



Proceedings of the 1st English Education International Conference (EEIC) in conjunction with the 2nd Reciprocal Graduate Research Symposium (RGRS) of the Consortium of Asia-Pacific Education Universities (CAPEU) between Sultan Idris Education University and Syiah Kuala University

November 12-13, 2016, Banda Aceh, Indonesia



THE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS' ABILITY IN MAKING THE PROPOSAL OF CLASSROOM ACTION RESEARCH

Tri Murni

Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh, INDONESIA

Email: tri.murni.iy@gmail.com

Abstract

Professional teachers in Indonesia have to be able to make a proposal and do a Classroom Action Research (CAR). Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to describe the teachers' achievement in making the proposal of CAR while they are on the Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Profesi Guru (PLPG) or Education and Training of Professional Teachers (ETPT). The method used is descriptive quantitative, and the data were analyzed by using item analysis. The data of this research were the teachers' proposal of CAR submitted during their training in Banda Aceh. The sample was taken from 30 teachers of junior high schools. The teachers attending the training were from several districts, namely from Great Aceh (6 teachers), North Aceh (7 teachers), Bireuen (4 teachers), Singkil (6 teachers), Pidie (5 teachers), and Tamiang (2 teachers). The instrument used to assess the teachers' proposal of CAR was taken from the guide book of ETPT. The components to be evaluated were: 1) the Title, 2) Introduction (a, b, c), 3) Problems (a, b, c), 4) Purpose, 5) Benefit, 6) Review of Literature (a, b), 7) Method of research (a, b, c, d), 8) Schedule, 9) References, and 10) Language used. These were fourteen criteria that have to be scored based on the completeness of the component. The results of this study showed that 15 teachers scored well in writing their proposal of CAR. Among these, one teacher achieved the scores perfectly, five got excellent, and nine got sufficient. From the result of index difficulty, there are thirteen criteria that are easy for the teachers to write their proposal, the criteria are numbers 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6a, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 10. Next, the three criteria that are difficult are numbers 3c, 6b, and 7d. Then, there are two criteria that are fair (numbers 8 and 9). From those results, it can be said that only half of the participants have the ability in writing a good proposal of CAR, meanwhile the other half still faces difficulty. This means that their writing on the proposal of CAR still needs to be improved.

Keywords: Teachers' ability, ETPT, Classroom Action Research.

INTRODUCTION

As stated in Law no. 20/2003 about the system of national education, in Chapter 3, educational system functions as to develop the nation's life as one purpose of national independence (Kemendikbud, 2003). That is why the teachers' effort to develop the quality of learning in class is an honorable deed. Classroom Action Research or CAR is a process in which teachers investigate teaching and learning in order to improve their own teaching and their students' learning. It is conducted not only to discover the effective teaching and learning methods, but also to train teachers to think reflectively about their profession and performances (Schon, 1983).

CAR means to improve the students' result of learning (Carr & Kemmis, 1986). The action must be hooked to learning and related to the teachers' effort in the learning process. Furthermore, CAR is not only as usual as teaching but must contain a meaning, that the action is done based on an effort to improve better results than before. Next, CAR is a collaborative research which states classification of some interesting problems that are felt together by a group of teachers. Every one (in that group) expresses problems in his or her mind or those found in the classroom. It should investigate problems and find another person to look into the most important part of the problems and together they find solutions that can be done. This activity of research is one competence which must be mastered by a professional teacher. However, in reality, teachers seldom do this activity. The reasons are because they have less ability and experiences to do research; they have limitation of time because to do a research often makes them have to leave their teaching hours, need more time to read, finances, and so on.

In education, especially in the learning activity, CAR is very advantageous for teachers to enhance the standard process and the learning achievement in class (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). In implementing the steps of CAR, teachers can find solutions to the problems appearing in their own class, not other teachers' class, by applying various theories and relevant learning technique creatively. Besides that, as an applied research, teachers can implement their major duty in class and they do not have to miss their teaching hours to do so. Therefore, CAR is a research which solves actual problems faced by teachers in the field. By applying CAR, teachers have dual roles: as practitioners and researchers.

The purpose of CAR is to change teacher's learning behavior, students' behavior in class, and/or to change the framework in carrying out the learning in a teacher's classroom. CAR is a research designed to help a teacher find out what is happening in his or her classroom, and to use that information to make wise decisions for the future. So, CAR usually means to develop skills or new learning and for problem solving by directly application in class room. It functions as a tool to improve teaching and learning quality in the classroom.

Based on the explanation above, this study is important to do in order to know the junior high school teachers' ability in making a CAR proposal after they were given ten hours of workshop or training and practicing in making the proposal.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The Definition of Classroom Action Research

Cross (1987) said that CAR is geared to self-improvement since it is designed, conducted, and used by teachers themselves. Next, Carr and Kemmis (1986) explained that CAR is a form of self-reflection conducted by participants (teacher, student, headmaster, etc.) in social situation (including education) to repair rationality and the truth. Then, Mills (2003) said CAR is any systematic inquiry conducted by teacher researchers' to gather information about how their particular school operates, how they teach, and how well their students learn. Furthermore, McNiff (1988) saw CAR as a form of a reflective research conducted by the teachers themselves and the results of which can be utilized as a tool for the development of teaching skill.

Therefore, it can be concluded that CAR is a process in which teachers investigate teaching and learning so as to improve their own students' learning. It is one of the most innovative approaches in the education field. It is conducted not only to discover effective teaching learning methods but also to train teachers to think reflectively of their profession and performance (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988). It is clear that CAR is done in order to make the teachers to be able to do introspection, to look back at oneself, to reflect or evaluate oneself so that their ability as teachers or educators are professional. By improving their ability, it can also influence their students' qualities in the aspects of intelligence, skill, knowledge, social relation, and others for students to be adults. By applying CAR, it means that a teacher as a researcher is always ready to improve their teaching quality. The effort to enhance their teaching quality is done systematically, realistically, and rationally. Another collaborator is also involved to observe all their action in class so that the teacher really knows his or her weakness and strength.

Based on the explanation above, it can be concluded that CAR is a research done systematically that reflects any action done by the teacher and also as a researcher. This is because the

arrangement of planning till the evaluation toward the real action in the classroom is in the form of teaching and learning activities that help improve teaching and learning condition. The main reason for CAR is for teachers to engage in the improvement of their own teaching (Hopkins, 1985) and leads teachers to come to their own understandings about their own teaching (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1990).

The Systematics of Classroom Action Research Proposal for ETPT

In Indonesia, to become a professional teacher, one must go for the *Pendidikan dan Pelatihan Profesi Guru* (PLPG) or Education and Training of Professional Teachers (ETPT) after obtaining their Bachelor's degree in Education. Near the end of this training, they are to practice their teaching directly in school with students in the classroom. During this training, every teacher is to write a proposal for CAR before they teach in class. Following Depdikbud (1999), Soedarsono (1997) and Tim PGSM (1999), the proposal typically consists of:

Title

The title of a CAR must be stated accurately and the problem is clear. The form of action which is done by the researcher as efforts to solve the problem must be mentioned. The formulation of title should be concise, clear, and simple.

Introduction or the Background of Problem

The background of problem should describe the urgency of handling the problems which are proposed through CAR. For that, it must show real facts which come from the teacher's long observation and review of literature. Supports such as any earlier research results will strengthen the argumentation about the urgency and problem signification which will be handled through the proposed CAR. Specific characteristics of CAR differs from other formal research is reflected in this part.

Research Problem and Problem Solving

Problems which are proposed to be handled in CAR are described in detailed in this part. The problems raised from daily problems at school are suitable and need to be solved through CAR. The description of problems in the proposal should start from problem identification, continued to problem analysis, reflection, and problem description. In this part, the form of CAR must show consistency and ways to propose on how to solve the problems.

Research Purpose

The purpose of CAR is formulated clearly between the beginning and the improvement of the last action; the purpose of formulation must be consistent with the proposed problem. Automatically, the articulation of CAR's purpose is different with formal research purpose. Next, the achievement of purpose is able to verify objectively, and can be evaluated quantitatively.

The Advantage of Research

The advantages of CAR also need to be described. The advantages need to be stated specifically, especially for the students as direct beneficiaries of the result of CAR, besides for the teacher as the doer of CAR, for teacher's colleagues, also for the lecturers as educators of the Education Institution. Differing from formal research contexts, the advantage for the development of knowledge, technology and art are not a priority in the CAR context, thus the probability of it is accepted.

Review of Literature

In this part, the basic substantive theory and methodology which is used by the researcher in deciding alternatives to be implemented is described. For this purpose, the study and experiences of the researcher as an actor in CAR or other researchers of CAR are described besides explaining various related references. Based on the arranged conceptual framework, written hypothesis is formulated.

Research Method

Subject, Place and Time (Setting) Research

In this part, it must mention the location of research, the grade/level of class, the characteristics of the class (e.g. the composition of male and female students, their background of social economics which may be relevant to the problems, level of ability, etc.). At this part, make sure the research variables are explained. Those variables can be (1) input variable relating to the students, teachers, teaching materials, learning sources, assessment procedure, learning environment, and so on, (2) variable of proses clashing with the learning and teaching activity such as teaching and learning interaction, the skill of asking questions, the way of teacher's teaching, the way of students' learning, the implementation of various teaching methods in class, etc., and (3) output variables such as the students' willingness to know, the students' ability to apply the knowledge, the students' motivation, the students' learning result, behavior towards learning experiences which had been improved and so on.

Plan Steps Scenario of CAR

At this part it is described the action plan in order to improve learning, namely:

- Plan, this is the preparation related to CAR which initiate such as something used for entry behavior, the use of diagnostic test for problem specification, making learning scenario, preparing equipment in the framework of implementation of CAR, and other things related to action improvement that has been planned before. Besides that, it also describes those that has been stated before and also alternative solutions which will be tried out in the plan of solving the problem(s). The form of collaboration between teachers and lectures is also stated in this part.
- Implementation action is the description of action that will be done; the work scenario of action improvement and procedure which will be implemented.
- Observation and interpretation is the description about the procedure of recording and data prediction about the process and product of improvement of the planned implementation action.
- Analysis and reflection are description about the procedure analysis towards the results of observation and reflection which deal with the process and the impact of action improvement, personnel involvement, and also the criteria and plan of action for the next cycle.

Clear and Exact Cycle

In this part, it shows clearly the kinds of data which will be collected based on the process and improvement action that will be used as a basic to evaluate the successful and less of successful of try outs on the learning improvement action. The format of data can be qualitative and quantitative or a combination of both. Besides that, the technique of collecting data must be described clearly, such as participative observation, making a daily journal, observation activity in class (including various possible format and equipment used), the description of interactions in the class (sociometric analysis), measuring the learning result with various assessment procedure, etc. Furthermore, in the procedure of collecting data of CAR, the writer must not forget that as a performer of CAR, he or she must also be active as the collector of data and not just as a source of data. Finally, all technique used in collecting the data must have suitable evaluation the in context of CAR.

Criteria of Success or Indicator of Achievement

In this part, the result indicator of action improvement is stated explicitly until making verification for improvement action through CAR. For example, to decide the output criteria in the form of reducing or decreasing (kind of numbers and/or level of difficulty) misconception that can be predicted as an impact from the implementation of action.

Research Schedule

Research schedule activity is arranged in the form of matrices which describe steps and activities from the start till the end. The research schedule is in the form of Gantt Chart.

References

In writing the references, it must be suitable with the regulation of the APA style.

Using Standard Indonesian

A standard language is the acceptable language used in formal situation, such as in Law, correspondences, and formal meetings. It is firstly used as a unity language in a language society that speaks many languages. Generally, the standard language is found in the dictionary (spelling and vocabulary), grammar, spelling, language board, law status, and the use of the language in the society (government, schools, etc.). It can be used for all occasions, but only for formal communication, technique discourse, speaking in front of public, and speaking with others. Therefore, the Indonesian standard language used is suitable with the Indonesian language rules.

Earlier Studies in Classroom Action Research

Mustafa (2014) conducted a study on improving students' reading ability by using CTL method, a CAR that was conducted at the 4th grade state primary school in Sabang. This study was conducted in two cycles. In the first cycle, there were some weaknesses. The teacher was unable to follow all of the CTL teaching procedure and had lack of time management, and so, not all of the students had the chance to present their work. And the students' average scores were 83. In the 2nd cycle, the teacher had improved his teaching style. She had motivated the students and improved classroom management. The students' scores increased from 83 to 91. Accordingly, CTL was an appropriate method to be applied in the reading lessons.

Another study by Basri (2014) looked into the application of TPR to improve students' speaking skills, a CAR that was conducted at the 5th grade of semester 1, SD 25 in Sabang. This study was conducted in two cycles. The results showed that applying TPR in the teaching and learning process could improve students' ability in giving instruction on English. In the first cycle, only 64% of the students improved their scores, however, in the second cycle, 88% of the students improved their scores. The implementation of TPR increased the students' motivation and participation in the teaching and learning process.

METHOD OF RESEARCH

The method used in this research is descriptive quantitative. The data of this research is the teachers' proposals of CAR. There were two groups of teachers in the Education and Training for Professional Teachers (ETPT) in Banda Aceh when the data was collected. There were class A and B. Thus, the sample taken were the teachers' proposals of class A because this group had submitted their proposals earlier compared to class B. Group A consisted of 30 teachers of junior high school. The teachers were from several districts, namely Great Aceh (6 teachers), North Aceh (7 teachers), Bireuen (4 teachers), Singkil (6 teachers), Pidie (5 teachers), and Tamiang (2 teachers). The instrument used was the assessment for proposal of CAR, taken from Appendix 10 in the guide book of PLPG. The instrument can be seen in the following table.

Table 1. The Instrument to analyze the data.

No	Component	Criteria to be scored	Score
1	Topic/title	Maximum of 20 words, specific, clear to describe the problem to be researched, action to overcome the problem, result to be expected, and place of the research	5
2	Introduction	The existence of problem is concrete, clear, and urgent Cause of the problem is clear Problems and identification must clear	5 5 5
3	Problems and solving the problems	Research problems in the form of CAR problems Forms of action in solving the problem are suitable with the problems Clearly shows the indicator of success	5 5 5
4	Aim/purpose	In accordance with the research problems	5
5	Advantage	Clear on the benefits of result of the research	5
6	Review of literature	Relevance among points which is studied in the problems Clear theoretical framework of the research	5 10

Table 1 continued...

7	Method of the research	Clear subject, place, and date (setting of the research) Shows the plan in details and steps (scenario) of CAR Clear and accurate the cycles Criteria of the success	5 10 5 5
8	Schedule of the research	Clear schedule of the research in form of the Gantt Chart.	5
9	Reference	Writing the reference based on the regulation	5
10	The use of language	Indonesian Standard language	5
		Total score	100

The instrument consists of ten components, they were, 1). Title, 2). Introduction (a, b, c), 3). Problems and solving problems (a, b, c), 4). Purpose, 5). Advantage, 6). Review of Literature (a, b), 7). Method of research (a, b, c, d), 8). Schedule of the research, 9). References, and 10). The standard language. On the right column are maximum score for every criteria of complete CAR of teachers' proposal.

The interval score can be seen in Table 2 below.

Table 2. The interval score.

No	Range score	Frequency	Criteria
1	90 – 100	1	Perfect
2	80 – 89	5	Excellent
3	70 - 79	15	Good
4	60 – 69	9	Sufficient
	Total	30	

FINDINGS

The result in Table 3 shows that there are thirty teacher's proposal of CAR evaluated and ten criteria evaluated. There are 14 points which have to be scored based on the completeness of the criteria.

Table 3. The result of the Teacher's competence in writing proposal of CAR.

No	1	2a	b	c	3a	B	c	4	5	6a	B	7a	b	c	d	8	9	10	Total
1	5	5	3	3	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	71
2	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	75
3	5	5	5	3	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	5	68
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	75
5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	0	4	10	5	0	5	5	84
6	5	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	10	5	10	5	5	5	5	5	97
7	5	3	3	3	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	4	5	73
8	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	75
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	5	5	80
10	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	0	0	0	5	5	5	65
11	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	74
12	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	5	65
13	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	75
14	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	0	5	69
15	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	5	0	5	5	85
16	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	5	5	80
17	5	5	5	4	5	3	0	5	3	3	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	72
18	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	0	5	64
19	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	3	3	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	70
20	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	3	3	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	70
21	5	5	5	4	5	5	0	5	3	3	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	70
22	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	3	3	0	5	10	5	0	5	0	5	81
23	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	0	5	0	5	10	5	5	0	0	5	73
24	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	0	5	0	5	10	5	5	0	5	5	78
25	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	5	5	80
26	5	5	5	3	3	5	0	5	5	5	10	5	5	3	0	0	0	5	66
27	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	5	5	5	60
28	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	0	5	10	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	60

Table 3 continued...

29	5	4	3	3	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	0	0	5	60
30	5	5	5	5	5	5	0	5	5	5	0	5	10	5	0	0	5	5	75

From the whole score in Table 3, it can be seen that the highest score the teachers got is 97 and the lowest score the teachers got is 60. There is one teacher who got 97, this teacher got fewer score in describing the cause of the problem and identification of the problem is not clear. One teacher got 85, (this teacher does not write at all the theoretical framework of the research and schedule of the research in form of the Gantt Chart. For the least score of 60 were obtained by three teachers because they got less score in criteria numbers 2a, 2b, 2c, 3c, 7b and provided no explanation for criteria numbers 3c, 5, 6b, 7c, 7d, 8 and 9 (problems, advantage, literature review, method, schedule and references).

Table 4. The result of index of difficulty of the criteria.

No	Criteria	Index of difficulty (P)	Level of difficulty
1	1	1.00	Easy
2	2a	0.98	Easy
3	b	0.94	Easy
4	c	0.88	Easy
5	3a	0.96	Easy
6	b	0.98	Easy
7	c	0.16	Difficult
8	4	1.00	Easy
9	5	0.80	Easy
10	6a	0.90	Easy
11	b	0.10	Difficult
12	7a	0.99	Easy
13	b	0.90	Easy
14	c	0.88	Easy
15	d	0.13	Difficult
16	8	0.50	Fair
17	9	0.52	Fair
18	10	1.00	Easy

From the result of index difficulty in Table 4, it can be explained that there are thirteen easy criteria for the teachers to write their proposals, the criteria are numbers 1, 2a, 2b, 2c, 3a, 3b, 4, 5, 6a, 7a, 7b, 7c, and 10. Next, there are three difficult criteria; they are numbers 3c, 6b, and 7d. Then, there are two criteria that are fair, namely numbers 8 and 9. Thus, the most difficult criteria of the teachers to write their proposals were on determining the indicator of success in criteria number 3c, then, the theoretical framework of the research in criteria number 6b, and the criteria of the success of the research in criteria number 7d.

CONCLUSION

From the distribution of the scores, it can be concluded that only 15 teachers out of 30 got good scores in their writing proposal of CAR. It means that only 50% of the teachers are able to write the proposal of CAR. Only one teacher got perfect in his writing proposal, five teachers got excellent, and nine teachers got sufficient. From this distribution, it can be said that the teachers' ability in writing their proposal of CAR still needs improvement. This is a problem that the lectures of ETPT need to resolve in the future.

REFERENCES

- Basri. (2014). *The application of TPR to improve students' speaking skills (A CAR at the 5th grade semester 1 SD 25 Sabang)*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh.
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Knowing through action research*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Cross, P. (1987). The adventures of education in wonderland: Implementing educational reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 68, 496-502.

- Depdikbud. (1999). *Bahan pelatihan penelitian tindakan*. Jakarta: Depdikbud, Dirjen Dikdasmen, Dikmenum.
- Hopkins, D. (1985). *A teacher's guide to classroom research*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Kemendikbud. (2003). *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 20 Tahun 2003 tentang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional*. Retrieved from <http://buk.um.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/Undang-Undang-No.-20-Tahun-2003-tentang-Sistem-Pendidikan-Nasional.pdf>
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The action research planner*. Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1990). *The action research reader*. Victoria: Deakin University.
- McNiff, J. (1988) *Action research: Principles and practice*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Mills, G. (2003). *Action research: A guide for the teacher researcher*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mustafa. (2014). *Improving students' reading ability by using CTL method (CAR at the 4th grade state primary school, Sabang)*. (Unpublished Master's thesis). Syiah Kuala University, Banda Aceh.
- Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. New York: Basic Books.
- Soedarsono, F. X. (1997). *Rencana, desain dan implementasi: Pedoman penelitian tindakan kelas*. Jakarta: BP3SD, Dirjen Dikti.
- Tim PGSM. (1999). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (Classroom Action Research): Bahan pelatihan Dosen LPTK dan guru Sekolah Menengah*. Jakarta: Proyek PGSM, Dikti.