

When Mr. Basuki conducted his OC, his teaching practice was very similar to the daily teaching I observed. He instructed minimally and the majority of the time was spent on students working on their group assignments.

The model teacher, Mr. Basuki, started the lesson by showing a drawing of a man (a famous poet) and asked students who he was. After providing the explanation, the teacher posted a poem on the board, distributed worksheets to students, and then asked the students to discuss the difference between traditional poetry (puisi lama) and free poetry (puisi bebas) in groups. He told them to write down the result of the discussion on the worksheet.

Since there was little information, the students seemed to be confused about what to do. It took a while for the students to start a discussion. Most groups managed to put one sentence in their notebooks. During the students’ work, the teacher did not provide a timeframe for students to work on the assignment. The teacher stood by the blackboard and occasionally checked the progress of the students. “Mas39 Adi, how about you? Have you finished?”

In the second part of the lesson, he asked the students to write poems on a topic of the group’s choice. The students were generally working together although sometimes some boys were playing around and teasing each other (Excerpts from Fieldnotes, February 12, 2010).

39 Mas is used to refer young males in Indonesian.
Although the practice of Mr. Basuki aligned with what was promoted by the student-centered approach, his practice was criticized in the PLD. Firstly, there were criticisms of the lack of control of student activity, especially on time management. Mrs. Wati suggested that since the students seemed confused and spent some time to decide what poem to write, the teacher could have provided a list to choose from instead of giving students an open choice. Another comment by Mrs. Mira was the teacher should carefully avoid allowing students to just sit without doing anything. Here, the confusion was interpreted as the lack of the teacher’s clear instructions. The concern was with how teachers could control students’ activity in order to use time efficiently. Secondly, although Mr. Basuki was familiar with students and adopted a less authoritative approach, he was criticized for this. Mr. Umar said the teacher should not explain to students one by one but the information should be provided to all students. Mrs. Anggita said that the teacher should call the name of groups instead of calling the names of individual students which resulted in calling out the wrong names. These comments suggest that these teachers valued en masse instruction rather than taking an individualized approach. The criticisms indicate that there was a conflict between what was promoted by lesson study and the underlying assumptions on what constitutes “good” teaching. Despite the introduction of student activities, the comments in PLD suggests that attention was on how the teachers controlled student activities en masse.

The final summary of the discussion by the moderator, Mr. Umar, strongly represents this dominance of bureaucratic discourse of what should have been done.

Mr. Umar, the moderator, summarized the discussion as that the model teacher needs to make the students read (poems) aloud and to make sure all the students look to the front before starting the presentation. He also reminded the observers that they are not allowed to sit (while observing lessons).

In the end, the model teacher was asked to give final comment. Mr. Basuki said that he knows that he should have read the poem and he hopes to improve in the future. The post-discussion finished with a word of prayer “Alhamdulillah” (Excerpt from Fieldnotes, February 12, 2010).
Clearly, the discussion was oriented to evaluating teacher instructions. In the next section, I will explore why lesson study was implemented as peer evaluation rather than an exchange of practice to share how student learn.

8.4 Interpretation of Lesson study

Discontinuities in practice and continuities in discourse

In this section, I will examine how the teachers interpreted lesson study by drawing on the OCs and discussions in the PLDs. As the descriptions by Mr. Beni (pp. 192-193) suggest, lesson study was generally understood as a cycle of plan-do-see and the evaluation of OC. While lesson study motivated the teachers to employ more student-centered pedagogy (hands-on activities and group work), the emphasis was placed on carrying out bureaucratic protocols which had little link to daily teaching. The comparison between the practice of lesson study and the practice of daily teaching is presented in Table 8.3.

This shows how lesson study motivated the teachers to alter their pedagogy in line with lesson study protocols and distinguished from daily teaching. However, despite the difference in practice, there were continuities in terms of how teachers interpreted 1) teacher support; 2) student learning; 3) and peer support in professional development. Consequently, there were discrepancies between the student-centered pedagogy promoted by lesson study and the understanding by teachers of what constituted “effective” lessons. This will be examined in this section by linking the discussions on the accountability structure under familism (Chapter 6) and dominant pedagogic practice (Chapter 7).

Interpretation of the teacher support

While lesson study was intended for teachers to discuss how to support student learning, the majority of teachers did not intervene in the process of student learning. As described in Chapter 7, in the daily setting, teaching was equated with the delivery of the curriculum and the teachers’ role was understood as that of
instructor and evaluator. However, in lesson study, teachers avoided lecturing or drilling which were common in daily lessons, and introduced student activities. As a result, teachers treated lesson study as a separate activity from subject teaching (the delivery of the curriculum and teaching to the test). Despite the differences in methods, the role of teachers and how the teachers engaged with students remained the same.

Table 8.3: Comparison of Daily Lesson and OC Lessons in SMP Sari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Daily Lesson</th>
<th>OC Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>Delivery of the curriculum/Passing the UN</td>
<td>Activating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Tasks</strong></td>
<td>Listening and exercise solving</td>
<td>Listening, group work, and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods</strong></td>
<td>Lecture, rote learning, and problem-solving</td>
<td>Hands-on activities and group work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparation of Lessons</strong></td>
<td>None or minimum</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Materials</strong></td>
<td>Textbook and workbook</td>
<td>Worksheets and teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher’s Role</strong></td>
<td>Curriculum delivery and evaluation</td>
<td>Providing clear instructions and motivating students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student’s Role</strong></td>
<td>Recipients</td>
<td>Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student-Student Relationship</strong></td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Formative (tests)</td>
<td>Comments by the observers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Firstly, while student activities were introduced, they were treated as student tasks; thus, there was no teacher facilitation. In daily lessons, the teachers gave tasks in the form of drills whereas in lesson study the drills were replaced by student activities. The teachers restricted their support to a minimum since it was deemed desirable that students work on assignments independently. This is evident in how teachers responded when students sought help. In OC 2, Mrs. Arum distributed a large blue sheet and a plastic bag containing square cards along with two worksheets for students to work on. One boy asked the teacher
what to do with the squares. In response, she simply said, “read the worksheet” (Fieldnotes, February 19, 2010).

This is also reflected in the teacher’s suggestion on how to improve student participation in group work.

> In Pane Armyn group, only three students were active. Retno just played around so the teacher should have given each member responsibilities to minimize the risk of students playing by themselves (Mrs. Mira, OC1).

The above comment implies that the teacher’s role was restricted to providing tasks. In fact, there was no suggestion from teachers that recommended intervention in group work. The emphasis was placed on ensuring students’ participation per se and there was no investigation on why Retno was unwilling to work with other group members.

In fact, the role that the teacher could play to support student was ambiguous. As discussed in Chapter 7, the responsibility for acquisition rested on the students; thus, the issue of participation was treated as personal problems rather than a pedagogical issue. Thus, the teachers treated the issue in class management as an authority issue. This is reflected in the ambiguous comments below on how to motivate students.

> Teachers are important role models so they should be able to motivate children to be more interested and more motivated (Mrs. Mira, OC1).

> The teacher should provide motivation for the students in order for them to be more enthusiastic (Mrs. Risma, OC1).

Secondly, teachers considered the lesson to be effective if students were able to solve problems independently and with as little information and support as possible. This was reflected in how teachers evaluated the lessons negatively when the teachers provided too much information and were “too helpful” to students.

> There are some problems that need to be rectified in the LKS (student worksheet): LKS 1 (exercise) No. 2 and No. 3 in LKS 2. The format of the worksheet was too helpful for children. It was sufficient to provide short and clear instruction (Mr. Umar, OC4).
The role of teachers was understood to be that of instructor and evaluator (discussed in Chapter 7), and a personalized approach to students was evaluated negatively. In OC1, Mrs. Anggita said that the teacher should call the name of groups instead of calling the wrong names of students. Mr. Umar said the teacher should not explain to students one by one but the information should be provided to all students. In this way, the teachers were not held accountable for knowing individual students or about classroom settings. Consequently, there was no discussion about different factors that supported/hindered their learning.

Thirdly, there was no investigation of the process of student learning or how to support their learning. This is represented in how the teacher discussed the differences in the measurements for the circumference of a trapezoid in OC4.

*In the measuring activity, almost all groups got different results, because of the way of looking and the measuring instrument (Mrs. Prastiwi).*

*Little difference in the measurement was normal because of the accuracy of rulers and vision, but when there were big differences in the measurements, it was better for teachers to immediately request that groups measure again (Mrs. Wahyuni).*

The teachers discussed the possible reasons for mistakes, but the discussion stopped there. There was no further discussion on why these mistakes were made based on the evidence in the classroom. The suggestion by Mrs. Wahyuni was simply to instruct students to measure again. In fact, based on my observation, students were not used to using rulers and used them incorrectly. Some groups measured starting from the end of the ruler rather than the beginning of the scale. Without the construction of ZPD, teachers play no role in filling the gap between correct and incorrect measurements (just as in the Dance lesson described in Chapter 7, pp. 162-163). Thus, the question as to why students made a mistake was not a pedagogic concern for the teachers.

Fourthly, since teaching was understood as the fulfillment of a bureaucratic obligation, the practice was evaluated based on the externally set criteria.

*The model teacher sometimes used Javanese. He should speak in Indonesian (Mr. Endarto, OC1).*
The (seating) chart did not exist so it was difficult to know the name of the group and the student's name (Mrs. Mira, OC1).

In lesson study, the teachers were not evaluated based on the delivery of the curriculum or the preparation for the UN. Instead, they were evaluated based on the lesson study protocols. This is discussed in the next section.

**Interpretation of student learning**

One of the intended goals of lesson study was for teachers to gain an understanding of how students learn. On the other hand, in the institutional setting of SMP Sari, the teachers provided evaluative comments about students since they interpreted student learning as an output of teacher instructions.

Firstly, teachers assessed student learning by the output of group work.

* Nuguroho group wrote a good poem (Mr. Endarto, OC1).
* One group who read the poem about “my teacher” was reading the poem so well (Mr. Umar, OC1).
* The target was achieved since the students made at least 8 shapes (Mrs. Hani, OC2).

Moreover, these comments on students were general and lacked specificity. For example, it was unclear what constituted a “good poem” since the teachers did not clarify why the poem was good.

Secondly, the teachers evaluated student activities based on their participation and cooperation.

* In group work, the students were first making poems individually but after Mr. Basuki said to make one together as a group, they could work together. The teacher should approach everyone (Mrs. Gia, OC1).
* There were comments such as that Group 4 was active but there was a boy who was not active because he was the only boy in the group and the groups should be divided equally between girls and boys (Mrs. Tuti, OC3).
* Student concentration was good when they were working on the worksheet (Prastiwi, OC4).
“Ninety percent of students were studying” (Mr. Halim, OC4).

Again, their participation and cooperation were not linked to subject understanding or how they learned. Consequently, there was no discussion on how they cooperated. In fact, several teachers pointed out in the teacher survey that the weakness of lesson study as, “It decreases the confidence of students because they get used to working together with their friends” or “It decreases students’ independence because they are used to work with their friends.” These comments show that the teachers had little interest in how students cooperated due to their negative view toward peer support.

Thirdly, student activities were evaluated based on whether students were enjoying the activities.

*Children were having fun and enjoying making nets. There is a need for additional resources such as graph paper (Mrs. Fima, OC2).*

*Children enthusiastically participated in learning. An interesting method that makes math fun and not scary (Mrs. Risma, OC2)*

There was no discussion on why they were interested or how this contributed to their understanding of the topic.

These three points show how student learning was interpreted as the output of teacher instruction; thus, there was little concern for the process of their learning. There is a continuity from daily practice that there is a division of roles between teachers and students. The teacher’s role was to provide input in the form of lecturing, and the role of students was to reproduce what the teachers instructed. Thus, student activities were not designed to facilitate their understanding of the subject but interpreted as providing an opportunity for students to enjoy the activities and work with other students. It is consistent with the discussion on Chapter 7 (pp. 167-168) on how student presentation was treated separately from the understanding of the topic of study. Remarkably, there was almost no mentioning of *materi* in the PLDs while this was equated as the responsibility in teaching (discussed in Chapter 7).
Teacher cooperation and teacher dialogue

One of the characteristics in the PLDs in SMP Sari was the absence of teacher dialogue. As seen so far, the teachers’ comments in PLDs were general and evaluation of teaching or students. There were very few teacher exchanges. This is relevant to how teaching responsibility was not structured within the collective responsibility under the familism system but understood as an individual responsibility.

Firstly, accountability in OC was interpreted to fulfill a bureaucratic responsibility rather than based a place to share common concerns in teaching. Lesson study at SMP Sari was structured within school programs and a part of school-based subject study group (MGMPS) activity. Thus, the teachers owe a collective responsibility for the implementation of lesson study. However, there was no sense of shared responsibility in terms of teaching. As discussed in Chapter 6, while the teachers cooperated well to carry out tugas, there was almost no discussion on teaching or students in the staff room. The OC lessons were individually planned by the model teachers and there was little support in the process of planning lessons.

This discrepancy between collective responsibility for lesson study and individual responsibility for teaching is well represented in the comment below. Mr. Umar was defensive when one of the Mathematics teachers was criticized for the lack of preparation (seating charts for observers).

*If Mrs. Arum had asked for help, I could help her but actually, Mathematics teachers did not work together and Mrs. Arum did it alone.*

(Mr. Umar, OC2).

Mr. Umar’s comment suggests how other Mathematics teachers were expected to support Mrs. Arum in preparing OC. This was especially true for Mr. Umar since, under the patriarchal organization, the one in authority (the curriculum head and the subject group leader) was expected to support his subordinates. However, his comment, “if Mrs. Arum had asked for help” also clearly marked out
the boundary of responsibility. This confirms that the responsibility for teaching (the open lesson or indeed any lesson) rested with individual teachers.

Secondly, in relation to the first point, the content of discussion in the PLDs was not to share the issues in classrooms but to evaluate one another’s teaching. While the teachers emphasized the good cooperation among subject teachers, there was a hidden competition among teachers (as discussed in Chapter 6). Under these circumstances, there was little incentive to share the issues in their classroom for fear of being considered incompetent (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010). This was especially apparent for those who had been rated negatively by their peers. When there was a problem, the teachers preferred to resort to a personal connection for consultation. In the interview, Mrs. Citra explained that while she maintained good relationships with all the English teachers, she felt more comfortable consulting with Mrs. Amel this way:

…actually with Mrs. Ismi also no problem, with Mrs. Tuti no problem, it looks like if with Mrs. Amel I feel closer.

Hmm…let’s see…how is it…other teachers are also close…, it’s just with Mrs. Amel…we are…I lived in Tabosono (pseudonym), Mrs. Amel is actually from Tabosono. We often talked when I go there, actually…Mrs. Amel’s aunt is my friend. We went to the same school and we often talked (…) I can ask Mrs. Ismi, I can ask Mrs. Tuti but I feel better with Mrs. Amel, like this (laugh).

When an issue in the classroom was raised in the PLDs, it was discussed not as a shared concern but attributed to individual competence. In Mrs. Hani’s Mathematics OC (OC4), the noise level of students was so high that the teacher had to yell at one point. Afterward, the issue of class management was discussed in the PLD this way:

Mrs. Bella: In the lesson, many students like Agus, Harjo, and Samita were not listening. These students should have received special attention.

Mr. Umar (the moderator): Why (were students) not listening to the teacher?"

(A long pause)

Mrs. Fima: Class management.
Mr. Umar: We must pay attention to class management. If the questions are easy, do we need all groups to present the answers? It is a waste of time.

Mrs. Fima: Class management is important. Students were not listening because of unclear instructions. The teacher could not correct their behavior.

Mr. Umar: Class management is really important

Although the moderator raised a question for teachers to discuss, the comments were general evaluations of teaching rather than a discussion based on what took place in the classroom. It was unclear at which point of the lesson Agus, Harjo, and Samita were not listening and what kind of “special attention” was needed. Although the comment by Mr. Umar implied that he considered the inefficient use of time resulted in student misbehavior, it was unclear how to use time efficiently in order to improve class management. Although many teachers struggled with class management and they could share the problem as the shared pedagogical concern, the problem was attributed to Mrs. Hani’s lack of ability in class management.

In the interview, Mrs. Risma reflected on Mrs. Arum’s OC and recounted the issue in class management this way (Interview, June 9, 2010):

*When Mrs. Arum did OC it was noisy but in my class students are not noisy. Students change depending on the teacher. If a teacher is good, they can make students quiet. If a teacher is always upset or ignores them even, they are noisy, they keep being noisy. I try to be close to students. I talk to them like a friend and share.*

Although Mrs. Risma recognized how her approach to students was different, she attributed the problem to Mrs. Arum’s disposition and her personality. In this way, without a shared concern for ZPD, facilitation skills were not discussed as a pedagogic concern. Without shared accountability for student learning, the PLD became not an opportunity for open exchanges but as a place for teachers to evaluate each other against the externally-set lesson study protocols.

Thirdly, as discussed in Chapter 7, while the teachers shared the responsibility to deliver the curriculum, there were variations in opening up of ZPDs. This
difference in pedagogic strategies—RPS and EPS—resulted in the different interpretations of what constituted an “effective” or “efficient” teacher intervention. In the PLDs of OC4, when Mr. Halim suggested that it would be good if Mrs. Hani went over and explained the wrong answers one by one, Mr. Umar disagreed. He commented that explaining the procedures to solve the problem step by step once was enough and Mrs. Hani should not go over all the wrong answers. For Mr. Umar, if the teacher presented the correct steps for problem-solving once, this was sufficient. On the other hand, Mr. Halim, who mainly employed EPS, was interested in going over wrong answers one by one since he considered such could provide support for students to learn from their mistakes. Nevertheless, the discussion did not develop any further. These contrasting views on “effective” pedagogy stemmed from different pedagogic strategies that were simply understood as a difference of opinion and not discussed as a shared pedagogic concern. Moreover, under the hierarchical organization, the expertise of Mr. Umar (the bureaucratic mode of authority) was legitimatized by his managerial position and Mr. Halim’s comment was dismissed.

This lack of a shared understanding of pedagogic expertise was pointed out by Mr. Edi, one of the “good” teachers mentioned in Chapter 7. He even said that he was dissatisfied with lesson study due to this.

_I do really do not like lesson study in SMP Sari._

_It is far from what I want. What I want is a group of subject teachers, really developing a teaching material…or a worksheet, [they] improve these in order for children to understand more easily. In reality, though, this is not the case._

_(…) I do not like the observers. From what I have observed, I found that they only observed the students’ movements._

_What I mean is, they observe why the students are not acting based on the learning materials planned by teachers. That is what I meant._

_So, (…) what I want to happen in the reflection is that they [teachers] would discuss how to develop the next lesson plan better so that the students would be more active. In reality, though, that was not the case. That is why I feel bored with the type of lesson study in SMP Sari (Interview, June 2, 2010)._
While Mr. Edi was interested in developing strategies to work with students, this concern was not shared with his peers. The discussions in PLDs consisted of the evaluation of students and this was not linked to the analysis on how to support students’ learning. This resulted in Mr. Edi to feel that lesson study discussions were not useful for him or for other teachers.

8.5 Conclusion

The discussion in this chapter has presented how the implementation of lesson study at SMP Sari was bureaucratized to meet external requirements as an official responsibility. As discussed in Chapter 7, bureaucratic accountability regulated the practice of teachers in terms of what to teach but not how to teach. While new protocols—hands-on and group activities—were introduced, they were practiced and discussed as add-ons to the existing teaching practice. This simply reflected how the teachers had been responding to policy and curricular changes. The policy change altered the teachers’ practice at the official level (new protocols were implemented) but not at the unofficial level (any change in daily settings). This was similar to how student presentations in the Economics lesson (pp. 167-168) were treated separately from the subject study or delivery of the materi.

It was also revealed that despite the introduction of student activities, there was a persistent emphasis on the efficiency of teacher instructions and the use of an en masse approach. Although lesson study motivated a change in the methods employed, this had no impact on how teachers understood their role in student learning. The target of lesson was still placed on what teachers taught and not on how to mediate student learning or how students learned. The teachers told me that without formal assessment, they were not sure how much the students understood. This resulted in teachers evaluating what was promoted by lesson study—a personalized approach and attempts at scaffolding—as “ineffective.” Also, since a didactic approach and drilling were absent in lesson study, what took place in lesson study were not linked to the understanding of subject topics. Student activities were treated as merely fun activities for students to engage in.
The variations in pedagogic approaches—RPS and EPS—suggests, there was no agreement on what constitutes “effective” teaching. There were some teachers who discussed supporting students in terms that might be described as scaffolding (EPS), the majority of the discussion on teaching centered on the efficiency and effectiveness of teacher instruction (RPS). These differences were not pursued as pedagogic issues but understood as matters of personal opinion. Thus, there was little incentive to investigate the process of student learning among teachers or to embody skills to support their learning. Without such a shared understanding of teaching or shared responsibility for student learning, it was difficult to establish common ground for discussion.

In addition, the bureaucratic implementation of lesson study also reflected the nature of teacher cooperation. While the same subject teachers were expected to cooperate, and in some cases, the teachers supported one another in administrative work, they did not share the responsibility to teach. Under the hierarchical organizational structure, the teachers were evaluated against one another. This made difficult for teachers to consult one another for OC (or any lesson). Consequently, the teachers relied on the personal connection when they needed to seek help. Consequently, those “weak” teachers, such as Mrs. Hani, did not seek support from their colleagues.

The discussion in PLDs mainly focused on the efficiency of teacher instruction and student output, but very little on the process of student learning. This resulted in lesson study functioning as peer evaluation rather than as a place for teacher exchange. There was little motivation for teachers to interpret open lessons, to exchange their practice and issues in teaching, or to connect lesson study to their daily teaching. Thus, the pedagogic concerns of teachers were not shared as intended by lesson study.
Chapter 9: Recontextualization of lesson study

9.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine the “recontextualization” of lesson study in Java by examining the practices of lesson study in Japan and Java against the contextual settings of respective countries. As discussed in Chapter 2, when the pedagogic practice is transferred from one setting to another, its meaning is reconstructed. This reconstruction of meaning took place even within the setting of SMP Sari. The anecdote by Mr. Edi below well illustrated the issue in the pedagogic transfer.

Some of the teachers who copied my worksheet later complained that it did not work well in practice. Of course (it did not work), because these teachers should have made worksheets depending on the condition of their classrooms (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010).

There was a fundamental difference in understanding between Mr. Edi and his colleagues how to apply the worksheet. Mr. Edi understood the content of the worksheet required elaboration (Elaborated Pedagogic Strategy: EPS) to accommodate the level of student understanding. In contrast, his colleagues designed a lesson without teacher mediation; thus, presenting worksheet as it was, was sufficient for them (Restricted Pedagogic Strategy: RPS). In the setting of SMP Sari, students’ acquisition was generally presumed to be identical to the unmediated pedagogic text. Thus, the worksheet made by Mr. Edi’s was ineffective for his colleague. In this way, the meaning of practice could fluctuate even within the same setting.

In the previous chapter, it was argued that while lesson study motivated changes in teachers’ practice, these changes were brought about in response to fulfilling bureaucratic requirements. Consequently, lesson study was interpreted as a “special activity” and implemented at surface level (the official discourse). In this chapter, I will discuss how lesson study was reinterpreted in SMP Sari by situating the practice within the contextual settings in Java. I will do this by drawing on the ethnographic data presented in the last three analysis chapters and compare them with the contextual settings in Japan. The descriptions on the Japanese
setting is drawn from secondary sources. The examples of lesson study in Japan tended to concentrate on the cases of mathematics lessons due to the limitation of research literature in other subjects\(^\text{40}\). In comparing teachers’ practice and contextual settings, I am by no means generalizing the situations in Java or Japan. The data is simply presented to compare the impact that sociocultural setting has on the interpretation of pedagogic initiatives such as lesson study. If lesson study in Japan has been motivating collaborative learning of teachers to support students’ learning, what was the situation in Indonesia? What were the contexts that supported such efforts in Japan and what were the contexts that transformed the initiative in SMP Sari?

9.2 Professional accountabilities

There is a famous proverb in Indonesia that describes the ideal image of teachers (Hattori & Ramli, 2012).

"Guru adalah pahlawan tanpa tanda jasa."

(\textit{Teachers are heroes without medals.})

Teachers here are referred to as heroes who dedicate themselves to children without economic compensation. In Japan, ideal teachers are similarly described as those who are dedicated and sacrifice themselves for children (Kudomi, 2017; Sakurai, 1926). While the image of a good teacher may be similar in Java and Japan, the “professional responsibilities” of teachers are socially constructed and differ across the two contexts. Consequently, the teachers in Japan and Java work to fulfill different obligations and these differences are reflected in the implementation of lesson study.

In the setting of SMP Sari, being a teacher meant balancing the roles of a good civil servant and a good member of the teacher community. While the teachers

\(^{40}\) Historically, there are abundant records of practice (\textit{jissen kiroku}) in Japan which consists of narrative accounts of teaching and their engagement to lesson study. However, due to the practice-orientated nature of these documents, the research literature on lesson study has been scarce. Recently, there are increasing publications mainly targeting foreign audiences who are interested to learn from Japanese mathematics and science lessons.
diligently worked for *tugas* and prioritized the school programs as “special activities,” daily routines including general teaching are distinguished from this. The teaching responsibility was equated with *materi* and interpreted as a one-way transfer of the state designated curriculum. Thus, the dominant practice of teachers in SMP Sari suggests, the responsibility to teach did not encompass sharing the responsibility for acquisition. Consequently, there was little evidence of constructing ZPDs and there was no space to mediate student learning. Teachers were not responsible for fulfilling the gaps between actual performance and ideal performance. This is relevant to the stratified nature of the school and Javanese society in general. In Javanese society, the social hierarchy was generally accepted because of the assumption that people are unequal and they have appropriate places and roles in society (Mulder, 1994). The students in SMP Sari had been selected to enter the school because of their high performance in the graduation examinations of elementary school. Thus, the teachers categorized the ability of students in terms of their IQs and understood them as given (Interview Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010). Thus, these students were considered possessing sufficient ability to pass the UN (the minimum requirement for graduation) if they tried. Since the responsibility for acquisition rested on students, filling the ability gap between students did not rest with the teachers.

In SMP Sari, a few teachers acknowledged as “good teachers” (discussed in Chapter 7) went beyond the bureaucratic obligation and extended their support to mediate student learning. As both “good teachers” recounted, their outside-school experience motivated them to take up the responsibility to support students. For Mr. Edi, it was the tutoring experience where he designed lessons to accommodate individual students and developed strategies to support them. For Mr. Halim, it was the boy scouting experience where he realized the importance of developing students’ abilities beyond that of academic achievements. In these experiences, the teachers provided scaffolding and witnessed the changes in students. However, their “good” practice was recognized as exceptional and attributed to personal commitment and even personal sacrifice. Under the
circumstance, the teachers were not motivated to play the role of facilitator, investigate the individual students’ needs, or to understand how students learn.

In contrast, Japanese teachers consider their roles to be that of educator and to support the holistic development of students. Thus, they are expected to be more than subject instructors but also to be moral and spiritual role models. Compare to Indonesia, there is less academic pressure in Japan since there are no national standardized tests and there is virtually no requirement for graduation at the elementary and junior high school levels. This might be attributed to the historical development of the Japanese school where students went to seek their masters (師) for tutoring in terakoya based on respect for those who were expected to set an example in the Confucian tradition (Iwata, 2008).

The work of Japanese teachers is centered around students. Instead of teaching, the word shido—which literally means providing guidance to students—is commonly used to describe the responsibilities of teachers (Rohlen & LeTendre, 1998). In fact, the teachers spend a considerable amount of time with students inside and outside lessons—eating lunch, cleaning classrooms, and supervising extracurricular activities. In this way, teachers are expected to work closely with students and building a relationship of trust with students is considered essential (MEXT, 2011). Teachers assume “social, emotional, intellectual, and physical development are intertwined” (Tsuneyoshi, 2014, p. 3). In this way, the work of teachers is identified as organizing and facilitating various kinds of collaborative and self-initiated activities for students to experience “learning by doing” (Tsuneyoshi, 2001, 2014). Research suggests that the nature of the Japanese teacher’s “infinite role” strengthens the autonomy of teachers. In supporting students, the teachers inevitably make decisions based on their own understanding of what students need especially in those activities outside lessons (Fujita, Yufu, Sakai, & Akiba, 1995)\textsuperscript{41}.

\textsuperscript{41} The infinite role of teachers also has a negative consequence. Based on the results of the Teaching and Learning International Survey by the OECD (2014), Japanese teachers work long
In addition, due to the egalitarian nature of Japanese schooling, Japanese teachers identify it is their responsibility to support students regardless of their ability level (Cummings, 2014; Kariya, 2011).

Although the teachers recognize differences in ability among their students, they feel it is their responsibility as public school teachers in a democratic society to try to bring all the students to a common level (Cummings, 1980, p. 127).

This is in contrast with the hierarchical setting of SMP Sari where the ability differences were taken for granted. This difference is reflected in how Japanese teachers approach students in classrooms. While whole class instruction is similarly used in Japan, different techniques and strategies are used to accommodate the different needs of students within a classroom. Stigler and Hiebert (2009) explain how Japanese teachers even make use of ability difference among students as a resource. They structure lessons accordingly to the exchange of different ideas in a way that enables the deepening of students’ understanding of topics. In this way, the pedagogic practice of Japanese teachers involves sharing the process of learning and ZPDs are constructed to mediate students’ learning.

Thus, the professional responsibilities of Japanese teachers are structured around supporting students while the responsibility of the teacher in SMP Sari was equated with curriculum delivery without sharing responsibility for student learning.

9.3 Collegiality

Teacher Cooperation

Lesson study requires teachers’ collaboration which is motivated by the shared goal to improve teaching practice. However, as A. Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) distinguished the difference between collaborative culture and contrived working hours (53.9 hours per week compared to the OECD average of 38.3) and the use of time for non-teaching tasks has attracted attention and been raised as a social problem.
collegiality, the way teachers work with one another influences the nature of collaboration in their professional development:

*Collaborative cultures comprise evolutionary relationships of openness, trust, and support among teachers where they define and develop their own purposes as a community. Contrived collegiality consists of administratively contrived interactions among teachers where they meet and work to implement the curricula and instructional strategies developed by others. Collaborative cultures foster teacher and curriculum development. Contrived collegiality enhances administrative control (p. 227).*

While the teachers in SMP Sari support one another as members of the patriarchal community, their relationship in terms of professional development matched the description of the contrived collegiality. The school was managed in a top-down manner and the role of teachers to carry out the assigned tasks related to their responsibility as a community member included knowing their place and obligations in the hierarchy. The community harmony was maintained by the cultural values of obedience to superiors (*manut*), generosity, conflict avoidance, understanding of others, and empathy (Koentjaraningrat as cited in Rohandi & Zain, 2011). Consequently, even when the teachers expressed concerns about the school operation (the example of Mrs. Ema on page 146), they were never addressed in public but resolved quietly behind the scenes.

In addition, since teaching responsibility was understood as a bureaucratic obligation but not structured within the familism system, communal interests often overrode bureaucratic rules. For instance, being late for lessons was overlooked as long as it was within the social norm. In this way, the accountability owed to the community could work against working for the interests of students. Since responsibility to students was structured neither within the social or bureaucratic responsibility of the community, issues in teaching or students were rarely discussed among teachers (discussed in Chapter 6 as coping strategies of teachers). While teachers chit-chat about their personal lives, there was no consultation on teaching or discussion about students in the staff room. These cultural norms worked against open discussions intended for lesson study.
In contrast, the structure of the Japanese teacher community is relatively flat and the school is managed under the distributed leadership (Shimahara, 1998; Tsuneyoshi, 2008). The school operated under the system of cooperative management (koumu bunsho) which Shimahara (1998) describes as follows:

…every Japanese school is cooperatively managed by faculty, and the division of work is published in the teachers’ handbook. Teachers are assigned specific responsibilities to promote: school programs, the school environment, the lunch program (in which all students participate), public relations, counseling, in-service education [my emphasis], subject-area study activities, moral education, student guidance, school events, and like. Basically, it is this cooperative management by teachers that provides a smooth implementation of everyday routines and new initiatives in the programs. (p. 455)

In this way, the teachers collaborate to organize various educational activities based on the shared goal of nurturing students (Lewis, 2000; discussed in Chapter 3). In order to run the school, the teachers participate in various kinds of the committee and they are encouraged to take the initiative in supporting the educational goals of schools. The heads of the committee are rotated in order to distribute the leadership roles. In terms of responsibility for teaching, especially the teachers of the same grade communicate regularly to support students holistically and to ensure there is a coherence in instructions. This internal accountability is so strong that there is even pressure to align their practice with that of their colleagues (Yufu, 1990).

Responsibility for professional development

As the quote by Shimahara on the previous page described, in-service education or professional development is also structured under a system of cooperative management and the collaborative work of teachers in Japan. This includes the expectation that mid-career teachers will play key roles in school management and assist younger teachers in their career development. Since the teachers’ work is centered on students’ development, they share a collective responsibility to support the holistic and long-term development of students. They also understand that teaching is a complex endeavor that requires experience and support from other teachers (Sakamoto & Akita, 2008). Thus, teachers depend on one another
for professional development and consider it is essential to work as a team to improve their practice, to learn from the practice of other teachers, and to reflect on their own experience. In this way, lesson study is embedded in the teacher collaboration where they are collectively "committed to creating and regenerating the craft knowledge of teaching" (Shimahara, 1998, p. 451).

On the other hand, Javanese teachers’ accountability to professional development was externally motivated by bureaucratic requirements. As a result, the teachers alter their practice to meet for the purpose of the fulfilling requirement but the change was superficial (official discourse). There was little continuity between the altered pedagogy and the daily practice (unofficial discourse). The teachers often complained that the bureaucratic evaluation system was inadequate in measuring teachers’ competencies—especially their ability to work with students. Also, while lesson study in Japan is motivated by the teachers’ shared responsibility for student learning, this was not the case in SMP Sari. The cooperation of teachers was for the collective interest of the community but the responsibilities for teaching and professional development were not included. This is evident from the fact that when a teacher did not come in, there was no system to cover his/her absence. The teachers were individually held accountable for teaching and developing their professional competencies (i.e. the certification program). Moreover, since the teachers were in a competitive relationship under the bureaucratic evaluation, there was little incentive for teachers to disclose the issues in their classrooms and share problems with their peers.

In fact, under the familism system, there is a strong force to legitimatize practice by the alignment to bureaucratic codes (the bureaucratic authority) and a tendency to follow the precedents set by social hierarchy. Especially, the teachers owe a collective obligation to protect one another under the patriarchal community, and it was risky to discuss one another’s competence in public. While senior teachers were often criticized for their lack of motivation and efforts to try new teaching approaches, they maintained privileged positions. They were prioritized to go through the certification screening (discussed in Chapter 6) or
held managerial roles such as the subject group leaders. As discussed in Chapter 6, while some of the science teachers felt that they were better than senior teachers, there was no justification to validate this claim. Since the bureaucratic obligation equated teaching to the delivery of the curriculum but not on how to teach (or more specifically how to support student learning), there was no agreed understanding of what constituted good teaching. Thus, there was a lack of shared criteria (internally or externally) in evaluating teaching.

The quotes below suggest that while what Mr. Edi hoped for was actually what was promoted by lesson study—kyozai kenkyu or the study of teaching materials to fit the classroom needs—this was not realized in lesson study in SMP Sari.

*I really do not like lesson study in SMP Sari.*

*It is far from what I want. What I want is a group of subject teachers, really developing a teaching material...or a worksheet, [they] improve these in order for children to understand better. In reality, though, it is not the case.*

While Mr. Edi was interested in developing materials that would facilitate learning by students, this interest was not shared by other teachers. Eventually, Mr. Edi stopped participating in lesson study.

### 9.4 Professional Expertise

#### The challenges in teaching

In Japan, researchers have argued that lesson study has been supporting teachers “a new way to see teaching as a series of activities of inquiry around student learning” (Murata, 2011, p. 5). The holistic approach is reflected in how the focus of learning activities is not only on being able to solve problems but also on building a positive attitude toward learning, as well as on how to induce a deep understanding of the topics. Also, the egalitarian nature of Japanese schooling (Cummings, 2014; Kariya, 2011) motivates teachers to work closely with individual students in order to support their development. Consequently, expertise in teaching involves facilitation such as designing a lesson anticipating student
thinking (Perry & Lewis, 2009). This requires different skills than merely delivering the curriculum. According to a Japanese teacher described in Perry and Lewis (2008):

In order to anticipate what your students will come up [with], you might want to think about what previous knowledge that students could use to solve the problem. In other words, it might be a good idea to make a list of what students have learned at the time of the lesson. Throughout this process, you will be able to have a broader perspective of the lesson [by] including a [curriculum] scope and sequence... (p.380).

In this way, teaching involves working to accommodate students’ levels and needs which requires teachers to employ flexible strategies to support student learning. Indeed, one of the attractions of foreign researchers to lesson study is in the different ways Japanese teachers examine students’ learning. Since Japanese teachers are held accountable for the process of learning, there was a need for teachers to continuously improve their practice. The engagement in lesson study in Japan has been motivated by this shared interest to continuously improving practice based on the understanding that teaching is a complex endeavor (Sakamoto & Akita, 2008).

However, this view is in contrast with that of the teachers in SMP Sari who considered teaching to be generally easy. Compared to the extensive responsibilities of Japanese teachers, the responsibilities of teachers in SMP Sari were clearly defined and limited to presenting the curriculum and evaluating based on the standards set by the UN. Thus, teaching involved regulating the input and output of student learning based on bureaucratic standards but this did not necessarily entail mediating the process. For this purpose, going over the textbooks and drilling exercises in the workbooks was sufficient. This one-way and en masse teaching required little knowledge about students. The majority of teachers admitted they only remembered the names of a few students. Also, the teachers commented that after mastering the subject material, it is relatively easy to teach (Interview, Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). Thus, the teachers rarely prepared for lessons, nor was there any need to accommodate contextual factors that can
support/hinder student learning. In this way, without the construction of ZPD, there was little concern for the process for student learning.

While it is agreed that lesson study supports teachers to enhance their expertise in teaching, the expertise in teaching socially constructed reflecting the professional responsibilities of teachers situated within the institutional culture. What the teachers discussed in the PLDs reflect the underlying assumptions about teachers’ roles and student learning. While foreign researchers saw the benefit of lesson study as the different ways Japanese teachers examine students’ learning, this is merely a reflection of how teachers’ responsibilities were structured around supporting students in Japan. In contrast, Javanese teachers understood their role as curriculum implementer. Thus, the expertise in teaching included supporting the process of learning in Japan while there was less concern for the process of student learning in the Javanese setting. When I showed Japanese textbooks to Mr. Faud, he compared them with Indonesian ones and said that while Japanese teachers use creative textbooks and encourage students to think, Indonesian teachers only thought of covering the materials due to the influence of the UN (Fieldnotes, December 17, 2009).

**Teaching Approaches**

Teachers’ understanding of their roles—whether curriculum implementors as to the case in Java or learning facilitators in Japan—has an impact on teachers’ choice in pedagogy. Although whole class instruction is similarly used in Japan and Java, the Japanese teachers engage with students as active learners and used flexible approaches in facilitating their learning. On the other hand, Javanese teachers consider student learning as the output of teacher instruction; thus, they designed lessons presuming students to be passive learners. This corresponds to a challenge in implementing student-centered pedagogy (SCP) discussed in Chapter 2 and how the differences in sociocultural contexts impacted the way SCP was carried out.
How Japanese teachers design lesson reflects their holistic approach and understanding of their role as providing “learning by doing” experience for students. Based on the assumption that students are active learners, the teachers provide learning opportunity not only to develop academic ability but also to cultivate active attitudes toward learning. The example below by Okubo and Tsuji (2015) describes the difference between teacher-led instruction and a problem-solving approach, and how the latter targets the active engagement of students in learning.

“With ‘instructions centering on teacher-led explanations’ and ‘instruction centering on drills’, it is hard to get children enthusiastic about mathematics and to feel that it is really interesting. On the other hand, ‘instruction based on problem-solving’ aims not only to develop an ‘ability to think’ and ‘ability to solve problems’ but also to cultivate an ‘active attitude toward classroom learning’ and ‘ability to make active use of mathematics.’ The goal is to get children to experience how much fun thinking can be, and through that, nurturing interest in and enthusiasm for an active attitude toward mathematics” (p. 170).

Thus, lessons are designed anticipating supporting students not just in terms of subject learning but also in their motivation and attitude towards learning. Learning is structured in a way that reveals students’ thinking even during whole class instruction and group work. Instead of demonstrating how to solve a problem for students, Japanese teachers first present a problem, then encourage students to explore, even to struggle (Stevenson & Stigler, 1992). Reflecting this, Japanese teachers share an internal language to discuss techniques and approaches to classroom teaching. Some of the examples discussed in Chapter 3 included *kikan-shido* (between desks instruction), *neriage* (polishing students’ ideas through discussion), and *yusaburi* (challenging students’ ideas and thinking) (Clarke, 2013; Lee & Ling, 2013; Takahashi, 2009). These words suggest that there are accumulated knowledge and skills to facilitate students’ understanding that has been shared over time.

Also, rather than simply listening to the teachers, student collaboration is structured in lessons such as the exchange of ideas and peer support in problem-

---

42 The issues in mathematics lessons are discussed here, but these are shared by other subjects.
solving. Japanese students are expected to act responsibly as members of the classroom. Student activities provide experience for students to actively participate and work with one another to develop both cognitive and non-cognitive skills (Tsuneyoshi, 1994). Thus, teachers are interested in how students engage in problem-solving making use of various resources including peer and teacher support. As a result, they focus on how students learn and work with one another rather than on how teachers teach, to ensure high-quality learning of individual students (Lewis, 2016).

On the other hand, the dominance of RPS practice in SMP Sari indicates that the emphasis of teaching for teachers in SMP Sari was on transferring the curriculum for the exam preparation. Thus, the role of students was marked out as the recipients of teacher instruction. Consequently, in PLDs, student learning was discussed as the output of teacher instruction in terms of 1) the product of group work; 2) participation and cooperation in group work; and 3) whether they were enjoying the activities.

Children were having fun and enjoying making nets. There is a need for additional resources such as graph paper (Mrs. Fima, OC2).

The hands-on and interactive activities introduced in lesson study were considered “fun” and “interesting” activities separated from formal subject understanding. Consequently, the quality of student learning was not investigated in relation to the subject understanding. In fact, some of the teachers told me that lesson study was time-consuming and if implemented daily, they would not finish covering materi (Interview, Mrs. Citra, June 21, 2010). Because daily interactions with students were regulated by the IRE sequence and class was managed en masse, the exploratory and individualized approach encouraged in lesson study was evaluated negatively. When Mr. Basuki employed student-centered approaches in OC1, his personalized approaches to students were considered inefficient and criticized by his colleagues (Chapter 8, pp. 195-198).

Thus, while student activities were structured into OC lessons, they were transformed into another bureaucratic protocol and add-on to the existing teaching.
practice. The introduction of student activities did not alter the way teachers worked with students since teachers’ expectation on what role students play in their learning did not change. Although the teachers experimented with student-centered methods in lesson study, it did not change the way teachers interacted with students.

**Reflection on student learning**

Lesson study in Japan has been motivated by a shared interest to exchange narrative, descriptive and subjective reflection of practice and to learn from others to improve the quality of student learning (Maruno & Matsuo, 2008; Sakamoto & Akita, 2008). This is distinguished from generalized technical expertise since the purpose of reflection was to develop “contextualized reasoning” as expertise (Inagaki & M. Sato, 1996). In discussing lessons, different aspects of lessons are examined in relation to how to support students’ learning. Through this process of reflection, Japanese teachers reconstruct the meaning of lesson experience and gain an understanding of how students learn within a particular context of the classroom setting. This helps teachers to visualize implicit and explicit knowledge and skills in pedagogy. Although there are personal and contextual variations, there is a shared interest in embodied expertise (the claim for traditional authority)—the ability to facilitate student learning. In this way, in the institutional setting in Japan, the expertise to embody the pedagogic skills and knowledge motivate teachers to accumulate expertise by learning from specific cases. Kage (2008) describes the importance of accumulated expertise in creating dynamic lessons; it enables the teachers to make instant judgments as they teach and solicit students’ ideas and incorporate their thinking to deepen topic understanding. In this way, lesson study is embedded in the internal accountability of teachers to support student learning based on the shared understanding of the good practice.

In the case of Java, the bureaucratic requirements motivate the teachers to go through the formalities of lesson study but they are not necessarily held accountable for the quality of student learning. Thus, the lesson was evaluated
against externally set protocols rather than shared professional interest. Consequently, the PLDs in SMP Sari were implemented as peer assessment rather than a reflection and an exchange of practice. The practice of teachers was assessed based on the effectiveness of their instruction and student learning was discussed as an output of teacher instruction. In fact, in an interview, Mr. Beni described the PLD as an evaluation of teaching.

[... see (in the cycle of plan-do-see) is evaluation... There we present what we observed of others to evaluate how students learned, whether the learning was good or not. We present things that lack in children due to the lack of mastery of the content by the teacher... or why children were noisy due to the lack of teacher preparation. And from that... [...] If a teacher has sufficient knowledge, materi could be presented well (Mr. Beni, Interview, June 10, 2010).

Note that Mr. Beni described student learning “good or not” as evaluation and attributed to teachers’ mastery of content and the preparation of lessons. This represents how student learning was assessed based on the input-output model (as discussed in Chapter 7). Since the teachers did not intervene in the process of student learning, they were not concerned about how students learned. Thus, the discussions in PLDs concentrated on instruction and evaluation and not how the student learned. Two comments below in the PLDs suggest this.

The teacher should provide motivation to the students in order for them to be more enthusiastic (Mrs. Risma, OC1).

The target was achieved since the students made at least 8 shapes (Mrs. Hani, OC2).

The first remark by Mr. Risma suggests the ineffective teacher instruction evidenced by the lack of enthusiasm by the students. The second quote by Mrs. Hani suggests an evaluation of a lesson based on the target set in the lesson plan. However, discussion on how the student learned or how the teachers worked with students was absent.

Lesson study provides an opportunity for teachers to examine cases because learning is understood as “situated learning” or participation in social activities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). When teaching was understood as a one-way transfer of knowledge en masse (RPS), the focus was on effective transfer. Thus, expertise
in teaching was equated with subject knowledge and clearly differentiated from embodied knowledge/skills. While one of benefit in lesson study is to enhance pedagogic content knowledge (PCK) (Shulman, 1986), the emphasis was more on content knowledge and less on pedagogic knowledge. Moreover, student activities in lesson study were not linked to subject understanding. Thus, the discussion in PLDs centered on the evaluation of lessons based on bureaucratic protocols (efficiency of instruction and lesson study protocols).

The teacher should provide motivation to the students in order for them to be more enthusiastic (Mrs. Risma, OC1).

As the comment above suggests, rather than specifying the reason for the lack of student motivation or suggestions on how to support student, the teacher merely suggested the teacher need to motivate students. Without the construction of ZPDs, teachers’ responsibility did not extend to supporting students’ acquisition; thus, they were not motivated to investigate how students learn. This contrasts with the situation in Japan where teachers need to examine their practice in order to develop strategies to encourage the active involvement of students.

Japanese teachers are able to conduct research on lessons and discuss based on classroom evidence because they share internal accountability to support students. Examining this using the Dowling’s authority scheme, unlike the Javanese setting where teachers were able to employ bureaucratic authority and carry out tasks as protocols, the practice of Japanese teachers is difficult to codify since they are basically responsible for everything; this entails that responsibility for failure lies with the teacher (Dowling, personal communication, December 10, 2018). Thus, the expertise requires embodied skills and knowledge in working with students and the accumulation of such over time. This uncertainty motivates teachers to share the responsibility with students and to exchange their practice. Thus, the internal accountability of Japanese teachers set responsibility to work closely with students which is likely to weaken bureaucratic boundaries and

\[\text{The negative impact of this internal culture which imposes peer pressure on teachers to align their practice with fellow teachers as what restrict teachers’ unique practice has been pointed out (Yufu, 1990).}\]
strengthen their autonomy. Japanese teachers’ need to accommodate students’ needs and levels of understanding necessitates the teachers to reflect and analyze lesson focusing on how to support student learning and to examine lessons with a researcher’s disposition (Fernandez, Cannon, & Chokshi, 2003; Lee, 2015) and develop “the eyes to see children (kodomo wo miru me)” (Lewis 2002, p.12).

9.5 The bureaucratization of lesson study

Table 9.1: Differences in teacher practice between Japan and Java

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Japan</th>
<th>Java</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher cooperation</td>
<td>Teachers participate in school management; regularly discuss the issues relevant to students and their learning activities</td>
<td>Efficient top-down school management; almost no discussion of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson preparation</td>
<td>Lesson plans and teaching materials are prepared to accommodate classroom setting</td>
<td>Almost no preparation in daily lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson design</td>
<td>Lessons are structured to provide a learning experience for students</td>
<td>Lessons are designed specifically to transfer knowledge for the purpose of exam preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive methods</td>
<td>Used to mediate student learning</td>
<td>Used to fulfill bureaucratic obligations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson study</td>
<td>Opportunity to exchange practice and to reflect on own practice</td>
<td>Evaluation of a model teacher and open class lesson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When we examine teaching as context-dependent social practice as discussed in this chapter, we are able to understand why lesson study meant something different to the teachers of SMP Sari from that in Japan. These differences between Japan and Java are presented in Table 9.1. These gaps resulted in the Javanese teachers attributing different significance to lesson study from that in Japan. As discussed using Dowling’s Authority Strategies, teachers’ pedagogic strategies are motivated by the inertial force of maintaining the institutional culture (discussed in Section 7.6). In the case of SMP Sari, there was a strong bureaucratic impetus to close down the practice. Thus, the teachers were motivated to teach and evaluate exactly as authorized by the bureaucratic
protocols. This resulted in a striking similarity among teachers’ practice from the sequence of lessons to didactic methods used in teaching. The dominance of RPS practice in SMP Sari indicated, generally teaching responsibility did not extend to mediate student learning to support acquisition (although both EPS and RPS strategies were generally employed to some extent). As in the case of “good teachers” discussed in Chapter 7, a minority of teachers employed EPS and extended their responsibility to work with students. However, by doing this they needed to go beyond the bureaucratic protocol and to rely on their own expertise (the charismatic mode of authority). Good teachers were motivated by personal experience to construct ZPDs in order to support the learning of individual students. The fact that teachers did not prepare their lessons suggests that professional accountability had little to do with working with students or accommodating to their needs.

As summarized in Table 9.2, the practice of daily lessons and open class lessons differed in many aspects. The inconsistencies between daily practice and open class lessons suggest that lesson study failed to function as professional learning in situ or situated learning. Instead, the implementation of lesson study in SMP Sari was treated as a “special activity” and distinguished from daily teaching. As Mr. Beni said, lesson study helped to push the teachers to perform their best with the presence of observers but this was not possible every day (Interview, June 10, 2010). Although a cycle of plan-do-see was carried out and interactive and hands-on approaches were introduced, there was little change in how the teachers interacted with students to support their learning. Thus, there was a consistency in terms of patterns of social interactions. In Chapter 5, the ethnographic studies were presented to show how the introduction of student-centered pedagogy was mere “rhetoric” and actually masked social stratification. Thus, contrary to its intention, it deprived some students of learning opportunities. In the case of lesson study, students were provided with opportunities for hands-on activities and interactive learning. However, neither teachers nor students were accustomed to such an interactive approach. Thus, these new methods were used to “activate students” but this did not necessarily contribute to deepening student
understanding of subject topics. Thus, it is understandable that the teachers thought interactive methods were time-consuming and inefficient for curriculum acquisition targeted for exam preparation. This is why the teachers commented that they could not do lesson study every day.

Table 9.2: Comparison of Daily Lesson and Open Class in SMP Sari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Daily Lesson</th>
<th>Open Class Lesson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of the curriculum/ Passing the UN</td>
<td>Activating students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Tasks</td>
<td>Listening and exercises</td>
<td>Listening, group work, and presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods</td>
<td>Lecture, rote learning, and problem-solving</td>
<td>Hands-on activities and group work to motivate student’s involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>None or minimal</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Material</td>
<td>Textbook and workbook</td>
<td>Worksheets and teaching aids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher’s Role</td>
<td>Curriculum presentation and evaluation</td>
<td>Providing clear instructions for hands-on activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s Role</td>
<td>Recipient</td>
<td>Some kind of student involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Student Relationship</td>
<td>Competitive</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureaucratic Control</td>
<td>Focus on the output</td>
<td>Student activities are observed and evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>The result of tests</td>
<td>Comments by the observers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Collective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The coexistence of two patterns of practice was not a unique phenomenon in a case of foreign pedagogic transfer; however, it simply followed the pattern of how the teachers had been responding to policy changes and curriculum reform. This is relevant to two layers of discourse discussed in Chapter 6—official discourse and unofficial discourse—and how bureaucratic accountability has a limited impact on unofficial discourse. The first example of such a superficial change was the teachers’ response to a new regulation to create their own lesson plans. Mrs. Risma told me in an interview that since the teachers were no longer allowed to
photocopy lesson plans, these were typed rather than photocopied, but copied nevertheless with almost no modification of the content. In any case, the content of lesson plans did not matter since nobody used lesson plans, as Mr. Umar told me.

The second example of superficial change is how team teaching was implemented with almost no change in teaching practice. To accommodate a new requirement for teachers to teach a minimum of 24 hours per week and to cope with a surplus of teachers in some subjects, some lessons were taught by two teachers. However, it merely meant the presence of two teachers. There was almost no collaboration between the two teachers. Most teachers taught as they had been teaching before. In this way, the practice of teachers was altered to comply with bureaucratically-set standards, but this had little impact on daily practice. This is also evident from how the teachers held cynical attitudes toward the professional certification scheme. The teachers themselves criticized these bureaucratic requirements had no relevance to the ability to work with students.

Similarly, there was little evidence of collaborative learning among teachers. There was an inconsistency between what lesson study promoted and the structure of teachers’ responsibilities. In the survey, all teachers at SMP Sari replied that continuous professional development was needed. However, the fact that the teachers rarely prepared for their lessons suggests that they were not challenged by the obligation to teach the curriculum. Thus, there was no shared interest (or challenge) that drove them for professional learning. Reflecting this, the discussion in the PLDs focused on that particular OC lesson only, and was not linked to daily teaching. Also, there was no discussion on the long-term development of students or on the process of their learning.

Responsibilities for school program were structured within the system of familism; however, this had little relevance to how to teach or responsibility to students. Good cooperation among teachers was protected by the interest in communal harmony under the system of familism. But in terms of teaching, the teachers
were individually evaluated. Even though the teachers maintained close relationships and communicated about personal matters, there was almost no consultation on teaching in the staff room. In regard to professional competencies, the teachers were in a competitive relationship under the bureaucratic evaluation. This suggests, just as the students working in groups were nevertheless individually accountable for learning, the teachers were also individually held accountable for their responsibility for professional development. Thus, lesson study was not implemented based on a shared mission to build a knowledge base unlike the situation reported in Japan. Thus, lesson study was interpreted as a tool for teacher evaluation to hold teachers accountable for their own professional development rather than an opportunity for collaborative learning.

9.6 Conclusion

In this chapter, the recontextualization of lesson study has been examined to provide a theoretical understanding of lesson study and the issues in the transfer of liberal pedagogy. The analysis revealed the practice of teachers in Japan and Java simply reflected professional accountabilities which were shaped by sociocultural settings of the respective countries. The comparison from the Japanese setting suggests that the practice was subsumed into the existing institutional sociocultural settings of SMP Sari.

In Japan, professional accountabilities of teachers centered around educating students. The engagement to lesson study was motivated by the shared interest to provide better learning experiences for students and to facilitate their learning. In contrast, the teachers in SMP Sari were accountable for presenting the curriculum, but not necessarily for facilitating student learning. Due to the difference in pedagogic strategies (Table 7.1), expertise in teaching was interpreted differently among teachers in SMP Sari. As Mrs. Risma recounted in the interview, that there was no difficulty in teaching as long as they knew the content of the curriculum well (Interview, Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). Under this situation, even when a minority of teachers showed an interest in facilitating
students’ learning, this was not shared by their colleagues. Consequently, an interest in how students learn, developing strategies to support their learning, or to embody facilitation skills was not shared.

Thus, lesson study in SMP Sari was implemented as a bureaucratic project where teachers extensively prepared and introduced lesson study protocols. There were indications that the open lesson was conducted as a “demonstration lesson” where teachers evaluated the effectiveness of peers’ instruction. This was well reflected in the content of the PLDs. The teachers assessed the practice of model teachers—the efficiency of their instructions and/or the output of students. The discourse was evaluative and de-contextualized as a general practice because the practice was assessed against bureaucratic standards. There was no comment examining the process of student learning or interpreting the meaning of student learning.

Another important issue in the recontextualization of lesson study is that the choice of pedagogy is influenced not only by official responsibility but also by social responsibility owed to the community. Often this aspect is neglected in research since this may be not directly relevant to professional development or teaching responsibility. However, as discussed in Chapter 6, teachers’ unofficial discourses suggest that social responsibilities to community members constrained their pedagogic choices. Japanese teachers are able to collaborate in professional development since it is based on a shared responsibility to support students’ development. Also, distributed leadership in school management requires teachers to participate in decision-making and make autonomous choices. Lesson study plays a crucial role in developing this understanding, knowledge, and skills to embody expertise in supporting student development. In contrast, in the setting of SMP Sari, lesson study was implemented as school programs and structured under the social hierarchy of the familism system. Under the familism system, the teachers were accountable for fulfilling their bureaucratic and social responsibilities; however, professional development was not part of this collective responsibility and interpreted as an individual responsibility. Due to the
hierarchical nature of the teachers’ community, it was difficult to have an open discussion on teaching.

While the attraction of lesson study was on its collaborative professional learning focusing on student learning, these were socially-constructed within the schooling setting of Japan. In the setting of Java where teaching was understood as the delivery of the curriculum, the interactive approaches proposed by lesson study were regarded as inefficient. The daily teaching of Javanese teachers and their engagement with lesson study could be seen as insufficient in the eyes of Japanese teachers. However, it simply meant that responsibility for how to teach or being accountable for student learning was not part of the responsibility for the majority of teachers in SMP Sari. This shows, a professional development initiative such as lesson study simply reflects organizational structure and culture rather than bringing about changes in them. In these ways, the concept of “recontextualization” enables us to understand the issue in professional development beyond the ability or efforts of individual teachers or insuperable cultural differences. Meaningful practice in one context could be seen as ineffective in another context due to this lack of shared assumptions and principles behind teachers’ practice. By examining teachers’ practice as a meaningful endeavor within a particular sociocultural context, one is able to interpret the effectiveness/ineffectiveness of pedagogic reform initiatives from a new perspective. Rather than evaluating the unchanged practice as failure, it provided understanding that the practice was simply adapted to and its meaning was interpreted against the setting of SMP Sari. It is apparent from the discussion in this chapter that how the teachers negotiated various demands on them had influence over what they did in their classroom teaching and how they responded to professional development opportunities including lesson study.
Chapter 10: Conclusion

10.1 Achievements of the research

This thesis set out to explore what happens when a foreign professional development program, lesson study, was practiced in a Javanese junior high school. Since pedagogic practice is contextually dependent, the meaning of lesson study was socially constructed and reinterpreted against the contexts of the receiving setting. By presenting the case of lesson study implementation in SMP Sari, I examined the issues of “recontextualization” inevitable in the transfer of liberal pedagogy. Since professional accountabilities are negotiated and contested within social relations, the practice such as lesson study transforms as it moves between contexts.

While lesson study was considered effective in improving student performances and as the remedy to shortcomings of schooling in foreign countries’, there is a fundamental issue behind such pedagogic transfer. There is an underlying assumption that when “the best practice” in Japan is transferred to another country, it will generate a similar effect and will improve the quality of schooling. However, as revealed in this thesis, pedagogic transfer always results in the “recontextualization” of practice. Due to the strong bureaucratic accountability, lesson study in SMP Sari was implemented as a bureaucratic project. Under the hierarchical organization structure where the responsibility for teaching and student learning was not shared, lesson study merely provided an opportunity for teachers to experiment with group work and hands-on activities and conduct peer evaluation based on lesson study protocols. This suggests, a professional development initiative such as lesson study merely reflects the accountabilities of teachers and supporting organizational structure rather than bringing about changes in them.

In Chapters 2 to 4, through a review of the literature, issues in pedagogic transfer and recontextualization of liberal pedagogy were discussed. In Chapter 2, it was
discussed how the emergence of international surveys such as OECD’s PISA had a significant impact on the quality of discourse and motivated efforts to transfer best practice in the global education reforms. However, such international comparisons and transfer tend to ignore the complexity of educational practice. This had the effect of standardizing the measurement of education quality globally without attention to the different historical and economic backgrounds. When best practice was transferred from one setting to another, the practice was transformed against the local contextual settings. Since education is a social process, the pedagogic practice cannot stand alone in a vacuum but should be examined with reference to its social context. The examples of transfer of constructivist approaches to developing countries in the 1990s suggest they often fell short of what had been expected. This is because teachers’ interpretations of what constitutes “effective” pedagogy are always open to interpretation against the local contextual settings. Thus, when the best practice is transferred, it is deemed to be “recontextualized” within a given sociocultural setting. For example, active participation by students in student-centered learning was in some cases interpreted as disruptive or as misbehavior. Pedagogic transformation cannot be imposed but adapts itself to the existing sociocultural contexts.

In Chapter 3, I examined the dynamic development of lesson study by exploring how different sociocultural contexts have supported the historical development of lesson study. Lesson Study served the different purposes of practitioners, policymakers, and researchers. Lesson study was built upon teacher traditions in Japan where responsibility to students was perceived as a shared goal of schooling and this encouraged Japanese teachers to continuously engage in professional development. The goal of schooling and the teachers’ role are structured to support the learning experiences of students and this shared accountability lies at the heart of lesson study. Expertise in teaching is relevant to reconstructing the meaning of and relationships in lesson experience which can be shared through reflections on personal, narrative, and context-specific accounts of the lesson (M. Sato, 1996). Thus, teachers understand their professional expertise is “experientially-grounded repertoire constructed by
teachers to deal with evolving events in the classroom” (Shimahara, 2002, p. 25). Such shared understanding, tools, knowledge, visions, and philosophies of Japanese teachers are embedded in the practice of lesson study.

In Chapter 4, the cases of foreign implementation of lesson study—China, the US, Asia, and developing countries—were discussed. The introduction of lesson study was motivated by global trends in curriculum reform and the need to introduce constructive approaches in teaching and learning. Lesson study was imported/exported as an "effective" form of professional development that would lead to improving the quality of schooling by promoting a more student-centered approach in teaching and learning. However, the quality of schooling and the “effectiveness” in improving its quality depends on the local contextual settings. When lesson study was introduced, it did not automatically initiate a shift in student-centered pedagogy or bottom-up initiatives of teachers for collaborative professional development. The actual implementations of lesson study in these countries presented unique variations in “recontextualization” reflecting the local contextual settings. In the case of developing countries, lesson study was introduced as top-down and large-scale professional development programs. In such training, the formalistic aspects of lesson study were emphasized but it often failed to impact the daily practice of teachers. These cases suggest there was a challenge when what was promoted by lesson study contradicted the existing structure of schools and norms of teachers. The studies suggest that pedagogic transformation demands conscious and continuous adaptations which requires a long-term and structural commitment which connects policy and practice.

In Chapter 5, the methodological discussions revealed how data collection and analysis of this study was also “recontextualized” to serve the purpose of this study. Firstly, the ethnographic approach provided the interpretative and context-specific analysis of the practice of teachers that was helpful in examining teaching as a cultural practice that takes place within a context characterized by specific social relations. Secondly, the multi-methods in ethnographic approach brought in accounts of educational experience to present the explicit and implicit impact of
the schooling process. By bringing the multiple perspectives, it captured the complexity of schooling experience within a cultural/social system. Thirdly, the ethnographic approach enabled the analysis of the practice of teachers as “strategies” or ongoing negotiation within a community. Data analysis was guided by aspects of grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967)—open coding, constant comparison, theoretical sampling, theoretical saturation, and memo writing. In distinguishing the practice of teachers, I borrowed the sociological concepts introduced by Bernstein, Vygotsky, and Dowling and recontextualized them to fit my research.

Based on the issues of pedagogic transfer raised in the literature review, the analysis on the recontextualization of lesson study based on empirical data is provided from Chapter 6. In Chapter 6, the organizational structure of SMP Sari and the nature of the teachers’ community was discussed. Under the familism system, teachers held strong accountability as civil servants as well as family members of the patronage system. The teachers were bounded by both “official” obligations to run the school efficiently and “unofficial” obligations to protect the interests of community members. Official responsibilities were structured as priorities in the familism system as “special” school programs. However, in a dual-accountability system, bureaucratic requirements were targeted to satisfy the administrative requirements rather than to bring about change in practice. Thus, in the absence of external pressure, the bureaucratic rules were loosened to protect the community interests of teachers. It was the social norms that actually regulated the daily conduct of teachers. The teachers were protected by the familism system for the efficient school operation where the teachers were rarely held accountable for their individual performances. Responsibility for students was included in neither internal nor external accountability. Moreover, when the teachers pursued a professional interest to enhance their ability to teach or to take up the responsibility to cater for students’ needs, this could be seen as a disruption to social norms and the existing school hierarchy.
In Chapter 7, I have presented the teaching practice of the teachers in SMP Sari and examined them as patterns of cultural practice negotiated within social relations and under the particular contextual setting. The professional responsibility to teach was interpreted as to present the curriculum and prepare students for the national examination. Consequently, teaching accountability was “bureaucratized”: there was strong regulation to standardize the content of teaching (instructional discourse: ID) but more flexibility in how to teach (regulative discourse: RD). As a consequence, the construction of ZPDs—where the process of student learning was mediated by teachers—was considered to be “good teaching” practice but not obligatory. Although a minority of “good teachers” extended their support beyond the bureaucratically-set responsibilities to student learning (EPS), such expertise in supporting students was not institutionally motivated. Thus, the majority of teachers deployed RPS and preferred to use didactic approaches where the teacher-student interactions were regulated by the IRE structure. Using Dowling’s modes of authority strategies, it was revealed how professional expertise was legitimatized by the bureaucratic mode in the setting of SMP Sari. This clarifies how the teachers’ responsibility to teach was treated separately from supporting student learning.

In Chapter 8, the implementation of lesson study in SMP Sari was examined. Lesson study was introduced as a government-sponsored school program and recognized as a bureaucratic responsibility. Thus, it was interpreted as a “special activity” separated from daily priorities in classrooms to present the curriculum for the exam preparation. The implementation of lesson study was guided by lesson study protocols such as a cycle of plan-do-see and the introduction of student activities. In contrast, there were continuities in social relations especially in how support was provided to students (pedagogic strategies). The teachers taught open lessons en masse and there was no evidence of the construction of ZPDs to support the process of student learning. Equally, there was an absence of pedagogic dialogue among teachers. Although teachers attempted to discuss pedagogic issues, the hierarchical organizational structure and the absence of a shared professional interest in teaching made it difficult to establish teacher
dialogue. Since teachers interpret teaching responsibility as a bureaucratic responsibility, it was natural that teachers evaluated peers’ lessons against the bureaucratic standards. Without shared accountability to improve teaching and interest to support student learning, lesson study was interpreted as the implementation of (lesson study) protocols and peer evaluation.

In Chapter 9, I tackled the problem of recontextualization in lesson study by comparing the original setting of lesson study (though dynamic over a period of more than a century and a half)—Japan—from the Javanese setting. Building on the analysis of the empirical data in the Javanese case of lesson study, the interpretation of lesson study was examined. Recontextualization involves how teachers carry out pedagogic practice within a particular sociocultural setting. Apparently, school settings in Japan and Java are quite different.

• Firstly, there were differences in professional roles and responsibilities. In Japan, teachers are accountable for educating students while in the Javanese teachers were mainly responsible for the curriculum delivery.
• Secondly, there were differences in how teachers were expected to support student learning. The egalitarian view of Japanese teachers makes it impossible to ignore individual differences among students’ abilities. In contrast, there was less concern for filling such ability gaps in the Javanese school due to the hierarchical structure in school and society in general.
• Thirdly, there was a difference in the organizational structure and how teachers shared responsibilities for school operation. The work of Japanese teachers is structured under a system of cooperative management. This system not only divides tasks but also requires consultation with one another to run the school. In contrast, the familism system in Java did not require consulting with others since the school was managed in a top-down manner and responsibilities were divided based on the social hierarchy.
• Fourthly, professional development was considered as a collective responsibility in Japan whilst, in the Javanese setting, it was considered as an individual choice.
• Fifthly, what constitutes professional expertise involves embodied skills and knowledge to support student learning in Japan but not in Java.
• Sixthly, designs of student learning reflected the understanding of teachers on student learning as a necessity. Japanese teachers tend to prefer an exploratory approach since they see students as active learners and teachers are the ones who accommodates to how students learn. In the Javanese setting, teachers preferred the didactic approach that enabled the teachers to directly align their practice with the state designated curriculum and standards. Students were expected to work independently without teacher support.
• Seventhly, the meaning of and reflection on student learning was interpreted differently in Japan and Java. Japanese teachers understand student learning as a social experience and see value in reflecting on teaching in order to understand how students learn. There is a shared interest to interpret learning in different classroom settings and to exchange insights and wisdom gained from them. On the other hand, Javanese teachers sought an effective pedagogic approach and exemplary lessons since the purpose of teaching related to the high performance of students. Thus, the Japanese teachers prioritize competence, whilst the Javanese teachers prioritized performance.

Obviously, there are variations among individuals even within the setting of the same school. This was exactly the point of distinguishing the practice of teachers as strategies—something flexible and contested. However, as the dominant practice of RPS suggests, the scope of professional responsibility and how teachers engage with students reflect the institutional setting. When a foreign pedagogic practice was imported/exported, there needs to be a consideration for continuities and discontinuities between the new practice and the contextual settings. When the new pedagogic practice was introduced, recontextualization or negotiation of various accountabilities in a particular contextual setting takes place. This consideration is often beyond the scope of professional development but crucial in order to initiate a change and sustain it.
10.2 Limitation of the research

In order to examine teaching as a social and cultural practice, this study relied on ethnographic approaches for data collection and analysis. Since this approach requires extensive time to be spent on both data collection and data analysis, the empirical data collection was limited to one school. However, the purpose of this study is not on the applicability of findings themselves across contexts but to analyze conceptually how the sociocultural settings shape teachers’ practice and influence their choice of pedagogy. The case of SMP Sari illustrated the nature and mechanisms of recontextualization and indicated how and where we might look in other contexts.

Also, the source of data in describing Japanese contexts in Chapter 9 relied on secondary sources rather than empirical data. Again, the purpose of this review was not to generalize the setting in Japan or practice of Japanese teachers, this was presented simply in order to compare how the differences in contextual settings between Java and Japan could influence teachers’ interpretation of lesson study.

Another limitation is while this study examined interactions between teachers and students in depth, the views, and experience of students were not included. This was due to the political consideration since teachers were sensitive about being evaluated and interviewing students might exacerbate the image of the researcher as an evaluator, which may inhibit free conversation with teachers.

Another limitation was that being a former JICA expert, the researcher’s presence might have influenced the implementation of lesson study or the understanding of teachers toward lesson study. I refrained from making public statements about teaching or lesson study and spoke only when invited to give an opinion. Even then, I refrained from giving negative views or evaluative opinions about the practice of teachers and kept to general comments about Japanese schools or my own previous experience. Considering that my research question focused
more on the continuation from daily practice and professional development, and
employed multiple ways to examine the institutional setting of SMP Sari, the
impact on my presence on the empirical data was kept to a minimum.

10.3 Implications of the research

Implications for Policy and Practice

There are mainly three implications from examining the recontextualization of
lesson study in the study and one proposal for future practice resulting from this
study.

Firstly, using the ethnographic approach, this study examined lesson study
provided interpretations of pedagogic practice as patterns of cultural practice
shaped by social relations within the institution. This enabled me to examine the
problems in the pedagogic transfer not as merely success/failures but as the gaps
in contextual settings as well as the gaps in policy and practice. Using the
sociological conceptual frameworks, the study provided an analysis of how
teachers interpret the policy (lesson study) in practice. Although the teachers in
SMP Sari acknowledged that lesson study could be a beneficial approach, they
also acknowledged that this could not be done every day. Under the school
setting with strong bureaucratic accountability, there was little motivation for
teachers to support the process of student learning. Moreover, due to the
hierarchical school structure and society general, the differences in student
performance was understood to be given and teachers were not held accountable
for reducing the ability gaps. The fact that the teachers rarely prepared for their
lessons, or consulted one another on the issues in teaching suggests that the
teachers faced little difficulty in daily teaching; thus, there was little motivation for
them to engage in “professional learning.” When “professional responsibilities”
had little relevance to accountability to students, lesson study was interpreted as a
special activity and implemented as bureaucratic protocols. This means that, while
lesson study was intended to support the continuous professional learning of
teachers, the structure of work and accountability of teachers in SMP Sari was not
conducive to such collaborative learning. This suggests that policymakers (both local and international) and school leaders need to take measures to fill the gaps between policy and practice and by examining ways to embed professional learning in teachers’ daily work lives. The examples of lesson study implementation abroad suggest that, even when teachers implemented the new practice, it resulted in a temporary change when it was not supported by shared professional interest or collaborative inquiry of teachers.

Secondly, this study examined the practice of teachers not as individual competencies and choices, but as strategies within the community. Often the failures of professional development were attributed to individual teachers’ competence including lack of motivation and the knowledge/skills that they possess. However, this study suggested that teachers’ choice of pedagogy was influenced by the organizational setting. Moreover, it is constantly contested and negotiated as represented in coping and in pedagogic strategies discussed in Chapter 6 and 7. Especially, in developing countries, people tend to depend their lives on a small and closed community where there is a strong force to maintain the social hierarchy. This puts pressure to conform to the social norms, which could work against professional accountability. In the situation of SMP Sari, in addition to official bureaucratic responsibilities, teachers were constrained by “unofficial” responsibilities to maintain the community harmony and to reinforce the existing social hierarchy in order to protect their “family.” Thus, situating professional development within the schooling system and to structure it within teachers’ daily routine is essential. If we focus only on “official” responsibility concerning teaching and school management, these constraints may not be visible. Responsibility for professional development constitutes merely one of the multiple and conflicting accountabilities. Especially under the global trend of education reform, schools, teachers, and students worldwide are facing increasing bureaucratic control and performance accountability. Such an emphasis on achievements and the efficiency of the schooling system might end up undermining the process of learning and could result in depriving students of opportunities for meaningful learning experiences.
Thirdly, this study addressed how bureaucratic control on teachers’ practice could result in the “de-professionalization” of teaching and professional development. This has become a major issue around the world. Even in Japan, the practice of lesson study is corroding because the schools implement it as the fulfillment of a requirement rather than it being based on a shared professional mission (M. Sato, 2009b, 2015; Yufu, 2007). Therefore, the bureaucratization of lesson study is not a unique phenomenon in SMP Sari but policymakers and practitioners in other parts of the world share similar issues. In the globalized world, rather than comparing different educational systems by countries, it may be more useful to learn from the similarities/differences across the regional settings or even across school settings. As discussed in the case of SMP Sari, while teachers could alter the structure of lessons, the social interactions between teachers and students were more coherent and difficult to change.

In sum, a key problem is a way in which the role of the teacher is constituted institutionally worked to prioritize bureaucratic rather than pedagogic responsibilities. Thus, such responsibility to support student learning should be embedded in the school structure, and in a way, for teachers to collectively share the responsibility for student learning and also to support one another for professional development. One way to address this issue is to set up a research school in which: 1) teachers’ work is structured around supporting the process of student learning; 2) the school is managed under distributed leadership and a collaborative culture is promoted based on open professional dialogue; 3) professional development is organized as a professional learning community and embraces bottom-up and process-oriented professional development. In fact, such bottom-up initiatives of lesson study outside of the government program are growing in Indonesia. An interest in the Lesson Study Club (LSC) in Indonesia was established as local groups of teachers who are personally committed to improving classroom teaching and learning to provide necessary care to students (Kusanagi, 2019; Suzuki, 2016). The LSC members commented that they experienced the positive learning experience and exposed to the joy of being
teachers by witnessing changes in students. One teacher admitted the LSC experience encouraged her to change her assumptions about students’ abilities as fixed and wanted to search for ways to support their learning (Kusanagi, 2019).

**Implications for Future Research**

The work presented in this thesis could be extended and developed in a number of ways, both in relation to the school setting I have explored and new and different settings.

Firstly, it would be interesting to explore the issue in “recontextualization” of pedagogic transfer in another setting to explore continuities and discontinuities with the Javanese case. It is especially useful to analyze sociologically using the three conceptual frameworks I introduced in this thesis that I borrowed and recontextualized: Vygotsky, Bernstein, and Dowling.

Secondly, I could focus more on individual differences in pedagogic practice due to the difference in the pedagogic and authority strategies. One of the issues raised in my discussion on the difference in pedagogic strategy was how “good teachers” both mentioned outside-school experience as contributing to their taking up the role of educators. This could be explored in more detail to understand the outside of school factors and how more long-term professional development impacted the practice of teachers.

Thirdly, examining the more sustainable case of lesson study would reveal how to work with the issue of recontextualization. Based on the discussion so far, while lesson study was “borrowed” as what Dowling and Burke (2012) described as “push” strategy where the practice was externally planted whereas what is needed is “fetch” strategy. When the aim of professional development is on altering the existing pedagogic practice, this may face obstacles in transferring of policy into practice. However, efforts should be concentrated on how to facilitate the import of new policy by recognizing the nature of the receiving context. In the fetch strategy, the aim is how to organize school activities to prioritize professional
development as a primary goal. By aligning teachers’ practice with the goal of professional development, there is a possibility for the positive recontextualization of lesson study.

As I discussed, even in cross-cultural contexts or within the same setting, cases could be similar/dissimilar. How to embed meaningful professional learning within the web of complex and demanding accountabilities placed on teachers could provide useful insights for policymakers, researchers, and practitioners.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: Questions in Teacher Questionnaire

[Gender]

[Subject that you teach]

[Years of experience in teaching]

Q1. When you finished your study, was it your first choice to be a teacher?
Q2. Can you explain the reason why you became a teacher?
Q3. In your opinion, what are the characteristics of a good teacher?
Q4. In your school, is there an example of good teacher who possess the characteristics stated in the question number 3?
Q5. In your opinion, what is bad teacher like?
Q6. What is most important for you as a teacher? Please choose 3 characteristics which are most important.
   - a teacher who has appropriate subject knowledge
   - a teacher who prepares well before the class
   - teacher who has pedagogical knowledge to approach SMP student
   - a teacher who knows the individual characteristics of the students
   - a teacher who can be a good moral example for the students
   - a teacher who makes students think
   - a teacher who is good religiously
   - a teacher who can discipline students
   - a teacher who can work well with other teachers
   - a teacher provides correct answer for the students
   - a teacher who is good at preparing government requirement papers (pankat, certification, etc).
   - a teacher who has good educational background (Master, PhD)
   - a teacher who can communicate well with parents
   - others (please specify)
Q7. Do you feel you need professional development?
Q8. How many times have you become a model teacher in lesson study?
Q9. How many times you have participated LSBS lesson study as an observer?
Q10. In the reflections that you joined, what are the things that you learned?
Q11. How many times have you participated lesson study at MGMP?
Q12. What are the strengths or benefits of lesson study in your opinion?
Q13. What are the weaknesses of lesson study in your opinion?
Q14. Do you think lesson study is an effective approach for professional development of teachers? Please explain why.
Q15. Which ones are most important in your classroom? Please choose three that are most important for you.
Q16. When students cannot solve problems, what are the problems in your view? Please check [   ] all that apply.
[   ] they do not try hard
[   ] they lack proper instruction by teacher
[   ] they are lazy
[   ] they have behavioral problems
[   ] they lack in their intellectual ability
[   ] they are from lower economic background
[   ] their parents do not help children
[   ] other (please specify)
Q17. Which problems do you face in your classroom? Please check [   ] all that apply.
[   ] there are some students who cannot solve the problems
[   ] there are students who do not understand my explanation
[   ] students are too shy to speak up their opinion or answer
[   ] there are some students who cannot pay attention to the teachers
[   ] students cannot work well with other students
[   ] students do not respect teacher
[   ] there are too many materials to cover and there is little time
[   ] teachers do not have enough time for preparation
[   ] there are too many students in my classroom and difficult to manage them
[   ] other (please specify)
Appendix 2: Semi-structured Interview Guide

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. Is there any difficulty in teaching daily lesson?
3. Who do you consult with when there is any issue in teaching?
4. How do you work with other subject teachers?
5. What is your experience of lesson study? (Experience as a model teacher, observer, coordinator, etc.)
6. Have you conducted an open class lesson? Can you describe the experience?
7. What is your understanding of lesson study? What is lesson study to you?
8. What kind of things did you learn in the PLDs? What were the comments you received?
9. What are the positive things about lesson study?
10. Where are difficulties and challenges in lesson study?
11. Do you think lesson study is suitable for the Indonesian school culture?