



Selection, introduction, and editorial content © Simon Borg  
and Hugo Santiago Sanchez 2015  
Individual chapters © Respective authors 2015

All rights reserved. No reproduction, copy or transmission of this  
publication may be made without written permission.

No portion of this publication may be reproduced, copied or transmitted save with  
written permission or in accordance with the provisions of the Copyright, Designs and  
Patents Act 1988, or under the terms of any licence permitting limited copying issued  
by the Copyright Licensing Agency, Saffron House, 6–10 Kirby Street, London EC1N 8TS.

Any person who does any unauthorized act in relation to this publication may be  
liable to criminal prosecution and civil claims for damages.

The authors have asserted their rights to be identified as the authors of this work in  
accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published 2015 by  
PALGRAVE MACMILLAN

Palgrave Macmillan in the UK is an imprint of Macmillan Publishers Limited,  
registered in England, company number 785998, of Houndmills, Basingstoke,  
Hampshire, RG21 6XS.

Palgrave Macmillan in the US is a division of St Martin's Press LLC,  
175 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10010.

Palgrave is the global academic imprint of the above companies and has  
companies and representatives throughout the world.

Palgrave® and Macmillan® are registered trademarks in the United States,  
the United Kingdom, Europe and other countries.

ISBN 978–1–137–37620–6 hardback  
ISBN 978–1–137–37621–3 paperback

This book is printed on paper suitable for recycling and made from fully managed and  
sustained forest sources. Logging, pulping and manufacturing processes are expected  
to conform to the environmental regulations of the country of origin.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

A catalog record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

Typeset by MPS Limited, Chennai, India.

# Contents

<i>List of Figures and Tables</i>	ix
<i>Series Editors' Preface</i>	x
<i>Notes on Contributors</i>	xii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
1 Key Issues in Doing and Supporting Language Teacher Research <i>Simon Borg and Hugo Santiago Sanchez</i>	1
2 Towards New Understandings: Reflections on an Action Research Project with Japanese University Students <i>Gerald Talandis Jr. and Michael Stout</i>	14
3 Action Research as a Means of Stepping Out of the Teaching Comfort Zone <i>Megan Yucel and Vicki Bos</i>	29
4 Learning to Do Teacher Research Independently: Challenges and Solutions <i>Jianmei Xie</i>	47
5 Teacher Research in Video-Based Online Classrooms <i>Paula Charbonneau-Gowdy</i>	57
6 Border Crossings: Researching across Contexts for Teacher Professional Development <i>Patsy Vinogradov</i>	70
7 Participative Investigation: Narratives in Critical Research in the EFL Classroom <i>Gerrard Mugford</i>	87
8 Facilitating Teacher Research: Course Design, Implementation, and Evaluation <i>Simon Borg</i>	98
9 Supporting Teacher Research through a Practical In-Service Course <i>Anisa Saleh Al-Maskari</i>	113
10 Action Research as a Professional Development Strategy <i>Servet Çelik and Kenan Dikilitaş</i>	125

11	Practices and Principles of Pre-Service Action Research <i>Maureen Rajuan</i>	139
12	Teacher Research in the English Language Teacher Development Project <i>Rachel Bowden</i>	152
13	Encouraging Teacher Research through In-House Activities: The Approach of a Finnish University Language Centre <i>Tuula Lehtonen, Kari Pitkänen, and Johanna Vaattovaara</i>	170
14	Teacher Research: Looking Back and Moving Forward <i>Hugo Santiago Sanchez and Simon Borg</i>	185
	<i>Further Reading</i>	194
	<i>Index</i>	199

# 1

## Key Issues in Doing and Supporting Language Teacher Research

*Simon Borg and Hugo Santiago Sanchez*

### Introduction

This chapter identifies and discusses key issues in the contemporary literature on teacher research in language teaching and our purpose here is to outline the broader theoretical framework within which the individual chapters which follow are situated. Teacher research in education generally has a long history (see, for example, Noffke 2002; Olson 1990) and is characterized by a substantial body of literature; we will not attempt to provide a comprehensive analysis of this here but rather our focus will be on selected salient themes. After dealing with definitional matters we focus on methodological and practical issues in the conduct of teacher research. We then consider teacher research from the perspective of those who facilitate it, and outline some observations on both the benefits of teacher research and criticisms of it. We conclude with a brief overview of the structure of the book.

### Defining teacher research

A minimal definition of teacher research is systematic self-study by teachers (individually or collaboratively) which seeks to achieve real-world impact of some kind and is made public. It is thus *systematic* – like any form of research – and involves *self-study* – the focus of inquiry in teacher research is the teacher and their own work. Its goal is *real-world impact* (i.e. it is not an exercise in generating knowledge for its own sake) and such impact can assume many forms. A wide range of possibilities exist; for example, teacher research may impact on teachers' beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, skills, and classroom practices. It may impact on students' beliefs, knowledge and performance, or on some aspect of institutions more generally. Emancipatory views of teacher research (see Hammersley 2004) extend its impact even further to include challenging and promoting change in inequitable social conditions (we return to this notion of teacher research later).

Finally, teacher research needs to be *made public*, as opposed to being a wholly private activity. Teacher inquiry that remains wholly private should not be called research; this does not imply such activity is not valuable, but research by definition seeks to make a contribution to knowledge and it cannot do so if it is not made public. Private inquiry cannot be scrutinized, reviewed, replicated and built on by others, but research can. Private inquiry, no matter how systematic, is better referred to using terms other than research (e.g. reflective practice).

Teacher research goes by many different names. *Practitioner research* is a broader term that includes not just teachers but practitioners in other fields (e.g. nurses) who engage in systematic self-study. *Action research* (e.g. Burns 2010) denotes a particular methodology for doing teacher research which is typically defined by repeated cycles of planning, action, observation and reflection through which changes to practice are evaluated. *Classroom research* is another term that recurs in the literature; this simply denotes research that is conducted in the classroom (i.e. *where* the research takes place). Thus while most teacher research is also classroom research, the latter may also be carried out by, for example, university researchers who visit classrooms to collect data but who are not doing teacher research (because they are studying others rather than themselves).

## Doing teacher research

Teacher research, in common with research generally, requires teachers to identify an issue to examine, to collect information (i.e. data) relevant to it, to examine and interpret that information, and to reach some conclusions. ‘Conclusions’ is perhaps an unfortunate word in that it suggests a degree of finality that research can never justifiably claim, and therefore the conclusions reached through teacher research are always provisional – i.e. they may be revised as a result of further inquiry.

Teacher research is a methodologically-flexible activity – a wide range of strategies can be used in collecting and analysing data as well as in reporting findings. These strategies can be quantitative, qualitative, or a combination of these (mixed methods research) and the range of specific data collection methods available to teachers is quite extensive, for example: interviews (of various kinds), lesson observation, questionnaires, diaries, group discussions, photos, video, student work, teaching materials, policy documents, drawings, recordings of lessons, note taking, checklists, rating scales, stories, and biographical writing (see, for example, Campbell et al. 2004; Freeman 1998; Kalmbach Phillips and Carr 2010).

Teacher research, then, is not defined by particular research methods and, as in research generally, teachers will choose data collection strategies according to the questions that are being investigated. However, one important practical consideration in teacher research is feasibility, or what Allwright (1997)

refers to as sustainability. Teacher research needs to be designed in a way that teachers can manage given the limitations and constraints of their knowledge, skills, and working conditions. A project which requires teachers to invest ten hours a week of their time outside school hours is wholly unfeasible. Similarly, a teacher research project which seeks to collect large volumes of numerical data and to subject these to complex statistical analyses will not succeed. It is essential, then, that decisions to pursue or promote teacher research are based on a sound understanding of what can be feasibly achieved in any given context. This suggests that a feasibility audit may be a useful exercise to engage, addressing questions such as the following:

1. Does the teacher have experience of reflective practice?
2. Do they understand what teacher research is?
3. Are they motivated to do teacher research?
4. Do they have the knowledge required to do research?
5. Do they have the skills required to do research?
6. Will they be able to exercise some autonomy in making decisions about their inquiry?
7. Will they have access to appropriate advice or mentoring?
8. Is the time required for teacher research available?
9. Will the teacher's school support their efforts to do teacher research?
10. Will the teacher have access to a community of teacher researchers?
11. Will the teacher have opportunities to share their work?
12. Will the teacher have access to appropriate resources?
13. Can teacher research be integrated into the teacher's routine practices?
14. Does the project have clear potential benefits?

Clearly, where the answer to the majority of these questions is 'no', then teacher research is not an appropriate option to pursue and other forms of professional development should be considered. In contrast, many 'yes' answers would suggest that the conditions for teacher research are more favourable. Although we are very committed to teacher research, we also recognize that it will not be appropriate in all contexts.

As question 13 above implies, in making teacher research a feasible activity it is important to integrate it as far as possible into the professional practices teachers engage in routinely. We do not believe that teacher research can be accommodated by teachers without any extra commitment (temporal, intellectual, and emotional) on their part; however, teacher research becomes much more feasible when teachers are able to use skills, knowledge, and opportunities which already exist. For example, the observation of learners will be an activity teachers engage in regularly and the skills they have in this respect

can be utilized to good effect in the context of teacher research. Interestingly, as Bartlett and Burton (2003) note, teacher researchers may undervalue the research skills they already possess; yet taking full advantage of these is an important way of making teacher research a more feasible activity.

It is also important to stress that, although it is unreasonable to expect teachers to achieve the scale, rigour, or sophistication that full-time researchers can, quality is an essential concern in teacher research. We understand the argument (reported by practitioners in Borg 2013) that teacher research – because it stimulates reflection on practice – is a beneficial activity irrespective of the results it produces. However, teacher research extends beyond reflection (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999); it seeks to generate understandings which inform practice, and it is thus important that those understandings are trustworthy. This is why quality matters in teacher research – it is not a watered-down, amateurish, or inferior form of inquiry; it has its own distinctive characteristics but shares, with research generally, a commitment to reaching sound conclusions through systematic processes of data collection, analysis, and interpretation, all of which are driven by a concern for specific issues, problems, puzzles, or questions.

What counts as quality in teacher research, though, has been an issue of debate in the literature. One position is to argue that the value of teacher research should be assessed using the same criteria that apply to research generally, though various perspectives also exist on what these generic criteria might be (e.g. Borg 2010a; Denscombe 2002; Pawson et al. 2003). For example, Eisenhart and Howe (1992) specify five quality standards that can be applied to all forms of research; one, for instance, is that the research methods should fit the research questions while another is that clear links should be made to existing knowledge. The latter is a good example of where generic criteria for research quality may not sit comfortably with teacher research; teachers typically do not have easy access to background literature and may lack the time and skills to process this material when they can access it; thus while we would always recommend that teacher researchers do some background reading, we would not expect this to be extensive or deeply analytical in the manner that it is written up. An alternative position is to argue that teacher research, as a distinctive form of inquiry, should be assessed against a unique set of criteria. Anderson and Herr (1999), for example, propose five kinds of validity (outcome, process, democratic, catalytic and dialogic) for evaluating practitioner research (see Oolbakkink-Marchand et al. 2014 for a recent analysis that applies these criteria to secondary school teachers' practitioner research). Another example is McNiff and Whitehead (2009: 319) who assess the quality of action research using the criteria of

comprehensibility; truth in the sense of providing sufficient evidence to justify the claims being made; rightness in the sense of justifying the normative assumptions in the research; and authenticity in the sense that the

researcher shows over time and in interaction that they are genuinely committed to what they claim to believe in.

Clearly, then, there is no ‘correct’ answer to what counts as quality in teacher research; it is important, though, that teacher researchers are explicit about which of the available quality criteria they are seeking to address.

One significant methodological advantage that teacher research has over conventional forms of inquiry stems from the extended and intimate contact with the classroom that teachers have. Teachers’ professional lives unfold and are enacted on a daily basis in the very settings in which teacher research happens. That affords teachers access to data which exceeds by far that available to any outside researcher visiting a classroom, even over an extended period of time. However, teachers’ dual role as researchers and research participants also creates challenges. For example, it can be difficult for teachers to achieve the distance from their experience that is required to examine it critically. Another challenge for teacher researchers relates to their relationships with students and colleagues. In conventional research, the roles of researchers and participants are clearly defined – the former have full responsibility for the study, the latter contribute by providing data, and interactions between the two parties are typically infrequent, short-term, and fairly formal. Teacher research involves a different set of relationships between the researchers and those individuals who form part of their local professional community. For example, teachers work with their students on a daily basis and will seek, in the interests of good pedagogy, to establish good relationships with them. These relationships cannot be dismissed because the teacher researcher feels they need to be ‘objective’. Similar questions arise in relation to the roles that students play in teacher research. They may function simply as a source of data; they may, though, assume a more participatory role (e.g. by contributing to the choice of issues to focus on or to how the data will be collected). Students may even be involved in collecting (rather than just providing) data – see, for example, the discussion of exploratory practice in Allwright and Hanks (2009). The same applies to the role of colleagues in teacher research; they may only be asked to provide data or can alternatively be an active part of a group that is collectively responsible for the design, conduct, and reporting of the study. Teacher researchers, then, need to adopt an explicit stance in relation to the members of the educational communities in which inquiry is taking place.

### **Supporting teacher research**

Borg (2010b) claims that teacher research remains a minority activity in the field of language teaching, particularly if those teachers who do research in their classrooms as part of an academic degree are not counted. While it



remains the case that teacher research is not a common activity in our field, there is increasing evidence worldwide of initiatives that are seeking to promote it in systematic ways (e.g. the Cambridge English-English UK Action Research Scheme or the Cambridge University Press Teacher Research Scheme). This realization that teacher research needs to be supported is important and represents a step forward from the rather simplistic belief that once teachers have been told about the benefits of teacher research they will then without hesitation proceed to engage fully in it. It is clear that teachers' own backgrounds and the contexts in which language teachers work around the world are often not conducive to teacher research and indeed to professional development more generally; however, with carefully planned support structures it is possible for teacher research to become a productive element in teachers' professional lives. This, then, raises important questions about how the development of teacher researchers can be effectively facilitated.

An important source of insight here is contemporary thinking in the field of teacher professional learning more generally (e.g. Borg 2015; Borko et al. 2010; Darling-Hammond and Lieberman 2012; Muijs et al. 2014; Timperley 2011). Although we would not want to be prescriptive about what constitutes good practice in supporting the professional development of teachers (as Opfer and Pedder 2011 note, varying contexts mean that what 'works' will also vary), there is broad consensus in education generally that professional learning will be more effective when it has these characteristics:

- it is seen by teachers to be relevant to their needs and those of their students;
- teachers are centrally involved in decisions about content and process;
- collaboration and the sharing of expertise among teachers is fostered;
- it is a collective enterprise supported by schools and educational systems more broadly;
- exploration and reflection are emphasized over methodological prescriptivism;
- expert internal and/or external support is available;
- classroom inquiry by teachers is seen as a central professional learning process.

Teacher research, as a strategy which has reflective classroom-based inquiry at its core, is well-aligned with such aspirations. The importance of collaboration is also noted here; in its most basic form, this implies that teacher researchers will benefit from opportunities to talk to colleagues about the work they are doing; collaboration can, though, where appropriate, be significantly scaled up to include teacher research projects in which several teachers in one or more schools are concurrently engaged in exploring an issue of common interest.

Beyond these general recommendations for supporting teacher learning, specific discussions of the practices and principles of teacher research facilitators

are not widely available in the literature. Outside language teaching, Levin (2008) discusses ways of preparing PhD students for action research. Taylor et al. (2008) discuss how they teach reflective practice, while Mead (2008) discusses ten attributes that a facilitator of a large-scale action research project requires – for example, not being attached to particular ways of working, a capacity to tolerate uncertainty, a willingness to act decisively when needed, and a determination to insist on what is needed to make the project work. Another relevant resource for facilitators of teacher research is McKernan (1996), who dedicates a chapter of his book to ‘Teaching Action Research’. He discusses several courses from different contexts and outlines the principles he follows in his own work. He also highlights key course design issues which merit close attention, such as the duration of the course, how it is assessed, the size of the group, and the teaching and learning approaches that are used.

In language teaching, Anne Burns, who has been involved in supporting action research for many years, particularly in Australia, has written about the design and evaluation of different initiatives she has facilitated (most recently Burns 2014) and these analyses provide consistent support for the central role that an expert mentor can play in fostering teacher research; the importance of institutional support for teacher research is also repeatedly highlighted. Borg (2013) reviews various reports<sup>1</sup> of various teacher research projects and also analyses two he facilitated in order to identify factors in their design and conduct that contributed to positive outcomes. A long list of such factors were identified, including official support, an extended period of time, feasible objectives, a clear structure, an advisor who provided teachers with regular support, a strong practical orientation, concrete outcomes and opportunities for dissemination. The analysis of teachers’ needs and concerns was also important in allowing these courses to maximize the effectiveness of the support provided. For example, in one case, early in the project teachers were asked to identify challenges they felt they would face and they noted issues such as time-management, staying on schedule, obtaining relevant books, and designing instruments. An awareness of these potential difficulties allowed the facilitator to consider ways of addressing them.

Overall, then, there is scope for a wider discussion in the literature of the thinking behind the design of teacher research initiatives and of the practices that facilitators on such initiatives adopt to support teachers, particularly in contexts outside university-based programmes.

## **Benefits of teacher research**

In contrast to some of the issues we have discussed so far, the benefits of teacher research have received extensive coverage in the literature, and a very long list of such benefits could be extracted from a wide range of sources. For example (see Borg 2013), teacher research has been reported to impact on

teachers' confidence, self-esteem, classroom practices, autonomy, motivation, collegiality, and enthusiasm. The benefits to schools more generally have also been noted (Sharp 2007) and positive impacts on learners have been identified too (Bell et al. 2010). There is no doubt, then, that teacher research is seen to have enormous potential to impact positively on teachers, students, and organizations. More critically, though, much of the evidence that is available comes from self-reports provided by teachers, either in written or oral feedback or through written research reports, and which capture teachers' perspectives at the end of a teacher research course. While such sources of insight into the impacts of teacher research will continue to be important, it would also be valuable to complement them with additional perspectives, such as those of colleagues, students, and head teachers. The benefits of teacher research over time, too, is an issue we need to examine more closely – to what extent are the gains teachers report at the end of a teacher research course sustained in the subsequent months? There are, of course, practical difficulties involved in tracking down teachers months after a course has ended and limitations of funding may often mean that delayed evaluations of this kind are not possible; the general point is, though, that as a field we would benefit from a broader and longer-term analysis of the impacts that teacher research has on teachers, students, and schools.

### **Criticisms of teacher research**

Finally, but not insignificantly, it is important for us to acknowledge some of the criticisms that have been levelled at teacher research. In his analysis of published teacher research in language teaching, Borg (2010b) notes that this is often conducted within the context of academic programmes or by teachers working in universities rather than in schools. The format in which much teacher research is reported also mirrors that used in conventional research reports, which may imply that teacher research is struggling to establish its own identity as a genre of research. Other criticisms relate to the methodological quality of teacher research. In education, Huberman (1996) has questioned the reliability of the methods used in teacher research and of the conclusions that are reached; Ellis (2010) notes similar methodological concerns about work conducted by language teachers. The importance of quality in teacher research has been noted above and it is difficult to defend work which has severe methodological flaws. Criticisms of teacher research, though, will always be based on assumptions about what research is, the standards it should meet, and the purposes it should serve, and it is unfair to judge teacher research against targets which it does not aspire to meet. For example, teacher researchers tend to have local concerns – they want to develop understandings which can contribute to the improvement of their own practices; concerns about

the generalizability of the conclusions they reach are secondary. Critiques of teacher research which focus on its lack of generalizability, then, are not justified, particularly when the notions of generalizability being applied are ones which rely on statistical logic. Alternative ways of thinking about generalizability do exist, though, which depend on ‘a richness of description and interpretation that makes a particular case interesting and relevant to those in other situations’ (Richards 2003: 286). This takes us back to our earlier discussion of the criteria against which teacher research should be assessed.

We will highlight two further criticisms of language teacher research. The first comes from Dörnyei (2007), who claimed that he had never met a teacher who had volunteered to do action research. We hope that several years on, he has been fortunate enough to meet some teachers who have, for many do exist (e.g. on the action research schemes run in the UK and Australia by Cambridge English and its respective partners). A more serious criticism of teacher research in language teaching is that it tends to have a very immediate focus on pedagogical issues in teachers’ own classrooms. The context for such an observation is the view that teacher research has the potential to contribute to broader social and political change (see, for example, Kemmis and McTaggart 2008). Teacher research in language teaching, though, very often limits itself to teachers’ individual classrooms and fails to make broader connections with the schools these are part of, never mind socio-political concerns more generally. We do not have an explanation for the narrow practical focus of teacher research in our field; it may relate to the fact that for many language teachers, the process of becoming teacher researchers involves such a significant conceptual and attitudinal shift that a consideration of broader and deeper socio-political issues is not feasible. The explanation may also lie more broadly in the culture of English language teaching globally and specifically in the training courses through which individuals gain access to the profession; if an awareness of the socio-political dimensions of language teaching (see, for example, McKay and Rubdy 2011) is not created early in their careers, teachers may not be sensitive to them. In any case, there is a stark contrast between teacher research reports and textbooks in the field of language teaching, on the one hand, and volumes such as, for example, Noffke and Somekh (2009) where there is a strong focus on the broader social and political implications of educational action research. Such observations may extend to much teacher research outside language teaching too, given some criticisms of work done by teachers in the UK (e.g. Elliott and Sarland 1995).

### **Structure of the book**

In this chapter we have highlighted a range of issues which are central to teacher research in language teaching, both from the perspectives of the

practitioners who engage in such research as well as of those who are responsible for facilitating such engagement. In the chapters that follow, language teaching professionals from around the world describe and analyse specific examples of their experiences in either doing or supporting teacher research and, through their accounts, provide situated illustrations that shed light on how some of the dilemmas and challenges we have signalled here are realized in practice.

Chapters 2 to 5 focus on the perspectives of teachers as they experience what becoming and being a teacher researcher involve. In Chapter 2, Talandis and Stout provide a reflective account of a year-long collaborative action research project undertaken at a private university in Japan. The authors discuss issues of research design, implementation, and reporting, and address some of the difficulties inherent in simultaneously fulfilling teacher and researcher roles. In Chapter 3, Yucel and Bos report on an action research project conducted in an English language centre attached to a university in Australia. The authors examine how engaging in action research represented stepping out of their comfort zones in different ways, from doing research for the first time to exploring an unconventional method for pronunciation teaching, and how this contributed to the development of relevant teaching and research skills. In Chapter 4, Xie reflects on her experience as a novice teacher of English learning to do research independently in an examination-oriented tertiary education context in China. She explores both the factors that facilitated her learning as well as the challenges she faced and her responses to them. In Chapter 5, Charbonneau-Gowdy describes her experience as a teacher researching her own video-based on-line classroom setting. She details the challenges encountered and the lessons learnt and considers the deeper principles underpinning her approach to action research.

Chapters 6 to 13 focus on the perspectives of those who facilitate teacher research, highlighting the practices and principles they employ in supporting teachers. Chapter 6 acts as a bridge between the two sets of perspectives since Vinogradov adopts the dual role of teacher researcher and facilitator. The author describes a collaborative inquiry conducted in the context of adult ESL education in the United States, and illustrates the impact on professional development of stepping outside one's teaching context, or 'border crossing', to engage in teacher research. In Chapter 7, Mugford reflects on the process of supporting beginning 'non-native' EFL student-teacher researchers in Mexico in defining and evaluating modes of research which were locally relevant. He outlines the challenges and obstacles which these student-teacher researchers met as they engaged in research. In Chapter 8, Borg examines a teacher research initiative that he facilitated with a group of university and college teachers of English in Pakistan. The analysis utilizes a five-point framework through which several factors which contributed to the success of the initiative are highlighted. Al-Maskari, in Chapter 9, reports on a research in-service

training course offered to teachers of English in Oman. She discusses the features of the course's structure and processes which contributed to the teachers' positive evaluation of it and the major obstacles to research engagement in the Omani context. This is followed in Chapter 10 by Çelik and Dikilitaş' account of an action research programme with Turkish EFL teachers. The authors outline the procedures followed in the programme, the challenges experienced by the teachers, and the perceived impact of action research on their practices. In Chapter 11, Rajuan provides a description of an action research course in the final year of a pre-service teacher education course in Israel. She details the framework used to support student-teacher learning and discusses how it enables student teachers to integrate theories and principles of education with their classroom practices. Bowden, in Chapter 12, illustrates three case-study examples of teacher research drawn from a large-scale teacher development project in Malaysia. The author presents reflections from mentors on processes, outcomes, challenges and, in particular, on the factors which facilitated teacher research. Finally, in Chapter 13, Lehtonen, Pitkänen, and Vaattovaara discuss the approaches adopted by a university language centre in Finland to encourage teacher engagement with and in research. The authors outline the role which support, collaboration and in-house activities played in promoting research engagement in a traditionally teaching-oriented university department.

Each of the core chapters includes a list of 'engagement priorities' which suggest issues for continuing inquiry in relation to teacher research. The book concludes with a chapter which pulls together key commonalities in the collection, highlighting issues that are central to the continuing development of teacher research in language teaching and identifying some new lines of thinking.

## Notes

1. As this chapter went to press two further publications of relevance appeared – Burns & Edwards (2014) and Smith et al. (2014).

## References

- Allwright, D. (1997). Quality and sustainability in teacher-research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31(2): 368–370.
- Allwright, D. and Hanks, J. (2009). *The Developing Language Learner: An Introduction to Exploratory Practice*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Anderson, G. L. and Herr, K. (1999). The new paradigm wars: Is there room for rigorous practitioner knowledge in schools and universities? *Educational Researcher*, 28(5): 12–21, 40.
- Bartlett, S. and Burton, D. (2003). The professional development of teachers through practitioner research: A discussion using significant cases of best practice research scholarships. *Teacher Development*, 7(1): 107–120.

- Bell, M., Cordingley, P., Isham, C. and Davis, R. (2010). Report of professional practitioner use of research review: practitioner engagement in and/or with research. Coventry: CUREE, GTCE, LSIS & NTRP.
- Borg, S. (2010a). Doing good quality research. *JACET Journal*, 50: 9–13.
- Borg, S. (2010b). Language teacher research engagement. *Language Teaching*, 43(4): 391–429.
- Borg, S. (2013). *Teacher Research in Language Teaching: A Critical Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borg, S. (2015). Researching language teacher education. In B. Paltridge and A. Phakiti (eds). *The Continuum Companion to Research Methods in Applied Linguistics* (Second Edition). London: Bloomsbury.
- Borko, H., Jacobs, J. and Koellner, K. (2010). Contemporary approaches to teacher professional development. In P. Peterson, E. Baker and B. McGaw (eds). *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition). Oxford: Elsevier, pp. 548–556.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching. A Guide for Practitioners*. New York: Routledge.
- Burns, A. (2014). Professional learning in Australian ELICOS: An action research orientation. *English Australia Journal*, 29(2): 3–20.
- Burns, A., & Edwards, E. (2014). Introducing innovation through action research in an Australian national programme: Experiences and insights. In D. Hayes (ed.). *Innovations in the Continuing Professional Development of English Language Teachers*. London: British Council, pp. 65–86.
- Campbell, A., McNamara, O. and Gilroy, P. (2004). *Practitioner Research and Professional Development in Education*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Cochran-Smith, M. and Lytle, S. L. (1999). The teacher research movement: A decade later. *Educational Researcher*, 28(7): 15–25.
- Darling-Hammond, L. and Lieberman, A. (2012). *Teacher Education around the World: Changing Policies and Practices*. London: Routledge.
- Denscombe, M. (2002). *Ground Rules for Good Research*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eisenhart, M. A. and Howe, K. R. (1992). Validity in educational research. In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy and J. Preissle (eds). *The Handbook of Qualitative Research in Education*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp. 643–680.
- Elliott, J. and Sarland, C. (1995). A study of ‘teachers as researchers’ in the context of award-bearing courses and research degrees. *British Educational Research Journal*, 21(3): 371–385.
- Ellis, R. (2010). Second language acquisition, teacher education and language pedagogy. *Language Teaching*, 43(2): 182–201.
- Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing Teacher Research*. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Hammersley, M. (2004). Action research: A contradiction in terms? *Oxford Review of Education*, 30(2): 165–181.
- Huberman, M. (1996). Focus on research moving mainstream: Taking a closer look at teacher research. *Language Arts*, 73(2): 124–140.
- Kalmbach Phillips, D. and Carr, K. (2010). *Becoming a Teacher through Action Research* (Second Edition). London: Routledge.
- Kemmis, S. and McTaggart, R. (2008). Participatory action research: Communicative action and public sphere. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (Third Edition.). Los Angeles: Sage Publications, pp. 271–330.
- Levin, M. (2008). The praxis of educating action researchers. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* (Second Edition). London: Sage Publications, pp. 669–681.

- McKay, S. L. and Rubdy, R. (2011). The social and sociolinguistic contexts of language learning and teaching. In M. H. Long and C. J. Doughty (eds). *The Handbook of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 9–25.
- McKernan, J. (1996). *Curriculum Action Research: A Handbook of Methods and Resources for the Reflective Practitioner* (Second Edition). London: Kogan Page.
- McNiff, J. and Whitehead, J. (2009). Demonstrating quality in educational research for social accountability. In S. E. Noffke and B. Somekh (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Educational Action Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 313–323.
- Mead, G. (2008). Muddling through: Facing the challenges of managing a large-scale action research project. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds), *The Sage Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* (Second Edition). London: Sage Publications, pp. 629–642.
- Muijs, D., Kyriakides, L., van der Werf, G., Creemers, B., Timperley, H. and Earl, L. (2014). State of the art – teacher effectiveness and professional learning. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 25(2): 231–256.
- Noffke, S. E. (2002). Action research: Towards the next generation. In C. Day, J. Elliott, B. Somekh and R. Winter (eds). *Theory and Practice in Action Research*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 13–26.
- Noffke, S. E. and Somekh, B. (eds). (2009). *The Sage Handbook of Educational Action Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Olson, M. W. (1990). The teacher as researcher: A historical perspective. In M. W. Olson (ed.), *Opening the Door to Classroom Research*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, pp. 1–20.
- Oolbakkink-Marchand, H. W., van der Steen, J. and Nijveldt, M. (2014). A study of the quality of practitioner research in secondary education: Impact on teacher and school development. *Educational Action Research*, 22(1): 122–139.
- Opfer, V. D. and Pedder, D. (2011). Conceptualizing teacher professional learning. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(3): 376–407.
- Pawson, R., Boaz, A., Grayson, L., Long, A. and Barnes, C. (2003). Types and quality of knowledge in social care. Available from: <http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/knowledgereviews/kr03.pdf> [Accessed 29/07/14.]
- Richards, K. (2003). *Qualitative Inquiry in TESOL*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Sharp, C. (2007). *Making Research Make a Difference. Teacher Research: A Small-Scale Study to Look at Impact*. Chelmsford: Flare.
- Smith, R., Connelly, T. and Rebolledo, P. (2014). Teacher-research as continuing professional development: A project with Chilean secondary school teachers. In D. Hayes (ed.). *Innovations in the Continuing Professional Development of English Language Teachers*. London: British Council, pp. 111–129.
- Taylor, S., Rudolph, J. W. and Foldy, E. G. (2008). Teaching reflective practice in the action science/action inquiry tradition: Key stages, concepts and practices. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds). *The Sage Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and Practice* (Second Edition). London: Sage Publications, pp. 656–668.
- Timperley, H. (2011). *Realizing the Power of Professional Learning*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.



# Index

- action research, 7, 9, 17, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 37, 40, 44, 73, 89, 98, 115, 116, 125, 126, 128, 129, 139, 140, 141, 149, 158, 186, 187, 188, 194, 195, 196, 197  
 aims of, 15, 38, 139, 158  
 cycles of, 2, 14–15, 127, 129, 144–7  
 definitions, 2, 14–15, 38  
 facilitating, 44, 128, 136, 141, 144, 145, 148, 149, 150, 158, 165  
 impact of, 10, 11, 29, 30, 33, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 108, 135, 140, 141–4, 148, 149, 150  
 issues, 135  
 nature of, 24, 30, 64  
 principles of, 10  
 projects, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 29, 34, 37, 38, 43, 44, 51, 108, 126, 130, 132, 140, 141, 143, 144–7, 148, 149, 150  
 quality of, 4, 19  
 websites, 140, 144  
 agency, 58, 60, 167, 171  
 anxiety, 49, 51, 100, 146, 147  
 autonomy, 3, 8, 17, 106, 139, 159, 161, 189  
  
 beliefs, 1, 6, 26, 34, 48, 62, 74, 99, 101, 102, 103, 106, 108, 114, 115, 118, 119, 145, 146, 149, 155, 157, 160, 164, 167, 170, 175, 181, 182, 188, 190, 196  
  
 case study, 11, 116, 152, 153, 156, 158–61, 161–3, 163–4, 165, 168, 196, 197  
 choir, 29, 33, 36, 39, 41, 42, 43  
 classroom-based inquiry, *see* classroom research  
 classroom-based research, *see* classroom research  
 classroom research, 2, 6, 14, 22, 23, 25, 26, 58, 59, 61, 63–4, 65, 66, 67, 114, 157, 195, 196, 197  
  
 collaboration, 6, 26, 33, 37, 38, 45, 64, 73, 77, 81, 84, 123, 143, 144, 149, 152, 160, 170, 171, 173, 176, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 189, 195  
 collaborative inquiry, 10, 75, 79, 80, 81, 83, 84, 188  
 collaborative working culture, 171, 180, 182  
 constructivism, 153  
 course design, 7, 44, 98, 121, 178  
  
 data analysis, 24, 68, 100, 116, 129  
 data collection, 2, 4, 20, 24, 25, 35, 65, 94, 100, 113, 116, 127, 129, 132, 133, 167, 187  
 methods, 2, 100, 113, 129, 130–1, 131  
 dissemination, 7, 68, 99, 100, 103, 107, 143, 197  
 document analysis, 187  
  
 education, types of,  
   adult, 72, 73, 75, 77, 185  
   primary/elementary, 76, 84, 88, 153, 161  
   private sector, 10, 14, 16, 89, 91, 126, 185  
   secondary/high school, 16, 19, 75, 85, 88  
   state sector, 161, 185  
   university/higher, 16, 85, 99, 100, 106, 136, 183, 197  
 empowerment, 33, 40–1, 45, 141, 149  
 English as a foreign language (EFL), 10, 11, 15–16, 31, 60, 66, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94, 96, 125, 126, 127, 136, 139, 140, 195, 197  
 English as a lingua franca (ELF), 31, 125  
 English as a second language (ESL), 10, 71, 72–7, 77–9, 80, 81, 84, 194  
 English language teaching (ELT), 9, 23, 44, 50, 51, 53, 55, 70, 88, 99, 121, 122, 126, 127, 136, 137, 158, 186, 195, 196  
 ethics, 62, 107, 116, 187

- facilitative conditions, 109  
   *see also* action research (facilitating)  
   *see also* teacher research (facilitating)
- impact, 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 32, 53, 55, 73,  
   74, 82, 83, 99, 101, 102, 103, 107,  
   108, 110, 128, 134, 137, 139, 149,  
   155, 160, 161, 162, 167, 171, 182,  
   185, 187, 189, 190, 191, 194, 198  
   *see also* action research (impact of)  
   *see also* teacher research (impact of)
- institutional structures, 173–5
- interviews, 2, 48, 50, 60, 63, 65, 73, 75,  
   81, 82, 83, 90, 92, 93, 94, 100, 101,  
   116, 124, 131, 132, 133, 159, 163,  
   187
- journals, 18, 22, 27, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 45,  
   90, 145, 196  
   pedagogical, 144  
   reflection, 30, 38, 40, 42  
   reflective, 35, 76  
   research, 120  
   teacher, 35, 45, 187
- language as local practice, 95, 96
- language centre (LC), 10, 11, 29, 32, 170,  
   171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177,  
   178, 179, 181, 182, 185, 196, 197
- language learner histories, 90, 91, 93, 94,  
   95, 96, 196
- leadership, 38, 155, 170, 171, 173, 180,  
   182
- learning community, 80, 143
- lesson notes, 19, 187
- literacy, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76,  
   77–9, 80, 81, 83, 84, 188, 194,  
   195, 198
- literature review, 20, 24, 130
- mentoring, 3, 51, 144, 155, 156, 165, 166,  
   176, 196
- motivation/demotivation, 8, 15, 17, 19,  
   23, 42, 55, 58, 73, 93, 101, 105, 109,  
   115, 117, 121, 125, 127, 143, 159,  
   160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 189, 190,  
   191, 196
- music, 31–2, 33, 42, 197  
   *see also* singing
- narrative inquiry, 35, 195, 196
- narratives, 22, 25, 35, 37, 87, 90, 91,  
   92–4, 92, 93, 94, 95, 107, 194, 195,  
   196, 197, 198
- observations, 1, 3, 9, 20, 30, 42, 45, 63,  
   74, 75, 81, 116, 144, 145, 146  
   classroom, 2, 165, 187  
   peer, 174, 178  
   personal, 137  
   process of, 129  
   teacher's, 132
- parental involvement, 162, 163, 164
- participation metaphor, 90, 91, 92, 93,  
   95, 96, 197
- participatory action research, 64, 187
- pilot activities, 100, 163
- practicum, 140, 143, 150
- practitioner research, *see* teacher  
   research
- professional development (PD), 3, 6, 10,  
   30, 34, 36, 37, 40, 51, 52, 54, 62, 66,  
   70, 71–4, 75, 79–80, 81, 82, 83, 84,  
   85, 98, 101, 102, 106, 110, 113, 114,  
   115, 123, 125, 126–7, 128, 131, 132,  
   134, 135, 136, 141, 149, 152, 156,  
   158, 166, 186, 187, 189, 190, 191,  
   192, 196, 197
- teacher development, 11, 52, 120, 121,  
   123, 128, 135, 136, 152, 153, 154,  
   155, 155–6, 157, 164, 167, 168, 189,  
   196, 198
- progress reports, 117, 120, 135
- pronunciation teaching, 10, 30–1
- publication, 8, 18, 25, 26, 40, 51, 72, 89,  
   100, 102, 107, 109, 127, 134, 144,  
   145, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180,  
   195, 198
- questionnaires, 2, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 24,  
   27, 48, 50, 62, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95,  
   116, 117, 124, 130, 132, 141, 159,  
   162, 179, 187
- reflective practice, 2, 3, 7, 29, 30, 54, 73,  
   106, 121, 149, 155, 156, 157, 181,  
   196, 197
- promoting, 118, 120

- reflective practitioner, 30, 54, 110, 152, 155, 157, 158, 167
- reflective teaching, 25, 30, 35, 196
- research courses, 8, 11, 89, 98, 99, 102, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121, 122, 123, 140, 188, 194, 197
- research development group, 174, 176
- research engagement, 11, 171, 173, 175, 180, 181, 182, 183
  - engagement priorities, 26–7, 55–6, 122–3, 172–3, 182–3
- research proposals, 48, 49, 51, 54, 100, 104, 116, 124, 127, 131–3
- research questions, 4, 19, 24, 83, 103, 116, 119, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 158, 159, 160, 161, 178
- self-esteem, 8, 15, 16, 51, 101, 189
- singing, 31, 32, 33, 37, 42, 45
  - see also* music
- socio-cultural theory, 153, 171, 177, 182, 195, 197
- student teacher, 11, 47, 89, 94, 139, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150
- study circle, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83
- teacher education, 11, 108, 147, 155, 194
  - pre-service, 11
  - student-teacher learning, 11, 139
  - teacher development, *see* professional development (teacher development)
  - teacher educator, 127, 128, 139, 143, 156, 191
  - teacher trainer, 66, 113, 126, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 149
  - teacher training, 51, 66, 125, 132, 139, 140, 149
  - teaching and, 154–5
    - see also* student teacher
- teacher identity, 33, 34, 37, 43, 44, 143, 189
- teacher learning, 6, 11, 48, 51, 74, 82, 99
- teacher research, 1, 9, 15, 21, 47, 48, 59, 64, 67, 75, 83, 84, 91, 96, 106, 114, 123, 124, 127, 134, 196
  - assessment on, 105–6
  - challenges of, 3, 14, 24, 33, 51–53, 55, 56, 68, 71, 73, 107, 114, 152, 170, 171, 173, 175, 180, 181, 191–2
  - characteristics of, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 14, 55, 185–6
  - contexts for, 106, 110, 185
  - criticisms of, 8–9
  - defining, 1–2, 14, 26–7, 30, 51, 54, 100, 113, 139, 167, 185, 186, 196
  - doing, 2, 2–5, 10, 14, 47, 55, 98, 99, 102, 103, 105, 116, 118, 119, 121, 122, 136, 185, 195, 196
  - facilitating, 1, 5–7, 10, 11, 53, 54, 55, 56, 89, 90, 95, 98, 99, 101, 106–10, 110, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118–22, 123, 136, 137, 152, 153, 158, 163, 164–6, 167, 168, 185, 188–9, 191, 192, 194, 195, 196, 197
  - impact of, 1, 6, 7–8, 9, 14, 60, 61, 65, 71, 72–4, 98, 101, 102, 107, 108, 110, 113, 137, 164, 189–91
  - quality of, 4, 8, 104, 105, 110, 187
  - schemes, 6, 99
  - strategies for, 186–7
- teacher trainer, *see* teacher education (teacher trainer)
- teacher training, *see* teacher education (teacher training)
- teaching methodology, 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 29, 34, 35, 38, 40, 42, 44, 48, 49, 50, 51, 87, 88, 89, 94, 96, 98, 99, 100, 105, 115–16, 129, 130, 132, 135, 136, 142, 155, 157, 164, 166, 167, 186, 187, 191, 194, 195, 198
- technology, 37, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 71, 100, 195, 197
- university pedagogy, 173, 174, 176, 176–7, 178, 179, 180, 183
- videoconference, 60, 64