Published by English Department Faculty of Languages and Arts of Universitas Negeri Padang in collaboration with Indonesian English Teachers Association (IETA)

Vol.15, No.2, 2021, Page 210-221

Encountering Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers' Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLC) Experience in Microteaching Class

Titik Temu Pengalaman Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLC) Calon Guru dan Dosen di Kelas Microteaching

Yuli Tiarina¹, Harwati Hashim², Yenni Rozimela¹, Aryuliva Adnan¹

¹Universitas Negeri Padang ²Universitas Kebangsaan Malaysia E-mail: yuli.tiarina@fbs.unp.ac.id

Permalink: http://dx.doi.org/10.24036/ld.v15i2.115230
Submitted: 16-11-2021

Accepted: 11-12-2021

DOI: 10.24036/ld.v15i2.115230

Published: 13-12-2021

Abstract

Considering the effectiveness of Lesson Study as a continue teacher development, this study was conducted to explore prospective teachers' and lecturers' experience in implementing Lesson Study in Microteaching class. Quantitative research approach was employed where a total of 49 prospective teachers and 2 Microteaching lecturers at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang were involved as the participants. The data were gathered through questionnaires with 1-5 Likert scales consisting of four sessions. The results indicate that prospective teachers and lecturers have positive experience in implementing lesson study for learning community with the mean score 3.75 and 4.08 out of 5. It is supported by the Mann Whitney U test where the value with 1-tailed (.358) was bigger than level of probability α (0.05). They perceived that LSLC promotes to improve the ability of collaboration between members of the learning community and facilitates the process of teaching and learning in Microteaching classes in preparing teaching material and teaching strategies for teaching in microteaching class. Therefore, it is suggested that LSLC must be implemented continuously to improve teachers' pedagogical competency and collaboration skills.

Keywords: Microteaching, Lesson Study for Learning Community, EFL

Abstrak

Mengingat efektivitas Lesson Study sebagai pengembangan guru yang berkelanjutan, penelitian ini dilakukan untuk menggali pengalaman calon guru dan dosen dalam menerapkan Lesson Study di kelas Microteaching. Pendekatan penelitian kuantitatif ini melibatkan 49 calon guru dan 2 dosen Microteaching di Jurusan Bahasa Inggris Universitas Negeri Padang. Data dikumpulkan melalui kuesioner dengan skala Likert 1-5 yang terdiri dari empat sesi. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa calon guru dan dosen memiliki pengalaman positif dalam melaksanakan Lesson Study for Learning Community dengan nilai rata-rata 3,75 dan 4,08 dari skor 5. Hal ini didukung oleh uji Mann Whitney U dimana nilai 1-tailed (0,358) adalah lebih besar dari tingkat



probabilitas (0,05). Menurut calon guru dan dosen, LSLC dapat meningkatkan kemampuan kolaborasi antara anggota komunitas belajar dan memfasilitasi proses belajar mengajar di kelas Microteaching dalam mempersiapkan bahan ajar dan strategi pengajaran untuk mengajar di kelas microteaching. Oleh karena itu, disarankan agar LSLC dilaksanakan secara berkelanjutan untuk meningkatkan kompetensi pedagogik dan keterampilan kolaborasi guru.

Kata Kunci: Microteaching, Lesson Study for Learning Community, EFL

INTRODUCTION

Microteaching helps prospective teachers master specific skills, increase competence, find their own weaknesses and strengths, and feel like a real teacher (Godek, 2016). self-confidence, improve teaching performance in class, and develop classroom management skills (TomaN, Çimer, & Cimer, 2014; Arsal, 2015; Celik, 2019; Wangchuk, 2019). The importance of microteaching has encouraged education practitioners to apply various approaches, methods, or learning strategies such as Concept Mastery Routine (Lindell, 2013), blended learning (Albhnsawy & Aliweh, 2016), reflective journal (Tiarina & Rozimela, 2017), and social networks (Kelleci, Kulaksiz, & Pala, 2018). However, all of the above research focuses on individual students. In other words, there is no emphasis on collaborative learning. In fact, one of the demands of the 21st-century curriculum in the era of revolution 4.0 is that students must have the ability to work together (to collaborate).

Besides the importance of collaboration, efforts to increase competence are not something temporary but something that is continuously planned and should become a culture (Lieberman & Woods, 2003). One of the efforts that can make prospective teachers accustomed to always improving their competence and collaborating is through *Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLC)*. Moquin (2019) found that Lesson Study was the best form of professional development experienced in America and Europe. *Lesson study* is a model of coaching teachers to always learn their own classes or other teachers' classes. They collaboratively plan lessons, make observations and reflect on what they observe. Padang State University, starting this year, has launched a Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLC) in the Microteaching course.

There have been many studies regarding the benefits and the challenges, and the effectiveness of lesson studies to improve the competency of teachers or prospective teachers. Ogegbo, Geigher, & Salagram (2019) point out that collaboration in lesson study is beneficial to upgrade teachers' techniques, organizing abilities, self-adequacy and inspirational perspective toward instruction. Lesson Study provides teachers to explore students' learning in-depth (Wahman, Peplow, Kumar, & Refaei, 2020). However, the absence of time, the absence of institutional help, and inadequate instructional materials represent obstacles in implementing lesson study (Moquin, 2019; Ogegbo, Geigher, & Salagram, 2019). Meanwhile, a research review conducted by Kanellopoulou & Darra (2019) shows that from 2008 - 2018 there were 29 articles, published by ERIC, which examined the effectiveness of Lesson Study on improving the performance of teachers or prospective teachers. Judging from the scientific clump, the average lesson study is applied in science, no published research has yet been implemented in learning English as a foreign language (EFL).

From the above explanation about the importance of microteaching, the effectiveness of lesson study and the limitations of existing research, and the new implementation of Lesson Study at UNP, there is an urgency to conduct research on

the application of Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLC). In addition, how students, prospective teachers and teachers perceive Lesson Study is vital to figure out. Jhang (2019) approves that teachers' participation in Lesson Study is positively influenced by their attitudes. In order to have Lesson study in accordance with Indonesian identity or culture, it is necessary to develop a model of Lesson Study for Learning Community (LSLSC) conducted in Microteaching class. Since developing a model needs preliminary research, it is urgent to conduct preliminary research about prospective teachers' and lecturers' experience in implementing LSLC in Microteaching class. What make this study is different from other studies is that this study not only describes the experience but also compares the experience of prospective teachers and lecturers.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Originated from Japan, Lesson study has been well-known overseas. Lesson study is additionally a specific activity research that builds understudies' triumphs and has pragmatic yield with the point of empowering educators to build up their own proficient turn of events. Also, it is in-class research that empowers educators to look through instructing and learning in genuine class setting. Lesson study is additionally a cycle that incorporates revealed works for example how instructors plan their exercises, clarify and experience their educating, and also what they realize and instruct in the class (Ono & Ferreira, 2010). Lesson study rehearses, which are called as hands on preparing as far as instructors' expert improvement, are round exploration measures that redesign educating and learning periods, subsequently being investigated the restrictions of the exercise by 4 or 6 educators to succeed the points of the exercise. Moreover, lesson study is self-approved and majority rule measure. All members into the exercise concentrate all together when they choose, and contribute themselves similarly (Stepanek, Appel, Leong, Mangan, & Mitchell, 2007).

There have been techniques in microteaching in the 21st century. First, microteaching through blended learning has been done by Albhnsawy & Aliweh (2016). They combine Facebook with face-to-face. The lecturer uploads the material on the Facebook group. Students study at home, and prepare lesson materials to be presented in the face-to-face session in the class. After doing teaching practice, the student is asked to reflect on his teaching. Lecturers and other students act as observers who provide feedback. Second, Shaw (2017) initiated microteaching learning by using video recordings. The student practices (performs) teaching in the class. His performance is recorded. Other students and lecturers provide feedback. At the student's house, he watches the video recording and make a reflection about his learning. Third, Kaymakamoglu & Ersel (2019) offer a Microteaching learning model. The steps are that students are asked to record themselves practicing teaching at home. Then, the student watches the videotape. Then he writes a self-report. In class, he does practice teaching again. Lecturers and other students who act as observers provide feedback. Then he does practice teaching at the next meeting on the same topic.

The three techniques have in common, namely doing teaching practice, being given feedback and making a reflection (self-report). The drawback of these techniques is that they prepare lesson plans individually, and when giving feedback, the observer focuses the assessment on the success of the teaching components. Assessment aimed directly at the student (model teacher) can reduce self-confidence and lead the student's reluctance to perform due to the negative comment (Kaymakamoglu & Ersel, 2019). Therefore, we need a model that trains prospective teachers to make collaborative

preparations and makes the students not feel commented on (embarrassed) in the feedback session.

Basically, lesson study has three phases, namely plan (jointly designing Lesson Study), do (implementation and observation), and see (reflection and redesign of the lesson plan) (Utami, Mashuri, & Nafi'ah, 2016). At the plan stage, teachers of the same subject through constructive dialogue and freely exchange views work together voluntarily to make detailed lesson plans that will be taught in class (Stepanek, Appel, Leong, Turner Mangan, & Mitchell, 2007). With different experiences, teachers can create rich and structured lesson plans (Espinosa, Datukan, & Butron, 2018). At this stage also, the technique and media are bolted in detail. Teachers also made predictions about the reactions of students and what the teachers would do (Dania, Voutsina, & Moumouri, 2013). Meanwhile, observation is the stage where one of the teachers (model teachers) teaches in class according to the lesson plan that has been designed together (Stepanek, Appel, Leong, Turner Mangan, & Mitchell, 2007). Other teachers (observers) monitor whether the learning objectives are achieved, whether students learn. The focus of observation is students, not teachers. In the last stage, namely reflection, the observer provides feedback on learning. Observers must mention facts (evidenced by name, photo or video) about how students learn. Observation and reflection are the main components contributing to improving teaching (Lewis & Tsuchida, 1998).

What is interesting about this lesson study, and what distinguishes it from the teaching stage in Microteaching, is the collaboration of teachers to make lesson studies, and in reflection, (either individual reflection or from observer) the focus of observation is the student who is learning, not the teacher who is teaching. By targeting students who follow lessons well, who are not concentrated, pensive, playful or not active in discussions, indirectly observing the teaching process and events of the teacher.

METHODS

This study employed descriptive method with quantitative approach. A total of 49 prospective teachers and 2 Microteaching lecturers at English Department of Universitas Negeri Padang were selected to become the participants. The participants were invited to fill out the questionnaire with Likert scale. The questions in the questionnaire were divided into three sections based on the stages in the lesson study and the benefits of lesson study. Plan section consisted of 11; observation (do) consisted of 14; reflection (see) consisted of 9, and the benefits consisted of 20 items. There were five criteria for each item, namely strongly agree (5 points), agree (4 points), neutral (3 points), disagree (2 points), and strongly disagree (1 point). The researcher checked the validity and reliability of the instrument. The instrument was validated by one of the lecturers at Padang State University who was the Lesson Study Advisor at UNP. Based on the content validity test, the instrument was declared fit for use. Since the data were in scale form, the Cronbach Alpha with the Social Science Statistical Package (SPSS) was used to determine its reliability. After being conducted 3 individual-test, the coefficient was 0.79. It means that the instrument had good reliability. Due to the pandemic condition where researchers could not distribute questionnaires directly (face to face), researchers made a questionnaire using the google form with the link http://forms.gle/nGw5kDKaqJud26ux5. The experience of the students in using Lesson Study were categorized into negative, moderate and positive. The data were analyzed descriptively. Meanwhile, to compare prospective teachers' and lecturers' experience, Mann Whitney U test was used with SPSS 20.

Table 1 Experience Interpretation

Mean range	Category	Interpretation
1.00 - 2.33	Negative	Generates negative experience
2.34 - 3.67	Moderate	Generates moderate experience
3.68 - 5.00	Positive	Generates positive experience

Taken from (Rahman, N. H. A., Ismail, H. N. & Khalifah, Z. 2019)

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The data of lectures' experience in implementing lesson study were taken from the questionnaire. The tables show the lectures' experience based on the means and standard deviation per stage: plan, do (observation), reflection (see), and the benefits of lesson study.

Table 2. Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers' Experience in Plan Stage

-		ers' Experience in Plan					
Statements		Prospective			Lecturers		
		Teacher	S				
	n:	Mean	SD	n:	mean	SD	
	49			2			
1. I was free to express my opinion when		3.7	0.84		4.5	0.7	
designing learning.							
2. I did an interactive dialogue in		3.7	0.7		4.5	0.7	
expressing an opinion when making							
lesson design.							
3. The members of learning community		4.1	1		4.5	0.7	
and I exchanged views when making							
lesson design.							
4. I collaborated voluntarily to develop		3.98	0.75		4	0	
lesson design.							
5. At the end I applied learning techniques		3.22	0.98		2	0	
according to my own wishes.							
6. At the end I determined learning		4	0.8		4	0	
techniques based on input obtained							
from friends and lecturers.							
7. At the end I developed learning		3.04	0.79		2	0	
materials according to my own wishes.							
8. At the end I decided learning materials		3.8	0.8		4	0	
based on input obtained from friends							
and lecturers.							
9. I made predictions and reactions of		4	0.7		4	0	
students and teacher actions.							
10. I imagined one of the students who		3.8	0.79		4	0	
had problems in learning when I started							
to create lesson design.							
11. After completing the learning		4	0.76		4	0	
design, I imagined the student could							
understand the material.							
Total		3.75	0.8		3.8	0.3	

Table 2 above indicates the participants experienced plan stage of Lesson study in Microteachig positively. Plan stage deals with the planning process by making Lesson Design with learning community members. The average Mean Scores (M) of the prospective teachers' and lecturers' experience in the plan stage were 3.75 and 3.8 that categorized as positive level. Statement number three gets the highest score by prospective teachers and lecturers. Prospective teachers and lectures give the same point to statement number 6, 9, and 11. Statement numbers 5 and 7 get the lowest scores.

Next, the prospective teachers and lecturers also show positive experience in observation stage of lesson study. They stated that they focused on the learning objective. The table 3 reports the mean and standard deviations of the scores gained.

Table 3. Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers' Experience in Observation (Do) Stage

Statements	Table 3. Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers				rvatio	on (Do)	Stage	
n: Hean SD n: Hean SD n: Hean SD	Statements		-			Lecturers		
12. I arrived earlier before the observation process began. 13. I prepared a special observation notebook (observation sheet) and pen. 14. I silent my cell phone before starting the observation to focus on the observation process. 15. I paid attention to whether the learning objectives are achieved. 16. I paid attention to whether the students active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students assistive during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model assistive servation of the students.		Teachers						
process began. 13. I prepared a special observation notebook (observation sheet) and pen. 14. I silent my cell phone before starting the observation to focus on the observation process. 15. I paid attention to whether the learning objectives are achieved. 16. I paid attention to whether the students active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students 2.7 1.2 3.5 2.1 or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.			mean	SD		mean	SD	
notebook (observation sheet) and pen. 14. I silent my cell phone before starting the observation to focus on the observation process. 15. I paid attention to whether the learning objectives are achieved. 16. I paid attention to whether the students active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I as 3.8 3.1 4.5 0.7 observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students as 3.8 1.04 1.5 0.7 during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model 3.39 0.84 3.5 2.1 teacher when teaching students.			3.84	0.82		4.5	0.7	
the observation to focus on the observation process. 15. I paid attention to whether the learning objectives are achieved. 16. I paid attention to whether the students active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I 3.8 3.1 4.5 0.7 observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students as 3.8 1.04 1.5 0.7 during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model 3.39 0.84 3.5 2.1 teacher when teaching students.			4.1	0,9		4	0	
objectives are achieved. 16. I paid attention to whether the students active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.	the observation to focus on the		4	1.1		5	0	
active in the class by asking questions and responding teacher. 17. I paid attention to all students in turn. 18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I 3.8 3.1 4.5 0.7 observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.			4	1		4	0	
18. I only focused on one or two students or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I 3.8 3.1 4.5 0.7 observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students 3.8 1.04 1.5 0.7 during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model 3.39 0.84 3.5 2.1 teacher when teaching students.	active in the class by asking questions		4.29	0.3		3.5	2.1	
or one group. 19. I noted the name of the student I 3.8 3.1 4.5 0.7 observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students 3.8 1.04 1.5 0.7 during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.	17. I paid attention to all students in turn.		3.9	0.9		4.5	0.7	
observed. 20. I observed students using assistive devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.			2.7	1.2		3.5	2.1	
devices (cell phone cameras or other recording devices). 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.			3.8	3.1		4.5	0.7	
 21. I recorded the time students made a reaction. 22. I positioned myself beside or behind the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students. 3.71 0.94 4 1.4 0.9 3 2.8 1.04 1.5 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7	devices (cell phone cameras or other		3.22	1.16		4.5	0.7	
the student. 23. I did not talk directly with students during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students.	21. I recorded the time students made a		3.71	0.94		4	1.4	
during the observation. 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students. 3.31 0.82 3.5 2.1 3.5 2.1 3.5 2.1 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5 3.5			4	0.9		3	2.8	
 24. I did not pay more attention to how the model teacher teaches. 25. I noted all the actions of the model teacher when teaching students. 3.31 0.82 3.5 2.1 3.5 2.1 3.5 2.1 			3.8	1.04		1.5	0.7	
25. I noted all the actions of the model 3.39 0.84 3.5 2.1 teacher when teaching students.	24. I did not pay more attention to how the		3.31	0.82		3.5	2.1	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	25. I noted all the actions of the model		3.39	0.84		3.5	2.1	
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		3.72	0.96		4.2	0.7	

Observation (do) stage dealing with the observation process (before and during) was intended to see how the students learn and also the focus of this process. The average Mean Score of the respondents' experience in Observation stage are 3,72 and 4.2 which are categorized as positive. The highest statement score in Observation stage is statement number 16 for prospective teachers. The prospective teachers focused on the student' activeness. Meanwhile, statement number 16 was considered moderate from the lecturers' experience. From statements number 18, 20 and 24, it is indicated that the participants did not focus on one individual or group. They more focused on all students in turn. Whereas in lesson study, the observer should focus on one individual or group that has low motivation or highest motivation in the class. In other words, the observer should focus on students whether they learn or not. The lowest mean from lecturers' side was statement number 23 with 1.5. It means that during the observation the lectures talked to the students. Lecturers' response on statement 22 is also contrast to LSLSC observation rules. The observer should not talk to the students; they should stand behind or beside the students; it may disturb students' and teachers model concentration. The response to statement 24 was categorized moderate. The observers should have paid much attention to students instead of a teacher model. From 12, 20, and 21, it can be seen that the lectures are discipline and equipped with the facility to record the process.

Moreover, the prospective teachers' and lecturers' responses to each item of experiencing reflection (see) stage are in different level. The mean score from prospective teachers was moderate (3.62) while the mean score from lecturers was positive (4.2). Compared to the means score from plan and observation stages from prospective teachers, this is the lowest. Table 4 below shows the mean score of each statement.

Table 4. Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers' Experience in Reflection (See) Stage

Statements		Prospective Teachers			Lecturers		
	n: 49	mean	SD	n: 2	mean	SD	
26. I mentioned the name of the student I've observed.		3.63	0.88		5	0	
27. I showed the evidence of students I observed by showing photos or videos.		3.1	8.9		4.5	0.7	
28. The comment I made focuses on the activities of the students I observed.		3.74	0.8		5	0	
29. The comment I made focuses on how the model teacher teaches.		3.3	0.8		3.5	2.1	
30. I made comments based on my theories and opinions as observers.		3.86	0.76		3	2.1	
31. I made comments based on the results of previous observations.		3.7	1		4.5	0.7	
32. I made comments in the form of a message that was far from "patronizing".		3.82	0.97		4	0	

33. I stated the reasons WHY students' reactions could be like that (interpretation) and HOW was the solution (suggestions for future improvement).	3.69	0.82	4	0
34. I asked and explained the lessons that could be learned on that day.	3.7	0.8	4.5	0.7
Total	3.62	0.86	4.2	0.7

The results from prospective teachers' and lecturers' responses show the positive experience toward the implementing the third stage in lesson study for learning community. The means of all statements are at different level. From prospective teachers, the highest mean was statement number 30 with 3.86, and the lowest was statement number 27 with 3.1. This finding has relation to the previous stage. The prospective teachers do not show the evidence of the students they observed because they did not record the teaching learning process with recording devices.

Finally, the mean score of the benefits of LSLC is presented in table 5 below.

Table 5. Prospective Teachers' and Lecturers' Experience about the benefits of Lesson Study

Statements		Prospective Teachers		Lecturers		·s
	n: 49	mean	SD	n: 2	mean	SD
35. The application of Lesson Study facilitates the process of teaching and learning in microteaching classes.		4.2	0.9		4.5	0.7
36. When I introduced Lesson Study to the students, I said that the main part of Lesson Study is lesson design.		3.6	0.8		4.5	0.7
37. I really understand what Lesson Study is and the stages in it.		3.6	0.8		4	0
38. With Lesson Study, it is easy for me to apply the components of microteaching.		3.8	0.7		4	0
39. Learning community helps me improve my ability to work collaboratively (work in teams).		4	0.9		4	0
40. Learning community is a place to exchange ideas in developing lesson design with other learning community members.		4.1	0.9		4.5	0.7
41. I really need further guidance from the lecturer to make lesson design.		4.3	0.9		4.5	0.7
42. The information of a learning community really helped me in preparing lesson design.		4.1	0.8		4.5	0.7
43. With the lesson design, I found it helpful to anticipate students' responses		4.12	0.78		4.5	0.7

to teaching and learning in				
microteaching class.				
44. Lesson design really helped me in	4.18	0.83	4.5	0.7
preparing teaching material for				
teaching in microteaching class.				
45. With Lesson Study it is easy for me	4.1	0.8	4	0
and members of the learning				
community to arrange the stages of				
learning so that they are arranged				
systematically.				
46. The process of making lesson design	4.9	0.3	4	0
helped me to improve the ability of				
collaboration between members of the				
learning community.				
47. Lesson design increase my self-	3.8	0.8	4.5	0.7
confidence.				
48. It is easy for me in preparing the	4.02	0.83	4.5	0.7
learning phase, providing material, and				
what the model teacher said.				
49. The difficulty I felt when	3.39	0.98	3.1	2.1
implementing lesson study was				
preparing lesson design with members				
of the learning community.				
50. The easiest time in implementing	3.5	0.8	3	1.4
lesson study is when preparing lesson				
design with members of the learning				
community.				
51. I could apply lesson design in real	3.9	0.8	3	1.4
teaching.				
52. Preparation of lesson design can help	4	0.7	4	0
me in the teaching and learning process				
while in real teaching.				
53. I had difficulty if I prepare lesson	3.06	1.05	2	0
design during real teaching.				
54. Lesson design is very useful and	4	0.8	5	0
helpful in preparing for my teaching				
and learning during real teaching.				
Total	3.9	0.8	4.1	0.6

To compare the experience between prospective teachers and lecturers, the Mann Whitney U test statistic formula was done.

Ranks

	Groups	N	Mean	Sum of				
			Rank	Ranks				
C	1.00	49	25.85	1266.50				
Score of Experience	lecturers	2	29.75	59.50				
Experience	Total	51						

The hypothesis that is being tested in null hypothesis (Ho) versus alternative Hypothesis (Ha). Null hypothesis says there is no different between prospective teachers' experience and lecturers' experience in implementing lesson study in Microteaching class. Whereas alternative hypothesis says there is different between prospective teachers' experience and lecturers' experience in implementing lesson study in Microteaching class. The hypothesis was tested by using Mann Whitney U test. Based on the U test, it was found that the t table with 1-tailed (.358) was bigger than level of probability α (0.05) as can be seen in the table below.

Test Statistics^a

Score of			
Experience			
41.500			
1266.500			
364			
.716			
.725 ^b			

- a. Grouping Variable: Groups
- b. Not corrected for ties.

DISCUSSION

The results highlight that lesson study promotes collaboration as stated by Ogegbo, Geigher, & Salagram (2019). However, what is meant by collaboration in lesson study is solving the problems together but in the end each person must have their own solution (Stepanek et all, 2007). Meanwhile, the statement telling "After completing the learning design, I imagined the student could understand the material" can be interpreted that the participants have gone through the planning stage very well. This is in line with Godek (2016) that points out that teachers master specific skills and increase competence.

It can be figured out that the majority of prospective teachers and lectures agreed that LSLC is beneficial to improve the ability of collaboration between members of the learning community, facilitates the process of teaching and learning in microteaching classes, and prepare teaching material and teaching strategies for teaching in microteaching class. These benefits are in line with benefits proposed by Buttun (2019), and Ogegbo, Geigher, & Salagram (2019).

CONCLUSION

From the findings, it is clearly seen that having the positive experience in implementing lesson study enriches not only teaching competence but also collaboration. Increasing the competence and collaboration skills does not only depend on prospective teachers (students) but also on lecturers (teachers). They all should experience lesson study. Therefore, lesson study should be implemented before (plan), while (observation) and after (reflection) teaching and learning process in order to increase the ability to design the effective lesson, make students active and reflect the success or failure of the teaching and learning process. Further research to develop a design a model of collaborated/guided lesson study for learning community needs to be done.

REFERENCES

- Albhnsawy, A. A., & Aliweh, A. M. (2016). Enhancing Student Teachers' Teaching Skills through a Blended Learning Approach. International Journal of Higher Education, 5(3), 131-13
- Arsal, Z. (2015). The Effect of Microteaching on the Crtical Thinking Disposition of the Pre-service Teahers. Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 40(3), 140-153.
- Celik, F. (2019). The Effect of Microteaching Practices on the Professional Self Determination Belief on Teacher Candidates of University Education in Turkey. Journal of Education Issues, 5, 22-41.
- Dania, A., Voutsina, I., & Moumouri, A. (2013). The Application of the Lesson Study model on the teaching practice of physical education university students. Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference eRA-8. Athens, Greece.
- Espinosa, A., Datukan, J., & Butron, B. T. (2018). Perceptions of pre-service chemistry teachers on the utilization of productive lesson study as a framework for teaching and learning. International Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 12(1).
- Fernandez, C. (2002). Learning from Japanese approaches to professional development: The case of lesson study. Journal of Teacher Education, 53(5), 393-405.
- GÖDEK, Y. (2016). Science teacher trainees' microteaching experiences: A focus group study. Educational Research and Reviews, 11(16), 1473-1493.
- Kaymakamoğlu, S. E. (2019). In search of developing practical knowledge in preservice EFL teachers: a proposed model. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 15(3), 1000-1010.
- Kelleci, O., Kulaksiz, T., & Pala, F. K. (2018). The Effect of Social Network-Supported Microlearning on Teachers' Self-Efficacy and Teaching Skills. World Journal on Educational Technology: Current Issues, v10 n2 p, 10(2), 115-129.
- Lewis, C., & Tsuchida, I. (1998). A lesson is like a swiftly flowing river: Research lessons and the improvement of Japanese education. American Educator, 50(52), 14-17.
- Lieberman, A., & London., D. W. (2003). Hand Book of Management. in B. Davis, Sustaining the Professional Development of Teachers: Learning in Networks. London: Longman.
- Lin, G.-Y. (2016). Effects That Facebook-Based Online Peer Assessment with Micro-Teaching Videos Can Have on Attitudes toward Peer Assessment and Perceived Learning from Peer Assessment. EURASIA Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 12(9), 2295-2307.
- Lindell, M. A. (2013). The Effects of Microteaching on Pre-Service Teachers' Knowledge and Implementation of the Concept Mastery Routine. ProQuest LLC. 789 East Eisenhower Parkway, P.O. Box 1346, Ann Arbor, MI 48106. Tel: 800-521-0600; Web site: http://www.proquest.com/en-US/products/dissertations/individuals.shtm. 15
- Ogegho, A. A., Gaigher, E., & Salagaram, T. (2019). Benefits and challenges of lesson study: A case of teaching Physical Sciences in South Africa. South African Journal of Education, 3(1), 1-9.
- Ono, Y., & Ferreira, J. (2010). A case study of continuing teacher professional development through lesson study in South Africa. South African Journal of Education, 30(1), 59-74.

- Pang, M., & Ling, L. (2012). Learning study: Helping teachers to use theory, develop professionally, and produce new knowledge to be shared. Instructional Science, 40(3), 589-606.
- Shaw, D. (2017). Accomplished Teaching: Using Video Redorded Microteaching-discourse to Build Candidate Teaching Competencies. Journal of Interactive Learning Research, 28(2), 161-180.
- Stepanek, J., Appel, G., Leong, M., Turner Mangan, M., & Mitchell, M. (2007). Leading Lesson Study. A practical guide for teachers and facilitators. California
- Tiarina, Y., & Rozimela, Y. (2017). Reflection on Action: The use of Reflective Journal Plus Video Recording. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research (ASSEHR), Fifth International Seminar on English Language and Teaching (ISELT 2017), 228-234.
- Toman, U., Cimer, S. O., & Cimer, A. (2014). Analysis of pre-Service Science Teachers' View about the Methods which Develop Reflective Thinking. International Journal on New Trends in Education and Their Implication, October 2014 Vol. 5 ISSN 4, 162-173.
- Utami, I. W., Mashuri, & Nafi'ah, U. (2016). A Model of Microteaching Lesson Study Implementation in the Prospective History Teacher Education. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(27), 10-14.
- Uzun, N. (2012). A Sample of Microteaching in Environmental Education and its Effect on Preservice Teachers' Presenting Effective Lessons. Asia PacificForum on Science Learning and Teaching, 13(9).
- Wangchuk, S. (2019). Effect on Microteaching in the Pre-service Teacher's Teaching Competence: A case in Bhutan. International Journal of Education and Development Using Information and Communication.
- Wessels, H. (2018). Noticing in Pre-service Teacher Education: Research Lessons as a Context for Reflection on Learners' Mathematical Reasoning and Sense-Making. In G. Kaiser et al. (Eds.), Invited Lectures from the 13th International Congress.
- Yan, C., & He, C. (2017). Pair Microteaching: An Unrealistic Pedagogy in Pre-Service Methodology Courses? Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy, 43(2), 206-218.