Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics
Vol. 6 No. 2, 2021
eISSN: 2503-4197, pISSN: 2527-5070
www. indonesian-efl-journal.org
doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v6i2.414

Empowering EFL Teachers for Scientific Writing in PPG Workshop: Writing Classroom Action Research Proposal

Lalu Suhirman
Universitas Cenderawasih, Papua, Indonesia
lalusuhermanmpd@gmail.com

Budi Rahayu
Universitas Cenderawasih, Papua, Indonesia
buray_u@yahoo.com

Abstract:
The aims of this paper are (1) to Enhance EFL teachers' professional competence and skill in writing scientific papers of research results; (2) to produce scientific articles of EFL teachers' investigation (minimally produce an action research proposal). This workshop was given to Pendidikan Profesi Guru - PPG (Teacher Professional Education). There were 33 EFL English teachers actively participating in the workshop. The content of the materials was how to discover themes and topics, how to write a proposal of classroom action research (CAR), and how to compose research of CAR, then how to create it into a scientific article. By having these skills, it was expected that they were able to report or write their own CAR and how to create it into a scientific article so that raise their position and prosperity. The PPG workshop for CAR took 10 hours and at the end of the workshop, the participants (the EFL teachers) are obliged to submit a classroom action research. After evaluating each CAR proposal project submitted by the EFL teachers, almost all of them wrote the CAR proposal well. But, in certain components, not all participants' CAR proposals were categorized good, as well as the bibliography and language components, for bibliography, the participants must include a minimum of 17 to 20 reference lists derived from books and journals which cited as references in the body of the proposal. There were 45.45% of

participants who listed 17 references and 45.45% of participants listed 20 references, and the remaining 9.9% included less than 17 references. For language, all participants used Indonesian, their reasoning was to make them easier to express thoughts and ideas in the proposal. It was also found that 87,87% of EFL teachers stated that they were able to identify the research problems, themes, and topics well. While there were 66,66% of EFL teachers described that they were able to decide CAR design, theory, quote, and paraphrase experts' ideas well and 90,90% of them stated 17 to 20 titles of references.

***Keywords**: classroom action research, teacher professional education, workshop,*

1. INTRODUCTION

In developed country educational systems around the world, there has been a growing change away from concern with access quality. If Indonesia is to keep up with global trends in this regard, it must aggressively campaign to boost the quality of its teachers, with low student performance attributed to teachers' overall performance and teacher adequacy (Jalal et al., 2009). To resolve this issue, the government passed the Teacher and Lecturer Law (Law No. 14 of 2005, hereafter referred to as the Teacher's Law) to give teachers a much-needed opportunity to develop their qualifications and professional skills. The aim of the teacher law is to develop a high-quality national teaching force that is skilled in the four core competency domains of pedagogical, professional, personal, and social competence.

The new strategy, according to others, is the result of many prior efforts to improve teacher quality as a way of enhancing overall educational quality, following a variety of previous initiatives and strategies aimed at improving teacher quality and competency (Jalal et al., 2009). These policies and initiatives were formulated in response to the state of the education sector and its complexities at different times. We all know that the Teacher Law 14/2005 brought about reforms, and the teacher certification program is the culmination of many efforts to increase teacher quality. The Indonesian government structured the new curriculum to address a number of aspects for improvement, including competency, academic qualification, credential, health, and teacher status and incentive programs, based on previous experiences (Suhirman et al., 2016; Mertler, 2017).

On the other hand, Indonesia's education world faces challenges to adjust to the paradigm of world education. The world education paradigm has changed from schooling to learning (Suhirman, 2018), from instructive to facilitating, from government roles to community roles, and from centralistic to democratic (Diknas, 2007; Hulett, 2007). In the end, the learning paradigm is directed holistically, namely learning to know, learning to do, learning to be, and learning to live

together. This learning paradigm requires a change in learning methods in the classroom which was originally teacher-centered into a student-centered. Based on the regulation of the Minister of Education and Culture of Indonesia Number 65 of 2013 concerning the standard of the education (teaching) process as amended by the Regulation of the Ministry of Education and Culture Number 22 of 2016 that the learning process in educational units is held interactively, inspirational, enjoyable, stimulating, encouraging students to actively participate, and providing ample room for initiative, imagination, and freedom according to the skills, interests, and physical and psychological development of students.

The teacher certification program basically aims to build on the previous teaching license program. Teachers must fulfill two requirements, according to the teacher and lecturer rule. First, to begin with, all teachers must hold a minimum academic qualification of four years of post-secondary education (S1 or D 4). Second, after receiving this academic certification, in-service teachers must pass a portfolio review. Before entering the teaching profession, pre-service teachers must complete one or two semesters of professional training in order to earn training credits and pass a certification test.

Certified teachers are admitted as professional teachers who have mastered four teachers' competencies as stated in teacher Law, namely pedagogical, professional, personal, and social (Suhirman et al., 2016; Suhirman, 2019b; Jalal et al., 2009). One of the important professional development for a teacher is writing a scientific paper which is triggered on enhancing instructional quality through classroom action research (CAR), (Hendaryana, 2010; Kemendikbud, 2012). Based on the Ministry of *PAN* and *RB* (empowerment of the state apparatus and bureaucratic reform) regulation No. 16 the year 2009 about teacher's continuous professional development (CPD) includes personal development (training and education), the scientific publication (research result or innovative ideas on field of formal education, and instructional textbooks and teacher's book guide), innovative work (finding effective technology, finding or create artwork, create and modify instructional media), and take part on composing test standard, (Kemendikbud, 2012; Suhirman, 2018; Suhirman, 2019a).

Indeed, the activity of teacher certification formerly PLPG (teacher professional education and training) and now it's called PPG (Teacher professional education) listed one of the training materials is about CAR as scientific writing. The number of training or workshop hours for this subject matter listed 10 hours, divided into two forms of activities, namely four (4) hours for classroom lecturing and discussing and the rest six (6) hours used to practice writing CAR proposal individually. Within 6 hours used by the participants for consultation and assistance in writing the CAR proposal for better results. At the end of the program, participants are required to submit a research proposal of CAR.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 The Principle of Action Research

Action research is a term that refers to a practical way of looking at a teacher's own work to check that it is as he/she would like it to be (Kemmis et al., 2014). Since action research is undertaken by a teacher, it is also referred to as practitioner-oriented research; and since it allows the teacher to think about and reflect on his or her job, it is also referred to as self-reflective practice (McNiff, 2010; Schon, 1993; Kemmis et al., 2014). The aim of action research was on solving a problem in the here and now in a local environment. It is a means of systematically addressing issues or changing procedures. Action research is concerned with the actual challenges that clinicians face, as well as efforts to address those problems (Kosy, 2005; Zeichner & Liston, 2013; Meerah & Osman, 2013; Hulett, 2007). It is adaptable and takes place in informal environments in order to change the current situation. Action research has two purposes: diagnostic and remedial (Alberta, 2000; Atemrman et al., 2001; Richards, 1998). The purpose of action research, for example, would be for a teacher to find issues and then develop classroom practices (Atterman et al., 2001; McNiff; 2010; Arikunto, 2006).

Action Research is a process of systematic inquiry into a self-identified teaching or learning problem to better understand its complex dynamics and to develop strategies geared towards the problem's improvement (Alberta, 2000: 3). Action research can be used in three ways:1) action research can be used to examine the teaching and learning process; 2) action research can be used to solve a problem or introduce a change, and 3) action research can be used to track teacher professional development. (McNiff, 2009; Kemmis et al., 2014; Ferrance, 2000). Action research is a method in which educators, students, or staff are charged with controlling the change process in every area of an organization (Aqib, 2007; Kuang & David, 2017). Anyone in a workplace organization may begin the action analysis process, but in order to be successful, that individual must be personally involved in some aspect of the organizational process and willing to take action to change it (Johnson, 2012; Madya, 2006).

In 2009, the Indonesian Ministry of Education endeavored to introduce classroom action research as an effort to improve teaching and learning in schools (see BERMUTU Classroom Action Research Guide Book, 2009). However, its implementation is very slow because it can be seen from the lack of reports recorded in journal articles or books published by teachers that are very limited or almost non-existent because teachers are still burdened with administrative tasks. This problem certainly hinders the career and professionalism of teachers to develop themselves as professional teachers.

This is in line with Burns (2009); Kemmis et al. (2014); McNiff & Whitehead (2010); Burns (2010) who explain that action research is a real-world practice

intervention aimed at improving practical situations. Because of that action research conducted by the teacher is aimed at improving the learning situation that is his responsibility and it is called "classroom action research" (Nugent et al., 2012; Spaulding & Palcol, 2013; Bell & Aldrige, 2014). In this connection, the question that arises is "When can a teacher properly conduct CAR?" The answer is When teachers want to improve the quality of learning that is their responsibility and at the same time he/she wants to involve his/her students in the learning process (Burton, 2009; Somekh, 2006; Stringer, 2007).

2.2 Action Research is Reflection and Collaborative Work

Classroom action research is collaborative research that aims to solve real-world issues in the classroom. These problems are found and observed by a few teachers or peers to determine the root of the problem, and then they reflect to determine the best solution (Hopkins, 2008; Stringer, 2007). To reflect means to take some time, usually at the end of the day, to evaluate if something had occurred well and if so, why or why not. Thus, action research can be conducted individually or in groups with people who share similar issues or problems (Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Burton, 2009; Rainey, 2000). According to Denscombe (2009), an action research approach is to "solve a specific issue and develop best practice recommendations," while Burns (2009) states that the basic principle of action research is to interfere in a deliberate way in the difficult situation in order to bring about changes and, even better, improvements in instructional practice. Action research can also be divided into two categories: determining what is actually happening and testing a hypothesis (Meerah & Osman, 2013). Since data is often descriptively analyzed, action analysis outcomes appear to be qualitative.

This is due to the fact that the study entails all students in the respective classrooms. (Hendricks, 2017; Mertler, 2017; Somekh, 2006). However, the most significant finding that can be learned from action research is that it can help classroom teachers to learn and develop their own results (Meerah & Osman, 2013; Luchini & Rosello, 2007). Action research encourages teachers to—reflect upon their own teaching practices and, as a result, engage in change with the aim of redirecting their instructional objectives to meet their students‘ needs‖ (Luchini & Rosello, 2007, p. 266). This is valuable as it contributes to enhancing the teacher‘s development (Luchini & Rosello, 2007).

Action research (Classroom Action Research), according to Latif (2012), is an important part of professional classroom teachers' activities. Teachers can improve the quality of their instructional performance by developing innovative instructional strategies to solve classroom problems using this type of research. Suhirman (2019b) also clarifies that the activities in classroom action research are professional learning communities and the result of coaching such learning communities is ordinary collaboration and regular instructional practices with their colleagues. One of the most important classroom action research characteristics found in a structured

environment for professional development is collegiality and experimentation. There are a number of factors that contribute to the effectiveness of collaborative and reflective action research.

Action research has been used by teachers to test the effectiveness of the shadowing‖ technique for learning English rhythm especially pronunciation, among Japanese adults (Omar & Umehara, 2010). In their study, Omar & Umehara (2010) observe that their involvement as both facilitator and group member, allowed them to observe the students‘ responses including their nonverbal behaviors (e.g., facial expressions, gestures, and body movements). This helped them to understand their learners better. They were also able to develop the relevant intervention to assist their learners in becoming better at learning.

2.3 Cycle in Action Research

There are certain steps to follow when implementing action research. First, the teacher identifies a problem, which can only be identified through reflection, looking for the cause of the problem (Kemmis et al., 2014; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010; Hopkins, 2008). The teacher observes the problem once again and then reflects on how the problem can be best intervened. A plan is then hatched, usually through a series of reflections (Hllet, 2007; Henning et al., 2009; Hendricks, 2017; Bell & Aldridge, 2014). The teacher would also have reflected on implementing this plan (Susman, 1993; Winter, 1989; Aterman et al., 2001). Until the plan is implemented, data will first have to be collected and the teacher then analyses the cause of the problem based on the data. The teacher then takes the appropriate course of action and he/she then evaluates the success of the action plan. These procedures—with some modifications—have been endorsed by some experts such as Cherry (2001); Richard (1998); Stringer (2007); Burns (2010); and Ferrance (2000).

Step 1: Identifying the problem as the first step, identifying the problem in a classroom takes the observation of the teacher who is the person managing the class. However, as Ferrance (2000) articulates, the teacher must be able to answer the following questions: a) is the problem at hand one which the teacher has impacted over?; b) is the problem something of interest and worth the time and effort?; and is the problem actual and worth researching or is it due to some discomposure or tension experienced by the teacher or is it due to some mismatch of teaching strategies and learner differences (Meerah & Osman, 2013; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010; Hullet, 2007)? *Step 2*: Planning upon reflecting on the problem, the teacher can try to look at the problem from various angles and then develop a plan to resolve the problem. This usually involves several cycles of reflection (Koshy, 2005; Burton, 2009; Zeichner & Liston, 2013). *Step 3*: Implementing the plan, for example, taking hold of the class and then carrying out the plan and collecting data. This is followed by studying the data and looking for answers to the problem (Johnson, 2012; Stringer, 2007; Arikunto, 2006; Madya, 2006; Somekh, 2006). The next step is to apply the answers and evaluate the success of the resolution. Most

EFL teachers report on the outcome of their research either to their colleagues as a sharing practice or with students so as to be accountable (Richards & Lockhart, 1983; Richards, 1994; Luchini & Rosello, 2007).

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The current paper draws on a case study of action research in Indonesia on *PPG–Pendidikan Profesi Guru* (Teacher Professional Education- TPE). The context of this paper focuses on the method and the product of CAR proposals. The aim is to encourage EFL teachers to take the initiative and conduct classroom action research in their respective schools so that they become reliable researchers and practitioners who can innovate beyond their conventional teaching roles to become active disseminators of knowledge through print, digital, and other social media. By doing so, EFL teachers can offer greater learning opportunities and experiences in their classrooms for their students. Through the experience and outcome shared, those EFL teachers can also be seen as contributors who are capable of rising to the occasion of facing and resolving current EFL issues by offering their own insights and not just take those obtainable by educational researchers only.

The participants of this PPG workshop were EFL teachers who had been nominated and registered as PPG participants at *Lembaga Penjaminan Mutu Pendidikan - LPMP* (Educational Quality Assurance Institution) in Papua Province and *Lembaga Pendidikan dan Tenaga Kependidikan-LPTK* (Educational Institutions and Educational Personnel) of Cenderawasih University. There were 33 EFL teachers, 25 of whom were Junior High School (*Sekolah Menegah Pertama-SMP*) teachers, and the remaining 8 among them were Senior High School (*Sekolah Menengah Atas-SMA*) teachers. All of them had undergraduate English language qualifications and alumni from various universities or institutions of Higher Education in Indonesia.

Before getting a scientific paper writing workshop related to classroom action research, the researchers conducted various methods including a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) to find out how many PPG participants had scientific writing experience related to writing CAR proposals or reports or how many of them had participated in scientific activities or attended scientific forums such as seminars, symposia, conferences, etc. Furthermore, ice-breaking as the beginning of this activity was to encourage the participants to start focusing on workshop activities in terms of writing scientific papers and CAR only. In addition, the methods used were tutorials or lectures, dialogues, questions and answers, and the practice of designing and writing a CAR proposal. In a tutorial or lecture session, participants were given the systematic way of writing scientific papers and writing CAR proposals, as well as how to transform the results of classroom action research in scientific article reports to be published in scientific journals. At the end of the activity, participants were given the opportunity individually to practice their writing scientific writing papers in terms of CAR proposals. EFL-PPG participants were given the freedom to

determine the topics and titles of scientific papers each but should be related to the theme of EFL instructions.

CAR proposal made by the EFL PPG participants was corrected and evaluated by the researchers, then each proposal was returned back to the owner/writer with some corrections as feedback. Finally, the writers could revise their own CAR proposals and they were expected to be able to conduct CAR at their own schools. As long as they conducted classroom action research, they were given an opportunity to consult their research report via mentors' (researchers') e-mail address.

4. FINDING AND DISCUSSION

The findings and the discussion of this research highlighted two problems or objectives of the research, firstly related to the workshop activities or process in the classroom that discussed the theories and systematic writing of scientific papers, and the second stage was the direct practice of writing or composing a scientific work. At this stage, it focused on how to write a research proposal in terms of classroom action research in accordance with the systematic explained in the lecture stage. The systematic of CAR proposal writing, it's begun by revealing the ideal condition that must be achieved in the learning process. Then it was continued with the identification of problems that come from the students, teaching facilities and infrastructure, and the classroom environment. After that, a presented solution was offered which included instructional approaches, methods, techniques, and media.

Workshop or training analysis in the form of quality was aimed at three things, namely the lecturing process, the practice of writing scientific papers, and paper products in the form of CAR proposals. Lecturing activities were running well. It was based on the observations during the training process. During the training process going on, the participants took parts and asked a lot to do the writing practice related to the elements that should be written in terms of the CAR proposal. All participants continued to follow the entire writing procedural until the activity ended. Almost no significant obstacles happened as long as the workshop activities going on. All the participants were very enthusiastic to ask questions and wrote down their CAR proposals.

On the stage of writing practice of writing scientific papers (CAR proposal), they wrote their writing projects seriously and each participant generated CAR proposal because they remembered the mandate of the enactment of legislation of the Minister of Administrative and Bureaucratic Reform Number 16 in the year 2009 about the 'teachers' functional position and credit point states that one of teachers' professional development through writing scientific papers had to be carried out by teachers since taking rank III b. Problems in the field showed that teachers in these groups experience barriers in the preparation of scientific work as one of the requirements in the promotion of position to reach the higher level. The obstacles

were possible because of teacher's competence in writing scientific papers was not in accordance with the requirements.

After conducting interviews and FGDs by researchers on the participants, it was shown that almost all participants claimed that they did not have enough experience to write scientific papers, even though all participants were bachelor (s-1) graduates in English but they had never made or written scientific papers in terms of scientific activities form of CAR training and writing of CAR proposals. However, PPG EFL participants were asked to write CAR proposals as a result of their professional activities.

After carefully evaluating and analyzing the products made by PPG EFL participants in the form of CAR proposals, several problems were found related to the contents and systematic writing of the proposal. Based on the rubric of evaluating the writing of a CAR proposal, it is known that the ability of English PPG participants in writing a CAR proposal and the quality of the proposal is made at least covers the ten main components as follows.

Table: 1 The rubric of the proposal components in the CAR

No	Components	Criteria n=33			
		VG	G	S	L
1.	Title: A maximum of 20 words, specific, clear, describe the problem, solution, and location Research	9	14	5	5
2.	Background and Problem Identification: (a. The existence of a real, clear, and urgent problem to be solved, b) the cause of the problem is clearly identified, c) Alternative solutions are clearly identified)	7	9	15	4
3.	Formulation and problem solving: a) formulation of the problem in the form of CAR, asking for strategy and implementation process of action, b) the accuracy of the action to solve the problem, c) Indicators of success are clearly and measurably formulated).	5	5	7	16
4.	Objectives: The formulation of objectives in accordance with the formulation of the problem,	5	5	7	16
5.	Benefits: clarity of theoretical benefits and practical benefits of research results.	5	10	11	7
6.	Literature Review: a) theories and concepts, are relevant with the problem, b) the thinking framework presented clearly show the relationship between the variables.	5	7	12	9
7.	Research methods: a) subject, place, and time (setting), techniques and instruments of data collection, as well as data analysis techniques are planned clearly, b) the CAR steps (scenarios) are planned in detail, c) the CAR cycle is planned precisely	6	11	5	11
8.	Research schedule: Research schedule is arranged clearly, completely, and rationally and duration (in the form of a chart, or other forms)	11	15	7	0
9.	Bibliography: Writing a bibliography according to the provisions, minimally state 17-20 book and paper titles.	0	15	15	3
10	Language and grammar: standard language and grammar follow the existing reference and consistency	0	3	30	0

Notes: VG = Very Good G = Good S = Sufficient L = Lacking

After conducting careful analysis, the researchers of the CAR proposals made by the PPG participants based on the rubric components or aspects that must be present (see table 1) in a CAR proposal. The criteria on the right of table 1 above are the criteria for evaluating CAR proposals that use quality criteria or standards such as:

1. *VG = Very Good* means that if each component that must exist in a proposal there are all supporting indicators written completely.
2. *G = Good*, meaning that if each component or aspect must be contained in a proposal, almost all supporting indicators are written or included.
3. S = Sufficient, meaning that if each component must exist in a proposal there are
   several supporting indicators are written.
4. L = Lacking, meaning that if each component must exist in a proposal there are only a few indicators written.

From the results of analysis aspects that must be present in a CAR proposal, it's found that the CAR title made by participants can be categorized as positive or good, if it combined the ability criteria from *good enough*, *good*, *to very good*, they are at the position 84.84%, and the rest of the participants are in the position of *less (lacking)* 15.15%. The Writing of the CAR proposal title can be supposed to be good if the words in the title are not more than 20 words, then the title looks specific, clear, describe the problem, indicating the solution of the problems and the place of the study (Arikunto, 2006, Hullet, 2007; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010; Kemmis et al., 2014).

Analysis of the background and identification of the problems in the CAR proposal, if it is classified criteria as sufficient, good, and very good, there are 29 or 87.87% of CAR proposals that meet the indicators and aspects of a CAR proposal. A good CAR proposal is a proposal that meets the criteria of scientific writing by determining the background and identification of real issues that occur in class. In the other words, the background of the research problem illustrates that what will be learned is really the problem that needs to be solved, and the problem is theoretical and practical. For this reason, the background needs to identify actual and contextual problems (Koshy, 2005; Alberta, 2000; Zeichner & Liston, 2013; Nugent et al., 2012; Spaulding & Falco, 2013; Hendricks, 2017).

In the aspect of writing a problem-solving and the objectives of the CAR proposal, it appeared that the participants' competencies are not enough yet (see table 1 points 3 and 4) or in other words, the CAR proposals of PPG participants only half meet the criteria of sufficient, good, and very good, i.e .17 of N = 33 or 51, 51% is slightly different with the insufficient/lacking criteria, there are 16 proposals or 48.48%. CAR proposals that meet scientific requirements if the research problem formulation can formulate the problem in the form of CAR, ask about the strategy and process of implementing the action, the accuracy of the action to solve the problem, and indicator of success is formulated clearly and measurably. While the goals of CAR

must be adjusted to the problem formulation, meaning that the number of research objectives must be adjusted or equal to the number of problem formulations (Aqib, 2007; Striger, 2007; Johnson, 2012; Meerah & Osman, 2013; Mertler, 2017).

For the significance of the research, most of the CAR proposals for PPG participants are in a fairly good, good, and very good position, namely 26 or 78,78% of proposals from N = 33, while proposals stated to be lacking in the aspect of research benefit are 21.21% or 7 proposals. CAR proposals are stated to be good or even very good if they include the benefits of research with a statement describing the things that can be obtained by researchers, respondents/informants, and related institutions as well as their contributions to science and art for research conducted (Somekh, 2006; Burns, 2010; Bell & Aldridge, 2014; Nugent et al., 2012).

For the study of literature review, in the CAR proposal of PPG participants found only 12 or 36.36% of N = 33 who wrote a literature review in both good and very good categories. PTK proposals are categorized quite well in the literature review component, there are 12 or 36.36%, while proposals in the less category are 9 or 27.27%. CAR proposals can be categorized as either very good if they can describe the literature review of facts, concepts, principles, procedures, ideas, opinions, theories, and models that have been written by experts relevant to the problem/focus of research. Besides that, it is also necessary to disclose previous research findings that are relevant to the research problem or problem focus (Burns, 2009; Kuang & David; 2017; Richards, 1998; Madya, 2006; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010).

After reading and analyzing the PTK proposals from PPG participants related to the CAR methodology, it was found that the CAR methodology used could be categorized as good. There are 22 out of N = 33 or 66.66% of the proposals which are in the sufficient criteria 15.15%, good 33.33%, and very good 18.18%, while proposals that are categorized as less good are 11 or 33.33%. A good CAR methodology is even very good if the methodology meets the following indicators,

This research method includes Population-respondent or subject-sample-research. Data collection techniques (observation, interviews, questionnaires, documentation) Data analysis techniques, such as quantitative - percentage, chi-square, product-moment, etc. - and qualitative-descriptive, reflective, synthesis, etc. (Kemmis et al., 2014; Burns, 2010; Bell & Aldridge, 2014; Richards, 1998; Madya, 2006; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010).

The last three components in table 1 that should be included in the CAR PPG Participants' proposal are considered complementary, namely the research schedule, bibliography, and language use. In principle, all CAR proposals included a research schedule according to the recommended criteria. As well as the bibliography and language components, for bibliography, the participants must include a minimum of 17 to 20 reference lists derived from books and journals cited as references in the body of the proposal. There were 45.45% of participants who listed 17 references

and 45.45% of participants listed 20 references, and the remaining 9.9% included less than 17 references. For language, all participants used Indonesian, their reasoning was to make them easier to express thoughts and ideas in the proposal.

5. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis and evaluation results of each CAR proposal project submitted by EFL teachers, it was found that almost all PPG participants were able to write a CAR proposal well that was marked by fulfillment of the indicators or criteria that must be contained in a proposal. In certain components, not all participants' CAR proposals were categorized "good: as well as the bibliography and language components, for bibliography, the participants must include a minimum of 17 to 20 reference lists derived from books and journals which cited as references in the body of the proposal. There were 45.45% of participants who listed 17 references and 45.45% of participants listed 20 references, and the remaining 9.9% included less than 17 references. For language, all participants used Indonesian, their reasoning was to make them easier to express thoughts and ideas in the proposal. The pedagogical implication of CAR is the right channel for EFL teachers to develop their professionalism so that their real (empirical) experience in the learning process can be exposed or published in order other peers (fellow teachers) can learn from each other from the teacher's CAR result.

6. REFERENCES

Alberta. (2000). *Action Research Guide for Alberta Teache*rs. Alberta Teachers' Association (ATA).

Aqib, Z. (2007). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. YRama Widya.

Arikunto, Suharsimi dkk. (2006). *Penelitian Tindakan Kelas*. Bumi Aksara.

Aterman, H., Tillen, D., Dikson, R., & de Koning, K. (2001). Action Research: A Systematic Review and Guidance for Assessment. *Health Technol Assess*, 5 (23).

Bell, L.M. & Aldridge, J.M. (2014). *Student Voice, Teacher Action Research and Classroom Improvement*. Sense Publishers.

Burns, A. (2010). *Doing action research in English language teaching: A guide for practitioners*. Routledge.

Burton, J. (2009). Reflective practice. In A. Burns & J. C. Richards (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education* (pp. 298-307). Cambridge University Press.

Cherry, N. (2001). *Action Research: a pathway to action, knowledge, and learning*. RMIT Publishing

Denscombe, M. (2009). *Ground rules for social research: Guidelines for good pra*ctice. McGraw-Hill Education.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think–A restatement of the relation of reflective learning to the educative process.*

Ferrance, E. (2000). *Action research. Providence, RI*: LAB at Brown University.

Hendricks, C. (2017). *Improving Schools Through Action Research A Reflective Practice Approach.* Pearson Education, Inc.

Henning, J. E., Stone, J. M., Kelly, J. L. (2009*). Using Action Research to Improve Instruction : an Interactive Guide for Teachers*. Taylor & Francis Routledge.

Hopkins, D. (2008). A teacher's guide to classroom research (4th Ed.). McGraw-Hill Education - Open University Press.

Hulett, E. C. (2007). Action research in the classroom: Center for teaching excellence grants and statewide university classes. (Ed.) in Hulett, E. C. Center for Teaching Excellence.

Johnson, A. P. (2012). *A short guide to action research* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.

Kemmis, S., Nixon, R., & McTaggart, R. (2014). *The Action Research Planner: Doing Critical Participatory Action Research*. Springer.

Koshy, V. (2005). *Action Research for Improving Practice: A Practical Guide*. Paul Chapman Publishing.

Kuang, C. H., & David, M. K. (2017). Empowering language teachers through action research: Two case studies from Malaysia. English Review: *Journal of English Education*, 5(2), 163-174.

Latief, M. A. (2012). *Research Methods on Language Learning: An Introduction.* UM Press.

Luchini, P., & Rosello, A. (2007). Developing learners' oral communicative language abilities: A collaborative action research project in Argentina. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 4(4), 245-271.

Madya, S. (2006). *Teori dan Praktek Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (Action Research)*. Alfabeta. Bandung.

McNiff, J. (2009). *Action research for professional development: Concise advice for new action researchers*. Dorset: September Books.

McNiff, J., & Jack Whitehead, J. (2010). *You and Your Action Research Project* (3rd Ed.). Third edition. Routledge - the Taylor & Francis Group.

Meerah, T. S. M., & Osman, K. (2013). What is 'action' in action research: A Malaysian exposure. *Asian Social Science*, 9(16), 148.

Mertler C. A. (2017). *Action Research Improving Schools and Empowering Educators.* (5th Ed.) SAGE Publications India Pvt. Ltd.

Nugent, G., Malik, S., & Hollingsworth, S. (2012). *A Practical Guide to Action Research for Literacy Educators*. The Global Operations Unit, International Reading Association.

Omar, H. M., & Umehara, M. (2010). Using a Shadowing' technique to improve English pronunciation deficient adult Japanese learners: An action research on expatriate Japanese adult learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, *7*(2), 199-230.

Rainey, I. (2000) Action research and the English as a foreign language practitioner: time to take stock, *Educational Action Research*, 8:1, 65-91, DOI: 10.1080/09650790000200112.

Richards, J. C. (1998). *Teaching in action: Case studies from second language classrooms*. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.

Richards, J. C., & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective teaching in second language classrooms.* Cambridge University Press.

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic books.

Somekh, B. (2006). *Action Research: a Methodology for Change and Developmen*t. New York: McGraw-Hill Education - Open University Press.

Spaulding, D. T., & Falco, J. (2013). *Action Research for School Leaders*. Pearson Education, Inc.

Stringer, E.,T. (2007). *Action research*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Suhirman, L., Admowardoyo, H., & Husain, J. (2016). Perception of EFL Teachers' Satisfaction on Pedagogical Process. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. Vol. 6. No. 5 October 2016.

Suhirman, L. (2018a). ESP Textbook Evaluation: English for Islamic Learning for College Students. *IJOLTL* (2018), 3(1): 13-22.

Suhirman, L. (2018b). Lesson Study – Based Instruction for Enhancing EFL Teacher's Pedagogical Competence. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 20 (5), 201 – 208.

Suhirman, L. (2019a). Building Professional Development for Peer Coaching and Collaborating to Plan Research Lesson: Case of Japanese Lesson Study Approach. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 21 (2.4), 9 – 32

Suhirman, L. (2019b). EFL Teachers' Perception on the Use of Online Learning for Debriefing Pre-Condition of Teacher – Certification in Papua. *The Asian EFL Journal*, 23 (3.3), 327 – 349.

Tacchi,J., Salter, D., & Hearn, G. (2003). *Ethnographic Action Research*. New Delhi: UNESCO.

Winter, R. (1989). Learning from experience: Principles and practice in action research. The Falmer Press.

Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (2013). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Routledge.