

## 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup> 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 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] 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).<sup>3</sup> 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 counterside 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 a 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*

*qua non* for the delivery of education (as opposed to, for example, child-minding, or what some have called 'schooling') by schools to their students.

In this line of thought, action research

provides a means by which distorted 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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 enquiry, and

those engaged in this reflective process [must] attempt to 'bracket' their experience—that is they attempt to stand outside their experience and attend to it in such a way that they move beyond what appear to be common-sense interpretations of what things mean. In this way they are able to approach setting aside their ordinary assumptions about their situations and attain a heightened consciousness and clarified understanding about the range of meanings that participants attach to school events. (Sirotnik and Oakes 1986: 35)

When a cycle of investigation is concluded, the results must be communicated—first, to those who engaged in the research itself, and also to other teachers and interested parties. Since the intent of the report (as well as the reflection and inquiry) is to lead to immediate action, they must be communicated to teachers in forms they can immediately utilize. This leads to a major area in which progressive action research may dispute standard research practice—how the findings of investigations are communicated to teachers. Through coexisting with regular research reports, action research reports may influence and benefit teachers' access to more established report formats.

##### 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 Riordan 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 series 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,

precisely because of the unknowable dimension of practice on a moment-to-moment basis.<sup>7</sup> (4) Many research reports, given in both oral and written form, use unfamiliar concepts and a rhetorical format which serves the purposes of the community of mainstream researchers, rather than of teachers (Mohr 1987; Kidder 1991); a major concern of those using this format is to present statements in a standard form, whose use is intended to facilitate the replicability of studies and their critical assessment.

The desires that teachers have for clarity and relevance may lead non-action researchers to respond by moving away from accompanying prescriptions for practice with a detailed accounting of the bases of such prescriptions.<sup>8</sup> (And cf. also Shavelson 1988: 9 on the 'greater risks' that must be taken to 'bring research to bear on the information needs of policy-makers and practitioners'.) This sort of response to the understandable pressures from teachers and policy-makers actually undermines the relationship between teachers and research.<sup>9</sup> There are defensible reasons why research is reported the way it is—but since those reasons do not obtain under all circumstances, it is possible to argue for alternative report and knowledge transmission formats, in the following way.

The stronger the claims for general applicability that a study makes and the more damage such claims, if wrong, could do, the greater the demand that should be made for reliability, validity, and trustworthiness (cf. LeCompte and Goetz 1982; Mishler 1990) of the study, which in turn can be obtained through requiring full adherence to scientific practice in both the carrying out and reporting of the study. The less strong such claims, the less need to conform to the values implicit in the (currently) standard rhetoric of science (not a value-free rhetoric: Schuster and Yeo 1986; Bazerman 1987; Nelson, McGill, and McCloskey 1987). As Argyris and Schön (1991: 85) say: 'from the action researcher's perspective, the challenge is to define and meet standards of *appropriate* rigor without sacrificing relevance.' Since action research starts with the immediate needs of a teacher or a group of teachers, and is carried out by these individuals with their limited time and resources, their reports (without which their actions cannot be considered research—Ebbutt 1985) should reflect such realities and limitations. They also reflect the expository predispositions of writer and targeted audience: they may be more discursive, subjective, and anecdotal or discursive (by 'orthodox' standards). (See, for example, Reason and Rowan 1981; Ray 1987; Whitehead and Lomax 1987.) As Winter (1989: 73–4) states:

since our writing emerges from a different set of relationships (collaborative and action-oriented, rather than authoritative and observation-oriented) the format of our writing should also be different. . . . certain stylistic features of 'academic' writing could also be seen as inappropriate for action-research reports, i.e. those . . . which seem to express the expert role by suggesting a withdrawal from personal involvement, and a sustained abstraction from concrete detail.

It is such teacher-oriented reports,<sup>10</sup> when presented beyond the confines of their intended application or dissemination, which can cause the concern

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.<sup>11</sup> 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)

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks to Craig Chaudron, George Jacobs, Julie Kerekes, and Mike Long for comments on earlier versions of this paper, and to the *Applied Linguistics* reviewers for exceptionally helpful comments.

## NOTES

A difference between theory-driven and teacher-originated research is likely to exist whether or not the field moves away from dependence on theories of learning and closer to theories of practice (for example, van Lier 1991), as it is still important and entirely legitimate that teachers should investigate what is of immediate concern to them. (In considering such issues, which there is not space to do in this paper, it may be useful to preserve the distinction between a theory-in-use—a teacher's own conceptual map of teaching—and a theory of teaching as a more 'external' cognitive entity jointly possessed by the field as a whole.)

Wilson (1990: 8) states: 'The term *action research* is usually credited to John Collier, Commissioner of Indian Affairs from 1933 to 1945 (Corey 1953; Wallace 1987; Wann 1990: 5)'. 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 (Elden 1979; Karlsen 1991). The general attitude (rather than the term itself) can be traced back at least to Dewey (for example, 1904)—cf. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990); the best recent historical survey is Holly (1991).

Winter (1989) states that action research implies the rejection of positivist conceptions of research. This is no great imposition since much current social science is indeed post-positivist, in the sense of interpretive at least (Rorty 1979; Taylor 1980; Ruffalo 1983; Newsome, in press). But a key point in this rejection is the acceptance of locally-validated understandings 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 matter of how, from a practical point of view, such communities of action researchers can be established, nurtured, and defended in difficult times and circumstances is a complex one, which it is not my objective to discuss here, whether or not any general rules or suggestions could be made. One anonymous reviewer of this article commented that 'in Britain at least ... after a decade or so of considerable activity ... [action research] is at a low ebb ... (Schools I currently visit in one area ... do not have enough books; it is hard to see how teacher action research could alter this anti-educational fact)'. Nevertheless, Holly (1991: 143) comments that it is action researchers, 'inspired by a sense of community' who become the "scufflers" in new change scenarios'. While not wishing to be over-optimistic, I would concur that, with schools as with other institutions, change is often unlikely to succeed unless group development is first fostered and subsequent efforts are made on a united basis. (Cf. Crookes 1989, for some related elementary suggestions.)

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

<sup>6</sup> The conditions surrounding such a dialogue must also be supportive. Usher and Bryant (1989) provide a critique of action research relevant to this line of argument but prosecuted at a much higher level of abstraction drawing on the ideas of Habermas (for example, 1972) and Gadamer (1981); cf. also Lather (1986).

<sup>7</sup> A similar situation exists in psychology: 'When psychologists are requested to rank order the usefulness of informational sources to their practice, research articles and books of empirical research are consistently rated at the bottom of the scale' (Kupfersmid 1988: 635). And from the researcher's perspective, Hadley (1987: 101), drawing on his investigations of social institutions, states that there was 'very little evidence' that research findings presented in standard journal or book form 'engage the minds of those in our target groups or measurably affect ... the policies of those practices of social institutions'.

<sup>8</sup> Here, for example, are Krashen and Terrell (1983: 1): 'At the time this book was written, our confidence in the Natural Approach [which they are therein commending to the teacher] was based primarily on underlying theory ... and the enthusiastic reactions of students and instructors.'

<sup>9</sup> The failure of professional training in education and applied linguistics to validate this gap, and the associated lack of research (until recently) on the role of the practitioner as a decision-maker under non-eliminable conditions of uncertainty only exacerbates the 'gap' between the knowledge base for practice and practice itself.

Lampert and Clark (1990) discuss the role of research on teacher thinking in teacher education. Drawing on Greeno (1990), they comment that the field should pay more careful attention

to how experts acquire whatever knowledge might be said to characterize their thinking about the problems of practice. ... The domain of knowledge that belongs to experts ... is an environment containing resources ... [within which one can] 'get around' ... as well as have a sense of where there is to go ... Our reading of cognitive theory and of the research on teacher thinking suggests that the conventional academic pattern of producing general principles from particular cases and delivering those principles to novices may not be the most appropriate form for teacher education to take. (Lampert and Clark 1990: 22)

<sup>10</sup> See, for instance, Goswami and Stillman (1987) or Johnstone (1990) for examples of such reports.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Cochran-Smith and Lytle (1990: 3) who propose a four-part typology of teacher-research formats: 'teachers' journals, brief and book-length essays, oral inquiry processes, and classroom studies'. In addition, it is the contextualized nature of such reports which makes them a more likely source of influence on teachers than standard reports.

## REFERENCES

- Allwright, D. and K. M. Bailey. 1991. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Armstrong, D. G. 1980. 'Researchers' incentives and the dearth of practical research results.' *Peabody Journal of Education* 58/1: 55-60.
- Argyris, C. and D. A. Schön. 1991. 'Participatory action research and action science compared: a commentary' in W. F. Whyte (ed.): *Participatory Action Science*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Bazerman, C. 1987. 'Codifying the social scientific style: The *APA Publication Manual*

- as a behaviorist rhetoric' in J. S. Nelson, A. Megill, and D. N. McCloskey (eds.): *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Beasley, R. and L. Riordan. 1981. 'The classroom teacher as researcher.' *English in Australia* 55: 36-41.
- Bennett, N. and C. Desforjes. 1985. 'Ensuring practical outcomes from educational research' in M. Shipman (ed.): *Educational Research: Principles, Policies, and Practice*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Billups, L. H. and M. Rauth. 1987. 'Teachers and research' in V. Richardson-Koehler (ed.): *Educators' Handbook: A Research Perspective*. New York: Longman.
- Brandon, P. R. 1982. 'An Examination of an Interactive Approach to Educational Program Evaluation.' PhD thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Brindley, G. 1990. 'Towards a research agenda for TESOL.' *Prospect* 6/1: 7-26.
- Brumfit, C. and R. Mitchell. 1989. 'The language classroom as a focus for research' in C. Brumfit and R. Mitchell (eds.): *Research in the Language Classroom* (ELT Document 133: 3-15). London: Modern English Publications.
- Bullock, R. H. 1987. 'A quiet revolution: the power of teacher research' in G. L. Bissex and R. H. Bullock (eds.): *Seeing for Ourselves*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Carr, W. and S. Kemmis. 1986. *Becoming Critical*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Chesler, M. A. 1990. 'Action research in the voluntary sector: a case study of scholar-activist roles in self-help groups' in S. A. Wheldon, E. A. Pepitone, and V. Abt (eds.): *Advances in Field Theory*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Cochran-Smith, M. and S. L. Lytle. 1990. 'Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide.' *Educational Researcher* 19/2: 2-11.
- Cohen, D. K. 1988. 'Teaching practice: Plus que ça change . . .' in P. W. Jackson (ed.): *Contributing to Educational Change*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Cohen, L. and L. Manion. 1985. *Research Methods in Education* (2nd edn.). London: Croom Helm.
- Corey, S. M. 1953. *Action Research to Improve School Practices*. New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, Columbia University.
- Crookes, G. 1989. 'Grassroots action to improve ESL programs.' *UH Working Papers in ESL* 8/2: 45-61.
- Crookes, G. 1992. 'Theory format and SLA theory.' *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 11/4: 425-50.
- Cuban, L. 1988. 'Constancy and change in schools (1880s to the present)' in P. W. Jackson (ed.): *Contributing to Educational Change*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Dewey, J. 1904. *The Relation of Theory to Practice in Education* (3rd NNSE Yearbook, pt. 1). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ebbutt, D. 1985. 'Educational action research: some general concerns and specific quibbles' in R. G. Burgess (ed.): *Issues in Educational Research: Qualitative Methods*. Lewes: The Falmer Press.
- Elden, M. 1979. 'Three generations of work democracy experiments in Norway' in C. Cooper and E. Mumford (eds.): *The Quality of Work in Eastern and Western Europe*. London: Associated Business Press.
- Elliott, J. 1987. 'Teachers as researchers' in M. J. Dunkin (ed.): *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Emmett, D. 1966. *Rules, Roles and Relations*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Ericson, D. P. 1986. 'On critical theory and educational practice' in K. A. Sirotnik and J. Oakes (eds.): *Critical Perspective on the Organization and Improvement of Schooling*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.

- Eykyn, L. B. 1987. 'Confessions of a high school language teacher, or "Why I never (used to) read *Foreign Language Annals*".' *Foreign Language Annals* 20/2: 265-6.
- Florio, S. and M. Walsh. 1981. 'The teacher as colleague in classroom research' in H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, and K. H.-P. Au (eds.): *Culture and the Bilingual Classroom: Studies in Classroom Ethnography*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Gadamer, H. G. 1981. *Reason in the Age of Science* (trans. F. Lawrence). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Gebhard, J. G., S. Gaitan, and R. Oprandy. 1987. 'Beyond prescription: the student teacher as investigator.' *Foreign Language Annals* 20/3: 227-32.
- Goodlad, J. I. 1984. *A Place Called School*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gore, J. M. and K. M. Zeichner. 1991. 'Action research and reflective teaching in pre-service teacher education: a case study from the United States.' *Teaching and Teacher Education* 7/2: 119-36.
- Goswami, D. and P. R. Stillman (eds.). 1987. *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*. Upper Montclair, Vt.: Boynton/Cook.
- Greeno, J. G. 1990. *Number Sense as Situated Knowledge in a Conceptual Domain* (Report No. IRL90-0014). Palo Alto, Calif.: Institute for Research on Learning.
- Habermas, J. 1972. *Knowledge and Human Interests* (trans. J. J. Shapiro). London: Heinemann.
- Haberman, M. and J. Sikula. 1991. 'Preface' in W. R. Houston (ed.): *Handbook for Research on Teacher Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Hadley, R. 1987. 'Publish and be ignored: proselytize and be damned' in C. G. Wenger (ed.): *The Research Relationship*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Hartnett, M. and A. Naish. 1976. 'What theory cannot do for teachers.' *Education for Teaching* 96/1: 12-19.
- Holly, P. 1991. 'Action research: The missing link in the creation of schools as centers of inquiry' in A. Lieberman and L. Miller (eds.): *Staff Development for Education in the '90s*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Jarvis, G. 1991. 'Research on teaching methodology: Its evolution and prospects' in B. F. Freed (ed.): *Foreign Language Acquisition Research and the Classroom*. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath.
- Johnstone, R. 1990. 'Action-research in the foreign languages classroom.' *Language Learning Journal* (UK) 1/1: 18-21.
- Karlsen, J. I. 1991. 'Action research as method: reflections from a program for developing methods and competence' in W. F. Whyte (ed.): *Participatory Action Research* (pp. 143-58). Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Kelly, A. 1985. 'Action research: What is it and what can it do?' in R. G. Burgess (ed.): *Issues in Educational Research: Qualitative Methods*. London: Falmer Press.
- Kemmis, S. and R. McTaggart (eds.). 1982. *The Action Research Reader*. Deakin: Deakin University Press.
- Kemmis, S. and R. McTaggart. 1988. 'Introduction' in S. Kemmis and R. McTaggart (eds.): *The Action Research Reader* (3rd edn.). Deakin: Deakin University Press.
- Klinghammer, S. J. 1987. 'Teacher as researcher.' *English for Foreign Students in English-speaking Countries Newsletter* (TESOL Interest Section) 5/1. 3.
- Kidder, R. M. 1991. 'Academic writing is convoluted, jargon-ridden, and isolated from the messy realities of the world.' *Chronicle of Higher Education* 37/20: B1-B3.
- Krashen, S. D. and T. D. Terrell. 1983. *The Natural Approach*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Kupfersmid, J. 1988. 'Improving what is published: a model in search of an editor.' *American Psychologist* 43/8: 635-42.
- Lampert, M. and C. M. Clark. 1990. 'Expert knowledge and expert thinking in teaching: A response to Floden and Klinzing.' *Educational Researcher* 19/5: 21-3.
- Lane, H. 1962. 'Experimentation in the language classroom: Guidelines and suggested procedures for the classroom teacher.' *Language Learning* 12/2: 115-21.
- Lather, P. 1986. 'Research as praxis.' *Harvard Educational Review* 56/3: 257-77.
- LeCompte, M. D. and J. P. Goetz. 1982. 'Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research.' *Review of Educational Research* 52: 31-60.
- Lewin, K. 1946. 'Action research and minority problems.' *Journal of Social Issues* 2: 34-46.
- Lightbown, P. M. 1985. 'Great expectations: Second language acquisition research and classroom teaching.' *Applied Linguistics* 6:173-89.
- Long, M. H. 1989. 'Second language classroom research and teacher education' in C. Brumfit and R. Mitchell (eds.): *Research in the Language Classroom* (ELT Document 133). London: Modern English Publications.
- Lowry, C. D. 1908. *The Relation of Superintendents and Principals to the Training and Professional Development of their Teachers* (Seventh yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 1). Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- McDonough, J. and S. McDonough. 1990. 'What's the use of research?' *ELT Journal* 44/2: 102-9.
- McIntyre, A. 1981. *After Virtue: A Study of Moral Theory*. London: Duckworth.
- Miranda, E. O. 1988. 'Broadening the focus of research in education.' *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 22/1: 23-38.
- Mishler, E. G. 1990. 'Validation in inquiry-guided research: the role of exemplars in narrative studies.' *Harvard Educational Review* 60: 415-42.
- Mohr, M. M. 1987. 'Teacher-researchers and the study of the writing process' in D. Goswami and P. R. Stillman (eds.): *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*. Upper Montclair, Vt.: Boynton/Cook.
- Myers, M. 1985. *The Teacher-Researcher: How to Study Writing in the Classroom*. Urbana, Ill.: National Council for Teachers of English.
- Nelson, J. S., A. McGill, and D. N. McCloskey, (eds.). 1987. *The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Newsome, G. (in press). Review: 'Becoming critical: education, knowledge, and action research'. *Canadian Journal of Education*.
- Neubert, G. A. and J. B. Binko. 1987. 'Teach-probe-revise: a model for initiating classroom research.' *The Teacher Educator* 22/1: 9-17.
- Nixon, J. 1981. *A Teacher's Guide to Action Research*. London: Grant McIntyre.
- Nunan, D. 1989a. 'The teacher as researcher' in C. Brumfit and R. Mitchell (eds.): *Research in the Language Classroom* (ELT Document 133). London: Modern English Publications.
- Nunan, D. 1989b. *Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide for Teacher-initiated Action*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Nunan, D. 1990. 'Action research in the language classroom' in J. C. Richards and D. Nunan (eds.): *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Olsen, M. W. 1990. 'The teacher as researcher: a historical perspective' in M. W. Olsen (ed.): *Opening the Door to Classroom Research*. Newark, Del.: International Reading Association.

- Orem, R. A. 1990. 'Theory, practice, research, and professionalization of the field of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages' in J. E. Alatis (ed.): *Linguistics, Language Teaching, and Language Acquisition*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Popham, W. J. 1991. 'A slice of advice.' *Educational Researcher* 20/6: 18, 35.
- Ratcliffe, J. W. 1983. 'Notions of validity in qualitative research methodology.' *Knowledge: Creation, Diffusion, Utilization* 5/2: 147-67.
- Ray, L. C. 1987. 'Reflections on classroom research' in D. Goswami and P. R. Stillman (eds.): *Reclaiming the Classroom: Teacher Research as an Agency for Change*. Upper Montclair, Vt.: Boynton/Cook.
- Reason, P. and J. Rowan. 1981. 'Issues of validity in new paradigm research' in P. Reason and J. Rowan (eds.): *Human Inquiry*. New York: Wiley.
- Rogers, E. M. 1986. 'Models of knowledge transfer: critical perspectives' in G. M. Beal, W. Dissanayake, and S. Konoshima (eds.): *Knowledge Generation, Exchange, and Utilization*. Boulder, Colo.: Westview.
- Rodgers, T. and J. C. Richards. (n.d.). 'Teacher-based curriculum development: illusion or reality?' Ms.
- Rorty, R. 1979. *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sanford, N. 1981. 'A model for action research' in P. Reason and J. Rowan (eds.): *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research*. London: Wiley.
- Schaefer, R. J. 1967. *The School as a Center of Inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Schuster, J. A. and R. R. Yeo. 1986. 'Introduction' in J. A. Schuster and R. R. Yeo (eds.): *The Politics and Rhetoric of Scientific Method: Historical Studies*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Shostak, R. J. 1987. 'Teachers' centres' in M. J. Dunkin (ed.): *The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Simon, H. A. 1957. *Models of Man*. New York: Free Press.
- Simon, H. A. 1958. *Administrative Behavior* (2nd edn.). New York: Macmillan.
- Shavelson, R. J. 1988. 'Contributions of educational research to policy and practice: Constructing, challenging, changing cognition.' *Educational Researcher* 17/7: 4-11, 22.
- Sirotnik, K. A. and J. I. Goodlad. (eds.). 1988. *School-University Partnerships in Action: Concepts, Cases, and Concerns*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Sirotnik, K. A. and J. Oakes. 1986. 'Critical inquiry for school renewal' in K. A. Sirotnik and J. Oakes (eds.): *Critical Perspective on the Organization and Improvement of Schooling*. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Stenhouse, L. 1975. *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Stern, H. H. 1983. *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Taylor, C. 1980. 'Understanding in human science.' *Review of Metaphysics* 34: 25-38.
- Torbert, W. R. 1981. 'Why educational research has been so uneducational: The case for a new model of social science based on collaborative inquiry' in P. Reason and J. Rowan (eds.): *Human Inquiry*. New York: John Wiley.
- Tyler, R. W. 1988. 'Utilization of research by practitioners in education' in P. W. Jackson (ed.): *Contributing to Educational Change*. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan.
- Usher, R. and I. Bryant. 1989. *Adult Education as Theory, Practice, and Research: The Captive Triangle*. London: Routledge.
- van Lier, L. 1988. *The Classroom and the Language Teacher*. London: Longman.

- van Lier, L. 1991. 'Inside the classroom: learning procedures and teaching procedures.' *Applied Language Learning* 2/1: 29-70.
- van Lier, L. and K. Bailey. 1988. 'Innovation and action research in pre-service teacher education.' Paper presented at the 23rd annual TESOL convention, San Antonio, Tex.
- Wallace, M. 1987. 'A historical review of action research: Some implications for the education of teachers in their managerial role.' *Journal of Education for Teaching* 13/2: 97-115.
- Wann, K. D. 1953. 'Action research in schools.' *Review of Educational Research* 23/4: 337-45.
- Whitehead, J. and P. Lomax. 1987. 'Action research and the politics of educational knowledge.' *British Educational Research Journal* 13/2: 175-90.
- Winter, R. 1988. *Learning from Experience: Principles and Practice in Action Research*. London: Falmer Press.