



Training on Classroom Action Research Proposal Writing for Senior High School Teachers in Semarang City, Indonesia

Mohamad Sodikin^{1*}, Asih Niati²

¹Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Cendekia Karya Utama

²Universitas Semarang

¹email: sodikinmohamad73@gmail.com; ²email: asih.niati@usm.ac.id

Correspondence author email: sodikinmohamad73@gmail.com

Keywords: *classroom action research; teacher professional development; proposal writing; research training; community service*

Abstract: *This community service program aimed to improve teachers' understanding and practical skills in preparing Classroom Action Research (CAR) proposals among senior high school teachers in Semarang City, Indonesia. Classroom Action Research is an essential component of teacher professional development, enabling educators to systematically identify classroom problems, implement pedagogical interventions, and evaluate learning improvement strategies. However, many teachers encounter difficulties in translating classroom challenges into structured research proposals. The program involved 22 teachers from public and private senior high schools in Semarang City and was implemented using a participatory and experiential learning approach integrating theoretical sessions, guided discussion, proposal-writing workshops, and direct mentoring. Training materials covered classroom problem identification, research cycles, proposal structure, formulation of objectives, intervention design, and indicators of success. Program effectiveness was evaluated through direct assessment of participants' practical outputs. The success indicator was defined as a minimum of 90% of participants being able to prepare an initial classroom action research proposal draft correctly according to the provided guidelines. The results showed that the program successfully achieved its target, with 90.9% of participants able to produce an initial classroom action research proposal draft containing essential proposal components. Participants also demonstrated improved confidence and understanding regarding classroom-based research implementation. This program contributes a practical professional development model integrating research literacy enhancement and hands-on proposal writing practice to strengthen teachers' reflective teaching and evidence-based instructional improvement capacity.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Teacher professionalism requires continuous development not only in pedagogical competence but also in reflective practice and research-based instructional improvement. One important competency expected from teachers in Indonesia is the ability to conduct Classroom Action Research (CAR), commonly referred to as Penelitian Tindakan Kelas (PTK).

Classroom Action Research allows teachers to systematically identify classroom problems, implement pedagogical interventions, evaluate instructional effectiveness, and improve learning outcomes through cyclical processes of planning, action, observation, and reflection (Kemmis et al., 2014). Through this process, teachers are encouraged to become reflective practitioners capable of improving instructional quality using evidence derived from their own classrooms.

Previous studies suggest that action research strengthens teacher autonomy, reflective competence, pedagogical innovation, and professional development (Morales, 2016). Furthermore, engagement in practitioner research supports teachers in making data-informed instructional decisions and developing contextually relevant teaching strategies (Banegas & de Castro, 2019; Fraser et al., 2024; Korthagen & Nuijten, 2022). Despite its importance, many teachers continue to experience challenges in preparing classroom action research proposals. Common difficulties include identifying researchable classroom problems, formulating research objectives, designing intervention cycles, and developing measurable indicators of success (Norton, 2009).

Based on preliminary discussions with teachers in Semarang City, many participants reported limited experience and confidence in preparing classroom action research proposals. Teachers often perceived PTK as administratively demanding and lacked practical guidance in translating classroom issues into structured research designs. Therefore, this community service activity was designed to provide practical training on classroom action research proposal writing for senior high school teachers in Semarang City.

2. METHOD

This community service activity employed a participatory training approach emphasizing active participant engagement and practical skill development.

The participants consisted of 22 teachers from public and private senior high schools in Semarang City. The activity was conducted in workshop format consisting of theoretical explanation, guided discussion, practical exercises, and proposal-writing mentoring.

The first stage involved delivery of theoretical materials related to classroom action research, including:

1. The concept and characteristics of CAR,
2. Research cycle structure (planning, action, observation, reflection),

3. Classroom problem identification,
4. Formulation of research objectives,
5. Intervention design,
6. Proposal structure.

The second stage consisted of interactive discussions and case analyses. Participants were encouraged to identify actual classroom learning problems based on their teaching experiences and discuss possible intervention strategies.

The third stage focused on hands-on proposal-writing workshops. Participants were guided step-by-step to prepare initial classroom action research proposal drafts including:

1. Background of the study,
2. Problem formulation,
3. Research objectives,
4. Intervention design,
5. Indicators of success.

Program effectiveness was evaluated through direct assessment of participants' proposal outputs using a checklist instrument assessing (Table 1):

Table 1. Proposal Assessment Checklist

Indicator	Assessment Aspect
Problem identification	Relevance and clarity of classroom issue
Objectives formulation	Alignment with identified problem
Intervention design	Feasibility and relevance
Success indicators	Measurability and appropriateness
Proposal completeness	Required structural components

The success indicator was defined as at least 90% of participants being able to produce an initial classroom action research proposal draft correctly according to the provided guidelines. This output-based evaluation was selected to ensure that program effectiveness was measured through practical competency acquisition rather than participant satisfaction alone.

3. RESULT

Initial observations showed that most participants had limited experience in classroom action research proposal preparation. Although generally familiar with PTK, many participants

struggled to formulate classroom problems into researchable topics and organize proposal components systematically. During training, participants actively engaged in theoretical sessions and discussion activities.



Figure 1. Delivery of classroom action research materials and participant discussion session

Participants discussed issues such as: low student motivation, limited classroom participation, inconsistent learning outcomes, ineffective instructional media. The workshop session became the central component of the program. Participants were guided to directly prepare proposal drafts based on actual classroom challenges.



Figure 2. Guided workshop and proposal drafting activities

To summarize the relationship between identified problems, interventions, and outcomes, the results are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Identified Problems, Interventions, and Outcomes

Identified Problem	Intervention	Observed Outcome
Limited teacher understanding of CAR concepts	Theoretical training on classroom action research	Improved conceptual understanding
Difficulty writing research proposals	Guided proposal drafting workshop	Participants produced initial proposal drafts
Low confidence in conducting CAR	Facilitator mentoring and discussion	Increased teacher confidence in research implementation

To further evaluate the effectiveness of the training program, participants' practical outputs were assessed based on their ability to develop an initial Classroom Action Research (CAR) proposal draft according to the provided guidelines. The assessment focused on proposal completeness, relevance of identified classroom problems, formulation of research objectives, intervention design, and indicators of success. The evaluation results are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. Participant Output Achievement

Assessment Indicator	Number of Participants	Percentage
Successfully completed initial CAR proposal draft	20	90.9%
Required further revision	2	9.1%
Total participants	22	100%

As shown in Table 2, the training program successfully achieved its predefined success indicator, with 20 out of 22 participants (90.9%) able to produce an initial classroom action research proposal draft correctly according to the established guidelines. This result indicates that the combination of theoretical explanation, guided discussion, and hands-on proposal writing workshop was effective in facilitating participants' practical competency development.

The high completion rate suggests that participants were able to translate theoretical understanding of classroom action research into structured proposal components, including problem identification, objective formulation, intervention planning, and indicators of success.

Meanwhile, 2 participants (9.1%) still required further revision, primarily in refining methodological sections, aligning intervention strategies with identified classroom problems, and formulating measurable indicators of success. This finding reflects the heterogeneous research backgrounds among participants and suggests that some teachers may require additional mentoring or follow-up assistance to strengthen proposal quality.

Overall, the results demonstrate that output-based evaluation provides a more objective measure of training effectiveness by assessing tangible participant performance rather than relying solely on self-reported satisfaction or perceived learning improvement. Participants also reported increased confidence in conducting classroom-based research.



Figure 3. Group documentation after completion of training activities

The results indicate that the training successfully improved participants' conceptual understanding and practical competency in classroom action research proposal preparation.

4. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that participatory and practice-oriented training effectively strengthens teachers' competencies in classroom action research proposal preparation. The success of this program is consistent with previous studies emphasizing that teacher professional development is more effective when integrating theoretical knowledge with contextual practice, reflection, and active engagement (Cirocki et al., 2024; Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone & Garet, 2015; Sims et al., 2021; Tobin et al., 2025). Unlike lecture-only approaches, this program adopted an experiential learning model requiring participants to directly apply theoretical concepts into practical outputs. This practical orientation appears to be a critical factor contributing to program effectiveness.

Experiential learning theory suggests that knowledge becomes more meaningful when learners engage in concrete experience, reflection, conceptualization, and active experimentation

(Kolb, 2014) In this program, participants were not limited to passive information reception but were required to operationalize research concepts into proposal drafts. This finding is particularly relevant because teachers frequently struggle not only with conceptual understanding of classroom action research but also with technical aspects of proposal preparation (Banegas & de Castro, 2019).

The use of output-based evaluation further strengthened program accountability. Rather than relying solely on participant satisfaction or self-reported understanding, the program assessed tangible outputs in the form of proposal drafts. The achievement of the 90% success target indicates that the training design was effective in facilitating short-term competency development.

However, several implementation challenges were identified. First, participants demonstrated heterogeneous prior experience in research activities, resulting in varying learning speeds and mentoring needs. Second, the one-day workshop format limited the depth of proposal refinement. Although participants successfully developed initial drafts, many proposals still required further improvement in methodology, instrument design, and data analysis plans. Third, the absence of post-training mentoring or longitudinal follow-up limits understanding regarding whether participants subsequently implemented their classroom action research projects.

These limitations suggest that short-term intervention programs may effectively build initial competencies but are insufficient to ensure sustainable research practice among teachers.

Future programs should therefore integrate:

1. Multi-Session Mentoring,
2. Proposal Clinics,
3. Manuscript Writing Assistance,
4. Follow-Up Monitoring.

Such initiatives may strengthen the transition from proposal development to research implementation and publication outcomes. Despite these limitations, the program successfully strengthened teachers' research literacy, reflective practice, and evidence-based instructional improvement capacity.

5. CONCLUSION

This community service program demonstrates that participatory and experiential training

effectively improves teachers' classroom action research competencies. Through theoretical sessions, guided discussions, and proposal-writing workshops, participants improved both conceptual understanding and practical ability in preparing classroom action research proposals. More than 90% of participants successfully produced initial classroom action research proposal drafts according to established guidelines, indicating achievement of the program's success indicators.

This program contributes a practical professional development model integrating research literacy enhancement and hands-on proposal writing practice to strengthen teachers' reflective teaching and evidence-based instructional improvement capacity.

Future initiatives should incorporate follow-up mentoring and longitudinal monitoring to support proposal refinement, classroom implementation, and academic publication outcomes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to all participating senior high school teachers from public and private schools in Semarang City for their active engagement and enthusiasm throughout the training activities. Appreciation is also extended to the organizing institution and supporting partners for facilitating the successful implementation of this community service program.

REFERENCES

- Banegas, D. L., & de Castro, L. S. V. (2019). Action research. In *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 570–582). Routledge.
- Cirocki, A., Indrarathne, B., & Calderón, V. E. A. (2024). Effectiveness of professional development training on reflective practice and action research: a case study from Ecuador. *Reflective Practice, 25*(5), 676–694
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher professional development. *Learning Policy Institute*.
- Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). *Best practices in teacher's professional development in the United States*.
- Fraser, M., Wotring, A., Green, C. A., & Eady, M. J. (2024). Designing a framework to improve critical reflection writing in teacher education using action research. *Educational Action Research, 32*(1), 43–59.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research* (Vol. 200). Springer.

- Kolb, D. A. (2014). *Experiential learning: Experience as the source of learning and development*. FT press.
- Korthagen, F., & Nuijten, E. (2022). *The power of reflection in teacher education and professional development: Strategies for in-depth teacher learning*. Routledge.
- Morales, M. P. E. (2016). Participatory action research (PAR) cum action research (AR) in teacher professional development: a literature review. *International Journal of Research in Education and Science*, 2(1), 156–165.
- Norton, L. (2009). *Action research in teaching and learning: A practical guide to conducting pedagogical research in universities*. Routledge.
- Sims, S., Fletcher-Wood, H., O'Mara-Eves, A., Cottingham, S., Stansfield, C., Van Herwegen, J., & Anders, J. (2021). What Are the Characteristics of Effective Teacher Professional Development? A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Education Endowment Foundation*.
- Tobin, B., Farren, M., & Crotty, Y. (2025). Impacting teaching and learning through collaborative reflective practice. *Educational Action Research*, 33(5), 756–776.