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Abstract
This study aimed at improving the teaching skills of prospective physical education teachers by using the drill guide method. The design used was Classroom Action Research from S. Kemmis and R. McTaggart involving 41 research subjects. Data for each cycle were taken by using teaching skill observation guidelines and in-depth interviews. The data were analysed descriptively. The improvement of the subjects’ teaching skills from the Pre Cycle to Cycle 1 was 86,4%, from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2 was 12,8%, and from Cycle 2 to Cycle 3 was 16,7%. The fastest improving item was to wear clean and neat clothes (3,95) and the slowest one was to relate the material to other fields of science (2,46). From the result, it can be concluded that the drill guide method is one of the best methods that can be applied when educators (lecturers or teachers) are giving a skill guidance.
INTRODUCTION

Teachers can have abundant knowledge. However, to be competent, teachers need the right way to deliver knowledge units, behaviors, and skills to their students. Every teacher and prospective teacher highly require skills when teaching (Dhillon, 2014), to make it easier to organize quality learning activities. Teaching the teaching skills can train prospective teachers to be more confident, to encourage the use of appropriate learning strategies, and to make a good plan and self-regulation (Mansur, 2016). In addition, by mastering the components of teaching skills, students become more active in learning process (Ambarawati, 2016), and are able to improve learning practices, improve the quality of learning, and improve their learning outcomes (Gibbs & Coffey, 2004; Mansur, 2016; Safitri & Sontani, 2016; Blegur, Wasak, & Manu, 2017).

Training the teaching skills up can be implicitly taught in a variety of subjects, however the course that specifically and explicitly trains up the teaching skills is microteaching. Microteaching assists prospective teachers to teach systematically, whether from the aspects of understanding, planning, implementation, or observation (Helmiati, 2013) as well as develops teaching skills of prospective teachers (Syafi’i, 2014). Microteaching can also be dealt with the concept of peer teaching, the main goal is similar to the formation of mastery of teaching skills (Ismail, 2015).

Before doing the internship program in schools, prospective teachers need to practice and improve their teaching skills. This preparation process lasts for one semester to ensure that prospective teachers are truly capable of and competent in orchestrating their learning. In fact, most of the prospective teachers still have not yet used their teaching skills maximally at the beginning of the microteaching meeting (see table 1). This data was feared to have an impact on the learning process that will be implemented by prospective teacher when doing internship program in schools.

Teachers’ competence can be identified from their ability to streamline approaches, methods, and learning strategies with expertise, personality, and social relations to explore students’ potential (Blegur, Wasak, & Manu, 2017). One of its manifestations is through guided drill methods for this method helps students to have practical learning in order to have better skills over the materials are being studied (Roestiyah, 2012). The guided drill method has been introduced by researchers in their learning inquiries for students’ self-development, including improving understanding (Ratnaningsih, 2012), short story, writing skills (Sudarti, 2017), and ability to paraphrase advertisements (Pramestiswari, Sudiana, & Astika, 2017), problem-solving skills (Kusumawati & Irwanto, 2016), and streamline students’ learning outcomes (Susilowati, Santosa, & Hamidi, 2013; Handayani, 2013; Nurhayati, Redjeki, & Utami, 2013). Besides, the drill method for skills is also proven the improvement of students’ writing skills (Prayitno, 2013; Yuliana, Rustono, & Hodidjah, 2017) and reading skills (Yunita, 2017).

Table 1. Teaching skills of prospective teachers in the internship program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>51,1707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8,92441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the drilling method for skills has been useful to improve students’ abilities, skills, and learning outcomes, it has not yet been optimized to improve the teaching skills of prospective teachers. Though looking at the research above, the drill guide method can be used as an alternative method to improve the teaching skills of prospective teachers. Because teaching is a skill, so that the method based on more exercises gives more opportunities for the achievement of improvement in teaching skills. Teachers will conduct guided teaching exercises on the skills required by prospective teachers in carrying out the learning process.

Prospective teachers need to be trained to use many inputs and improvements so that they are accustomed to practice using skillsets in carrying out simula-
tions and demonstrations about learning activities. Moreover, the drill guide method is a process to help the prospective teachers to apply a quality learning when they become real teachers in the future. Therefore, this study was aimed at improving the teaching skills of prospective physical education teachers in Microteaching courses using the drill guide method.

METHODS

Research Design and Subjects

The study used classroom action research design so that actions for improving skills were the main focus of researchers in managing drill guide methods and considering the views of prospective teachers in designing other actions in the research cycles. Each action manifested in the research cycles; plan, action, observe, and reflect of Kemmis & McTaggart (1988), so that prospective teachers succeed in having good teaching skills following the teaching skills observation guide based on the perimeter of the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Artha Wacana Christian University. The research subjects involved were prospective teachers class A, semester VI in academic year 2018/2019 totaling 41 students, consisting of 4 females and 37 males (M = 23,2927, SD = 1,99053).

Data Collection Techniques

To elicit data and information regarding teaching skills, researchers used teaching skills observation guidelines developed by the Artha Wacana Christian University Learning Laboratory in 2018 which is also used by the committee in implementing the internship program in the Educational Unit.

This observation guidelines consist of four main indicators, namely: 1) Pre-learning, 2) Open the learning, 3) Content learning, and 4) Close the learning. Observers only gave responses on the 4 scale points that have already prepared in line with the guidelines (30 items closed). The guideline was used when prospective teachers were ready to be evaluated (observed) their teaching skills, so that in the period before the assessment, the subjects were accompanied and equipped with drill guide method for their teaching skills during one semester of Microteaching class.

In-depth interviews were used to probe subjects who have not maximally developed their teaching skills yet. The results of in-depth interview underlied the researchers designing actions in the next cycles. Researchers and peers also interviewed the subjects’ attitude and motivation in doing the learning practice and the efficiency and effectiveness of drill guide method.

Subjects’ negligence was reduced and tabulated in the form of in-depth interviews. This is an exploration effort so that the data, designed for cycles, fully answers the problems in teaching skills and considers the subjects’ psycho-social development during the learning process. Some of these questions were the examples, “What difficulties do you experience in teaching practice?”, “Can the drill guide method help improve your teaching skills?”, “Why are you not comfortable teaching in front?”

Data Analysis Technique

The research data were analyzed qualitatively and quantitatively. Quantitative analysis relates to the subjects’ decisions of teaching skills in accordance with table 2. Whereas the qualitative analysis used is qualitative analysis of Spardley (1979) model by limiting the domain of causality, rationality, ways to goals, and functions. These domains were used to provide procedural meaning and specific semiotic relationships from the application of drill guide method to improve the teaching skills of subjects in each cycle of actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>103-120</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85-102</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67-84</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-66</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-48</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Incomplete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This research was carried out in 3 main cycles. The first cycle was conducted for 4 meetings, the second cycle was for 2 meetings, and the third cycle was for 2 meetings. Microteaching relates to the mastery and development of teaching skills, so that during the
learning process, the focus was only on improving the teaching skills of prospective physical education teachers in the form of study groups using drill guide methods.

**Cycle 1**

**Plan**

Planning was underlied on the results of prospective teachers’ teaching skills in pre-cycle (see table 1), teachers then designed learning scenarios to improve the teaching skills of prospective teachers. The design of the scenario was the application of the drill guide method. The drill guide method is a learning activity oriented to teachers’ activity guidance to individuals through certain exercises.

The case in this study, the drilling activities that coaches want to guide are the teaching skills of prospective physical education teachers. There were seven stages were applied in the drill guide method, namely: 1) Enrich the information, experience, and goals of prospective teachers about drill, 2) Divide prospective teachers into small training groups, 3) Do exercises, 4) Diagnose skills trained, 5) Explore drill difficulties, 6) Focus on skill guidance and the solutions, and 7) Final test.

Coaches provided opportunities for prospective teachers to choose their learning materials they want to orchestrate to give a little “comfort” for them in mastering the material and their passion in teaching. However, some videos on physical educational learning have also been distributed and played to enrich the visualization of prospective teachers about the physical education learning process using scientific learning methods.

Observation sheet for teaching skills were prepared by coaches. Interview guidelines prepared as well to localize teaching difficulties that were not answered in the observation guidelines. Also, interview guidelines were used to explore the exercise difficulties from the perspective of prospective teachers while discussing with groups is to find and equate perceptions of further solution action.

**Action**

The implementation of the actions were characterized by teaching activities carried out by prospective teachers according to the division of groups. They alternately taught according to the material and the time specified. This teaching activity was carried out by departmental methods, so that they began teaching in the introductory component first, proceed to the content, and end with a closing with a maximum allocation of 15 minutes for each person per part of learning. So each person taught using 45 minutes but separately. During teaching, the observers were his/her peers (one group).

When the first person taught (hereinafter referred to as a facilitator), then the second participant did the observation, and the other participants became the participants who were taught. Furthermore, if the second participant taught, then the third participant observed and the other participants as participants taught (including the first participant). After finishing the teaching process, all of them evaluated teaching skills in groups before being reported or submitted to coaches. The focus of group discussion was on exploring teaching difficulties that facilitators applied and the solutions they offered to improve facilitator teaching skills.

**Observe**

Peer observations referred to the assessment rubric that all facilitators already have to emphasize on peer subjectivity in assessing teaching skills. Besides, peer observation was also an initial exercise for the facilitator. This initial exercise was as a process for them to assess and improve their teaching skills following the results of observations. While coaches did the same observation, but it was in the syntax aspects of the drill guide method and crucial field notes that the facilitators performed during carrying out the learning process.

Observations were more direct and guided. In this sense, when finding crucial cases, coaches immediately gave corrections. Thus, the capacity of coaches during carrying out the learning process were more on direct guidance, because the activities that the facilitators did were by involving skills that still need more for improvement. This action aimed to stimulate the facilitators to practice systematic teaching skills, for example in using supportive verbal and non-verbal communication.

**Reflect**

Reflection from Cycle 1 indicated that facilitators who have not met the completeness criteria are 65.8%
The average value of teaching skills items that have not been optimized by facilitators were as follows: 1) Conducting the apperception and conveying learning objectives (2,76), 2) Relating material to other fields of knowledge (1,59), 3) Openness toward students’ liveliness (2,51), 4) Stimulating students to actively solve problems (2,41), 5) Conducting assessments in accordance with learning objectives (1,95), and 6) Providing follow-up after learning (2,07).

Thus, the improvement efforts made in Cycle 2 were to guide learning activities in the packaging “play and games” to encourage problem-solving activities and developed self-confidence through various performance appreciation that students produce. The facilitators were also guided so that they were accustomed to giving applause, thumbs up, or supporting students by saying: “The movement is good, but pay attention again to the position of you feet to produce the right kick”.

Efforts to solve other learning problems were by guiding students’ movement activities from simple activities to the complex (for example from material without new media to using media or dividing motion tasks into stages and rationalization) then ending with playing activities as the accumulation.

**Cycle 2**

**Plan**

Planning in Cycle 2 began with the change of the use of teaching time. If in Cycle 1 learning took place over 4 meetings, then in Cycle 2 was only 2 meetings conducted, because the time spent by the facilitator when teaching was not departmental, but universal. It means that the facilitator started teaching from the preliminary to closing activities using 25 minutes so that in one meeting (3 hours of learning) 20 people taught from four different drill groups.

The teaching cycle was still the same, but strengthened at the content of learning, where the facilitator only taught one learning material, i.e “Kicking the ball with the inner leg”. This was an effort to deepen the teaching skills of facilitators according to the allocation of 15 minutes, because the remaining 5 minutes were used for preliminary and closing activities. Also, by teaching one material, the facilitator was more expressive about sensitizing so that learning was systematic, comprehensive, interactive, and empowering to answer the teaching difficulties that facilitators experienced in cycle 1.

**Action**

The implementation of the action was still similar to Cycle 1, the facilitators carried out learning under the material they have set themselves. However, they were recommended not to teach using the previous material. The reason was because they were prospective teachers, so they must familiarize themselves with the experiences of teaching in all learning materials, material from football, volleyball, athletics, and so on. When carrying out learning, the observers immediately assessed all the skills in the observation guide (30 items).

The facilitators were encouraged to be able to organize the learning process according to time allocation (5 minutes introduction, 15 core minutes, and 5 minutes closing). Thus, they must ensured that each composition of teaching skills could be carried out well during the time they are used. The facilitators were free to improvise as well as engineer the learning atmosphere to be able to present active, participatory, joyful, and efficient learning. Rotation done was similar to the previous cycles, so the observers alternately became the facilitator after they had done their task.

**Observe**

Peer observation was still around guiding facilitator teaching skills. While coaches observed the teaching skills area that facilitators have not maximized in their teaching practices. However, the facilitators did not seem to experience difficulties while teaching in Cycle 2, because some of the problems they already knew in

---

**Table 3. Results of reflection on teaching skills of**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48,8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 86,5854

SD 10,92240
cycle 1, as well as coaches made direct improvements while teaching, so the facilitator already had the initial information and skills while conducting the learning process.

To be noted, coaches also immediately gave correction practices to the learning practice of facilitators when they neglected to organize the learning activities. For instance, when teaching kicking material using the inner leg, the coaches gave an example of improving the initial position of the student when he or she practiced the movements incorrectly. Observations were not conducted on one group, the coaches also rotated during the observation (group 1 to group 2 to group 3, and group 4 and vice versa). This action implied that the drill guide method was not limited to the process of assessing, but more essence is in the process of mentoring and improvement during the exercises.

**Reflect**

Reflections on the observation result in Cycle 2 showed that the participants’ teaching skills were classified as good, but 31,7% still did not meet the criteria for completeness (see table 4). Overall there were 6 skill items with the lowest average value, namely 1) Items explaining the material clearly, comprehensively, and contextually (2,9), 2) Items associating material with other fields of science (1,66), 3) Items stimulating students to actively solve problems (2,2), 4) Items monitoring student learning progress (2,49), 5) Items carrying out assessments according to learning objectives (1,98), and 6) Items providing follow-up after learning (2,22). Thus it was necessary to emphasize and habituate drill through teaching activities so that facilitators were more intense and innovative in developing the 6 items of teaching skills.

Efforts to make improvements were still relying on direct assistance and efforts to confirm teaching skills from coaches through educative communications but were more individualistic. For instance, when teaching, a facilitators recorded aspects of student learning outcomes, such as cognitive aspects (students did not know why the knee was bent when doing repulsion in long jump), affective aspects (students did not have cooperation in playing football), psychomotor aspects (students did not have the right-hand position when swinging the forearm passing in volleyball). This note was important so that they have objective data when evaluating learning activities.

**Table 4. Results of reflection on teaching skills of**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>91,8537</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8,68205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cycle 3**

**Plan**

Cycle 3 was planned not to be in the form of drill groups so that observations and assessments were carried out by peers. However, coaches themselves directly observed and assessed the teaching skill of facilitators, so that they took turns in the learning process. Why was this done in Cycle 3? Because coaches needed to confirm the results of observations made by peers in previous cycles (Cycle 1 and Cycle 2) to ensure peer observations on facilitators’ teaching skills were objective and accountable. However, the facilitators continued to use their group as the taught participants, so that participants from other groups acted as observers who could not judge directly as the coaches did.

Each facilitator was asked to prepare himself/herself, both technically and non-technically to organize the learning process. The facilitators’ teaching activities still used the same assessment instruments and rubrics during the teaching period in the group (drill period). Each facilitator taught for 30 minutes with a proportion of 7,5 minutes for introduction, 15 minutes for the contents, and 7,5 minutes for closing with one learning material, such as “Overhead passing in volleyball games.”

**Action**

The implementation of Cycle 3 was more of a final test, because in the previous cycle (Cycle 1 and Cycle
2) prospective teachers had passed the drilling process, diagnosed teaching skills, explored the difficulties of teaching practice and conducted guidance and solutions to teaching skills. The facilitators taught for 30 minutes based on the sequence of the scheduled attendance and used the rehearsal group that the used during the drill, so that other individuals acted as learners and no longer acted as observers.

Before they were on the final test, each facilitator first provided learning tools and introduced the media that he/she used in learning activities to coaches (observer and assessor). Furthermore, all the time (30 minutes) was given to the facilitator to organize learning activities in accordance with the assessment rubric but still orchestrated according to the facilitators’ teaching preferences. Learning ended when coaches blew long syringes and continue with other facilitators. Because this was the final test, there was no improvement, both from peers and coaches (except for the importance of evaluation after all have passed the final test).

**Observe**

The process of peer observation was in line with the long syringes as the sign to start the learning process to the end of the learning process carried out by the facilitators. All observation activities were focused on the facilitators’ teaching skills that have been made in the assessment instruments and rubrics (30 items). starting from pre-learning (preparing places and learning media and checking learners’ readiness) until closing learning (implementing cooling down, evaluating learning materials, giving follow-up after learning, attendance, and praying).

In the opening part of learning, coaches also observed a number of activities, including praying, doing apperception and delivering learning goals, as well as carrying out warming up). While the core part of learning, observation activities starting from the appearance of the facilitators when teaching (there were 3 items), the use of learning media (there were 2 items), mastery of learning material (there were 2 items), use of learning methods (there were 7 items), learning that stimulates learning activity (there were 4 items), as well as assessment of the learning process (there were 2 items). The indicators mentioned were the main focus of observation because the learning process was related to teaching skills. Each indicator was assessed at 4 scale points, so the highest value of teaching skills was 120 and the lowest was 30.

**Reflect**

Reflections on observations in Cycle 3 showed that prospective physical education teachers, individually and classically, had teaching skills that meet the completeness criteria, which was 92,7% (see table 5) so that this action research was ended in Cycle 3. Although the prospective teachers have met the completeness criteria individually and classically, it does not mean that they have been “perfect” in teaching. Some skill items require attention and improvement while they strengthen and develop the skill items that are already good. This is an affirmation that teaching skills can change according to the needs of the times.

**Table 5. Results of reflection on teaching skills of**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>56,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>98,7073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8,91135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facilitators must always reflect on the skills they have now and then adapt again to the skill needs in the future, it could be the skills to use technology to monitor the progress of learning and evaluate the learning outcomes of their students. A summary of the aspects of teaching skills that the facilitators should pay attention to in the future is on skill items: 1) Linking material to other fields of science (2,46), 2) Openness to student activity (2,76), 3) Stimulating students to actively solve problems (2,56), 4) Monitoring student learning progress (2,66), 5) Conducting assessments according to learning objectives (2,59), 6) Providing post-learning follow-up (2,51).
There were facilitators who quickly experience progress and success and some were slow. Facilitators experienced the progress higher than the transition period in the pre Cycle to Cycle 1 because more time is needed with the depersonalization method, the drilling process is higher and the coaches’ guidance is also more maximal on each teaching skill item. The role of the coaches in the drill guide method is very important because he must drill and guide the facilitators to have good teaching skills (Sudarti, 2017). Coaches more focused on providing direct guidance to make it easier for the facilitators to do the description, imitation, direct analysis, and be creative about the teaching skills they do.

In addition, coaches also focused on improvements to guidance activities as well as neglected elements of the drill (teaching skills), including facilitating facilitators to relate the material to other fields of science. For example, facilitators were guided to teach by integrating the knowledge of English in a count of motion stages (simply: one, two, three, four). In addition, they could use physics for a 45-degree hand position before making forearm passing in volleyball. When guidance was carried out directly, it was easier for other facilitators to adapt to the information and examples practiced. Although it was not short, there was an equilibration process in cognitive structures which was then manifested in the form of teaching skills.
The low teaching skills in the pre-cycle as evidence that the facilitators were not used to do various drilling skills. Why was that? Because in the semester lesson plan, it was clearly outlined the instruments and rubrics for the assessment of teaching skills, but the facilitators still had difficulty in teaching. Thus, the drill guide method is one of the right options and is proven to help the facilitator improve his teaching skills. This is because the drill guide method is able to stimulate the facilitators to instill habits through a process of reflection and evaluation when using teaching skills to be agile, right, to become skilled when carrying out the learning process (Djamarah & Zain, 2010; Roestiyah, 2012; Mardiana, Margiati, & Halidjah, 2015).

Microteaching is a training technique for prospective teachers to learn teaching skills (Banga, 2014). Microteaching provides real teaching experience and the opportunity to practice a number of basic teaching skills separately and gradually (Helmiati, 2013) so that the drill guide method is very relevant to microteaching-learning. The drilling method is a process that is widely used in aspects of learning centered on skill acquisition (Kani & Sa’ad, 2015).

The scientific journal Tambak (2016) once described 5 weaknesses of drill methods, including the tendency to learn mechanically, cause boredom, turn off creativity, give rise to verbalism, lead to static adjustments to the environment. To overcome these, teachers need to place the method as a learning procedure, so that students take the time to create and make conception according to their own potential and learning material potential because such strategies can also shape academic self-concepts (Blegur, Wasak, & Pabala, 2018), besides practice skills. Another step is to determine the skills assessment rubric so that it suppresses intervention from teachers while encouraging students to be creative, expressive, and dynamic in managing learning material in accord with the objectives.

Drill guide method provides opportunities for learners to get used to solving problems (Kusumawati & Irwanto, 2016), improving cognitive abilities (Sari, Suarni, & Ambara, 2014), critical and creative thinking skills (Sianturi, 2012), and student learning outcomes (Juniati, 2017). In conclusion, drilling activities and guidance can develop psychomotor domains, cognitive domains and affective domains of students, although coaches who carried out guidance should focus on improving the skills trained.

Coaches can refer to skills indicators, make appropriate diagnoses during the drilling and are open to various solutions. This means that the aspirations of students through interviews also underlie the formulation of problem-solving skills. Even though drilling activities are oriented towards learning practices such as repetition of concepts, examples, and systematic practice problems (Lim, Tang, & Kor, 2012) yet still build learning situations that are active, communicative, and interactive, using humanistic feedback, and objective and comprehensive assessment and evaluation of learning outcomes as an embodiment of a quality learning process (Blegur & Wasak, 2017; Pentury & Anggraeni, 2019).

CONCLUSION

Learning objectives formulated by educators (lecturers and teachers) require appropriate learning methods and strategies so that educators must be selective in formulating their learning methods so that prospective teachers can achieve learning goals effectively and efficiently. The drill guide method is proven to be able to improve the teaching skills of prospective physical education teachers in 3 research cycles. Educators at both university and school level, middle and basic levels, can apply and develop the drill guide method in their learning classes.

The drill guide method is not only limited to improve the skills of prospective teachers but also to encourage them to be able to become objective assessors through assessment rubrics (although there are some not yet, but only 7.31%), individuals who are able to collaborate in study groups, become persons who care about others because they want to share knowledge and skills, and are critical and creative because they have to be able to identify various difficulties as well as solutions in improving teaching skills. Teaching activities related to skills require an intense and periodic drill and guidance so that learning based on teaching skills should be protected by 2 or 3 teachers in a single learning class.
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