

INVESTIGATING THE POTENTIAL USES OF TEACHER-INITIATED RESEARCH IN IMPROVING THE PROFESSIONAL SITUATION OF PART-TIME TEACHERS

- Description of a pilot study -

Rachael Roberts

Introduction

This paper describes and evaluates an exploratory programme of teacher-initiated research which was undertaken over a ten week period. A brief description of the context and the actual process of the programme will be followed by the main focus of the paper - the perceived outcomes of the process and the insights gained by both myself and my colleagues involved in the research.

The Context

The EFL department in which I have been working is in a college of further education in the UK. The students are both full-time and part-time, both native speakers and non-native speakers. Some of this latter group are studying subjects other than English and require English language support; some are living in the area temporarily and working as au pairs and some are more properly termed ESL students, and resident in the country but still requiring language assistance. The department is staffed by two full-time lecturers/administrators and eleven part-time lecturers. The atmosphere is generally supportive and comfortable, but because most of the teachers only come in for short periods of time to teach, there is very little communication between many of the teachers on a regular basis. As a result there are rather limited opportunities for teachers to find out what colleagues are doing in their classrooms and to ask anyone for help and advice. Generally speaking, the teachers feel undertrained and are not very confident about their abilities. They would like more in-service training but, as simply another part-time lecturer, I was not in a position to provide a teacher-training course as such. Instead, I

wanted to discover whether, and to what extent, teacher-initiated research might help to improve these teachers' professional situation.

In attempting this I had three main objectives:

1. To combat the feelings of isolation (both personal and professional) teachers might be feeling and develop a collaborative and supportive network.
2. To develop teachers' confidence in their own capacities to empower themselves: building self esteem and autonomy.
3. To provide for a bridging between theory and practice: lacking a great deal of inservice training, teachers felt the need for input but often failed to see the relevance of books and articles or one-off seminars to their own situation.

This pilot study could not have the effects of a long term project but I hoped that the insights gained could prove useful in making long-term future changes in this context and to other teacher educators setting up similar projects. I wanted to exploit my position as a member of the institution, with an insider perspective, to take a genuine part in the classroom research while simultaneously acting as an observer of the process.

Describing the process.

i. The beginning

A starting point for any teacher-initiated research is the identification of a shared concern amongst the participants - a joint problem which can be consensually addressed. Four colleagues felt able to commit themselves to the project and after some discussion the teaching of the skill of writing was identified as an area of common concern. Having done some preliminary reading and thinking about the area, we arranged our first group meetings. I had originally thought of all four teachers collaborating together but it only proved possible to meet in two pairs, with me present at each meeting. We agreed that follow up meetings would be held two or three weeks later in order to discuss issues and make any modifications to the original plan of action, to be followed by final meetings to evaluate progress and make plans for the future.

In conjunction with these meetings I also asked participants to keep a diary. As McDonough (1994) points out diary keeping is a natural choice of tool for the teacher as researcher paradigm, providing a means 'for teachers to formulate context specific issues

out of the reality of their classroom.' Bailey (1990) cites a study by Butler-Wall (1979:6), who notes that keeping a diary helped her 'to sort out recurring issues, important questions, and points to keep an eye on in the future.' Writing a diary can thus be viewed like discussion, as a discovery process - a way to generate and explore ideas, make connections, argue, question and in this way conduct an internal dialogue. I also intended to keep my own diary recording my day-to-day thoughts and changing perspective on the project as a whole.

ii. Setting the agenda with the first group

I would now like to briefly summarise some of the themes raised and actions taken by the participants over the period of the project. The first meeting to be held was with the two teachers I shall call Claire and Sarah. There was a great deal of discussion about different aspects of writing. Some recurring themes were the lack of enthusiasm for writing among the students and the importance of having a reason to write. We also felt that students tended to abdicate the responsibility for their writing to the teachers and looked at ways of overcoming this, particularly at how we might deal with correction. The following plan of action to address these problems was decided upon:

1. Talk to students about writing, finding out more about their attitudes, likes and dislikes, problems.
2. Use a correction code
3. Put aside the first ten minutes for correction
4. Ask students to write on alternate lines, in order to facilitate comments and correction, including self-correction
5. Ask students to self monitor, annotating with queries as they write. (as suggested by Charles 1990)

Claire found a student questionnaire in Hedge (1988), entitled 'What do you think about your writing?' which we implemented. The feedback from this was discussed in our second meeting. It seemed that students were keen on improving the formal aspects of writing and generally enthusiastic about the use of the correction code and, theoretically at least, willing to take more responsibility. Claire was pleased with the results, commenting that, *'I think it pays off, I find that it does make them think.'* However, as she goes on to add, *'..if I had ten or twelve students doing it each time I wouldn't fit it into fifteen minutes.'* In her diary, Claire concluded:

○

'I don't think I have satisfactorily resolved the problem of correction and double correction within the allotted timespan, (however) I think that the correction code has been a good thing on the whole and has led to more critical awareness on the part of the student.'

At the same second meeting, Sarah felt that perhaps the use of a correction code was not so suitable for her particular group of students. A student suggestion had been for them to correct their own work at home, but Sarah felt a more realistic option would be to use the last fifteen minutes of the class time for self correction and so it was decided to adopt this plan. Although Sarah retained reservations about the use of a correction code for her group of students, she did feel that, overall, it had been a useful experience in focusing both her and her students on certain important issues.

iii. Setting the agenda with the second group

The second group, with the participants I shall refer to as Joanne and Teresa, identified the antipathy the students sometimes had, as an important area to focus on. We felt that they needed more motivation and a reason to write. Project work seemed to provide a possible solution and we discussed the possibility of learners collaborating on a type of alternative students' handbook for next year's students. This would be suitable for all levels and could involve working in groups and, with publication as an end, focusing on the process of planning, drafting, writing and editing.

The plan of action decided upon was to :

1. Talk to students about writing, for the reasons mentioned above
2. Focus on the process of writing
3. Suggest the idea of a student handbook as a possible motivation
4. Encourage students to see teachers as a resource rather than a guide
5. Encourage peer-correction
6. Break tasks down into manageable sizes and give more praise and encouragement

At the next meeting we shared feedback. Joanne felt that a lot had been gained from discussing the issues with her students. She quoted one of them as having commented that *'Sometimes she just feels that nothing happens. She gets the writing back with corrections*

and that's it. I think she would wish to share it more, and see examples of other ways of doing it.'

Teresa's students were at a more elementary level and she had obviously found it more difficult to elicit their attitudes and opinions. She had also come to the conclusion that it would be difficult for them to contribute to the proposed handbook saying at the feedback discussion: *'Well, I just feel my elementary students, they write so little and what we're doing, making up sentences and things, I just felt that this was a little way beyond them when we came to do it.'* She felt that they had a generally negative attitude towards writing, so we discussed possible ways of encouraging students to write at that level. It was decided that she would try encouraging the learners to start a learner diary, in which they could record what they had learnt, problems and achievements. It was felt that this might have the double purpose of both encouraging writing and encouraging reflection on their own part in the learning process. Joanne and I would continue working on the handbook project. The students involved in this project did eventually produce some excellent work for the handbook, and we felt that this had been largely as a result of the increased motivation they felt in producing something relevant and which needed to be well written. Joanne also felt that the project had affected her practice in that it had *'made me look at writing in a much more varied way and to see it more from the students' point of view.'*

However, Teresa had finally decided against the idea of a learner diary, explaining, that she 'felt it was something they couldn't really handle effectively'. She had a group of students who were partly EFL and partly ESL and felt that the ESL students might not have the educational background to be sufficiently reflective. On the whole, it had not been an entirely successful experience for Teresa. It seemed clear that she had, from the outset, been looking for something different from the project:

'No, I've got to admit that I don't think it was particularly useful to me, in that I haven't got a lot of ideas out of it for myself ...for actual sort of tips and techniques . I haven't got that much from it, but then that's perhaps not what it was all about to start with - was it?'

Evaluating the Outcomes

Having related very briefly something of the process of the project, I would now like to consider how far the project might be considered to have been successful. What might the participants have actually gained from the experience and to what extent could the guiding

aims of the project be said to have been achieved? Had working together on a teacher-initiated research project been able to, or shown the potential to significantly improve the situation of the participants? If not, what factors might this be due to?

i. *How far had the project been able to combat the feelings of isolation teachers might be feeling and to develop a collaborative and supportive network?*

This was the aim in which, superficially at least, the project was most evidently successful. All the teachers involved pointed out how pleased they had been to have been able to spend time talking about teaching. Although the atmosphere within the college was open and co-operative there was normally little chance to work together or see each other teach. Participants in the project frequently became so involved in discussion that meetings tabled to last no more than one hour, frequently went on for two, leading me to conclude that the teachers did indeed, as Teresa said, value an opportunity to *'Share things with people of like mind and in the profession you are.'* That said, it is however, doubtful how much they discovered, or even wanted to know, about each others' situations. I asked Claire about this:

'I never really got to know what anybody else was doing. I think Sarah thought it was a good idea from the point of view of making them aware of their mistakes, but I don't really know what she thought about the other things, whether she did the other things, I don't know.'

In fact the participants did describe what they had been doing and the make-up of their classes in some detail. That participants did not recognise this may have been due to a perceived lack of relevance to their own immediate needs, especially considering the limited timescale of the project. Joanne commented,

'It felt slightly limiting just having three of us, and we seemed to be from totally different areas. I was First Certificate and Teresa was beginners. So it was interesting but I couldn't relate to it at the time.'

It would seem that the potential for successful collaboration was there, but was not always fully exploited. The perceived reluctance to really 'attend', to use Edge's (1992) term, to each other may also have been at least partly due to defensiveness. It is possible that they

did not feel sufficiently confident to comment on each others' teaching, and therefore preferred to concentrate on how what was being said might apply to their own situation.

ii. To what extent did the project enable the participants to develop confidence in their own capacities to empower themselves and build self-esteem and autonomy?

Even more than I had expected, the teachers, especially Sarah and Claire, frequently expressed self-doubt. As a way of further exploring this area, I asked participants how they felt about asking students to comment on their teaching, something which had been tried at varying degrees of remove. Participants agreed with the idea in principal, holding it a necessary evil, but there was an understandable reluctance to hand over too much power to the students. Joanne, for example, had tried asking students for feedback but commented that it was not something that she would normally do. She went on to explain:

'Sometimes I do feel that the students would say, 'I don't think we ought to do this, this is a waste of time.', when I've got very good reasons for doing it ... So to some extent I suppose I feel that if I did I'd open a can of worms.'

Sometimes 'feedback' was interpreted in a more limited, and safer, way. Teresa remarked:

'I think we should be open to that (student feedback). I do sometimes say to my students, "Now, how did you find that? Did you enjoy that?" And, for example, the listening I did this morning with them, many of them said, "Too fast, too fast!"'

Teresa was also reluctant to experiment with anything which deviated from her usual classroom practice, feeling that she 'knew' that a suggested approach would or would not work with her students. In the following interchange, Joanne and I are trying to suggest ways in which Teresa might extend the writing skills of her elementary students:

Joanne: There's something I've seen where they're given a poem but it's muddled up, to rearrange it.

Teresa: Oh, in a poem...they can rearrange sentences, but..

Joanne: Even a story?

Teresa: Oh, I tried that, I did try that and they were very confused. They like doing, they actually like doing

-
- things that they find useful I suppose*
- Rachael: What do they need to do in terms of writing in their everyday life?*
- Teresa: Postcards. We've done postcards.*
- Joanne: What about filling in forms or..*
- Teresa: Haven't done forms. Letters? We've done informal letters, just short letters. We've done that on the board.*
- Rachael: Maybe they could write letters to each other? You know, to give them a..*
- Teresa: I've got a feeling I've done that but they could do that again.*
- Joanne: Invitations - would you like to come to my party, or something.*
- Teresa: I think I've covered really all the writing one does with them'*

Teachers often preferred to retell successful experiences, in order to gain peer approval, than to discuss problematical areas. While I can certainly see the value of this, I also felt that it was important to stress that doing something inadequately could be even more valuable in terms of the insights it afforded, hoping that, as Elliott (1991:7) also found, 'The more teachers view themselves as action researchers the greater their ability to tolerate losses of self-esteem'. Creating what Underhill (1992) calls, 'an atmosphere with understanding, trust and shared commitment (which) can facilitate risk-taking and openness' is possibly not something which could ever be entirely satisfactorily achieved in such a pilot study. Nonetheless, despite the constraints of the pilot study, there were definite signs that the approach could indeed help to develop some teachers' confidence in their own capacities. In the final interview, Claire commented;

'It's given, I think it's given me the chance to do something new without feeling that I'm doing it off my own bat, without feeling that I daren't do that. It's forced me into doing something, I've done lots of new things'

iii. How successful was the project in providing for a bridge between theory and practice?

Although the teachers were quite happy to discuss the theory behind the teaching of writing they did often feel, as one participant noted, that *'So much of the theory doesn't apply in the classroom'*. There was a marked tendency to reject an idea out of hand because it did not fit their own situation rather than examine the principles behind it and decide how it might be adapted. Rather than exploring the reasons for failure and modifying practice accordingly, participants often expressed the opinion that the project would have been more 'successful' if they had been in a more ideal teaching situation. In the final meeting, Sarah suggested:

'For the record, for the future, if anyone wants to try this again, they perhaps try it with a full-time class, who, they're committed, aren't they? Working for something, like the TOEFL group, or EFL Plus.'

In general there was a much more positive reaction to what Teresa refers to as 'tips and techniques' than to the process of teacher development itself. Teachers sometimes seemed unwilling or unable to reflect in such a way that they 'transcend the technicalities of teaching and think beyond the need to improve instructional techniques' (Bartlett 1990:205)) Many of the setbacks or successes experienced by the participants seemed to be due to what I would like to term 'teacher variables': the individual differences in the beliefs teachers hold about teaching and learning and in the ways they go about implementing these beliefs in the classroom.

Knowing-in-action and reflection

It would appear from reading much of the literature on teacher-initiated research that most if not all teachers were somehow, naturally reflective. However, this is not necessarily the case. Wallace refers to two phenomena, described by Schon , which go to make up the experiential knowledge of a teacher: 'knowing-in-action' and 'reflection'. Knowing-in-action is defined by Schon in the following way:

'..Every competent practitioner,...in his day-to-day practice makes innumerable judgements of quality for which he cannot state criteria and displays skills for which he cannot state the rules and procedure.'

Schon (1983) in Wallace 1991:13

○

The profession of teaching is no exception. All the participants referred to making such instinctive judgements. Joanne, for example, talked about the way *'you start something with a class and then you slightly adapt it on the way because you have a feeling that it's going to work better that way.'* Teachers often need to 'think on their feet.' This ability to make quick instinctive judgements is therefore a vital skill.

However, what would seem to mark a more reflective approach in some of the participants, was the way in which these judgements were later assessed, if at all. Teresa tended to measure her success in technical matters, such as timing, and on the instinctive feeling she had about the overall success of the lesson.

I think to myself, "I ought to have expanded there." or "I rushed them with that" or "I've got my timing wrong there." I don't really analyse that much. I'm just aware, "That was good, I got that right, they enjoyed it, that's great."

Similarly, Sarah described the way in which she would *'sort of click it as it goes, "oh, this is working, use this again, oh this is awful, never going to use this again.'*

Sarah and Teresa seemed to rely heavily on knowing-in-action or instinct, rather than reflection. In contrast, both Joanne and Claire seemed to question not only what had been effective but why that might have been so. In some ways it might be possible to draw a correlation between each teacher's propensity for reflection and, for example, their attitude towards keeping the diary - one of the elements of the programme.

Claire was probably the participant who felt that she had gained most from the experience. She was also the only participant, apart from myself, who kept writing her diary regularly and wrote at some length, allowing it to become a conduit for reflection. Joanne also felt positive about the diary, commenting that, *'it's rather like when you speak to somebody about what's on your mind and you actually realise more as you're actually speaking, than was in there in the first place.'* *'I think, in practical terms,'* she continued, *'I would be more likely to write, not in a diary but to write something on a lesson plan. But I think now I've done this with you I might be a bit more focussed in that now.'*

Claire's partner, Sarah, seemed to be not so much analysing herself as keeping a record of more concrete events. She often seemed to use her diary as a place to note problem areas

to bring up at meetings, reading aloud from it. Teresa never wrote a word in her diary. She had warned me from the beginning that she did not have much sympathy with the idea:

*'I'm very interested to come and share ideas, but the writing is just.....
I'm not sure that it would help me... I don't honestly feel that keeping
a diary like this is of any use to me.'*

A similar division between more and less reflective approaches appears if we compare the participants' planning styles. None of the teachers involved in the project was in the habit of writing very detailed lesson plans. Nevertheless, there was still a significant variation in what participants considered was involved in preparing a class. Their approaches could almost be ranged along a continuum. At one end was Teresa, who, said Sarah, 'just sort of thinks, "Oh, I'm going to do this today." and just goes and does it'. Sarah spent more time planning than Teresa, but she also seemed to concentrate largely on the content of the lesson, asking herself, 'What am I going to teach them?' and 'Are they going to be interested in the way I present this?'

Shavelson and Stern suggest that there is 'a mismatch between the demands of classroom instruction and the prescriptive planning model.' This mismatch arises, they argue, because,

'teachers must maintain the flow of activity during a lesson or face behavioural management problems. Hence they are faced first and foremost with deciding what activities will engage students during the lesson or put another way, the teacher must decide how to entertain his or her audience while attending to the curriculum.'

Shavelson & Stern 1981:477

Probably every teacher would identify with this to a certain extent but Claire and Joanna did claim to focus their planning primarily on the aims of the lesson.

*'If I find I'm sitting there thinking, 'Oh my God , what am I going to do?' ..I literally get a piece of paper and I write down aims, maybe three, and then I think 'OK, well, how are you going to get there?'
And it helps me enormously. I do it most of the time.'*

○

Kennedy writing about trainee teachers suggests that, 'it may be that in the early stages of learning to teach trainees need to concentrate on acquiring a confident grasp of classroom routines and that critical analysis develops at a much later stage.' Kennedy 1993:162. It is tempting to conclude that the difficulty encountered by some of the participants was due to lack of experience. Certainly it is true that Joanne was the most experienced teacher, but Teresa also had several years' teaching experience. Sarah and Claire had taken the initial training course together two years earlier, and yet showed very different attitudes. It would seem that an individual teacher's approach is probably based on nothing so easily identifiable as the amount of experience gained, but is rather based on what they have actually experienced, as teachers and learners. Somekh suggests that the routines of teaching, 'have been developed in practice...they have become bound up in our self-image and feelings of professional confidence and security' (Somekh 1993:35). Such routines probably begin to develop long before a teacher ever undergoes training - they may derive from early learning experiences in childhood at home and school. While all four participants were committed teachers who enjoyed their work, both Teresa and Sarah seemed to feel strongly that they wanted to somehow make a difference. In Teresa's case this was echoed by her attitude towards the students, which tended to be very protective:

'They need it controlled, because I set them doing it by themselves and they were in such a flap, and I could see Rubena....so I said, 'Would you like me to do it with you?' 'Yes, please.' they all said. ...and they all copied it and then they knew they'd got it right.'

Interestingly, Sarah, who might have been expected to hold quite similar beliefs, remarked, 'I think it's very easy to spoonfeed students and I think it's good for them to take responsibility.' This is of course a reminder that teachers do not fall neatly into two camps. As Elliott notes:

Dilemmas for insider researchers can arise from a clash of professional values between those which undermine the traditional craft culture and those which underpin an emergent culture of reflective practice. This clash occurs not so much between as within individuals.'

Elliott 1991:57

It is not then a case of reflective and unreflective teachers but of points along a continuum. The important thing is to realise that individuals can interpret and view the same phenomena differently. Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) writing about successful change,

refer to the need for compatibility, the extent to which an innovation is perceived as being consistent with the participants' existing values, past experiences and present needs. If it is not felt to be compatible they suggest, it will be undermined or subverted. Clearly the approach which lay behind this project had not proved immediately compatible with some of the values, experiences and needs of at least two of the participants. Wiser, at the end of the project, I realised the importance of this. The project had by no means failed, but it would undoubtedly have been more successful had I known at the beginning what I had discovered by the end.

The results of this research would seem to indicate that some teachers may be more naturally inclined towards reflective practice, while others tend to rely almost entirely upon 'knowing-in-action' or instinct in making their classroom decisions. Experience is seen as important by these teachers mainly because it provides them with a store of 'ideas that are tried and trusted' (Allwright and Bailey 1990). However, as Allwright and Bailey go on to point out, 'In the long run it is not enough to know that ideas do work; we need also to know how and why they work. Until we can throw more light on these issues, successful teaching will remain a mystery.' (Allwright and Bailey 1990:197). If teachers do not understand and cannot make informed choices about their techniques they will remain simply 'highly skilled technicians' (McNiff 1988). For a teacher to become an expert in their field they need to actively learn from their experience. As Somekh (1993) points out, getting teachers to self-monitor their practice is the first step. This will help them to identify and understand their personal theories - a change in practice may lead from a change in these theories.

Encouraging a reflective approach

If teachers are, like Teresa, not overly predisposed towards a critical analysis of practice, what can, or should, be done about it? It is notoriously difficult to attempt to change such deep-rooted beliefs, especially over a short period of time. Calderhead (1987) cites a study by Korthagen (1985) which found that in a teacher education course aimed at developing the skills of critical reflection on practice, 'the only students to be influenced appeared to be those who were already disposed towards critically analysing their practice anyway.' As Somekh, previously cited, suggests, such perspectives may form an important part of a teacher's self-image. Pushing a teacher to change something so fundamental before they are ready may be extremely counter-productive. A reflective approach may not always be the most suitable approach for a given teacher at a given point in time. Teachers may initially be more concerned with developing effective and

efficient teaching routines - they may need to learn to survive before they can begin to reflect on their own practice.

However, with all the potential benefits which appear to accrue to the reflective teacher, it would seem that his or her orientation to development through self-enquiry must still remain an end goal. Rather than trying to force teachers to become more reflective, a thankless and possibly demoralising task, we might consider ways in which the process can be facilitated.

Kemmis and MacTaggart (1988) set out a number of very useful suggestions for developing action research projects, to which I would refer the facilitator. However, I would also like to add the following observations, based on this experience and aimed at creating the most favourable climate possible for teachers to develop their reflective capabilities, which I believe may also be generalisable over different contexts.

1. Encourage discussion of and some general agreement on, educational goals within the institution as a whole: this may help researchers to feel that they are working within the institution rather than against it and thus encourage risk-taking.
2. Set up good channels of communication with the management /administration so that potential conflicts may be defused and change made safer.
3. Try to ensure maximum publicity and support from the administration: this may also encourage others to join the research group, leading in turn to less and less marginalisation.
4. Make sure that teachers receive plenty of praise and recognition for their work, even if more material benefits are not possible.
5. Maximise participants' sense of ownership. This may be better achieved if:
 - a) the research question is not imposed
 - b) the facilitator is not solely responsible for the writing up and publicity of the project.

6. Be patient with teachers who fail to see the benefits of a reflective approach. Publicising the benefits found by other teachers might help but you may have to accept that there are no benefits for this particular teacher at this stage in their career.

7. Consider ways of helping teachers to develop their reflective abilities. Thornbury (1991) for example, guided teachers in their self-observation tasks by asking them to focus on very specific aspects of their practice.

This study inevitably leaves many questions unanswered but on a personal level, the process was, however, extremely educative. I began with a rather evangelistic view of the numerous potential benefits of this type of approach and ended, or rather paused, no less convinced of these benefits but considerably better informed about the pitfalls and with some ideas of how I might improve my own practice as a facilitator. From the wider point of view, the study can only be seen as a tiny increment to the knowledge already amassed. Nonetheless, if all those conducting action research continue to investigate its workings in this way, together we may create a fuller picture of what is involved and thus actually make a real difference to the professional situation of participant teachers.

Bibliography

Allwright, D and Bailey, K M (1990) *Focus on the Language Classroom: An Introduction to Classroom Research for Language Teachers* Cambridge:Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, K M (1990) 'The use of diary studies in teacher education' in J.Richards and D.Nunan (eds)

Bartlett, L (1990) 'Teacher development through reflective teaching' in J.Richards and D.Nunan (eds.)

Butler-Wall, B (1979) 'Diary Studies' In E. Arafa, C. Brown, B. Butler-Wall and M. Early, Classroom Observation and Analysis. Unpublished manuscript, Applied Linguistics Ph.D. program, University of California, Los Angeles

Calderhead, J (ed) (1987) *Exploring Teachers' Thinking* London:Cassell

Charles, M (1990) 'Responding to problems in written English using a student self-monitoring technique' *ELT Journal* 44/4

Edge, J (1992) *Cooperative Development* London: Longman

- Edge, J. and Richards, K eds (1993) *Teachers Develop Teachers Research* Oxford: Heinemann International
- Elliott, J (1991) *Action Research for Educational Change*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press
- Hedge, T (1988) *Writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kemmis, S and McTaggart, R (1988) *The Action Research Planner*. Victoria: Deakin University Press
- Kennedy, J (1993) 'Meeting the needs of teacher trainees on teaching practice' *ELT Journal* 47/2
- Korthagen, F (1985) 'Reflective Teaching as a Basis for Teacher Education' (cited in J. Calderhead 1987)
- McDonough, J (1994) 'A teacher looks at teacher diaries' *ELT Journal* 48/1
- McNiff, J (1988) *Action Research: principles and practice*. Macmillan Education.
- Nunan, D (1989) *Understanding Language Classrooms* London: Prentice Hall
- Richards, J and Nunan, D (eds) (1990) *Second Language Teacher Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press C.U.P.
- Rogers, E M and Shoemaker, F F (1971) *Communication of Innovations: A Cross Cultural Approach*. New York: The Free Press.
- Schon, D A (1983) 'The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action' (cited in M. Wallace 1991)
- Shavelson, R and Stern, P (1981) 'Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgements, decisions and behaviour' *Review of Educational Research* 51/4 455-98
- Somekh, B (1993) 'Quality in educational research - the contribution of classroom teachers' in J. Edge and K. Richards (eds)
- Thornbury, S (1991) 'Watching the whites of their eyes; the use of teaching practice logs' *ELT Journal* 43/4.
- Underhill, A (1992) 'The role of groups in developing teacher self-awareness' *ELT Journal* 46/1
- Wallace, M (1991) *Training Foreign Language Teachers: a reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press