

Sulastrini Djuningin. (2017). The Practice of Lesson Study Model in Teaching Writing Report Text. *Journal of Education and Learning*. Vol. 11 (1) pp. 103-110. DOI: 10.11591/edulearn.v11i1.4315

The Practice of Lesson Study Model in Teaching Writing Report Text

Sulastrini Djuningin*

Indonesian Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar

Abstract

This study aimed at testing the effective use of the lesson study model to write report text from the observation performed by students at Junior High School level. This research was an experimental study with the posttest only control group design. The sampling technique was purposive sampling. The data were collected through test and observation. The results showed that the lesson study model is sufficient to be applied to write report text of observation for the Junior High School students. It is proven by the data that the value of $t_{calc} = 16.087 >$ value of $t_{table} = 1.67$ on $\alpha 0.05$ and degree of freedom=58.

Keywords: *Lesson study model; writing skill; observation report*

*Dr. Sulastriningsih Djuningin, Indonesian Department, Faculty of Languages and Literature, Universitas Negeri Makassar.
E-mail: sulastriningsih77@gmail.com

Introduction

Instructional text on curriculum brings students on mental development and solving problems of their life by using critical thinking (Tyler, 2013). The more types of text mastered by the students, the more structure of critical thinking can be used in constructing knowledge. The report text needs to be mastered by the students to report one of the observations of the surrounding environment. A good lesson plan produced by teachers such as lesson study model in learning is required to achieve this goal. Through the application of the model lesson study, the teachers collaborate and share the results of observational learning by writing report text of observation. Curriculum development changes learning paradigm from teacher center to student center, text-based learning required several innovations that can accommodate the needs to realize that learning (Estes, 2004; Pedersen & Liu, 2003).

In a student-centered learning, it is expected that students construct their own knowledge while the teachers act as facilitators. Likewise, the Indonesian language serves as a draft of science as well as a tool to absorb, develop, and communicate science to another. In other words, the ability in Indonesian language skill can shape students' skills in communicating thoughts, ideas, and ideas in various fields of knowledge. Another characteristic of Indonesian language learning based on the 2013 curriculum is text-based. Language is seen as text, and it is not only a collection of words or rules of language, but it is also a functional that is not out of context. This context reflects the ideas, attitudes, values, and ideology of the users of the language. The language becomes the maturity formation of human thinking. Therefore, the more types of text mastered by the students, the more structure of critical thinking can be used in constructing knowledge.

In relation to this matter, the teachers should quickly respond to changes in negotiating the learning that will encourage students to build oral or written text as a vehicle in mediating a wide range of knowledge (Richards, 2005). Therefore, the ability to design text-based Indonesian language learning becomes crucial as a precondition for the successful implementation of curriculum. Thus, the success of the quality of Indonesian language learning also highly depends on the skill of the teacher to design and realize learning activities. One of the efforts performed by teachers in improving the ability to plan learning activities is lesson study model. The lesson study model is a model for professional guidance for teachers through a collaborative and continuous assessment based on the principles of collegiality and mutual learning, real experience in the classroom, reflection to build a learning community (Cerbin & Kopp, 2006). Through the guidance of lesson study model, teachers can improve the professionalism and facilitate the learning process, so that the quality of education can be increased. Lesson Study can enhance the professionalism of teachers for the development of learning that is conducted by paying attention to criticism and suggestions from observers.

In the globalization and information era, the literacy skills become a critical thing. Access to information is performed by various means namely listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Someone who has strong literacy skills will be able to master all four language skills in different aspects of life. Writing is one of the literacy skills that is one of the objects of language proficiency that is necessary, especially in expressing ideas, thoughts, and feelings. Literacy is the ability to read and write that is associated with the success in the academic community environment (Beers, Beers, & Smith, 2009; Jay & Strong, 2008, 2008; Rogers, 2003; Sedgwick, 2010). It means that literacy is a device that is owned in order to achieve success in a social environment. Through writing, students are required to absorb, search, and master information in relation to the written topics. By comprehending writing skills, students will be able to express his ideas coherently and contextually. Writing activities require a more complex capability. It does not need only various data or information but also it takes skill to use written language regularly by using appropriate rules.

Method

The variables of this research were the lesson study model as the independent variable (X) and the ability to write the report text as the dependent variable (Y). This study design was an experimental study with the posttest control group design (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 1993). The author chose 280 of the seventh grade students of Junior High School 26, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia consisting of six classes purposive sampling technique (Kothari, 2004). The instruments that were used were in the form of observation and tests writing skills in the seventh-grade students in junior high school through writing report text of observation. The report text of observation is the observation text written in detail that is systematic, and factual. In writing the report text, the author must be careful towards the text that is written. Several things are required to achieve this purpose. The first is thoroughness in the use of Indonesian language applied by the writer. The second is the precision in revealing the facts. The third is the accuracy in discussing ideas. By fulfilling those requirements, the message to be conveyed by the

author in the report text can be easily absorbed and understood by the reader. If the learning activities to write report text are planned, designed, and developed collaboratively and continuously by the teacher team through Lesson Study, the learning activities of writing skill become fun. Finally, the students will be motivated, trained and accustomed to writing to convey ideas and information or knowledge that could be useful for themselves and others. Thus, the students are not only as objects of development but also as the actors of the development which became the successor to the ideals of a nation. The data were analyzed with descriptive statistics and inferential statistical by using SPSS program.

Results

Test Scores of Writing Report Text in Control Class

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the content aspect, it is known that six students (9.8%) can get four as the maximum score. 19 students (31.1%) get 3, and five students (8.2%) obtain 2. It indicates that the value that can be achieved in writing the report text of observation of Junior High School is in the range of 2 to 4. Based on the criteria of ability that has been established in accordance with Minimum completeness criteria in this school on the subjects of Indonesian language the students are stated capable, if the number of students reached 85% who obtained 2.66 (B-) or more. On the contrary, the students have not been able if the number of students is less than 85% who obtained the value of 2.66. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the content aspect are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are five students (16.7%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 25 students (83.3%) of the total sample. The mean score is 3.03, the standard deviation is 0.615, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 3.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the content aspect in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage that is achieved in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the text structure aspect, it is known that one student (3.3%) can obtain four as the maximum score. 11 students (36.7%) get 3, and eight students (26.7%) obtain 2. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the text structure aspect are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are 18 students (60%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 12 students (40%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 2.57, the standard deviation is 0.50, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the text structure aspect in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage that is achieved in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the diction aspect, it is known that seven students (23.3%) can obtain 3. The score of 2.5 is achieved by six students (20%), and 17 students (56.7%) gain 2. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the diction aspect are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are 23 students (76.7%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are seven students (23.3%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 3.33, the standard deviation is 0.42, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 3.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the diction aspect in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage that is gained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the aspect of constructing sentences, it is known that four students (13.3%) can obtain 3. The score of 2.5 is achieved by eight students (26.7%), and 18 students (60%) obtain 2. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the aspect of constructing sentences are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are 26 students (86.7%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are four students (13.3%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 2.27, the standard deviation is 0.365, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 3.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the aspect of constructing sentences in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the aspect of spelling and punctuation, it is known that one student (3.3%) can obtain 4. The score of 3.5 is achieved by one student (3.3%), and six students (20%) obtain 3. In addition, the score of 2.5 is achieved by four students (13.3%), and 18 students (60%) get 2. It

means that the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the aspect of spelling and punctuation are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are 22 students (73%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are eight students (27%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 2.363, the standard deviation is 0.55, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the aspect of spelling and punctuation in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Test Scores of Writing Report Text in the Experimental Group

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the content aspect, it is known that 21 students (70%) can obtain four as the maximum score. 5 students (16.7%) get 3.5, and four students (13.4%) obtain 3. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the content aspect are as follows. No student scored below 2.66 of the total sample, and the students who scored 2.66 above are 30 students (100%) of the total sample. The mean score is 3.78, the standard deviation is 0.36, the minimum value is 3.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the content aspect in the control class was considered adequate because the scores obtained by the students have reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the text structure aspect, it is known that four students (13.3%)) can obtain four as the maximum score. 13 students (43.3%) get 3.5, 11 students (36.7%) obtain 3, and two students (6.7%) obtain 2. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the text structure aspect are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are two students (6.7%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 28 students (93.3%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 3.32, the standard deviation is 0.40, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the text structure aspect in the control class was considered adequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the diction aspect, it is known that four students (13.3%)) can obtain 4. The score of 3.5 is achieved by ten students (33.3%), 12 students (40%) obtain 3, and three students (10%) obtain 2.5. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the diction aspect are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are four students (13.3%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 26 students (87%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 3.22, the standard deviation is 0.486, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the diction aspect in the control class was considered adequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the aspect of constructing sentences, it is known that seven students (23.3%)) can obtain four as the maximum score. The score of 3.5 is achieved by three students (10%), 14 students (60%) obtain 3, and one student (3.3%) get 2. Thus, the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the aspect of constructing sentences are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are six students (20%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 24 students (80%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 3.16, the standard deviation is 0.57, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be concluded that the ability to write report text on the aspect of constructing sentences in the control class was considered adequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Based on the value, frequency, and percentage obtained in terms of writing report text on the results of observation based on the aspect of spelling and punctuation, it is known that eight students (26.6%)) can obtain 4. The score of 3.5 is achieved by seven students (23.3%), seven students (23.3%) obtain 3, and seven students get 2.5. In addition, the score of 3 is achieved by one student (3.3%). It means that the frequency and the percentage of the value for the level of ability to write report text on the aspect of spelling and punctuation are as follows. The students who scored below 2.66 are eight students (27%) of the total sample. The students, who scored 2.66 above, are 22 students (73%) of the total of the sample. The mean score is 2.363, the standard deviation is 0.55, the minimum value is 2.00, and the maximum value is 4.00. Thus, it can be assumed that the ability to write report text on the

aspect of spelling and punctuation in the control class was considered inadequate because the value obtained by the student has not reached the specified criteria.

Normality tests

Normality test used in this study was the Kolmogorov-Smirnov with by using SPSS program version 16 with the criteria that if the significant value of $p > 0.05$, then the data are normally distributed. If the significance value of $p < 0.05$, then the data are otherwise not normally distributed. Based on the results of normality test, it is obtained that $p = 0.194$ for the control group and $p = 0.275$ for the experimental group. It shows that $p > \alpha = 0.05$. It means that the data score of students' learning outcomes of the two groups, both the control and the experimental group on writing the report text comes from normally distributed population. The results of normality test can be seen in Table 1 and 2.

Table 1. Normality test in Control Group

Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
.194	30	.005	.943	30	.112

Table 2. Normality test in Experimental Group

Kolmogorov-Smirnov ^a			Shapiro-Wilk		
Statistic	df	Sig.	Statistic	Df	Sig.
.275	30	.000	.748	30	.000

Homogeneity Tests

The researcher applied homogeneity of variances to test the homogeneity. Homogeneity test criteria are that if the significance value > 0.05 , then the data are expressed homogeneous and if the significance value < 0.05 , then the data are expressed not homogeneous. Based on the calculation of homogeneity of variance for the population, it is obtained that the value $p = 0.906$ where $p > \alpha = 0.05$. The results of these calculations indicate that the population variance is homogeneous. It can be seen in Table 3 below.

Table 3. The Results of Homogeneity Test

<i>Test of Homogeneity of Variance</i>					
		Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
DATA	Based on Mean	.014	1	58	.906
	Based on Median	.079	1	58	.779
	Based on Median and with adjusted df	.079	1	52.346	.779
	Based on trimmed mean	.043	1	58	.837

After testing prerequisites, namely normality test and homogeneity test, a t-test was then performed to test the hypothesis. The gain scores were analyzed using an independent t-test in order to obtain the results as shown in Table 4.

Table 4. The Results of t-test

Paired Samples Test									
Paired Differences									
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	KONTROL - EKSPERIMEN	-.84000	.28599	.05222	-.94679	-.73321	-16.087	29	.000

Based on the data analysis, it is found that the value of t_{calc} is 16.087 with the significance level is 5% (1,67) . The rule of hypothesis testing is used when $p > 0.05$. Therefore, the hypothesis is accepted, and it means that the lesson study model is effectively applied to writing skill of the report text.

Discussion

In this section, the author discussed the findings obtained from the research data about the teaching and learning of writing skill of the report text. The results showed that the students in the control group have many obstacles, namely confusion, less excited, no discussion in the learning activities of writing report text. The students' activities in the control class indicate that they have a great spirit. However, their attention is still lacking. Even, there are still some students who do activities that do not relate to the subject. Hence, during the discussions and presentation lasts, only some of them are active. Based on observations, the things that affect why the students' ability to write report text are found. From the five aspects assessed on aspects of writing skills of the report text, the scores of content, text structure, diction, sentence, and mechanics (spelling and punctuation) values obtained are still less.

The phenomenon experienced by the students in the control class has an impact on the evaluation of learning outcomes. It can be recognized that based on the frequency and percentage of students' ability to write report text of observation only seven students (23%) who received 2.66 above or the average is only 2.50 (C +). Thus, it is stated that the ability to write the report text is still low. It is in contrast to the phenomena that occurred in writing report text of the by using learning model of Lesson Study. It shows that all students did not experience problems in writing the report text of the observation results. The observed teachers and the observer can collaborate in terms of making the lesson plan and performing the learning activities in the classroom. Likewise, teachers may facilitate students to ask questions, discuss, and solve a problem. In addition, students can share their opinions to solve learning problems together, and they are positioning their teacher as a resource if they cannot solve the problems.

Through learning to write report text of observation results by using the model of lesson study, the students can learn in a conducive and pleasant situation. It has a positive impact on learning outcomes. The average value achieved in the experimental class is 3.33 (B +). There are 29 students or 97 % who obtain the score of 2.66 above. There are several advantages of lesson study. The first is building social and emotional relationships between teachers and students. The second is to deepen the understanding between teachers and students about learning materials. The third is increasing the confidence of teachers in improving the professionalism as a teacher in Indonesian language subject. The fourth is to build a good collaboration, meaningful discussion, and fair competition either teachers and teachers or students and students. The fifth is to improve the ability of teachers in designing learning activities, such as: mastering the material, planning, implementing, and utilizing learning tools such as media, materials, and learning resources as well as evaluating the learning activities. In addition, lesson study can improve the quality of lesson plan including its components, such as teaching materials, teaching objectives, and learning strategies (Bowe & Gore, 2016; Lamb and Po Yuk Ko, Lamb, & Ko, 2016; Marble, Kamen, Naizer, & Weinburgh, 2016; Olsen, 2016; Pennington & Richards, 2016; Stigler & Hiebert, 2016). Another benefit of lesson study is to help the teachers to observe and criticize learning and to help the teachers to focus on its assistance on students' activities (Cerbin & Kopp, 2006). Furthermore, through lesson study; teachers can make lesson plans together and practice their work.

Conclusions

Based on the above description, it can be concluded that the ability to write the report text by using the model of lesson study is declared successful. This statement is supported by the results of the tests calculation. The rule that is used is if $p > 0.05$, then H_1 is accepted. The analysis showed that the value $t_{\text{calc}} > t_{\text{table}}$ or $t_{\text{count}} = 16.087 > t_{\text{table}} = 1.67$ (α is 0.05 and df is 58). It shows that the alternative hypothesis is accepted. It means that the learning model of lesson study is effective to be applied to writing report text of the seventh-grade students in Junior High School.

References

- Beers CS, Beers JW, Smith JO. *A Principal's Guide to Literacy Instruction*. Guilford Press. 2009.
- Bowe J, Gore J. Reassembling teacher professional development: The case for Quality Teaching Rounds. *Teachers and Teaching*. 2016: 1–15.
- Cerbin W, Kopp B. Lesson Study as a Model for Building Pedagogical Knowledge and Improving Teaching. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*. 2006; 18(3): 250–257.
- Estes CA. Promoting student-centered learning in experiential education. *Journal of Experiential Education*. 2004; 27(2): 141–160.
- Fraenkel JR, Wallen NE, Hyun HH. *How to design and evaluate research in education* (Vol. 7). McGraw-Hill New York. 1993.
- Jay, A., Strong MW. *A Guide to Literacy Coaching: Helping Teachers Increase Student Achievement*. Corwin Press. 2008.
- Kothari CR. *Research methodology: Methods and techniques*. New Age International. 2004.
- Lamb, Po Yuk Ko, P Lamb P, Ko PY. Case studies of lesson and learning study in initial teacher education programmes. *International Journal for Lesson and Learning Studies*. 2016; 5(2): 78–83.
- Marble S, Kamen M, Naizer GG, Weinburgh M. Our Journey of Understanding Through Lesson Study. In *Enhancing Professional Knowledge of Pre-Service Science Teacher Education by Self-Study Research*. Springer. 2016: 177–191.
- Olsen B. *Teaching for success: Developing your teacher identity in today's classroom*. Routledge. 2016.
- Pedersen S, Liu M. Teachers' beliefs about issues in the implementation of a student-centered learning environment. *Educational Technology Research and Development*. 2003; 51(2): 57–76.
- Pennington MC, Richards JC. Teacher Identity in Language Teaching: Integrating Personal, Contextual, and Professional Factors. *RELC Journal*. 2016; 47(1): 5–23.
- Richards JC. *Communicative language teaching today*. SEAMEO Regional Language Centre. 2005.
- Rogers R. *A critical discourse analysis of family literacy practices: Power in and out of print*. Routledge. 2003.
- Sedgwick F. *100 ideas for teaching literacy*. A&C Black. 2010.
- Stigler JW, Hiebert J. Lesson study, improvement, and the importing of cultural routines. *ZDM*, 2016: 1–7.
- Tyler RW. *Basic principles of curriculum and instruction*. University of Chicago press. 2013.

