Education in the Asia-Pacific Region:
Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69

Kanako N. Kusanagi

Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer

A Sociological Analysis

UNEVOC Network Member

ASIA-PACIFIC EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH ASSOCIATION

Springer

Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects

Volume 69

The purpose of this Series is to meet the needs of those interested in an in-depth analysis of current developments in education and schooling in the vast and diverse Asia-Pacific Region. The Series will be invaluable for educational researchers, policy makers and practitioners, who want to better understand the major issues, concerns and prospects regarding educational developments in the Asia-Pacific region.

The Series complements the Handbook of Educational Research in the Asia-Pacific Region, with the elaboration of specific topics, themes and case studies in greater breadth and depth than is possible in the Handbook.

Topics to be covered in the Series include: secondary education reform; reorientation of primary education to achieve education for all; re-engineering education for change; the arts in education; evaluation and assessment; the moral curriculum and values education; technical and vocational education for the world of work; teachers and teaching in society; organisation and management of education; education in rural and remote areas; and, education of the disadvantaged.

Although specifically focusing on major educational innovations for development in the Asia-Pacific region, the Series is directed at an international audience.

The Series Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects, and the Handbook of Educational Research in the Asia-Pacific Region, are both publications of the Asia-Pacific Educational Research Association.

Those interested in obtaining more information about the Monograph Series, or who wish to explore the possibility of contributing a manuscript, should (in the first instance) contact the publishers.

Please contact Lay Peng, Ang (e-mail: laypeng.ang@springer.com) for submitting book proposals for this series.

Rupert Maclean
University of Tasmania, Hobart, Australia
and RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia

Kanako N. Kusanagi

Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer

A Sociological Analysis

Springer

Kanako N. Kusanagi
Graduate School of Education
University of Tokyo
Tokyo, Japan

ISSN 1573-5397 ISSN 2214-9791 (electronic)
Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects
ISBN 978-981-19-5927-1 ISBN 978-981-19-5928-8 (eBook)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8

Series Editor's Introduction

Most countries worldwide are constantly seeking to strengthen and upgrade their education and school systems, to make them most relevant to meeting the needs of learners and society at large. In doing this, they seek to learn from best, most successful and innovative education and schooling practices in other countries, to maximize the relevance, quality, and effectiveness of education and schooling. This process of learning from other countries is referred to as "education transfer."

It is increasingly realised that *education transfer* is not a straightforward matter since what works well in one country may not automatically enjoy the same level of success in other countries. This is largely because of fundamental differences between countries in their economic, social, and cultural roots and orientation, and in how they can best organize their particular education systems to maximize the relevance, effectiveness, and quality of such systems. For "education transfer" to be successful, it is essential that the practices being exported from one country to others are adequately adapted, or adjusted, to meet prevailing, often very different, characteristics of recipient countries.

This book, by Kanako Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer: A Sociological Analysis,* provides an interesting case study of "education transfer" by examining the recontextualization of lesson study through an ethnographic study of a Javanese school. This is the latest volume to be published in the long-standing Springer Book Series "Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns, and Prospects." The first book in this Springer international series was published 20 years ago, in 2002, this book by Kanako Kusanagi being the 69th volume to be published to date in the series.

This book examines education transfer, with particular reference to pedagogic transfer, and analyzes what occurs when "lesson study" was introduced into foreign contextual settings. Lesson study is a professional development approach that originated in Japan some 150 years ago and has been widely regarded as being one of the best practices for collaborative professional development. Lesson study has now been adopted in very many countries worldwide.

By discussing main issues in education transfer and teacher development, the book draws together ideas concerning professional identify, teacher strategies, pedagogic transformation, and professional development. Since teaching is a socially constructed activity, what is regarded as being "good teaching practice" varies between countries and across contextual settings. The examination of lesson study in various countries shows that its practice has been transformed to meet locally defined professional responsibilities.

In terms of the Springer Book Series in which this volume is published, the various topics examined in the series are wide-ranging and varied in coverage, with an emphasis on cutting-edge developments, best practices, and education innovations for development. Topics examined in the series include: environmental education and education for sustainable development; the interaction between technology and education; the reform of primary, secondary, and teacher education; innovative approaches to education assessment; alternative education; most effective ways to achieve quality and highly relevant education for all; active aging through active learning; case studies of education and schooling systems in various countries in the region; cross-country and cross-cultural studies of education and schooling; and the sociology of teachers as an occupational group, to mention just a few. More information about the book series is available at http://www.springer.com/series/5888.

All volumes in the series aim to meet the interests and priorities of a diverse education audience including researchers, policymakers, and practitioners; tertiary students; teachers at all levels within education systems; and members of the public who are interested in better understanding cutting-edge developments in education and schooling in Asia-Pacific.

The main reason why this series has been devoted exclusively to examining various aspects of education and schooling in the Asia-Pacific region is that this is a particularly challenging and dynamic region. It is renowned for its size, diversity, and complexity, whether it be geographical, socio-economic, cultural, political, or developmental. Education and schooling in countries throughout the region impact on every aspect of people's lives, including employment, labour force considerations, education and training, cultural orientation, and attitudes and values. Asia and the Pacific is home to some 63% of the world's population of 7 Billion. Countries with the largest populations (China, 1.4 Billion; India, 1.3 Billion) and the most rapidly growing mega-cities are to be found in the region, as are countries with relatively small populations (Bhutan, 755,000; the island of Niue, 1,600).

Levels of economic and socio-political development vary widely, with some of the richest countries (such as Japan) and some of the poorest countries on earth (such as Bangladesh). Asia contains the largest number of poor of any region in the world, the incidence of those living below the poverty line remaining as high as 40 percent in some countries in Asia. At the same time, many countries in Asia are experiencing a period of great economic growth and social development. However, inclusive growth remains elusive, as does growth that is sustainable and does not destroy the quality of the environment. The growing prominence of Asian economies and corporations, together with globalization and technological innovation, are leading to long-term

changes in trade, business, and labour markets, to the sociology of populations within (and between) countries. There is a rebalancing of power, centered on Asia and the Pacific region, with the Asian Development Bank in Manila declaring that the Twenty-first Century will be "the Century of Asia Pacific."

We know from comprehensive feedback received from numerous education researchers, policymakers, and practitioners, worldwide, that this book series makes a useful contribution to knowledge sharing about cutting-edge developments concerning education and schooling in Asia-Pacific.

Any readers of this or other volumes in the series who have an idea for writing or co-writing their own book (or editing/co-editing a book), on any aspect of education and/or schooling, relevant to the region, are enthusiastically encouraged to approach the series editor either directly, or through Springer, to publish their own volume in the series. We are always willing to assist perspective authors shape their manuscripts in ways that make them suitable for publication.

March 2022

Rupert Maclean AO
Schools of Education
University of Tasmania
Hobart, Australia

RMIT University
Melbourne, Australia

The Recontextualisation of Lesson Study: A Foreword

This is clearly an important book. At its heart is an account of an ethnographically inspired study of an Indonesian (Javan) Junior High School; rather a niche topic, one might think. But this school is the setting for the implementation of the Japanese teacher development scheme referred to (as usual, in English) as 'lesson study'; it's still looking rather a specialist theme. What happens, however, when an educational technology—lesson study—is exported from one schooling system to another? We could generalise yet further, of course: what happen when a practice is exported (or imported) from the setting of its origin to (by) a second setting? Enticing as these extensions are, I'll stick, for the now, to the export of lesson study from Japan to the Javan Junior High School.

The answer to the 'what happens?' question is that the export—lesson study—is recontextualised, which invites an analysis of the social context that is the Javan school. Such an analysis is presented by Kusanagi in the central part of her book. This analysis describes an environment that is structured by two systems that are firmly in place alongide each other, not mutually supporting nor, it seems, in mutual contradiction. The first is a strongly hierarchical, bureaucratic, managerial system that locates the teachers in relation to each other and prescribes their duties, which, in relation to the students, involves presenting the curriculum to them; they are, in this sense, constituted as living textbooks. The second system is a familial culture that insists on the acceptance of responsibility to the teachers' community. These systems do not interfere with each other because they regulate different regions of the teachers' lives and the school life; they are parallel sets of obligations. It is crucial to point out that the teachers' bureaucratic responsibilities include presenting the curriculum, but they do not refer otherwise to supporting student learning. Such support is, it seems, optional and by and large absent from the teachers' pedagogy. Largely absent, but not prohibited and two teachers are indeed active in supporting student learning, drawing on experience from pedagogic activities outside of the school setting.

The Japanese lesson study initiative in its current form imagines schooling as student centred and draws on constructionist pedagogic principles, so practical activities in mathematics, group working and avoiding telling students 'how to do it' are to

dominate lesson content. Teachers are expected to put effort into lesson preparation and, in discussion with other teachers, lesson evaluation. The protocol for lesson study 'open classes' involves a teacher teaching a lesson, which is to be observed by colleagues, who then discusses the lesson afterwards with the teacher who taught the class. The general idea is that this will encourage and enable teachers to develop their pedagogy in conversation with other teachers.

The teachers in the Javan school interpreted the open class protocol as an add-on to their responsibilities, which they carried out, but which had no impact on what they perceived to be their principal duty—to present the curriculum—in their other lessons. Furthermore, the rigid hierarchical structure of the school served to inhibit critical engagement and, in any event, whilst the teachers recognised, but generally did not emulate a 'good' teacher, most did not see support for learning as their responsibility: rather, their responsibility was simply to present the curriculum, it was the students' responsibility to acquire it. So lesson study was implemented 'to rule', so to speak, but had no impact on pedagogy more generally in the school.

It would be easy to write off this study as a unique and unrepresentative case and, of course, it is. However, Kusanagi deploys the two strategies by which qualitative research is able to generalise beyond itself. Firstly, the book includes summary accounts of the transfer of lesson study to a range of settings globally. In different ways, they all exhibit the recontextualisation of the scheme as it moves from Japan, some by export from Japan, others by import by the target setting. This effectively expands the sample from a single case to a wide range of international cases. Kusanagi also describes the historical development of lesson study in Japan from its inception at the time of the Meiji restoration in the late nineteenth century to its present very different form: its internal (to Japan) recontextualisation. She discusses this in relation to the development of teaching as a professional practice in Japan, which now looks significantly different from the situation in Java, both structurally and culturally: Japanese teachers are expected to take responsibility for all aspects of the students' development, including, but certainly not limited to their acquisition of the curriculum; this, arguably, relates to the longstanding influence of Confucianism in Japanese education. Japanese culture is also fundamentally hierarchical, but there is a traditional as well as a bureaucratic dimension to this, so that the justification for one's position in a hierarchy should be deserved or earned, at least in principle, even if merely in terms of age or tenure, not simply awarded or imposed. This is in stark contrast to the hierarchy in the Javan school, which is purely bureaucratically established and maintained.

This description signals the second generalising strategy that Kusanagi introduces, which is the development of theory. She draws on theory from several sources, but not in such a way as to impose extant theory on her data. Rather, theoretical constructs introduced by Lev Vygotsky, Basil Bernstein and in my own work are themselves recontextualised in their use in her own analysis. The category 'recontextualisation' itself was initially my recontextualisation from Bernstein and has been subsequently deployed in the present work. Vygotsky's 'zone of proximal development' has been productively combined with a recontextualisation of Bernstein's speech codes to construct two modes of pedagogic strategy, neither of which is deployed exclusively

in the Javan school. Finally, my own reontextualisation of authority strategies from Max Weber has been again recontextualised by Kusanagi in her own analysis of the Javan school. At its best and most productive research—qualitative or quantitative—involves a transaction between methodology, setting, theory and, of course, authorial charisma: all achieved to good effect in Kusanagi's work.

All qualitative research, indeed, all research involves interpretation and is limited in respect of its extension by its methodology, including its sampling strategies. This work focuses on a small sample—a single case school—but extends its relevance by very substantially enlarging this sample base through its accounts of the global (and internal, historical) recontextualisation of lesson study and by its imaginative and highly productive deployment and recontextualisation of theory. The key message of this book is that under recontextualisation things do not stay the same: what has contributed to the excellent international test results (PISA and TIMSS) of Japanese schooling, which has presumably motivated the the widespread interest in Japanese lesson study, may not, indeed, does not have the same effect elsewhere: the constructivist educational ideas of liberal thinkers such as Dewey, Piaget, Schön and others must be applied to schooling systems and schools as much as to individuals; we/they all have to learn from where we stand and this is not well achieved by simply attempting to copy what works elsewhere. Kusanagi's research not only illustrates, but explains why this is the case: this is why it is an important book.

London & Yokohama Paul Dowling
September 2022

Preface

In this book I set out to address policy and practice in schooling and to provide a sociological understanding of global educational reform, approaches to international development, and teacher professional development. These interrelated fields have grounded my life experience.

Firstly, I encountered sociocultural stresses in my educational experience when my family moved to North Carolina in the United States from Kanagawa. I was fourteen years old and had been raised in the collectivist society of Japan. My survival strategy was to be "the same" as everyone else. This proved to be impossible in an American public school with predominantly Caucasian and African American students. As an Asian, I was constantly made aware of being "different" and experienced a life of being "other." I struggled to to be "normal" and as "American" as possible (whatever that may mean). This multicultural educational experience led me to question a universal approach to global education reform.

Secondly, my experience of working for local NGOs in Indonesia made me aware of the divide between what aid projects apparently intended to do and what was actually happening in the field. While international experts in donor agencies had privileged status and saw the world within the "projects," I participated in daily activities as an intern and this gave me access to local perspectives. In 2004 and 2005, I worked in a local fishermen's village in the tsunami-stricken Banda Aceh and local communities of ex-refugees from East Timor in Kupang. Both communities experienced the in-rush of donors in the aftermaths of their emergencies. The majority of the donor projects were not sustainable and even harmful to local communities. I vividly remember when I attended an international networking meeting in Kupang 17 years ago, a man angrily blamed donors for destroying his village by causing fights for donor funding. On another occasion, a local villager told me they had no idea why a road, that led nowhere and was not helpful to anyone, was built; its construction was not ever completed. These voices were often not heard beyond the time and place of the "projects" themselves. It has since been my urgent question as to what development aid can do to support local communities.

Thirdly, I saw the same school with completely different eyes when I was working as an educational consultant for the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA)

in 2006 and as a participant observer for fieldwork in 2009. When I was working for JICA, I was overseeing the emergency program in Bantul Regency after the area was hit by an earthquake. It caused the loss of over 5,000 lives and damage to the school building. The schools were funded with an emergency grant to carry out programs of their choice. To my surprise, some schools started lesson study programs alongside psychological counselling for students and building repair using this emergency fund. I was intrigued by the enthusiasm in schools for lesson study and chose the topic for my master's dissertation at Oxford University and again for my doctoral thesis at UCL Institute of Education. For this second study, I participated extensively in the daily activities in my study school. I realized that I had previously observed the teachers' practice only superficially. So, in the empirical research that is presented in this book I looked closely at the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study lessons and the teachers' daily practice.

Today, lesson study in Indonesia is widely regarded as one of its successful examples. At the time I started this study, I had no sense that lesson study in Indonesia would continue to flourish today. In 2022, after sixteen years of its initiation and nine years since the completion of JICA's lesson study projects, the number of practitioners and researchers in lesson study continues to grow. This study will argue that there is more to this than a straightforward success story. The study revealed the complexities of the reality: how teachers understood that professional development is not uniform, but that teachers negotiate complex realities and contesting demands in making their professional decisions. I hope this book will contribute by providing a view "beyond" both professional development and aid projects and the eyes of outsiders. I hope also that it will challenge some of the misunderstandings and sociologically inevitable misfirings of imagined "best practice" in international development, professional development, and educational reform.

Tokyo, Japan Kanako N. Kusanagi

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Professor Paul Dowling (UCL Institute of Education) for his guidance and intellectual challenges that made possible the realization of this book. I would like to thank the teachers of SMP Sari who let me share in their community. I would also like to thank Professor Christopher Bjork (Vassar College) for his valuable comments in revising the manuscript. My sincere thanks also go to those who have 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), and Dr. Pete Dudley (the University of Cambridge), Dr. Fumiko Takahashi (the University of Tokyo), Dr. Kazuaki Iwabuchi (Tokyo Metropolitan University), Professor Ryoko Tsuneyoshi (Bunkyo Gakuin University), Professor Yuto Kitamura (the University of Tokyo), Dr. Norimichi Toyomane (IDCJ) and Dr. Christopher Gerteis (the University of Tokyo). I am also grateful to JICA, IDCJ, and the State University of Yogyakarta for their support as also the World Bank and the British Council Japan Association for financial assistance. A very special thanks to Pitrawati who assisted me in the fieldwork. Finally, I would like to acknowledge with gratitude, my husband Daisuke and my daughter Tsumugi, for their care and support.

Contents

Part I
Lesson Study and Pedagogic Transfer

Chapter 1
Introduction

Abstract Education transfer and efforts to learn from "best practices" in other countries are ever active under the global education reform efforts of the 2000s. However, there are issues involving such education transfer. When foreign theory, pedagogy, and professional development were imported/exported to another country, the result did not turn out to be what was expected. Since pedagogic practice is socially constructed, the meaning of "best practice" is context-dependent. The best practice in one setting may not be meaningful in another setting. In this chapter, I discuss this gap in education transfer as the issue of "recontextualization." Two levels of recontextualization are investigated: (1) the translation of policy into practice and (2) the transfer of pedagogy from one sociocultural (school) setting to another. This chapter sets the background for the challenges of pedagogic transfer and lay foundation for the subsequent chapters where the sociological analysis of lesson study will be discussed.

1.1 Education Transfer and Recontextualization

Ever since the emergence of international assessments—particularly the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) in 2000—there has been a tremendous interest in comparing different educational systems and learning from the policies and practices of better-performing ones. In the past, efforts for educational borrowing and lending were limited to the policy and national levels. Such an example is how Americans conducted policy reviews to learn from the Japanese educational system in the 1980s to improve the deteriorating American economy (Spring, 2009). In the 2000s, international assessments motivated education transfer[1] at various levels for multiple actors.

The source of "education borrowing" has also diversified from the West to other countries since the implementation of PISA. While in the past, there was attention to

[1] The definition provided by Beech (2006) represents this education transfer at multiple levels: "The concept of 'educational transfer' can be defined as the movement of educational ideas, institutions or practices across international borders" (p. 2).

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_1

the UK, the U.S., France, and Germany, some of these countries performed poorly on international assessments. Alternatively, Finland and some Asian countries including Japan—the successful performers—began to attract attention. Those countries, especially Finland and Singapore, began to "export" their educational practices (Le & Edwards, 2021; Schatz, 2015).

In "developing countries,"[2] governments are often criticized for their education systems and reform policies based on the evidence of low student performance on international assessments. These countries are under pressure to improve the quality of schooling and to catch up with industrialized countries. There have been efforts to transfer the "best practices" of Western nations to improve the quality of education through international donor agencies.

However, there are problematic, often taken for granted assumptions behind such education transfer. The legitimacy of such transfer of "best practice"[3]—whether it could contribute to improving the quality of schooling—is called into question. First, schools in developing countries may operate very differently from industrialized countries where the pedagogic models originate. Second, the best practice has often been transferred to developing countries without sufficient understanding of pedagogic transformation and treated as if it takes place in a vacuum. Historically, experts have warned that education transfer should always be modified in relation to the local context (Cowen, 1994; Phillips & Ochs, 2003; Steiner-Khamsi, 2002). Although comparative educators have critiqued the global borrowing and lending of educational policies and practices, their analyses are usually at the policy level, and few studies have examined the factors that motivate/demotivate transformation.

The external support provided through professional development and international assistance tends to focus on inputs—such as transferring skills and knowledge through training. There is less focus on the process—how teachers take up, resist, or adapt to the new initiative. It is often left up to individual teachers to overcome the gaps between the realities of the classroom/school and what is promoted through the professional development program. In addition, evaluations of these projects only focus on the outputs—such as student performance or teacher performance—and fail to capture the complex realities of schools and classrooms. Contextualized analysis of this pedagogic transformation would help us understand the impact of international assistance and professional development beyond success and failure.

---

[2] 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 book (Hope, 1996; Toye, 1993). One should also note that overseas aid is used for the well-being of developing countries but also as a tool for foreign diplomacy and economic development (Hope, 1996). Therefore, while acknowledging the problematic nature of the term developing countries, I will eliminate double quotations in the rest of the book.

[3] Throughout this book, the problematic nature of best practices will be discussed. Although I discontinue using double quotation marks for best practice, I claim that best practice in one context may not be replicated in another context.

This book examines education transfer, specifically focusing on pedagogic transfer, and analyzes what happens when lesson study, which originated in Japan, was introduced into foreign contextual settings. Lesson study, a professional development approach that originated in Japan 150 years ago, has been widely considered one of the best practices for collaborative professional development. Two decades after lesson study was first introduced in the U.S.; it is now practiced in over 50 countries (Akita, 2017). Since the 1990s, it was also introduced to 27 countries in Asia, Latin America, and Africa by the Japan International Co-operation Agency (JICA) as one of the best practices for teacher training (Matachi & Kikuchi, 2015). Lesson study aligns with global trends in educational reform such as collaborative professional development, student-centered pedagogy, professional learning communities, curriculum development, and teacher-initiated inquiry. Thus, lesson study is considered an effective approach to accommodate new challenges in teaching and learning for the twenty-first century.

This book discusses the challenge of pedagogic transfer through sociological analysis of pedagogic transformation or "recontextualization" of lesson study. Since pedagogic practice is socially constructed, the meaning of educational practice is always open to interpretation within the local setting of the receiving country. These issues in pedagogic transfer are discussed in this book in terms of "recontextualization." Dowling (2014) defines "Recontextualization as referring to the contention that texts and practices are transformed as they are moved between contexts of their reading or enactment" (p. 526). I analyzed the recontextualization of lesson study at two levels.

> The first level is the issue of recontextualization as the translation of policy into practice. When new pedagogic practice—lesson study—is introduced through a professional development program, what change does it bring to classroom practice?
>
> The second level is the problem of recontextualization in the transfer of pedagogy from one setting to another.

I problematize decontextualized discussions of policy and standard-setting in international aid projects and global education reform. Often international donor agencies emphasize ownership and sustainability of projects; for example, the Japanese government considers their role is "to encourage (…) the self-help efforts of aid recipients" (Burghart, 2017, p. 414). However, donor policy and project design do not necessarily consider what would help participants to take ownership of the program or how to ensure the sustainability of the project. This results in most aid projects discontinuing as soon as external intervention and funding end. I also challenge the standardized approach to goal and indicator setting in education reform, which neglects to take diverse needs and socioeconomic gaps into consideration. Without adequate support in the process of pedagogic transformation, teachers interpret these policies and standards as they wish or consider them as burdens rather than for their benefit.

In this book, I discuss the following issues as potentially problematic assumptions behind pedagogic transfer.

- Is it legitimate to set universal standards to assess education quality and compare different education systems worldwide?
- What justifies transfer of the best practices of industrialized countries—such as student-centered pedagogy (SCP[4])—to developing countries?
- What happened when student-centered pedagogy was introduced in developing countries?

These "recontextualization" themes will provide the basis for the discussion on the recontextualization of lesson study in the subsequent chapters.

1.2 The Global Discourse on Education Quality

The Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), since its first implementation in 2000, has had a significant impact on 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, para. 1). With over seventy countries participating and represented in the league table, it has triggered international competition and motivated governments to learn from other nations searching for effective schooling (Lingard, 2010; Takayama, 2008). The PISA ranking has been used as an indicator for the success or failure of education systems (Forestier & Crossley, 2015; Takayama & Apple, 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).

International surveys have an impact on educational discourse in developing countries in several ways. One impact of PISA and other international surveys on policy and curriculum formation suggests that the goals set by international organizations have become the worldwide definition of "good quality" schooling. In the past, education was defined as a basic human right. The influence of international agencies such as UNICEF/UNESCO and the World Bank was limited to setting a framework for 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 human rights (Auld et al., 2018).

There have been criticisms of the standardizing of education quality and measurements such as PISA based on three grounds. First, is PISA really measuring what

[4] Learner-centered pedagogy, child-centered pedagogy, student-centered learning, and child-centered learning are used as interchangeable terms within student-centered pedagogy.

OECD claims it to be measuring? While OECD claims to be measuring twenty-first-century skills such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and collaboration in conjunction with a student-centered approach, the success of East Asian countries, widely 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). Researchers such as Meyer and Schiller (2013) and Morris (2015) 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 students' performance.

Second, there have been criticisms of PISA for standardizing education quality to narrowly defined, short-term goals and for its emphasis on economic growth (Meyer & Benavot, 2013). An open letter addressed to Andreas Schleicher, a director of the OECD's PISA, was 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 might "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).

Third, it was also pointed out that 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 international survey's ideological foundation and methodological justification. Nevertheless, PISA has a significant impact on global educational reform and is a principal motivating factor behind education transfer.

Despite the controversy, international assessments such as PISA and TIMSS have a standardizing effect on education quality and have been playing a significant role in defining what constitutes "good quality." This has impacted education policy and curriculum reforms not only in industrialized countries but also in developing countries. Due to accountability concerns, international donors became interested in monitoring student performance. The World Bank has utilized the results of international assessments, TIMSS and PISA, in policy dialogue with developing countries and as an instrument to decide funding and the assessment of projects (Lockheed et al., 2015). A review of World Bank projects from 1998 to 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).

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, "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). The low performance of students in developing countries has been used as evidence to criticize their national education systems and 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 schooling. Newspaper headlines refer to the crisis in education as "Indonesia as Lowest Education Quality in the World" or "As many as 75 percent 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 the OECD acknowledged Indonesia as the fifth-fastest improving education system among 72 participants (OECD, 2016b), the fact that it remains in the bottom tier of ranking conveys a more powerful message to the public. It imposes a sense of urgency and that there are many challenges to overcome in raising the quality of education in Indonesia.

As late-comers, developing countries have an incentive to introduce those skills encouraged by the 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 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 Student-Centered Pedagogy (SCP), teacher education, and certification reforms (Akiba, 2017, p. 5). The concern over meeting international standards could work negatively in terms of social and cultural variations in education and inhibit developing countries from making their own choices in determining how to raise their citizens.

1.3 Transfer of Student-Centered Pedagogy

1.3.1 Background of Student-Centered Pedagogy Introduction

Global trends in educational reforms such as competency-based curricula, outcome-based education, and interactive teaching approaches are strongly influenced by constructivist theories of teaching and learning (Guo, 2013; Sulfasyah et al., 2015; Tanaka, 2008). The policy papers of international organizations clearly show the preference for constructivist pedagogic approaches, especially student-centered pedagogy (SCP). 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 pointed out 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.

SCP represents a prominent example of constructivist approaches introduced in Asia and Africa (Sriprakash, 2010). Its introduction was justified in several ways. First, the introduction of SCP was seen as desirable for building a democratic society as a precondition for economic and social development (Schweisfurth, 2013). Second, student-centered pedagogy was perceived as modern, progressive, and effective in improving student achievements (Altinyelken & Sözeri, 2017). This was often linked to teacher quality and transforming teaching practice, as Altinyelken and Sözeri (2017) describe:

> SCP is linked to improving teacher quality by changing 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 a significant difference in student learning outcomes. (p. 255)

This move to promote SCP is closely linked to the popularity of lesson study abroad. Engagement to lesson study was motivated by the interest to shift teachers' pedagogy from a didactic approach to a student-centered approach.

1.3.2 Criticisms of Student-Centered Pedagogy

While donor agencies promoted the introduction of SCP, there is ambiguity over what constitutes SCP and the effectiveness of such practice. First, there is no clear definition of what constitutes SCP, which 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 have a different meaning and different implications for the goals of learning (Schweisfurth, 2013, p. 9). 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).

Second, while SCP was offered in developing countries as unquestionably accepted and practiced in the West, there is no apparent empirical 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).

Third, there has been criticism 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 as "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 that it is a form of colonialism or cultural imperialism (Guthrie, 1990; Lam, 2009; Nguyen et al., 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).

Fourth, 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 inherent to SCP form the topic of discussion in the next section.

1.3.3 Local Adaptation of Student-Centered Pedagogy

In this section, I will examine the challenges to introducing SCP in developing countries as issues of recontextualization. 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 international organizations, need to be in tune with the everyday realities of the classroom and the motivations and capabilities of ordinary teachers. (p. 400)

First, the most apparent challenges to 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 et al., 2010; Nguyen-Phuong-Mai et al., 2012; Schweisfurth, 2013).

Second, SCP puts more demands on teachers compared to didactic methods of teaching. Teachers need high levels of knowledge, skills, and experience to design their own curriculum and respond flexibly to meet the diverse needs of students (Altinyelken, 2011). However, teachers in developing countries are often unqualified or lack proper training to implement SCP. Thus, to implement SCP, professional development needs to make up for the lack of basic skills and knowledge (O'Sullivan, 2004; Schweisfurth, 2013). Training for SCP in developing countries is not specifically learner-centered; it is often too short, too theoretical, and lacking in practicality (Schweisfurth, 2011). This training focuses on transferring knowledge and skills and rarely addresses 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).

Third, since the evaluation system in developing countries is examination-oriented, teachers tend to favor a didactic approach of lecturing, memorization, and drilling (Altinyelken, 2011; Vavrus, 2009). For example, in Uganda, teachers were

under pressure to cover the curriculum within a limited time in over-populated classrooms; thus, the classroom situation was not compatible with the individual approach promoted in SCP (Sikoyo, 2010). The cases from sub-Saharan African countries cited similar challenges of implementing SCP due to the pressure placed on parents and students to prepare for high-stakes exams (Samoff, 2003; Vavrus & Bartlett, 2012). In 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 it into practice.

Fourth, the practice of SCP may fail or result in superficial implementation when there is a discrepancy between the newly implemented policy/curriculum prescribed in SCP and the existing social norms (Brodie et al., 2002; Sikoyo, 2010). 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 et al., 2000; Sriprakash, 2010). 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 as it could undermine the teacher's authority or oppose pressure for group conformity. For example, in a case in Namibia, critical skills that required students to question adults contradicted the expected conduct of students to be respectful and obedient (O'Sullivan, 2004). Similarly, Altinyelken and Sözeri (2017) observed that some teachers in Turkey were concerned that SCP would promote individualistic values among students, which are contrary to the collectivist norms in Turkish society (p. 262). Furthermore, a flexible learning approach promoted by SCP could potentially widen academic gaps among students. Because of the stratified societies and schools in developing countries, teachers may assume some students had greater potential, which 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).

1.3.4 Pedagogic Transformation and Teacher Agency

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 must 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 indicate that the success or failure of the adoption of best practice depends on whether it matches the local sociocultural contexts that shape the dominant pedagogy. Biesta et al. (2015) claim the importance of teacher agency, which they define as the "active contribution [of teachers] to shaping their work and its conditions – for the overall quality of education" (p. 624). Therefore, it is unrealistic to expect a radical change induced solely by SCP, but there should be more attention to teachers' working environment and conditions. Research suggests it is more realistic and beneficial to search for ways to improve the practice within existing structures (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).

The discussions on SCP suggest that there is a fundamental issue in pedagogic transfer: the meaning of educational practice is socially constructed and always open to interpretation within local settings. Teachers are not passive recipients of transmitted knowledge and skills. They make conscious and unconscious choices within a given context by negotiating various institutional and social demands.

This book examines professional development beyond the cultural barriers and gaps often cited as issues in education transfer. This study situates teachers' practice 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" is not always clear; the terms are often used synonymously. However, in this study, such a distinction is essential. The social is understood to be concerned with the system of relations between individuals and groups realized in the form of alliances and oppositions and fluidity within this system (Dowling, 2009, 2013). On the other hand, culture 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 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 an initiative, and this is what is found in the research presented here.

1.4 Overview of the Book

This study provides a sociological analysis of education transfer by examining the recontextualization of lesson study at different levels. Since teaching is socially constructed, teachers' professional accountabilities are negotiated and contested within existing social relations. Thus, the practice—lesson study—transforms as it moves between policy and practice and across sociocultural contexts.

Lewis (2002) highlights the context-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, 2002, p. 13)

This book is comprised of three parts. Part I, "Pedagogic Transfer and Lesson study," situates the practice of lesson study and such pedagogic transfer within sociocultural settings. In Chapter 1, I discuss how education transfer is motivated by the global education reform efforts of the 2000s; however, these efforts fail to consider how the meaning of "best practice" is context-dependent. I raise two levels of recontextualization as the target of investigation: (1) the translation of policy into practice and (2) the transfer of pedagogy from one setting to another. In Chapter 2, I examine the historical development of lesson study in Japan and how the unique sociocultural settings in that country have contributed to dynamic development. The chapter reveals how lesson study is not uniform practice but has transformed in accordance with changing educational contexts. In Chapter 3, the importing/exporting of lesson study in foreign settings are examined. Cases in the U.S., Singapore, China, South Korea, Taiwan, and JICA-assisted lesson study in developing countries—Indonesia, Vietnam, Zambia, Kenya, Senegal, and South Africa—reveal issues in education transfer. They present how lesson study was recontextualized and given new meaning as it moved from policy to practice across contexts.

Part II presents an ethnographic-style study of an Indonesian junior high school—SMP Sari—and provides a sociological analysis of teachers' practice. By comparing the daily teaching of Javanese teachers with lesson study, I conceptually analyze how the sociocultural settings shaped teachers' practice and influenced their choice of pedagogy. In Chapter 4, I look at teacher professional development in Indonesia and how the sociological examination of education reform could contribute to understanding the gap in policy and practice and across contextual setting. An overview of the history of lesson study in Indonesia, a description of the research setting, and research methods are presented to provide further context for analysis. In Chapter 5, I discuss the professional responsibilities of teachers in SMP Sari and how their professional accountability was structured within a social hierarchy and intertwined with collective community interests. Chapter 6 examines the pedagogic practice of

teachers in SMP Sari and provides a conceptual analysis of how teachers' choices in pedagogy were impacted by the demand to meet internal and external accountabilities of the teacher community.

Part III, "Sociological Understanding of Pedagogic Transfer," provides a theoretical understanding of the "recontextualization" of lesson study and builds on the analyses in Part I and II. In Chapter 8, I tackle the second issue of recontextualization mentioned at the beginning of this chapter—the transfer of lesson study from Japan to Java. I compare professional responsibilities of teachers, collegiality, and teaching expertise in Japan and Java and present how the meaning of lesson study was reconstructed. Finally, in Chapter 9, I will discuss the main achievements of this book, its limitations and constraints, and the recommendations for policymakers and practitioners. In Chapter 7, I explore the first level of recontextualization in pedagogic transfer: a gap between policy and practice. I examine the implementation of lesson study by understanding its continuities and discontinuities from daily practice. As pointed out as an issue of recontextualization, lesson study in Japan was not replicated in Java but reinterpreted to meet professional responsibilities at SMP Sari.

References

Akiba, M. (2017). Editor's introduction: Understanding cross-national differences in globalized teacher reforms. *Educational Researcher, 46*(4), 153–168.

Akiba, M., & LeTendre, G. (2017). Introduction: Conceptualizing teacher quality and policy in a global context. In M. Akiba & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher quality and policy* (pp. 1–21). Routledge.

Addey, C., & Sellar, S. (2017). Why do countries participate in PISA? Understanding the role of large-scale international assessments in global education policy. *Global education policy and international development: New agendas, issues and policies.*

Altinyelken, H. K. (2011). Student-centred pedagogy in Turkey: Conceptualizations, interpretations and practices. *Journal of Education Policy, 26*(2), 137–160.

Altinyelken, H. K., & Sözeri, S. (2017). Assumptions and implications of adopting educational ideas from the West. In M. Akiba, & LeTendre, G. (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher quality and policy* (pp. 255–270). Routledge.

Altinyelken, H. K., Sözeri, S., Akiba, M., & LeTendre, G. (2018). Assumptions and implications of adopting educational ideas from the West: The case of student-centered pedagogy in Turkey. In M. Akiba & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher quality and policy* (pp. 255–270). Routledge.

Andrews, P., Atkinson, L., Ball, S. J., Barber, M., Beckett, L., Berardi, J., & Zhao, Y. (2014, May 6). OECD and PISA tests are damaging education worldwide–academics. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/education/2014/may/06/oecd-pisa-tests-damaging-education-academics

Auld, E., Rappleye, J., & Morris, P. (2018). PISA for development: How the OECD and World Bank shaped education governance post-2015. *Comparative Education*, 1–23.

Beech, J. (2006). The theme of educational transfer in comparative education: A view over time. *Research in Comparative and International Education, 1*(1), 2–13.

Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2015). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. *Teachers and Teaching, 21*(6), 624–640.

Brodie, K., Lelliott, A., & Davis, H. (2002). Forms and substance in learner-centred teaching: Teachers' take-up from an in-service programme in South Africa. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(5), 541–559.

Burghart, S. (2017, September). Ownership in East-Asian aid discourses. *Forum for Development Studies,* 44(3), 401–427.

Cowen, R. (1994) Schools and selected aspects of culture from the perspective of comparative education: Neither a borrower nor a lender be. In E. Thomas (Ed.), *International perspectives on culture and schooling: A symposium proceedings.* Department of International and Comparative Education, Institute of Education, University of London.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Policy and change: Getting beyond bureaucracy. In A. Hargreaves (Ed.), *Extending educational change: International handbook of educational change* (pp. 362–387). Springer Netherlands.

Dowling, P. (2009). *Sociology as method.* Sense.

Dowling, P. (2013). Social activity method (SAM): A fractal language for mathematics. *Mathematics Education Research Journal, 25*(3), 317–340.

Dowling, P. (2014). Recontextualization in mathematics education. In S. Lerman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of mathematics education* (pp. 525–529). Springer Netherlands.

Fuller, B., & Clarke, P. (1994). Raising school effects while ignoring culture? Local conditions and the influence of classroom tools, rules, and pedagogy. *Review of Educational Research, 64*(1), 119–157.

Forestier, K., & Crossley, M. (2015). International education policy transfer–borrowing both ways: The Hong Kong and England experience. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 45*(5), 664–685.

Ginsburg, M. (2010). Improving educational quality through active-learning pedagogies: A comparison of five case studies. *Educational Research, 1*(3), 62–74.

Guo, L. (2013). New curriculum reform in China and its impact on teachers. *Comparative and International Education, 41*(2), 87–105.

Guthrie, G. (1990). To the defense of traditional teaching in lesser-developed countries. *Teachers and Teaching in the Developing World, 8*, 219–232.

Harber, C., & Davies, L. (1997). *School management and effectiveness in developing countries: The post-bureaucratic school*. Cassell.

Hope, K. R. (1996). *Development in the third world: From policy failure to policy reform: From policy failure to policy reform.* Routledge.

Indoriani. (2016, December 6). *Peringkat PISA Indonesia alami peningkatan* [PISA Indonesia's rating has increased]. Retrieved from https://www.antaranews.com/berita/600165/peringkat-pisa-indonesia-alami-peningkatan

Johnson, D., Hayter, J., & Broadfoot, P. (2000). *The quality of learning and teaching in developing countries: Assessing literacy and numeracy in Malawi and Sri Lanka.* Department for International Development.

Johnson, S., Hodges, M., & Monk, M. (2010). Teacher development and change in South Africa: A critique of the appropriateness of transfer of northern/western practice. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 30*(2), 179–192.

IMF & World Bank. (2009). *Global Monitoring Report 2009: A Development Emergency*. Retrieved from http://go.worldbank.org/AR2V89HT70

Kellaghan, T. (2001). The globalization of assessment in the 20th century. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 8*(1), 87–102.

Lam, E. (2009). *An investigation of possibilities and limitations of 'education borrowing' in Barbados and Trinidad and Tobago (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).* Bath Spa University, Bath, the United Kingdom.

Le, H., & Edwards, D. B., Jr. (2021). *Singapore's educational export strategies: 'Branding' and 'selling' education in a favorable global policy marketspace.*

Lewis, C. C. (2002). Does lesson study have a future in the United States? *Nagoya Journal of Education and Human Development, 1*, 1–23.

Lingard, B. (2010). Policy borrowing, policy learning: Testing times in Australian schooling. *Critical Studies in Education, 51*(2), 129–147.
Lockheed, M., Prokic-Bruer, T., & Shadrova, A. (2015). *The experience of middle-income countries participating in PISA 2000–2015*. The World Bank & OECD Publishing.
Matachi, A., & Kikuchi, A. (2015). Lesson study projects in developing countries supported by JICA : Achievements and challenges. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, 18*(1), 91–104.
Meyer, H. D., & Benavot, A. (2013). PISA and the globalization of education governance: Some puzzles and problems. In M. Heinz-Dieter & A. Benavot (Eds.), *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 9–26). Symposium Books.
MEXT. (2011). *Gakushu shido yoryo "ikiru chikara"* [The course of study "zest for living"]. Retrieved from http://www.mext.go.jp/a_menu/shotou/new-cs/youryou/syo/sou.htm
Meyer, H. D., & Schiller, K. (2013). Gauging the role of non-educational effects in large-scale assessments: Socio-economics, culture and PISA outcomes. In *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 207–224). Symposium Books Ltd.
Morris, P. (2015). Comparative education, PISA, politics and educational reform: a cautionary note. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 45*(3), 470–474.
Nguyen-Phuong-Mai, M., Terlouw, C., & Pilot, A. (2012). Cooperative learning in Vietnam and the West–East educational transfer. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 32*(2), 137–152.
Nguyen, P. M., Elliott, J. G., Terlouw., & Pilot, A. (2009). Neocolonialism in education: Cooperative learning in an Asian context. *Comparative Education, 45*(1), 109–130.
Nykiel-Herbert, B. (2004). Mis-constructing knowledge: The case of learner-centred pedagogy in South Africa. *Prospects, 34*(3), 249–265.
O'Sullivan, M. (2004). The reconceptualization of learner-centred approaches: A Namibian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24*(6), 585–602.
OECD. (2014). *PISA 2012 results: What students know and can do. Student performance in mathematics, reading and science.* OECD Publishing.
OECD. (2016a). *About: What is PISA?* Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/pisa/aboutpisa/
OECD. (2016b). *Country note – results from PISA 2015: Indonesia [PDF file]*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/pisa/PISA-2015-Indonesia.pdf
Phillips, D., & Ochs, K. (2003). Processes of policy borrowing in education: Some explanatory and analytical devices. *Comparative Education, 39*(4), 451–461.
Phillips, D., & Schweisfurth, M. (2006). *Comparative and international education: An introduction to theory, method and practice*. Continuum Google Scholar.
Sahlberg, P. (2011a). The fourth way of Finland. *Journal of Educational Change, 12*(2), 173–185.
Samoff, J. (2003). Institutionalizing international influence. *Safundi: The Journal of South African and American Comparative Studies, 4*(1), 1–35.
Sari, R. P. (2013). Mutu Pendidikan Indonesia Terendah di Dunia [Indonesia's lowest education quality in the world]. *TEMPO.COM*. Retrieved from https://nasional.tempo.co/read/535256/mutu-pendidikan-indonesia-terendah-di-dunia
Schatz, M. (2015). Toward one of the leading education-based economies? Investigating aims, strategies, and practices of Finland's education export landscape. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 19*(4), 327–340.
Schweisfurth, M. (2011). Learner-centred education in developing country contexts: From solution to problem? *International Journal of Educational Development, 31*(5), 425–432.
Schweisfurth, M. (2013). *Learner-centred education in international perspective: Whose pedagogy for whose development?* Routledge.
Schweisfurth, M. (2015). Learner-centred pedagogy: Towards a post-2015 agenda for teaching and learning. *International Journal of Educational Development, 40*, 259–266.
Sellar, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). Looking East: Shanghai, PISA 2009 and the reconstitution of reference societies in the global education policy field. *Comparative Education, 49*(4), 464–485.

Sheany. (2017, September 15). Investing in teachers crucial to improve education in Indonesia: World Bank. *Jakarta Globe.* Retrieved from http://jakartaglobe.id/news/investing-in-teachers-reforming-teaching-profession-crucial-to-improve-education-in-indonesia/

Sikoyo, L. (2010). Contextual challenges of implementing learner-centred pedagogy: The case of the problem-solving approach in Uganda. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 40*(3), 247–263.

Spring, J. (2009). *Globalization of education: An introduction.* Routledge.

Sriprakash, A. (2010). Child-centred education and the promise of democratic learning: Pedagogic messages in rural Indian primary schools. *International Journal of Educational Development, 30*(3), 297–304.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2002). Reterritorializing educational import. In *Fabricating Europe* (pp. 69–86). Springer.

Sulfasyah, S., Haig, Y., & Barratt-Pugh, C. (2015). Indonesian teachers' implementation of new curriculum initiatives in relation to teaching writing in lower primary school. *International Journal of Education, 7*(4), 53–72.

Tabulawa, R. (2003). International aid agencies, learner-centred pedagogy and political democratization: A critique. *Comparative Education, 39*(1), 7–26.

Takayama, K. (2008). The politics of international league tables: PISA in Japan's achievement crisis debate. *Comparative Education, 44*(4), 387–407.

Takayama, K., & Apple, M. W. (2008). The cultural politics of borrowing: Japan, Britain, and the narrative of educational crisis. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 29*(3), 289–301.

Tan, C. (2012). The culture of education policy making: Curriculum reform in Shanghai. *Critical Studies in Education, 53*(2), 153–167.

Tanaka, Y. (2008). *Betonamu no kyoiku kaikaku* [The education reform in Vietnam]. Akashi Shoten.

Toye, J. (1993). *Dilemmas of development: The counter-revolution in development economics.* Blackwell Publishers.

UNESCO. (2007). *Education for All by 2015: Will we make it?* (n.p.): Oxford University Press Oxford.

Vavrus, F. (2009). The cultural politics of constructivist pedagogies: Teacher education reform in the United Republic of Tanzania. *International Journal of Educational Development, 29*(3), 303–311.

Vavrus, F., & Bartlett, L. (2012). Comparative pedagogies and epistemological diversity: Social and materials contexts of teaching in Tanzania. *Comparative Education Review, 56*(4), 634–658.

Vulliamy, G., & Webb, R. (2009). Using qualitative research strategies in cross-national projects: the English–Finnish experience. *Education 3-13, 37*(4), 399–411.

Wahyuni, T. (2014, January 12). Sebanyak 75 Persen Sekolah di Indonesia Tak Penuhi Standar [As many as 75 percents of schools in Indonesia are not meeting the standards]. *CNN Indonesia.* Retrieved from https://www.cnnindonesia.com/nasional/20141201134529-20-14960/sebanyak-75-persen-sekolah-di-indonesia-tak-penuhi-standar

Watson, R., & Manning, A. (2008). Factors influencing the transformation of new teaching approaches from a programme of professional development to the classroom. *International Journal of Science Education, 30*(5), 689–709.

Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization, 7*(2), 225–246.

World Bank. (2009). *Global monitoring report 2009: A development emergency.* The World Bank.

Wilby, P. (2014, May 6). *Global school tests under attack as OECD accused of killing 'joy of learning.'* Retrieved from www.easybib.com/reference/guide/apa/newspaper

World Conference on Education for All. (1990). *World declaration on education for all and framework for action to meet basic learning needs: the inter-agency commission* (UNDP, Unesco, Unicef, World Bank). New York.

Chapter 2
Historical Development of Lesson Study in Japan

Abstract This chapter discusses the origins and historical development of lesson study in Japan. Lesson study began around 150 years ago as a way to disseminate classroom teaching from the West. However, lesson study is not a uniform model. The practice has transformed to serve different purposes and educational ideals. It has been used as both a top-down and bottom-up initiative, a scientific investigation of effective learning, as well as a personal and narrative learning experience in classrooms. This chapter reveals the unique historical, social, and cultural contexts of Japanese schooling that have supported the dynamic development of lesson study. Lesson study is not a fixed practice but continues to transform to meet changing educational contexts.

2.1 Introduction

Lesson study, a professional development approach that originated in Japan at the end of the nineteenth century, has been practiced in over 50 countries since the late 1990s. Lesson study is generally known as an approach for professional development that is bottom-up and collaborative, in which teachers engage in learning for the purpose of improving student learning (Arani et al., 2010; Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; Lewis, 2002; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). Lesson study is often believed to be an effective approach for professional development, or best practice, to improve students' academic achievement. However, lesson study 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).

Thus, lesson study is not based on a particular theory or methodology, and there is no agreed definition. 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,

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_2

> professional development, the building of school culture, or basic research conducted by researchers. (p. 167)

Lesson study began when the modern school system was established. Originally, it was an instrument for experimenting and disseminating "modern" teaching imitating the West. Over time, lesson study has accommodated educational contexts 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 study has endured over 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 the comprehensive picture of lesson study. This understanding is essential for foreign practitioners and researchers since the absence of necessary supporting conditions often poses challenges to implementing lesson study abroad.

The aim of this chapter is to present the origins and historical development of lesson study in Japan to understand the educational contexts that have supported its dynamics. As will be revealed, there are mainly three forces that have contributed to the diverse development of lesson study:

- Top-down initiatives by policymakers to standardize lessons and bottom-up initiatives of practitioners to experiment with innovative practice.
- Governmental efforts to institutionalize professional development for the purpose of quality assurance and teachers' efforts to work collaboratively to pursue their educational ideals in order to guarantee students' learning.
- 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.

2.2 Origins of Lesson Study

Lesson study was born subsequent to the establishment of the modern Japanese educational system. Following the Meiji Restoration in 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, 2003). In both these types of schools, students' learning was based on a tutoring system such that students sought 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 them 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 & 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 & Sato, 1996; 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 & Sato, 1996; Matoba, 2013). In particular, the government used five steps of the Herbart approach (preparation, presentation, association, generalization, and application) as an effort to control the quality of teaching (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 & Sato, 1996; 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.

2.3 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. From the 1920s to 1930s, the New Education Movement 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 (Sato, 1996). While lesson study was previously undertaken for the purposes of directly importing Western teaching, Seijo pursued its own educational ideals, conducted lesson study as a laboratory school, and published its results (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 (Sato, 1996; Yamazumi, 1987). These and other progressive schools held lesson study and documented these lessons for the purpose of enabling teachers in other schools to learn from them (Inagaki & 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 at the Ikebukuro Students' Village. In 1929, they launched a new monthly journal entitled *Composition Life,* and in 1935 they began a new one 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) described the characteristics of *jissen kiroku* as (a) the use of the first person "I"; (b) the specific names of students are mentioned in the record; and (c) the events between "I" (teacher) and students are described in narrative descriptions. Asai (2019) pointed out that *jissen kiroku* allowed teachers to pursue their educational ideals and discover the meaning of teacher 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 issues in practice.

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 in light of relevant contextual factors.

These views of teaching have motivated Japanese teachers to reflect on their practice and build what Shimahara (1998) called "craft knowledge," in which they value expertise "embedded in teacher-generated experience and knowledge" (p. 452). Due to this, "teaching was learned, transmitted, and reformulated as a craft in Japan" (Shimahara, 2002, p. 24). This continues to be a strong tradition among Japanese teachers distinct from that of researchers' scientific and theoretical inquiries.

2.4 The New Education Movement and Lesson Study

These teachers' efforts to record learning narratively and to exchange practice through such documentation have 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" and "has been one of the means of lesson study in Japan" (Asai, 2019, p. 126). 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. Fifth, lesson study reports and research using narratives (such as *seikatsu tsuzurikata* 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 of the 1940s, grassroots 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 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, 70% of elementary and middle schools engaged in developing school-based curricula (Sato, 1996, p. 39). In response to this great interest in curriculum design, many reports on research lessons were published in the 1950s (Inagaki & Sato, 1996; Yasuhiko, 2009).

2.5 Promulgation and Stagnation of Lesson Study

In the post-war period and under the influence of the Cold War, there was a shift away from democratic and autonomous practices of schools toward the strengthening of government control over education (Inagaki & 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). In the 1960s, academics began conducting research on lessons due to the introduction of foreign research and theories on lesson analysis and pedagogy. Based on different theoretical backgrounds, five universities—Hiroshima University, Kobe University, Nagoya University, Tokyo University, and Hokkaido University—began conducting research on lessons (Sato, 1996, 2009). This marked the beginning of researchers' collaboration with schools. In 1962 the National Council of Lesson Study (*Zen koku jyugyou kenkyu kyogikai*) 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 (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 (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; Shibata, 2007). 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 and 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 & Sato, 1996). In addition, the system of "designated research schools" was first established in 1964. In this system, schools participate in conducting research on a particular theme for two to three 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 (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 & 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 grassroots effort to further lesson study under the movement called *minkan kyoiku undou* or Popular Education Movement. Voluntary subject study groups by teachers were organized. They 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 (Sato, 2009).

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, and they lost the motivation to learn (Sato, 2000). Japanese schools faced problems such as school violence, delinquency, and bullying (Akita, 2012; 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 weakening of bottom-up initiatives of teachers concerning lesson study. Furthermore, there was a lack of momentum from researchers as various approaches to lesson analysis were introduced in lesson study in the 1990s. While ethnomethodology, qualitative research, participant observation, critical theory, social constructivism, cognitive science, and activity theory were introduced, there was no agreed approach to analyzing lessons (Matoba, 2013; Sato, 2009).

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. While lesson study as systematized in-service and in-house training continued, the new bottom-up approach to lesson study was born.

2.6 Lesson Study as a Learning Community

In the 1990s, a new movement in lesson study was initiated to reform schools and to create a "learning community" (Dewey, 1938), advocated in Japan by the prominent scholars Yutaka Saeki and Manabu Sato. To deal with the school crises and to meet the emerging needs of education under the New Course of Study, there was interest in reforming schools and moving away from standardized teaching (Inagaki & Sato, 1996). This is when the school as a learning community (SLC) initiative started. According to 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 twenty-first 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. 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.):

- School is a public sphere in which all teachers should open their classrooms (public philosophy).
- 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, 1916) (democratic philosophy).
- The school pursues excellence in teaching and learning.

The first attempt to create a school based on the philosophy of SLC started with the establishment of the Hamanogo Elementary School in 1998 (Sato, 2012). This was initiated by the former education officer in Chigasaki City Education Council, Toshiaki Ose, who became the first principal of Hamanogo. Ose worked with a professor at the University of Tokyo, Manabu Sato, 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 (2000) published a book entitled Establishing a School: The Birth and Practice of Hamanogo Elementary School. The book provided detailed accounts of the experience of building the learning community in the school. This included firsthand 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 facing similar challenges nationwide. 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. Sato distinguishes traditional lesson study from SLC, as shown in Table 2.1. The new lesson study approach, SLC, was developed as a dialogue between the Western philosophies and long-standing Japanese teacher traditions. The concept of SLC was developed under the influence of "reflective practice" by Donald Schön (1983), an

Table 2.1 Comparison of traditional lesson study and lesson study in school as a learning community

	Traditional Lesson Study	Lesson Study in School as Learning Community
Aim	Lesson improvement for effective lessons Improving the academic performance of students Training competent teachers	Ensuring the right of every child to learn Creating high-quality learning Development of thoughtful teachers Building collegiality Democratic schools and classrooms
Focus	Study of materials, lesson plans, and lesson techniques	Relationship and activities of student learning, authentic learning, and collaborative learning
Frequency of lesson study	Around three times a year	More than 30 times a year

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

approach in which teachers develop through reflecting on and exchanging their own practice. Inagaki and Sato (1996, p. 20) called this restructuring of the classroom into a "discourse community", 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 ensure high-quality student learning based on the study of individual cases. The focus of lesson study has 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 & Sato, 1996; Sato, 1996).

According to Sato (2018), around 1,500 elementary schools, 2,500 junior secondary schools, and 300 senior secondary schools in Japan engage in SLC. In the early 2000s, a national network of lesson study as a learning community, the Japan Network for School as Learning Community, was established. SLC spread widely, mainly in the domain of compulsory education (at the primary and junior secondary school level), 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 at 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 form. The majority of engagement in SLC was bottom-up initiatives led by schools, although some programs were led by municipal governments. Thus, it is not a systematized form of professional development and was not designed to disseminate nationally. Nevertheless, it is clear that SLC had a significant impact on schools in Japan. One explanation behind the 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 in declining achievement levels and working with those students who had lost the motivation to learn (Sato, 2012). SLC was considered an effective approach to resolving social problems in school, improving academic achievement, and providing a new vision for teachers to care for students.

2.7 Lesson Study Today

Today lesson study is implemented in various forms, as listed in Table 2.2. There are 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. According to a survey by the National Education Policy Research Institute in 2011, 99% of Japanese elementary schools, 98% of junior high schools, and 90% 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 cases of superficial implementation (Sato, 2009, 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.

2.8 Conclusion

Based on the discussions of the historical development of lesson study presented in this chapter, it is apparent that the sociocultural setting in Japan is conducive to and has facilitated the dynamic development of lesson study. In conclusion, a summary of the characteristics and underlying philosophies of lesson study will be presented.

2.8.1 Student Learning as a Social and Holistic Experience

There is a shared understanding among Japanese teachers that their role is to support students' learning as a social 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 (Rohlen &

Table 2.2 Types of lesson study in Japan

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

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

LeTendre, 1998). 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 focus on 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.

2.8.2 Teacher-Initiated Inquiry

Lesson study is rooted in a professional culture that supports teacher-initiated inquiry centered on student learning (Sato, 2015). For example, Japanese teachers carefully observe lessons and view lessons from the students' perspectives, and this has helped to develop "the eyes to see students" (Lewis, 2002):

> 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, 2002, p. 21)

Similarly, *kyozai kenkyu*—the study of teaching materials—requires not only a deep understanding of subject teaching but also teachers to develop strategies that anticipate students' thinking. This contributes to improving teachers' pedagogical content knowledge (Yoshida & Jackson, 2011). Non-Japanese researchers have pointed out that the concise curriculum and standardized textbooks facilitated such sharing of teaching materials and practice (Lewis et al., 2004; Stigler & Hiebert, 1999). This sense of shared interest in working with students has contributed to building the knowledge base of teachers.

2.8.3 Teacher-Generated Knowledge and Professional Knowledge Base

Over the history of lesson study, Japanese teachers have developed accumulated tools, language, and artifacts which have helped to support 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 Sato (1996) described "contextualized reasoning" as the expertise valued in lesson study as a 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 (Sato, 2015). Lesson plans, records of lessons, and research papers are shared not just between schools but across schools. These include resources developed for curriculum study and *kyozai kenkyu* or the study of teaching materials (Lewis et al., 2011; Watanabe et al., 2008). Such teacher-generated knowledge is also evident from the context-specific vocabulary used among Japanese teachers. Words such as *kikan-shido* (between desks instruction; Clarke, 2013), *neriage* (polishing students' ideas through discussion; Takahashi, 2009), and *yusaburi* (challenging students' ideas and thinking; Lee &

Ling, 2013) are difficult to translate into another language. These vocabularies imply that particular teacher-student social interactions are presumed in lesson study.

2.8.4 A Flexible Learning System

Described as "a flexible learning system" by Lewis (2002), lesson study is adaptable to 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 twenty-first 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. Lesson study developed as a way of seeking unique pedagogical approaches to realize educational ideals. Whether based on theoretical grounds or practical needs, lesson study provided a platform to share practice, reflect on teaching and learning, and learn from others.

2.8.5 Practitioner–researcher Dialogue and Collaboration

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 (Sato, 1997): an objectified language on the part of researchers and narrative accounts from teachers; and scientific and theoretical investigation by researchers; and personalized and contextualized reflective practice among teachers. Sato (1997) also warned 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; rather, they need to learn from teachers' practice, to support teachers' inquiries in teaching, and to "live" lessons as insiders with teachers and students (Sato, 2009, p. 126). Kaneta (2010) also found that action research in lesson study provides a new form of collaboration between teachers and researchers to engage in "reciprocal learning." She claimed 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 et al., 2007; Shibata, 2007).

This discussion 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" and merely as an approach to 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.

This chapter discussed Japanese educational contexts that have supported the development of lesson study. I have suggested that a professional development initiative such as lesson study merely reflects the accountabilities of teachers, which is supported by organizational structure, rather than bringing about changes to them. In the context of foreign implementation, these sociocultural contexts are most likely not available. The issues in education transfer of lesson study abroad will be discussed in the following chapter.

Acknowledgements This chapter was published as the following journal article:

Kusanagi, K. N. "Historical Development of Lesson Study in Japan," *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education,* 2021, Retrieved 18 Jun. 2021, from https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-1216.

References

Akita, K. (2012). *Manabi no Shinrigaku: Jyugyo wo Dezain suru* [Psychology of learning: Designing lessons]. Tokyo: Sayusha.

Arani, M. R. S., Fukaya, K., & Lassegard, J. P. (2010). "Lesson Study" as Professional Culture in Japanese Schools: An Historical Perspective on Elementary Classroom Practices. *Nichibunken Japan Review*, 171–200.

Asai, S. (2016). Kyoshi no kyouiku kenkyu no rekishi teki iso [Historical Aspects of Teachers' Educational Research]. In M. Sato, K. Akita, K. Shimizu, S. Kodama, & Y. Kitamura (Eds.), *Manabi no semmon ka toshiteno kyoshi* [Teachers as learning professionals] (pp. 35–64). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Asai, S. (2008). *Kyoshi no katari to shin-kyoiku: "jido no mura" no 1920 nen-dai [Narrative of teachers and New Education: "Village of Students" in the 1920s]*. University of Tokyo Press.

Asai, S. (2019). Teacher narrative description. In Y. Kitamura, T. Omomo, & M. Katsuno (Eds.), *Education in Japan: Reforms of education governance and quality assurance* (pp. 125–141). Springer.

Asanuma, S. (2012). Lesson study and curriculum politics in contemporary Japan. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Development (APJED), 1*(1), 25–32.

Clarke, D. J. (2013). Contingent conceptions of accomplished practice: The cultural specificity of discourse in and about the mathematics classroom. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 45*(1), 21–33.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education.* Macmillan.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. Collier Books.
Duke, B. (2009). *The history of modern japanese education: constructing the national school system, 1872–1890*. Rutgers University Press.
Fernandez, C., & Yoshida, M. (2004). *Lesson study: A case of a Japanese approach to improving instruction through school-based teacher development*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
Fujiwara, Y. (2009). Jyugyo kenkyu undo no tenkai [Development of Lesson Study Movement]. In National Association for the Study of Educational Methods (Ed.), *Lesson Study in Japan: Nihon no jgygyokenkyu "Jyugyokenkyu no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku"* [*Lesson Study in Japan: "The history of lesson study and teacher training" Jyugyokenkyu no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku* (pp. 25–38). Tokyo: Gakubunsha.
Inagaki, T., & Sato, M. (1996). *Jyugyo Kenkyu Nyumon* [Introduction to Lesson Study]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
JICA. (2003). *Nihon no Kyouiku Keiken—Tojoukoku no Kyouiku Kaihatsu wo Kangaeru (The History of Japan's Educational Development—What Implications Can be Drawn for Developing Countries Today).* Institute for International Cooperation, Japan.
JICA. (2004). *The History of Japan's Educational Development: What implications can be drawn for developing countries today.* Retrieved from https://www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/IFIC_and_JBICI-Kaneta (2010)
Kaneta, Y. (2010). Gakko ni okeru "kyodo" wo toraeru: jyugyou kenkyu wo kaku to shita kyoshi tachi no kyodo [Grapsing "collaboration" in schools: collaboration of teachers based on lesson study]. *Ninggenkankei kenkyu [The study of human relations]*, (9), 43–57.
Kawaji, A. (2017). Daily Life Writing in school: Creating alternative textbooks and culture. In Y. Yamasaki & H. Kuno (Eds.), *Educational Progressivism, Cultural Encounters and Reform in Japan* (pp. 109–124). Taylor & Francis.
Lee, C., & Ling, C. L. M. (2013). The role of lesson study in facilitating curriculum reforms. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 2*(3), 200–206.
LeTendre, G. K., & Rohlen, T. P. (1996). *Teaching and learning in Japan. (n.p.)*: Cambridge University Press.
Lewis, C. C., Perry, R., & Hurd, J. (2004, February). A Deeper Look at Lesson Study. *Educational Leadership*, 18–22.
Lewis, C. C., & Lee, C. (2017). 12 The Global Spread of Lesson Study. *International Handbook of Teacher Quality and Policy*, 161.
Lewis, C. C. (2002). Does Lesson Study Have a Future in the United States? *Nagoya Journal of Education and Human Development, 1*, 1–23.
Lewis, C., & Hurd, J. (2011). *Lesson study step by step: How teacher learning communities improve instruction.* Heinemann.
Matoba, M. (2013). Jyugyo kenkyu no kigen to rekishi [The origin and history of lesson study]. In M. Matoba, & S. Shibata (Eds.), *Jyugyou kenkyu to jyugyo no souzou* [Creation of lesson study and lesson] (pp. 279–293). (n.p.): Keisui Publishing.
Matoba, M. (2017). Gyugyo kenkyu to jyugyobunseki no kadai—jissen to riron heno sono koken [Lesson study and lesson analysis—its contribution to practice and theory]. *Tokaigakuen Daigaku Kyouiku Kenkyu Kiyo [bulletin of Educational Research, Tokaigakuen University], 2*(1), 159–172.
Matoba, M., Shibata, Y., & Arani, M. R. S. (2007). School-university partnerships: A new recipe for creating professional knowledge in school. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 6*(1), 55–65.
Ose, T., & Sato, M. (2000). *Gakko wo tsukuru [Establishing a school].* (n.p.): Shogakukan.
Rohlen, T. P., & LeTendre, G. K. (1998). *Teaching and learning in Japan.* Cambridge UP.
Sato, M. (1996). *Kyoiku Houhou Gaku* [Educational Methods]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
Sato, M. (1997). *Kyoushi to iu aporia: Hanseiteki jissen he* [Aporia known as teachers: Toward a reflective practice]. *Tokyo: Seori Shobo.*
Sato, M. (2009). Kaikaku no doko [The trend of reform]. In National Association for the Study of Educational Methods (Ed.), *Lesson Study in Japan: Nihon no jgygyokenkyu "Jyugyokenkyu*

no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku" [*Lesson Study in Japan: "The history of lesson study and teacher training" Jyugyokenkyu no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku* (pp. 104–114). Tokyo: Gakubunsha.

Sato, M. (2012). *Gakko wo Kaikaku Suru.* [Philosophy of School Reform]. Tokyo: Iwanami.

Sato, M. (2018). *Spread and Progress of School as Learning Community in Asia.* In A. Tsukui, A., & Murase, M. (Eds.), *Lesson Study and Schools as Learning Communities: Asian School Reform in Theory and Practice* (pp. 3–13). (n.p.): Routledge.

Sato, M. (2015). *Senmonka to shite Kyoshi wo Sodateru: Kyoshi Kyoiku Kaikaku no Gurando Dezain [Developing Professionalism of Teachers: A Grand Design of Teacher Education Reform].* Iwanami.

Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action.* Routledge.

Shibata, S. (2007). Kyoikugaku kenkyu ni okeru chiteki seisan to shiteno jyugyo bunseki no kanousei: Shigematsu Shigeyasu/Hibi Yu no jyugyo bunseki no houho wo tegakari ni [Possibility of Lesson Analysis as Intellectual Production in Pedagogical Research: Using the Method of Lesson Analysis of Shigeyasu Shigematsu and Yu Hibii]. *Kyoikugaku Kenkyu [educational Studies in Japan], 74*(2), 189–202.

Shimahara, N. K. (2002). Teacher professional development in Japan. *National standards and school reform in Japan and the United States*, 107–120.

Shimahara, N. K. (1998). The Japanese model of professional development: Teaching as craft. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(5), 451–462.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom.* Free Press.

Takahashi, A. (2009). Characteristics of Japanese mathematics lessons. *Colección Digital Eudoxus*(18).

Watanabe, T., Takahashi, A., & Yoshida, M. (2008). Kyozaikenkyu: A critical step for conducting effective lesson study and beyond. *Inquiry into Mathematics Teacher Education, 5*, 131–142.

Yamazumi, M. (1987). *Ninon kyouiku shoshi: kin gendai (Vol. 363)* [*A Brief History of Japanese Education* (Vol. 363)]. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.

Yasuhiko, T. (2009). Curriculum Research and Lesson Study (Karikyuramu Kenkyu to Jyugyo Kenkyu). In National Association for the Study of Educational Methods (Ed.), *Lesson Study in Japan: Nihon no jgygyokenkyu "Jyugyokenkyu no houhou to keitai"* [Lesson Study in Japan: Method and forms of lesson study] (Vol. 2., pp. 11–20). Tokyo: Gakubunsha.

Yoshida, M., & Jackson, W. C. (2011). Response to part V: Ideas for developing mathematical pedagogical content knowledge through lesson study *Lesson study research and practice in mathematics education* (pp. 279–288): Springer.

Yufu, S. (2007, July). Start lesson study from where you can: taking "substance" and not "form" *Lesson study that link teachers.* Retrieved from http://berd.benesse.jp/berd/center/open/syo/view21/2007/07/s01toku_01.html

Chapter 3
Importing and Exporting Lesson Study

Abstract This chapter discusses cases of importing/exporting lesson study in the U.S., Singapore, China, South Korea, Taiwan, and JICA-assisted lesson study in the developing countries of Indonesia, Vietnam, Zambia, Kenya, Senegal, and South Africa. The analysis will explain the motivation behind global education reform trends and efforts that support lesson study to improve student performance through teacher development. Foreign implementation of lesson study reveals that challenges exist due to the lack of supportive environments and shifts in the meaning of lesson study when interpreted against local settings. The debates in this chapter suggest that if what were promoted by lesson study was not consistent with local educational settings, change in practice may not occur, be temporary, or only happen at a superficial level.

3.1 Introduction

Lesson study was the first internationally known Japanese education model and has gained popularity worldwide in the past two decades since it was first introduced by American scholars in the late 1990s (Tsuneyoshi, 2017). First introduced to the U.S. and Hong Kong in 1999, it quickly spread to 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). The World Association of Lesson Study (WALS) was established in 2007, and the first publication of the *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*[1] 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

[1] Learning study is a variation of lesson study born out of a collaboration of 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 it has transferred to other countries as well.

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_3

WALS 2017 organizing committee, personal correspondence, December 23, 2017). Currently, as of 2021, it is practiced in over 50 countries.

In this chapter, I will explore the following questions:

- What are the forces (motivations), both pull and push, behind importing and exporting lesson study?
- What are the challenges inherent to the import/export of educational practices?

Unlike the situation in Japan—where lesson study organically emerged, lesson study abroad was artificially implemented by researchers and agencies at least at the onset, into sociocultural contexts different from Japan. Through a review of the literature, various cases of "recontextualization" of lesson study will be discussed in this chapter. As previously mentioned in Chapter 1, recontextualization involves transforming the practice and its meaning against the social conditions of the receiving context. Depending on the interest of the exporter or importer, one aspect of the lesson study may be emphasized or may even be altered. One example of such recontextualization is how foreign practitioners established lesson groups on mathematics and science compared to other subjects. This reflects how the foreign implementation of lesson study was motivated by Japanese students' excellent academic achievement in mathematics and science in the international assessments. In this chapter, different cases of lesson study implementation abroad will be presented to understand the issues of "recontextualization."

3.2 Foreign Attraction to Lesson Study

Various forces and global trends in educational reform have resulted in the attraction to lesson study. First, the emergence of international surveys such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (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). The high performance of Japanese students, especially in mathematics and science, in these surveys contributed to the growing foreign interest in lesson study. Second, there was a global trend to introduce a social constructivist approach to teaching and learning, and teachers have been required to shift their pedagogy from a didactic approach to a student-centered approach. 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 continuously alter their pedagogy and sustain such change to engage in professional development continuously (Bolam & Stoll, 2005; DuFour, 2007; Little, 1982; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006). Lesson study was considered a practical approach in bringing these pedagogical changes to accommodate the new challenges in teaching and learning for the twenty-first century.

While it is impossible to compile a comprehensive list of lesson study implementation abroad, I will introduce several countries' cases to present various issues of "recontextualization." I will first introduce a case from China that presents a development of lesson study based on a different tradition than in Japan. Second, I will explore the development of lesson study in the U.S., which triggered the other countries' interest in lesson study and has several lesson study developments due to its relatively long history. Third, I will introduce cases from Asia. Namely, the implementation of lesson study in Singapore and School as Learning Community (SLC)[2] efforts in South Korea and Taiwan. Fourth, the cases of lesson study "export" to developing countries will be discussed. The following comparison of cases enables an exploration of the complexity in pedagogic transfer and how it does not occur uniformly; however, the meaning of the practice will be contextualized across contexts.

3.3 Parallel Development of Lesson Study in China

3.3.1 Historical Development in China

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

After Provisional Regulation for Secondary Schools (draft[3]) mandated every school to establish subject-based research groups in 1952, the Teaching Research Group (TRG; or *jiaoyanzu*) was established at various levels in China (Yang, 2009). TRG's purpose was "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). Teachers' systematic cooperation was structured under TRGs; offices were set up for teachers to meet regularly and spend after-school hours together (Chen & Yang, 2013).

The decentralization policy and curriculum reform in 2001 emphasized students' active participation based on the constructivist ideal of learning; this 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 schools to implement the new curriculum (Guo, 2013). TRGs were

[2] 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).

[3] It was called draft and did not have a regulatory power.

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 Chinese teachers' daily work since all teachers are required to conduct and observe open lessons (Pang & Marton, 2017). Chinese teachers engage in different types of lesson study activities depending upon their career stage. 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).

3.3.2 Features of Chinese Lesson Study

Chinese TRGs share similarities with lesson study, such as its cycle of planning, public lesson, and post discussion; however, there are also differences. First, TRG is a subject study group[4] that emphasizes how to teach specific subject content (Huang et al., 2017). This process is supported by teacher research specialists (Yang & Ricks, 2011). Based on an ethnographic study of TRGs, Han and Paine (2010) identified three contributions of lesson study in improving instructional practices: "designing mathematical tasks for students, understanding and instructing difficult mathematical ideas, and using the appropriate mathematical language" (pp. 526–536). These points show how the focus of lesson study is placed on teacher instruction linked to students' mastery of the subject content. Indeed, Ma, as cited in Yang (2009), points out how the activities of TRG contributed to developing a profound understanding of fundamental mathematics by Chinese teachers. While the pre-service courses at the universities tend to focus on 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 is that discussions in Chinese lesson study focus on improving teacher behavior and teaching approaches while the Japanese discussions focus more on student learning (Chen & Yang, 2013). According to Yang, as cited in Yang and Ricks (2011), there are three key themes for discussions: (1) the lesson's key points, (2) the lesson's difficult points, and (3) the lesson's critical points. Third, lesson study in TRG has been practiced to disseminate expert teachers' best practices by holding demonstration lesson for other teachers to imitate and adapt to their teaching contexts.

These lesson study features indicate that the purpose of lesson study in China is to enhance teacher's subject expertise, improve teacher instruction, and disseminate best practices. Consequently, it is common for teachers to conduct several lesson study

[4] Elementary school teachers in China teach a single subject, although there are some exceptions in rural areas.

cycles of the same lesson to refine one lesson (Han & Paine, 2010; Yang, 2009). In some cases, lessons were rehearsed for large-scale public lessons. Recently, there have been new lesson study movements outside of government-led and systematic lesson study to pursue bottom-up professional inquiries. This was motivated by the philosophies of SLC and SLC advocators, such as Professor Chen Xianming of Peking University (Manabu Sato, personal communication, June 14, 2018).

3.4 Lesson Study in the U.S.

3.4.1 Background

Although lesson study has been practiced in Japan since the 1870s, it was not "discovered" by the international community until the late 1990s when American researchers published English publications on lesson study (Tsuneyoshi, 2017, p. 23). In 1997, Catherine Lewis and Ineko Tsuchida published the first article on lesson study in English. They attributed research lessons (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). In 1999, Stigler and Hiebert (1999), also American researchers, published *The Teaching Gap,* in which they ascribed lesson study as a key contribution to Japanese students' high performance on TIMSS. They discussed how the image of teaching patterns (which they called teaching scripts) significantly differed in each country and proposed lesson study as a helpful strategy to produce "the cultural change" needed to improve teaching gradually over the long term.

The attraction to lesson study was also underlined by domestic criticism of the American school system. This was 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. Their studies laid the groundwork for the global 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 precipitated interest in lesson study within the U.S. when American students' low performance 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 teacher learning (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990; Louis

et al., 1996; McLaughlin & Talbert, 2006; Senge, 1991; Wenger, 2000). Collaborative and continuous professional development was considered key to improving teaching and learning. Lesson study was recognized as a preferred approach for professional learning for enhancing pedagogic content knowledge, organizing teachers' collaborative and bottom-up professional inquiry, increasing teacher efficacy, and shifting understanding of teaching to be based more on student inquiries and ideas (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004; Murata, 2011; Puchner & Taylor, 2006).

3.4.2 Progress and Diversification of Lesson Study in the U.S.

The first public research lesson[5] in the U.S. was held in 2000 at Paterson Public School 2 in Paterson, New Jersey, with support from Teachers College, Columbia University (Lewis, 2002a). In the same year, 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, 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 according to the Common Core State Standards (Akiba & Wilkinson, 2015). By 2004, lesson study emerged at more than 335 schools across 32 states.

There were multiple actors involved in the spread of lesson study. At the initial stage, at least three groups of researchers with a different focus had contributed to the development of lesson study in the U.S. (Matoba et al., 2006, 2007). The first group, Stigler and his team, were interested in the content of lessons and how they created "cultural routines" of effective teaching (Stigler & Hiebert, 2016). The second group, Fernandez and her team, focused on teachers' roles with an emphasis on research and curriculum and effective methods and tools (Fernandez & Yoshida, 2004). The third group, Lewis and her collaborators, was interested in students' holistic learning and teachers' collaborative culture (Matoba et al., 2006, 2007). The American practitioners who implement lesson study may not be fully aware of these differences. Nevertheless, these other developments laid the ground for the multi-layered motivation and implementation in lesson study in the U.S.

The establishment of supporting mechanisms facilitated the rapid expansion of lesson study in the U.S. In the early to middle 2000s, various English papers,[6] reports,

[5] Research lessons, public lessons, and open lessons, among other terms, are used to describe the phase of lesson study where teachers open their lessons for other practitioners or researchers.

[6] For example, see Brown et al. (2002), Chokshi and Fernandez (2004), Fernandez (2002), Lesson Study Research Group (2004), McGraw et al. (2003), National Research Council (2002), North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (2002), Lewis and Perry, R., & Hurd, J. (2004), Richardson (2004), Stepanek (2001, 2003), Wang-Iverson and Yoshida (2005), Watanabe (2002), Wilms (2003).

and guidebooks[7] were published, which introduced the principles of lesson study and described the experience of implementing lesson study in American settings. Various lesson study networks[8] were also formed and became platforms for sharing resources, exchanging practice, and seeking advice. For instance, the Lesson Study Group at Mills College[9] offers lesson study videos and Global Education Resources sold products related to lesson study such as mathematics textbooks, workbooks, DVDs, and other teaching resources. Also, both American and Japanese researchers have served as external resource persons and worked with regional practitioners. These English resources and networks facilitated lesson study transition into US contexts and other countries.

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

3.4.3 Contextual Gaps of Lesson Study in the U.S.

Since professional development was not structured within teachers' daily responsibilities in the U.S., there were practical challenges to implementing lesson study. For example, there was the problem of how to secure time for lesson study, and external funding was needed to pay stipends for teachers to attend training and to hire substitute teachers 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 in some locations (Akiba & Wilkinson, 2015; Stigler & Hiebert, 2016). Especially at the early stage of importing lesson study, American practitioners tended to focus on short-term and measurable goals, which conflicted with the long-term and holistic process proposed

---

[7] *Lesson Study: A Handbook of Teacher-Led Instructional Change* (Lewis, 2002b), *Lesson Study Communities: Increasing Achievement with Diverse Students* (Wiburg & Brown, 2007), *Leading Lesson Study: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Facilitators* (Stepanek et al., 2006), *A Mathematics Leader's Guide to Lesson Study in Practice* (Gorman et al., 2010), *Lesson Study Step by Step: How Teaching Learning Communities Improve Instruction* (Lewis & Hurd, 2011), among others.

[8] Some of the lesson study networks in the U.S. are: Columbia Lesson Study Research Group (http://www.tc.columbia.edu/lessonstudy/), Lesson Study Group at Mills College (http://www.lessonresearch.net/index.html), Chicago Lesson Study Group (http://www.lessonstudygroup.net/), Lesson Study Alliance (http://www.lsalliance.org/), and Lesson Study Project (http://www.uwlax.edu/sotl/lsp/).

[9] https://lessonresearch.net/.

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 indicate that merely introducing lesson study may bring structural and conceptual conflicts that may hinder practical implementation.

3.4.4 Local Adaptation of Lesson Study in the U.S.

One of the perceived strengths of lesson study was its adaptability to local educational settings. While the reported challenges of lesson study were often attributed to cultural differences, empirical studies suggest that its local adaptation of lesson study was possible if time and effort were spent to overcome conceptual gaps (Murata, 2011; Perry & Lewis, 2009). The research by Perry and Lewis (2009) described how teachers gradually developed their understanding of lesson study. As teachers practiced small components of lesson study and built them into their existing practice, they began to value different aspects of lesson study, such as "developing a lesson rationale and documenting their learning" (p. 387).

Similarly, Lieberman (2009) examined the case of lesson study in a middle school mathematics department and showed how it could alter the norms of teaching over seven years. 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 lesson study cases, 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).

The lesson study experience may not be the same within a professional community since teacher learning develops over time. Bocala (2015) observed how the participants from the same community benefited differently from the lesson study experience depending on their familiarity with lesson study and teaching experience. The novice practitioners focused more on specific lesson study features and recounted benefitting from observing other lessons or getting ideas from other teachers. The experienced practitioners and those familiar with lesson study routines expressed how they reconceptualized teachers' and students' roles and reconsidered their pedagogy

to elicit student thinking. For them, lesson study was a helpful approach to gather evidence of how students learn or how they understand mathematics. These American experiences present to us that it takes time, and both conscious and unconscious adaptation is needed for lesson study to take root in local settings.

3.5 Lesson Study in Asia

3.5.1 Asian Curriculum Reform under Globalization

The low performance of American students in international surveys motivated the introduction of lesson study in the U.S. In contrast, Asian countries such as China (Shanghai), Taiwan, Singapore, and South Korea had performed relatively well in international surveys such as TIMSS and PISA. It was a changing global 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 South Korea; and the "Nine-Year Integrated Curriculum" (2002) in Taiwan.

These Asian countries shared a common interest in adapting to changing needs in education for the twenty-first century and transforming pedagogy (Kennedy & Lee, 2007; Sato, 2015). Governments and university researchers introduced lesson study to facilitate curriculum reform and bridge the gap between policy and practice (Chen & Yang, 2013; Lee & Ling, 2013; Tan-Chia et al., 2013). Due to widespread pressure to shift away from the traditional exam-oriented approach to a more interactive and student-centered approach, lesson study gained popularity in Asia. Moreover, governments proposed building PLCs of teachers to facilitate the transition of implementing the new curriculum. Despite the limited literature on these cases in English and Japanese, a review will present a common motivation in engaging lesson study in Asian countries and the variations in actual implementation across contexts.

3.5.2 Singapore

3.5.2.1 Historical Development of Lesson Study in Singapore

Singapore provides an informative case since it has a relatively long experience with lesson study. Initially, lesson study in Singapore was implemented as a part of a larger government initiative to transform classroom pedagogy for twenty-first-century learning (Saravanan & Ponnusamy, 2011). Government policies such as

"Thinking Schools, Learning Nation" (1997) and "Teach Less, Learn More" (TLLM) (2004) were initiated to reform curriculum and pedagogy from teacher-centered pedagogy to more student-centered learning (Hairon & Dimmock, 2012; Lee & Lim, 2014). Amid these reform movements, lesson study was first introduced by an American researcher, Catherine Lewis, at an international conference on Cooperative Learning in 2004 (Lee & Lim, 2014).

The first attempt to implement lesson study in Singapore took place in 2004 as a small pilot project in a primary school (Edmund Lim, personal communication, January 8, 2018). Between 2006 and 2007, another pilot study was implemented within the Cooperative Learning Programme (Lee & Lim, 2014). In Singapore, researchers from the National Institute of Education, in cooperation with the Ministry of Education, played a crucial role in introducing lesson study. These researchers adopted resources from the U.S. and trained Singaporean teachers. They also made modifications borrowing from the components of other foreign lesson study implementations, such as the use of Variation Theory[10] in Hong Kong and "critical incidents" in China (Fang & Lee, 2015). These researchers also integrated original elements into their lesson study. These included adding a short discussion by the observers with the observed students at the end of the research lesson to understand the students' thinking and learning better.

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

The quick spread of lesson study in Singapore was made possible with government policies on 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 & 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 utilized by the national government as one form of building professional learning communities (Lawrence & Chong, 2010). Three big ideas—focus on student learning, collaborative culture, and data-driven outcome—promoted by the government were consistent with lesson study principles (Yeap et al., 2015).

[10] 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).

Consequently, lesson study gained popularity as a tool to build PLCs, and the number of participating schools rose from 59 in 2009 to 112 in 2010 (Lee & Lim, 2014). Based on a survey of all principals, 58% of elementary and junior high schools in Singapore are exposed to lesson study (Lee, 2015). In this way, the collaborative learning of teachers was structured top-down as a school-based professional development program.

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 a lesson study team across subjects. This evidenced that teachers' focus went beyond subject expertise and more on student management (Lee & Lim, 2014). While the formal lesson study in Singapore focuses on collaborative planning and curriculum study, SLC focuses on observations and student learning reflections.

3.5.2.2 Benefits and Challenges of Lesson Study in Singapore

The following were cited as benefits of lesson study implementation in Singapore (Lim et al., 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 external resource persons (university researchers and the Ministry of Education officials).

On the other hand, reported challenges included how to embed the practice within the broader educational context. For example, the biggest challenge in lesson study mentioned by teachers was a lack of time (Lim et al., 2011; Yeap et al., 2015). However, this was more a matter of whether teachers perceived it was worthwhile to engage in lesson study. Since Singaporean schools emphasize educational goals with a short-term orientation of academic success, teachers had difficulty seeing interconnectedness across subjects or grade levels. Consequently, school-wide engagement in lesson study was facilitated by subject groups rather than a school-wide initiative (Fang & Lee, 2010). Teachers failed to connect lessons as a unit and did not consider long-term goals such as school or curriculum goals (Lee & Lim, 2014). Under the circumstances, some teachers considered the iterative process of planning—which is the characteristic of *kyozai kenkyu* (the study of instructional materials)—to be unnecessarily time consuming (Lee, 2015). Naturally, some teachers believed that spending time for lesson study was not worthwhile, and they saw it as an additional burden (Lim et al., 2011).

How teachers collaborate in professional development is strongly linked to school culture. The competitive and hierarchical school structure in Singapore worked negatively in terms of collaborative professional learning. There was pressure to conduct a perfect lesson rather than to learn from a lesson (Lee & Lim, 2014). There was

also a tendency for teachers to rely on external expertise (university experts or officials from the Ministry). Teachers were concerned about doing lesson study properly instead of setting up personal research themes (Lim et al., 2011). Outside experts' involvement was limited since teachers were skeptical (Cheah, 1998 as cited in Lee & Lim, 2014; Lim et al., 2011). These conditions made it difficult for some teachers to collaborate and benefit from lesson study.

The approach to lesson study was top-down since lesson study was recommended as a form of professional development by the government. This resulted in a significant diffusion of lesson study in Singapore. However, evidence from Singapore suggests that more than government support was required to realize continuous and collaborative learning. Lee and Lim (2014) argued, "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 lesson study cycle. Considerations need to be attended to the practice's local meaning. This suggests the adaptation required a broader approach attending to the school climate beyond the scope of professional development. When lesson study has a weak link to overall education goals, is not embedded in daily school structure, and does not fit teachers' needs and interests, it can lead to "superficial" implementation similar to the reported cases in the U.S.

3.5.2.3 Lesson Study: School as a Learning Community in Asia

There has been an emergence of interest in "school as learning community (SLC)" in Asia since the 2000s. This approach was first advocated by Professor Manabu Sato (discussed in Chapter 2) as an initiative to reform schools of the twenty-first century based on democratic principles. SLC has been practiced in countries such as China, South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Vietnam, Hong Kong, Singapore, and Thailand, among others (Sato, 2018). The annual conference, "the International Conference of School as Learning Community," has been held annually since 2014.[11] Advocates of SLC from Japan, China, South Korea, Taiwan, Indonesia, Thailand, and Vietnam present their cases and research on schools engaging in SLC. The SLC movement is especially substantial in China, South Korea, and Taiwan. These East Asian countries share the common challenge of reforming schools, the curriculum, and its pedagogy away from the traditional emphasis on rote learning and paper examinations (Sato, 2000). Therefore, there was an interest to learn from the cases of school reforms in Japan and SLC, and the translated books of Manabu Sato provided a framework and vision for 21st-century schools. Another catalyst for the engagement in SLC was educators' critical positions against neoliberal policies and the negative consequences of such policies on public schooling (Sato, 2018).

[11] http://school-lc.com/.

This section will describe the cases in South Korea and Taiwan and present what motivated many schools to engage in school reform in line with SLC principles.[12] Unfortunately, the research in the cases of SLC from China has not been made available in English or Japanese. The SLC developments in these countries were supported by both grass-roots initiatives of schools and top-down government policy.

3.5.2.4 SLC in South Korea

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

More sustainable efforts of SLC were backed up by the emergence of 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 started to implement SLC in 2006 to build grass-roots reform to create a learning community. However, a teacher at this school recounted that even within the alternative school's progressive atmosphere, there were challenges in sustaining SLC. Since the school was established as a new model for public schooling, there was pressure to improve students' performance quickly. Besides, parents were concerned about whether the new teaching approach was a practical way to prepare students for university entrance examinations (Shin, 2014).

There has been structural support for SLC since it was introduced as part of the government's effort to reform schooling based on bottom-up and democratic principles. In 2009, 13 out of 15 superintendents of district education offices in South Korea introduced "innovative high schools" where bottom-up school reforms were encouraged to promote creativity, diversity, and a democratic atmosphere in the school (Shin, 2014). SLC had a high affinity for innovative schools since it takes

[12] 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.

a more democratic approach to education centered on student learning (Sato, 2018; Shin, 2010, 2014, 2016; So et al., 2010).

In 2010, the Korean Institute of School as Learning Community was established under Dr. Woojung Son's leadership. 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 Korea's SLC movement (Sato, 2018). The Institute held 3600 members in 2016, and its annual conference was attended by a thousand participants (Sato, 2018; Shin, 2016).

There are several features of SLC in South Korea that are distinctive. First, 90% of schools engaging in SLC are at the secondary school level. Second, there are few partnerships between schools and university researchers. For example, the Korean Institute of School as Learning Community members are primarily teachers and expert teachers who visit other schools and provide support to each other. In other countries, it is mainly university researchers who play the role of external resource persons.

The South Korean experience suggests that when SLC philosophy contradicts societies' and teachers' expectations, it often poses a challenge. For example, one of the reported challenges was to build a "listening relationship." In South Korea's culture, students were encouraged to speak up in lessons actively; thus, emphasizing "listening" contradicted this expectation. There were also challenges in the lack of pedagogic methods, skills, and experts to support schools to implement SLC (Shin, 2014).

The experience of SLC in South Korea suggests the resonance of SLC and the government's reform efforts to democratize schooling. These top-down efforts were facilitated by both bottom-up engagements of teachers using SLC.

3.5.2.5 SLC in Taiwan

The landscape of education in Taiwan quickly changed after the announcement to extend compulsory education to 12 years and abolish the university entrance examination. This posed a substantial challenge to the teachers who had identified their primary responsibility as preparing students for the high-stakes examination (Huang, 2014). According to the survey conducted by Tien Xia's Family magazine in 2012, 95% of 3000 teachers surveyed answered that they feel the need for reform in both school and lessons; however, at the same time, half also answered they did not know how to do this (Huang, 2014).

The curriculum reform and rising interest in building professional learning communities triggered teachers' interest in SLC. SLC first appeared in an interview article with Manabu Sato in Tien Xia's Family magazine in 2012 (Chen et al., 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 widespread coverage by the media. It was awarded runner-up in the 2012 Best Insights into Asian Societies non-fiction category of the Asian Publishing Awards (ACN Newswire, 2012).

The number of schools implementing SLC grew as the government began to support SLC as a desirable approach to move away from traditional teaching to inquiry-oriented teaching (Sato, 2018). Professor Sato has been frequently invited by universities and local authorities to give speeches 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 sample surveyed schools, 33% chose SLC as an essential research theme (Chen et al., 2014).

In Taiwan, the teachers, who were inspired by Sato's book, formed voluntary study groups to implement SLC (Kusanagi, 2019). Also, there was 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 (Sato, 2018). There is also a Facebook community for SLC practitioners and researchers (Huang, 2014). One characteristic of SLC in Taiwan is that most of the implementation was not through school-wide initiatives. The large size of the schools and the number of staff made it difficult to organize school-wide activities. According to Stigler et al. (1987), the average number of students in Taipei schools was 2790. Thus, self-motivated teachers who shared a common interest in professional learning formed smaller study groups. This posed a challenge in school reform since only some teachers engaged in SLC activities, and not all teachers shared the same vision. Also, the frequent examinations hindered teachers from spending the sufficient time to support individual students in their learning (Sato, 2012).

The lesson study experiences in Asia discussed so far show that the lesson study engagement was motivated by global trends in curriculum reform and the need to transform to student-centered pedagogy. Lesson study has been used as an instrument to drive a shift in pedagogy and to meet the changing needs of education in the twenty-first century. In Singapore, lesson study was recommended by the government to build PLCs and to enhance pedagogic content knowledge. In South Korea, public criticism of the existing schooling system and excessive emphasis on the university entrance examination system led to the reform movement, and SLC was used to incorporate democratic approaches to teaching and learning. In Taiwan, SLC was supported by the teachers' need to redefine their professional identity and establish PLCs after the drastic curriculum reform and the abolishment of the university entrance examination. These cases of lesson study in Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan suggest the complexities in engagement and the implementation of lesson study and how they are intertwined with respective countries' educational contexts.

3.6 Lesson Study in Developing Countries

3.6.1 Introduction of Lesson Study in Developing Countries

While local educators of the respective countries imported lesson study in the U.S. and Asia, lesson study was initially exported to developing countries in the form of a

foreign development program.[13] Since the late 1990s, the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) has introduced lesson study in more than 27 countries across Asia, Latin America, and Africa (Matachi & Kikuchi, 2015). Three interconnected forces motivated the export of lesson study: (1) the Japanese government's policy of providing support for mathematics and science education, (2) growing concern about the governments of developing countries to improve the quality of education, and (3) international support for reforms that necessitate the adoption of student-centered approaches in teaching and learning.

First, lesson study fitted well within the Japanese government's overall framework of support for teacher training in the area of mathematics and science education. At the G8 Kananaskis Summit in 2002, the Japanese government declared its support for improving the quality of developing countries' primary education for the first time. Previously, its educational assistance concentrated on school buildings. The government had identified mathematics and science education as Japan's strength (JICA, 2006; Kuroda & Hayashi, 2015; MOFA, 2002). JICA stated that there was "high demand" for assistance in mathematics and science education in a 2010 policy paper:

> 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 for science and mathematics education. (JICA, 2010, p. 5)

The second motivation behind the export of lesson study was the increasing *concern for education quality* in developing countries against international standards. There was a clear shift from access to the quality of education in developing countries. While the Millennium Development Goals (2000–2015) focused on improving access to schooling (enrollment rate), Sustainable Development Goals (2016–2030) emphasize quality improvement as the prioritized agenda (Kitamura et al., 2017). Often the governments of developing countries faced both international and domestic criticism for their low rankings in international surveys such as TIMSS and PISA (including Indonesia). Thus, intense pressure was placed on these countries to improve the quality of schooling and to meet international standards. Lesson study was lent to improve the quality of education by learning from Japanese best practice (Steiner-Khamsi, 2006).

Third, international reform trends of curriculum triggered interest in lesson study because of the need to shift from teacher-centered learning to student-centered learning. Developing countries have been facing the challenge of transforming their pedagogy from didactic teaching styles to more interactive methods. This change

[13] In principle, Japanese Official Development Assistance is on a request basis, which means that the priority of donor assistance is determined by the requests of developing countries (Sunaga, 2004). In reality, however, the Japanese government and corporations have influence over the project formation and generally reflect the interests of Japanese companies, and this has been criticized (Sunaga, 2004).

coincided with the widespread support for education decentralization reform, which requires bottom-up initiatives from schools. In Vietnam, a new curriculum was introduced in 2002, focusing on child-centered education (JICA, 2004; Saito & Tsukui, 2008; Tanaka, 2008). In Indonesia, a Competency-based Curriculum (KBK) was introduced in 2004, and a School-Based Curriculum in 2006 required 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 challenged teachers to alter their pedagogy to take a more learner-centered approach (Bantwini, 2010; Ono & Ferreira, 2010).

3.6.2 Features of JICA Lesson Study

According to policy papers, JICA identified lesson study as one of three major approaches to improving teacher quality. 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).

Lesson study has been introduced in JICA projects, mainly in large-scale training targeted at mathematics and science teachers in which local administrators, researchers, and Japanese experts serve as trainers. In Table 3.1, the list of JICA projects and their objectives show that project designs reflect the three approaches proposed by JICA. 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; 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 et al., 2006). Lesson study has been used as a tool for the in-service professional development of teachers.

Compared to past professional development programs, lesson study was considered practical and effective in impacting teachers' practice. First, lesson study exposed teachers to new teaching methods and teaching resources to be used on site—such as group work, hands-on activities, and student worksheets—and this contributed to instructional improvement (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito et al., 2006, 2007). Second, it offered teachers an opportunity to engage in subject study groups (e.g., *Kyozai kenkyu* in Zambia) and to deepen their subject

Table 3.1 Examples of the JICA projects that utilized lesson study

Project Name/Year	Country	Objectives	Target
Strengthening of Mathematics and Science in Secondary Education Project (SMASSE)/1998–2008	Kenya	Improvement of mathematics and science education through In-service Training (INSET) for teachers	All 71 districts in Kenya
Mpumalanga 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	One province

(continued)

Table 3.1 (continued)

Project Name/Year	Country	Objectives	Target
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
Strengthening Mathematics, Science, and Technologies in Education Project (PREMST)/2007–2015	Senegal	To strengthen the capacity of teachers by improving their pedagogical practices in mathematics and science in primary school	Phase 1: 3 provinces Phase 2: 14 provinces
Strengthening of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education (SMASTE) School-Based Continuing Professional Development Program (SBCPD Program) Phase 1 and 2/2005–2011	Zambia	Improving teaching and learning at classroom level through activities of lesson study in target provinces	3 provinces (140,000 teachers)
Program for Enhancing Quality of Junior Secondary Education (PELITA)/2009–2013	Indonesia	Quality of junior secondary education is enhanced through lesson study and participatory school-based management extensively in the nation	6 districts and 3 cities in 7 provinces

Source Made by the author based on IDCJ (2006, 2011), JICA (n.d., 2002, 2005, 2006, 2007), Kanja et al. (2001), Miyazaki (2014, 2016), Saito and Tsukui (2008)

content knowledge (Sibunimba, 2015). This was, in fact, the most cited benefit of lesson study in the context of developing countries. Third, lesson study helped the teachers build networks that could potentially support their professional learning. Previously, teachers rarely interacted with other teachers or educators outside of school. Participating in government-sponsored workshops gave them an opportunity to communicate with teachers from other schools and to learn from resource persons such as university lecturers and government officials (JICA, 2007; Saito et al., 2006, 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 new people.

However, there was a convenient ambiguity in what JICA intended to promote through lesson study. In Indonesia, lesson study was simplified and understood as a cycle of plan-do-see; that is, planning a lesson, implementing/observing the lesson,

and discussing the lesson. In a 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). However, JICA also acknowledged variations in lesson study and stated that it is more appropriate to say "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 science] 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 had 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). These discourses indicate that the application of lesson study by JICA has been flexible and evolved over the years, reflecting the various application of lesson study depending on the projects.

3.6.3 Challenges in JICA Lesson Study

While formalistic aspects of lesson study—such as a change in instructional methods or going over the cycle of plan-do-see—were easy to incorporate, the quality and sustainability of lesson study was more difficult to ensure. There were challenges in providing meaningful learning opportunities through lesson study since it depends on local settings. For example, teachers engaged in lesson study activities often failed to set clear learning objectives and paid little attention to the process of student learning, although these were essential in lesson study activities (Miyazaki, 2016; Saito & Tsukui, 2008; Saito et al., 2006). These issues show discrepancies between what lesson study promoted and the daily practice and priorities of teachers.

First, despite the introduction of student-centered approaches through lesson study, teachers continued to use didactic approaches in daily lessons. Teachers continued to view their primary role as the deliverer of the curriculum; thus, the target of lessons was perceived as the preparation for standardized tests (Kusanagi, 2014; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito & Tsukui, 2008; Saito et al., 2007). In order to cover the voluminous curriculum content and to memorize vocabularies, terminologies, and formulas, didactic methods were preferred. Likewise, the introduction of student activities did not alter how teachers worked with students or how students worked with their peers. Teachers continued to engage minimally with students, 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 & Tsukui, 2008; Saito et al., 2007).

Second, the bureaucratic and hierarchical institutional settings of schools in developing countries hindered dialogue presumed in lesson study (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 evaluation of teacher instructions, whether the lesson was implemented according to the plan or the students' performance met the target set by the teacher, rather than how students learned (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito & Tsukui, 2008; Saito et al., 2006, 2007). Teachers tended to evaluate lessons based on impressions rather than based on the evidence observed in classrooms; thus, the post-lesson discussion was superficial and not based on shared concerns (Jita et al., 2008; Ono & Ferreira, 2010; Saito & Tsukui, 2008). Rather than exchanging and sharing practice, lesson study was often used to disseminate government policies or new curricula.

Third, there were challenges to the ownership and sustainability of lesson study when contextual settings did not match what lesson study promoted. In many cases, lesson study was introduced as a large-scale project with external funding and external resource persons (Hashimoto et al., 2003; Minamoto & Nagao, 2006). Thus, it was difficult to sustain without external support (Miyazaki, 2016; Ono & Ferreira, 2010).

3.6.4 Implications for Pedagogical Transformation

The cases described above suggest that a pedagogical transformation is not automatically induced by lesson study and large-scale training is not suitable for overcoming contextual gaps. The case study of Vietnam by Saito and Tsukui (2008) illustrates how reforming schools as learning communities requires a long-term commitment since structural, conceptual, and relational adjustments are needed. They claim that continuous dialogue between Japanese experts and local participants helped teachers gradually overcome barriers to professional learning, such as resistance to collaborative professional learning, altering the current views toward student learning, and building collegiality among teachers.

Similarly, H. Ozawa et al. (2010, p. 138) examine South Africa's case and how the experience of participating in training in Japan had a gradual yet significant impact on teachers. In the beginning, the teachers focused on individual components of lessons, such as including hands-on materials, making a hypothesis about students' outputs, and using appropriateness of instruction methods. However, after extensive exposure to lesson study in Japan, the teachers began to understand how these different components were intertwined in lessons and were able to discuss the lesson with the lesson's coherence in mind. In effect, teachers began to facilitate student learning by paying attention to various learning aspects, such as prior knowledge of students and connecting with the topic covered in the next lesson. Although both the cases in Vietnam and South Africa were presented as cases in progress, they raised

the important point that shedding light on the process of adaptation is essential for pedagogic transformation.[14]

In sum, lesson study offered in developing countries was effectively implemented as a top-down professional development program. 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 to moving away from a didactic teaching style toward a student-centered one, building collaborative professional learning among teachers, and sustaining such efforts for professional development. Going over the lesson study cycle generally merely reinforced existing values and priorities. Thus, lesson study alone could not produce a pedagogic shift or foster collaborative learning among teachers. These issues point to the significance of the "recontextualization" of lesson study.

3.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the import and export of lesson study were examined. These cases shared similarities in how the introduction of lesson study was motivated by global curriculum reform trends and the need to introduce student-centered pedagogy. However, there were variations in actual implementation of lesson study since it was shaped by the local contextual setting unique to each country. These cases show how pedagogic transfer is always "recontextualized," or the practice is adapted to, and its meaning is interpreted against the new setting.

The discussions in this chapter suggest that 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 only happens at a superficial level. This may result in the formalistic, fragmented, or modified implementation of lesson study. Even if lesson study is initiated, but the practice is at odds with the contextual settings, it is difficult to sustain. Taylor et al. (2005) reported that in the U.S., while lesson study "empowered" the teachers and motivated bottom-up professional development, they often became frustrated because they were constrained by 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 L.S. [lesson study] by the disruption they perceive will be created to the school timetable, staff cover system and availability of teacher budget—not to mention the headache of convincing reluctant staff and governors that L.S. is rewarding and effective" (Dudley, 2013, p. 120).

In concluding this chapter, I raise two issues in pedagogic transfer and recontextualization learning from importing/exporting of lesson study. First, while lesson study was introduced as an "effective" form of professional development, what is considered "effective" largely depends on the local context. Lesson study could offer a structure for teachers to engage in professional development collectively. However,

[14] There are also reported cases of more "successful" lesson study that were not conducted as donor-initiated projects (Gutierez, 2016; Ronda, 2013).

as the practice moves between contexts, "recontextualization" occurs, and 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 took the form of subject study groups. This reflects how teachers' professional identity to subject expertise was more substantial in foreign countries than in Japan. Also, the implementation of lesson study in foreign countries concentrated on mathematics and science but not on other subjects. This reflects the motivation behind the engagement in lesson study—Japanese students' excellent academic achievement in mathematics and science.

Second, 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 instead of producing a shift in pedagogy or generating collaborative learning. Introducing student-centered approaches in teaching and learning and having discussions about lessons are only meaningful if they match teachers' concerns and are supported by the structures of school activities. More successful lesson study cases suggest extensive time and effort could ultimately expand the role of teachers and their understanding of student learning. However, the majority of foreign efforts to implement lesson study have been framed as short-term professional development projects. This could pose a challenge since what was promoted by lesson study usually did not fit within school routines and was not in line with the norms of teachers.

Based on the actual cases, the issue of "recontextualization" in lesson study was examined. There were negotiations between newly introduced lesson study and the daily routines in teaching and learning; however, usually, the existing practice overrode newly imported practice. As discussed in this chapter, lesson study has emerged and developed in Japan supported by the unique historical, social, and cultural contexts supporting such collaborative learning in improving practice. In contrast, the cases of importing/exporting lesson study in foreign countries showed how these supporting conditions were not necessarily available in overseas settings. The philosophy and assumptions behind the practice of lesson study were often taken for granted, and a lack of awareness in the absence of these conditions became apparent only after the practice was transferred to a foreign setting.

The cases of lesson study abroad discussed in this chapter and the review of literature in Chapters 1 and 2 presented an understanding of the problem of "recontextualization" in pedagogic transfer. In the next chapter, I will discuss the background of Indonesian education reform and how lesson study was introduced to Indonesia. I will also discuss why the examining case of Indonesia and providing a sociological analysis on such cases contributes to understanding the complex process of pedagogical transformation.

References

ACN Newswire. (2012). APC announces winners of the Asian Publishing Awards in Kuala Lumpur. *ACN Newswire.* https://www.acnnewswire.com/press-release/english/11721/apc-announces-winners-of-the-asian-publishing-awards-in-kuala-lumpur

Akiba, M. (2016). Traveling teacher professional development model: Local interpretation and adaptation of lesson study in the U.S. In M. A. F. Astiz (Ed.), *The global and the local: New perspectives in comparative education* (pp. 77–97). Sense Publishers.

Akiba, M., & Wilkinson, B. (2015). Adopting an international innovation for teacher professional development: State and District approaches to lesson study in Florida. *Journal of Teacher Education, 67*(1), 74–93.

Bantwini, B. D. (2010). How teachers perceive the new curriculum reform: Lessons from a school district in the Eastern Cape Province, South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development, 30*(1), 83–90.

Bocala, C. (2015). From experience to expertise: The development of teachers' learning in lesson study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 66*(4), 349–362.

Bolam, R., & Stoll, L. (2005). *Creating and sustaining effective professional learning communities.* DfES.

Brown, C., McGraw, R., Koc, Y., Lynch, K. & Arbaugh, F. (2002) Lesson study in secondary mathematics. In D. S. Mewborn et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the twenty-fourth annual meeting of the North American chapter of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education.* ERIC.

Bush, T., & Qiang, H. (2002). Leadership and culture in Chinese education. In A. Walker & C. Dimmock (Eds.), *School leadership and administration: The cultural context* (pp. 174–186). Routledge.

Chen, L. H., Chen, C. H., & Chen, C. R. (2014). Strategies and thinking concerning the introduction of school as learning community in Taiwan. *Tien Xia's Family magazine.*

Chen, X., & Yang, F. (2013). Chinese teachers' reconstruction of the curriculum reform through lesson study. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 2*(3), 218–236.

Cheng, L. P., & Yee, L. P. (2011/2012). A Singapore case of lesson study. *The Mathematics Educator*, *21*(2), 34–57.

Chokshi, S., & Fernandez, C. (2004). Challenges to importing Japanese lesson study: Concerns, misconceptions, and nuances. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*(7), 520–525.

Day, C., & Sachs, J. (2005). *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers.* McGraw-Hill Education.

Dudley, P. (2013). Teacher learning in lesson study: What interaction-level discourse analysis revealed about how teachers utilised imagination, tacit knowledge of teaching and fresh evidence of pupils learning, to develop practice knowledge and so enhance their pupils' learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 34*, 107–121.

DuFour, R. (2007). Professional learning communities: A Bandwagon, an idea worth considering, or our best hope for high levels of learning? *Middle School Journal, 39*(1), 4–8.

Fang, Y. (2017). School-based teaching research and lesson-case study in mediating the second-cycle curriculum reform in Shanghai. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 6*(4), 293–305.

Fang, Y., & Lee, C. (2010). *Lesson study and instructional improvement in Singapore.* National Institute of Education.

Fang, Y., & Lee, C. K. E. (2015). Lesson study in Singapore: A case of division with remainder in a third grade mathematics classroom. In I. Maitree, I. Masami, & Y. Ban-har (Eds.), *Lesson study: Challenges in mathematics education* (pp. 293–309). World Scientific.

Fernandez, C. (2002). Learning from Japanese approaches to professional development: The case of lesson study. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(5), 393–405.

Fernandez, C., & Yoshida, M. (2004). *Lesson study: A case of a Japanese approach to improving instruction through school-based teacher development*. Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gorman, J., Mark, J., & Nikula, J. (2010). *A mathematics leader's guide to lesson study in practice.* EDC.

Guo, L. (2013). New curriculum reform in China and its impact on teachers. *Comparative and International Education, 41*(2), 87–105.

Gutierez, B. S. (2016). Building a classroom-based professional learning community through lesson study: Insights from elementary school science teachers. *Professional Development in Education, 42*(5), 801–817.

Hairon, S., & Dimmock, C. (2012). Singapore schools and professional learning communities: Teacher professional development and school leadership in an Asian hierarchical system. *Educational Review, 64*(4), 405–424.

Han, X., & Paine, L. (2010). Teaching mathematics as deliberate practice through public lessons. *The Elementary School Journal, 110*(4), 519–541.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*(3), 227–241.

Hashimoto, Y., Tsubota, K., & Ikeda, T. (2003). *Ima naze jugyou kenkyuu ka* [Why lesson study now?]. Toyokan.

Huang, E. (2014). Gurobaru-ka no naka de shido suru taiwan no gakko kaikaku [School reform in Taiwan in the globalization]. In M. Ueno, J. Shin, E. Saito, Y. Kitada (Eds.), *Higashiajia no mirai wo hiraku gakkokaikaku* [School reform open to the future of East Asia] (pp. 476–477). Kitaooji Syobou.

Huang, R., Fang, Y., & Chen, X. (2017). Chinese lesson study: A deliberate practice, a research methodology, and an improvement science. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 6*(4), 270–282.

IDCJ. (2006). *Program for strengthening in-service teacher training of mathematics and science education at junior secondary level (SISTTEMS) (inception report).* IDCJ/JICA.

IDCJ. (2011). *Program for enhancing quality of junior secondary school education (PELITA-SMP/MTs) progress report 5.* IDCJ/JICA.

JICA. (n.d.). *Project information sheet: Technical cooperation project for strengthening cluster-based teacher training and school management in Vietnam.* https://www.jica.go.jp/vietnam/english/pdf/TCP_Cluster-based.pdf

JICA. (2002). *Terminal evaluation: Mpumalanga secondary science initiative.* https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/project/term/africa/south_africa_2002.html

JICA. (2004). *The history of japan's educational development: What implications can be drawn for developing countries today.* Retrieved from https://www.jica.go.jp/jica-ri/IFIC_and_JBICI-Studies/english/publications/reports/study/topical/educational/index.html

JICA. (2005). *Terminal evaluation: Mpumalanga secondary science initiative.* https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/evaluation/tech_and_grant/project/term/africa/c8h0vm000001rp75-att/south_africa_2005_1.pdf

JICA. (2006). *Japan's assistance in science and mathematics education: JICA's activities and achievements.* JICA.

JICA. (2007). *Philosophy and significance of JICA's assistance in mathematics and science education.* Institute for International Cooperation, Japan International Cooperation Agency. https://openjicareport.jica.go.jp/pdf/11864212.pdf

JICA. (2010). *JICA's operation in education sector*. JICA. https://www.jica.go.jp/english/our_work/thematic_issues/education/pdf/position_papaer.pdf

JICA. (2015). *JICA position paper in education cooperation* [Press release]. JICA. https://www.jica.go.jp/activities/issues/education/ku57pq00002cy6fc-att/position_paper_education_en.pdf

Jita, L. C., Maree, J. G., & Ndlalane, T. C. (2008). Lesson study (Jyugyo Kenkyu) from Japan to South Africa: A science and mathematics intervention program for secondary school teachers. In B. Atweh, A. C. Barton, M. Borba, N. Gough, C. Keitel, C. Vistro-Yu, & R. Vithal (Eds.), *Internationalisation and globalisation in mathematics and science education* (pp. 465–486). Springer.

Kanja, C., Iwasaki, H., Baba, T., & Ueda, A. (2001). For the reform of mathematics education in Kenyan secondary schools. *Journal of International Development and Cooperation, 7*(1), 67–75.
Kennedy, K. J., & Lee, J. C. K. (2007). *The changing role of schools in Asian societies: Schools for the knowledge society*. Routledge.
Kitamura, Y., Okitsu, T., & Yamazaki, M. (2017). Kyoiku ni okeru SDGs: "ryo" kara "shitu" heno tenkan to kadai [SDGs in education: Transformation from "quantity" to "quality" and relevant issues]. In N. Kanie (Ed.), *Jizoku kanou na kaihatsu mokuhyo toha nani ka: 2030 nen he muketa henkaku no ajenda* [What are sustainable development goals: Agenda of change towards 2030] (pp. 106–127). Minerva Shobo.
Kuroda, K., & Hayashi, M. (2015). Japan's educational cooperation policies and its implications for a post-2015 world. In I. H. Cheng & S. J. Chan (Eds.), *International education aid in developing Asia: Policies and practices* (pp. 39–56). Springer Singapore.
Kusanagi, K. N. (2014). The bureaucratising of lesson study: A Javanese case. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 16*(1), 1–17.
Kusanagi, K. (2019). *Recontextualization of professional development: Bureaucratization of lesson study in a junior secondary school in Java* (Doctoral dissertation, UCL (University College London)).
Lawrence, C. A., & Chong, W. H. (2010). Teacher collaborative learning through the lesson study: Identifying pathways for instructional success in a Singapore high school. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 11*(4), 565–572.
Lee, C. (2011, November). *Crossing borders: The global spread of lesson study.* Paper presented at the World Association of Lesson Study International Conference, Tokyo, Japan.
Lee, C. (2015, December 8). *Lesson study in Singapore: Practices, perceived impact and pitfalls.* Paper presented at Graduate Student Seminar, the University of Tokyo, Japan.
Lee, C., & Lim, C. R. (2014). Exploring the variety and quality in the practice of lesson study in Singapore schools. In K. Wood & S. Sithamparam (Eds.), *Realising learning: Teachers' professional development through lesson and lesson study* (pp. 41–61). Routledge.
Lee, C., & Ling, C. L. M. (2013). The role of lesson study in facilitating curriculum reforms. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 2*(3), 200–206.
Lesson Study Research Group. (2004). *Timeline of U.S. lesson study.* Teachers College, Columbia University. http://www.tc.edu/lessonstudy/lsgroups.html
Lewis, C., & Hurd, J. (2011). *Lesson study step by step: How teacher learning communities improve instruction*. Heinemann.
Lewis, C., Perry, R., & Hurd, J. (2004). A deeper look at lesson study. *Educational Leadership, 61*(5), 18.
Lewis, C. C. (2002a). Does lesson study have a future in the United States? *Nagoya Journal of Education and Human Development, 1*, 1–23.
Lewis, C. C. (2002b). *Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional change.* Research for Better Schools.
Lewis, C. C. (2008). Jyugyo kenkyu—America gasshukoku ni okeru hatten to chosen [Lesson study: Development and challenge in the United States]. In K. Akita & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Jyugyou no kenkyu kyoshi no gakushu* [Learning from lessons: Teacher inquiry and lesson study] (pp. 12–23). Akashi Shoten.
Lewis, C. C. (2015). What have we learned about lesson study outside Japan? In I. Maitree, I. Masami, & Y. Ban-har (Eds.), *Lesson study: Challenges in mathematics education* (pp. 141–152). World Scientific.
Lewis, C. C., & Lee, C. (2017). The global spread of lesson study. *International Handbook of Teacher Quality and Policy*, *161*.
Lewis, C. C., Perry, R. R., & Friedkin, S. (2011). Using Japanese curriculum materials to support lesson study outside Japan: Toward coherent curriculum. *Educational Studies in Japan: International Yearbook, 6*, 5–19.
Lewis, C. C., & Tsuchida, I. (1997). Planned educational change in Japan: The shift to student-centered elementary science. *Journal of Educational Policy, 12*(5), 313–331.

Lieberman, J. (2009). Reinventing teacher professional norms and identities: The role of lesson study and learning communities. *Professional Development in Education, 35*(1), 83–99.
Lim, C., Lee, C., Saito, E., & Syed Haron, S. (2011). Taking stock of lesson study as a platform for teacher development in Singapore. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education, 39*(4), 353–365.
Little, J. W. (1982). Norms of collegiality and experimentation: Workplace conditions of school success. *American Educational Research Journal, 19*(3), 325–340.
Lo, M. l. (2009). The development of the learning study approach in classroom research in Hong Kong. *Educational Research Journal《教育研究學報》, Hong Kong Educational Research Association, 24*(1).
Lortie, D. (1975). *School teacher: A sociological study*. The University of Chicago Press.
Louis, K. S., Marks, H. M., & Kruse, S. (1996). Teachers' professional community in restructuring schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 33*(4), 757–798.
Marton, F., & Ling, L. M. (2007). Learning from "The Learning Study". *Tidskrift för lärarutbildning och forskning* [Journal of Research in Teacher Education], *1*.
Matachi, A., & Kikuchi, A. (2015). Lesson study projects in developing countries supported by JICA: Achievements and challenges. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education, Center for the Study of International Cooperation in Education, 18*(1), 91–104.
Matoba, M. (2008). Amerika no lesson study ni okeru nihon no jyugyo kenkyu no jyuyou to hyoka [Acceptance and evaluation of Japanese lesson study in the American lesson study]. *Chuto kyoiku senta kiyo* [Bulletin of Secondary Education Research Center, Education and Human Development Nagoya University], *8,* 1–26.
Matoba, M., Sarkar Arani, M. R., Hanasaki, E., Ito, K., Shiroyama, M., & Kani, M. (2006). Challenges and progress of lesson study in America: Focus on James Stigler's Research Group. *Chuto kyoiku senta kiyo* [Bulletin of Secondary Education Research Center, Education and Human Development Nagoya University], *5*(6), 51–68.
Matoba, M., Shibata, Y., & Arani, M. R. S. (2007). School-university partnerships: A new recipe for creating professional knowledge in school. *Educational Research for Policy and Practice, 6*(1), 55–65.
McGraw, R., Arbaugh, F., Lynch, K., & Brown, C. A. (2003). Mathematics teacher professional development as the development of communities of practice. *International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education, 3*, 269–276.
McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2006). *Building school-based teacher learning communities: Professional strategies to improve student achievement* (Vol. 45). Teachers College Press.
Minamoto, Y., & Nagao, M. (2006). Process considerations in evaluating educational cooperation projects. *Journal of International Cooperation in Education, 9*(1), 89–105.
Miyazaki, T. (2014). *Is changing teaching practice the mission impossible?: A case study of continuing professional development for primary school teachers in Senegal* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Sussex). https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/20047859.pdf
Miyazaki, T. (2016). Is changing teaching practice the mission impossible? A case study of continuing professional development for primary school teachers in Senegal. *Compare—A Journal of Comparative and International Education, 46*(5), 701–722.
MOFA. (2002). *BEGIN: Basic education for growth initiative*. http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/africa/education3.html
Murata, A. (2011). Introduction: Conceptual overview of lesson study. In L. C. Hart, A. Alston, & A. Murata (Eds.), *Lesson study research and practice in mathematics education* (pp. 1–12). Springer.
Nanzhao, Z., Muju, Z., Baohua, Y., Xia, G., Wenjing, W., & Li, Z. (2007). Educational reform and curriculum change in China: A comparative case study. *International Bureau of Education*.
National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. *The Elementary School Journal, 84*(2), 113–130.
National Research Council. (2002). *Studying classroom teaching as a medium for professional development: Proceedings of a U.S.–Japan Workshop*. National Academy Press.
North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. (2002). *Teacher to teacher: Reshaping instruction through lesson study.* North Central Regional Educational Laboratory.

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.

Owens, T. L. (2013). Thinking beyond league tables: A review of key PISA research questions. In *PISA, power, and policy: The emergence of global educational governance* (pp. 27–49). Symposium Books Ltd.

Ozawa, T. (2013). Lesson study in Mpumalanga Province, South Africa. *CICE叢書5 Africa-Asia University Dialogue for Educational Development: Final Report of the Phase II Research Results: (3) Teacher Professional Development, 5*(3), 175–193.

Ozawa, H., Ono, Y., & Chikamori, K. (2010). Change of a South African natural science teacher through the training focused on lesson study in Japan. *Journal for the Science of Schooling, 11*(2010–03), 129–140.

Pang, J. (2016). Improving mathematics instruction and supporting teacher learning in Korea through lesson study using five practices. *ZDM, 48*(4), 471–483.

Pang, M. F., & Marton, F. (2017). Chinese lesson study, learning study and keys to learning. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 6*(4), 336–347.

Perry, R. R., & Lewis, C. C. (2009). What is successful adaptation of lesson study in the US? *Journal of Educational Change, 10*(4), 365–391.

Puchner, L. D., & Taylor, A. R. (2006). Lesson study, collaboration and teacher efficacy: Stories from two school-based math lesson study groups. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 922–934.

Rappleye, J., & Komatsu, H. (2017). How to make lesson study work in America and worldwide: A Japanese perspective on the onto-cultural basis of (teacher) education. *Research in Comparative and International Education*, 1745499917740656.

Richardson, J. (2004). Lesson study: Teachers learn how to improve instruction. *Tools for Schools, 7*(4), 1–6.

Robinson, J. P. (2015, March 25). Getting millions to learn: How did Japan's lesson study program help improve education in Zambia? *Brookings*. https://www.brookings.edu/blog/education-plus-development/2015/03/25/getting-millions-to-learn-how-did-japans-lesson-study-program-help-improve-education-in-zambia/

Ronda, E. (2013). Scaffolding teacher learning through lesson study. In *Lesson study: Planning together, learning together* (pp. 195–216). UPNISMED.

Saito, E., & Atencio, M. (2015). Lesson study for learning community (LSLC): Conceptualising teachers' practices within a social justice perspective. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 36*(6), 795–807.

Saito, E., Harun, I., Kuboki, I., & Tachibana, H. (2006). Indonesian lesson study in practice: Case study of Indonesian mathematics and science teacher education project. *Journal of in-Service Education, 32*(2), 171–184.

Saito, E., Imansyah, H., Kubok, I., & Hendayana, S. (2007). A study of the partnership between schools and universities to improve science and mathematics education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27*(2), 194–204.

Saito, E., Murase, M., Tsukui, A., & Yeo, J. (2014). *Lesson study for learning community: A guide to sustainable school reform.* (n.p.): Routledge.

Saito, E., & Tsukui, A. (2008). Challenging common sense: Cases of school reform for learning community under an international cooperation project in Bac Giang Province, Vietnam. *International Journal of Educational Development, 28*(5), 571–584.

Saravanan, G., & Ponnusamy, L. (2011). Teacher education in Singapore: Charting new directions. *Journal of Research, Policy & Practice of Teachers & Teacher Education, 1* (1), 16–29.

Sato, M. (2000). *Kodomotachi wa naze'manabi'kara toso suru ka?:'gakuryoku-teika'ni miru Nihon-shakai no bunka-teki kiki* [Why are children escaping from 'learning'? Cultural crisis of Japanese society indicated by a'decline of knowledge level'] (Vol. 674). Iwanami.

Sato, M. (2012). *Gakko wo Kaikaku Suru.* [Philosophy of school reform]. Iwanami.

Sato, M. (2015). *Senmonka to shite Kyoshi wo Sodateru: Kyoshi Kyoiku Kaikaku no Gurando Dezain* [Developing professionalism of teachers: A grand design of teacher education reform]. Iwanami.

Sato, M. (2018). *Spread and progress of school as learning community in Asia.* In A. Tsukui, & M. Murase (Eds.), *Lesson study and schools as learning communities: Asian school reform in theory and practice* (pp. 3–13). Routledge.

Schweisfurth, M. (2013). *Learner-centered education in international perspective: Whose pedagogy for whose development?* Routledge.

Senge, P. M. (1991). The fifth discipline, the art and practice of the learning organization. *Performance + Instruction, 30*(5), 37–37.

Shin, J. (2008). *1990 nen dai iko no kankoku ni okeru gakko kaikaku no tenkai* [Development of school reform in Korea since the 1990s]. Retrieved from Kyouiku test kenkyu senta [Report of the 8th Conference on Educational Testing Research Center]: https://www.cret.or.jp/files/d043e2a5d172812896c2cd92909b8c22.pdf

Shin, J. (2010). *Kankoku ni okeru jyugyo wo chushin to shita gakko kaikaku heno chosen to kadai—Iu gakko no jirei wo Chushin ni—*[Challenges and issues of school reform centered on lessons in Korea]. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Human Studies, 3*, 59–75.

Shin, J. (2014). Kankoku no gakko kaikaku—gakko bunka no kakushin wo motomete [School reform in Korea—In search of school culture innovation]. In M. Ueno, J. Shin, E. Saito, & Y. Kitada (Eds.), *Higashiajia no mirai wo hiraku gakkokaikaku* [School reform open to the future of East Asia] (pp. 57–85). Kitaooji Syobou.

Shin, J. (2016). Kankoku ni okeru kyoshi wo chushin to shita gakko kaikaku ni kansuru kenkyu: 1990 nen dai kohan iko no kankoku shakai ni okeru gakkozo no mosaku katei ni chumoku shite [A study on school reform focusing on teachers in Korea: Focusing on the process of searching for school images in Korean society since the late 1990s]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4–14.

Sibunimba, K. (2015). *Effectiveness of school based continuing professional development in the teaching of English language in schools of Gwembe District, Zambia* (Doctoral dissertation, Solusi University). http://scholar.solusi.ac.zw/handle/123456789/109

So, K., Shin, J. w., & Son, W. (2010). A comparative study of classroom teaching in Korea and Japan: A case study on reforming schools into learning communities. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 11*(3), 273–283.

Stepanek, J. (2001). A new view of professional development. *Northwest Teacher, 2*(2), 2–5.

Stepanek, J. (2003). A lesson study team steps into the spotlight. *Northwest Teacher, 4*(3), 9–11.

Stepanek, J., Appel, G., Leong, M., Mangan, M. T., & Mitchell, M. (2006). *Leading lesson study: A practical guide for teachers and facilitators.* Corwin Press.

Stevenson, H. W., & Stigler, J. W. (1992). *The learning gap.* Summit Books.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2006). The economics of policy borrowing and lending: A study of late adopters. *Oxford Review of Education, 32*(5), 665–678.

Stigler, J. W., Lee, S., & Stevenson, H. W. (1987). Mathematics classrooms in Japan, Taiwan, and the United States. *Child Development*, 1272–1285.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (1999). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom.* Free Press.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (2016). Lesson study, improvement, and the importing of cultural routines. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 48*(4), 581–587.

Sulfasyah, S., Haig, Y., & Barratt-Pugh, C. (2015). Indonesian teachers' implementation of new curriculum initiatives in relation to teaching writing in lower primary school. *International Journal of Education, 7*(4), 53–72.

Sunaga, K. (2004). The reshaping of Japan's official development assistance (ODA) Charter. *FASID (Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development) Discussion Paper on Development Assistant*, (3), 4.

Tan, Y. S. M. (2014). Enriching a collaborative teacher inquiry discourse: Exploring teachers' experiences of a theory-framed discourse in a Singapore case of lesson study. *Educational Action Research, 22*(3), 411–427.

Tan-Chia, L., Fang, Y., & Chew Ang, P. (2013). Innovating the Singapore English Language curriculum through lesson study. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 2*(3), 256–280.

Tanaka, Y. (2008). *Betonamu no kyoiku kaikaku* [The education reform in Vietnam]. Akashi Shoten.

Taylor, A. R., Anderson, S., Meyer, K., Wagner, M. K., & West, C. (2005). Lesson study: A professional development model for mathematics reform. *Rural Educator*, *26*(2), 17–22.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2004). The new Japanese educational reforms and the achievement "Crisis" debate. *Educational Policy, 18*(2), 364–394.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2017). "Exceptionalism" in Japanese education and its implications. In *Globalization and Japanese "Exceptionalism" in education* (pp. 31–54). Routledge.

Wang-Iverson, P., & Yoshida, M. (2005). *Building our understanding of lesson study*. Research for Better Schools.

Watanabe, T. (2002). Learning from Japanese lesson study. *Educational Leadership, 59*(6), 36–39.

Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization, 7*(2), 225–246.

Wiburg, K., & Brown, S. (2007). *Lesson study communities: Increasing achievement with diverse students.* Corwin.

Wilms, W. W. (2003). Altering the structure and culture of American public schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 84*(8), 606–613.

Yang, Y. (2009). How a Chinese teacher improved classroom teaching in Teaching Research Group: A case study on Pythagoras theorem teaching in Shanghai. *ZDM Mathematics Education, 41*(3), 279–296.

Yang, Y., & Ricks, T. E. (2011). How crucial incidents analysis support Chinese lesson study. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 1*(1), 41–48.

Yeap, B., Foo, P., & Soh, P. (2015). Enhancing mathematics teachers' professional development through lesson study—A case study in Singapore. In M. Inprasitha, M. Isoda, P. Wang-Iverson, & B. H. Yeap (Eds.), *Lesson study: Challenges in mathematics education* (pp. 153–168). World Scientific.

Zhong, Q. Q. (2006). "Challenges and reflections on the new curriculum reform." *Principals' Reading Journal, 12*, 21–25.

Part II
Ethnography of Lesson Study in a Javanese Junior High School

Chapter 4
Teacher Professional Development in Indonesia: Issues and Challenges

Abstract This chapter discusses the issues and challenges of teacher professional development and education quality improvement initiatives in Indonesia. Indonesian education reform presents one exemplary case of global education reform and education transfer—its reform initiatives have been influenced by foreign educational theory, policy, and pedagogy. With the support of international donor agencies, the "best practices" of Western nations were transferred to improve the quality of education. However, evidence showed that these efforts did not lead to an improvement in teaching or student performance. The past studies on teacher development indicated there was a discrepancy between policy and practice; however, the process of its pedagogic transformation—what actually took place at the school level—continues to be a black box. This study employs a sociological approach and provides a context-specific examination of teachers' practice embedded within the web of social relations. The advantages of such sociological analysis are discussed as well as an overview of the history of lesson study in Indonesia, a description of the research setting, and research methodology.

4.1 Introduction

As a fast-developing nation, Indonesia has been prioritizing the education of its citizens. The Indonesian education system consists of 55 million students, 3 million teachers, and 236,000 schools (MoEC, 2013, as cited in Tobias et al., 2014). The government has been struggling to ensure quality standards and meet the diverse needs of an ethnically diverse country with 300 ethnic groups and over 700 dialects (Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, n.d.). The constitutional motto of *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*, translated as "Unity in Diversity," has been a principal challenge in the Indonesian education system. Indonesian education reform presents one exemplary case of global education reform and education transfer discussed in Chapter 1.

Indonesian education reforms resonate with the global educational reform of the decentralization policy and curriculum reform with an emphasis on students' active participation in learning. The government implemented school-based management

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_4

(SBM) in 2003, which promoted "SBM as a management model that grants autonomy to local schools to promote school independence and initiatives in managing 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, a school-based curriculum (KTSP) was introduced. The curriculum reform was intended to give schools more autonomy, accommodate local needs, and move away from rote learning (Sulfasyah et al., 2015; Tobias et al., 2014). The evaluation of SBM suggested that it further deepened the resource gap among schools (Toi & Muta, 2006), and community involvement did not increase the accountability of schools (Vernez et al., 2012). 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). Studies suggest that the teachers preferred direct methods of teaching to the tests due to their concern for preparing students for the national examination[1] (Chang et al., 2013; Tanaka, 2011). A major change was made in the current curriculum—Curriculum 2013. The curriculum was restructured from subject-based learning to different learning themes. However, some schools still struggle to cope with this change and continue to use the previous curriculum. The upcoming curriculum, *Merdeka Curriculum*, emphasizes the development of soft skills and character through project-based learning (Mendikbudristek, 2021). These changes require teachers to develop their own curriculums and make teaching more difficult.

The Indonesian government addressed reforming teachers as a priority and has been working on upgrading the qualification of teachers. One of the major structural reforms was the Teacher Certification Program initiated in 2005 (promulgated by the Teacher Law (UU/14)). This set minimum standards of teachers' qualifications, and if teachers passed the certification, they were rewarded with increased remuneration (Fahmi et al., 2011; MONE, 2007; Tobias et al., 2014). The government thought redressing the low economic and social status of teachers could strengthen their professionalism and resolve the problems such as absenteeism and improve the performance of students (Fahmi et al., 2011). However, while the teacher certification aimed to improve teacher competencies in terms of pedagogical, personal, social, and professional aspects, its assessment through portfolios had little relevance to subject knowledge, pedagogic skills, or the actual practice of teachers (Chang et al., 2013; MONE, 2007). In fact, teachers have expressed cynical views toward government policies and regulations at the time of my fieldwork. Some teachers claimed that the certification scheme merely pressured teachers to lie since some teachers would buy fake training certificates to satisfy the required hours of training.

[1] The national examination was held at the end of primary (grade 6), junior secondary (grade 9), and secondary school (grade 12) as the requirement for graduation. It was abolished in 2019 during the COVID-19 pandemic, but similar regional tests continue to exist.

The Indonesian government and foreign donor agencies implemented numerous large-scale professional development projects in the past three decades and introduced constructivist pedagogic approaches as quality improvement efforts. These initiatives—such as Active Learning Through Professional Support (ALPS; 1988–1995) Project by the British government (the Department for International Development: DFID) and the Primary School Teacher Development Project (PEQIP; 1992–1997) by the World Bank—introduced learner-centered approaches (Nielsen, 1998). However, the evaluation of these projects suggests that pedagogic transfer did not bring about an improvement in teachers' or students' performance (Malcolm et al., 2001; Nielsen, 1998; Thair & Treagust, 2003). The study by DFID suggested that teachers misunderstood the concept of "active learning" and lacked the knowledge and confidence to implement the new pedagogy (Malcolm et al., 2001). 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 (Nielsen, 1998; World Bank, 2004). 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, the teachers were more concerned with drilling the students for the national examination. While teachers saw potential benefits of student-centered methods, there was no incentive to implement these methods in daily teaching (Thair & Treagust, 2003).

These challenges in professional development in Indonesia share a commonality with the issues in transforming pedagogic practice in developing countries discussed in Chapters 1 and 3—sociocultural contexts shape the teacher's choice of pedagogy—whether or not they introduce SCP depends on the educational context of schooling. Especially 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, after two decades of education reforms to improve the quality of education, these efforts did not yield desired results. The Minister of Education, Culture, Research and Technology, Nadiem Makarim, stated Indonesia is still in a learning crisis, evidenced by the low ranking of Indonesian students in the PISA for fifteen years (Tempo.co., 2022). The reform efforts in Indonesia were based on the assumption that improving inputs—spending more of the education budget and improving the qualifications of teachers—would consequently improve outputs. However, while it is evident that there has been a discrepancy between policy and practice, the process of its pedagogic transformation—what actually took place at the school level—continues to be a black box. There need to be studies to investigate this gap.

4.2 Sociological Analysis of Teacher Professional Development

This study examines the recontextualization of professional development, lesson study, at two levels—the translation of policy into practice, and across different sociocultural settings of Japan and Indonesia. Since pedagogic practice is socially constructed, the meaning of educational practice is always open to interpretation within the local setting of the receiving country. In examining pedagogic transformation, I extend the scope of study beyond the professional development program and situate teachers' practice within the social relations of a particular institutional setting. This is important since professional development programs often assume the availability of supportive environment for pedagogic innovation. However, depending on the everyday context of schooling and the nature of the teacher community, it could both hinder or support teacher professional development (Talbert & McLaughlin, 1994). An ethnographic approach offers several advantages by offering a sociological analysis of the practice of Javanese teachers and the nature of teachers' community.

First, an ethnographic approach provides interpretive and context-specific analysis, which enables one to understand the pedagogic transformation—recontextualization of lesson study. I provide an alternative to the universalist view—narrow, technical, and decontextualized interpretations—of the international pedagogic discourse I problematized in Chapter 1. Unlike previous educational research on Indonesia, which employed survey and statistical methods, the multi-methods of an ethnographic approach enables a "focus on many previously taken-for-granted, familiar, aspects of schooling and treat[s] them as anthropologically 'strange'" (Delamont & Galton, 1986, p. 241). Rich contextualized data, or "thick description" (Geertz, 1973), situates educational practice within the cultural/social system and provides a holistic understanding of teachers' experience and pedagogic transformation. The ethnographic approach has the potential to contribute since its "sensitivity to people, culture, and context offer one approach to providing valuable new insights that can contribute to educational improvement and reform" (Zaharlick, 1992, p. 122).

One of the recurrent issues in Indonesia's teacher reform is its bureaucratic education system (Beeby, 1979 as cited by Nielsen; Bjork, 2005; Nielsen, 1998). While the past studies addressed the problems of the bureaucratic educational system in relation to quality reform, there have been few studies that examined its impact on teachers' practice. One such study—the ethnographic studies by Bjork (2005)—pointed out that under the strong bureaucratic school culture, the teachers were concerned about accommodating the expectations of the state. Consequently, although the teachers were given the freedom to design lessons by the Local Content Curriculum (LCC), there was little motivation to act as autonomous educators. In his words, "teachers almost always placed a higher priority on conforming to the norms that guided the activities of government employees" (Bjork, 2005, p. 161). Kusanagi (2014) investigated this bureaucratic accountability pervasive in Indonesian schools worked negatively for engaging in collaborative professional development as well as not conducive for student-centered pedagogy since teaching responsibility constituted

the curriculum delivery for high-stakes testing. In this study, I examine the bureaucratic school environment, not as an insuperable obstacle; however, I analyze it conceptually and examine its impact on teachers' practice and their choice of pedagogy.

Second, sociological analysis treats teaching, not as a fixed practice but acknowledges its complexity and variations within social relations. An ethnographic approach treats culture as something contested and negotiated, acknowledging power relations and fluidity within it (Mills & Morton, 2013). In this study, culture is understood to be concerned with the system of relations between individuals and groups realized in the form of alliances and oppositions and recognizes fluidity within this system (Dowling, 2009, 2013). Thus, teachers' practice is by no means uniform, but they negotiate to carry out professional responsibilities within complex social relations. The concept of "teacher strategies" is useful to describe how teachers negotiate competing demands when faced with a 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 (1970) 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. I examine the pedagogic practice of Javanese teachers within a particular institutional setting and sociologically analyze how sociocultural contexts impact teachers' choice of pedagogy.

In professional development, usually the goal is on increasing the competencies of individual teachers, but teachers are guided by both the norms of the community and their individual interests. 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 survival/coping strategies were synonymous with teaching. This study examines professional development as a form of "social learning" system and examines the practice of teachers as "communities of practice" (Wenger, 2000). This perspective is crucial since it allows us to see teachers, not as mere passive recipients or executors of international development assistance or educational policy, but it enables them to be seen as active participants in the transformation process. 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.

Sociological analysis of lesson study provides the context-specific examination of teachers' practice embedded within the web of social relations. This enables us to

understand the process of pedagogic transformation—how teachers take up, resist, or adapt to the new initiatives within the constraints/support of the teachers' community.

4.3 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, Culture, Research, and Technology) to improve the quality of education (MONE, 2007; Saito et al., 2006). It was first introduced to the faculties of mathematics and science at three universities in Java[2] to enhance the capacities of teachers through pre-service and in-service teacher training, as shown in Fig. 4.1 (IDCJ, 2008; Karim, 2006). In 2006, another JICA project, the 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 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). Most lesson study groups consisted of regional subject groups across schools. However, nine schools, including SMP Sari, 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" engaging in lesson study activities across subjects as entire school efforts (IDCJ, 2006). SMP Sari provides a unique case of lesson study in Indonesia. It does not necessarily represent best practice, but it was a rare instance of school-wide lesson study. As a pilot school, SMP Sari received additional funding and technical support from JICA experts in 2007 and 2008. At the time of my fieldwork (2009–2010), another lesson study project called PELITA (2009–2013) was ongoing. PELITA's target area was Kalimantan, Sumatra, and Sulawesi; thus, the external support for SMP Sari at the time was limited to occasional support from the local Yogyakarta State University (UNY: *Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta*).

4.4 The Research Setting and Fieldwork: SMP Sari

SMP Sari is located in Bantul District, adjacent to the city of Yogyakarta, in a special district of Yogyakarta (DIY) on Java Island. In referring to the school, I use the term "Javanese" rather than "Indonesian" school since Java is known for having distinctive

[2] The three universities were 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.

Fig. 4.1 JICA lesson study projects in Indonesia

historical and cultural traditions such as a rigid hierarchical social system (Mas'oed et al., 2001). A local king still rules the region as a regional governor, and Central Java is known for its "high" Javanese culture compared to other parts of the island (Mas'oed et al., 2001). In DIY, academic achievements are generally higher than the national average.

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. At the time of fieldwork, the principal of SMP Sari suggested that she would welcome me if I returned to the school to conduct data collection for my PhD. Gaining access via the principal was important as Indonesian schools are strongly characterized as bureaucratic organizations with strong top-down leadership.

At the time fieldwork was conducted, SMP Sari had been implementing LSBS for three years under strong leadership from management. The principal and the curriculum head (a senior mathematics teacher) 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 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 (Indonesian and English) starting in 2008 as an initiative to move toward passing the accreditation as an "international standard school."[3]

[3] The government introduced a scheme for "international standard schools" in 2009. If schools satisfied the requirements set by the government to be international standards (for curricula, the use of ICT and bilingual classes, etc.), they were entitled to receive additional funds and to charge fees to students. However, there was opposition from civil society due to the issue of equity in schooling, and it was terminated when the constitutional Court ruled it was unconstitutional in 2013 (Rosser, 2018).

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 the 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 study reported here, the scope of the investigation was on how the sociocultural context impacted the way lesson study was interpreted and implemented by the teachers.

During the period of fieldwork between December 2009 and June 2010, I visited SMP Sari 63 times. Even though I have observed Indonesian classrooms many times before, when I began my fieldwork, I was struck by how different daily lessons were from the lessons that I had observed in lesson study. The noise level, time frame, the structure of lessons, the equipment being used, the seating arrangements, and the mode of instruction by teachers were completely different. These 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.

I followed the daily activities and events of the school as much as possible. I observed over 60 lessons and a total of 40 out of 50 teachers at SMP Sari. When I was not observing lessons or school activities, I spent time talking to and following the social activities of 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 avoided sensitive topics, including discussing teachers' professional competencies. Generally, teachers were receptive, but in the beginning, I was treated like a special guest by the principal. As I spent extensive time with the teachers, I found out that joining their activities was an important qualification for recognition as a member of the community. Originally, I had planned to teach as an assistant teacher. Moreover, when I tried to support one of the English teachers, I faced an ethical dilemma. The English teacher asked me if she could skip the class to take care of her personal business and if I could substitute for her class. Accordingly, I decided not to teach but remained as a researcher who joined their daily activities purely 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 would have compromised the fieldwork. I conducted formal interviews only toward the end of my time at the school 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.

An ethnographic approach treats the researcher not as invisible but considers the role of the researcher in the environment. This includes the reflexivity of the researcher in the study. This perspective is critical since foreign researchers and

practitioners have been criticized for the lack of sensitivity and local knowledge and for imposing political agendas in supporting educational reform (Guthrie, 1990; Tabulawa, 2003). I conducted fieldwork as a PhD student with no personal agenda and was relatively free from conflicts of interest. But even as a participant observer, I inevitably landed in a complex web of social and power relations. My first contact with SMP Sari (pseudonym) was in 2006, when I monitored relief activities after the Central Java Earthquake. I visited the school again in 2008 when I interviewed teachers for my Master's dissertation. Since I gained entry to SMP Sari through the principal, the teachers were friendly at the surface level. At the same time, some of the teachers kept some distance from me at 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. 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. Even then, there were a few moments of tension with the principal since the school was going through a period of transition away 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 relation to their professional responsibilities.

The teachers were generally reluctant to provide any kind of evaluation of 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 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 that conducted a 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.

4.5 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 obtained 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, the 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 shifted to understanding 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 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 conversations 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 that consideration for other teachers hindered them from carrying 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 make use of these concepts while remaining sensitive to data (Glaser, 1992). In discussing the pedagogic strategies of teachers, I distinguished the pedagogic strategies of teachers by 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 the learning of students was mediated or scaffolded (Wood et al., 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" (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/practices of teachers through theoretical lenses. Although Bernstein (1990) uses the same term, "recontextualization," I have used it differently from how he used it as one of the rules of the pedagogic device (evaluation and distribution being the other two sets of rules). Here, Bernstein was specifically referring to the recontextualizing of 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 sociocultural context to any other, which is to say, how one social activity "sees" another, following Dowling (2014).

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter discussed issues in teacher professional development and how Indonesian reform policies were influenced by foreign reform trends and introduced student-centered pedagogy. Then, the benefits of employing a sociological approach to examine pedagogic transfer, especially in teacher professional development, were explained. Teachers are not passive recipients of policy, but they are the agents of change (Watson, 2014). The background of lesson study in Indonesia was presented alongside an overview of participants in this study to contextualize the school setting. The methods for data collection and analysis were also presented. Although this study took place eleven years ago, the Indonesian government still raises the de-bureaucratization of schooling system and negligence of teaching and learning process as serious issues in education reform at the moment (Kemendikbud, 2019). This suggests that despite the government's various efforts to improve the quality of schooling, the issues that are addressed in this study remain to be unsolved. In subsequent chapters, an analysis of teachers' practices at SMP Sari based on the empirical data is provided.

References

Bernstein, B. (1961). Social class and linguistics development: A theory of social learning. In A. H. Halsey, J. Floyd & C. A. Anderson (Eds.). *Education, Economy, and Society*. Glencoe: Free Press.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The Structuring of pedagogic discourse, volume, IV: class, codes and control, volume, IV*. London: Routledge.

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian education: Teachers, schools, and central bureaucracy*. Taylor & Francis.

Chang, M. C., Al-Samarrai, S., Ragatz, A. B., Shaeffer, S., De Ree, J., & Stevenson, R. (2013). *Teacher reform in Indonesia: The role of politics and evidence in policymaking*. World Bank Publications.

Delamont, S., & Galton, M. (1986). *Inside the secondary classroom*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Dowling, P. (2009). *Sociology as method*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Dowling, P. (2013). Social activity method (SAM): A fractal language for mathematics. *Mathematics Education Research Journal, 25*(3), 317–340.

Dowling, P. (2014). Recontextualization in mathematics education. In S. Lerman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mathematics Education* (pp. 525–529). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia, Washington, DC. (n.d.). People. http://www.embassyofindonesia.org/people/

Fahmi, M., Maulana, A., & Yusuf, A. (2011). *Teacher certification in Indonesia: A confusion of means and ends*. http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:unp:wpaper:201107

Fullan, M., & Watson, N. (2000). School-based management: Reconceptualizing to improve learning outcomes. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 11*(4), 453–473.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. Basic Books.

Glaser, B. G. (1992). *Basics of grounded theory analysis: Emergence vs forcing*. (n.p.): Sociology press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldire.

Guthrie, G. (1990). To the defense of traditional teaching in lesser-developed countries. *Teachers and Teaching in the Developing World, 8*, 219–232.

Hargreaves, D. (2010). The occupational culture of teachers. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies* (pp. 125–148). (n.p.): Routledge.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1995). *Ethnography: Practices and principles*. New York: Routledge.

Hendayana, S. (2015). Teacher learning through lesson study in Indonesia. In S. Sithamparam & K. Wood (Eds.), *Realising learning* (pp. 78–93). Routledge.

IDCJ. (2006). *Program for strengthening in-service teacher training of mathematics and science education at junior secondary level (SISTTEMS)* (Inception Report). IDCJ/JICA.

IDCJ. (2008). *Program for strengthening in-service teacher training of mathematics and science education at junior secondary level (SISTTEMS)* (Project Completion Report). IDCJ/JICA.

Jawas, U. (2014). *Instructional leadership in Indonesian school reform: local perceptions and practices* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Canberra).

Karim, M. A. (2006). Implementation of lesson study for improving the quality of mathematics instruction in Malang. *Tsukuba Journal of Educational Study in Mathematics, 25*, 67–73.

Kemendikbud. (2019). *Merdeka Belajar: Pokok-Pokok Kebijakan Merdeka Belajar*. Makalah Rapat Koordinasi Kepala Dinas Pendidikan Seluruh Indonesia.

Kusanagi, K. N. (2014). The bureaucratising of lesson study: A Javanese case. *Mathematics Teacher Education and Development, 16*(1), 1–17.

Lacey, C. (1970). *Hightown grammar: The school as a social system*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Malcolm, H., McLean, J., Tanuputra, G., & Harlen, W. (2001). *Active learning through professional support (ALPS) project, Indonesia 1988–1995*. Department for International Development.

Mas'oed, M., Panggahean, S. R., & Azea, M. N. (2001). The case of Yogyakarta, Indonesia. In *The politics of multiculturalism: Pluralism and citizenship in Malaysia, Singapore, and Indonesia* (p. 119). University of Hawai'i Press.

Mendikbudristek. (2021). *Materi Kurikulum Prototipe dengan Komisi X DPR*.

Mills, D., & Morton, M. (2013). *Ethnography in education*. Sage.

MONE. (2007). *Reforming teachers: Towards educational equality and quality*. Ministry of National Education.

Nielsen, H. D. (1998). Reforms to teacher education in Indonesia: Does more mean better? *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, 18*(2), 9–25.

Nozu, K. (2008). *The effectiveness of the Japanese 'lesson study' approach to the professional development of junior secondary teachers in Indonesia* (Unpublished MSc. Dissertation). University of Oxford.

Rosser, A. (2018). *Beyond access: Making Indonesia's education system work.* Lowy Institute.

Saito, E., Harun, I., Kuboki, I., & Tachibana, H. (2006). Indonesian lesson study in practice: Case study of Indonesian mathematics and science teacher education project. *Journal of In-Service Education, 32*(2), 171–184.

Saito, E., Imansyah, H., Kubok, I., & Hendayana, S. (2007). A study of the partnership between schools and universities to improve science and mathematics education in Indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Development, 27*(2), 194–204.

Scarth, J. (1987). Teacher strategies: a review and critique. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 8*(3), 245–262.

Sulfasyah, S., Haig, Y., & Barratt-Pugh, C. (2015). Indonesian teachers' implementation of new curriculum initiatives in relation to teaching writing in lower primary school. *International Journal of Education, 7*(4), 53–72.

Tabulawa, R. (2003). International aid agencies, learner-centred pedagogy and political democratisation: A critique. *Comparative Education, 39*(1), 7–26.

Talbert, J. E., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1994). Teacher professionalism in local school contexts. *American Journal of Education, 102*(2), 123–153.

Tanaka, Y. (2011). *Indonesia no kyoiku: lesson study wa jyugyo no shitsuteki kojo wo kano ni shitanoka [Indonesian education: Did lesson study improve the quality of education?].* (n.p.): Akashi Shoten.

Tempo. (2022, February 11). *Indonesia in learning crisis: Education Minister*. https://en.tempo.co/read/1559792/indonesia-in-learning-crisis-education-minister

Thair, M., & Treagust, D. F. (2003). A brief history of a science teacher professional development initiative in Indonesia and the implications for centralised teacher development. *International Journal of Educational Development, 23*(2), 201–213.

Tobias, J., Wales, J., Syamsulhakim, E., & Suharti. (2014). *Towards better education quality: Indonesia's promising path, development progress.* https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/9066.pdf

Toi, A., & Muta, H. (2006). Indonesia zenki chuto khoiku ni okeru chiho bunkenka no eikyo: kyoiku kankyo to kyoiku seika ni kansuru inga model ni yoru hyoka [The Influence of the Decentralization in the Area of Junior Secondary Education in Indonesia: An Empirical Study Using Causality Model on the Relationship between Educational Environment and Outcome]. *Nihon Hyoka Kenyu [The Japanese Journal of Evaluation Studies], 6*(1), 71–83.

Vernez, G., Karam, R., & Marshall, J. H. (2012). *Implementation of school-based management in Indonesia.* Retrieved from https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2012/RAND_MG1229.pdf

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Watson, C. (2014). Effective professional learning communities? The possibilities for teachers as agents of change in schools. *British Educational Research Journal, 40*(1), 18–29.

Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization, 7*(2), 225–246.

Woods, P. (1977). "Teaching for survival." In P. Woods, & M. Hammersley (Eds.), *School experience* (pp. 271–293). London: Croom Helm.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.

World Bank. (2004). *Education in Indonesia: Managing the transition to decentralization. Indonesian education sector review* (Vol. 1). World Bank.

Zaharlick, A. (1992). Ethnography in anthropology and its value for education. *Theory into Practice, 31*(2), 116–125.

Chapter 5
The Javanese Teacher Community and Their Coping Strategies

Abstract This chapter discusses teacher community at a Javanese junior high school and how their professional responsibilities are structured in relation to institutional setting. The analysis is based on the premise that professional responsibilities of teachers differ across contextual settings. In daily school activities, teachers were accountable for various responsibilities. At SMP Sari, the teacher community was referred to as "family" and professional accountabilities were embedded as family responsibilities. Family signified not only interdependent relationship among teachers but it obligated teachers to prioritize collective interests of community members. This familism system facilitated teachers to carry out school programs, and at the same time, stretched the bureaucratic regulation to enjoy a relaxing and harmonious working environment. However, teaching responsibility was not structured as the school program or collective responsibility. In fact, the collectivistic and hierarchical organizational setting worked negatively toward teachers to pursue their professional interest. Using the sociological concept of "Coping Strategies" (Hargreaves, 2010), I discuss how teachers negotiated various professional responsibilities within the familism system of SMP Sari.

5.1 Introduction

One of the attractions of lesson study was that it is seen as an effective approach to changing professional norms of teachers (Lieberman, 2009) within communities of practice (Wenger, 2000). Thus, teachers are understood as agents of change to engage in professional development rather than passive recipients. While the lack of resources or inadequate teacher qualifications in developing countries is emphasized as a failure of professional development projects, a more fundamental issue is that there is a gap between what professional development intends and how local educational settings work. For example, absenteeism of teachers or their skepticism of government policy could be detrimental to their engagement in professional development. However, the factors outside professional development were rarely considered in training design. Since the definition of professional accountabilities is

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_5

context-dependent, we need to first understand what teachers value and prioritize in a daily setting. In international aid programs, pedagogy and theories from industrialized countries were brought in, but schools in developing countries may operate very differently.

In the subsequent two chapters, I will describe the daily lives of teachers at SMP Sari. In this chapter, I examine the teacher community at SMP Sari by answering the following questions:

1. What were considered the professional responsibilities of the teachers at SMP Sari? What kind of negotiations took place within the teachers' community at SMP Sari?
2. How did teachers cooperate at SMP Sari? How did they divide responsibilities, and how much autonomy did they have in school operation and in teaching?
3. How were the accountabilities for teaching and to students shared and carried out at SMP Sari?

I examine what constitutes their professional responsibilities and how they were carried out within the school structure. Bjork (2005) described in his book *Indonesian Education* how bureaucratic organizational culture was a challenge to the autonomous practice of teachers. I examine beyond "bureaucratic culture" and frame teachers' practice as ongoing negotiations within a community. The concept of "teacher strategies" is useful to understand how teachers negotiated competing demands when faced with a dilemma. I examine the practice of teachers not as a fixed cultural representation but situate their practice in the web of social relations and present this as "coping strategies." 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 (Woods, 1979). Professional development is built on the professional identities of teachers, and their collaboration reflects how teachers cooperate in daily teaching.

5.2 Overview of the Teachers' Community

SMP Sari is a relatively privileged school located in Bantul District just outside the city of Yogyakarta. It was accredited as a "national standard school" and known for academic excellence, good facilities, and experienced teachers. The vision of the school is "To become an international standard school which excels in achievement and under the faith and piety of the Indonesian character." A similar vision is commonly seen in schools across Indonesia. 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 9th grade. In the year of my fieldwork, SMP Sari ranked 5th in the district and 24th in the province on the UN league table. 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.[1]

There were approximately 680 students and 51 teachers in the school. Forty-nine teachers held permanent employment status as civil servants (PNS; an abbreviation for *Pegawai Negeri Sipil*) and are listed in Table 5.1. Two teachers, not listed in the table, were honorary teachers (an ICT teacher and a science lab assistant) 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 at SMP Sari due to its proximity to the city and the privileged status of the school. Around half of the teachers at SMP Sari had been working in the school for over ten years.

The teachers shared a strong sense of community, and the school was governed by a system of social stratification. Respecting the social hierarchy was in line with the values of Javanese society in general. Seniority was generally respected. The teachers were ranked according to the system of civil service ranking (CSR). Teachers were paid according to CSR. Most of the teachers held the position of either 3D or 4A, as shown in Table 5.1, and they were paid around 3–4 million rupiahs (the equivalent of USD 220–325) a month.[2] At the time of my fieldwork, 36 out of 49 PNS teachers had already passed the certification scheme and held the status of "professional teacher" (Fieldnotes, December 20, 2009). While absenteeism of teachers has been a major issue in Indonesia, it was generally not a major issue at SMP Sari. However, there were a few teachers who were occasionally tardy or missed lessons. While it was officially prohibited, it was common practice for teachers to have side jobs after school. While the working hours were from 6:30–13:00, teachers usually only came in to teach scheduled lessons and left after they finished teaching. There were some teachers whose presence stood out due to their active participation in school activities. Participating in social activities organized both inside and outside the school was considered important. However, there was a different degree of participation depending on the individual teachers. Generally, school events followed a mixture of Javanese and Muslim rituals due to the school being located in a predominantly Muslim area. Consequently, four Christian teachers opted out from participation in events such as the School Anniversary Event or Teacher Gathering outside school hours. Thus, I interacted more with those who were active in school management and actively participated in school activities.

My analysis will focus on the teachers of the four UN subjects—Mathematics, Science, Indonesian, and English—since these subject teachers formed lesson study groups under the school-level subject groups called MGMPS. These four subjects were considered important. Since passing the national examination (UN) was considered the most important goal in schooling, there was a clear emphasis on the four subjects included in the UN. The teachers of PE, ICT, Javanese, Home Economics,

[1] The national examination was abolished amid the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. But in Bantul, a similar regional test is being implemented.

[2] 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.

Table 5.1 Teachers in SMP sari

	Name	Subject	Grade	Age	CSR*	Other Details
1	Umar	Mathematics	9th	50	4A	Curriculum (H)
2	Edi	Mathematics	9th	52	3D	UN committee (H)**
3	Arum	Mathematics	8th	43	4A	Master's Degree
4	Hani	Mathematics	7th	46	4A	
5	Faud	Mathematics	8th	38	3B	Master's Degree
6	Fima	Mathematics	7th	36	3A	
7	Prastiwi	Mathematics	7th	37	3A	
8	Joko	Science (Physics)	9th	55	4A	Science Dept. (H)
9	Halim	Science (Physics)	9th	44	4A	Student Affairs (S) **
10	Bella	Science (Biology)	7th and 9th	43	4A	
11	Wahyuni	Science (Physics & Biology)	7th and 8th	49	3D	
12	Ema	Science (Biology)	7th and 9th	33	3A	
13	Puji	Science	8th	36	3A	
14	Endarto	Indonesian	7th and 9th	52	4A	
15	Gia	Indonesian	9th	49	4A	
16	Sugini	Indonesian	8th and 9th	51	4A	
17	Basuki	Indonesian	8th	53	4A	
18	Anggita	Indonesian	7th	51	4A	
19	Wibobo	Indonesian	7th and 8th	50	3D	Student Affairs (H)
20	Tuti	English	7th and 8th	48	4A	English Dept. (H)
21	Amel	English	8th and 9th	45	4A	
22	Citra	English	7th and 8th	50	4A	
23	Ismi	English	7th and 9th	49	4A	Master's Degree
24	Danar	Social Science (Economics)	7, 8, and 9th	50	4A	
25	Usmiwatun	Social Science (Economics)	7, 8, and 9th	46	3D	
26	Dewi	Social Science (Geography)	7A, 8, and 9th	39	4B	Vice-principal
27	Risma	Social Science (Geography)	7 and 8th	37	3A	
28	Arfan	Social Science (History)	7, 8, and 9th	43	3D	
29	Danar	Social Science (History)	7 and 9th	53	4A	Human Resources (H)

(continued)

Table 5.1 (continued)

	Name	Subject	Grade	Age	CSR*	Other Details
30	Ditya	Civics	8th and 9th	48	3D	
31	Janur	Civics	7th and 8th	55	3C	
32	Ahmad	Civics	7th and 8th			
33	Beni	Religious Studies	9th	56	4A	Vice-principal
34	Nardi	Religious Studies	7th and 8th	39	3A	
35	Dita	Religious Studies	7th and 8th	49	4A	
36	Priyo	PE	8th and 9th	51	4A	Facility (S)
37	Subagyo	PE	7th and 9th	57	3D	
38	Mira	Culture and Art (Painting)	-	48	4A	Principal
39	Angga	Culture and Art (Painting)	9th	45	3B	
40	Elita	Culture and Art (Painting)	9th	48		
41	Nina	Culture and Art (Dance)	8th	50	3D	
42	Handoko	ICT	8th and 9th	52	4A	Human Resources (S)
43	Galih	ICT	7th and 8th	35	-	
44	Andri	Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)	8th and 9th	46	4A	
45	Ismawati	Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)	7th and 8th	47	3D	
46	Fira	Local Content Curriculum (Javanese)	7th and 8th	38	3A	
47	Erna	Local Content Curriculum (Home Economics)	7th and 9th	55	3D	
48	Beti	Local Content Curriculum (Home Economics)	7th and 9th	37	3A	
49	Irfan	Local Content Curriculum (Gamlen)	7th and 8th	53	4A	Facility (H)

* Teachers are evaluated and paid according to Civil Service Ranking (CSR)[14]
** (H): Head; (S): Secretary

Art, and Music were less involved in school activities, and I rarely saw them at social events.

5.3 The Indonesian Familism System

5.3.1 Family Responsibilities

A vice-principal, Mrs. Dewi, once described the teacher community as "a family" who "gets together in sadness and happiness." One of the first rituals I encountered when I started the fieldwork was a morning ritual of friendly greetings among teachers.

> As the teachers arrived at the school on motorcycles (only a few teachers drove cars), they greeted their colleagues on the way to the staff room. Each teacher 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)

Starting a day with this ritual, the teachers spent a considerable amount of time socializing with one another on a day-to-day basis. Whenever the teachers had free time between classes, they engaged in conversations in the staff room. Whenever I entered 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." An Economics teacher 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 teachers' interdependent relationship, which extended beyond that of professional roles.

In fact, the word "family" has a deeper significance in the Indonesian political/social system. Takashi) described how the Suharto regime (1967–1998) tactically used the ideology of familism or the patronage system to maintain power. Under the familism system, the organization was governed by two authorities. Formally, it was governed as "the bureaucratic state" and operated by bureaucratic rules. However, at the same time, it also functioned as "the family state" where "children" relied on personal favors and the generosity of leaders. The leader or "*bapak*" (father/leader) was expected to take care of the nation as president through formal authority but also expected to play the role of generous father (of the nation). This enabled the leaders "*bapak*" to govern "*anak*" (child/subordinate) through both official responsibility and debts of personal gratitude. Since the state salary was not sufficient, even bribery was systematized as a favor from *bapak*, and justified in the familism to support living as long as the wealth was distributed and not monopolized by leaders (Shiraishi, 1992). Since the Suharto regime, this model has transcended various levels of bureaucracy and is still present (Shiraishi, 1997a, 1997b). This system of familism was perpetuated in the institutional setting of SMP Sari. Being a "family" signified

two meanings: being a member of the civil service community and being a member of the teacher community, which functioned as an interdependent social system.

5.3.2 Two Discourses in the Familism System

For Indonesian teachers, the status of PNS, or civil servant, signifies guaranteed job security and social support as the members of government "family" (Bjork, 2005). Once teachers enter the civil service, there is no system to sanction poor work performance (World Bank, 2010). Teachers explained to me that contract-based teachers worked hard until they became PNS, but then they could relax. Since almost all teachers were PNS at SMP Sari,[3] they were not under pressure to prove themselves. Even Mr. Edi, who was regarded as a "good teacher" by his peers (this will be elaborated further in the next chapter), said that he preferred being a teacher in a public school over a private school because a civil servant teacher could relax (Fieldnotes March 10, 2010).[4] While the official working hours at SMP Sari were between 6:30 and 13:00, most teachers came in only for their scheduled teaching. They came to the school right before the lessons and went home shortly after finishing. There was little to hold teachers in the school besides being physically present to teach lessons.

The example of working hours represents how the familism system served to fulfill two conflicting demands—to carry out orders from the Education Office while maintaining a relaxing and harmonious working environment. In other words, the school was managed by two contradictory discourses. The **official discourse** was guided by bureaucratic obligations, and the **unofficial discourse** responded to the social norms of the community. While the official discourse regulated what should be done (on paper), it was the unofficial discourse—internal codes of practice—which regulated the conduct of its members. This resembles how Javanese teachers switch two languages: Indonesian was used as the official language of instruction at the school, while the local language of Javanese was used in informal conversations. Indonesian was used in classrooms, but Javanese was used in the staff room. Indonesian is more egalitarian, whereas Javanese is complex since "social and political hierarchy is encoded and expressed in Javanese" (Woodward, 2010, p. 15). To the eyes of outsiders, only official discourse—what was prescribed by policy documents—might be visible. But it was the unofficial discourse—social norms—rather than bureaucratic regulations that actually determined the conduct of teachers.

---

[3] 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.

[4] This coincides with the finding of a study on government bureaucrats in 1970 by Oostingh as cited in Bjork (2005, p. 86). The principal attraction of a career in the civil service was job security, undemanding work, short working hours, and lifetime employment. In the public sector, teachers are less accountable for the output of their work.

5.4 School Leadership Under the Familism System

In this section, I describe the leadership of three school managers—a principal and two vice-principals—and their attempts to fulfill both official and unofficial discourses described in the previous section. At the official level, the school was managed top-down and run as a bureaucratic organization. However, leaders were also expected to be benevolent patrons of the "family." Shiraishi described this 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, 1997a, 1997b, p. 97).

5.4.1 Leadership of Principal

Mrs. Mira had been a principal of SMP Sari for four years. She was regarded as a competent principal since she attracted more funding 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). Generally, the teachers welcomed these reforms. More school programs meant additional honoraria for teachers. Still, sometimes conflicts arose. One incident was when the principal introduced the popular vote, and some senior teachers lost their managerial positions and expressed dissatisfaction (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010; Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010).

While Mrs. Mira was a charismatic leader, she was careful to maintain her role as a benevolent leader. When I asked her why the teachers were not in their classrooms for morning reading time, her response was that we needed to be patient since "time and process were needed" to make change (Interview, February 6, 2010). This signifies how Mrs. Mira acknowledged the balance of running the school efficiently and playing the role of a generous leader.

At the official level, the principal seemed to possess sovereign power over school operation. All official documents produced at SMP Sari—from students' report cards, letters to parents, to the reports of individual teachers—required the signature of the principal before they could be submitted 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 paternalistic leadership, the approval was symbolic while the actual operation was left up to the staff. However, occasionally, teachers complained about management, as will be explored in a later section.

5.4.2 Symbolic Leadership of Mr. Beni

Two vice-principals at SMP Sari exhibited contrasting leadership styles. Their choice of leadership presented how teachers negotiated two layers of accountabilities under the familism system; moreover, how it was almost impossible to balance them.

The first vice-principal, Mr. Beni, was an Islamic Religion teacher in his late fifties who had been working at SMP Sari for over twenty years. Mr. Beni was an exemplary Muslim and was respected as a moral and religious leader. He had been to Mecca several times and occasionally gave a sermon to local communities. In Indonesia, religion played an important role in education. Every morning, the first class started with prayer. Any formal event at SMP Sari started with the prayer of "*assalamualaikum warrahmatullahi wabarakatuh*" (Peace be upon you, and may God bestow on you his blessing in Arabic greeting).

Mr. Beni was the most popular teacher at SMP Sari. In a teacher survey, he was nominated as an example of a good teacher for being a religious, honest, disciplined, and fair person. These personality traits resonate with the Javanese values of *alus*—polite, calm, or soft behavior—which value harmony and the ability to repress one's own feelings at the expense of minimizing conflict (Geertz, 1961; Irawanto et al., 2011). However, there was nothing extraordinary about his teaching. Mr. Beni used didactic methods, and the majority of his lessons consisted of students reciting the *Qur'an* (Fieldnotes, January 19, 2010). Even Mr. Beni himself admitted that he needed to try more interactive approaches (Interview, June 10, 2010). Mr. Beni did not get upset even when the noise level rose with students chattering. He simply kept the lesson going reciting the *Qur'an.* With the students who were paying attention.

As a vice-principal, his role was merely symbolic. There was no indication that he had any influence over school management decisions. 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. In terms of his career, the success of Mr. Beni was ambiguous. While Mr. Umar—the curriculum head—passed the exam to be promoted to be a principal, Mr. Beni did not. His explanation was that Mr. Umar was thoroughly familiar with government policies and regulations (Interview, June 10, 2010).

This shows that Mr. Beni's ability to do well with anyone was most valued in a "familism" system. Being a good leader in Javanese society required devotion and self-sacrifice. One of the reasons Mr. Beni was elected as a vice-principal was that he was debt-free (Interview, June 10, 2010). The majority of the teachers borrowed money from the cooperative[5] to pay for housing, motorcycles, and tuition fees for children. Their financial struggles often came up in conversations. For example, a senior history teacher, Mr. Danar, told me, "Miss. Kanako,[6] teachers are stressed today. Because it's the end of the month and they [teachers] don't have money" (Fieldnotes, December 24, 2009). Mr. Beni had the power to benefit financially as

[5] In the Indonesian civil service, there is a system of microfinancing organized under the cooperative.

[6] Some teachers called me "Miss. Kanako," others called me "Mrs. Kanako" or "Mbak Kanako".

the head of the cooperative, but he never did. Thus, his conduct was well-respected since Javanese are "motivated by a general ethos of selflessness and concern for the common good" (Bowen, 1986, p. 546). In fact, Mr. Beni said, "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 followed the working hours prescribed by the government guidelines. Thus, there were indications that personal qualities (rather than teaching ability) were important indicators in evaluating a good teacher.

5.4.3 Authoritative Leadership of Mrs. Dewi

The second vice-principal, Mrs. Dewi, was a geography teacher in her thirties who had made remarkable achievements in her 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 at SMP Sari—even higher than the principal (as shown in Table 5.1). 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 a reward for receiving 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 PhD. 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 at 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 of 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 for the next lesson.

Mrs. Dewi's career success was made possible by aligning her practice with bureaucratic standards. 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 moves in this way:

> Teachers often care about credit points. But you don't have to go outside of 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 were negative consequences to her career success. In contrast to the popular Mr. Beni, Mrs. Dewi was somewhat alienated from her peers.

There was a symbolic episode representing her isolation. In a workshop on professional competency, Mrs. Dewi presented her experience of making and compiling student worksheets and how by submitting such documents, teachers could earn additional credit points for a promotion (Fieldnotes, January 22, 2010). She encouraged her colleagues to spend ten percent of their salary on professional development since they would receive a significant salary raise after being certified. When she encouraged her colleagues to buy books or to attend seminars using their pocket money, a disapproving murmur broke out in the room. Subsequently, teachers lost interest in her lecture and started to chat with one another. There was clearly an emotional distance between Mrs. Dewi and her peers. While Mr. Beni kept a low profile and was seen as a selfless and devoted community member, Mrs. Dewi's accomplishments stood out. In terms of teaching and management, she won respect from her colleagues, but because she differentiated herself from her peers, she was seen as individualistic and authoritative.

5.4.4 The Impossibility of Balancing Two Accountabilities

In order to gain trust as leaders, principal and vice-principal were held responsible for fulfilling both official and unofficial accountabilities. As a charismatic leader, Mrs. Mira needed to not only run the school well but also act as a generous leader. Even then, being a principal required sacrifice. Once, an English teacher told me that she preferred to have friends over becoming a principal and being lonely. The vice-principal, Mr. Beni, was not alienated from the community in contrast to Mrs. Mira and Mrs. Dewi. However, this was possible because he internalized community values and avoided taking any leadership or action that might be considered pursuing a personal interest. In contrast, Mrs. Dewi internalized bureaucratic values and acted like the one in authority. While this granted her power and high status in the bureaucratic hierarchy, she was no longer considered one of the "children" of the community but one of the "parents" who was responsible for taking care of them. As these examples presented, the teachers were in constant negotiation between two seemingly irreconcilable accountabilities—official and unofficial obligations—under the familism system.

5.5 Teacher Cooperation Under the Familism System

In this section, I will discuss what constituted the professional responsibilities of teachers in day-to-day school operations and how they were executed. As I will reveal, the familism system facilitated smooth school operations. In general, teachers cooperated well to carry out school programs as a shared responsibility; however, teaching was not part of this shared responsibility. Moreover, while bureaucratic requirements were linked to career advancement, they had little relevance to the

responsibilities of supporting students. Mr. Edi—who was regarded as a competent teacher by his peers—described his frustration:

> 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? (Fieldnotes: June 2, 2010)

To understand his frustration, we need to understand how teachers negotiated various responsibilities and prioritized some over others. The following sections will help us understand the nature of teachers' work and how teachers worked together with the consideration of official and unofficial accountabilities.

5.5.1 School Programs as Community Participation

At SMP Sari, school programs constituted the center of school activities. They included the selection of newly entering students, middle, end of term examinations, mock examinations, and extracurricular programs. Most of the programs were funded by the government, and a few programs, such as the UN preparation lessons, were paid for by parents. The administrative work associated with the school programs was called *tugas* (literally means "duty" or "tasks") and taken seriously. The prioritized nature of bureaucratic work was visible from the use of public space and time in the staff room. While I never saw teachers preparing for their lessons, I often witnessed the teachers busily engaging in different *tugas*: going around asking colleagues to sign an attendance list or completing financial reports. For working on these programs, teachers were compensated by honoraria.[7] Thus, some teachers told me that nowadays, teachers work harder for these programs than for teaching (Fieldnotes, May 10, 2010).[8] Whenever there was a school program event, food—such as lunch boxes or boxes containing snacks—was always provided. This symbolic gesture of sharing was similar to how villagers are served food at a local wedding or other festivities. The honorarium was divided equally, except for those who bore heavier responsibility, such as leaders of the program or secretariats who spent a considerable amount of time making the financial/activity report. Thus, the familism system also functioned to ensure a fair distribution of wealth.

The implementation of the school program was facilitated by committee groups called *timbok* (*tim bekerja kelompok* or group work team). The teachers were members of one of four *timbok*. 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 *timbok*. The

[7] For example, for participation in supervising mock tests, teachers were paid IDR 25,000 (the equivalent of GBP 1.7) each.

[8] She was getting funds for these programs that constituted an important role for the principal. The administrators were also rewarded financially for taking the role of supervisors, which involved checking implementation and reporting.

discussion on how to run the programs was also generally unnecessary since the teachers executed the programs following the guidelines provided by the District Education Office. Younger teachers were more likely to be assigned to handle time-consuming work, such as making program reports or financial reports. This involved producing timetables for activities, creating a list of participants, collecting signatures from participating teachers, collecting receipts, and calculating. In return, they were compensated financially for the extra work.

However, such an appointment created a problem since it was based on the social hierarchy and not based on merit. Mr. Halim told me that Mr. Angga (an art teacher) was appointed as a note-taker, but he did not possess the skills required to carry out this task. Mr. Angga could not transfer data from a computer to an external disk. Although Mr. Halim had tried to teach Mr. Angga, he could not 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 poor performance. In the end, Mr. Halim replaced him with another teacher.

This episode illustrates how teachers are protected from individual evaluation under the familism system. When a problem occurred, the issue was resolved quietly since it was a collective responsibility. There was never a question of who did what and who did not do what. The members of the "family" relied on this interdependent system where they were committed to supporting one another emotionally and technically. Consequently, there was a strong pressure to follow the institutional norms and to support community interests.

5.5.2 Accountability to Teach for Exam Preparation

The teachers often discussed *tugas* in the staff room but rarely discussed their teaching or students. In Indonesia, elementary and junior secondary school teachers understood that the aim of education was to help their students pass the UN held at the end of the 6th and 9th grade. Passing the UN was not only a requirement for graduation, but also determined the reputation of schools. Every year, the league table was published at the regency level, and parents chose schools based on this. In an interview with an officer in the Education Office, he named six good schools based on the criterion that all students passed the UN (Interview, May 20, 2010). Thus, schools were motivated to keep a high ranking on the league table.

Teachers generally understood the aim of teaching was to prepare students for the UN. The word *materi* equated their responsibility to teach and was frequently used in daily conversations. It meant anything associated with preparing students for the UN—the curriculum, teaching materials, or subject topics. The emphasis on *materi* indicated the strong association with government-set curriculum and standards. On the other hand, this had little to do with accountability to students. Just as Mr. Angga was not held accountable for his failure to perform his task as a note-taker, individual

teachers were rarely held accountable for student performance. This accountability to teaching and students will be further discussed in the next chapter.

While there was an overall concern for students' performance on the UN, ensuring students' success did not rest on an individual teacher. However, it was considered the responsibility of the managers. Earning a high rank on the league table means the school could attract high-level students and additional funding from the Education Office. In attempt to achieve a high ranking on the league table, the UN preparatory lessons (they called it *tajam*, an abbreviation for *les tambahan jam* [additional lessons]) were provided after school. Mr. Faud, a young Mathematics teacher, ridiculed this effort by school management, saying, "now the world is upside down" (*dunia terbalik*) because the UN preparatory lessons were offered out of the school managers' interest for school reputation and not based on a request by parents or students (Fieldnotes, May 10, 2010).

5.5.3 Discourses in Professional Accountabilities

At the time of my fieldwork, the Teacher Certification Program was ongoing. The intention of the program was to acknowledge teachers as "professionals" by strengthening their economic and social status. Once teachers were certified, their salaries nearly doubled. This, of course, was a matter of great concern for teachers. In reality, the certification merely ensured that the requirements were met but had little relevance to the actual competency of teachers. In fact, government regulation favored senior teachers,[9] and this showed the certification was not purely based on merit. Moreover, teachers discussed the certified or professional status of teachers separately from their actual performance. 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). The example of certification showed how teachers discussed "professional" through two layers of accountability. Passing certification merely signified meeting official (bureaucratic) requirements and did not guarantee the teaching ability of teachers. In fact, the certification program has been criticized for having little impact on the actual performance of teachers (Chang et al., 2013).

Generally, teachers were reluctant to take on responsibilities that required them to work closely with students. The curriculum head, Mr. Umar, said that younger teachers were pushed to be homeroom teachers because teachers were generally reluctant (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010). Apart from a few teachers who were interested in working closely with students, most teachers considered making report cards or taking care of problematic students as additional burdens.[10] This indicates how

[9] Those who held the civil ranking status of IV, aged 50 or older, or had more than 20 years of teaching experience were exempted from obtaining a bachelor's degree (World Bank, 2016).

[10] The certification program motivated some of the senior teachers to become homeroom teachers to earn additional credits.

responsibility to students was not shared in the familism system. This topic will be further explored in the next chapter.

5.5.4 Professional Interests as a Personal Choice

In this section, I present two teachers, one evaluated negatively and the other positively, and illustrate how the practices of both teachers resulted alienating themselves from the community.

The below is the excerpt of the interview where Mr. Beni recounted Mrs. Dita as a problematic teacher:

> 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 normal…Mrs. Dita has difficulty improving herself. […] I told her several times, "you have to set an example for other teachers," but she is not communicative and lets students work by themselves (without supervision). 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)

The bad conduct of Mrs. Dita was not acceptable either by bureaucratic standards or the internal code of conduct of the teachers' community. However, rather than presenting bureaucratic guidelines, Mr. Beni used peer pressure and urged her to set an example for other teachers. This indicates the social norm had more regulating power than bureaucratic rule. Since Mrs. Dita was a senior teacher and an Islamic Religion teacher, she had an obligation to do so. This method of appealing to conscience by the use of shame is commonly used by Javanese parents in disciplining their children (Geertz, 1959). Javanese share a strong sense of belonging to the community, and this discourages differentiating oneself from others.

> Living in the Javanese society should be characterized 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)

When Mrs. Dita did not change her behavior, Mr. Beni attributed her disciplinary problem to her personal (and possibly personality) problem. Without fulfilling her obligation to the community, Mrs. Dita was marginalized from the community. Thus, the problem was no longer treated as a community issue but as her personal problem.

In fact, it was equally risky for teachers to differentiate themselves from their peers, even in a positive way. In daily conversations, they rarely discussed their teaching or their students. Any discussion that could be considered an evaluation of teachers was avoided.

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 to lesson study was a lack of funds. He said:

> It took me IDR 50,000 (the equivalent of GBP 3) to photocopy worksheets for the students and observers (in lesson study). If it is for every day, it is impossible, especially for someone like me who is lazy. (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010)

In response, Mr. Edi stated in an uncritical tone that even in daily lessons, he paid to photocopy worksheets for students (there was no photocopy machine in the school). He said that it was okay because he was happy to see the students with good UN results (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010). To this, Mr. Basuki explained that although he would like to improve himself, his family and financial situation—taking care of a baby at home—hindered him from engaging in professional development. Mr. Basuki said, "I have a headache thinking about financial problems." What became apparent from this conversation was that a professional commitment was discussed as a choice or personal sacrifice rather than an obligation.[11]

The discussion on teaching like this was a taboo topic at SMP Sari. It was only possible because there was no conflict of interest among these teachers. Mr. Angga and Mr. Irfan were teachers of non-academic subjects; Mr. Basuki exempted himself by labeling himself as lazy; and Mr. Edi was regarded as an outstanding teacher who successfully prepared students for the UN.

However, while Mr. Edi was recognized as a good teacher, he was seen as individualistic. Being assigned as head of the committee for UN preparatory lessons, Mr. Edi gained the compensation of IDR 200,000 (the equivalent of GBP 13). When three of his students got perfect scores on the UN (which was extremely difficult), he was also rewarded IDR 75,000 (IDR 25,000 for each student; the equivalent to GBP 5). Although Mr. Edi earned relatively small amount of money, some teachers still felt this to be unfair (Fieldnotes, June 2, 2010). This personal gain was evaluated negatively by his peers since it could disrupt the existing social hierarchy and harmony. Thus, Mr. Edi was considered "outlaws" and was not protected by the community just as Mrs. Dita—this discouraged teachers from pursuing their professional interests for the fear of alienating themselves from the community.

In fact, teachers were careful not to be seen as individualistic especially when they made an achievement. They made a symbolic gesture of "sharing" to contribute to the community and avoid being seen as individualistic. During my fieldwork, there were two occasions where teachers provided food as a token of appreciation to the community.[12] The first instance was when a senior Indonesian teacher, Mrs. Sugini, passed the certification evaluation. The second one was when the vice-principal, Mrs. Dewi, was promoted to the civil service ranking of 4B. They both provided lunch boxes to all the teachers and administrative staff for a celebration. Sharing wealth and happiness among the community was important for teachers to avoid jealousy. Such redistribution of wealth commonly took place in rural communities (Sekimoto, 2004). Mr. Edi was also aware of this sharing gesture of giving back to the community. He told me that he gave away half of the honorarium (IDR 100,000) and shared it with the choremen who perform miscellaneous tasks to help teachers, such as copying or making tea. Such an act to tip low-paid workers was a common practice. However, other teachers did not consider this a contribution to the community.

[11] Contrary to his self-evaluation, Mr. Basuki was described as a problematic teacher by Mr. Beni.

[12] 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.

This symbolic gesture of sharing was not mandatory since it could impose a significant economic burden on the teachers. Mrs. Sugini was the only one who gave away lunch boxes, although there were other teachers who had been certified at the same time. In some cases, the teachers hid their personal success because they could not treat everyone in the same way. 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). This kind of redistribution of wealth within the community coincides with the custom of Javanese rural villages. Those wealthier ones are expected to bear a heavier financial burden to serve others, such as serving good food at a wedding or hiring widows in harvesting seasons (Sekimoto, 2004).

While the hierarchical structure of SMP Sari facilitated the smooth operation of the school, it discouraged teachers from pursuing their own professional interests. This meant being a responsible member of the community could be in conflict with being a good teacher. In the next section, I will explore how the teachers negotiated contesting demands to develop coping strategies.

5.6 Negotiating Responsibilities in the Familism System

In this section, based on the discussion of how teachers were accountable for various, sometimes irreconcilable responsibilities under familism, I present how teachers negotiated and resolved these conflicting accountabilities within the setting of SMP Sari.

5.6.1 Negotiations Between a "Good" Family and a "Good" Teacher

As discussed in the previous sections, the school was governed under the familism system, where teachers worked to protect community interests and harmony. While there was strong pressure to maintain the existing social hierarchy, the teachers were increasingly held accountable for their individual performance in the reform movement, as seen in the case of the certification program. As a result, there was an emerging conflict between the existing social hierarchy and the actual performance of teachers. In this section, I present cases to understand how teachers dealt with these emerging conflicts.[13]

[13] My discussions focused on Science teachers and relied mainly on data from an interview with Mr. Halim. Since this kind of discussion was politically risky, only a few teachers revealed this type of 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 an accurate accounts of events.

5.6.2 Seniority as Privileged Status

At SMP Sari, senior teachers held privileged status in the social hierarchy. One such privilege was their entitlement to leadership roles and reduced workload. After teachers were certified, it was mandatory to teach 24 hour per week. However, those who held managerial positions were exempted from this obligation. For instance, Mr. Umar, the curriculum head, taught only 12 hour per week 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).

However, since these privileges were given based on the social hierarchy, it was uncertain these teachers could actually perform the assigned tasks. 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. Referring to this episode in an interview, Mr. Halim said, "When seniority is not accompanied by ability, it is problematic" (Interview, June 8, 2010). This showed contradictory discourses (the official and unofficial discourses) presented in the earlier section—those teachers who were persons in charge on paper were not capable nor held accountable for actual implementation.

5.6.3 Understanding of Teaching Competence

While seniority played an important role in the social hierarchy, senior teachers were often described negatively in terms of teaching competence. For example, some teachers said because senior teachers were old, they were no longer motivated to improve themselves, or they were too authoritative toward students and younger teachers (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010; Interview with Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). A senior English teacher, Mrs. Ismi, explained that when she was younger, there were limited stable career options, and being a teacher was not their first choice. She said that what motivated young people to start choosing teaching as a profession was the better salaries. She said, younger teachers in this school, such as Mr. Faud and Mr. Halim, were motivated in developing their professionalism (Fieldnotes, May 11, 2010).

However, there were different interpretations of the relationship between seniority and professional competency. The senior teachers legitimatized their high status with their experience in teaching. For example, the curriculum head (and the senior teacher) Mr. Umar, justified senior teachers' appointment to teach 9th grade in the following way:

> 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) teach ninth-grade mathematics while Mrs. Hani (in the forties) teaches seventh-grade. Also, Mrs. Astuti, a science teacher (in her forties and older than Mr. Halim or Mrs. Bella, who taught ninth grade), is not good, so she teaches 8th grade. Also, Mrs. Ditya (in her forties) teaches 9th

> grade for Civics while two male teachers, Mr. Janur (in his fifties) and Mr. Ahmad (in his thirties), are still new and not as good, so they teach 7th and 8th grades. (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010)

Teaching 9th, especially for the four subjects tested in the UN, was considered privileged status since it bore more responsibility to prepare students. While he justified the appointment based on merit, 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 the lesson rang: those who committed professionally moved immediately from their seats while those who were not continued to chat with other teachers (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010). Just as Mr. Beni's description of a religious person as a better teacher, Mr. Umar cited the disciplinary issue as proof of a good teacher.

5.6.4 Hidden Competition

While it was taboo for teachers to discuss one another's competence in public, there was a hidden rivalry between senior and younger teachers. Mr. Halim said that he and Mrs. Bella compared the performances of their students (9D, 9E, 9F, and 9G) with those taught by Mr. Joko—a senior teacher—(9A, 9B, and 9C), and found out their students had higher scores (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010).

> …the strange thing is the mathematics scores of students between (classes) taught by 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 science like that (referring to the different performances of students among classes)? I believe we must learn and develop continually. From what I have seen, maybe due to his age, Mr. Joko has an issue there. (Interview with Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010)

The above narrative indicated that the performance of students was used as an indicator to imply that younger teachers were more competent than senior teachers. This was clearly in contrast with how Mr. Umar described how competent senior teachers were assigned to teach the 9th grade. These different accounts of senior and younger teachers suggest the existence of a gap in understanding regarding their competence and the existing social hierarchy. However, this competition was kept hidden and never surfaced in public.

5.6.5 Good Cooperation Under the Patronage

Teachers generally emphasized good relationships among subject teachers. Although younger teachers occasionally complained about senior teachers, these conflicts never surfaced. Mr. Halim told me when his peer Science teachers complained that "Mr. Joko (the head of Science subject group) always wants to check everything,"

his response was to "Just keep quiet and let him be, it's nothing" (Interview, June 6, 2010). He explained, "Previously, I had difficulty accepting Mr. Joko because he was always *menggurui* (patronizing me)" (Interview, June 6, 2010). In Javanese culture, the humble attitude was respected; thus, the word *menggurui*, or patronizing attitude, signified arrogant and bad behavior against Javanese values—especially those in power. Mr. Halim never confronted Mr. Joko but resolved the problem quietly by accepting his personality and treated it as a matter of personal difference. 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.

His words align with the Javanese values of *alus* in which valuing harmony even by repressing one's own feelings was preferred at the expense of minimizing conflict (Geertz, 1961; Irawanto et al., 2011). Mr. Halim was a major player in school management. He was the secretary for both the Lesson Study Program and Student Affairs. However, he chose not to confront Mr. Joko for fear of sabotaging a good relationship among science teachers. This suggests the existence of strong social pressure to maintain the existing hierarchy and social harmony. While this worked to support good cooperation among teachers, it demotivated any change or even to have a discussion on how the school was operated. Consequently, any reform effort could be seen as a risk to undermine social harmony and the existing hierarchy.

In fact, maintaining a good relationship among other members of the community was an important prerequisite for a good teacher. Mr. Halim emphasized that science teachers had better relationships than English teachers or mathematics teachers (Interview, June 8, 2010). Since the teachers strongly identified themselves as subject experts (more discussion will be given in the next chapter), having a good relationship was the basis of professional identity.

5.6.6 The Ambuguity of Bureaucratic Boundaries

Under the new management of Mrs. Mira, new school programs were offered at SMP Sari. However, there was ambiguity in how new responsibilities were distributed in the existing bureaucracy. Mrs. Ema—a science teacher in her thirties—reported a confrontation between her UN preparation team and the team for the bilingual class.

> As Mrs. Ema handed me a paper, she told me she made the schedule for the UN preparation lessons. At that time, Mr. Faud joined the conversation and told me about the trouble between Mrs. Ema's UN preparatory team and the team of bilingual class. The team for the bilingual class was offended that the UN preparatory team had made a schedule including bilingual classes; thus, they had made a new schedule and replaced it with theirs. (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 and said the responsibility laid in the hands of the principal. According to her, the principal should have said something when she signed to approve the schedule. Since the responsibility was attributed to the principal, the

incident was recounted as an uncomfortable experience that was beyond the control of Mrs. Ema. The issue in the school operation was left unsolved because it was treated as an authority issue rather than a professional issue.

In fact, the introduction of bilingual classes blurred boundaries in the professional hierarchy as well. The mathematics and science lessons of those classes designated as "bilingual classes" (7A and 8A) were taught partially in English. (In fact, a very small portion was taught in English.) In the following year, 9A would also be a bilingual class. While the privilege to teach 9th grade was reserved for senior teachers, they did not want to teach in English. Thus, younger teachers, who had better (but limited) knowledge of English, would be assigned to teach 9A. This would certainly disrupt the existing hierarchy and threaten the privilege of senior teachers. Mr. Umar was skeptical about whether a young mathematics teacher, Mr. Faud, had enough ability to serve as a 9th-grade teacher (Interview, May 24, 2010). Although Mr. Faud was recognized as a young, competent teacher (refer to the remark made by Mrs. Ismi), Mr. Umar said that he was keen to assess the performance of Mr. Faud's students.

As seen by the rise of conflicts after the introduction of the bilingual program, a change in the system disrupted the existing hierarchy. Previously, the teachers have been evaluated based on their loyalty to the civil service system rather than their performance as teachers (Bjork, 2005; Hattori & Murni, 2012). However, the teachers were increasingly held accountable for individual performance under the bureaucratic gaze. For senior teachers, this could be considered as a threat to their high status, while younger teachers saw it as a potential opportunity.

5.7 Coping Strategies of Teachers

This chapter has shown how the familism system worked to prioritize collective responsibilities and maintain social harmony. The system facilitated the execution of school programs but discouraged the teachers from acting outside social norms. This system made it difficult for teachers to pursue their professional interests because if teachers prioritized their pedagogical decision over community values and norms, they would be considered individualistic or even selfish.

Borrowing from the concept of "coping strategies" by D. Hargreaves (2010), I present Coping Strategies of Teachers in Table 5.2. This provides a conceptual understanding of how teachers negotiated and resolved these possibly conflicting accountabilities within the setting of SMP Sari. By choosing a particular coping strategy, teachers prioritize a specific responsibility over other responsibilities. Of course, teachers were not bound to one strategy but chose multiple strategies depending on the situation.

Table 5.2 Coping Strategies of Teachers

Accountability to the Familism System

Accountability	Individual (Choice)	Collective (Obligation)
Official Discourse: Bureaucratic Accountability	i. Bureaucratic Authority **Externalization:** Align conducts with government-set standards	ii. Civil servants **Compliance:** Meet bureaucratically set requirements; implement school programs; transfer of curriculum
Unofficial Discourse: Social Accountability	iii. Moral leader **Internalization:** Act as a moral example; sacrifice for the community	iv. Community members **Conformity:** Prioritize the collective good and maintaining social harmony

5.7.1 Internalization

The strategy of internalization prioritized social accountability more than anything else. The conduct of Mr. Beni falls into this category. He internalized community ethics as his own choice and acted as a moral example. His good personality and selfless act enabled him to win high recognition within the community. However, this had no relation to his teaching or management ability. He never expressed his opinion or took active leadership for the consideration of communal harmony. His leadership was merely symbolic.

5.7.2 Conformity and Compliance

The majority of teachers in SMP Sari fall into this category. The accountability to the familism system (Table 5.2) was structured in the school system, and this worked to reinforce the existing institutional hierarchy. Teachers were expected to fulfill both official (bureaucratic) accountability and unofficial accountability (adhering to the social norms) roles as "family members." The teachers were accountable for complying with both official and unofficial discourses; thus, in most cases, the conformity and compliance strategies co-existed. The significance of this strategy is

[14] According to Government Regulation No. 26 Year 2007 as cited in Holfelt (2008), 3C teachers were 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).

that meeting both official and unofficial accountabilities was possible due to the two layers of discourse. The bureaucratic obligation was interpreted merely as rules on paper. In reality, it was social norms that regulated the conduct of teachers.

5.7.3 Externalization

In this strategy, teachers align their practice with bureaucratic policy. While social norms worked to stretch bureaucratic rules, the teachers employing this strategy adhered to bureaucratic policy. Two layers of discourse no longer existed since the teacher's actual conduct aligned with bureaucratic requirements. An example of this strategy would be Mrs. Dewi. Teachers who employed this strategy would be rewarded with career advancement, but they also faced the risk of alienating themselves from the rest of the community, just as in the case of Mrs. Dewi. This strategy was often employed by teachers temporarily under special circumstances—for example, when there was a visit by a school supervisor. Importantly, this strategy merely signifies the fulfillment of minimum bureaucratic requirements, which was separate from having a good ability to teach.

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter illustrated how the professional responsibilities of teachers at SMP Sari were structured as the responsibilities of "family members." First, I examined how the school operated under two (official and unofficial) layers of reality, which enabled teachers to meet bureaucratic requirements and to protect a relaxing and harmonious working environment simultaneously. Second, I examined how teachers' work and financial rewards were distributed based on the social hierarchy of the familism system, which ensured smooth operation of the school. Third, while school programs were structured as a collective responsibility, teaching accountability was not included in this responsibility.

The "coping strategies" of SMP Sari presented how teachers made choices by negotiating contesting demands placed on them within the familism system. The institutional norm of SMP Sari worked to prioritize the collective interests of the community. There were strong incentives for teachers to protect the community since they were interdependent and protected by it. On the other hand, accountability for teaching and supporting students was not part of the community interest; thus, it was considered as a matter of personal choice. This made it difficult for teachers to pursue their professional interests, especially when it disrupted the community hierarchy.

Their collegiality was characterized as what Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) called "contrived collegiality." Teachers cooperated well to carry out administrative tasks, but they merely carried out activities based on bureaucratic guidelines. This is in contrast with "collaborative culture" where teachers act autonomously and share

accountability for teaching. At SMP Sari, teacher collaboration was difficult since teachers were individually accountable for their professional competency. Anything that could be understood as an evaluation of teachers or source of conflict was hidden in daily conversations.

We often examine "professional responsibilities," focusing only on those that are directly relevant to teaching. However, the analysis in this chapter showed that professional responsibilities were embedded as a community responsibility to maintain the social norms. In the next chapter, I will examine the teaching practice of teachers at SMP Sari and how their choice of pedagogy was also influenced by bureaucratic accountability and collectivist norms.

References

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian Education: Teachers, Schools, and Central Bureaucracy*: Taylor & Francis.

Bowen, J. R. (1986). On the political construction of tradition: Gotong Royong in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Studies, 45*(3), 545–561.

Chang, M. C., Al-Samarrai, S., Ragatz, A. B., Shaeffer, S., De Ree, J., & Stevenson, R. (2013). *Teacher reform in Indonesia: The role of politics and evidence in policy making*. World Bank Publications.

Geertz, H. (1959). The vocabulary of emotion: A study of Javanese socialization processes. *Psychiatry, 22*(3), 225–237.

Geertz, H. (1961). *The Javanese Family. (n.p.)*: Free Press of Glencoe.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*(3), 227–241.

Hargreaves, D. (2010). The occupational culture of teachers. In P. Woods (Ed.), *Teacher strategies* (pp. 125–148). (n.p.): Routledge.

Holfelt, I. (2008). *Preparatory work for a World Bank programming mission on civil service reform in Indonesia.* https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/12579/693120ESW0P1140ummary0Report.0Final.pdf?Sequence=1

Irawanto, D. W., Ramsey, P. L., & Ryan, J. C. (2011). Challenge of leading in Javanese culture. *Asian Ethnicity, 12*(2), 125–139.

Lieberman, J. (2009). Reinventing teacher professional norms and identities: The role of lesson study and learning communities. *Professional Development in Education, 35*(1), 83–99.

Hattori, M., & Murni, R. (2012). *Indonesia kunshou no nai eiyu kara senmonshoku toshiteno kyouin he* [Indonesia: teacher from a hero without a medal to a professional]. In Y. Ogawa & M. Hattori (Eds.), *Ajia no kyoin: henbo suru yakuwari to senmonshoku heno chosen* [Asian teachers: changing roles and challenges to the profession] (pp. 280–308). The Earth Kyoikushinsha.

Santoso, B. (2012). The influences of Javanese culture in power of making decisions in Indonesian universities: Case studies in Mm programmes. *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business, 27*(2), 224–241.

Sekimoto, T. (2004). *Fubyodo shakai ni miru byodo heno keiki: jawa nouson no jirei* [Opportunities for equality in an unequal society-a case of rural Java]. In H. Terashima (Ed.), *Byodo to fubyodo wo meguru jinruigakuteki kenkyu* [Anthropological research on equality and inequality]. Nakanishiya.

Shiraishi, T. (1992). *Indonesia: Kokka to Seiji* [Indonesia: State and Politics]. Libroport.

Shiraishi, S. (1997a). *Young heroes: The Indonesian family in politics (Vol. 22).* (n.p.): Cornell University Press.

Shiraishi, T. (1997b). *Sukarno to Suharto: Idai naru Indonesia wo mezashite* [Sukarno and Suharto: Aiming for the Great Indonesia]. Iwanami.
Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice aworldnd social learning systems. *Organization, 7*(2), 225–246.
Woods, P. (1979). *The divided school*. Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Woodward, M. (2010). *Java, Indonesia and Islam*: Springer Netherlands.
World Bank. (2010). *Transforming Indonesia's teaching force: From pre-service training to retirement: Producing and maintaining a high-quality, efficient, and motivated workforce.* Retrieved from http://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:wbk:wboper:2853
World Bank (IBRD). (2016). Teacher certification and beyond: An empirical evaluation of the teacher certification program and education quality improvements in Indonesia.

Chapter 6
Teachers' Pedagogies, Strategies, and Authority

Abstract This chapter explores the teaching practice of teachers within the institutional setting of SMP Sari. Their practice showed that teaching was regulated by the bureaucratic obligation to teach the curriculum for the national exam preparation. While teachers described "good teachers" as those who support student learning, the teachers admitted such teacher was rare at SMP Sari. The majority of teachers taught didactically with minimum intervention to students. I examined the practice of teachers using the sociological concepts. Borrowing from the concept of Zone of Proximal Development by Vygotsky (*Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*, Harvard University Press, 1978), I distinguished the practice of majority of teachers and "good" teachers. Then, I recontextualized the concept of pedagogic discourse by Bernstein (*The structuring of pedagogic discourse, Volume, IV: class, codes and control, Volume, IV*, Routledge, 1990; *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity. Theory, research, critique*, Taylor & Francis, 1996) and presented how teachers were held accountable for *what* they teach but not necessarily *how* they teach at SMP Sari. At last, I showed how teachers legitimatized their professional expertise in relation to the institutional culture borrowing the Mode of Authority Strategy by Dowling (*Sociology as method*, Sense, 2009). It showed bureaucratic organizational structure worked negatively and discouraged teachers to embody professional expertise in teaching.

6.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the teaching practice of teachers at SMP Sari and examines how it was socially constructed within the school context. At SMP Sari, teachers often used the word *materi* to discuss their teaching responsibility. There are multiple meanings of *materi* dependent on context: it could mean actual teaching materials, topics to be taught, or the curriculum itself. Teachers often complained that there was too much *materi* to be covered with limited time for its delivery. The word *materi* signifies both an obligation and the challenge of preparing for the UN national

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_6

examination. Like *tugas* (duty) described in Chapter 5, *materi* connoted that works must be taken seriously and prioritized at any cost.

While *materi* represented an obligation to teaching associated with UN preparation, it was clearly distinguished from "good" teaching. One teacher wrote in the teacher survey, "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[1] of the curriculum was understood merely as a minimum obligation but not sufficient for good teaching practice.

In the survey, good teachers were described as follows:

- Teachers who can make students understand the materials presented.
- Teachers who can explain materials as easily 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.

In the next section, I present two different pedagogic strategies to distinguish this minimum teaching and "good teaching" at SMP Sari. This differentiation is made based on whether or not the practice of teachers opened a social space to provide scaffolding (Wood et al., 1976). Second, the features of classroom practice will be explored in relation to this scaffolding. Third, cases of "good teachers" are presented to show how their practice extended beyond bureaucratically set boundaries and shared learning responsibility with students. Fourth, the impact of institutional settings on teachers' practice is analyzed by employing the schema of Authority Strategies by Dowling (2009). It will show how teachers' understanding of "professional responsibilities" is relevant to ongoing efforts to maintain or strengthen their authority in a particular contextual setting. 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 impact individual choices.

[1] The transmission or presentation of curriculum material described in the setting involved merely delivering the curriculum without concern for acquisition.

6.2 Pedagogic Strategies

6.2.1 Zone of Proximal Development as Social Space

To distinguish "good" teaching and ordinary teaching, I will employ the concept of Zone of 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 discussed ZPD in terms of 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) to reconceptualize ZPD as a social rather than a psychological zone. They described how by fostering a better understanding of their children, parents negotiated ZPD (they called it a triadic ZPD) and managed to reduce the relational distance between students and teachers. I follow their example and treat ZPD as a social space where student learning is mediated. From the subsequent sections, I present two different pedagogic strategies in relation to ZPD.

6.2.2 Restricted Pedagogic Strategy

I first introduce two lessons from SMP Sari that illustrate 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).[2]

> 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 briefly explained what they had learned 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.
>
> Himpunan kosong -> { } dan 0
>
> [empty set -> { } and 0]
>
> By this point, some students lost their concentration. I could hear their chatting. Mrs. Hani seemed not to care. She 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 seated toward the back

[2] 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. Team teaching will be discussed further in Sect. 7.5.

> continued to chat. She continued to explain for another ten minutes and then told the students to work on 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 students expressed their discontent. As time passed, the noise level of the class rose.

In this lesson, there was almost no interaction between the teacher and the students. The roles of teacher and student were clearly divided, with the teacher as a transmitter of knowledge/skills and the students as receivers of knowledge. In the first part, the teacher didactically transferred the curriculum content to the whole class. In the second part, students independently worked on the exercises. The teacher did not intervene in the process of learning to assist the problem-solving or to 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 with the student. I categorize this practice as the **restricted pedagogic strategy (RPS)**. In RPS mode, there is no establishment of a ZPD; instead, the development is presumed to be identical to the unmediated pedagogic text. As will be described in this chapter, the RPS practice was the dominant teaching practice at SMP Sari.

6.2.3 Elaborated Pedagogic Strategy

In the 7th grade biology lesson, Mrs. Ema employed much more interactive methods and displayed a different pedagogic strategy compared to the mathematics lesson just presented (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 point to those who spoke up in class, presumably 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. Unlike most teachers who provided the definition straight from the textbook, Mrs. Ema elaborated on the scientific terms and linked them to the actual classroom environment. Her use of an interactive method showed her attempts to facilitate students' knowledge acquisition. 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 there was a

Table 6.1 Pedagogic strategies

	Restricted (RPS)	Elaborated (EPS)
Learning responsibility between teachers and students	Divided	Shared
Discourse	One-way	Interactive
Knowledge	Universal and authorized	Socially situated and mediated
Teacher's role	Instructor	Facilitator
Student's role	Recipients	Active participants
Authority	A teacher is in control	Possibility for negotiation between students and teacher

teacher-student interaction in this zone. This practice is categorized as an **elaborated pedagogic strategy (EPS)**. Teachers' and students' roles were not clearly divided as in RPS since teachers shared responsibility for the acquisition by students.

Table 6.1 shows the difference between the two pedagogic strategies. This analytical distinction is helpful in understanding the commonalities and variations of practice among teachers. None of the teachers employed either RPS or EPS exclusively, but the teachers employed both strategies to varying degrees. These analytical concepts are helpful because they allow us to distinguish teachers' practice concerning the support provided to students.

In the next section, I will present the common features of teaching at SMP Sari. The practice of teaching was predominantly in alignment with RPS. This shows how their professional responsibilities were bureaucratically defined and did not include sharing learning responsibilities with students. Under the strong bureaucratic accountability of the school, teaching was interpreted as the delivery of the curriculum and it was standardized as didactic instruction. Their style of teaching was remarkably similar.

6.3 Features of Teaching Practices at SMP Sari

6.3.1 Presentation of Materi *as Standardized Texts*

At SMP Sari, there was a consistency in focus on curriculum delivery. Two lessons described below show 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 questions?" 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, using a didactic style: lecturing, recitation, and prompting to finish a sentence with a correct word as Mr. Subakti did.

Another popular classroom 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) illustrates this:

> Mr. Endarto started the lesson by going over the worksheet from the previously 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 expected to learn the application of the grammatical rules that Mr. Endarto presented by correcting the mistakes on their classmates' answer sheets.

In both of Mr. Subakti's and Mr. Endarto's lessons, the classroom exchanges 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 directly relevant to UN preparation. The aim of lessons was for teachers to present the curriculum to the class and for students to reproduce it. Consequently, the sequences of lessons were routinized to fit the IRE structure. The students were used to this routine interaction and being evaluated for their answers. Thus, even when Mr. Subakti went outside the IRE structure and encouraged students to ask a question, students remained silent and did not seem to benefit from this opportunity.

6.3.2 Minimum Teacher Support

Another shared feature of teaching among SMP Sari teachers was that teacher support for student learning was kept impersonal and minimal. The following description of an English lesson in 7B (Fieldnotes, January 11, 2010) shows that the teacher's role was limited to 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 them 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 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).

The lesson was divided into the following three steps: (1) teachers provide instructions and assignments (input); (2) students work on assignments (output); and (3) teachers evaluate student work (evaluation). Before 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.

This is a common phenomenon at SMP Sari. Once given an assignment, students were often left to work on their own for a considerable amount of time (in the range of ten to forty minutes). While students were working on assignments, most teachers sat down at their desks and waited until students finished. A few teachers went around the classroom to check students' progress, but they did not intervene. This signifies how the responsibility for acquisition rested entirely with the students. In fact, Mrs. Ismi told me that working independently was important since students could consult with others about lessons, but they could not do that during 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 intervention to support the knowledge acquisition. In the biology lesson previously described, Mrs. Ema encouraged students to provide specific examples based on students' personal understanding of "ecosystem" as an attempt to link textbook knowledge to everyday knowledge. In her practice, a ZPD or social space was established, enabling the teacher to accommodate the students' level of understanding. However, she was one of few teachers who showed such practice. As will be unfolded in this chapter, the majority of teachers' practice in SMP Sari did not construct a ZPD.

6.3.3 Teacher Discourse in RPS

In RPS, teachers were concerned of meeting externally defined standards. As a result, teachers regulated students through instruction and evaluation. Teachers focused

on "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, each group was instructed to perform a dance formation while other groups conducted 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 (defensively), "8D is good, and they can do it." Mrs. Nina explained that she provided a booklet of formations to students and 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 began to dance with awkward movements, trying to dance as best as they could remember. (Fieldnotes, January 27, 2010)

From the students' movement, it was evident that they lacked practice. However, the teacher was not responsible to support students 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." The teacher focused on *what should be happening*, and filling the gap between actual performance and expected performance was not the teacher's responsibility. The teacher's comment that another class (8D) could perform well implies that she has done her part, and the performance of 8F was their responsibility.

This division of responsibility is represented in how teachers concluded their 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 point out what they lacked. The discourse was evaluative, and the feedback provided by Mrs. Nina involved reprimanding students and reminding them what they should have done. The teacher's job was to hold students accountable for their performance but not to facilitate mastering moves. She concluded that the students had to perform again because they failed to receive a passing mark. Without the construction of a ZPD, filling the gap between the current and the expected performance was not the teacher's responsibility; thus, it was not problematized as a pedagogic issue.

6.3.4 Class Management

In class management, the teachers generally took a *laissez-faire* and *en masse* approach. Here is an example of an economics lesson (8D) by Mrs. Usmiwatun (Fieldnotes, February 20, 2010):

> While going over the homework, Mrs. Usmiwatun called on students by their attendance numbers. When a student failed to answer, she urged the student to respond several times. When he was still unable to answer, she called on another student. The girl had not been paying attention, and she also failed to respond. 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 episode, when a student failed to answer, the teacher simply moved on to the next student. From this, it is clear that the lesson's focus was on presenting correct answers (transmission) to the class (*en masse*) and not on supporting individual students. Disciplinary issues were tolerated as long as they were not obstructive to the whole class. As with the case of Mrs. Usmiwatun, when teachers addressed student behavior, it usually involved a verbal warning to "get serious" or a physical admonishment by light slapping. The majority of teachers at SMP Sari admitted that they did not remember the names of most students. As in this episode, most teachers used attendance numbers rather than names to call on students. The teachers had little personal knowledge of individual students, and there was limited interaction with students.

This illustrates that the teachers did not bear responsibility for working with individual students or handling their disciplinary issues. However, a *laissez-faire* approach did not work for some 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, even banging the whiteboard, students ignored her. The teacher became angry and lectured students, "You cannot be behaving this way." She told them their behavior was shameful, it would be known by the principal, and it would give this school a bad reputation; the students finally became quiet.
>
> As Mrs. Wahyuni and I walked 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 control. She was angry, although it was taboo for the teachers to get emotional. In urging the students to behave well, she resorted to external authorities—referring to the principal and the school's reputation. This shows that class management issues were no longer treated as a pedagogic issue but as a challenge to authority. It was the students' fault for failing to fulfill their responsibility to be obedient and respectful students.

Teachers often attributed the disciplinary issues of students to their home environment. How Mrs. Ismi (English teacher) described problematic students in the extract suggests this:

> 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 two students, I can handle them. But if there are five, I cannot. It is a problem in their home environment, so that the guidance teacher can work with them. It is not the English teacher's job since we do not have enough time. The poor education of the parents probably causes it, so they cannot handle their children. (Fieldnotes, December 28, 2009)

The comment that she could handle two problematic students but not five implies that deviant behavior was problematized only when it was an obstruction to the whole class and curriculum delivery. Her statement, "It is not the English teacher's job since we do not have enough time," suggests the disciplinary issues were not her responsibility. 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.

6.3.5 Teaching to the Test

Since passing the UN was a prerequisite for graduation,[3] it was the biggest concern for teachers and students in Indonesia as well as in SMP Sari. Teaching 9th grade involved greater responsibility, which Mr. Umar described as follows:

> The preparation (for the exam) for the 9th grade is different since there is very little materi to teach. The 8th grade has the most materi. In the 9th grade, lots of it is to solve exercises. (Fieldnotes, May 24, 2010)

There was no significant difference in teaching 9th grade from teaching 7th and 8th grades. However, there was less curriculum delivery, and the majority of lessons were spent on test drilling and evaluation. The following description of the English lesson for the 9th grade shows this (Fieldnotes, December 28, 2009).

> Mrs. Ismi gave students thirty minutes to work on the worksheet (although she said she would provide forty minutes, but 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 only a 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 on the UN?" She then continued to lecture on how the students should be serious and the UN's importance for them for about two minutes.

The above lesson presents a typical sequence for a 9th-grade class in UN subjects. Rather than giving *materi*, teachers' role focused on presenting 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 on students and not shared with the teacher. 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 on the UN was comparatively easy. Thus, by exposing students to failing experiences, as in the case of Mrs. Ismi's lesson, students were reminded it was their responsibility to pass the UN.

[3] It has not been a requirement for graduation since 2020.

6.3.6 Variations in the Lesson Format

While most lessons were taught didactically in SMP Sari, there were some variations, especially for those subjects outside the four subjects in the UN. Some of the teachers attempted to include student-centered activities. Nevertheless, there was continuity in the nature of student–teacher interaction.

In the 9E economics lesson by Mr. Wibobo and Mrs. Usmiwatun, each group of students discussed 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 as an outside class assignment.
>
> A group of four girls first presented a report on the "Bank Century corruption scandal," which was a hot topic at the time. The girls read the text projected on the screen while managing their PowerPoint presentations.
>
> Some of the audience, mainly the boys, were talking while the presentation proceeded. The presenting group spoke softly despite the fact that 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 PowerPoint slide. 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 no longer didactic, there was a consistency in teachers' minimum intervention and *laissez-faire* approach. The students had the freedom to choose what and how they presented their work. However, the presentation was delivered to fulfill the minimum requirement—presenting the topic about money and financial institutions using PowerPoint. Just as the teachers recited material included in textbooks, the students merely took facts from media and reproduced them in their presentations. There was no evidence of personal elaboration of these facts in their presentation. Thus, the aim of the presentation was fulfilling requirements rather than understanding its content.

This was evident during the question and answer session. The students were encouraged to ask questions to earn points. The questions asked were mere confirmation of facts. The students received points for answering questions regardless of whether they responded appropriately. Also, there is no feedback or elaboration on the content by the teachers. Moreover, it was not "legitimatized" as the delivery of curriculum since it was not transferred by the teacher and not taken from a textbook. Thus, it was treated as a separate activity from covering *materi*. This is probably why student activities were more common in non-UN subjects (including social science) and non-academic subjects.

In some lessons, teachers attempted to go beyond the IRE structure and solicited students' active participation. However, when teachers asked an open question, students could not benefit from it. Here is an example from 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)

There was no response from students when Mr. Angga asked them to provide interpretations of their classmates' artwork. He intended to encourage students to exchange ideas about the paintings. However, 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 understanding of paintings. This was similar to the previously described Mr. Subakti's civics lesson, where he failed to encourage students to ask a question. In this way, the change in the lesson structures did not alter social interactions between teachers and students.

6.3.7 The Pedagogic Scope and Challenges

Since the dominant teaching at SMP Sari consisted of reproducing the curriculum, most teachers considered teaching relatively easy. Mrs. Risma said there was no difficulty teaching as long as she was teaching the subject she majored in at university (Interview, June 9, 2010). However, some teachers expressed challenges in their classrooms. Mrs. Citra confided issues in her classrooms:

> … some children have difficulty working on worksheets. Sometimes, lazy children…they cheat (copy an answer) …
>
> I asked each student to make a list of 10 vocabulary words and write down their meanings. The following day, I added 15 […], but they only remembered at the time. Later, when I asked them again, they had forgotten…They are supposed to remember…they should remember…(laugh). (Interview, June 21, 2010)

In the above quote, while the students' behavior was problematized, this was attributed to their lack of effort as "laziness." Students' inability to memorize vocabulary was problematized, but the teacher concluded that "they should remember." These quotes show how the issues in student learning were not treated as a pedagogic issue or linked to *how* to teach. In the RPS practice, there was no ZPD in which to mediate the acquisition by students. The lack of social space to mediate student learning, *how students learn* was a black box. In the next section, I will present the practice of teachers who employed EPS and worked to fill this gap of understanding.

6.4 "Good" Teachers and Their Pedagogies

As noted in the opening of this chapter, the teachers of SMP Sari made a distinction between "good teaching" and ordinary teaching. So far, the ordinary teaching practice in SMP Sari has been presented. Generally, the teachers' responsibilities were equated with the transmission of *materi* and presentation of the UN standards. However, there were a few teachers who engaged in a different mode of practice. In this section, I will present two teachers—a mathematics teacher, Mr. Edi, and a science teacher, Mr. Halim—whose practice constituted constructing ZPD and provided scaffolding. They were named as examples of "good teachers" in the teacher survey (Table 6.2).

As will be explored in this section, while the structure and style of lessons were similar to the RPS practice, what differentiated these two teachers was that they mediated student learning to fill the gap in the acquisition.

6.4.1 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 (Table 6.2), he was recognized for supporting students regardless of their abilities. The activities in his lessons followed the everyday routines in the 9th grade. He gave out exercises for students to work on and called on 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. He said he pushes a lower ability student to work hard by asking them to solve a problem in front of the class. This way, he said, "the students can not cheat and copy from other students"—which happened in many classrooms (Interview, May 24, 2010). However, it was not clear how successful the scaffolding was since the teacher mostly did the students'

Table 6.2 Descriptions of "good teachers" from teacher survey

Name of "good teacher"	Respondents' comments in the survey
Edi	He makes students who are not good become good or able to master lesson material. He is patient and disciplined
	He gives a chance for smart students, and he cares for those who lack or are weak and work with them patiently
	He transfers his knowledge in detail and in a way that is easy to be understood by students
	Disciplined and smart
	You can see from the daily teaching–learning process
Halim	Disciplined, charismatic, outgoing, creative, and friendly

work. Nevertheless, Mr. Edi provided step-by-step and personal support in problem-solving. Moreover, he also offered emotional support. Mr. Edi told me that he often told his students, "Don't say I cannot, but say I cannot yet" (Interview, June 2, 2010).

Mr. Edi told me it was his experience as an after-school private tutor for 21 years where he gained the most expertise in working closely with students.[4] Some of the "good teachers" at SMP Sari, including Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim, were hired by parents as private tutors for UN preparation outside of school hours. At the time of his interview, Mr. Edi said that he tutored 22 students (Fieldnotes, March 10, 2010). Mr. Edi said he taught classroom lessons similarly to how he taught tutoring lessons. He said those students who were taught by other teachers came and asked for help because they said 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 explained that he classified the students into three ability levels and provided adequate support according to their levels. Mr. Edi's teaching clearly opened ZPDs to give scaffolding to fill the ability gaps among students.

Another difference between Mr. Edi and his colleagues was that he considered creating a good classroom environment important for students to learn well. According to him, 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 9th 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, made his worksheets, supported the students, and provided helpful feedback. In fact, Mr. Edi was quite successful in preparing students for the UN; three students obtained a perfect score in the actual UN (Fieldnotes, May 7, 2010).

6.4.2 Mr. Halim

In his early forties, Mr. Halim, a physics instructor, was another teacher who employed EPS and supported students. In a lesson that I observed, Mr. Halim used

[4] 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 h of lessons. Since the teachers earned around IDR 2 million to 3 million a month, this could add up to 10–20% of Mr. Edi's salary.

a computer to project exercises onto a whiteboard (Fieldnotes, February 10, 2010). While the lesson's sequence was similar to those of other 9th-grade teachers, he used the media effectively to accommodate students' levels and needs. For example, when many students failed to answer a problem, he chose a similar exercise for them to solve. In the interview, Mr. Halim told me that media use helped students 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 in the back of the classroom. When the concentration of students was declining, he threw in interesting personal stories. When he noticed 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. Mr. Halim told me that he asked a noisy student to come to the front of the classroom and supervised him closely while he worked on a problem. As with Mr. Edi, Mr. Halim deployed strategies to work with students that constituted EPS.

Just as Mr. Edi cited his out-of-school experience of tutoring in the development of his strategies to work with students, Mr. Halim said he gained his ability to manage student activities through Boy Scouts. Mr. Halim told me that other teachers were often surprised with his skills at managing the student government to organize events by themselves (Fieldnotes March 15, 2010). The majority of teachers interacted with students only inside classrooms. However, Mr. Halim was the secretary of student affairs and spent time with students outside the classroom. He had a responsibility to supervise students in the morning assembly and was an advisor for student government activities. He said that education was not just for enhancing students' academic ability but also for developing their characters, social skills, and moral values. The way Mr. Halim worked with students reflected his view to educate students holistically. For example, he told me that dressing correctly was necessary 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 only, but he tried to enhance students' strength, including their social and artistic skills (Interview, June 8, 2010).

Mr. Halim's approach in teaching resembled Mr. Edi's in some ways, but there were some key differences. Mr. Halim analyzed his students in the following way:

> The students of 7B 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 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 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)

While Mr. Halim differentiated the ability of his students just as Mr. Edi did, this differentiation was made as a unit of classes rather than as individual students. This suggests that Mr. Halim's strategies were targeted at the class as a whole. Also, another difference was he was concerned not only with the academic ability but also the social skills of students, such as their communication skills. These differences could be attributed to his experience in managing a group of students and developing social skills in Boy Scout activities.

His practice showed EPS where he opened a ZPD considering contextual factors such as students' characters and abilities to fill the gap between their current performance and standards required by tests. He said that students entering SMP Sari were above average students (because the school only takes in those students who scored highly in the elementary school graduation exams). Students' ability was not a problem. He considered the problem was on the side of teachers and said, "Although students had potential, we (teachers) did not give them a chance or guide them" (Interview, June 8, 2010).

The practice of "good teachers"—Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim—showed the construction of ZPDs and how they shared responsibility with students to acquire *materi*. Consequently, they were interested in developing strategies on *how to teach*. 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 of out-of-school experience. Mr. Edi accumulated experience working with students in private tutoring, while Mr. Halim gained experience from supervising students in non-academic activities and Boy Scouts. In the setting of SMP Sari, the ability to work with students did not constitute teacher obligation.

6.5 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) as EPS or that fails to do this as RPS. These terms are inspired by Bernstein's (1971) work on speech codes as well as Vygotsky's (1978) scholarship, but they are

Table 6.3 Pedagogic strategies and pedagogic discourse in relation to ZPD

	RPS (One-way support)	EPS (Scaffolding or considerations for ZPDs)
ID	Transmission of the bureaucratically set content	Transmission of the bureaucratically set content
RD	En masse and laissez-faire	Individualized support

very different: elaborated (speech) code constitutes an orientation to universal meanings and 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 is related, in my analysis, to social class, and these are not, unlike speech code, psychological constructs.

At SMP Sari, there was continuity in terms of the content of teaching (ID) between pedagogic strategies. In both RPS and EPS, the teachers were concerned with transmitting the curriculum content and preparing students 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 their classroom order (RD). While the majority of teachers intervened minimally to maintain classroom order, some teachers took pedagogic measures to discipline students. This indicates that while bureaucratic rules regulated teachers' practice in terms of the content of teaching (ID), there was flexibility in *how* the teachers managed their classrooms (RD). The reputation of teachers was often based on their ability to control the classroom. For example, Mrs. Wahyuni was considered incompetent since other teachers could hear the excessive noise from her classrooms. In Table 6.3, teachers' pedagogic strategies (RPS/EPS) are presented in relation to the pedagogic discourse (ID/RD).

In RPS, teachers transferred the curriculum relying on a hierarchical structure of the classroom. The teachers acted like the ones in charge, and the role of students was to follow teacher instructions. Since the content was transferred directly from textbooks, this did not require teachers to elaborate the curriculum or have personal knowledge of students to interact with them. Since the role of students was interpreted as obeying the teacher's instructions, disciplinary issues were understood as a challenge to the teacher's authority rather than a pedagogic issue for teachers to deal with. 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 used to being recipients of knowledge, they did not take up opportunities to go beyond their prescribed roles outside of the IRE structure even when they were given a chance for active participation. This is what happened in the art lesson or civics lesson described earlier; students were not motivated to express their ideas or opinions. Thus, in RPS, students' participation was limited, and there was little intervention by teachers, especially in terms of RD.

On the other hand, "good teachers" mediated student learning. They adjusted the pace and level of teaching in order to provide individualized support within ZPDs. The comments below suggest that both Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim felt responsible for supporting 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, June 8, 2010)

This means the teachers not only considered the current levels 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 develop strategies to fill gaps between students' current and expected levels of performance.

The pedagogic discourse explains how social interactions of teachers are closely connected to institutional settings. 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 is 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 to give feedback and afford an opportunity to seek support.

Even within the practice of EPS, there were variations in terms of how support was provided to maintain the social order of the classroom (RD). While the interventions of Mr. Edi were concerned purely with the acquisition of the curriculum content, Mr. Halim intervened to maintain social order of the classroom. 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 individual variation suggests that the EPS practice was motivated personally rather than institutionally. Nevertheless, good teacher practice shows how the regulation of both ID and RD may be necessary for effective teaching.

6.6 Teacher Expertise and Authority Strategies

The discussion in this chapter has highlighted how teaching responsibilities at SMP Sari were bureaucratized; thus, teachers were motivated to align their 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 showed mediating student learning as this was not a pedagogic concern for most teachers.

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

	Practice	
Practitioner	Open	Closed
Closed	Charismatic	Traditional
Open	Liberal	Bureaucratic

Fig. 6.1 Authority strategies (Adapted from "Modes of Authority Strategy" Dowling, 2009, p. 53)

Authority Strategies (2009; Fig. 6.1) recontextualize Weber's (1924) concepts of the ideal typology of leadership and provide a practical 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, 2009, p. 19)

This 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. In the case of SMP Sari, indifferent to the variations in pedagogic strategies (RPS and EPS), there was a consistency in the responsibility to present the curriculum. This suggests that there was a solid force to close down the practice as prescribed in textbooks and to teach to the UN. This was reflected in how the teachers equated instructional expertise with familiarity with *materi*. In contrast, open practice treats the content of teaching as flexible and open. This was rarely observed in the practice of teachers at SMP Sari. In a few cases—such as the student presentations in the economics lesson or an open discussion in the art lesson—the attempt to open practice was made, but it 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 (a particular teacher). Crucially, this is an authority claim—a strategy—and does not refer to the actual state of embodiment or otherwise. Alternatively, in an open practitioner mode, the practice is not legitimatized by the practitioner's specificity but by the nature of the practice: practitioners are interchangeable. In the case of SMP Sari, teachers' practice was strikingly similar across subjects and among teachers, as discussed earlier. This indicates that the unique practice of practitioners themselves did not legitimatize professional expertise.

Each of these four modes of Authority Strategy—bureaucratic, traditional, charismatic, and liberal—will be described 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, teachers' practice was strongly motivated to align with bureaucratic

requirements (closed practice). In this mode, teachers acted as delegates of authority, and the fulfillment of bureaucratic regulations legitimatized their practice. When introducing a new policy/pedagogy, this required a change in formality without a substantial difference. A good example of this is how the teachers responded to policy changes ordinated by the Education Office. Once teachers passed the certification assessment, they were obligated to teach 24 hours per week. As a result, to cope with the surplus of teachers in some of the subjects, some lessons were supposed to be taught by two instructors. However, most of the time, team teaching did not take place. There was no change in *what* or *how* the lesson was taught from that by a single teacher. Only in 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 teachers' professional expertise. 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)—these teachers who were invited to be external experts employed this strategy. The curriculum head, Mr. Umar, 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 for training courses. These citations legitimatized their claims to embodied expertise. Again, these claims to the embodiment are merely strategies and not states; thus, it simply means that knowledge and skills are claimed as unique to the practitioner. Thus, these teachers acted as "experts" by internalizing bureaucratic rules and policies. Therefore, 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 own pedagogic judgments and acted beyond the bureaucratically set standards. Their peers acknowledged the "good teachers" (Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim) for providing adequate support to students. They mediated student learning to fill the gap between the current and expected levels of acquisition within ZPDs (EPS). Thus, their practice was distinguished from the one-way presentation of curriculum and fulfilling the bureaucratic requirement. The practice of "good teachers"—Mr. Edi and Mr. Halim—falls in the charismatic mode category; their embodied expertise in supporting students led them to go beyond the bureaucratic requirement. By pursuing their interest in supporting student learning, the teachers went beyond both the social norms of the teacher community and the minimum bureaucratic requirement to transfer the curriculum. There was risk in this since this practice alienated them from most teachers, who limited their practice to curriculum delivery.

So far, three modes of Authority Strategies by Dowling have been discussed to describe teacher practice at SMP Sari. This 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 (to present the national curriculum), the opening of content and authorship—characteristics of the liberal mode—was not realistic at SMP Sari. Although I witnessed this practice in

one Indonesian teacher, Mr. Basuki, it was not intentional but caused by the teachers' inability to deliver the curriculum. For one of the lessons, he instructed students to write summaries of interviews they had conducted as homework. Other than that instruction, the teacher almost wholly left it up to his students what to do in the lesson, and some of the students wandered around, even outside the classroom.

The modes of Authority Strategies illustrated how teachers' professional expertise was legitimatized by strong pressure to close-down practice, but practitioners were interchangeable (bureaucratic mode). Teachers' practice was regulated by strong bureaucratic control, and there was little to motivate teachers to embody professional expertise such as the ability to support student learning. Using these four modes of Authority Strategies, I will depict how teachers legitimatized their professional expertise in relation to the institutional culture.

6.6.1 Career Advancement (Traditional Versus Bureaucratic)

The teachers often complained that bureaucratic administration was a burden that had little relevance to working with students. However, those teachers who had successful careers employed the traditional mode of Authority Strategy by aligning their practice with bureaucratically set rules. They were familiar with the curriculum and government policies and acted like the ones in authority. The practice of both Mr. Umar (the curriculum head) and Mrs. Dewi (the vice-principal) showed that there was a strong emphasis on hierarchical relationships, and they exerted more authority in classrooms. They controlled the lesson pace and student responses and behavior to a greater extent than 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 there was a negative consequence. They were often criticized for being authoritative and evaluated negatively by their colleagues. While the teachers did not publicly criticize their peers at 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; however, whenever this teacher entered the classroom, students froze in shock because they were so afraid of her (Fieldnotes, March 15, 2010). In an interview, Mr. Halim told me that Mr. Umar was not close to students and that students were afraid of him (Interview, June 8, 2010). Thus, there were conflicting evaluations between bureaucratically set standards and internal recognition of what constituted "good teachers." In Chapter 5, the distinction between official discourse and unofficial discourse was made and how the community's social norms overruled the bureaucratic rules discussed. These teachers acted as an authority by adhering to bureaucratic rules; in return, they were alienated from the social norms and the rest of the community.

6.6.2 *Responsibility to Students (Bureaucratic Versus Charismatic)*

Depending on the mode of authority claims, the claim to professional expertise differs. When teachers employed the charismatic mode, they understood and claimed expertise in applying embodied knowledge and skills. On the other hand, teachers resorting to the bureaucratic Authority Strategy understand their role as delegating authority. This different interpretation of teaching expertise will be examined here. When Mrs. Bella complained about a lack of discipline in one of her classes, Mr. Halim suggested allowing him to teach that class. It was a biology lesson in one of the bilingual classes (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 compared to usual. However, the interpretation of their changed behavior differed. The strategies Mr. Halim employed—the use of English, responding to noisy students, offering to support when a student failed—could all be considered factors. However, according to Mr. Halim, Mrs. Bella said later that the students told her that they were quiet because they were afraid and confused since Mr. Halim presented too many formulas. Mr. Halim told me that he disagreed with her and said that the students were not afraid since they were willing to respond when asked questions (Interview, June 8, 2010). 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 is not whose account was more accurate but how the two teachers interpreted the same events differently. Mrs. Bella believed that the presentation of authority made a difference in classroom management (bureaucratic mode), while Mr. Halim thought 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 to 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 female student's case in the episode above, an attempt to provide support for students often fails. 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.

These cases suggest that the teachers did not share an interest in supporting student learning under the institutional setting at SMP Sari. By pursuing their interest in supporting student learning, the teachers went beyond both the social norms of the teacher community and the minimum bureaucratic requirement to transfer the curriculum.

6.7 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to examine the practice of teachers beyond individual choice and to analyze how teachers' responsibilities for teaching were defined and shaped by the institutional settings of SMP Sari. Throughout the chapter, classroom episodes illustrated how teachers focused on curriculum presentation, but there was no regulation to encourage facilitating student learning. This is relevant to the quote of Mr. Edi presented below:

> I'm really sad. I often see my friends here…why do they 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)

He said that teachers worked hard for promotion through bureaucratic administration, but this had little to do with responsibilities to students. This dilemma arose due to conflict between the charismatic and bureaucratic modes in the Authority Strategy. While Mr. Edi recognized the embodiment of professional expertise to be necessary, his colleagues prioritized following the bureaucratic regulations. In fact, from the teacher survey, it is evident that other teachers also recognized that "good teaching" involved supporting students; still, they admitted, "There is no good teacher in this school. Most teachers are only chasing *materi*" (the teacher survey).

Due to the bureaucratic institutional setting, teachers were not motivated to take up the responsibility to construct ZPD or to develop strategies to work with students. Pedagogic strategies and pedagogic discourse presented in this chapter revealed there was little accountability to support student learning at SMP Sari. Unless personally motivated otherwise, bureaucratic accountability regulated one-way transfer of the curriculum; thus, teacher-student interactions were in the IRE sequence. Teachers kept their interventions minimal and impersonal, applying *en masse* and *laissez-faire* approaches. Classroom issues were treated as authority or personality issues rather than pedagogic issues. This shows there was little institutional motivation to embody professional expertise. This shows the bureaucratic responsibility held teachers accountable for ***what to teach*** (ID) but not necessarily ***how to teach*** **(RD)**.

By employing the scheme of Authority Strategies, it was shown how the institutional setting of SMP Sari worked to regulate teachers' practice to align with bureaucratically set standards (the bureaucratic mode of Authority Strategy). For the teachers who exhibited RPS, teaching was relatively easy, and they taught lessons without any preparation (Risma, Interview, June 9, 2010). This suggests that teaching was as the delivery of *materi*, and the responsibility for learning rested with the students. In fact, in the morning ceremony held on every Monday, the students recited the "Pledge of SMP Sari Students."

We, the students of SMP Sari, promise to:

1. believe in God the Almighty,
2. respect and obey parents and teachers,
3. be clean physically and mentally and courageous,
4. obey school rules,
5. be diligent in studying and working for the betterment of themselves, the nation, and country,
6. maintain school facilities and infrastructure.

While "good teachers" were personally motivated to go beyond the bureaucratic boundaries to embody the expertise of working with students (the charismatic Authority Strategy), employing the charismatic strategy meant deviating from the social norms. This is potentially risky since such practice was unlikely to be rated favorably and might result in alienation from the rest of the community in the familism system. By examining teaching expertise concerning the modes of Authority Strategies, we can understand there is no best way to teach, but professional expertise is constantly in negotiation and legitimatized by the different modes of authority.

In fact, 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 who 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 following the correct procedures for cooking a cake. These teachers accommodated themselves to the level of students rather than adhering to the standards of expectation. 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), the open practice (the charismatic authority or liberal authority) was difficult.

The discussions in this chapter—the bureaucratically set standards of practice in classroom teaching—are reflected in their engagement to lesson study, which is the topic of the Chapter 7.

References

Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language.* RKP.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse, Volume, IV: Class, codes and control.* Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity. Theory, research, critique.* Taylor & Francis.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: Theory, research, critique* (Rev. ed.). Rowman & Littlefield.

Dowling, P. (2009). *Sociology as method.* Sense.

Mehan, H. (1979). 'What time is it, Denise?": Asking known information questions in classroom discourse. *Theory into Practice, 18*(4), 285–294.

Morais, A. M. (2002). Basil Bernstein at the micro level of the classroom. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 23*(4), 559–569.

Panofsky, C. P., & Vadeboncoeur, J. A. (2012). Schooling the social classes: Triadic zones of proximal development, communicative capital, and relational distance in the perpetuation of advantage. In H. Daniels (Ed.), *Vygotsky and sociology* (pp. 200–218). Routledge.

Singh, P. (1997). Review essay: Basil Bernstein (1996). Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 18*(1), 119–124.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes.* Harvard University Press.

Weber Max translated by A M. (1924). *The theory of social and economic organizations.* Oxford University Press 1947.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 17*(2), 89–100.

Chapter 7
Enactment of Lesson Study as a Bureaucratic Project

Abstract In this chapter, I examine the implementation of lesson study at SMP Sari. I provide sociological analysis to understand the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study and daily practice. As pointed out as an issue of recontextualization, lesson study in Japan was not replicated in Java but reinterpreted to meet professional responsibilities at SMP Sari. Lesson study was implemented as a school program, and its implementation was bureaucratized to respond the institutional accountability. While student-centered approaches were introduced, the way teachers interact with the students remained the same. In the exam-oriented culture of the school, teachers' understanding of effective teaching consisted of employing didactic methods with minimal support to students. They limited their roles to instruction and evaluation; there was no facilitation of student learning. Consequently, teachers did not share an interest in how to teach—especially in providing scaffolding to students—an exchange of pedagogic expertise on how to support student learning did not take place. In the hierarchical organizational structure, lesson study did not promote collaboration in professional development, but the teachers were evaluated against one another.

7.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the implementation of lesson study at SMP Sari and analyzes how its implementation was bureaucratized. The lesson study analysis in this chapter is built on an understanding of teachers' practice as patterns of cultural practice shaped by social relations within the institution discussed in the previous two chapters. A sociological analysis of teachers' practice is provided to examine the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study and daily teaching. This will enable understanding how the teachers incorporated a new pedagogic practice—lesson study—into the existing system.

In Chapter 3, I presented the cases of foreign lesson study and pointed out how it was impossible to replicate "best practice" as found in the original context. The practice is transformed and "recontextualized" to meet the demands of a new setting.

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_7

Since the practice is socially constructed, how teachers interpret the practice reflects their understanding of professional accountability and the goal of schooling. As discussed in previous chapters, SMP Sari teachers responded to policy changes by accommodating changes only at the superficial level (this issue was discussed as official/unofficial discourses in Chapter 5), and there was almost no change in daily teaching practice.

In the institutional setting of SMP Sari, teachers were strongly motivated to align their practice with bureaucratic guidelines (as presented in the mode of Authority Strategy in Chapter 6). At the same time, teachers were aware that most teachers taught to fulfill minimum requirement but it was not enough for "good teaching." The teacher knew "good teachers" were expected to extend their support to facilitate the process of student learning. In such bureaucratic context and forces that were against innovative practice of teachers, how was lesson study implemented? The following questions will be answered in this chapter:

- What activities were implemented as lesson study?
- How was teacher practice in lesson study different from daily teaching?
- What was discussed in the post-lesson discussions (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?

7.2 The Bureaucratization of Lesson Study

7.2.1 Lesson Study as a School Program

At SMP Sari, lesson study was implemented as one of the school programs funded by the Bantul Education Office. While there was no specific guideline for its execution, its implementation generally followed what had been advised in past training provided by JICA experts and local university lecturers. Two teachers were responsible for running the lesson study program. The head of the curriculum, Mr. Umar, set the lesson study schedule while Mr. Halim coordinated the program. The "model teachers"—teachers who conduct a research lesson for other teachers to observe—were selected based on discussion among the subject teachers and Mr. Umar. Research lessons were commonly called "open class (OC)" in Indonesia. 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 an observer. However, many teachers skipped their lessons and participated in lesson study. 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 class scheduled at the time of OC (Interview, Mr. Umar, May 24, 2010).

As shown in Table 7.1, nine lesson study activities were initially scheduled for the academic year of 2009–2010, but only four activities took place. According to the

Table 7.1 Schedule for Lesson Study Activities at SMP Sari (2009–2010)

Original Schedule				Actual Implementation			
	Date	Subject	Model Teacher		Date	Subject	Model Teacher
1	Feb. 12	Indonesian	Mr. Basuki	1	Feb. 12	Indonesian (OC*1)	Mr. Basuki
2	Feb. 19	Mathematics	Mrs. Arum	2	Feb. 19	Mathematics (OC2)	Mrs. Arum
3	Mar. 12	Painting	Mrs. Mira	3	May 11	English (OC3)	Mrs. Citra
4	Apr. 10	Civics	Mr. Janur	4	May 29	Mathematics (OC4)	Mrs. Hani
5	April 21	Home Economics	Mrs. Erna				
6	May 1	Javanese	Mrs. Ismawati				
7	May 15	English	Mrs. Citra				
8	May 29	Mathematics	Mrs. Hani				
9	June 5	Islamic Religion	Mrs. Dita				

* OC: Open Class

principal, the school calendar was adjusted to prioritize UN preparation (Fieldnotes, March 10, 2010).[1] The Ministry of National Education decided to move up the UN a month early, and this change of dates in the middle of the academic year caused confusion. School activities, including regular teaching and school programs, were rescheduled in order "not to disturb those students taking the exam." It was unclear how the school decided which lesson study activities would be canceled. But the canceled one included an OC by the principal, Mrs. Mira.

In the first year, those teachers who were considered competent by their peers served as model teachers. By the time of my fieldwork, it was the third year, and less competent teachers who had not conducted OC were pressured to be model teachers. 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. The day before Mrs. Hani's open lesson, she complained to Mr. Halim that she had to be a model teacher (Fieldnotes, May 28, 2010). Nevertheless, the teachers implemented lesson study as *tugas* or bureaucratic obligation.

These model teachers' reluctance and lack of confidence were evident from their opening remarks in the PLDs (it was one of the protocols in lesson study to start with model teachers' reflections).

[1] Whereas the UN 2008/2009 took place from April 27 to 30, the UN 2009/2010 took place from March 29 to April 1 (Kompasmania, 2010).

I was unsure if I could do it since I am sometimes lazy, and things are missing in my teaching. I welcome comments for improvement. (Mr. Basuki, OC1)

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

I was nervous. Thank you for giving me this opportunity. Whether I wanted to or not, I had 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)

7.2.2 Lesson Study as Bureaucratic Protocols

Lesson study was structured into school programs and implemented as a top-down bureaucratic project at SMP Sari. Teachers interpreted the implementation of lesson study as carrying out a set of protocols and their practice at the time of OC reflected this.

7.2.2.1 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 an OC, which is a commonly used term in Indonesia)–See (the post-lesson discussions). Here is how the vice-principal, Mr. Beni, described lesson study (Interview June 10, 2010).

In planning, teachers prepare, make lesson plans, and teaching materials to be used, which are later **evaluated** [my emphasis]. For the second step, in do, teachers deliver the material and **evaluate** [my emphasis] 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 to deepen students' understanding. In the third step, see, 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 lesson study. The teachers used 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 pay attention to the process of student learning and think of ways to support their learning.

However, as discussed in Chapter 6, the teacher accountability did not include supporting student learning. As the description of lesson study by Mr. Beni illustrates, teachers were concerned about evaluating lessons and teachers. In Sect. 7.4, I will examine this issue further.

7.2.2.2 Incorporating Student Activities

Since lesson study promoted the introduction of student-centered approaches, all teachers included group work in their OCs, and three out of four teachers used hands-on activities as illustrated in Table 7.2. This was different from daily lessons as illustrated in Chapter 6, where the teachers mainly employed didactic methods and relied on textbooks and drills. Even student seating arrangements were different in OCs. They were arranged in groups of four students of mixed gender (as recommended by JICA experts in previous training) to facilitate group work. During daily lessons, students chose their seats. This generally resulted in girls and boys sitting separately—girls on one side of the classroom and the boys on the other side.

7.2.2.3 Extensive Preparation

The teachers at SMP Sari often mentioned that lesson study required "lots of preparation." While there was almost no preparation for 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 as follows:

> Kanako (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…Alḥamdulillāh. Children were able to follow and enjoy the lesson.
>
> They were able to understand what I told them.
>
> Kanako: 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].
>
> Kanako: 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)

Since lesson study was implemented as *tugas*, teachers were pressured to try a new teaching approach and prepare extensively for this.

Table 7.2 Open class schedule of lesson study in SMP Sari (2009–2010)

Open Class (OC) #/ Date	Model teacher	Subject/ (Class)	Lesson topic	Summary of lesson
OC1 Feb. 12	Mr. Basuki	Indonesian Language (8F)	Poetry	Reading a poem, discussing the different poetry styles and their objectives, and writing a poem as group work
OC2 Feb. 19	Mrs. Arum	Mathematics (8E)	Nets of a cube	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
OC3[2] May 11	Mrs. Citra	English (7D)	Descriptive texts	Ask questions about pets, read texts about pets and go over vocabulary, and work on worksheets in groups
OC4 May 29	Mrs. Hani	Mathematics (7F)	Trapezoid	Explaining about trapezoids followed by activities to understand trapezoids and to fill in worksheets and presenting the results of group work

[2] OC3 was different because it was implemented as MGMP (district-level subject teacher forum) activities and observers included English teachers from neighboring schools. The remarks made by the teachers from other schools were not included in the analysis.

7.3 Lesson Study Implementation

7.3.1 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 the understanding of "effective teaching" by SMP Sari teachers. The model teacher, Mr. Basuki, is an Indonesian language teacher in his forties whom the vice-principal, Mr. Beni, described 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 almost all the students' names. When I observed his daily teaching (Fieldnotes, February 15, 2010), his approach was unconventional. There was no evidence of the delivery of *materi* nor any attempt to control the lesson; it was left up to learners. The only instruction Mr. Basuki provided to students was to discuss and write up their homework results (interviews) in groups. 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 most of the time was spent on students working on their group assignments.

> The model teacher, Mr. Basuki, started the lesson by showing a man's drawing (a famous poet) and asked students who he was. After explaining, 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. "*Mas*[3] Adi, how about you? Have you finished?"
>
> In the second part of the lesson, he asked the students to write poems on the group's chosen topic. The students were generally working together, although sometimes some boys were playing around and teasing each other. (Excerpts from Fieldnotes, February 12, 2010)

Although the practice of Mr. Basuki could be categorized as a student-centered approach—which was promoted by lesson study—it was criticized in the PLD. First, there was criticism of the lack of control over student activity, especially on time management. Mrs. Wati suggested that since the students seemed confused and spent some time deciding what poem to write, the teacher should 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 student confusion was attributed to the lack of the teacher's explicit instructions. The concern was with how teachers could control students' activity to use time efficiently. Second, although Mr. Basuki was familiar

[3] *Mas* is used to referring young males in Indonesian.

with students and adopted a less authoritative and personal 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 groups instead of calling individual students' names, which resulted in calling out the wrong names. These comments suggest that these teachers valued *en masse* instruction rather than taking an individualized approach. These comments indicated a conflict between what was promoted by lesson study and the underlying assumptions on what constitutes "effective" teaching at SMP Sari.

The final summary of the discussion by the moderator, Mr. Umar, strongly represents this dominance of evaluating against bureaucratic standards or suggestions on "*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 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 (as suggested by the observer), and he hopes to improve in the future. The post-discussion finished with a word of prayer, "Alhamdulillah." (Excerpt from Fieldnotes, February 12, 2010)

The discussion was oriented to evaluating whether teacher instructions were effective. In the next section, I will explore why lesson study functioned as peer evaluation rather than an exchange of practice on student learning. I analyze this by examining the continuities and discontinuities between lesson study and daily teaching.

7.3.2 Interpretation of Lesson Study

This section will examine how the teachers interpreted lesson study by drawing on the OCs and discussions in the PLDs. 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), it was implemented to carry out bureaucratic protocols and had little relevance to daily teaching.

The comparison between the practice of lesson study and everyday teaching practice is presented in Table 7.3. The table 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, and (3) cooperation in professional development. In the following sections, I will discuss these gaps between what was promoted by lesson study and what was valued in daily school activities based on the comments in PLDs.

Table 7.3 Comparison of daily lesson and OC lessons at SMP Sari

	Daily Lesson	OC Lesson
Target	Delivery of the curriculum/ Passing the UN	Activating students
Student Tasks	Listening and exercise solving	Listening, group work, and presentation
Methods	Lecture, rote learning, and problem-solving	Hands-on activities and group work
Preparation of Lessons	None or minimum	Extensive
Teaching Materials	Textbook and workbook	Worksheets and teaching aids
Teacher's Role	Curriculum delivery and evaluation	Providing clear instructions and motivating students
Student's Role	Recipients	Participants
Student–Student Relationship	Competitive	Cooperative
Evaluation	Tests	Comments by the observers

7.3.3 Teacher Support in Student Activities

While lesson study was intended to encourage teachers to discuss how to support student learning, this did not happen. As described in Chapter 6, in the daily setting, teaching was equated with the curriculum's delivery, and the teachers' role was limited to that of instructor and evaluator. In contrast, in lesson study, teachers avoided lecturing or drilling and introduced student activities. As a result, teachers treated lesson study as a separate activity from subject teaching—the curriculum delivery and teaching to the test.

Despite these changes in methods, how teachers worked with students remained the same. This created discrepancies between what was intended and what actually took place. First, while student activities were introduced, they were treated as student tasks; teacher facilitation was not expected. 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 they considered working on assignments independently as desirable. This was evident in the teacher's response when students sought help in OC 2. After 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 was 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 shows how the role of the teacher was restricted to providing tasks. There was no suggestion from teachers to intervene 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. As discussed in Chapter 6, the responsibility for acquisition rested on the students. Thus, lack of participation was the students' problem and not the teacher's. In fact, since teacher support was not designed in lessons, there were very little teachers could do. This is reflected in the ambiguous role of teachers in motivating students:

> Teachers are important role models, so they should motivate children to be more interested and more motivated. (Mrs. Mira, OC1)
>
> The teacher should motivate the students to be more enthusiastic. (Mrs. Risma, OC1)

Second, teachers considered the lesson to be effective if students were able to solve problems independently with minimum support. Consequently, teachers evaluated the lessons negatively when a model teacher was "too helpful" to students.

> There are some problems that need to be rectified in the student worksheet: (exercise) No. 2 in Student Worksheet 1 and No. 3 in Student Worksheet 2. The format of the worksheet was too helpful for children. It was sufficient to provide short and explicit instruction. (Mr. Umar, OC4)

In fact, since the teacher's role was understood to be that of instructor and evaluator *en masse* (discussed in Chapter 6), a personal approach was evaluated negatively. In OC1, Mrs. Anggita said that the teacher should call groups instead of taking the risk 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 discouraged from working with individual students. Consequently, there was no discussion about individual students or different factors that supported/hindered their learning.

Third, there was no investigation into how to improve the process of student learning. This is represented in how teachers discussed the different measurements for a trapezoid's circumference 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. Still, when there were significant differences in the measurements, it was better for teachers to immediately request that groups measure again. (Mrs. Wahyuni)

The teachers mentioned the possible reasons for mistakes, but the discussion stopped there. There was no further discussion of *why* students made these mistakes based on the evidence in the classroom. The suggestion by Mrs. Wahyuni was simply to instruct students to measure again. Based on my observation, students were not used to using rulers, and some groups measured starting from the end of the ruler rather than the beginning of the scale. Without the construction of ZPD, teachers played no role in filling the gap between correct and incorrect measurements. Thus, the question as to *why* students made a mistake was not a pedagogic concern for the teachers; consequently, this issue was never investigated in PLDs.

Fourth, since teaching was understood as the fulfillment of a bureaucratic obligation, the practice was evaluated based on the externally set criteria rather than shared concern:

> 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 group's name and the student's name. (Mrs. Mira, OC1)

In lesson study, teachers were assessed based on the fulfillment of the lesson study protocols rather than the obligation to deliver the curriculum. Nevertheless, the concern was for the teachers to fulfill bureaucratic accountability in both daily and OC settings.

7.3.4 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, the teachers at SMP Sari interpreted student learning as an output of teacher instructions and evaluated it based on three criteria.

First, 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 well. (Mr. Umar, OC1)
>
> The target was achieved since the students made at least eight shapes. (Mrs. Hani, OC2)

These comments about 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.

Second, 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, participation and cooperation were not linked to subject understanding or *how* they learned but as an output. Consequently, there was no discussion of *how* they cooperated. In fact, there was an indication that teachers viewed peer support negatively. Several teachers pointed out in the teacher survey that the weakness

of lesson study is, "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 working with their friends." These comments show that the teachers consider there was little motivation to promote student cooperation in the exam-oriented culture of SMP Sari.

Third, 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)

The purpose of lesson study was understood as "activating students," but there was no discussion of why they were active/inactive or any attempt to link this to their topic understanding.

These three points show how student learning was interpreted as the output of teacher instruction. This reflects the lack of ZPDs in their practice. There was no space to intervene in students' learning processes. 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 in Chapter 6 of how student-centered activities—for example, student presentation—was treated separately from the transfer of *materi*. Remarkably, there was almost no mention of *materi* in the PLDs, while this was equated as teaching responsibility in daily lessons.

7.3.5 Teacher Cooperation in Post-Lesson Discussions

One of the characteristics of the PLDs at SMP Sari was the absence of teacher dialogue. As seen so far, the teachers' comments in PLDs were general, short, and evaluative. There were very few teacher exchanges. This is relevant to how teaching responsibility was considered as an individual responsibility and not structured under the familism system. Lesson study at SMP Sari was structured within school programs as a school-based subject study group (MGMPS) activity. Thus, the teachers implemented it as *tugas,* but this was not based on a shared interest in improving teaching. In Chapter 5, it was discussed how the teachers cooperated well to carry out *tugas*; however, there was almost no discussion of teaching or students in the staff room. Despite subject teachers often emphasized their good cooperation, the model teachers individually planned the OC lessons, and there was almost no support from peers in planning lessons.

This issue of sharing responsibility among subject teachers became apparent when an observer criticized one of the mathematics teachers for her lack of preparation (seating charts for observers). Mr. Umar, who was the head of the mathematics subject group, became defensive:

> 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)

His comment implies mathematics teachers should have supported Mrs. Arum in preparing OC. Mr. Umar felt obligated to offer support since he was the one in authority and bore responsibility for his subordinates. However, his comment, "if Mrs. Arum had asked for help," 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.

As discussed in Chapter 6, there was a hidden competition among teachers. Under these circumstances, there was little incentive to share 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 an interview, Mrs. Citra explained that while she maintained good relationships with all the English teachers, she felt more comfortable consulting with Mrs. Amel:

> ….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 went 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 teaching 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), students' noise level 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 essential. Students were not listening because of unclear instructions. The teacher could not correct their behavior.
>
> Mr. Umar: Class management is essential.

Although the moderator raised a question to discuss, the comments shared 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 Mr. Umar's comment implied the inefficient use of time resulted in student misbehavior, no suggestion was made on how to improve this. Since many teachers struggled with class management, it could be discussed as a shared pedagogical concern. However, the problem was attributed to Mrs. Hani's lack of class management ability.

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 loud. 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 her approach to students was different from Mrs. Arum, she did not discuss it as a pedagogic issue but attributed it to Mrs. Arum's disposition and personality. In this way, without shared concern for supporting student learning, the PLD functioned not as an opportunity for open exchanges but as an evaluation of OC against the externally-set lesson study protocols.

Pedagogic strategies presented in Chapter 6 showed that there were variations in teachers' practice to provide scaffolding (EPS and RPS). This choice of pedagogic strategy is reflected in different interpretations of what constituted an "effective" or "efficient" teacher intervention in PLDs. In 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 for solving the problem step by step once was enough, and Mrs. Hani should not go over all the wrong answers.

For Mr. Umar, efficient instruction meant presenting the correct steps for problem-solving once. In contrast, Mr. Halim, who mainly employed EPS, was interested in scaffolding; thus, he suggested going over wrong answers one by one so students could learn from their mistakes. These contrasting views on "effective" teaching were simply understood as a difference of opinion, and the discussion did not develop any further. Moreover, under the hierarchy of SMP Sari, Mr. Umar's expertise (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 6. He even criticized lesson study for this:

> I really do not like lesson study at 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 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 should observe why the students did not learn based on the learning materials planned by teachers. That is what I meant.

> (…) What I want to happen in the reflection is that they [teachers] would discuss how to develop a better lesson plan. In reality, though, that was not the case. That is why I am 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 evaluating students without a link to supporting students' learning. Consequently, Mr. Edi found lesson study discussions not helpful for him or other teachers. He stopped participating in lesson study.

7.4 Conclusion

This chapter's discussion has outlined how the implementation of lesson study at SMP Sari was *bureaucratized* to meet external requirements and not based on shared pedagogic responsibility. As discussed in Chapter 6, 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 implemented as "special activity." This simply reflected how the teachers had been responding to policy and curricular changes. The policy change altered teacher practice at the official level—new protocols were implemented—but did not alter the unofficial discourse—a change in code of conduct in daily practice. This was similar to how student presentations in the economics lesson were treated separately from the subject study or *delivery of the materi*.

Although lesson study motivated a change in the methods employed, this had no impact on how teachers understood their role in student learning. Even when student activities were introduced, teachers' understanding of "effective" instruction as an *en masse* approach remained the same. The lesson's target was still placed on what teachers instructed and not on how to mediate student learning or how students learned. This resulted in teachers to evaluate student-centered approach promoted by lesson study—a personalized instruction and scaffolding attempts—as "ineffective." Also, since a didactic approach and drilling were absent in lesson study, what took place in lesson study was 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 strategies—RPS and EPS—suggest there was no agreement on what constitutes "effective" teaching. Without such a shared understanding of teaching, it was difficult to establish a common ground for discussion. Thus, teachers had little incentive to investigate the student learning process or to embody skills to support their learning. Some teachers discussed supporting students in terms that might be described as scaffolding (EPS). However, the majority of the discussion on teaching centered on the efficiency of teacher instruction (RPS). These differences were not pursued as pedagogic issues but understood as matters of personal opinion.

The bureaucratic implementation of lesson study also reflected the nature of teacher cooperation. While the same subject teachers were expected to cooperate, the teachers supported one another in administrative work only, and they did not share the responsibility to teach. Under the hierarchical organizational structure, the teachers were evaluated against one another. This made it difficult for teachers to consult one another for OC or in any lesson. Consequently, the teachers relied on the personal connection when they needed to seek help. Therefore, 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 learning as output but not on how to support student learning. This resulted in lesson study functioning as peer evaluation rather than as a place for teacher dialogue and exchange. This shows how there was little motivation for teachers to embody pedagogic skills. Unlike in Japan, teachers were not collectively held responsible for supporting student learning and exchanging ideas and issues in their lessons. These issues will be explored in the next chapter as issues of recontextualization in lesson study.

Reference

Kompasmania, (2010, March 19). Jadwal Ujian Nasional (UN) 2010. Retrieved from https://www.kompasiana.com/irvandedy/54ff96eaa33311644c510917/jadwal-ujian-nasional-un-2010

Part III
Sociological Understanding of Pedagogic Transfer

Chapter 8
The Recontextualization of Lesson Study

Abstract In this chapter, I will examine the "recontextualization" of lesson study by comparing the practice in Japan and Java against the respective countries' contextual settings. I examine recontextualization of lesson study specifically focusing on three contextual differences: (1) professional accountabilities, (2) nature of collegiality, and (3) professional expertise. Since teaching is socially constructed and context-dependent, lesson study in Java was interpreted differently from Japan. In Japan, teachers share an interest in educating students and collegial support is essential in organizing student activities. Lesson study aligns with this responsibility to facilitate student activities. In contrast, the SMP Sari teachers were accountable for presenting the curriculum but not necessarily facilitating student learning. Consequently, the interest to embody pedagogic skills to support learning was not shared among teachers. Thus, lesson study at SMP Sari was implemented as a bureaucratic project where teachers extensively prepared and introduced lesson study protocols. The concept of recontextualization revealed how meaningful practice in one context could be seen as ineffective in another.

8.1 Introduction

In this chapter, I will examine the "recontextualization" of lesson study by comparing the practice in Japan and Java against the respective countries' contextual settings. When the pedagogic practice is transferred from one setting to another, its meaning is reconstructed (discussed as the issue of importing and exporting lesson study in Chapter 3); this is the issue of recontextualization. Recontextualization took place even within the setting of SMP Sari. The anecdote by Mr. Edi below well illustrates the problem of 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)

When Mr. Edi's peers used the worksheet, the issue of recontextualization emerged. Due to the difference in pedagogic strategies, the meaning of the worksheet

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_8

was fundamentally different between Mr. Edi and his peers. For Mr. Edi, student learning was to be mediated; thus, the worksheet inevitably required elaboration (Elaborated Pedagogic Strategy: EPS) to accommodate the level of student understanding. In contrast, his colleagues designed a lesson without scaffolding (Restricted Pedagogic Strategy: RPS); thus, presenting the worksheet as it was, was sufficient. Therefore, they considered the worksheet made by Mr. Edi to be ineffective. Thus, even within the same setting, the meaning of practice could fluctuate depending on how teachers assumed their role working with students.

In Chapter 7, it was revealed that the implementation of lesson study and changes to teacher practice in Java were externally motivated—in response to fulfilling bureaucratic requirements. Consequently, lesson study at SMP Sari was interpreted as a "special activity" at the surface level (the official discourse) but did not impact daily practice. This chapter will reveal why lesson study was bureaucratized by analyzing the teachers' practice against Java's contextual settings. I will do this by drawing on the ethnographic data presented in the last three analysis chapters and compare them with the contextual setting in Japan drawn from secondary sources. The examples of lesson study in Japan were mainly drawn from mathematics lessons due to the limitation of research literature in other subjects.[1] In comparing teachers' practice and contextual settings, it is not my intention to generalize the situations in Java or Japan. The data are simply presented to compare the impact that sociocultural setting has on pedagogic initiatives such as lesson study. If lesson study in Japan has motivated teachers' collaborative learning to support students' learning, what was the situation in Indonesia? What contexts supported such efforts in Japan, and what were the contexts that transformed the initiative in SMP Sari?

8.2 Professional Accountabilities

"*Guru adalah pahlawan tanpa tanda jasa.*"
(Teachers are heroes without medals)

The above is a famous proverb in Indonesia. Teachers are idealized as heroes who dedicate themselves to children without economic compensation. In Japan, ideal teachers are similarly depicted as selfless and dedicated (Kudomi, 2017; Sakurai, 1926). Despite the shared image of good teachers, how they work with students differs across the two contexts. Since teachers' professional accountabilities are socially constructed, what they discuss in lesson study reflects what they consider important in their teaching and learning.

[1] Historically, there are abundant records of practice *(jissen kiroku)* in Japan, which consist 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 have been increasing publications targeting foreign audiences who are interested to learn Japanese mathematics and science lessons.

At SMP Sari, being a teacher required balancing the roles of a good civil servant and a good member of the teacher community under the familism system. The teachers diligently worked to carry out the school programs as state-assigned duties (*tugas*). Smooth school operation was prioritized as a collective interest under the familism system. In contrast, daily teaching was considered an individual responsibility, and the issues in teaching were never discussed in public. Generally, teaching was equated with the transfer of *materi* or the state-designated curriculum. The dominant practice of teachers at SMP Sari—RPS—suggests that teachers interpreted one-way lecturing to be sufficient, and the responsibility to teach did not include constructing zone of proximal development (ZPD). The dominant practice suggests that teachers were not accountable for scaffolding to fill the gaps between actual performance and target performance. Thus, concerns about whether students could follow a lesson or not were situated outside of teachers' professional accountabilities.

The minimum intervention by teachers reflects the stratified nature of schooling and Javanese society. In Javanese society, the social hierarchy is generally accepted because of the assumption that people are unequal and they have appropriate places and roles in society (Mulder, 1994). Teachers often referred to students' IQs and described their abilities as given (Interview Mr. Halim, June 8, 2010). Since only those who had a high performance on the elementary school graduation examinations were admitted to SMP Sari, the teachers thought students at SMP Sari could pass the UN if they tried. Since responsibility for learning rested on students, students' ability gaps were not problematized as a pedagogic issue.

Under the institutional setting of SMP Sari, the teachers were not motivated to play the role of facilitator, contextualize their teaching to meet the individual students' needs, or to understand *how* students learn. At SMP Sari, only a minority of teachers intervened in the process of student learning. However, these "good teachers" cited what motivated them to support students were not their school experience. For Mr. Edi, it was the tutoring experience where he designed lessons to the needs of individual students and developed strategies to help them. For Mr. Halim, his experience in Boy Scout activities made him realize the importance of supporting students' social development. These outside-school experiences encouraged these teachers to provide scaffolding and they witnessed positive changes in students. However, the social norms of teachers at SMP Sari did not encourage going beyond the bureaucratic obligation. The majority of teachers were concerned of delivering the curriculum. Thus, "good practice" was recognized as exceptional and attributed to personal commitment and even personal sacrifice.

In contrast, Japanese teachers play the role of educators who are more than subject instructors. They are concerned about the holistic development of students since teachers assume that "social, emotional, intellectual, and physical development are intertwined" (Tsuneyoshi, 2014, p. 3). Teachers are expected to be moral and spiritual role models. This might be attributed to the history 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 Confucian traditions (Iwata, 2008). The emphasis on social aspects of development also reflects less academic emphasis

in Japan compared to Indonesia. There are no national standardized tests.[2] And there are virtually no requirements for graduation at the elementary or junior high school levels.

In this way, teachers' work is identified as organizing and facilitating various kinds of collaborative and self-initiated activities for students to experience "learning by doing" (Tsuneyoshi, 2001, 2014). Thus, instead of teaching, the word *shido*—which literally means providing guidance to students—is commonly used to describe teachers' diverse roles (Rohlen & LeTendre, 1998). 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 (Lewis, 1995). Research suggests that the nature of the Japanese teachers' "infinite role" has an effect of strengthening their autonomy. Supporting students in various activities, the teachers inevitably have to make decisions based on their understanding of what students need, especially in those non-academic activities (Fujita et al., 1995).[3]

Due to the egalitarian nature of Japanese schooling, Japanese teachers believe 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 contrasts with the hierarchical setting of SMP Sari, where ability differences were taken for granted. This contrast 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 students' diverse needs within a classroom. Stigler and Hiebert (2009) explain how Japanese teachers even use ability differences among students as a resource and structured their lessons in a way that students could benefit from an exchange of different ideas and to deepen understanding of topics. In this way, the pedagogic practice of Japanese teachers involves sharing the process of learning, and the construction of ZPDs is presumed to mediate students' learning. Thus, the professional responsibilities of Japanese teachers are structured around supporting students, while the main responsibility of a teacher at SMP Sari was equated with curriculum delivery without sharing responsibility for student learning.

---

[2] Since 2019, there is no longer a national standard exam, but exams are held at the school level.

[3] 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 working hours (53.9 h 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.

8.3 Collegiality

8.3.1 Teacher Cooperation

Collaboration in lesson study merely reflects teachers' shared interests and the nature of collaboration in daily settings. A. Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) distinguished the difference between collaborative culture and contrived collegiality:

> 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 SMP Sari teachers support one another as members of the patriarchal community, their relationship surely fits the description of contrived collegiality. 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). The school was managed in a top-down manner, and teachers were responsible for knowing their places and obligations in the hierarchy. Consequently, even when the teachers expressed concerns about the school operation (the example of a confrontation between the UN preparation team and the team for the bilingual class mentioned by Mrs. Ema in Chapter 5), they were never addressed in public but resolved quietly behind the scenes.

Another impact of teacher collegiality under the familism of SMP Sari was that internal codes of practice worked against the interests of students. For instance, teacher tardiness was overlooked as long as it was within the social norm. It is evident that responsibility to students was not structured as a social or bureaucratic responsibility in the familism system. While teachers' chit-chat about their personal lives and cooperate well for administrative matters, there was no consultation on teaching or discussing students in the staff room (discussed in Chapter 5 as coping strategies of teachers). Teacher collegiality did not support teaching or the interests of students but worked to maintain the community's social hierarchy. Thus, the norms of collegiality did not promote open discussions intended for lesson study.

In contrast, Japanese schools are known for cooperative management (*koumu bunsho*), in which the structure of the teacher community is relatively flat (Shimahara, 1998). 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)

Thus, this cooperation differs from the hierarchical cooperation in the case of Java. Japanese teachers are encouraged to take the initiative in supporting the educational goals of schools and to take part in school management. The heads of committees are rotated to ensure that leadership roles are distributed equitably. Also, the purpose of teachers' daily collaborations is to support students and to organize various educational activities for them (Lewis, 2000; discussed in Chapter 3). In teaching, teachers of the same grade communicate regularly to support students holistically and ensure there is coherence in instructions. This internal accountability is quite strong in that there is pressure to align teachers' practice with that of their colleagues (Fuchigami, 2005). Thus, Japanese teachers share internal accountability for both Instructional Discourse and Regulative Discourse in the pedagogic discourse.

8.3.2 Responsibility for Professional Development

As the quote by Shimahara on the previous page describes, in-service education or professional development is also structured under a system of cooperative management where teachers are expected to work collaboratively in Japan. This includes the expectation that mid-career teachers will play critical roles in school management and assist younger teachers with their career development. Teachers take collective responsibility for supporting students' holistic and long-term development; thus, teacher collaboration is considered essential in realizing this. 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 essential to work as a team to improve their practice, learn from other teachers' practices, and reflect on their own experiences. In this way, lesson study is embedded in a system of 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 to fulfill bureaucratic requirements. As a result, teachers altered their practice to satisfy bureaucratic requirements, but the changes were often superficial (official discourse) and temporary. Teachers often complained that the bureaucratic evaluation system was inadequate in measuring teachers' competencies—especially their ability to work with students. Also, in contrast to Japanese teachers, whose collegiality is based on shared responsibility for student learning, this was not the case at SMP Sari. The cooperation of teachers was structured into the system, but it was to protect the community's interests rather than based on shared responsibilities for teaching and professional development. This is visible because when a teacher did not come in to teach, there was no system to cover his/her absence. Moreover, teachers were in a competitive relationship related to bureaucratic evaluations. Teachers were individually evaluated for teaching and their engagement in professional development (e.g., the certification program). Thus, teachers had little incentive to disclose issues in their classrooms and share problems with their peers.

Under the familism system, there was strong pressure to align their practice with communal norms and to protect the existing hierarchy. Senior teachers were often criticized by young teachers for their lack of motivation to try new teaching approaches. However, they were nevertheless privileged to go through the certification screening process and held managerial roles such as the subject group leaders. As discussed in Chapter 5, while some of the younger science teachers felt more competent than senior teachers, there was no way to validate this claim. The education bureaucracy equated teaching with the delivery of the curriculum, but no agreement was made on *how* to teach (or, more specifically, scaffolding student learning). Consequently, there were no shared criteria (internally or externally) that could be used to evaluate teaching. Thus, teachers evaluated teaching using bureaucratic protocols rather than internal criteria in the post-lesson discussions.

The quotes below by Mr. Edi illustrate how his professional interest was not shared with his peers.

> 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 teaching material…or a worksheet, [they] improve these for children to understand better. In reality, though, it is not the case. (Interview, June 2, 2010)

What he hoped for—*kyozai kenkyu* or the study of teaching materials to fit classroom needs—is what was exactly intended by lesson study. However, while Mr. Edi was interested in developing materials that would facilitate student learning, this was not shared interests of teachers at SMP Sari. Eventually, Mr. Edi stopped participating in lesson study.

8.4 Professional Expertise

8.4.1 The Contextual Difference in Teaching Expertise

In Japan, researchers have suggested that lesson study has provided teachers "a new way to see teaching as a series of inquiry activities around student learning" (Murata, 2011, p. 5). Learning is targeted to the holistic and long-term development of students; thus, the learning goal is not merely for students to solve problems but also to build a positive attitude toward learning. Also, the egalitarian nature of Japanese schooling (Cummings, 2014) motivates teachers to work closely with individual students and to support their development. Consequently, teaching expertise involves designing a lesson anticipating student thinking and facilitating student learning (Perry & Lewis, 2009). This requires different skills than merely delivering the curriculum. According to a Japanese teacher described in Perry and Lewis (2009):

> 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)

Thus, teaching presumes scaffolding—working to accommodate students' levels and needs—and this requires teachers to develop strategies to support students. Engagement in lesson study in Japan has been motivated by this shared interest to support students based on the understanding that teaching is a complex endeavor and there is always room for improvement (Sakamoto & Akita, 2008). Indeed, one of the attractions of lesson study in foreign researchers' eyes is the different ways Japanese teachers explore how they can support student learning.

In contrast, the teachers at SMP Sari had limited responsibility. Teaching was standardized as a transfer of textbook knowledge for the exam preparation. For this purpose, going over textbooks and providing 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. Thus, teaching at SMP Sari was considered generally easy as long as they knew the curricular content well (Interview, Mrs. Risma, June 9, 2010). Teachers rarely prepared for lessons, nor did they feel the need to develop strategies to contextualize learning to support students.

Lesson study could help teachers develop their teaching expertise, but what constitutes teaching expertise varies across settings. This led to the differences in how student learning was discussed in post-lesson discussions (PLDs) in Indonesia and Japan. While lesson study in Japan helps teachers explore and support students' learning, this reflects how teachers' responsibilities are structured around supporting students in Japan. In contrast, Javanese teachers believed responsibility for acquiring knowledge rested on students. Thus, they discussed student learning as output of instruction and they did not discuss scaffolding student learning. Therefore, supporting the process of student learning constituted professional expertise in Japan while it was not in the Javanese setting. This is reflected in what Mr. Faud said when I showed him Japanese textbooks. He said that while Japanese teachers use creative textbooks and encourage students to think, Indonesian teachers were only concerned with covering the materials due to the UN's influence (Fieldnotes, December 17, 2009).

8.4.2 Interpretation of Student Activities

Teachers' understanding of students' role in learning is reflected in lesson design and their choice of pedagogy. Although whole-class instruction is similarly used in Japan and Java, Japanese teachers see students as active learners while Javanese teachers consider students as passive learners. The example below by Okubo and Tsuji (2015)[4] describes the difference between teacher-led instruction and a problem-solving approach and how the latter targets students' active engagement in learning.

[4] The issues in mathematics lessons are discussed here, but these are shared by other subjects.

> 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)

As the above quotation suggests, Japanese teachers design lessons not only to foster subject understanding but also to cultivate positive attitudes toward learning. For this, Japanese teachers first present a problem and encourage students to explore, even to struggle, rather than simply demonstrating how to solve a problem (Stevenson & Stigler, 1992).

Japanese teachers share an internal language when they discuss techniques to support students and to encourage their active participation in problem-solving. Some of the examples discussed in Chapter 2 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 unique terms were accumulated over time and shared among Japanese professional communities based on the common interest in scaffolding students.

Another difference is how student collaboration was structured through lessons in the two countries. In Japan, student collaboration—such as exchanging ideas and peer support in problem-solving—is presumed. Students take part in various communities—from classroom communities to inter-grade communities—where they are expected to act responsibly as members of the community and to work with one another (Tsuneyoshi, 1994). Thus, teachers are generally interested in structuring student collaboration in various educational activities and encourage students to engage in problem-solving using peer and teacher support as resources. As a result, rather than on how teachers teach, teachers focus on how students learn and work with one another and how to ensure high-quality learning of individual students (Lewis, 2016).

On the other hand, the dominance of RPS practice at SMP Sari suggest, there was no construction of ZPD at SMP Sari (RPS). Learning responsibility rested on individual students and students were seen as the recipients of teacher instruction. Teachers thought that students working alone was important for exam preparation. Thus, student-centered approaches—the active participation and collaboration of students encouraged by lesson study—were not incorporated into daily lesson design. Thus, the hands-on and interactive activities introduced in lesson study were considered merely "fun" and "interesting" activities and were separated from subject understanding.

The discussions in PLDs showed that teachers interpreted student learning as the output of teacher instruction (discussed in Chapter 7). Student learning was evaluated in terms of (1) group work results, (2) the level of participation and cooperation, and (3) whether students enjoyed the activities, as the following observations illustrate:

> Nuguroho group wrote a good poem. (Mr. Endarto, 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)
>
> Children were having fun and enjoying making nets. There is a need for additional resources such as graph paper. (Mrs. Fima, OC2)

There was no discussion concerning students' subject understanding in PLDs. Some teachers told me that lesson study was time-consuming, and if implemented daily, they would not finish *materi* (Interview, Mrs. Citra, June 21, 2010). Since daily lessons were taught through whole-class instruction and regulated by the IRE sequence, lesson study's exploratory and participatory approaches were considered inefficient. When Mr. Basuki employed student-centered approaches in OC1, his personal interactions with students were criticized by his colleagues (discussed in Chapter 7).

Thus, while student activities were introduced in OC lessons, they were interpreted as another bureaucratic protocol—an add-on to existing teaching duties. The introduction of student activities changed the format of the lesson but did not alter the way teachers worked with students.

8.5 Contents of Post-Lesson Discussions

Lesson study encourages teachers to improve their practice by reflecting on the meaning of their experience. Lesson study in Japan has been supported by unique tradition which encourages them to share personal experiences of teaching and learning. Teachers are interested in exchanging narrative, descriptive, and subjective reflection of practice and learning from others to improve the quality of student learning (Matsuo & Maruno, 2008; Sakamoto & Akita, 2008). This is distinguished from generalized technical expertise since the purpose of reflection is to develop "contextualized reasoning" as expertise (Inagaki & Sato, 1996). Through this process of reflection, Japanese teachers reconstruct the meaning of lesson experiences and gain an understanding of how students learn within a particular context of the classroom setting. This helps teachers visualize implicit and explicit knowledge and skills in pedagogy. Discussions of lessons centered on how to support students' learning, with attention paid to different contextual factors.

Despite personal and contextual variations in lessons, there is a shared interest in embodied expertise (the claim for traditional authority discussed in Chapter 6) to facilitate student learning. Thus, Japan's institutional setting motivates teachers to learn from specific cases and to accumulate contextualized knowledge. Kage (2008) states that accumulated and contextualized expertise plays an essential part in creating dynamic lessons; teachers can make instant judgments to solicit students' ideas, incorporate their thinking, and deepen their understanding. In this way, lesson

study is built on teachers' internal accountability and supports teachers based on their shared understanding of what constitutes good practice.

In Java, teachers were externally motivated to follow lesson study protocols, and this was not based on shared professional interest. Thus, OC lessons were evaluated against external protocols, and there was no personal reflection and dialogue. Instead of an exchange of practice, the PLDs at SMP Sari functioned to assess the effectiveness of their instruction. Consequently, 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 are lacking 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 as evaluation ("good or not") and attributed it to teachers' mastery of content and the preparation of lessons. This illustrates 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, *how* students learned was situated outside of their professional concern. The two comments below suggest how teacher instruction was evaluated by their peers.

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

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

The first remark by Mr. Risma implies ineffective instruction, evidenced by the student's lack of enthusiasm. The second quote suggests that Mrs. Hani evaluated the lesson based on students' performance against the target set in the lesson plan. However, these statements did not consider *how* the student learned or how the teachers worked with students. There was a continuity from daily lessons that teachers were concerned about input/output, but the learning responsibility was not shared with students (RPS).

Discussions in PLDs suggest that there were gaps in what was intended by lesson study and what was actually discussed among Javanese teachers. One of the benefits of lesson study is enhancing pedagogic content knowledge (PCK), which is concerned with both content knowledge and pedagogic knowledge (Shulman, 1986). However, the practice of teachers at SMP suggested teachers generally consider knowledge transfer directly from textbooks as sufficient. Thus, only a minority of teachers at SMP Sari showed concern for pedagogic knowledge such as how to teach (RD) or how to scaffold (EPS).

In addition, examining cases through lesson study is helpful in Japan since learning is understood as "situated learning" or participation in social activities embedded in the particular sociocultural setting (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Consequently, there is motivation to exchange expertise in working with students in a variety of situations.

However, at SMP Sari, teaching was understood as a one-way transfer of knowledge *en masse* (RPS). Thus, expertise in teaching had little to do with contextual knowledge or embodied expertise. Instead, the contents of PLDs centered on the evaluation of lessons based on bureaucratic protocols.

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

The above quote shows that the emphasis was on teacher instruction, and there was no further investigation of why the students were not enthusiastic. Without a shared concern for scaffolding, teachers were not motivated to investigate *how* students learn.

Examining this use of Dowling's authority scheme, the dominant practice in Java was a "bureaucratic mode" of Authority Strategy where teachers were responsible for fulfilling bureaucratic regulations. In contrast to Javanese teachers' limited responsibility, 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). This uncertainty motivates teachers to share the responsibility with students and to share their ideas about instructional practice.

Thus, Javanese teachers' professional expertise was externally regulated to fulfill bureaucratic requirements, while Japanese teachers were internally regulated based on their shared responsibility to support students. This strong interest in supporting students' learning experiences worked to weaken bureaucratic boundaries and strengthen teachers' professional autonomy. Japanese teachers were motivated to engage in lesson study based on the interest to reflect and analyze lesson focusing on *how to support* student learning and to examine lessons with a researcher's disposition (Fernandez et al., 2003; Lee, 2015) and develop "the eyes to see children" (*kodomo wo miru me*) (Lewis, 2002, p.12).

8.6 The Bureaucratization of Lesson Study

When we examine teaching as context-dependent social practice, we are able to understand why lesson study was interpreted differently in Java compared to Japan. These contextual differences between Japan and Java are presented in Table 8.1. Previously discussed using Dowling's Authority Strategies (in Sect. 6.6), teachers' pedagogic strategies are motivated by the inertial force of maintaining the institutional culture. 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 precisely as authorized by the bureaucratic protocols. This resulted in a striking resemblance among teachers' practices from the sequence of lessons to didactic methods used in teaching. The fact that most teachers did not prepare their lessons suggests that professional accountability had little to do with working with students or accommodating their needs. Thus, general teaching design did not presume to

Table 8.1 Differences in practice between Japan and Java

	Japan	Java
Teacher cooperation	Distributed leadership; teachers participate in school management; regularly discuss the issues relevant to students and their learning activities	Efficient top-down school management; cooperate well for administration; almost no discussion on teaching
Lesson preparation	Lesson plans and teaching materials are prepared to accommodate the classroom setting	Almost no preparation in daily lessons
Lesson design	Lessons are structured to provide a holistic learning experience for students	Lessons are designed specifically to transfer knowledge for exam preparation
Interactive methods	Used to provide scaffolding	Used to fulfill bureaucratic obligations
Lesson study	Opportunity to exchange practice and to reflect on own practice	Evaluation of a model teacher and open class lesson

extend support to students' acquisition, although they could be some support to the class as a whole. As in the case of a small minority of "good teachers" (who employed EPS) discussed in Chapter 6, they were motivated by personal (rather than school) experience to support students. However, by doing this, they went beyond bureaucratic protocol and relied on their expertise (the charismatic mode of authority); thus, there was a risk of alienating themselves from the community norm.

Table 8.2 shows contrasts between daily lessons and OC lessons at SMP Sari. These inconsistencies between daily practices and OC lessons suggest that lesson study failed to function as professional learning in situ or situated learning. Instead, implementation of lesson study in SMP Sari was treated as a "special activity." As Mr. Beni said, lesson study helped to push the teachers to perform their best with the pressure of having observers. 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. There was consistency in daily classes and lesson study; teachers intervened minimally to support student learning. The ethnographic literature presented in Chapter 4 showed how the introduction of student-centered pedagogy worked against its intention to serve various students' needs and actually deprived some students of learning opportunities and masked social stratification. While lesson study provided opportunities for hands-on and group activities, these new activities were implemented to satisfy external protocols related to "activating students." Since the activities were not linked to scaffolding, both teachers and students did not benefit from new pedagogic approaches. Understandably, teachers thought interactive methods were merely time-consuming and inefficient for exam preparation.

The gap between daily lessons and open class lessons was not a unique phenomenon in the case of lesson study as a foreign pedagogic transfer. However, it simply followed the pattern of how the teachers at SMP Sari had been responding to

Table 8.2 Comparison of daily lesson and open class at SMP Sari

	Daily Lesson	Open Class Lesson
Target	Delivery of the curriculum/ Passing the UN	Activating students
Student Tasks	Listening to lectures and exercises	Listening, group work, and presentation
Methods	Lecture, rote learning, and problem-solving	Hands-on activities and group work to motivate student's involvement
Preparation	None or minimal	Extensive
Teaching Material	Textbook and workbook	Worksheets and teaching aids
Teacher's Role	Curriculum presentation and evaluation	Providing clear instructions for group work
Student's Role	Recipient	Some kind of student involvement
Student–Student Relationship	Competitive	Cooperative
Evaluation	Test scores	Comments by the observers
Instruction	Collective	Collective

policy changes and curriculum reform. In Chapter 5, two layers of discourse—official discourse and unofficial discourse—were discussed in relation to how bureaucratic accountability regulated official discourse, mainly to fulfill administrative requirements, but had a limited impact on actual practice (unofficial discourse). This was how teachers had been responding to new regulations. The first example was how teachers responded to a new regulation to create their own lesson plans. Mrs. Risma told me in an interview that since the teachers believed that they were no longer allowed to photocopy lesson plans, these documents should be typed rather than photocopied; nevertheless, they copied their lesson plans with almost no modification of content. In any case, the content of lesson plans did not matter since nobody actually used lesson plans.

The second example of superficial accommodation to bureaucratic requirements was the implementation of team teaching. The school modified the teaching schedule after the introduction of the certification scheme so that every teacher fulfilled a new requirement to teach a minimum of 24 h per week.[5] To cope with a surplus of teachers in some subjects, some lessons were taught by two teachers. However, team teaching merely signifies the presence of two teachers in one class. Most teachers taught as they had been teaching before, and there was almost no collaboration between the two teachers. In this way, teachers' practice was altered to comply with bureaucratically set standards, but this had little or no impact on how they had been teaching. The teachers were critical of the professional certification scheme. They criticized that the new requirements had no relevance to the ability to work with students. Thus, as

[5] *Undang-Undang Nomor 14 Tahun 2005 tentang Guru dan Dosen.*

discussed in Chapter 5, there were two layers of discourse. Only official discourse—bureaucratic requirements—were fulfilled while unofficial discourse—the norms of practice shared by teachers—remained unchanged.

Based on the teacher survey, it was unclear whether teachers felt the need for professional development. While all teachers at SMP Sari replied that continuous professional development was needed, teachers said there was no challenge in teaching, and they rarely prepared for their lessons. Since teaching was relatively easy, there was no shared interest (or challenge) that encouraged them to engage in collaborative professional learning. Reflecting on this, the PLDs discussion focused on that particular OC lesson only and was not linked to daily teaching. Also, there was no discussion of how to support student learning. In regard to their professional careers, the teachers were in a competitive relationship influenced by bureaucratic evaluations. Even though the teachers maintained close relationships and talked about personal matters, there was almost no consultation on teaching in the staff room. This suggests that just as the students worked individually on their assignments, the teachers were also individually held accountable for their teaching and professional development. Thus, lesson study was not implemented based on a shared mission to build a knowledge base, unlike the situation reported in Japan. In the Javanese context, lesson study was interpreted as a tool for teacher evaluation rather than an opportunity for collaborative learning.

8.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, the educational contexts of Java and Japan are compared to understand the recontextualization of lesson study and the issue of the pedagogic transfer. The analysis revealed that different lesson study practices in Japan and Java simply reflected the difference in professional accountabilities, which were shaped by the sociocultural settings of the respective countries. The comparison with the Japanese setting suggests that lesson study practice was subsumed into the existing institutional sociocultural setting of SMP Sari.

In Japan, the professional accountabilities of teachers were motivated by shared interest in educating students and supporting student activities. Teachers engaged in lesson study to provide better student learning experiences and to be better facilitators. In contrast, the SMP Sari teachers were accountable for presenting the curriculum but not necessarily for facilitating student learning. The difference in pedagogic strategies (Table 6.1) showed only a minority of teachers developed strategies to facilitate students' learning. Consequently, the interests in how to embody skills to support their learning were not shared.

Thus, lesson study at SMP Sari was implemented as a bureaucratic project where teachers extensively prepared and introduced lesson study protocols. The open lesson was conducted as a "demonstration lesson" where teachers evaluated the effectiveness of their 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 students' output. The discourse was evaluative and de-contextualized as a general practice (not based on classroom evidence) because the practice was assessed against bureaucratic standards. There was no discussion of the process of student learning or exchange of classroom issues.

Another important issue in the recontextualization of lesson study is that the choice of pedagogy was influenced not only by official responsibility but also by social responsibility owed to the community. Often this aspect was neglected in professional development research since this is not directly relevant to teaching. However, as discussed in Chapter 5, teachers' unofficial discourse suggests that social norms had an impact on teachers' pedagogic choices. Japanese teachers are able to collaborate in professional development since it is based on a shared responsibility to support students' development. 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 hierarchy of the familism system. Under the familism system, the teachers were accountable for protecting the community's interest; however, professional development was not part of this and was interpreted as an individual responsibility. Due to the hierarchical nature of the teachers' community and the competitive nature of the bureaucratic evaluation, it was challenging to have an open discussion on teaching.

While the attraction of lesson study is its collaborative professional learning focusing on student learning, these were not absolute products of lesson study but nurtured within the school setting of Japan. In Java, where teaching was framed as the presentation of curriculum, the interactive approaches proposed by lesson study were regarded as inefficient. Whereas the daily teaching of Javanese teachers and their implementation of 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 shared by the majority of teachers at SMP Sari. This shows that a professional development initiative such as a 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 of professional development beyond the ability and/or efforts of individual teachers or insuperable cultural differences. Meaningful practice in one context could be seen as ineffective in another due to the lack of shared assumptions and principles behind teacher 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. Some might see the implementation of SMP Sari as a failure in professional development. However, the analysis presents that the practice was simply adapted to, and its meaning was interpreted against, the setting of SMP Sari.

References

Clarke, D. J. (2013). Contingent conceptions of accomplished practice: The cultural specificity of discourse in and about the mathematics classroom. *ZDM, 45*(1), 21–33.

Cummings, W. K. (1980). *Education and equality in Japan / William K. Cummings.* Princeton University Press.

Cummings, W. K. (2014). *Education and equality in Japan.* Princeton University Press.

Fernandez, C., Cannon, J., & Chokshi, S. (2003). A US–Japan lesson study collaboration reveals critical lenses for examining practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 171–185.

Fuchigami, K. (2005). *Gakko soshiki no shinrigaku.* [Psychology of a School System]. Nihon Bunka Kagakusha Co.

Fujita, H., Yufu, S., Sakai, A., & Akiba, Y. (1995). Kyoshi no shigoto to kyoshi bunka ni kansuru ethnography teki kenkyu—sono kenkyu wakugumi to jyakkan no jissho teki kousatsu [An ethnographic research on teachers' work and culture of teaching: Its perspective, framework, and some empirical findings]. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Education, University of Tokyo, 35*, 29–66.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*(3), 227–241.

Inagaki, T., & Sato, M. (1996). *Jyugyo Kenkyu Nyumon* [Introduction to Lesson Study]. Iwanami Shoten.

Iwata, Y. (2008). Kyoiku Kaikaku no Doukou to Kyoshi no "Senmonsei" ni Kansuru Shomondai [Trends in Educational Reform and "Problems on Professionalism" of Teachers]. In Y. Kudomi (Ed.), *Kyoshi no Senmonsei to Identity* [Teacher's Expertise and Identity] (pp. 31–48). Keisho Shobo.

Kage, M. (2008). Jyugyou zukuri ni okeru "shikake" ["Strategies" in lesson design]. In K. Akita & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Jyugyou no kenkyu kyoshi no gakushu* [Learning from lessons: Teacher inquiry and lesson study] (pp. 24–42). Akashi Shoten.

Kariya, T. (2011). Japanese solutions to the equity and efficiency dilemma? Secondary schools, inequity and the arrival of 'universal' higher education. *Oxford Review of Education, 37*(2), 241–266.

Kudomi, Y. (2017). *Nihon no kyoshi sono jyunisho* [Japanese teachers: Twelve chapters]. Shinnihon.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge University Press.

Lee, C. (2015, December 8). *Lesson study in Singapore: Practices, perceived impact and pitfalls.* Paper presented at Graduate Student Seminar, the University of Tokyo.

Lee, C., & Ling, C. L. M. (2013). The role of lesson study in facilitating curriculum reforms. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies, 2*(3), 200–206.

Lewis, C. (2000, April 28). Lesson study: The core of Japanese professional development. *Paper presented at AERA meeting.*

Lewis, C. C. (2002). Does lesson study have a future in the United States? *Nagoya Journal of Education and Human Development, 1*, 1–23.

Lewis, C. C. (1995). *Educating hearts and minds: Reflections on Japanese preschool and elementary education.* Cambridge University Press.

Lewis, C. (2016). How does lesson study improve mathematics instruction? *ZDM, 48*(4), 571–580.

Matsuo, G., & Maruno, S. (2008). Students learn the meaning of classroom ground rules from reflection and from each other: Case study of an elementary school class. *Japanese Journal of Educational Psychology, 56*(1), 104–115.

Mulder, N. (1994). *The ideology of Javanese-Indonesian leadership.* Curzon Press Ltd.

Murata, A. (2011). Introduction: Conceptual overview of lesson study. In L. C. Hart, A. Alston, & A. Murata (Eds.), *Lesson study research and practice in mathematics education* (pp. 1–12). Springer.

OECD. (2014). *PISA 2012 results: What students know and can do. student performance in mathematics, reading and science.* OECD Publishing.

Okubo, K., & Tsuji, H. (2015). Using lesson study to develop an approach to problem solving: Adding and subtracting fractions. In M. Inprasitha, M. Isoda, P. Wang-Iverson, & B. Yeap (Eds.), *Lesson study: Challenges in mathematics education* (pp. 169–184). World Scientific.

Perry, R. R., & Lewis, C. C. (2009). What is successful adaptation of lesson study in the US? *Journal of Educational Change, 10*(4), 365–391.

Rohandi, R., & Zain, A. N. (2011). Incorporating indonesian students' "funds of knowledge" into teaching science to sustain their interest in science. *Bulgarian Journal of Science & Education Policy, 5*(2).

Rohlen, T. P., & LeTendre, G. K. (1998). *Teaching and learning in Japan.* Cambridge UP.

Sakamoto, A., & Akita, K. (2008). Jyugyo kenkyu kyogikai deno kyoshi no gakushu—shogakko kyosi no shikokatei no bunseki [Teacher's Learning at Lesson Study Conference-Analysis of Elementary Teacher's Thinking Process]. In K. Akita & C. Lewis (Eds.), *Jyugyou no kenkyu kyoshi no gakushu* [Learning from lessons: Teacher inquiry and lesson study] (pp. 98–113). Akashi Shoten.

Sakurai, K. (1926). Gendai no kyoiku sha [Educators today]. Tokyo hobutsu kan.

Shimahara, N. K. (1998). The Japanese model of professional development: Teaching as craft. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(5), 451–462.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*(2), 4–14.

Stevenson, H. W., & Stigler, J. W. (1992). The learning gap. Summit Books.

Stigler, J. W., & Hiebert, J. (2009). *The teaching gap: Best ideas from the world's teachers for improving education in the classroom.* Simon and Schuster.

Takahashi, A. (2009). Characteristics of Japanese mathematics lessons. *Colección Digital Eudoxus,* (18).

Tsuneyoshi, R. (1994). Small groups in Japanese elementary school classrooms: Comparisons with the United States. *Comparative Education, 30*(2), 115–129.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2001). *The Japanese model of schooling: Comparison with the United States.* RoutlegeFalmer.

Tsuneyoshi, R. (2014, June). Models of schooling in the global age: The case of Japan. *Education in Asia in 2014: What global issues?, 1–5.*

Chapter 9
Conclusion

Abstract This chapter concludes with a discussion on issues in education transfer and teacher development. It unites the discussion among professional identity, teacher strategies, pedagogic transformation, and professional development. Since teaching is socially constructed, what is considered "good teaching" practice varies across contextual settings. The examination of lesson study in foreign settings showed that its practice was transformed to meet locally defined professional responsibilities. As presented by a case in Indonesia, this resulted in the transformation of lesson study or "recontextualization." There was a gap between policy and actual practice and a gap across Japan and Indonesia. While professional development such as lesson study was introduced to induce pedagogic transformation and to build a professional learning community, it had limited impact on social relations inside classrooms and among teachers. I provide recommendations for an alternative approach to professional development.

9.1 Teacher Professional Development and Pedagogic Transformation

This book problematized education transfer and the universal approach in teacher professional development. There is an underlying assumption behind education transfer that when "best practice" is transferred to another country, it will generate a similar effect and improve schooling quality. Lesson study has been introduced to foreign countries as a model to facilitate the process of pedagogic transformation aims to promote student-centered pedagogy, collaboration in professional development, and embodiment of pedagogic content knowledge. However, such transfer of the model neglects the impact of sociocultural aspects of teaching and learning. As past efforts for global education reform suggest, the translation of policy to practice is not a simple process or something that can be implemented detached from its local context (Altinelken & Sozeri, 2018; O'Sullivan, 2004). In fact, collaborative, student-focused, and grass-root efforts to improve daily practice are rooted in

K. N. Kusanagi, *Lesson Study as Pedagogic Transfer*, Education in the Asia-Pacific Region: Issues, Concerns and Prospects 69,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-5928-8_9

sociocultural contexts of Japanese education rather than the product of lesson study (Kusanagi, 2021).

The sociological analysis of lesson study in this study provided such an understanding of the complexity of the process of pedagogic transformation. This recontextualization of practice is evident in the fact that while lesson study in Japan is implemented across subjects, the majority of lesson study abroad is implemented as mathematics and science subject groups. The discussions in Chapter 3 revealed how teachers in other countries strongly identify their professional expertise to be associated with subject knowledge. In contrast, Japanese teachers' primary role is to understand and support students. This is reflected in how the common implementation of lesson study in Japan takes place in school as a unit while foreign lesson study groups are formed around subject groups. Thus, lesson study is strongly influenced by teachers' professional identities, which are shaped by sociocultural settings.

9.2 Essential Features of Lesson Study in Japan and Its Relation to Local Educational Contexts

The historical development of lesson study investigated in Chapter 2 suggests that there are sociocultural settings that have supported lesson study in Japan. Its continued practice developed a shared understanding in teaching, and this was reflected in the features of lesson study in that country. These can be summarized as:

- 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 study can be understood as "a flexible learning system" (Lewis, 2002). Lesson study provides a platform to share practice, reflect on teaching and learning, and learn from others.
- Lesson study is rooted in a professional culture that supports teacher-initiated inquiry centered on student learning. Learning is understood as a social experience and aims for long-term development. There is a shared understanding among Japanese teachers that their role is to support students' learning.
- Over the history of lesson study, Japanese teachers have developed accumulated tools, language, and artifacts that have helped to support teacher-initiated professional learning in lesson study.
- Lesson study has contributed to the culture of dialogue and collaboration between researchers and teachers.

Foreign practitioners and researchers may not be aware of these features behind the practice of lesson study. However, if they implement lesson study without taking these features into account, they may face challenges due to the lack of supporting conditions, as discussed in Chapter 3.

9.3 Teachers' Response to Teacher Development

The Indonesian case illustrated the impact of recontextualisation on international policy/practice transfer and the analysis explained the nature and reasons for this recontextualisation in global education reform. Its policies and professional development programs are strongly influenced by the trends in global education reform. In Indonesia, top-down structural reforms were vigorously implemented over two decades to improve the quality of education. However, there was no clear evidence of a link between policy reform and improvement in teachers' classroom practice. Research suggests that the strengthening input—improving the qualifications of teachers—did not result in the desired output—improved student performance (discussed in Chapter 4). Since educational reform cannot be imposed externally, teachers' interpretation of the policy and what they prioritize in daily activities is essential. In other words, understanding teachers' perspectives are essential in realizing pedagogic transformation.

This study examined how teachers responded to a policy change by examining what was prioritized in their professional accountabilities. At a glance, the Javanese teachers identified themselves as civil servants, and their professional duties were carried out according to government guidelines. However, SMP Sari was actually governed by maintaining two discourses—official and unofficial—bureaucratic requirements were fulfilled at the document level, but the actual practice was regulated by relaxing social norms (discussed in Chapter 5). The significance of this is that both official and unofficial discourses coexisted simultaneously, but bureaucratic requirements were treated *separately* from actual practice. Teachers were motivated to meet external protocols, but the change was superficial and/or temporary. For example, teachers were supposed to be in school from 6:30–13:00 daily, but they were not there unless there was scheduled teaching. This was the way teachers responded to any policy change and reform initiatives, including lesson study.

9.4 Accountability to Teaching

At SMP Sari, teachers treated the teaching responsibilities similar to administrative tasks and they taught to meet bureaucratic standards. There was strong accountability to teach to the test since the ultimate goal of schooling was understood to pass the national examination. The teachers' survey suggested that they understood "good teachers" to be those who support students' learning; on the contrary, they admitted that the majority of teachers at SMP Sari did not fulfill this criterion. I analyzed this phenomenon by analyzing teachers' practice using Bernstein's two pedagogic discourse—the instructional discourse (ID: regulating what to teach) and the regulative discourse (RD: regulating the social order of the classroom)—(Bernstein, 1990, 2000). At SMP Sari, teachers' practice was defined bureaucratically in terms of the content of teaching (ID), but there was flexibility in *how* the teachers managed their

classrooms (RD). Thus, the professional accountability of teachers at SMP Sari regulated what to teach (ID) but not necessarily *how to teach* (RD), including maintaining the social order of the classroom. There was little to hold teachers accountable for *how to teach* since teachers generally considered that learning responsibility rested with the students rather than being shared with teachers. The absence of a Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) in their practice showed scaffolding was not designed into their pedagogy. In other words, teachers were responsible for presenting the curriculum, but they were not responsible for supporting student learning. This resulted in students having little space to negotiate with teachers in terms of pace, interaction, and seeking support. Thus, teaching responsibility did not include supporting student learning.

9.5 Teacher Collegiality and Community Accountability

The teachers at SMP Sari were protected by interdependent relationship under the patriarchal and hierarchical "familism system." Since their professional responsibilities were embedded as community responsibilities, it facilitated smooth cooperation of Javanese teachers to carry out school programs. It was implemented top-down, and responsibilities were divided based on the existing hierarchy. Since teachers relied on the patronage of the principal and each other's support, there was a strong pressure for teachers to fulfill obligations as "family members." Teachers were expected to conform to community norms and comply with bureaucratic requirements (see "Accountability to the Familism System" in Table 5.2).

However, in terms of teaching, this collectivist community norm worked against teachers' autonomous practice. Since their responsibility to students or improving teaching was not structured within the familism system, teachers were reluctant to take the risk to go beyond the norm of didactic teaching. When teachers wanted to prioritize their professional interests to support students, they were at risk of alienating themselves from the community for acting outside the normative social boundary. In fact, they could be equally sanctioned as teachers who taught badly and failed to fulfill their community responsibility. In this way, the setting of the Javanese school worked to prioritize community interest, which was in fact detrimental to teachers' autonomous practice.

As seen in the case of SMP Sari, teachers negotiate complex and sometimes contesting demands when making pedagogical choices. The analysis of teachers' coping strategies (Table 5.2) revealed how the definition of professional accountability was by no means fixed but is fluid and constantly negotiated within the teacher community. It showed how teachers' choice of pedagogy was more than an individual choice and regulated by the community norm. This complexity of balancing internal and external accountabilities is often not visible to outsiders. Nevertheless, it has a significant impact on teachers' choices and how they carry out professional responsibilities. In the context of SMP Sari, there was no institutional motivation for teachers to embody pedagogic skills and to collaborate in professional development.

9.6 Lesson Study and Teacher-Student Interactions

The lesson study at SMP Sari was implemented as one of the school programs. This means teachers interpreted it as a bureaucratic project to be carried out faithfully. The discussion in Chapter 5 showed that strengthening professional accountability (such as the certification scheme) meant tightening bureaucratic control, but it had little relevance to daily teaching. This study examined the continuities and discontinuities between professional development and daily practice to understand this gap. Teachers incorporated teaching methods promoted by lesson study at open classes, but this had no impact on how teachers worked with their students. Consequently, although interactive methods—hands-on activities and group work—were employed by lesson study, there was no support provided to students. Even when students could not work with other students or struggled to solve problems, they were left to work on their own.

While lesson study promoted teachers to embody pedagogic content knowledge (PCK), it needed to be aligned with local professional accountability of teachers. Teachers' expertise at SMP Sari was equated with subject knowledge and teaching to the test. They preferred didactic methods, and lesson design did not structure teacher support to individual students. Interactive methods were not used in daily lessons. Thus, there was little interest in developing pedagogic expertise of how to work with students. The post-lesson discussions focused on evaluations of teacher instructions and student learning, and there was no discussion on the process of student learning or teacher facilitation. The discussions showed that teachers understood effective instruction to involve minimum intervention by teachers. Thus, while lesson study motivated a change in the teaching methods, teachers' understanding of their role and how they interacted with students remained the same.

Similarly, teachers' cooperation in lesson study merely reflected how they had been cooperating in school programs. They cooperated well to carry out administrative tasks based on top-down management. Their collegiality was characterized as what Hargreaves and Dawe (1990) called contrived collegiality. Teachers worked together to achieve externally-set goals that were not based on their own intentions. While they were encouraged to collaborate, their cooperation was limited to carrying out lesson study based on bureaucratic protocols. There was no dialogue or exchange of ideas among them since neither teaching nor professional development was structured as a shared responsibility. There was no incentive to collaborate with their peers since teachers were competitors under the scrutiny of bureaucratic evaluation.

9.7 Recommendations

This study showed how lesson study is recontextualized or reinterpreted against the local contextual setting of foreign countries. The sociological analysis provided the

understanding of lesson study beyond success or failure of professional development. It also fostered the understanding of teaching beyond individual competencies and choices and as strategies within the community. While failures of professional development were often attributed to individual teacher competence, this study suggested that teacher choice of pedagogy was influenced by institutional norms and setting. This sociological analysis on gaps in policy and practice provided insights to policymakers (both local and international), researchers, school leaders, and educators.

First, this study examined teacher response to policy change beyond the insuperable cultural gap. Bjork (2005) pointed out that Indonesian teachers were reluctant to take up the role of educators as intended by the local content curriculum due to the strong bureaucratic school culture. This study built on Bjork's research and further investigated the obstacles to changing practice, focusing not on a cultural gap but the contesting forces within a social system. The familism system embedded professional accountabilities as communal obligations. Responsibility for teaching and professional development constitutes merely one of multiple accountabilities. The teachers of SMP Sari were constrained by "unofficial" responsibilities to maintain the communal harmony in carrying out professional responsibilities. It protected the members of "family but also reinforced the existing social hierarchy. In designing professional development, if we focus only on "official" responsibility, these contextual constraints on teaching and school management may not be visible. Especially in developing countries, people often depend on a small and closed community where there is a strong incentive to maintain the social hierarchy. This pressure to conform to social norms often works against pursuing professional interest.

Second, this study showed that professional accountabilities are much more complex and there are administrative and social obligations beyond teaching and moreover beyond official job descriptions. Responsibility for teaching and professional development constitutes merely one of multiple accountabilities. The role of the teacher is defined not only by external accountability—such as curriculum or policy—teachers align their practice to the social norms for teachers, and this internal accountability is powerful but often hidden from the eyes of outsiders. Borrowing from the concepts of Vygotsky and Bernstein, this study presented how there was nothing to hold teachers accountable institutionally to support student learning (by a distinction between an elaborated pedagogic strategy and restricted pedagogic strategy discussed in Chapter 6).

The concept of "teacher strategies" described the complexity of their professional accountabilities and how teachers sometimes negotiated competing demands. Such understanding is essential in pedagogic transformation since teachers constantly negotiate the boundary and scope of their pedagogy within the institutional setting in order to pursue their professional interests. Understanding how teachers negotiate different responsibilities within the community of teachers is essential in building a professional learning community aimed at lesson study. In the case of SMP Sari, it merely induced contrived collegiality (Hargreaves & Dawe, 1990), which fostered administrative cooperation rather than collaboration to support professional development.

Third, this study addressed how imposing bureaucratic control over teachers' practice could result in "de-professionalization" despite its intention to improve the classroom practice of teachers. The modes of authority by Dowling (2009) showed how the professional expertise at SMP Sari was legitimatized by a bureaucratic mode. Thus, when a new policy was introduced, institutional norms prioritized bureaucratic administration, but that did not motivate a change in pedagogy. In fact, the practice of teachers showed that their responsibility was limited to the presentation of the curriculum; however, there was no motivation to support student learning or to support their peers for professional development. Under the global trend of education reform, schools and teachers worldwide face tightening bureaucratic control and are held accountable for student performance. Such performance accountability in teaching and bureaucratic control on school management might have a negative effect and actually undermine the process of learning.

Fourth, the sociological analysis in this study presented how professional expertise was legitimatized institutionally and set the norms of practice; this had a strong influence over teachers' choice of pedagogy. Bernstein's pedagogic discourse allowed for the examination of teacher practice as the representation of social practice within a particular institutional context. At SMP Sari, the concern for the content of teaching (ID) was shared, but how to maintain the social order of the classroom or how to teach (RD) was not shared. Consequently, when two teachers had contrasting views of how to support students, it did not develop into a dialogue but was regarded as a matter of difference in opinion. In other words, there was a lack of shared interest to improve pedagogic skills and to support student learning relevant to RD.

Even in Japan, the practice of lesson study is corroding because the schools implement it to fulfill administrative requirements rather than it being based on a shared professional mission (M. Sato, 2009, 2015; Yufu, 2007). Therefore, the bureaucratization of lesson study at SMP Sari is not a unique phenomenon. Policymakers and practitioners in other parts of the world share similar issues. The concept of "recontextualization" showed that rather than understanding teacher practice as fixed within a national educational setting, it might be useful to understand its variation in different regional or school settings. In creating a meaningful space for professional learning where teachers grow together, professional development efforts, including lesson study, need to be aligned with local contexts.

Since the fieldwork for this study took place in 2010 the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology (*Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi*) has acknowledged the problem of bureaucratization in the teaching profession and been working to overcome this issue. The government launched a program in 2019 called *Merdeka Belajar*—freedom to learn—which alleviates teachers from administrative burdens, promotes innovative teaching, and encourages teachers to pay more attention to the learning process in classrooms (Jannah, 2019; Kemendikbud, 2019). The government encourages teachers to interpret competencies and curriculum to meet the needs of individual students; thus, they are expected to present autonomous practice (Anis & Anwar, 2020; Kemendikbud, 2019). However, until now, it is not clear how this is ensured by policy or at the school level. As seen from the case of SMP Sari, there is strong social regulation to maintain the status quo

in the collectivist culture of the school. Teachers felt it was sufficient to fulfill the minimum bureaucratic requirements, and they were not motivated to support student learning (the bureaucratic mode of Authority Strategy discussed in Chapter 6). This works against the autonomous practice of teachers. Thus, unless new policy matches local educational contexts, a similar superficial transformation—bureaucratization of policy—is likely to occur.

One of the major problems is that the Indonesian government has been focusing on strengthening external accountability to improve the quality of education. As seen from the case of SMP Sari, bureaucratic (external) accountability and evaluation did not motivate teachers to engage in collaborative professional development. This study showed that the key in pedagogic transformation is to align the internal accountability of teachers with such external accountability. To build a professional learning community, there needs to be an approach to embed the responsibility to support student learning in the school structure and to hold teachers collectively accountable for professional development. One way to address this issue is to set up research schools in which: (1) teachers' work is structured around supporting the process of student learning; (2) the school is managed under distributed leadership, and collaborative culture is promoted based on open professional dialogue; (3) professional development is organized as a professional learning community. There is a case of whole-school lesson study in Indonesia where teacher collaboration was realized to support student learning. The school introduced another Japanese model called Tokkatsu in addition to lesson study. In Tokkatsu, teachers organize various social (generally non-academic) activities to develop the holistic development of students, where teachers are expected to be facilitators and encourage students to take the initiative in these activities (Tsuneyoshi et al., 2019). The key was that school reform through lesson study and Tokkatsu restructured teachers' roles to support student learning and transformed teachers' professional identity to support the holistic development of students (Kusanagi & Suratno, 2020).

Even at the time of fieldwork conducted in 2009–2010, there was an indication that teachers were increasingly held accountable for individual performance. This was causing potential disruption to the hierarchical and collectivistic teacher culture (discussed in Chapter 5). The concept of "teacher strategies" showed that teachers' practice or teacher culture is not fixed but constantly negotiated within the institutional setting. Thus, the collectivist and hierarchical culture of Javanese schools can change to a more open and dialogic relationship. If professional development was not imposed externally but implemented based on teachers' shared interest to provide better learning for students, it would have more chance of success. The efforts are needed to hold teachers accountable for how to teach—especially to motivate teachers for scaffolding. The key is how to structure the responsibility to support student learning in daily activities and how to promote teacher collaboration based on shared professional interests. The upcoming curriculum in 2022—*Merdeka Belajar*—is intended to support individual students and accommodate their learning needs (Kemendikbud, 2019). This study suggested that for policy and pedagogic reform to be successful, teachers' professional accountabilities need to be aligned with these changes. Professional responsibilities need not only to hold teachers

accountable for their official job descriptions but also to be aligned with the teachers' unofficial (social) accountabilities (to maintain communal harmony, for example); the reform is bound to be circumscribed to the existing bureaucratic and hierarchical organizational norms. If their daily routine is structured for supporting student learning, and their daily collaboration was based on this shared interest, lesson study would have a better chance in Indonesia.

References

Altinyelken, H. K., Sözeri, S., Akiba, M., & LeTendre, G. (2018). Assumptions and implications of adopting educational ideas from the West: The case of student-centered pedagogy in Turkey. In M. Akiba & G. LeTendre (Eds.), *International handbook of teacher quality and policy* (pp. 255–270). Routledge.

Anis, M., & Anwar, C. (2020). Self-organized learning environment teaching strategy for ELT in Merdeka Belajar concept for high school students in Indonesia. *JEES (journal of English Educators Society), 5*(2), 199–204.

Bernstein, B. (1990). *The structuring of pedagogic discourse, class, codes and control* (Vol IV). London: Routledge.

Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, Symbolic Control and Identity: theory, research, critique* revised edn. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bjork, C. (2005). *Indonesian education: Teachers, schools, and central bureaucracy*. Taylor & Francis.

Dowling, P. (2009). *Sociology as method: Departures from the forensics of culture, text and knowledge*. Brill.

Hargreaves, A., & Dawe, R. (1990). Paths of professional development: Contrived collegiality, collaborative culture, and the case of peer coaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 6*(3), 227–241.

Jannah C. (2019, December 23). Merdeka Belajar: Kebijakan Lompat-lompat ala Nadiem Makarim – Muslimah News. https://www.muslimahnews.com/2019/12/23/merdeka-belajar-kebijakan-lompat-lompat-ala-nadiem-makarim/

Kemendikbud. (2019). Merdeka Belajar: Pokok-Pokok Kebijakan Merdeka Belajar. Makalah Rapat Koordinasi Kepala Dinas Pendidikan Seluruh Indonesia.

Kusanagi, K. N. (2021). Historical Development of Lesson Study in Japan. Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education, 2021. Retrieved 18 June 2021, from https://oxfordre.com/education/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264093-e-1216

Kusanagi, K. N., & Suratno, T. (2020). Integrating lesson study with Tokkatsu to build teacher collegiality: A case of kindergarten, elementary school and junior high school collaboration in Bandung, Indonesia. *Tokyo Future University Bulletin, 14*, 63–68.

Lewis, C. C. (2002). Does Lesson Study Have a Future in the United States?. *Nagoya Journal of education and Human Development, 1*, 1–23.

O'Sullivan, M. (2004). The reconceptualisation of learner-centred approaches: A Namibian case study. *International Journal of Educational Development, 24*(6), 585–602.

Sato, M. (2009). Kaikaku no doko [The trend of reform]. In National Association for the Study of Educational Methods (Ed.), *Lesson study in Japan: Nihon no jgygyokenkyu "Jyugyokenkyu no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku"* [*Lesson study in Japan: "The history of lesson study and teacher training" Jyugyokenkyu no rekisi to kyoshi-kyouiku* (pp. 104–114). Gakubunsha.

Sato, M. (2015). *Senmonka to shite Kyoshi wo Sodateru: Kyoshi Kyoiku Kaikaku no Gurando Dezain [Developing professionalism of teachers: A grand design of teacher education reform]*. Iwanami.

Tsuneyoshi, R., Sugita, H., Kusanagi, K., & Takahashi, F. (Eds.). (2019). *Tokkatsu: The Japanese educational model of holistic education.* World Scientific.

Yufu, S. (2007). Start lesson study from where you can: Taking "substance" and not "form." *Lesson study that link teachers,* July. http://berd.benesse.jp/berd/center/open/syo/view21/2007/07/s01toku_01.html