Action Research for Second Language Teachers: Going Beyond Teacher Research

GRAHAM CROOKES
University of Hawaii

In this paper I outline the history of action research, and distinguish between two kinds of action research, both of considerable importance and utility to the second language (SL) field. I then discuss action research reports, which may have been a source of some concerns expressed as to the quality of action research. Although action research reports may take forms different from those of orthodox research, I suggest that they are of interest and potential benefit to both the regular SL teacher and the profession as a whole.

1. INTRODUCTION

Although 'action research' has a long history, it is a term which has only quite recently become known and used in ESL. It is apparently, therefore, something 'new', and predictably has already become a buzzword within the field of second language studies. There are good reasons for being sceptical of anything the ESL field takes up and finds fashionable, and this has already led to the suspicion in some quarters that action research implies a new research methodology which will lead to work of poor quality or work which is undesirable in other ways (for example, Jarvis 1991; cf. Brumfit and Mitchell 1989; Usher and Bryant 1989; Winter 1989). It is the purpose of the present paper to clarify the nature of action research, and thereby dispel this suspicion. Accordingly, I first outline the history of action research, and distinguish between two kinds of action research, both of considerable importance and utility to the SL field. I comment briefly on the written products of action research, which are part of the source of the suspicions concerning quality, and argue that, while the forms of action research reports are different from those of orthodox research, they are of interest and potential benefit to both the regular SL teacher and the profession as a whole.

2. DEFINITIONS; TWO BASIC CONCEPTIONS, HISTORY

There are varying understandings of the term 'action research' (Kelly 1985; Chesler 1990). At the very least, it carries a general implication that teachers will be involved in a research activity. An important difference between action research and other research done by teachers is that in the latter instance teachers might well be doing research on issues and questions which are those considered most important by the established community of scholars in the relevant field, i.e. theory-driven research. However, in action research it is accepted that research questions should emerge from a teacher's own immediate concerns and problems.

Having made this distinction, let us recognize a core area for action research—teachers doing research on their own teaching and the learning of their own students. Nunan (1990: 63) cites Kemmis and McTaggart (1982): action research is 'trying out ideas in practice as a means of improvement and as a means of increasing knowledge about the curriculum, teaching, and learning'. Van Lier (1988) cites Cohen and Manion (1985: 174), who define action research as 'small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world and a close examination of the effects of such intervention'.

These definitions subsume at least two distinguishable trends. The first is an older, relatively conservative line, which finds action research equivalent to research done by a 'teacher-researcher.' The second is a newer, more progressive line where the term 'action research' is used to refer to aspects of critical education practice that is, education and educational research which is committed to emancipating individuals from the domination of unexamined assumptions embodied in the status quo (cf. Ericson 1986: 208). The older line is nominally value-free (but in practice is not)—the newer line is explicitly value-laden. Both kinds are important, but whether our field understands or appreciates them equally is questionable (see Section 3).

I have said that action research is not truly new. This really applies to the older conception just mentioned. Thus defined, action research seems no more than a description of what good teachers might be expected to do in the course of their teaching and thinking, and thus while praiseworthy, seems hardly innovative. Whether such activities have in fact been a standard part of teaching is questionable, however. Olson (1990) refers to US teachers engaging in curriculum design and related classroom research during the first two decades of this century (for example, Lowry 1908) but this appears to have been exceptional. During the post-war period, with extensive federal funding, US educational research followed the practice of industry and adopted an 'R and D' model (Carr and Kemmis 1986), which accepted that researchers would research and teachers would teach, and the twain would only meet on curriculum projects, in which the researchers would tell the teachers what to do. This was certainly the case, for example, in the Hawaii English Project (Brandon 1982; Rodgers and Richards n.d.), which ran through the 1970s. A contrasting but equally unsatisfactory situation is claimed to have existed in Britain during this period; according to Elliott (1987: 162):

in the United Kingdom during the late 1960s and early 1970s... curricula were being misused by teachers, who adapted them to match their traditional pedagogy... the problem was exacerbated by the prevailing ideology of teacher autonomy, which gave developers little control over the use of their products.

Some interest in action research in mainstream education was apparent during the 1950s and early 1960s (Corey 1953; Wann 1953), and it was probably at this time that it first became a possibility in SL work (Lane 1962), but examples of actual practice seem to have been rare until recently, when there has been
renewed interest and a greater amount of such research. This has emerged earliest in the UK (notably through the efforts of Stenhouse, for example, 1975, and cf. Nixon 1981), Europe, and Australia, and only very lately in the US (cf. Sanford 1981; Kemmis and McTaggart 1988; Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1990; Holly 1991). Though not new, then, this kind of action research is at least renewed, and is in itself desirable, in that the more people there are doing research on relevant matters the better.

3. ACTION RESEARCH OF THE FIRST KIND
The straightforward teacher-researcher aspect of action research seems quite attractive to educational establishments. The US Department of Education has solicited research of this sort, and believes that 'the development of a local capacity for inquiry and problem-solving' is highly desirable in improving state education (Olson 1990: 1). Considerable efforts have been expended on encouraging 'teacher-researcher' and 'university-school' partnerships (for example, Sirotnik and Goodlad 1988). Teacher-researchers are figures praised in many research articles who 'model professional behavior through seizing authority for their subject matter and activities' (Bullock 1987: 23). Their efforts are supposed to foster connections between universities (as research institutions) and schools, and are also expected to integrate the functions of teacher and researcher by ensuring that teachers do research or collaborate actively with researchers. This, it is hoped, will contribute to the improvement of the teaching professional and the utilization of research. It is this teacher-research version of action research which has surfaced in the literature of SL research and pedagogy (for example, Florio and Walsh 1981; Gebhard, Gaitan, and Oprandy 1987; Long 1989; Nunan 1989a, 1989b, 1990; Brindley 1990; Allwright and Bailey 1991). As Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990) note, however, much of this body of work is actually 'published singly by university researchers and is[is] intended for academic audiences'.

There is no major methodological distinction to be made between 'regular' research and the more conservative line in action research. All the normal tools of social science or educational research can be brought to bear, to the extent that the teacher doing action research is familiar with them or wishes to use them. In practice, techniques which lend themselves to use in small-scale investigations, and those which can capitalize upon the investigator's familiarity and participation in the situation investigated are particularly appropriate (Winter 1989). There must be some problem or question which acts as the impetus to the work, and then after that, various regular steps can be taken: observation of one's students or one's own teaching, some form of data collection relevant to the research question, or (to take a more qualitative perspective) the revision or development of the initial research question; finally followed by some attempt to utilize the data to answer the question and thereby solve the problem.

4. ACTION RESEARCH OF THE SECOND KIND
I turn now to the more radical conception of action research, which is particularly associated with the work of Carr and Kemmis (for example, 1986) and Whitehead (for example, Whitehead and Lomax 1987), and which has gone almost without representation in SL discussions of this topic. Before attempting to define it, I will explain why it is important and needed.

Research into social institutions, such as schools, has been heavily influenced by the 'Received View in philosophy of science (now discredited; cf. Crookes 1992), which among other things presented science as value-free and objective. The counterte is to this is that most of the scientific community have seen values as not something worthy of investigation. In the context of educational research, the result has been to perceive schools as 'neutral, non-political places that go about the business of educating children as well as they can. We assume they are eager for new practices that will enable them to do better' (Sirotnik and Oakes 1986: 5). There has been little investigation of the values that schools actually embody, and there has been a general attempt to use research simply to enable schools better to achieve their unquestioned goals.

This is regrettable, because there is an inherent contradiction between the process of education and the needs of the institutions within which education is supposed to happen. This can be seen in the differing goals of those whose main purpose in an educational institution is to support and maintain it (the administrators) as opposed to those who deliver education itself (the teachers). If this were not the case, one hundred years of reform efforts in American education would not have been successfully resisted, and classrooms and lessons would not still be almost the same as they were many decades ago (but they are—cf. Goodlad 1984; Cohen 1988; Cuban 1988). The fact of the matter is that to exist, institutions must obtain resources, distribute rewards, and resist encroachment from other competitive institutions in the social sphere (McIntyre 1981), while at the same time delivering education. The characteristics of a social institution which has preserved itself as long as schools have include self-preservation mechanisms and structures which enable it to successfully obtain resources and distribute rewards to those that support it. They also act to preserve it from internal destabilization (which includes the process of change itself) and from external competition. Such mechanisms are often inimical to education which might meet society's highest goals, and create a 'literate, culturally enlightened, critically thinking citizenry' (Sirotnik and Oakes, 1986: 4). (Consider the point that both British and American societies, for example, are supposed to be democracies, yet within them the primary institution socializing future citizens is extremely undemocratic, at all levels.) Unless teachers are aware of this fact, and continually investigate the extent to which their purposes are being subverted and their professional values ignored, they may eventually be prevented from actually educating. Teachers' research into the degree to which they are attaining their goals or into the problems they are facing in doing so (that is, action research) is therefore a sine
In this line of thought, action research provides a means by which distorting self-understandings may be overcome by teachers analyzing the way their own practices and understandings are shaped by broader ideological conditions and ... by linking reflection to action, offers teachers and others a way of becoming aware of how those aspects of the social order which frustrate rational change may be overcome. (Carr and Kemmis 1986: 179-80)

Carr and Kemmis are not satisfied with a conception of action research in which teachers simply identify a problem and solve it—they wish to see the development of a cyclical program of reform, whose results are reflected on and further refined and developed in collaborative investigative communities: 'The establishment of a widening circle of self-reflective communities of action researchers ... foreshadows and engenders a different form of social organization' (Carr and Kemmis 1986: 185). This conception of the school as a community of researchers is also to be found much earlier in Schaefer (1967) as well as, from a less critical perspective, the teacher center movement (for example, Shostak 1987). It is an important component in distinguishing this second kind of action research from that discussed earlier—compare Gore and Zeichner (1991: 123), who observe:

what we have most often seen in the US action research literature is a purely individualist version of action research which largely ignores the social conditions of schooling and society.

The techniques involved in this kind of action research will not necessarily be distinguishable from the full range of educational research techniques (Myers 1985) but the range of techniques to be chosen from may be narrowed by the social organization involved in doing action research, and its reflective, collaborative, and dialogic nature. In particular, it should be understood that the objective of this kind of action research is locally-valid understandings of problems in teaching and learning, not necessarily findings of maximal generality. This means that on the one hand, large databases, techniques for their reduction and analysis, and steps which allow the replicability of results across many different environments are less needed. On the other hand, techniques which capitalize on the actors' and investigators' deep familiarity with the situation are appropriate. In addition, a central concept of critical theory is unconstrained dialogue which permits rational analysis and conceptual development. This should take place through individual teachers' reflection and communication with their co-investigators, so the concepts used and the forms by which results are communicated must reflect this. Action research, therefore, must start with the ideas and concepts of teachers, but it must be recognized that these are quite likely to embody the unexamined assumptions of the school culture which play a role in causing many of the problems teachers face ('false consciousness'). Consequently, these must be developed through reflection and inquiry, and

5. THE UTILIZATION OF RESEARCH AND ACTION RESEARCH

There is a continuing widespread disposition among teachers generally (not just those in SL education) that conventional research findings (at least as normally presented) are insufficiently relevant to their day-to-day problems (for example, Beasley and Riorian 1981; Carr and Kemmis 1986; Bullock 1987; Eykyn 1987; Miranda 1988; McDonough and McDonough 1990; and cf. Armstrong 1980; Sanford 1981; Neubert and Binko 1987; Tyler 1988; Orem 1990; Allwright and Bailey 1991). In this, teachers are supported by researchers critical from various standpoints of the body of knowledge generated by educational research thus far (for example, Armstrong 1980; Haberman and Sikula 1991). There are various reasons for this. (1) It can legitimately be recognized that because of topics addressed or the preliminary nature of many potentially-relevant lines of work, some work in regular education and SL-specific research really is irrelevant, at least in the short run (Lightbown 1985). (2) Most research reports are specifically not targeted to individuals' day-to-day problems. As Shavelson (1988: 5) has observed, if a teacher believes that 'education research should directly and immediately apply to a particular issue, problem, or decision' that she or he faces, 'the probability that any single study or review of studies could possibly meet these conditions must be quite close to zero'—unless the teacher takes action him/herself, of course. (3) Teachers have been led to believe that if one knew what the right theory (i.e. body of knowledge) was, one could simply apply it to practice and all problems of practice would be solved. But, in fact, practical judgments are always made under conditions of 'bounded rationality' (Simon 1957, 1958; see discussion in Emmet 1966; Hartnett and Naish 1976, and cf. Torbert 1981). Under these conditions, 'theoretical knowledge is often incomplete and practice situations never fully understood ... practice is always underdetermined by theory' (Usher and Bryant 1989: 74). 'Theory' will be to varying degrees inapplicable in this sense,
expressed by various authorities cited at the outset of this paper. The reports are, after all, intended for a particular audience: fellow action researchers involved in the work reported; the researcher him/herself, in that the reporting process is part of the reflection involved in changing practice; and fellow teachers in similar situations (Winter 1989). An action research report, therefore, should not be read as if unsuccessfully targeted for an academic journal (cf. Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1990). Its contents should, however, be disseminated (as research is not research unless communicated—Stern 1983). A range of alternatives to the academic journal article exist (for example, conference presentation, teacher-center poster), most of which are probably more effective in disseminating the information contained in such a report. Investigations of the utilization of research findings make it clear that findings only presented in academic journals stand little chance of being utilized. Other means of information dissemination must be adopted, in which the personal element is involved, either in dissemination alone (Popham 1991; cf. ‘linking systems’, Rogers 1986; ‘teacher research linkers’, Billups and Rauth 1987), or through institutionalizing action research so as to change school staffs into communities of action researchers (cf. Bennett and Desforges 1985).

6. SUMMARY
I have tried to outline here the differences between regular research, one kind of action research perhaps better called teacher research, and a second kind of action research which most truly warrants that name. All are important and useful; but it is the radical wing of action research which is least understood and conducted, and which I have highlighted here. It deserves our support for the following reasons: (1) its results are actually as relevant to the immediate needs and problems of teachers as any research can be; (2) it supports the process of teacher reflection, which is vital for educational renewal and professional growth; (3) engaging in action research may facilitate teachers doing other kinds of research and using the results of such research; and (4) because of its basis in critical theory, it faces up to the unquestioned values embodied in educational institutions which regularly threaten to cut the ground from under teachers, ‘deprofessionalizing’ them and preventing the delivery of true education.

So long as research is only presented as something that other people—not teachers—do, and so long as it seems to teachers that research reports must necessarily be written in a language they do not read or speak, we will be accommodating the exploitative pressures of the institutions teachers work in. Action against such pressures can take many forms. The conducting of action research as a means of critical reflection on teaching and on the sociopolitical context in which teachers find themselves has the potential to be a major component in the continuing struggle to improve SL teaching.

(Revised version received October 1992)
A difference between theory-driven and teacher-originated research is likely to exist or not the field moves away from dependence on theories of learning and closer to the practices of the field. This is still important and entirely relevant to the distinction that teachers should investigate what is of immediate concern to them. In considering such issues, there is no space to do in this paper, it may be useful to note the divergence between a theory-in-use—a teacher’s own conceptual map of what is—and a theory of teaching as a more ‘external’ cognitive entity jointly possessed by all the field as a whole.

As (1940: 8) states, ‘The term action research is usually credited to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1923 to 1940 (Corey 1953; Wallace 1987; Wann 1989). Others refer to the work of Lewin (1946) as the locus classicus. This has been an established tradition in rural, agricultural, and community development particularly in the Third World, and in the development of workplace democracy particularly in Scandinavia (Eiden 1979; Karlsen 1991). The general attitude (rather than the term) can be traced back at least to Dewey (for example, 1909).’

Wright (1989) states that action research implies the rejection of positivist conceptions of research. This is a great imposition since much current social science is indeed post-positivist, in the sense of interpretive at least (Rorty 1979; Taylor 1980; Hiddle 1982). Nevertheless, Holly (1991) states that action research implies the rejection of an essentially positivist understanding of educational practice (obtained through, for example, case studies) as being as desirable as, and more likely to be obtained than, broadly applicable generalizations.

The problem is that, from a practical point of view, such communities of action researchers can be established, nurtured, and defended in difficult times and circumstances. As a complex one, which is not my objective to discuss here, whether or not any general rules or suggestions could be made. One anonymous reviewer of this article suggested that, in Britain at least... after a decade or so of considerable activity... there were... enough books. It is hard to see how this could alter this anti-action research. Nevertheless, Holly (1991: 143) comments that it is action researchers, those in our sense of community who become the 'scroungers' in new change scenarios. (1988: 48). He admitted to being over-optimistic. I would concur that, with schools as with other institutions, change is often unlikely to succeed unless group development is first fostered. But, in any event, efforts are made on a unified basis. (Cf. Crookes 1989, for some related suggestions.)

In an SL context, the topics investigated are likely to involve the social and psychological concerns facilitating or preventing SLA— matters concerning motivation, class participation, the role of non-standard languages, etc.—rather than the less context-dependent matters of sequences of acquisition order in syntax, or the role of planning and monitoring in SL learning.
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