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Abstract
This study aims to investigate whether teachers practice the principles of effective teaching in their regular teaching practices. The concept of effective teaching refers to the classroom factors of the dynamic model of educational effectiveness developed by Creemers and Kyriakides (2008). Referring to teacher instructional roles that have been empirically found to affect student outcome, the dynamic model proposes eight classroom/teacher factors. They are orientation, structuring, modeling, application, questioning, establishment of classroom as a learning environment (CLE), management of time, and assessment. Mix method was used. The quantitative side used students’ questionnaire and structured observation instrument while the qualitative one used interview. The study was carried out in DKI Jakarta and involved 22 English teachers and 556 students from six State Islamic Schools. Referring to the observation data, the findings reveal that some teachers have applied some of the principles of effective teaching in their regular teaching practices. Out of five scales, questioning, application, CLE, assessment and management of time were scored three in average. However, structuring, orientation, and modeling were scored below three, which indicated teachers’ difficulties in these factors. This study is beneficial not only to provide valuable data concerning teachers’ practices but also to form fundamental consideration on what aspects should be improved.

1 INTRODUCTION
Many studies have found that teachers play a very important role in improving students’ outcome (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Fullan, 2001; Harris, 2002; Harris & Huijs, 2005). In line with this, Stronge (2007) concludes that teachers who teach a subject for which they are not prepared do not address students’ needs as good as certified teachers. Therefore, it is logical to assume that when students’ outcome is good, the teachers are also good.
Referring to international measurements such as Program for International Student Assessment (PISA), students' outcome in Indonesia could be considered low. In 2012, for instance, the mean score of Indonesian students was 375, far below the average of all participating countries (494) on Math (OECD, 2012), which has positioned Indonesia as the second from the bottom. Hence, there is a basis to assume that the quality of teachers in Indonesia is not yet as good as expected. Moreover, some studies have found that teachers in Indonesia are not yet capable of creating effective learning environment (Kaluge, Setiasih, and Tjahjono, 2004; Utomo, 2005). The most recent study sponsored by the World Bank also indicates that teachers' quality is low amidst certification program intended to improve their performance (Ree, Al-Samarrat, & Iskandar, S., 2012).

However, it should not be generalized that all Indonesian students and hence all teachers have low quality. Some schools including Islamic schools under the Ministry of Religious Affairs could be considered as good schools because they achieved high score in their national exam. For English subject for instance, in 2013 some schools such as MAN 4 Jakarta and MTsN 41 Jakarta scored above 8 in average. This achievement shows that the teaching and learning process in these schools is effective. In other words, there is empirical evidence to assume that teachers in these schools have good teaching quality, which results in good students' outcome as represented in their score in the national examination.

However, this assumption should be proved and therefore this study is intended to examine this assumption. In other words, this study aims to investigate whether teachers in some perceived-good schools have good teaching quality. In conceptualizing teaching quality, the findings of teacher effectiveness research, which deals with factors within teachers that are related to students' outcome, is considered. This is because the findings of this research provide empirical evidence on teacher factors that are found to positively affect students' outcome and hence those factors serve an important basis on what and how to improve. The findings of this research have consistently revealed that teachers' instructional roles in the classroom contribute the most in the differences of students' outcome (Luyten & Snijders, 1994).

In this paper, the dynamic model of educational effectiveness (Creemers & Kyriakides, 2008), one model of teacher effectiveness research is used. The model has four levels i.e. national / policy level, school level, teacher / classroom level, and student level. The emphasis is on the teacher level while the higher levels, which are the national and the school levels, are expected to provide necessary conditions for the effectiveness of the teacher level. In this paper, the teacher level is also the emphasis.

There are eight factors in the teacher level i.e. 1) orientation, 2) structuring, 3) modeling, 4) application, 5) questioning, 6) assessment, 7) time management, dan 8) creating classroom as a learning environment (CLE). Orientation deals with teachers' attempt to explain the objectives of the lesson, which is expected to help students understand the importance of their learning activities. To achieve this goal, teachers can connect the lesson to students' daily life or previous lesson. Structuring is the explanation on series of activities that students are going to do during the lesson. Next, effective teachers are found to help students use strategies and/or develop their own strategies of learning through the provision of modeling. This activity should be completed with application, which is the provision of immediate exercise of topics taught during the lesson to provide learning opportunities for students to apply the strategies they learn during modeling stage. In addition, effective teachers raise various questions to lead classroom discussion and pay attention to students' engagement during the lesson. The questions should include both easy and difficult ones, both process and product questions.
For the ease of reading comprehension, product questions deal with questions, which answers are easily found in the text whereas process questions require students to go beyond the printed information in the texts.

Furthermore, effective teachers conduct assessment to make sure that their students understand the materials, to identify students who need more assistance, and to identify topics that need to be retaught. The data gathered during assessment are expected to enable teachers to improve their teaching. The next classroom factor of the dynamic model is CLE, which main objective is to optimize students' opportunity to learn. CLE could be established by building 1) teacher-student interaction, 2) student-student interaction, 3) students’ treatment by teachers, 4) competition among students, and 5) classroom disorder. Finally, management of time is important to maximize students’ engagement and make sure that they are on tasks throughout the lesson.

The above classroom factors of the dynamic model are used in this study to conceptualize teaching quality due to several reasons. Firstly, all the eight classroom factors of the dynamic model are developed based on the findings of previous teacher effectiveness research, and therefore they have been proved to affect student outcome. Secondly, the factors involve various teaching approaches especially constructivist and direct or mastery learning. Some components of constructivist approach included in the model are orientation, modeling and collaborative element in CLE. Both orientation and modeling in the dynamic model are expected to raise students' motivation in developing their metacognitive skill, which is one of the main objectives of constructivist approach. The components of direct or mastery learning included the model are structuring and questioning.

Thirdly, referring to the 2013 curriculum, the above factors are in line with scientific approach. The provision of modeling, for instance, is very similar to the process of observation in the scientific approach, where students see the model before they do some exercises during application period. Fourthly, the model was firstly established by Creemers (1994) and further developed through some studies especially in Cyprus. Antoniou, Demetriou, & Kyriakides (2006) for instance have examined the validity of the model through a longitudinal study in Cyprus. In 2009, one year after the model was formally launched; an experimental study on the use of the classroom factors of the dynamic model resulted in the improvement of both teaching quality and student achievement (Antoniou, 2009). The findings of this experimental study reveal that when teachers apply the classroom factors of the dynamic model, not only their teaching quality will improve, but also their student achievement. In Indonesia, an experimental study conducted by Aziziyah (2013) also shows that teaching quality and student achievement of the experimental group, which uses the classroom factors of the dynamic model as the materials of the teacher training in the group, are significantly better than the control group. Thus, the classroom factors of the dynamic model has been proved effective in improving teaching quality and student outcome, and therefore they are used as a conceptual framework to indicate the teaching quality of several state Islamic schools in DKI Jakarta.

2 METHOD
As previously indicated, this study was intended to investigate whether teachers practice the principles of effective teaching at their regular teaching practices. The study used mix method; the quantitative side used student and teacher questionnaires and structured classroom observation whereas the qualitative one used interview. Therefore the instruments used in this study were observation sheet, teacher and student questionnaire,
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2 METHOD

As previously indicated, this study was intended to investigate whether teachers practice the principles of effective teaching at their regular teaching practices. The study used mix method; the quantitative side used student and teacher questionnaires and structured classroom observation whereas the qualitative one used interview. Therefore the instruments used in this study were observation sheet, teacher and student questionnaire,
and interview sheet. The observation sheet consisted of 50 items, the teacher 50 questionnaire items and the student questionnaire 48 items. All items in the instruments represented the classroom factors of the dynamic model and used 1 – 5 (very low – very high) Likert scale. A pilot study was conducted to check the reliability of student questionnaire, which was very good (α = .83). Due to the small number of participating teachers (N <10) in the pilot study, no reliability analysis was carried out for the classroom observation the observation sheet and teacher questionnaire.

In this study, 22 English teachers and 556 students from six State Islamic Schools (3 Senior Secondary School [SSS] and 3 Junior Secondary School [JSS]) in Jakarta participated. The schools were selected because their students achieved high score in English in their national exam. The observation was conducted by trained observers to investigate the teaching quality of English teachers. The student questionnaire was used to ask to students to rate their teachers’ teaching quality while the teacher questionnaire was intended to ask the teachers to rate their own teaching quality. The interview was conducted to clarify and gather necessary information from the teachers.

All data were then inputted in SPSS and descriptive statistic was used to analyze the data. The first analysis presented the mean score of teaching quality as one factor resulted from observation instrument, the student and teacher questionnaire. The second analysis presented the mean score of different factors in order to know in which factors the teachers had their strengths and weaknesses. Finally, the results of all instruments were compared and analyzed.

3 FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The findings in this paper were presented in three parts. The first part described the picture of teaching quality in general, which was the mean score of all items in each instruments. The second part demonstrated the quality of the eight factors as explained in the research method. The last one explained the teaching and learning process based on the observation data.

3.1 The General Picture of Teaching Quality

This section presents the general picture of teaching quality, which is the sum of all items in the three instruments i.e. observation, student questionnaire and teacher questionnaire. The finding is divided based on the level of the school as described in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School (MAN)</td>
<td>Observers</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School (MIA)</td>
<td>Observers</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table reports that there were different perceptions of teaching quality among the teachers, the students, and the observer. The perception of teachers was the highest whereas that of the observers was the lowest. Out of 5 scales, the teachers in both SSS and JSS rated 3.7 whereas the observers 2.5 and 2.7 respectively. Similar to the teachers, students in both levels of school rated their teachers good. These finding mean that teachers themselves perceive that their teaching quality was good. On the other hand, the observers perceived that the teaching quality of the teachers was still low. In this case, the observers could be considered to be more independent to examine the teaching quality because they did not have any relation to the teacher. Different from the observers, the students might be hesitant to give less score to their teachers. Moreover, teacher in Indonesia is perceived to be one of the role models within society.

The next question is the strengths and the weaknesses of teachers according to the classroom factors of the dynamic model. This will be presented in the following section.

3.2 The Factors in Teaching Quality

This section describes the score of the teachers according to each factor of the dynamic model, which score is based on the sum of items in each factor. This is intended to understand in which factors teachers were good and in which factors they scored less. Similar to that of teaching quality, the findings are presented according to the level of school. However, only the data of the observer was presented due to the difference perception of teaching quality among the observer, the students, and the teachers as shown in Table 1. When all data were presented, it was difficult to interpret and draw conclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of School</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior Secondary School (MAN)</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom as a learning environment (CLE)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of Time</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Secondary School</td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table reports that there were different perceptions of teaching quality among the teachers, the students, and the observer. The perception of teachers was the highest whereas that of the observers was the lowest. Out of 5 scales, the teachers in both SSS and JSS rated 3.7 whereas the observers 2.5 and 2.7 respectively. Similar to the teachers, students in both levels of school rated their teachers good.

These findings mean that teachers themselves perceive that their teaching quality was good. On the other hand, the observers perceived that the teaching quality of the teachers was still low. In this case, the observers could be considered to be more independent to examine the teaching quality because they did not have any relation to the teacher. Different from the observers, the students might be hesitant to give less score to their teachers. Moreover, teacher in Indonesia is perceived to be one of the role models within society.

The next question is the strengths and the weaknesses of teachers according to the classroom factors of the dynamic model. This will be presented in the following section.

### 3.2 The Factors in Teaching Quality

This section describes the score of the teachers according to each factor of the dynamic model, which score is based on the sum of items in each factor. This is intended to understand in which factors teachers were good and in which factors they scored less. Similar to that of teaching quality, the findings are presented according to the level of school. However, only the data of the observer was presented due to the difference perception of teaching quality among the observer, the students, and the teachers as shown in table 1. When all data were presented, it was difficult to interpret and draw conclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior Secondary School (MAN)</strong></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modeling</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom as a learning environment (CLE)</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Management of Time</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Structuring</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 conveys quite a lot of information. However, this section highlights only several important findings. Firstly, according to the observer, structuring at both SSS and JSS was the lowest compared to other factors, which indicated that teachers did not really practice structuring activities. This might happen because teachers understood structuring as mainly explaining the topic of the lesson whereas they were expected to also explain the series of activities students were going to do in order to achieve the learning goals and to signal the transition among different activities.

Secondly, teachers at Senior Secondary School (SSS) performed best in assessment. The only factor that scored above 3 for teachers in this level of school was assessment. Different from this, teachers Junior Secondary School (JSS) performed relatively good as they scored above 3 in more factors i.e., questioning, application, CLE, and management of time. Overall, these findings meant that orientation, structuring, and modeling were difficult activities whereas the other factors could be considered to be relatively easy for teachers.

3.3 The Teaching and Learning Process

In this section, only the observation data was presented. This is because the observers were previously trained in using the observation instrument and therefore they could be considered to have more knowledge of the concept of teaching quality used in this study. In addition, the data gathered from interview from teachers were used to further explain the findings resulted from observation.

Firstly, concerning orientation, the teachers were found to rarely provide the objectives of the lesson. To begin their lesson, some teachers invited students to review previous lessons, which were good. Several teachers also started to connect the lesson to students’ daily life. Nevertheless, there were also several teachers who only greeted their students and called for student attendance during orientation stage, which normally take place in the beginning of the lesson. Furthermore, they did not maximize the applications of the orientation such as reviewing the material, describing the teaching objectives related to daily activities, and challenging the students to identify the reason why a particular topic should be learned.

In terms of structuring, effective teachers explain series of activities during the lesson and signal the transition among the activities. In this study, the structuring activity conducted by most teachers is limited to the explanation of the topic covered during the lesson. Although in some occasions they signal the transition among the activities, they did not previously mention to the students the activities that they would do during the
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Secondly, teachers at Senior Secondary School (SSS) performed best in assessment. The only factor that scored above 3 for teachers in this level of school was assessment. Different from this, teachers Junior Secondary School (JSS) performed relatively good as they scored above 3 in more factors i.e., questioning, application, CLE, and management of time. Overall, these findings meant that orientation, structuring, and modeling were difficult activities whereas the other factors could be considered to be relatively easy for teachers.

### 3.3 The Teaching and Learning Process

In this section, only the observation data was presented. This is because the observers were previously trained in using the observation instrument and therefore, they could be considered to have more knowledge of the concept of teaching quality used in this study. In addition, the data gathered from interviews with teachers were used to further explain the findings resulted from observation.

Firstly, concerning orientation, the teachers were found to rarely provide the objectives of the lesson. To begin their lesson, some teachers invited students to review previous lessons, which were good. Several teachers also started to connect the lesson to students’ daily life. Nevertheless, there were also several teachers who only greeted their students and called for student attendance during orientation stage, which normally take place in the beginning of the lesson. Furthermore, they did not maximize the applications of the orientation such as reviewing the material, describing the teaching objectives related to daily activities, and challenging the students to identify the reason why a particular topic should be learned.

In terms of structuring, effective teachers explain series of activities during the lesson and signal the transition among the activities. In this study, the structuring activity conducted by most teachers is limited to the explanation of the topic covered during the lesson. Although in some occasions they signal the transition among the activities, they did not previously mention to the students the activities that they would do during the
lesson. A more meaningful information such as the explanation on the competence that the students had to master was not observed.

Furthermore, in the modeling stage where effective teachers provide learning strategies that students can use to solve problems or exercises that teachers will give during application stage, the teachers at Senior Secondary Schools were found not to provide enough learning strategies for their students. It was possible that the strategies were already taught in the previous lesson while more exercises (application) were provided when the observation was conducted. Nevertheless, the teachers did not engage students by asking them to explain the strategies they know to solve their exercises. In contrast, many teachers at Junior Secondary Schools were observed to practice modeling by asking students the strategies to solve the exercises that they would have to finish during the lesson. The teachers facilitated the activity by asking questions and elaborating the answers raised by students. In this part also, the teacher could remember well the students’ names and also paid attention to their pronunciation. In this way, the teachers were able to also create good interaction between the teachers and the students. Some teachers of this level of school explained that their students would be able to finish their work better and faster when they understood how to solve their exercises.

Related to application, the teachers at the Junior Secondary School (JSS) were found to have more activities than teachers at the Senior Secondary School (SSS). The teachers at the SSS did not only provide the exercises but also monitored, supervised, and provided supportive feedback to their students. Some teachers at this level also grouped their students into several groups and helped clarifying the tasks when the students did not really understand. Different from this, most teachers at the SSS used only individual task during the application stage and the activities were limited to answering provided questions in the textbooks. However, teachers at both level of school were similar in that they did not provide differentiated texts or tasks to students to address different group of students. In addition, most teachers did not encourage low-achieving students to be more active.

With respect to questioning, nearly all teachers posed questions throughout the lesson. They also praised their students when they could answer the questions correctly. However, when the students could not answer their questions, only several provided clues or hint to help students answer the questions correctly. Instead, the teachers in both SSS and JSS tended to translate the questions in Bahasa Indonesia when the students could not answer the questions correctly. In addition, the questions raised did not really promote students’ critical thinking because the questions raised were related to who, what, when, and where. In this case, questions concerning why and how were not really introduced.

Next, teachers were found to be relatively good in building the classroom as a learning environment. Only a few teachers were observed not to be able to create a supportive environment for learning. In the process of teaching and learning, teachers could provide students the time for both explanation and tasks. Teacher provided relevant feedback and gave positive reaction to students. Some teachers also returned students’ work so that they could learn from their mistakes. In addition, the responsibility of teachers could be proved not only in the process of teaching in the class but also outside of the class. The teachers invited students to respect and to use the school rules and creating a businesslike and supportive environment for learning.

Concerning time management, most of the teachers were not really good in managing the time. Not many teachers invite the students to finish the learning tasks on time by including time allotment in each phase of student activities. Therefore, it was observable that some students did not actually finish their tasks. Nevertheless, in the classroom observation, the teachers came and finished the teaching-learning process on