

Chapter Five

Case Studies of Teachers' Action Research

While the previous chapter discussed the findings that were conceptualised around the overall framework of *the input, the processes, and the products of teachers' AR*, this chapter focuses on providing a more in-depth examination of the AR experiences of a small number of the teachers in the study. It discusses individual cases where the realities of AR and the implications of AR can be seen from the teachers' viewpoints. This chapter aims to show how different individual teachers responded to the experience, and how AR affected teachers individually.

Among the ten teachers who participated in the study, the experiences of four of them will be presented in this chapter. These teachers, *Teacher A, Teacher C, Teacher E, Teacher H* were selected because their situations reflected particular facets or dimensions of the AR findings. *Teacher A* taught at one of the three best HSs in Surakarta, where the requirement to enter this HS was high. In addition, student achievement was higher than in other HSs, and most of the graduates were successful in entering the state universities. On the contrary, students achievement in *Teacher H's* HS was much lower than in *Teacher A's*. However, *Teacher A* and *Teacher H* were both very keen and successful in implementing AR in different ways.

Teacher C was the oldest participant in this study, and was about to retire. She was also the busiest teacher, due to her tight teaching schedules and other administrative duties from her school. Despite her positive perceptions towards AR, she always complained of a lack of energy which hindered her from undertaking related AR activities optimally. In addition, her heavy schedules hindered her from concentrating on data collection, such as documenting her progress and writing her diary. However, *Teacher C* was able to complete her research and significantly promoted her students' participation in class.

During his participation in this study, *Teacher E* underwent difficult personal times because he had to take care of his sick mother. Twice he could not attend the AR workshops. These workshops were very important for the teachers because they were meant to prepare and support them to implement AR. In the workshops, the teachers learnt about AR, gained skills of research methodology, selected and focused on topics for the research, and completed research proposals. However, *Teacher E* made a personal effort to contact and ask other teachers about the workshops he missed, so that he was able to complete the proposal and prepare himself to conduct his research. In addition, during the research there was significant improvement in his classroom in terms of the classroom atmosphere, the students' motivation, and the students' test achievements.

In presenting the case studies, each teacher's research is summarised through a table. The table identifies the research topic, the classes taught, the initial

impetus for the research, and the solutions and the processes which occurred. These data for the case studies are taken from a combination of the teachers'

research reports, the interviews, the interactions during the fortnightly focus group discussions, documents such as teaching materials, teachers' research reports, posters, and student works, the teachers' diaries, and my research journal. Detailed information about the teachers' profiles, such as gender, age, academic background, and teaching experience has already been presented in Table 3.2, section 3.4.2. Each of the case studies will be discussed in sections 5.1; 5.2; 5.3; and 5.4 respectively in the following.

5.1. Case study one: *Teacher A*

Teacher A who held an undergraduate degree in English had been teaching for 16 years, including two years in her current HS. She indicated that she was lucky to teach in the school which was the first ranking of the big-three HSs in Surakarta, "*I feel blessed and fortunate to teach in this school*" (*Teacher A*, 6/4/02, 1). The teaching requirements and expectations in this HS were high as only qualified students could enrol in this school. This HS was also famous for its students' achievements in terms of the large number of students who were accepted into state universities. Based on the results of the national examination in 2002, this HS was in the first ranking among the eight public HSs in Surakarta. In addition, as reported by *Teacher A*, in terms of socio-economic background the students usually came from middle to upper class families. "*Besides being clever, they also took (external) courses. Not only English, but also computer and other*

skills. So my problem was how not to be left behind by my students” (Teacher A, 6/4/02, 2). Teacher A’s comments reflected her views that the students worked at a sophisticated level. She indicated that this situation was a contrast with that of many other teachers, “It is shameful that there are lots of teachers who are not familiar with computers yet” (Teacher A, 6/4/02, 3).

Teacher A reported that she did not encounter many problems in her English class. She described her speaking class as dynamic and reported that the students actively participated in the lessons, “Usually my students learn fast. Most of them can speak English well. Only one or two students are quiet, but it does not mean that they do not know, it’s because they basically are quiet students. It’s very challenging since I have to be able to select interesting materials” (Teacher A, 7/5/02). However, she noticed some areas for improvement. She was concerned that the time allocated for her speaking class was not enough to give each student an opportunity to practise speaking. Only half of the students were able to practise conversation in the time available, “It’s very annoying to see lots of my students are disappointed” (Teacher A, 28/2/02). Teacher A reported that she tried to overcome this problem by asking them to practise speaking in groups. However, there were protests from neighbouring teachers, who complained that her class was noisy and disturbing, “Actually, it was not realistic to expect a speaking class to be quiet. But also I understand that other classes needed to concentrate on their own lessons” (Teacher A, 12/3/02, 1). In response to this situation, she decided to teach outside the usual classroom so

that the “*healthy noise*” (Teacher A, 12/3/02, 2) would not penetrate to other classes.

Through her AR, which is summarised in Table 5.1, she optimised the students’ speaking ability by conducting speaking outside the specific classroom. She reported that she selected the hall because, “*It was relatively close to the classroom but separated from the classes. So I hoped the noise would not be bothersome*” (Teacher A, 23/3/02). Teacher A who was rather shy in personality reported that actually this solution had come to her mind before, but she had never tried it because, “*I just felt uneasy to talk to the principal about this*” (Teacher A, 20/4/02, 1). Nevertheless, she chose this strategy and discussed it with her principal who had no objection, “*Now that I am conducting AR, I feel like having a strong back-up which support my decision*” (Teacher A, 20/4/02, 2).

Table 5.1 Summary of Teacher A’s Action Research

Topic:	Teaching speaking outside the regular classroom.
Class used for AR:	II4 (year 2, class 4)
Initial reflection:	Basically the students were very active in participating in the speaking classes. Practice time was limited. Speaking classes were noisy and disturbed other classes. Students needed to be provided with more chance to practise their speaking.
Proposed solutions:	Investigate strategies for setting up teaching opportunities outside the specific classroom.
Cycles:	3 cycles
Cycle 1	
<i>Planning:</i>	I would ask my students to practise speaking in the school hall. But I would conduct the pre-speaking and post-speaking activities in the class.

Action: I asked the students, in-group of 4-5, to develop and practise conversations based on the language functions that were explained in the pre-speaking activity. As the post-speaking activity, each group wrote the dialogues at home to be collected the following week.

Observation: Students showed enthusiasm in practising the conversation. Each group could use the language functions in an appropriate context and situation. Three groups were very active, as they were top ranking students; two other groups were rather quiet. However, everybody had enough time to take turns in the conversations.

Reflection: I was concerned with the quiet groups.

Cycle 2

Planning: I would re-arrange the group, mixing active students with less active ones.

Action: When I said that I wanted to rearrange the groups, the students showed that they were not happy. After negotiation, we maintained the three active groups and swapped the members of the two less-active groups.

Observation: As in the previous week the three groups were excellent and had almost no problems with the language. However, the two groups who had new members did not work well. These two groups eventually merged into one big group. Apparently each group did not want to be separated from the previous week members.

Reflection: It was not easy to group students.

Cycle 3

Planning: I would ask the students to choose their own groups. In addition, I would like to have feedback about my teaching. I would interview the students randomly.

Action: I asked my students to choose the group as they wished with one condition that they had to be active during the lesson, especially the quiet groups.

Observation: The students who were usually quiet made improvements. They tried to speak more so that the conversations were more alive. All groups were cheerful and very enthusiastic during the lessons.

Reflection: Students tended to form groups with their close friends who were comfortable to work with. For future classes I would use this strategy again.

Findings/overall reflection: Providing a supportive environment promoted learning. Practising speaking in the hall helped my students to improve their speaking ability.
Grouping the students as I wished did not always work well.
Feedback from the students indicated that studying in the hall was more interesting than in the classroom; it gave them freedom and confidence to practise speaking; they believed their speaking was improving.
The happy atmosphere and improvement in my speaking class was inspiring. I would like to apply this technique of teaching speaking in my other class in the next school term with some adjustment and improvement.

As shown in Table 5.1, in the pre-speaking activity in cycle 1 which was

conducted in the classroom, *Teacher A* discussed language functions or expressions which would be used in the conversations.

I explained expressions using prepositional phrases and participle phrases as noun modifiers. The students developed the expressions using structures, such as 'The man standing under that tree is my friend' into dialogues or conversations.

*They had to develop this into their own topics and context.
(Teacher A, 6/4/02)*

After explaining this in the classroom, *Teacher A* reported that she asked the students to practise the conversation in the hall. As illustrated in Table 5.1, the students practised speaking in group of four or five. *Teacher A* indicated that the action worked well,

Having the lesson in the hall gave freedom to my students for they could speak as they wished without being worried about disturbing other classes. And having them practise in group provided effective times since all students had the same time and opportunity to practise. (Teacher A, 20/4/02)

However, *Teacher A* noticed that the grouping was not balanced because there were two groups which were not as active as the others. In her opinion, "*The members of these groups were less clever and quiet students*" (*Teacher A*, 27/4/02, 1). Hence, as stated in cycle 2 of Table 5.1, she wanted to mix the members. Nevertheless, she found that grouping was not simple because most groups refused to do so. To solve this issue, *Teacher A* decided to exchange members of the two quiet groups. She reported her attempt to swap the members did not increase the participation of these two groups, "*Not happy with the members, most students in these group did not speak actively, and even one or*

two students did not talk at all. In the meantime other groups were excellent" (Teacher A, 7/5/02, 1). After negotiating this with the students, and an agreement that they had to be really active in the lesson, Teacher A, "... eventually let the students choose their own groups" (Teacher A, 7/5/02, 2). In the following classes, as summarised in cycle 3 in Table 5.1, the students' enthusiasm was reported to be increasing. At one occasion the students were so absorbed in the conversation that they, "... kept taking turns in the conversation and did not realise that the bell rang and the class was over" (Teacher A, 25/5/02, 1).

Her students were reported as delighted with the new situation. This was reflected in the students' comments that she recorded. She reported that one student said, *"I am happy and satisfied to have plenty of time to develop the topic of the discussion, and hope to have this opportunity for other speaking classes"* (Teacher A, 25/5/02, 2). Another student was reported saying, *"You know, miss, when I told my friends in other classes about this, they were jealous and wished to have their speaking class in the hall, too"* (Teacher A, 25/5/02, 3).

During the implementation of her research, Teacher A was one of the few teachers who conducted AR easily. This was shown from the early stage of this study in the workshops. When the workshop presented the topic of developing research questions, she was able to produce one focused question for her research that day, while other teachers needed to wait until the following week until they could think about the questions further. In the implementation, Teacher A showed that she conducted AR with relative ease and understanding. My journal

noted about her research.

I noticed that in each fortnightly AR group discussion, Teacher A indicated her readiness to share her progress to other teachers. She took the first opportunity when the teachers were asked to report the research orally. Her report flowed well and the information often inspired other teachers. In many visits to interview the teachers, they often asked me about Teacher A's progress in order to compare with theirs. This indicated that to some extent, Teacher A was a model for other teachers. (Researcher's journal, 26/6/02, 1)

However, as also experienced by the all other teachers, Teacher A encountered difficulties in conducting reflective practice through diary writing. The reasons were also typical, *"I am not familiar with expressing my ideas in written form. I find it very difficult to develop an entry into a richer description. And time is also a constraint"* (Teacher A, 27/4/02, 2).

When interviewed about aspects which promoted her enthusiasm during her research, she mentioned the influence of a senior teacher educator (TE) in her school with whom Teacher A often had discussions regarding her teaching practice.

TE had long experience in teaching. Besides that, she collaborated with lecturers in conducting several research projects. I also heard that she was invited to the university to demonstrate teaching English in HS as a model for students of the English Department of the Teacher Training and Education Faculty. With her varied experience, it was always enlightening to talk with her. (Teacher A, 24/7/02, 1)

Teacher A reported that TE was positive towards her involvement in AR, *"TE often asked me about my research and offered assistance in case I needed it"*

(Teacher A, 24/7/02, 2). The positive responses were also shown from other colleagues in Teacher A's HS, especially English teachers.

Yesterday I talked about the new atmosphere in my speaking class to other English teachers. They seemed interested. They became more interested when I mentioned about AR and wanted to know more about it. (Teacher A, 4/5/02, 1)

In addition, Teacher A reported that her husband who was about to submit his thesis for his master degree always encouraged her to be keen and make the best of her research as he said, "By the time you take your post-graduate study, you will build your research skill which is important for your study" (Teacher A, 18/5/02).

When interviewed about her experience in conducting the research she reported her impression about AR, "The procedures in AR are interesting. The steps in the cycles such as planning, action, observation and reflection allow flexibility as the lessons can be modified again and again as they progress" (Teacher A, 19/7/02). Hence, when asked about adopting the AR approach in the future, Teacher A indicated a positive response although she was not really sure about her consistency.

Yes, but maybe not the whole process as when I did it with you. If I have to do it in my class, I will really need someone to monitor and to assist me. I need more help in my research skill. Moreover, I need someone to remind me whether I am on track because I am not always sure whether the procedures of my research are correct. (Teacher A, 24/7/02, 3)

The case study of Teacher A portrays a teacher who taught English in a

favourable situation. She did not encounter the typical classroom problems about which other teachers complained, such as low students' participation, slow teaching and learning processes, and low achievement. In her case, teaching was challenging because her students were fast learners; and the teaching issue that concerned her was up-grading herself in order to be able to keep up with her students. In *Teacher A's* case, clearly that supportive atmosphere at school, such as appreciative colleagues promotes teacher's enthusiasm in conducting AR.

The next section will present the case study of *Teacher H* who, in contrast, taught in a HS situation which was much less favourable than *Teacher A's*. *Teacher H* was one of the only two teachers who had AR experience prior to this study.

5.2. Case study two: *Teacher H*

Teacher H taught in a public HS which was located in the outer city. Students usually came from nearby suburbs. The requirements for enrolment at her HS were not as high as the other HSs in the inner city. This also meant that the students' achievements were not as high as in other HSs. As an illustration, in Surakarta there are 53 HS, eight of which are public ones. Based on 1997/1998 data, the other seven public HSs belonged to the big-ten HSs, whereas *Teacher H's* HS was in the 23rd rank (Nurkamto, 2000: p.36). In addition, based on the results of the national examination in 2002, *Teacher H's* HS was in the last ranking among the eight public HSs. Typical complaints from this HS concerned

the "... *slow process of teaching and learning, low student motivation, low percentage of student attendance, discipline problem, student laziness, and class management*" (*Researcher's journal, 12/2/02*). Concerning the social and economic background, *Teacher H* stated that, "*Most parents work in factories and their salaries are hardly enough to support their family*" (*Teacher H, 11/2/02, 1*). This explained what I noted when I visited this HS for interviews,

"While waiting for Teacher H to finish teaching, I overheard a man who talked to the vice principal at his desk. The man asked for more time to reschedule the overdue fees of his son who studied in the third year. The vice-principal granted it until a certain date. Otherwise his son would not be able to sit in the final examination". (Researcher's journal, 8/5/02)

Teacher H commented, "*Lots of my students come to school only to be away from home. Their motivation to study is very very low*" (*Teacher H, 11/2/02, 2*). In addition to this situation, *Teacher H* reported that in her class there were five "*special*" (*Teacher H, 11/2/02, 3*). students who,

... needed extra attention. They were all from broken-home families. It seemed to me that they came here only to sleep. In the class they sat at the very back row and mostly slept during the lessons. Their attendance was also low. If these students attend a lesson in the morning, we could not expect to see them in other lessons after that. So, they could be in the Mathematics class, but there was no guarantee that they would attend in the next class. (Teacher H, 11/2/02, 4)

Teacher H had talked informally with these students and reported, "*To these five students, the classroom was like a prison*" (*Teacher H, 9/4/02*). She had strong feelings about these issues and indicated that these problems of low achieving students, low level of attendance at school, student laziness, and assisting such

students to become more motivated had become her school agenda. However, she reported that she saw few changes to improve this situation, *"That they come to school is much better than wandering out"* (Teacher H, 11/2/02, 5). As a young teacher, she admitted there were, *"... so many things that I would like to solve and to improve. But I feel powerless"* (Teacher H, 11/2/02, 6).

When *Teacher H* heard about this AR study, she responded to it enthusiastically. *Teacher H* who had conducted an AR study before heard about the study from *Colleague K* who helped me to publicise it and recruit participants.

I was involved in an AR study with three university lecturers. I found out that the study was very beneficial for me as a teacher or personally. Based on that experience, I was looking forward to participating in this study. (Teacher H, 11/2/02, 7)

She also showed her enthusiasm in the AR workshops which were conducted at the beginning of the study. She considered them as a means to, *"... learn about AR in a more complete way ... from the beginning, so I hoped I could have the whole idea of AR including the procedures and its implementation"* (Teacher H, 6/3/02). In my journal, I noted the following entry about her.

Teacher H was young and very enthusiastic to participate in the workshops. She never failed to complete the activities that should be done every week. She did not hesitate to ask for clarification or further explanations. In addition, Teacher H also looked happy to share her case or story with other teachers. (Researcher's journal, 30/3/02, 1)

In her research, summarised in Table 5.2, *Teacher H* wanted to investigate strategies which would enable her to overcome poor attendance, apparent

laziness, and the passive attitudes shown by the students. She stated that the situation was, “... *not favourable for an English class in which students should be able to practise and use the language*” (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 1). She decided to talk about these challenges in her classroom with the students and invited them to share their ideas about their learning and teaching preferences in the class. Teacher H was willing to discuss and negotiate her lessons with the students in order to enable her to teach, “... *in a more favourable situation from my students' point of views*” (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 2). Underpinning the decision to negotiate with her students was her belief that, “*Negotiating the lessons with the students means involving them as members of a team. And this means giving them trust and responsibility, as well*” (Teacher H, 28/4/02). Further description about the negotiation strategy which she used in her research is presented after Table 5.2.

Table 5.2 Summary of Teacher H's Action Research

Topic:	Negotiating lessons with the students
Class used for AR:	III IPS 4 (year 3 of <i>Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial</i> /Sociology Program, class 4).
Initial reflection:	Students were not enthusiastic in the classroom. They were passive, looked tired, and had low test achievements. Five students had attendance problems. I had to find ways to “attract” my students: to present my lessons more interestingly. In addition, I wanted to be able to increase their participation in my lessons.
Proposed solutions:	Finding strategies to increase the students' self-esteem so that they were more involved in the lessons. Distributing questionnaires to the students to find out what they wanted to do in class.
Cycles:	3 cycles

Cycle 1

Planning: I wanted to discuss with the students about the results of the questionnaires. The questionnaires revealed that the students wanted more variations in teaching materials, and how the materials were presented more interestingly. They also wanted to vary the location of the class.

Action: As planned, I talked to the students about the results of the questionnaires and we discussed each point. From the discussion, we made some agreements related to what we were going to do in class. For location, we chose outdoors: under the teak tree behind the class; and indoors: at the library and in the hall. Concerning the materials, the students let me choose for them. For presenting the lessons they suggested I vary the approach from "*being told*" only. Beside this, we talked about setting new rules such as: students should come to the place of study/"outdoor class" on time and prepare everything before the class began. While walking to the "outdoor class", they should not disturb other classes and do the homework I gave.

Observation: Initially it was very slow to get the students' opinion on where to go as the alternative to the current classroom. But when some students began to talk, other students also spoke up. When I asked them to set up the rules, they looked excited. Some students kept silent and looked shy to give their ideas. I did not think that they did not want to take part. I guessed it was because they were not familiar with this approach.

Reflection: The good atmosphere in my English class was very inspiring. Probably there was a feeling of empowerment for the students as it was they themselves who created the rules and not just obeyed the rules as usual. Asking them to choose, to decide and to do what they wanted to do for the lesson was a kind of a new and surprising thing. I was delighted that giving them a chance to express their opinions made my students cheerful. I could hardly wait to see how it would be with my students when they studied outdoors.

Cycle 2

Planning: Next meeting we would study reading outdoors and the topic would be *Energy*.

Action: We studied outdoors, under the shadow of the trees. The students worked in four groups (two groups of boys and two groups of girls). They chose the members of the group themselves. I gave each group handouts about the materials with some vocabulary related to the topic. As we studied outdoors, I used this opportunity to relate the topic with natural energy resources that could be identified by the students, such as wind and solar energy. Then they discussed it and answered questions. Going back to class, the students wrote the result of their discussions. At the end of the lesson, I gave them homework.

Observation: The students were excited. They expressed their opinions more freely. The girls looked full of enjoyment. However, they looked annoyed by a group of boys who seemed amused by the new situation. During the lesson these boys often looked around noticing the environment rather than focusing on the lesson. They were also not as active as the girls were. We wasted too much time for the preparation.

Reflection: My students reacted differently to the new situation of the study. For most students, the new situation really encouraged them to be more active which enabled them to speak up about their ideas. For other students, it was "a surprise". Studying outdoors, to some extent distracted my students' attention. I guessed this was understandable, as they were not familiar with it yet.

Cycle 3	
<u>Planning:</u>	I reminded my students about the agreements: the rules that we had made during the first cycle. The next meeting would be at the library. To have different material and technique, we would listen to music.
<u>Action:</u>	All the students were ready in the library when I went there. I divided the students into six groups. Each group consisted of six students, boys and girls. I gave them handouts of the song's text. There were some missing words that had to be filled in while they were listening to the cassettes. We listened to the song three times. When I was sure that all groups had correct answers, I let them discuss the song in their groups. There were also times for the students and I to sing the song along with the completed lyrics. In the end, each group reported the result of their discussion.
<u>Observation:</u>	The students seemed to try to keep to their own rules. The boys especially were more disciplined. The boys and the girls were able to co-operate with each other. All students came, even the five 'special' students who did not always attend the class. The other students welcomed them warmly. Everything ran well in this cycle.
<u>Reflection:</u>	Teachers should and always be patient in establishing discipline with their students. In my case I guessed I was lucky, since it was the students who set the rules. So it was easier for me to remind the students to keep and follow their own rules. The different material (songs) and technique (using a tape recorder) obviously brought excitement for the students. The pain of preparing the song and thinking about how to develop it was nothing compared to the excitement I got, not to mention that the students were relaxed and active during the lesson. Unfortunately, in the following classes I had to be back to the normal teaching because I had to use the rest of the class sessions for exam preparation.
Findings/ overall reflection:	Negotiating the teaching-learning process with the students improved the unfavourable class situation which I investigated in the research: poor attendance, student laziness, and student passive attitude. Since the negotiation provided me with data of student preferences, it helped me to become more relaxed and focused to prepare teaching. I could expand my roles as a teacher. Now I could also place myself as a friend in teaching; not only as the one who always "orders and instruct". Positioning the students as "human" not just as "objects" made my work lighter and easier.

As summarised in Table 5.2, *Teacher H* adopted a strategy of negotiating her lessons with the students. The following comments report *Teacher H's* journey of choosing this strategy. It is summarised from the fortnightly discussions conducted during the implementation of AR.

There must be several ways to overcome problems that happened in my class. But for me it was not easy to choose the right strategy. The impetus for the solution actually came from the AR

workshops. During the workshops, we have lots of opportunities to share ideas, tell our problems, and express ourselves. I found it was very enlightening to have the freedom to talk without being ridiculed or criticised, no right-wrong opinions, and develop the sense of authority in teaching, considering we were used to being instructed by curriculum or by systems. In the workshops I felt that we developed appreciation: to appreciate and be appreciated. I believed in what was said in the workshops that AR is about empowering, because that was what I felt. The idea of empowering inspired me. I applied it in my class with my students. I assumed if they felt appreciated, they would be happy and this would affect their learning positively. (Teacher H, 23/4/02)

In addition to her motivation to engage a negotiating strategy, she was also motivated to “humanise” (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 3) her students,

Usually students are treated as the objects. We never place them as members of a team. Through this research I would like to humanise them, talk to them about the class. I believe that they have potencies; only they have not been optimised. (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 4)

As a starting point to humanise the students, as stated in Table 5.2, Teacher H distributed a “simple” (Teacher H, 27/3/02) questionnaire to investigate the students’ preferences concerning teaching materials, techniques, and Teacher H’s performance. She reported that she discussed the results of the questionnaires with her students in order to accommodate the students’ most frequent preferences about the lessons. In addition, Teacher H reported that they also set rules such as, to be more serious in the study, not to be late, and not to be noisy.

As time elapsed in the study, Teacher H indicated that there were positive responses from the students about the different classroom techniques and materials.

Student complaints that the classroom was like a prison were probably true. As I observed, my students looked very happy to study in the out door class which was in the backyard, and were enthusiastic to learn listening through a song using a cassette recorder in the library. When we studied reading using the topic of energy, instead of using the textbook, I related this to discussing sources of natural energy which could be found in the world. Students showed more enthusiasm than using the book. (Teacher H, 24/4/02, 1)

However, she noted that her students who were unfamiliar with the strategies needed time to adjust.

Initially it took time for them to settle down. Many boys were busy looking around, and giggling excitedly. Some of the girls talked to themselves. I had to remind them about the rules that we had set and agreed, such as to be on time, concentrate on the study, and not to be too noisy. This improved in the next class when we did listening in the library. I found out that the students were already there and the cassette player was also ready to use. (Teacher H, 24/4/02, 2)

The attendance of the five students who usually rarely came to the class was reported to be increasing.

When I talked to two students who usually had terrible attendance problem, they said they heard something different in my English class so they were interested to come. They apparently liked the song from Michael Learns to Rock [a name of a group band] that was used in the listening class. They said, "We'll do it again, won't we?" (Teacher H, 8/5/02)

In one interview, *Teacher H* indicated that she had actually tried her strategies before, especially the strategy of taking the students to study in the backyard.

Before participating in this study, I had tried to teach the students in the backyard. It was shady there, as there were lots of big teak trees. My students responded positively towards this different class situation. However, it was the first and also the last time. Although there were compliments from the vice-principal who was in charge of curriculum affairs, he also suggested that I should

not do that any more as that was unusual in this school. He agreed that it was good for the students, but it was "beyond the usual teaching patterns". I heard other teachers jokingly called me an "unruly teacher". (Teacher H, 24/4/02, 3)

Teacher H reported that in her AR project she used this strategy again because she had permission from her principal, *"I personally went to see the principal and asked his permission to conduct the strategies that I would use in my research. He granted permission, as long as they were good for the students"* (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 1). She suggested that because of this study she had a strong reason to see the principal, *"I would certainly not dare to see him, if it were not because of this AR project"* (Teacher H, 13/3/02, 2).

Teacher H reported that in the term when the research was conducted, she also had to prepare the students, who were in year 3, for the national final examinations. As noted in Table 5.2, this meant that she could not devote all her time to the research only, as some classes were used to prepare the students through test materials,

If I could choose, I'd rather do the research than preparing the students for the test. The students also asked me, "Why do we have to stop this?". I knew that they were disappointed as the class was back to normal, no songs and no backyard classes. (Teacher H, 13/5/02)

When she was asked about the impact of AR to her students' achievements, she reported that she could not show *"concrete results"* (Teacher H, 5/6/02, 1) and indicated that she needed more time to continue conducting the research.

To this point I could not say whether the research affected my students' test achievements significantly. I would probably need to

do more research that concentrated on improving their test achievements. (Teacher H, 5/6/02, 2)

Teacher H said that she needed more time to provide stronger evidence about the effect of AR towards the students' test achievement. However, she showed her positive thinking towards her research as indicated in the following comments

I am happy with the improvement so far. I did not see sleepy students anymore. The five students also showed more attendance. And most of all, now the students and I were closer, like friends. (Teacher H, 5/6/02, 3)

Underpinning her comment above was her belief about evaluating learning process.

After all, the learning improvement could not be evaluated from their test scores only. The improving atmosphere in the classroom, the increasing enthusiasm and the increasing attendance were not less important than the increasing scores. (Teacher H, 5/6/02, 4)

Like Teacher A, Teacher H found that the process of conducting research was relatively easy, compared to other teachers who conducted the similar research in this study.

Teacher H's prior experience with AR had helped her in coping with the process of conducting this research. The flow of one cycle to the other was smooth and easy. She showed clear concepts and understanding in conducting the steps in the cycle of planning, action, observation, and reflection. (Researcher's journal, 19/6/02)

She also showed herself to be proactive in gaining greater clarity about her teaching practice, as indicated by her willingness to ask questions to the other

teachers, and the facilitators, *Colleague K* and myself.

When asked about continuing to adopt AR, she gave a positive response.

I will continue doing AR. I have no doubt about the advantages of an AR approach for my teaching, although it is also not easy to conduct it consistently. Another reason for adopting AR is that I feel stronger if I have to argue with the principal or with the vice-principals of curriculum affairs about the strategies of techniques that I use in my teaching. (Teacher H, 24/7/02)

Teacher H's case provides evidence of the central importance of the teacher's role in creating effective teaching and learning. In her school situation with its relatively unfavourable teaching and learning resources, a teacher could still make a breakthrough to improve the learning situation for the students. Although there are no data showing the impact of the AR strategies in the students' test achievement, *Teacher H* became optimistic about changing her students' learning experience into a more dynamic one.

In the next section, the case study of the oldest teacher, *Teacher C*, will be presented.

5.3. Case study three: *Teacher C*

Among the ten teachers who participated in this study, *Teacher C* who was 54 years was the oldest. As anticipated, she also had the longest teaching experience, 23 years. This excluded two years of being an interpreter prior to her career as a teacher. *Teacher C* taught in a HS which belonged to one of the big-three schools. As an illustration, based on the results of the national examination

in 2002, her HS was in the third ranking among the eight public HSs. Interviews with the principal indicated that this HS was sophisticated in that this HS had an email account, sent exchange students abroad regularly, especially to Australia, and had exchange teachers from Australia, *"The principal just showed me a document of her student who is now still in Australia as an exchange student. She showed me the address, and suggested me to contact her when I got back to Sydney"* (Researcher's journal, 11/2/02). Concerning the students' socio-economic background, Teacher C illustrated that, *"Usually the students come from middle to upper class families"* (Teacher C, 11/2/02).

Teacher C was also the teacher who had the heaviest workload. In one week she taught 15 regular classes: all nine classes of year 1; and six classes of year 2. Altogether each week this took 25 class sessions, in which each class session lasted for 45 minutes. Beside that, she also taught three *"special classes"* (Teacher C, 28/2/02, 1) of year 1. What she called the special classes were non-regular ones which were only conducted during the third term, and intended to give the year 1 students extra English skills that were not covered in the official syllabus. The non-regular class was conducted once a week and started at 6.30 a.m., 45 minutes earlier than the regular schedule. Alongside her academic duties, she had other duties which were conducted regularly, such as being the language laboratory supervisor, and the co-ordinator of English teachers; or incidentally, such as being the treasurer of the graduation day, the program co-ordinator of national events, and a jury member in her school's competitions.

Considering her tight schedules, it was not surprising that *Teacher C* often complained of a lack of energy. The following comments expressed in interviews revealed her opinions of her work situation.

With so many things to do, it is not good for teaching. Although I can say that I do not have many problems in choosing materials, and in using appropriate techniques to present them, I have to say that I cannot vary the lessons creatively. (Teacher C, 9/4/02, 1)

If I have more time, I will certainly as many skills that I have. For example, I will use actual and current materials from newspapers or magazines to deliver the topics in the syllabus, instead of using the textbook. I think I also have collections of games to use in the class. But I do not have enough time to prepare this. (Teacher C, 9/4/02, 2)

She pointed out that she knew her teaching was not always satisfying to the students.

Once I asked one student who did not show interest in my class, although he always had high scores in his test. He said that he actually liked English, but he did not like the way I taught which too often used the textbook. (Teacher C, 23/4/02)

Teacher C reported that she had talked about her heavy schedule to the principal who had then promised to reduce her workloads in the next term. On the one hand, *Teacher C* stated that she tried to perceive her duties positively, “*May be the principal trusts me. As you see, although my principal knew my schedules, she still appointed me to participate in this study, and not another teacher*” (*Teacher C, 28/2/02, 2*). On the other hand, she reported that her heavy schedule affected her teaching, “*It’s hard for a lethargic teacher to teach enthusiastically*” (*Teacher C, 28/2/02, 3*).

Nevertheless, despite her heavy schedule *Teacher C* indicated her willingness to participate in the study, and she was keen to attend all workshops. My comments summarised from my journal entries reveal my appreciation of *Teacher C*.

Considering her heavy schedule, it was awesome to see Teacher C's participation in the workshops. She was never late and never missed the workshops. She also could complete the activities that followed each workshop. Her comments in the workshops were always positive. One of the teachers even stated his admiration and surprise to see her endurance and enthusiasm. Another point was that she was the only teacher who came to the library of The Language Centre in my university after I introduced all the teachers to the sources of reference. In the library she showed her interest in the collections, and asked me if I could help to borrow one of the books. (Researcher's journal, 30/3/02, 2)

When asked about her keenness, *Teacher C* stated the following.

Initially, I was not entirely sure about the study. In my perception this was a very big and scary project, as I would have to do research, write diaries, and make a report. But I gave it a go. I began to like it when I found out that the workshops were very beneficial. I liked it when other teachers who were all younger asked me about my teaching experience. I felt like contributing. And I liked to listen to their experiences, too. (Teacher C, 26/3/02)

In one interview *Teacher C* reported that she encouraged younger teachers to experience AR.

The AR procedures that enable teachers to do reflective thinking and plan to improve the future are really good for us. AR makes us consider our teaching carefully; not just to teach as usual. I really hope that lots of teachers, especially the young ones, have the opportunity to participate in an AR study. (Teacher C, 17/6/02, 1)

However, she found that AR was too "luxurious" for herself.

I agree that AR is very important for teachers. After I got involved

in this study, I could even say that teachers should have done this since the beginning of their careers. However, as for myself whose time was so tight, I found that to be able to do AR well was too luxurious. I could not afford to spare extra time to think about AR. (Teacher C, 17/6/02, 2)

Her comments were reflected through the fact that during the AR implementation she was not always able to write diaries, and the flow from one cycle to another cycle of her research did not run smoothly.

In *Teacher C's* situation in which time was a real constraint, and where she suffered from lethargy, she indicated that her challenge was to teach English interestingly but in a way that was not too time-consuming for preparation and correction, *"I choose to use ready-to-use materials: a book and its cassettes"* (*Teacher C, 23/3/02, 1*). Another challenge was to choose one class for the research among her 15 regular and three non-regular classes. She chose one of the non-regular classes: class I.D because, *"In the non-regular classes, I teach only three classes, compared to 15 classes in the regular ones. Hence, if the other two non-regular ones are jealous and I have to use AR in their classes, it will not be too burdening"* (*Teacher C, 23/3/02, 3*). Concerning class I.D, *Teacher C* stated,

I teach in class I.D twice a week, on Wednesday for one class session and on Saturday for two class sessions. The Wednesday class is a non-regular one in which I conduct my AR. Although I teach early at 6.30 a.m., when students are supposed to be fresh, I find the students do not study enthusiastically. I assume that they are also tired with their studies. As an illustration, the students in this class usually study from 7.15 to 13.30 excluding the non-regular class, which is at 6.30 once a week. For those who take remedial classes, they have to stay until 15.30. In addition, there are compulsory extra curriculum classes once a week, which are

conducted in the afternoon. With this burden, students find it difficult to learn effectively (Teacher C, 28/2/02, 2)

As mentioned above, the non-regular class was intended to improve year 1 students' English skills by providing them with materials which were not covered in the curriculum. In her research, as summarised in Table 5.3, *Teacher C* focused on improving speaking comprehension by practising it with a cassette recorder.

Table 5.3 Summary of Teacher C's Action Research

Topic:	Improving speaking comprehension through cassette recorders.
Class used for AR:	I.D (year 1, class D: non-regular class).
Initial reflection:	<p>I was tired due to overloaded teaching and non-teaching duties.</p> <p>My students were not motivated to study.</p> <p>I needed to improve the students' motivation, and establish an enjoyable learning situation.</p> <p>As a tired teacher cannot teach effectively, I had to be able to respond to this situation appropriately by choosing materials which should be interesting for the students, but not too time consuming for the preparation, presentation, and correction.</p>
Proposed solutions:	Optimising oral practice using the book: <i>Grammarchants: More Jazz Chants</i> (Graham, 1993) and the cassettes.
Cycles:	2 cycles
Cycle 1	<u>Cycle 1 was conducted for 4 class sessions.</u>
<u>Planning:</u>	I chose language functions such as greeting, introducing, saying good-bye and giving/receiving compliments from the book.
<u>Action:</u>	I taught language functions. I asked the students to repeat the language functions after the teacher and after the tape.
<u>Observation:</u>	My students showed enthusiasm and could use the language functions correctly.
<u>Reflection:</u>	The students showed more motivation and were more active in participating in the class. However I would like them to be able to develop the language functions into contextual conversations.
Cycle 2	<u>Cycle 2 was conducted for 3 class sessions.</u>
<u>Planning:</u>	I would ask students to have conversation in groups using the language functions that they learnt previously.

<u>Action:</u>	I asked the students to form groups of three to five people and to have a conversation. Each group chose language functions and developed them into a conversation. The conversation was recorded.
<u>Observation:</u>	Students could hold conversations well. They indicated that they enjoyed conducting the conversations.
<u>Reflection:</u>	Students could develop language functions into a conversation with its particular theme, setting, and context.
Findings/ overall reflection:	Teaching my class with <i>Grammarchants: More Jazz Chants</i> with its cassettes solved my problem of presenting interesting lessons in my unfavourable situation. The strategy also increased my students' motivation and their participation in my class. Students reported that the language functions used in this class could be used outside the class, such as when they spoke to tourists.

As summarised in Table 5.3, *Teacher C* chose to use a book, *Grammarchants: More Jazz Chants* (Graham, 1993) which provided oral practice, exercises, answer keys, and was accompanied by cassettes. *Teacher C* stated that her reason for choosing this book, which was a gift from an Australian exchange teacher, was because it, "... *was very practical to use, and the materials were interesting. With the cassettes of native speakers, I believed it provided a very good model of pronunciation and intonation*" (*Teacher C*, 23/3/02, 2).

In the first cycle, *Teacher C* selected four sets of language functions as follows.

Week 1 Greetings

Hi! How are you? (a casual greeting)
How's Jack? (greeting someone and asking about mutual friends)
Hello. How've you been? (greeting someone you haven't seen in a long time)
Hello? Hello? (an informal greeting on the telephone)
Jack! You're back! (greeting a friend who has been away)

Week 2 Introductions/identifying self and others

Harry, this is Mary. (an informal introduction)
Nice to see you.
I'm glad to meet you. I've heard so much about you.
What's your name? Where are you from?
What's your first name? How do you spell it?

Week 3 Saying good bye

Good-bye, good-bye. (a casual good-bye to a friend)
Have a nice weekend.
It's getting late.
It was nice seeing you again.
Good-bye, Harry, say hello to Mary.
We're going to miss you.

Week 4 Giving and receiving compliments

You look wonderful today.
That's a nice sweater.
I like your gloves.
You look marvellous! You haven't changed a bit. (complimenting a person you haven't seen for a long time)
You speak English very well.
I'm afraid my English is not very good. (wishing for a compliment)

After explaining the language functions above, *Teacher C* asked her students to listen and repeat the models. Initially, as reported, the students listened and repeated after *Teacher C* who drilled the expressions repeatedly without using the cassette. She argued that, "*I used this approach so that the students could listen to the pronunciation and the intonation clearly, and could also see the appropriate gestures*" (*Teacher C*, 24/4/02, 1). After that, *Teacher C* played the cassette and asked the students to repeat after it, "*The students looked very enthusiastic and excited to repeat the model from the native speaker*" (*Teacher C*, 24/4/02, 2). She noticed the positive atmosphere in her classroom as follows.

They compared their own utterances to the utterances of the models in the cassette. I encouraged them to practise and use the expressions. I noticed that even without my encouragement, they already did that by repeating and practising them with their friends. In one of the classes, when I was about to finish teaching, I talked about the homework. In response to this, they said in unison, "Oh, no!" which was usually used to respond to bad news. The intonation and the pronunciation were precisely like the model in the cassette. I did not believe to what I heard; and my students looked very happy that they were able to use the language in the right situation. (Teacher C, 15/5/02)

As summarised in Table 5.3, in cycle 2 which took three class sessions, *Teacher C* wanted to improve the students' speaking skills; in not only being able to repeat the expression precisely, but also to develop the expressions into contextual conversations. Therefore, she asked her students to make groups of three to five students, *"I asked each group to develop a conversation based on the four sets of language expressions which were practised before"* (*Teacher C*, 27/4/02, 1). In addition, she told her students that the conversations would be recorded, *"I need to bring two cassette recorders into the classroom. One which is suitable for recording, and the bigger one is for playing back"* (*Teacher C*, 27/4/02, 2).

Teacher C reported that all the groups could perform the conversation well, *"They demonstrated their ability to use the expressions and develop them into contextual topics. In the conversation they used the language expressions from the book with the intonation like the models in the cassette"* (*Teacher C*, 22/5/02, 1). The classroom was reported to be more alive when *Teacher C* played the recorded conversations, *"As they listened to their conversations, students were excited and made funny comments"* (*Teacher C*, 22/5/02, 2).

Talking to some students afterwards, *Teacher C* revealed her students' enthusiasm and excitement, *"My students felt overjoyed as they were able to talk like native speakers"* (*Teacher C*, 5/6/02). In her reflections, *Teacher C* noted her relief in feeling that she had made the *"right choice"* (*Teacher C*, 12/6/02, 1),

using *Grammarchants: More Jazz Chants* in her teaching.

It was the right choice, since it did not need plenty of time to prepare, and was easy to present in the classroom. And more importantly was that the students were happy, and I was happy, not to mention the improvement in their motivation, their participation, and the better classroom atmosphere. (Teacher C, 12/6/02, 2)

However, during the research her experience of conducting AR was not as smooth as the description above suggests. At one point, I noted that *Teacher C* stated her intention to withdraw from the study.

This afternoon Teacher C called me on the phone. She wanted to give up and withdraw from her research. She said that the problems were because there were so many things to do at school, a lack of time, difficulties in following the AR procedures, and difficulties in writing diaries. (Researcher's journal, 6/4/02, 2)

This occurred twice, at "*the early stage*" (*Researcher's journal, 6/4/02, 1*) and "*after the fourth week*" (*Researcher's journal, 1/5/02, 1*) of her research. On her first plan of withdrawal, I "*persuaded*" (*Researcher's journal, 6/4/02, 3*) her to keep on and promised to provide her with more assistance. My reason for persuading her was that she was not alone in experiencing difficulties, "*After all, each teacher underwent difficulties at different levels*" (*Researcher's journal, 6/4/02, 4*). On her second plan of withdrawal, in trying not to place further pressure on *Teacher C*, I considered letting her withdraw. However, in a discussion with *Teacher C* I offered her the following option.

I suggested to Teacher C to keep conducting the AR strategies in her teaching, during which she still would have the same monitoring and assistance. However, she would not have to do the "obligations" as other teachers who conducted AR do. This meant that Teacher C would not have to write diaries, write a

report, write a paper for seminar, or prepare a poster.
(Researcher's journal, 1/5/02, 2)

My reason behind this suggestion was offering *Teacher C* to experience the process of teaching her class using AR strategies, excluding the responsibilities.

Without those research responsibilities, she can continue using the strategies as she planned in her research if she finds it good and enjoyable. Otherwise, she can stop her strategies anytime and is back to the way she usually taught. (Researcher's journal, 1/5/02, 3)

Realising that she was free from the “burden” (*Teacher C*, 30/4/02) of research, *Teacher C* accepted my suggestion to continue teaching her class using *Grammarchants: More Jazz Chants* as planned. In the meantime, I had to anticipate three possibilities: that she would withdraw from the research and would not use the AR strategies; that she would withdraw from the research but would still use the AR strategies; or that she would continue her research. Anticipating these possibilities, I carefully took more notes on *Teacher C*'s progress each time I interviewed her so that I had more detailed records of her research.

As time elapsed, *Teacher C* showed her greater interest when she noticed significant improvement in her class. Hence, she decided to continue her research project, “*It is really wasteful if I do not make the best of this opportunity. After all, support and direct assistance are available from you [the researcher]*” (*Teacher C*, 22/5/02, 1). However, she asked for dispensation not to write diaries, “*But it is beyond my capacity to write a diary*” (*Teacher C*, 22/5/02, 2). In

addition, she said that her decision to continue her research was because she wanted to provide “*mental support*” (Teacher C, 22/5/02, 3) for other teachers, “*If an older teacher like me can do it, I hope the younger teachers will get motivated to do so*” (Teacher C, 22/5/02, 4).

Basically it was not too difficult for her to continue her research. My meticulous notes of her research assisted her in providing information about the previous progress and details of her research. Without her diary writing, it should be admitted that discussions or interviews with Teacher C, “*...to reveal her insights about her research*” (Researcher's journal, 23/5/02) took more time than with other teachers. Eventually, Teacher C was able to finish her research with significant improvements in her classroom practice.

Although she was not able to write her diaries, except for some entries during the initial research, she was able to finish her research, write a report, prepare a poster, and even deliver her paper in the seminar. (Researcher's journal, 26/6/02, 2)

In an interview about the possibility of adopting AR in the future, she stated that, “*If I have the same heavy workload, it'll be impossible for me to adopt an AR approach. After all AR is not compulsory in my HS*” (Teacher C, 26/7/02, 1). Nevertheless, Teacher C indicated her positive perception of AR as reflected in her suggestions that, “*Teachers, especially the young ones, should do AR*” (Teacher C, 26/7/02, 2). She even suggested that, “*In order to have a complete picture of AR, principals should do AR too, so that they could provide support for teachers who conduct AR in more concrete ways*” (Teacher C, 26/7/02, 3).

Teacher C's case study reveals the realities of the heavy workloads and additional duties that some teachers encounter in the Indonesian context. Clearly these duties affected the teachers' capacity to conduct research. However, these limitations were overcome, at least partly by a conducive atmosphere, support from the principal, and assistance from facilitators. In addition, *Teacher C's* observations of the changes in her students increased her motivation to continue the research. Nevertheless, as can be seen in the case study of *Teacher C*, time constraints can have a significant impact on a teacher's capacity to optimise her research.

In the following section, a different AR experience, that of *Teacher E*, will be presented.

5.4. Case Study Four: *Teacher E*

Teacher E had been teaching English for 15 years during which he taught in three different HSs. His current HS had similarities with *Teacher H's* in that it was located in the outer city and that the students usually came from nearby suburbs. Typically these students had low achievements. This also meant that the students' achievements were not as high as in other HSs. As an illustration, based on the results of the national examination in 2002, his HS was in the seventh ranking among the eight public HSs in Surakarta. *Teacher E* reported that it was very common for teachers in his HS to complain about low achievement, low motivation in learning, and low level of students' interaction in

the classroom.

When he decided to participate in this study, *Teacher E* indicated that he was at his lowest level of motivation. He reported his situation as,

I taught my students because that was what I had to do as a teacher. But I did not really care whether they learnt something from my lessons. In brief, I did my job without enthusiasm, as long as I fulfilled the curriculum target, and taught the materials that I should teach in the term. (Teacher E, 8/2/02, 1)

Given his attitude, he realised that he was not able to get along well with his students,

The classroom's atmosphere was not relaxed. I did not make any efforts to be friendly to my students. In the class I taught unhappy faces. And I knew quite well that my students talked behind my back and called me a mean teacher. (Teacher E, 8/2/02, 2)

When he was asked about the reasons, *Teacher E* recounted his story from his early teaching.

When I traced back my early years as a teacher, I remembered teaching my students with full eagerness. That time I taught at a HS near Borobudur Temple. I often brought my students there to encourage them to speak English to tourists. I conducted the process of planning, presenting, and evaluating lessons carefully. Especially in scoring, I tried to do it fairly. Students got the scores that they deserved. (Teacher E, 8/2/02, 3)

He then described the situation where he taught in his current HS.

Once, I found out that the scores of students who failed from my class became higher in the report books. Later on I had an explanation that the school would be under scrutiny if there were lots of students who failed. (Teacher E, 8/2/02, 4)

To *Teacher E*, the score mark-up meant, "... *there was not any difference between students who passed and failed, who were honest and cheating. I felt sorry for my students who had worked hard and did well in my class*" (*Teacher E*, 8/2/02, 5). This affected his enthusiasm to teaching his classes,

It was disappointed me. I felt powerless because it was other people, not me, who decided the scores of my students. So, what was the different of teaching well and not? Little by little, I ultimately felt there was no point for me to teach well. (Teacher E, 8/2/02, 6)

When *Teacher E* heard about this AR study, he reported that he was sceptical as he felt that it, "... *was the same with other research before. Teachers were told by the researcher to do something in the class and were observed*" (*Teacher E*, 8/2/02, 7). However, he decided to participate in the study because he wanted to "*escape*" (*Teacher E*, 8/2/02, 8) from his monotonous routines. He indicated that he began to get interested in this study after he attended the second AR workshop where the topic of identifying research problems that would be implemented in AR and reviewing literature were introduced to the teachers. The second workshop was followed with further activities where teachers were encouraged to reflect on their current practices and decide which aspects they would change (see Table 4.4 in section 4.3.1.2.). From these aspects teachers were asked to develop and generate focused research questions. One of these focused research questions was targeted to be implemented in their AR. *Teacher E* indicated that he saw something different in AR.

Unlike other research conducted in this school before, it seemed to me that AR placed teachers as central. We did not do other people's research. We did the research. ... I began to think of investigating my own situation. After all, I actually have been tired

with my teaching situation. I needed to improve it. I hoped that AR was a fresh air for me. (Teacher E, 2/3/02)

Nevertheless, *Teacher E* was not able to attend all workshops. He was unable to come to the third and the fourth workshops because he had to take care his sick mother. *"On the phone I told Teacher E not to worry about the workshops and suggested he should concentrate on his mother"* (*Researcher's journal, 12/3/02*).

His concern about his mother's health had so occupied him that in my latest call I failed to make an appointment to see him. Despite my sympathy towards *Teacher E* during these difficult times, I was almost sure that *Teacher E* would not be able to continue participating in this study, *"... I have to prepare to lose Teacher E"* (*Researcher's journal, 15/3/02, 1*). However, after the fourth workshop *Teacher E*, *"...telephoned me and wanted to see me for a talk"* (*Researcher's journal, 15/3/02, 2*). When I met *Teacher E* on the following day, he showed me his notes. In contrast to what I had anticipated, *Teacher E's* notes illustrated a focused topic for his AR. He also showed me that he had begun to write his diaries, and was in the process of completing his research proposal. He reported that during the previous two weeks, when he could not attend the workshops, he had contacted other teachers, especially *Teacher I* to obtain copies of the workshop materials, and gain information about the workshops. When I asked him why he did not contact me, he said, *"I felt uneasy if I saw you without any draft to show"* (*Teacher E, 18/3/02, 1*). *Teacher E* indicated that he was very persistent. *"I have a hope that this is a chance to improve myself and my class. ... I must continue this study"* (*Teacher E, 18/3/02, 2*). *Teacher E's* efforts and

responses were unexpected and so much appreciated that I felt I needed to apologise to him, *"I have to be ashamed of myself for underestimating Teacher E. He was very persistent and was able to work extra hard in his difficult times"* (Researcher's journal, 19/3/02).

In conducting his research, like the other teachers, *Teacher E* encountered difficulties. In his case, the greatest obstacles were a lack of time and concentration on his research due to his mother's illness. It affected the documentation of his research.

On several occasions, interviews with Teacher E were used to put the cycles on track. As his research was not recorded well, I had to remind him about what he had already done or which stage he had got to. (Researcher's journal, 26/4/02)

In his HS, *Teacher E* taught reading, structures, and vocabulary in four classes of year 1. The syllabus to teach these language skills was required by the school and the reading passages were already selected. He indicated that the students in his classes were typical, passive and low in test achievements. In his diary, *Teacher E* wrote,

The students' motivation in studying English is very low. This was indicated by their ignorance in the class. They did not show active participation in my class. Most of them did not have a dictionary. If they had, the dictionaries were very simple editions that were not appropriate for high school students. (Teacher E, 15/3/02, 1)

Concerning his reading class, *Teacher E* wrote in his diary,

The failure in teaching reading was because students could not comprehend the readings well, where in turn they could not answer the questions or complete the tasks. They could not understand the readings because students did not know the

meaning of the words or phrases in the reading. In addition, students also had difficulties in understanding the questions, so they could not answer them, especially if they related to the skill of deducing meaning and reading between lines. (Teacher E, 15/3/02, 2)

In his research, *Teacher E* focused on improving the way he related to the students, and improving students' reading comprehension. The strategies that he planned were to be friendlier to the students, to use translation prior to the reading lesson, and to have each student use a dictionary.

My students are very dependent to the teacher. I will "force" them to be more responsible and pay more attention to the lessons. I am thinking of asking them to translate next week's reading at home so they will be more ready in the class. (Teacher E, 15/3/02)

His research is summarised in Table 5.4 as follows.

Table 5.4 Summary of Teacher E's Action Research

Topic:	Using Translation to Improve Students' Reading Comprehension
Class used for AR:	I.2 (year 1, class 2)
Initial reflection:	I needed to improve myself to be a friendlier teacher. Students had difficulties in completing reading tasks, such as comprehending passages, answering questions, and retelling passages. Only clever students participated actively in the reading class. Students did not have enough vocabularies to comprehend reading passages. Students were not familiar to the use of dictionaries. Students did not participate actively in the lesson.
Proposed solutions:	Find strategies to apply translation in the reading classes; have the students use dictionaries; and give rewards to motivate their participation.
Cycles:	2 cycles
Cycle 1	<u>Cycle 1 was conducted for 3 class sessions.</u>
Planning:	For the next class, I would ask the students to translate an English passage into Indonesian. They also had to be ready to retell this passage in English. In addition, the students had to bring dictionaries.

Action: In the first ten minutes I walked around, checked the students, and rewarded them with scores 7 to those who completed the translation and another 7 to those who brought a dictionary.

The passage was then discussed and students did reading tasks, such as answering questions, matching meaning, retelling passages, summarising passages, etc. The difficulty levels of the reading tasks increased gradually from one meeting to the other.

Scores, as a reward, were given to students who could do the tasks. Students were shown how to use dictionaries. In addition, I offered more help to students who had difficulties in reading by giving clues, similar meanings, etc.

Observation: In the first two meetings, there were 2-5 students who did not do the translation or did not bring the dictionaries. In the third class meeting, all students completed their translation and each of them brought a dictionary. Although many students translated passages literally, they showed better comprehension of the passages. The level of students' participation in asking questions and in answering or doing reading tasks was increasing. As the levels of difficulty of the reading tasks were given gradually, students looked proud that they were able to do the tasks.

Reflection: Translation technique "forced" the students to be more focused on the reading so that they were ready with the lessons. Scores as the reward also helped increase the students' motivation to complete translation, and bring a dictionary. They also increased the students' participation.

I was very tired to do correction.

Students needed to be able to translate more contextually.

Cycle 2 **Cycle 2 was conducted for 3 class sessions.**

Planning: Instead of translating individually, the students did it in groups, and correction of students' translation was conducted in the class.

Action: In groups of four, the students translated reading passages. The translations were checked together in the class. Other procedures of the reading lessons were the same as in cycle 1. However, after the fourth meeting, where students showed better comprehension and were more involved in the lessons, translation was used as one of the post-reading activities.

Observation: It was shown that translation which was conducted in groups was better than individually. The students did not show much difficulty in completing the reading tasks even though the tasks were more difficult. They also enjoyed retelling the passages.

The class atmosphere was more alive. Some students asked me if they could practise English with "real people" in tourist sites. They also asked me to conduct a speech contest, which was then conducted twice.

Reflection: In translation in groups, the students helped each other so that their translation was better and more contextual. In addition, by checking it in the class, it reduced much time of correction.

When the students were motivated, they became very active in the class. They even asked me to organise for them to practise English outside the class and conduct a speech contest.

Findings/ overall reflection:	<p>The way to use translation as the pre-reading activity, which was not suggested in the curriculum, was controversial. However, as a “<i>shock therapy</i>” it worked well as students became more prepared with the lessons.</p> <p>From the research I concluded that to motivate students was very important to increase their enthusiasm in learning.</p> <p>My attempts to be able to get along well with my students were rewarding. These improved the atmosphere in the classroom, bridged the gap between my students and me as the teacher so that there was an open communication in the class. In addition, I felt good that I improved this situation which I hate for so long.</p> <p>Considering the benefits of AR, it would be good for other teachers to experience doing AR.</p> <p>As I failed to convince my colleagues in this HS about the advantages of AR, I suggested to the principal to publicise it formally.</p>
-------------------------------------	--

As summarised in Table 5.4, *Teacher E* used translation to promote his students' reading comprehension. In his diary he wrote that he asked his students to,

...translate readings which would be discussed in the classroom. This was conducted at home, so that the students understood the reading and its questions. At least they knew the meaning of difficult words or phrases in the reading. (Teacher E, 30/3/02, 1)

Teacher E reported that the first three meetings were used as “*shock therapies*” (*Teacher E, 6/4/02, 1*) where he “*forced*” (*Teacher E, 6/4/02, 2*) his students to prepare reading at home prior to coming to class. “*Translation covered several skills focusing on vocabulary, word order, contextual meaning, and comprehension a text as a whole*” (*Teacher E, 31/5/2*). In his diary, he justified his decision to apply translation because, “*My students were very passive and lazy. I wanted my students to be ready with the reading so that they could have something to share in the class, not just be blank*” (*Teacher E, 30/3/02, 2*). During this cycle 1 that took three class meetings, he indicated that he increased gradually the task difficulties over those classroom sessions,

I selected the questions or other reading tasks based on the level of difficulties, starting from the less difficult. By this, I wanted to

make sure that my students were able to do the tasks without too much difficulty. (Teacher E, 12/4/02, 1)

Teacher E reported the impact of this strategy in his class, *"The students looked excited when they were able to complete the tasks. Hopefully it would increase their motivation"* (Teacher E: 12/4/02, 2). Teacher E reported that his students progressively showed more involvement in the lessons as they asked questions, answered reading questions and other reading tasks more voluntarily. This was very different from their previous behaviour when they tried to avoid the teacher's attention. Teacher E commented that they did, *"...not look at under the table anymore (Teacher E, 26/4/02)"*. He also noted that all students eventually did translations and brought dictionaries.

As summarised in Table 5.4, in cycle 2 when the students became used to being more alert in the lessons, translation was used as one of the post-reading activities. Teacher E indicated that this did not affect the positive atmosphere in the classroom. *"Probably because students were often asked to retell passages in front of the class, and that they got scores for this, they showed that they were more prepared for the lesson (Teacher E, 10/5/02, 1)"*.

As a part of the strategies, Teacher E reported that he became friendlier to his students.

In the classroom I tried to make conversation with my students, offered more help for difficult words or difficult questions. I spoiled my students by trying to fulfil what they wanted in the class, correcting their homework and returning it to them as soon as possible. (Teacher E, 28/6/02)

In addition to this strategy, *Teacher E* motivated his students by telling them, “... *inspiring stories about my previous students who were successful in their career because of their English*” (*Teacher E*, 31/5/2).

Although he complained that he was, “*tired of doing correction*” (*Teacher E*, 10/5/02, 2), he reported that he “*enjoyed*” (*Teacher E*, 10/5/02, 3) the fact that his approach to the students was worthwhile. His “*excitement*” (*Researcher's journal*, 31/5/02) because of this improving atmosphere also prevented him from getting annoyed by his colleagues' comments towards his “*new habits*” (*Teacher E*, 10/5/02, 4), such as, “*How come now your desk is full of students' work?*” (*Teacher E's colleague 1* as reported by *Teacher E*, 10/5/02, 5) or, “*What makes you so diligent*” (*Teacher E's colleague 2* as reported by *Teacher E*, 10/5/02, 6). *Teacher E* also reported that he was not bothered when, after letting his colleagues know about his research, one of them said, “*You are doing the impossible*” (*Teacher E's colleague 3* as reported by *Teacher E*, 7/6/02).

In line with the increasing student motivation and improving atmosphere in his classroom, *Teacher E* reported that the students showed more initiative. The students asked him to do more activities beyond the regular classrooms, such as going to tourist sites to practise their English, and conducting a speech contest. *Teacher E* could only agree with the latter because, it did not need, “... *complicated procedures as in organising a trip*” (*Teacher E*, 24/5/02). *Teacher E* explained that what was meant by a speech contest was retelling stories from topics taken and developed from the textbook. The students organised two

speech contests where in the second contest I was invited to be the judge. My journal revealed,

If Teacher E had not let me know about his students before, I would not have had any idea that they used to be passive in the class. The speech contest ran well. The contestants were very fluent and their pronunciation was good. (Researcher's journal, 4/6/02, 1)

After the contest, as planned by the students, there was a discussion session where they asked me questions.

In the discussion after the contest finished, many students asked me lots of questions. Mostly they asked about how to study English successfully and effectively. From their questions I drew the conclusion that they were enthusiastic and showed an interest in English. (Researcher's journal, 4/6/02, 2)

Besides students' motivation, *Teacher E* reported that their test achievements also increased, "... the results were better" (*Teacher E*, 21/5/2). In addition to the positive change in *Teacher E*'s class, the relationship with his students improved also. Students' comments, written on the final examination answer sheets, provide evidence of this improvement. Writing in English, they expressed their appreciation towards *Teacher E* as follows.

Student A indicated her positive feeling and hoped that *Teacher E* would teach her again later in Year Two, "*English and [Teacher E] is the best!!! I hope I will found [Teacher E] in the second class*" (*Student A's answer sheet*).

Student B wrote his appreciation as, "[Teacher E] is my teacher is the best with interesting English also his guide noisy" (*Student B's answer sheet*).

Student C, "I hope you'll nice with my result. I proud with U, my teacher"
(Student C's answer sheet).

Student D, "I can doing it because my teacher" (Student D's answer sheet).

Student E indicated her excitement in a more frankly spoken way,

This is my last test in first class. I know it's hard. But this will be OK because of you, [Teacher E]. I wish for good mark, and make you proud of me. Yesterday ... I hate you!!!! But now and forever ... I ♥ U. Thank you. Bye. (Student E's answer sheet)

Despite the obstacles and difficulties he encountered during the study, *Teacher E* indicated that he was impressed by AR as it enabled him to, "... grow my enthusiasm again" (*Teacher E*, 25/7/02, 1). When interviewed after finishing the study *Teacher E* indicated that he would continue using an AR approach in his teaching. He said that AR helped him to, "... improve the teaching and learning process, improve the atmosphere in the class, and be able to know more about the student's hidden potencies. AR enabled me to have lots of choices in teaching which was good for my students" (*Teacher E*, 25/7/02, 2).

Teacher E's case study reveals that initiatives and persistence from the teacher had a major impact on the success of his AR. His strong motivation to improve his situation underpinned all his efforts to continue the study at a difficult time and brought him to a point where the changes in him as a teacher and in his classroom were significant. He rejuvenated himself into a fresher teacher whose approach to teaching inspired his students, which in turn improved their motivation and achievements.

5.5. Overview of the case studies

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, the case studies of *Teacher A*, *Teacher H*, *Teacher C*, and *Teacher E* are presented in order to provide a more in-depth investigation of AR experiences. They portray how these teachers individually perceived, implemented and responded to the experience of conducting AR. The case studies also describe how AR affected teachers individually. Among the ten teachers participating in the study, *Teacher A*, *Teacher H*, *Teacher C*, and *Teacher E* were selected because they illustrate particular aspects of the situations of the teachers in this study. These include their working situations, personal situations, research problems, decisions to choose particular solutions for their research questions, and significant improvements which are illustrated briefly in Table 5.5 as follows.

Table 5.5 Overview of the Case Studies

Teacher	Working Situation	Personal Situation	Research problems	Solutions	Improvements
<i>Teacher A</i>	Top quality HS; High achiever students; Positive response to the AR study.	Enthusiastic; Supported by understanding husband; Interested to do AR.	Lack of time for the students to practise speaking.	Conducting the lesson in the school hall; Having the students study in-group.	Providing supportive learning environment; Enhancing learning atmosphere.
<i>Teacher H</i>	Low ranking HS; Very challenging students.	Young and very energetic. Enthusiastic to join AR; Had previous experience with AR.	Students' low motivation; Attendance problem.	Negotiating with the students about their learning preferences	Improving learning atmosphere; Enhancing students' enthusiastic; Expanding <i>Teacher H</i> 's roles.

<i>Teacher C</i>	Top quality HS; High achiever students.	Heavy workload; Burnt out; Interested to join the AR study.	Students' low enthusiasm; Her own lethargy; Lack of time.	Using a ready- to-use book together with the cassettes	Increasing students' confidence in using the language; Improving <i>Teacher C</i> 's own enthusiasm in teaching.
<i>Teacher E</i>	Low ranking HS; Very challenging students; Sceptical response to AR study.	Lack of enthusiasm in teaching and felt powerless; Responsible for taking care of his sick mother; Sceptical about AR study.	Students' low level of participation; Unfriendly relationship with his students.	Using translation as the pre- reading activity; Applying different ways to approach his students	Increasing students' vocabulary; Increasing students' reading comprehension; Increasing students' level of participation and enthusiasm; Improving classroom atmosphere. Transforming <i>Teacher E</i> into a better teacher.

The case studies, as illustrated in Table 5.5 reveal how each teachers conducted research under different personal conditions. In *Teacher A*'s case study, for example, there was no evidence that she encountered difficult times which affected her study. In addition, she had a supportive husband who encouraged and understood her research. *Teacher H* was younger, full of enthusiasm, had previous experience in conducting AR, and even idealistic in her approach to teaching. In contrast, *Teacher C* was about to retire and suffered from a lack of energy because of her heavy school workloads. On the other hand, *Teacher E* showed the lowest motivation energy level and had difficult personal times because of his sick mother.

Although these teachers worked as part of an overall group, each research problems emerged as unique and were contextual to their situations. To improve

the learning situation in which her students needed sufficient time to practise speaking, *Teacher A* put the students in groups and conducted the speaking class in the school hall. *Teacher H* wanted to “humanise” her students who had low motivation, and low attendance so that she came to the decision to negotiate her lesson with them. *Teacher C*, investigated strategies to overcome the students' low enthusiasm and her lethargy so that she came to the decision to use a ready-to-use book together with the cassettes. On the other hand, *Teacher E* in his attempt to overcome the students' low level of participation in the class and his low enthusiasm in teaching and unfriendly relationship with his students, he came to the solution of improving the way he approached his students, and using translation as the pre-reading activity. These aspects of uniqueness were interwoven forming dynamics and complexities of the research. The changes and significant improvement in their teaching practice were closely related to the factors which were very contextual to their situation.

Despite those unique aspects which are contextual to these teachers individually, there are some communal aspects which are experienced by the four teachers. These include the fact that each teacher had issues or problems in the classroom which they wanted to overcome and improve; that although these problems were challenging in one hand, they were also advantageous as a learning process as illustrated from the teachers' comments about the change and improvement they developed; that each teacher in conducting the research needed support from the school (the principal and colleagues), a conducive and supportive environment, facilitator assistance for the concept of AR, and to develop research

methodology skills. Although these teachers conducted their research under an overall framework of AR, the progresses were very much situational, which could be unpredicted. In reality I found it difficult to let the teachers conducted their research by themselves. They required a certain amount of ready-to-call assistance. Hence it is suggested that teachers are provided with a system in the school or support groups through collaboration with any individuals or institutions which are capable to promote the research.

5.6. Summary

This chapter provides a more in-depth investigation of AR experiences through the case studies of *Teacher A*, *Teacher H*, *Teacher C*, and *Teacher E*. The case studies reveal how these teachers individually perceived, implemented and responded to the experience of conducting AR in different situations which included their HS situations, personal situations, research problems, decisions to choose particular solutions for their research questions, and significant improvements.

The research findings have been presented in the last two chapters. In the next chapter, the finding will be summarised and discussed. Then, the significance of the results in the teachers' AR, particularly in Indonesian context will be suggested.

Chapter Six

Conclusions and Implications

This study was conducted to investigate the perceptions of English HS teachers in Indonesia of whether, and to what extent their engagement in AR enhances their professional development. The investigation was conducted through several stages which started from gaining background information about their perception about PD and their prior knowledge of AR, followed by their participation in workshops, and the implementation of their research in their classes, and finished with research dissemination and evaluation. The findings of this study were described in the last two chapters. Chapter Four focused on the findings of teachers' perception of PD; teachers' AR prior knowledge; teachers' participation in the workshops; teachers' AR implementation; teachers' research dissemination; and the impact of AR on teaching. Chapter Five focused on providing a more in-depth examination of the AR experiences of four teachers in the study where the realities of AR and the implications of AR can be seen from the individual teachers' viewpoints.

This final chapter summarises and discusses the findings of this study. It also presents the limitations of the study. In addition, the implications of the study are discussed, especially the implications for teachers, for schools, for researchers, and for teacher education. Finally, areas for further research will be recommended.

6.1 Issues arising from the findings in this study

This section summarises the findings in this study into these major issues: teacher PD in Indonesia; the teachers' implementation of their research; and the dissemination of teacher research to others.

6.1.1. Issues relating to teacher professional development in Indonesia

The initial part of this study, for which findings were presented in section 4.2.1, was conducted to investigate the teachers' perceptions, views, ideas about PD, and the situations in which they work. The findings from this part of the study suggest the following major issues.

Indonesian PD was generally perceived as teachers doing and learning something about teaching outside the classroom. There was no suggestion from the teachers that the classroom was a place for developing and learning as a teacher. The formats of PD activities were usually related exclusively to formal activities such as training and seminars. There was no suggestion from the teachers that PD activities might come from internal and individual teacher activities. Teachers were passive recipients who felt powerless, and lacking in opportunity to initiate their participation in PD and to determine its content. Therefore, there was no sense of the active role that a teacher can play. Participation in PD was based exclusively on the decisions of a higher authority. It generally occurred when it was regulated as a national policy.

Teachers' responses suggested that their view of PD was a transmissive learning model which is associated with passivity on the part of the teachers, and "*the objectives of educational practice are grasped in terms of the transmission of information from those who have it to those who do not*" (Littlewood, 2003: 1). Hence, knowledge is viewed as, "*the kind of thing that can appropriately be divided into units, packaged and then delivered, safe and sound, to largely passive recipients*" (Littlewood, 2003: 1). Within this model, as Freeman and Johnson (1998: 398) point out, second language teacher education (SLTE) has focused more on,

... what teachers needed to know and how they could be trained than on what they actually knew, how this knowledge shaped what they did, or what the natural course of their professional development was over time.

However, current thought on PD refers to transformative models and suggests that, "*Teachers should be actively pursuing their own questions, building upon their own knowledge base, and interacting within a social environment*" (Rock & Levin, 2002: 1). Mezirow (1991: 167 quoted by Imel, 1998) suggests that within this model, learning is viewed as,

...the process of becoming critically aware of how and why our assumptions have come to constrain the way we perceive, understand, and feel about our world; changing these structures of habitual expectation to make possible a more inclusive, discriminating, and integrating perspective; and, finally, making choices or otherwise acting upon these new understandings.

Edwards (1993: 181) describes the difference between the transmissive model of PD and the transformative one as follows:

The transmission of learning, of bolting on a particular canon or skills to people as they progress down the production line of education and training, is in the process of being replaced by individual learning programmes tied to the needs of particular individuals, mixing elements of formal, non-formal and informal learning. Associated with these changes are accreditation of prior learning, credit accumulation and transfer and modularization of the curriculum.

This transformative learning encourages teachers to critically reflect on their practice in order to explore new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners. Reflection is described as an effective strategy which enables teachers to, *“link theory and action, to move beyond teaching as a field of technical expertise, and to socially construct acts of making decisions and taking responsibility”* (Freppon, 2001: 157).

While in the broader educational world, transformative learning is gaining greater popularity and credibility; teacher PD systems in Indonesia still apply a transmissive model. Current education reform in Indonesia, through the implementation of the autonomy in education policy (since January 2001) suggests several positive recommendations that could be adopted in order to improve teacher quality (Jalal & Supriadi, 2001). Although to materialise these recommendations needs times and involves strong political will, it is anticipated that the implementation of the autonomy in education policy will improve the quality of education, facilitate teachers to be more autonomous learners which in turn will improve student learning. Built-in within the implementation of autonomy are new responsibilities as described by Johnson (1992: 1),

With the newly acquired autonomy, come new responsibilities. Teachers, local schools, and school districts are accountable to all stakeholders for the policies, programs, and practices they implement. It is not enough for teachers merely to make decisions; they will be called upon to make informed decisions, decisions which are data driven. Therefore, it is necessary for teachers to be much more deliberate in documenting and evaluating their efforts. Action research is one means to that end. ... Action research assists practitioners and other stakeholders in identifying the needs, assessing the development processes, and evaluating the outcomes of the changes they define, design, and implement.

Another issues arising from the findings on teacher PD concerns the effectiveness of PD activity. Little (1997, cited in Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001: 1) suggests the following way to identify effective PD,

The test of effective professional development is whether teachers and other educators come to know more about their subjects, their students, and their practice, and to make informed use of what they know.

The effectiveness of PD activities should not only be identified from teachers' positive responses about PD activities that they had attended. Current debates on teacher PD suggest that the effectiveness of PD should be identified from the link between teacher PD experience and, "*a change in the classroom that ultimately translates into improved student learning and performance*" (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2001: 1).

Given those views on the effectiveness of PD activity above, the findings of this study indicate a low level of the effectiveness of PD experienced by the teachers,

especially if it is related to the improvement of student learning. The findings suggest that there was no obvious evidence that the implementation of teacher knowledge gained from PD activity into teaching was evaluated. Therefore, there was no apparent impact of PD that was expressed by the teachers on classroom practice and learning outcomes. Some factors in this study can be considered as aspects affecting the effectiveness of PD on teaching and student learning. From the teachers' point of view, their heavy schedules appeared to hinder them from sparing time and prioritising PD activities. In daily practices, teachers encountered obstacles such as heavy teaching and non-teaching/administrative workloads, a large number of official syllabuses to cover in one term, large class sizes, students' low motivation and low English proficiency. These, as explained by Richards and Pennington (1998: 187-188), "... *discourage experimentation and innovation, and encourage a 'safe' strategy of sticking close to prescribed materials and familiar teaching approaches*". It was also reflected from *Teacher F's* comment on her reluctance to implement knowledge she gained from a PD program, "... *because while I am not sure that the implementation is successful; it has given me another burden in the teaching.*" In addition to burdens that teachers encountered in their daily routine, the following factors appeared to hinder teachers from implementing new knowledge they gained from PD activities: the unavailability of a substantive evaluating system from the PD provider; lack of acknowledgement from the school; and lack of leadership from the principals who are in charge of PD activities and their implementation in their schools.

6.1.2. Issues arising during teachers' participation in the workshops

As part of this study, AR workshops, for which findings were presented in section 4.2.2, were conducted in order to introduce the teachers to the nature of AR and to assist them to develop their research skills so that they were able to undertake AR. A number of issues which are discussed below arose from the findings on the workshop processes.

The findings show that the teachers had little knowledge of AR at the start of this study. AR as a PD concept was not well known to them. This could be explained by the fact that AR is relatively new in Indonesia. It was officially introduced in Indonesia in 1995 through a funded project to increase the education quality of HS teachers, known as the PGSM Project (Abimanyu, 1998). In this project, teachers from selected HSs were invited to undertake AR in collaboration with lecturers from local universities.

To learn and internalise the nature of AR, and more importantly to develop research skills, the teachers requested regular input. This study reveals that workshops were considered preferable to other modes of knowledge delivery, such as training, and seminars. The teachers perceived that workshops were different from the other “one-shot” workshop and “sit-and-get” types of PD they attended before. The teachers said that the AR workshops offered them: a more interactive learning atmosphere where they could connect directly the theory of AR to their teaching context; an opportunity to examine the approaches they usually used for teaching; intensive and direct support in which they obtained

step-by-step assistance to any arising issues, inquiries, and problems; and discussion with colleagues in which they shared their learning experiences together. The teachers' perceptions of the workshops as a learning process are relevant to theories of adult learning which suggest that in learning, adults need to know the relevancy of why they are learning new information, be self-directed and autonomous, make and have connections between new learning and previous life experiences, and be goal oriented, task-centred, and be problem solvers (Knowles, 1970). Considering these aspects of adult learning, effective PD should include more than a series of unrelated, short-term workshops and presentations with little follow-up or guidance for implementation; and separated from day-to-day tasks of educators (Craft, 1996; Laferriere, 1999). Effective PD should include the opportunity for teachers to learn by doing; to utilise their experience, and to exercise their critical reflection. Not less important is the availability of facilitators, as *"they learn faster if they have expert support as they try out new ideas"* (Rodgers & Pinnell, 2002: 1).

Another finding in this study reveals that due to teachers' previous limited experiences of AR, facilitators took important roles in assisting teachers to conduct AR. This study shows that the teachers required facilitators' involvement throughout the study, from the initial part to the end of their AR projects. This implies that facilitators' knowledge, experience, and supervision influenced the success of the teachers' AR. This finding is relevant to Taba and Noel's comments (1957, cited in Glanz, 1999: 6) that facilitators, *"needed expertise in action research not only to facilitate teachers' work, but to act as a*

research technician, devising, adapting, and borrowing research techniques as needed”.

6.1.3. Issues arising during the time the teachers undertook action research

The research findings during the time the teachers implemented AR in their classes are summarised and discussed in this section. To provide a framework for the issues arising during the implementation of AR, this section refers to the research questions posed initially in this study (see section 1.3). In Table 6.1 below, these issues are presented, and then followed by discussion.

Table 6.1. Issues Related to the Research Questions

Research Questions	Issues
1. <i>How and in what ways do teachers perceive that their involvement in AR enhances their PD?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Awareness raising ▪ Self-improvement ▪ Empowerment ▪ Autonomy ▪ New knowledge ▪ Data driven practice
2. <i>How and in what ways do teachers perceive that their involvement in AR affects their practice?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Classroom improvement ▪ More authority in teaching ▪ More varied approaches to teaching
3. <i>How and in what ways do teachers perceive that their involvement in AR influences their students' learning?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Better learning approaches ▪ See students differently ▪ Increase students' achievement ▪ Increase students' motivation ▪ Increase students' participation
4. <i>Do teachers experience problems in conducting AR.? If so, how do they consider these difficulties might be overcome?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Yes they do, indeed! ▪ General problems: time, funding, work overload. ▪ Research problems: focusing questions, collecting and analysing data, writing diary, academic writing. ▪ Individual problems: lack of confidence, limited teaching facilities, criticism, lack of energy, and lack of motivation.

5. What kinds of support structures do teachers need as they undertake AR?

- From the school
- From research facilitators
- From teachers themselves.
- From the government

In the following sections, issues which arise from the research questions are presented.

6.1.3.1. Teachers’ perceptions about their AR involvement in relation to their PD enhancement

The findings of this study support literature concerning teacher AR which highlights how inquiring teachers’ own practice brings real changes in the teachers, their classrooms, and their schools (Burn, 1999; Sagor, 2000; Sutton, 1997; Tinker-Sachs, 2002; Wallace, 1998; Zeichner, 2003). The ten English teachers in this study who engaged in AR for one term indicated several changes which they perceived as bringing improvement in their PD, teaching, and students’ learning. Relating to PD, this study revealed improvements in *awareness raising, self-improvement, empowerment, autonomy, and new knowledge*. The changes that occurred in this study were caused of what teachers learnt during their engagement in their AR projects. Through the steps in research cycles: planning, acting, observing and reflecting they were in the process of examining their practices. During this process, teachers obtained some information about the development of their study through, for examples, responses from the student about the strategy that were implemented; changes in the classroom atmosphere; and improvements in the students’ test achievements.

This kind of information provided the teachers with (new) knowledge and significant inputs for reflecting on their research, about what worked and not in their research. Through this mechanism, teachers were *'forced' (Teacher I)* to evaluate and re-evaluate their practice. Johnson's (1992: 3) argument that, *"teacher research will force the re-evaluation of current theories and will significantly influence what is known about teaching, learning, and schooling"* is relevant to the teachers' situation in conducting their research.

This study allowed the teachers to acquire a deeper awareness of the aspects of their teaching which were not realised before, such as understanding their strength and weaknesses, and revealing students' and their own potency; and considered strategies for solving their classroom problems (Glesne, 1991; Kemmis and McTaggart, 1982; Zeichner, 1987). They perceived that AR was empowering, since they thought they were more confident in making decisions during the process of teaching and learning. As Elliot (1991: 55) suggested, AR is empowering, enabling teachers to, *"critique the curriculum structures which shape their practices' and giving them 'the power' to negotiate change within the system that maintains them"*. This led to the sense of authority as they reported that they had more choices in conducting their practices. Freeman (1998: 15) states, *"[teacher research] is an important step in transforming education from a practice of implementation to a practice devoted to understanding learning"*.

As a learning process, AR offered different atmosphere for the teachers. Unlike

other kinds of PD activities which were often based on transmission of expertise and top down power relationships, AR was perceived as providing ownership of their PD. The findings show that the teachers appreciated the opportunity to be the managers of their own research, as it was they themselves who chose the research topic, and conducted it in their own classroom. This was reported as very different from other kinds of PD activities, where they used to be researched rather than doing the research.

6.1.3.2. Teachers' perceptions about their AR involvement in relation to their practice

New insights, perceptions, and knowledge which the teachers obtained during the implementation of AR influenced their ways of teaching and approaching their students. The teachers reported to have more choices to present the lessons. The findings suggest that teachers developed professional changes, expanding their roles as teachers from merely conducting the required curriculum into being more authoritative. For example, one of the cases study in Chapter Five revealed *Teacher E's* authority when he chose translation as a pre-reading activity (see section 5.4). In the official curriculum which adopts a Communicative Approach, translation is suggested to be used as a post activity. However, he decided to modify it into a pre-reading activity, as he believed that this was more effective to his classroom situation. Even when a senior teacher educator questioned him about this, he could respond persuasively using evidence from his research that showed significant improvements in his class.

As another example, *Teacher H* developed an expansion of her roles in the class into more facilitating. This was shown through her case study (see section 5.2) when she negotiated her lessons with her students. She had never conducted this approach before. In a previous study it was shown that although a learner-centred approach was recommended in English teaching, in practice the reality was more teacher-centred where teachers were dominant and acted as the only source of knowledge (Rochsantiningasih, Nurkamto, Ngadiso, Martono, & Pujobroto, 1997). However, *Teacher H* shifted the teacher's dominance through negotiating her lessons with her students.

In other case, *Teacher C* needed to go to the library in her attempt to provide better way of teaching. *Teacher I* involved and invited his students to write test items as he wanted to increase his students' motivation in learning English. These teachers provided evidence that they needed to expand their repertoire of teaching approaches. This was caused by new understanding obtained during the process of examining their practices.

6.1.3.3. Teachers' perceptions about their AR involvement in relation to their students' learning

Although there was no strong evidence from the data which supported the improvement of student as measured by standardized test scores, the findings shows that all teachers reported improvement in their classes related to students learning. Only two teachers reported and showed the increasing scores of their students from summative tests. One of them, *Teacher I*, reported that the score

increased dramatically to more than 200%.

The improvements which the teachers reported included students attitudes, involvement, behaviour, and learning as a result of specific actions taken in their research. A variety of new approaches were implemented into their teaching during the implementation of AR. These approaches included grouping, games, songs, brainstorming, making test items, translation, and learning in the open air. As the teachers implemented their approaches in which the strategies were implemented to overcome the classroom problems, they also improved the way they related to students. These included attempts from the teachers to increase their praise and reduce their criticism to students; reduce time talking about themselves and increase their awareness of their non-verbal clues in the classes; become more aware of their students' feeling; become friendlier; become clearer in explaining lessons; become more accommodative towards their students' needs; and become more appreciative such as giving extra scores for rewards.

As a result of different approaches, the situation in the classrooms improved where students showed their increasing participation in the lessons, more motivated, and more initiative in the way learning should be conducted. The atmosphere of the classroom also improved, as the relation between a teacher and the students became more relaxed so that learning was reported became more enjoyable.

All teachers agreed about improving themselves as a way to improve student

learning. As Guskey (2000) argues, the ultimate goal of PD is to improve the students learning so that they can achieve and perform better. Likewise, as suggested by Sarason (1996: 42), change should address the relation of student and teacher,

You can seek to change this or that aspect of the existing system, but unless those changes directly or indirectly change the student-teacher relationship, classroom learning will be unproductive, i.e., children will 'learn' but it will not be learning that has personal and motivational significances for the learner. There is a world of difference between wanting to learn and having to learn.

As the teachers investigated their classroom issues through their AR projects, they improved teaching, learning and classroom management. The improvement of student learning brought about satisfaction in feeling for the teachers and also the students. Tinker-Sachs (2002: 66) describes the excitement that AR can bring to teachers and their students as follows.

The excitement and challenges of inquiry through action research can be found in developing a critical and reflective stance to the work that we do as educators. The excitement of inquiry is embedded in uncertainty, which brings anticipation of the unknown; how our students will react, what we will do or say, and (in general), how our inquiry will affect ourselves, students, colleagues and the school as a whole.

6.1.3.4. Teachers' perceptions about problems they encountered during their involvement in AR

Basically, teachers experienced difficulties in most steps of their research. As detailed in sections 4.2.1.6 and 4.3.2.5, their difficulties during their participation in the AR workshops and the implication of their projects ranged general

problems, such as lack of time and funding; research problems, such as focusing research questions; and individual problems each teacher encountered, such as lack of confidence to complete the AR project and the unavailability of teaching equipment. This study suggests that time was found to be a significant factor to hinder teachers' involvement in their AR projects. Schlechty (1990) suggests that time is a luxurious commodity that teachers never have enough. Lack of time discouraged teachers to conduct their research effectively throughout the process of the study. Nunan (1989b) argues that this is a problem for which there is no easy solution and that the best that can be done is to consider practical and personal support strategies.

The findings suggest that teachers required support and assistance during their involvement in AR. The support included those from the government, the schools, the facilitators, and from the teachers themselves. While government was considered as providing indirect support, teachers required immediate support from the facilitator throughout the study. As the findings of the study increasingly revealed the teachers' limited experience and skills in AR, it was considered necessary to provide on-going assistance from the facilitator. Tinker-Sachs (2002: 77) recommends teachers not to, "*... work alone*". Where possible she suggests teachers to collaborate with, "*... university-based educators who are familiar with educational research and can assist with advising on which tools and techniques to adopt*". As regards the difficulties encountered by the teachers, this study provides empirical evidence that supports and relates to the problems experienced by other teachers and supports they require as mentioned

in the literature of similar studies conducted in other countries (Burns, 1999; McKernan, 1996; Nunan, 1992b).

6.1.3.5. Researcher's perceptions about action research as a learning process

Besides aiming to answer the research question as summarised in Table 6.1 above, this study was conducted to investigate my teaching practice as a university teacher educator who taught AR. In this self-study study I reflected on my practice in my attempt to understand my teaching situation for which I have to prepare and support teachers to understand and undertake AR. Four questions were posed in order to obtain better clarification of the problem. These questions were asking about the teachers' perception of AR as a learning process; the kinds of support structures or information teachers need as they undertake AR; my role in facilitating support needed by the teachers as they undertake AR; and my role in relation to strategies I could offer to encourage teachers to conduct AR. The first two questions overlap with the research questions about teachers' AR (see Table 6.1), hence the following commentary presents the conclusion and discussion of the last two questions.

As occurred for the ten teachers, I found this study a significant learning process to gain better understanding of my case as a facilitator. This study enabled me to have direct contact with the teachers and observed the process of their research at all stages. This was slightly different to my experience in the faculty to facilitate STs who undertake AR. Facilitating teachers directly at their HSs provided me

with richer information about the realities of AR when it is conducted by teachers in their natural environment. Tinker-Sachs (2000: 48), believes that,

Within the context of teacher development, engaging in action research with teachers helps the university researcher/teacher educator to understand the pathway to the adoption of particular ways of teaching and be able to recommend ways to overcome shortcomings as well as how to foster and further more effective practices.

I obtained deeper knowledge about the difficulties, constraints, and improvement which developed in their research. The study allowed me to exercise and strengthen my skills in researching, and facilitating teachers. I learnt that to be a facilitator required several abilities. These included academic expertise in presenting and endorsing learning through AR, interpersonal communication, management (such as, scheduling workshops and organising interview rosters), leadership, and the ability to share expertise with the teachers.

The obstacles encountered by teachers in their AR projects taught me about the teachers' levels of AR understanding and research skill. This encouraged me to investigate strategies suitable for the teachers' situations, such as minimising reading assignments for the teachers as soon as I knew that they did not have much time to spare.

As part of this learning process I also gained significant information from the field of teaching as the teachers were conducting the research. The information from the study was very beneficial in helping me to understand and reflect on the strength and weaknesses of my own teaching. From this point, I could plan

strategies to decide on better approaches in my teaching, and to promote my students' learning.

6.1.4. Issues relating to dissemination of teachers' research

Disseminating teachers' research, soon after it is completed is highly recommended in order to maintain and sustaining support for teacher AR (Burns, 1999). Burns suggests that the dissemination can be conducted through written format, oral presentation, and visual display. In this study, the dissemination was conducted through three media: research reports, a poster display, and a seminar. Each of them has its own challenges and advantages, but teachers found that the poster display was the most enjoyable. As teachers were not familiar with academic writing, they required intensive support in writing the AR reports. This support was needed to introduce them to how to write and what to write. In delivering papers in the seminar, teachers suffered from various levels of anxieties. Most of them reported that this was their first experience of presenting a paper in a seminar. Responses from the audience who attended the poster display and the seminar suggest that they appreciated these events. Comments were made that this kind of PD activity was highly desirable for teachers of other HS subjects of study, and not only for the English teachers.

The findings suggest that the teachers perceived the dissemination of their research as positive responsibility. Realising that their research would be shared with other people in the poster display and in the seminar encouraged them to

prepare their poster and their paper as their best. The findings also show that the teachers perceived this dissemination as a concrete prove: printed evidences of their reports, posters, and papers for the completion of their AR projects.

Despite the challenges, the teachers expressed satisfaction in feeling that they were able to finish their research projects. In particular after the seminar, there was a sense of content that they were able to talk in an academic forum delivering their research. This is relevant with what Ross' (1993: 329) argument that disseminating research could bring about empowerment for teachers,

... to be empowered, you must be able to convey to others why you do what you do. In other words, evidence about what your students have learned enables you to justify practices other might question. That justification is likely to give you the autonomy to continue making decisions you believe to be most appropriate for students.

Additionally, dissemination means publicising research into a wider audience. The audience benefited from obtaining more understanding of the nature of AR, process of AR, issues which hinder and promote the research, and insights which might be relevant and applicable to their teaching context. Thus, this kind of activity has the potential to inspire others to conduct similar AR projects with teachers, as they became aware that teachers were able to conduct and present the research effectively.

6.2. Implications from teachers' action research

Several writers have pointed out that essential characteristics of AR are its small

scale, its subjective nature, and lack of generalisability of the results (Burns, 1999; Garrido, Pimenta, Moura, & Fusari, 1999; Ghaye & Ghaye, 1998). Fischer (2000: 1) suggests that AR is based more on transferability than generalisability, *“The knowledge that teachers generate from teacher-research is highly contextual, so transferability rather than generalisability is one of key criteria of validity in teacher-research”*. However, although the findings of this research are particular to this situation within an Indonesian context, this study provides insights which can help others to understand the kinds of realities which occur when teachers undertake AR projects.

The findings of this study provide useful information about how the PD of teachers who conducted AR was affected and how it brought improvements to their teaching and student learning. Apart from the challenges that hindered the process, the findings suggest that the teachers benefited from undertaking AR as they became more aware of the classroom as a learning environment, and this awareness empowered them by giving them confidence to become more effective decision-makers about what went on in their teaching.

Based on the findings, it could be said that the procedures used in this study, including the preparation, the workshops, the implementation of the research, the dissemination, and the evaluation are applicable for HS teachers in the Indonesian context. However, if AR is to be applied more widely in Indonesia, particular amendments to various aspects of teacher PD will be needed. There should be shift in, for example, the perceptions about the principles and

characteristics underpinning teacher AR. This section provides some implications based on the outcomes of this study. The implications are addressed to the teachers, the schools, the researchers, and the teacher education. Each of them will be presented in sections 6.2.1; 6.2.2; 6.2.3; and 6.2.4.

6.2.1. Implications for teachers

The findings of this study reveal that during their engagement in AR projects, the teachers underwent changes which they perceived had brought improvement to themselves, their teaching, and the students. However, in conducting AR they encountered difficulties and they required support (see section 4.3.2.6). Nevertheless, the findings also offer suggestions to handle the problems addressed to the teachers. Teachers were suggested to consider planning their own PD. If AR is to respond to the need of ongoing learning, teachers will need to shift their perceptions about learning through PD activities, from the transmissive framework that this research shows to be still dominant into a more transformative one. This implies that teachers have to become more active in initiating their own learning and not just waiting for their turn to participate in PD.

If AR is to respond to the need for ongoing learning about teaching, teachers will need to shift their perceptions about learning through PD activities, from the transmissive framework that this research shows to be still dominant into a more transformative one. This implies that teachers have to become more active in

initiating their own learning, rather than just waiting for their turn to participate in PD. Also if AR is to be adopted into teaching, teacher will need to become aware of the kinds of research skills to develop. Table 6.2 which is adopted from Osler & Flack (2002: 243) provides summaries of research conditions which teachers should be aware of, and skills which should be developed.

Table 6.2. Skills and Research Conditions for Teacher-Researchers

Research conditions	Skills to be developed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time: teacher-researchers need to create time to reflect on their work and talk to colleagues • Link: develop links with academics • Forums: access to various forums to share research findings • Support: from the immediate school community • Systematic support: beyond the school for sharing findings more widely – e.g. financing teacher replacement days 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflection: developing and valuing reflective practice • Articulation: ability to name and ‘frame practice’ • Familiarity with research literature: to seek and undertake more professional reading • Linking: learn how to link their own work and theories of others • Writing: skills of professional writing • Presentations; skills of ‘presenting’ to other

Table 6.2 provides illustration of factors which teachers should develop and prepare. Similarly, as suggested by Borgia and Schuler (1996: 3) the following factors need to be considered if teachers want to adopt an AR approach in their practice.

Commitment. Action research takes time. The participants need time to get to know and trust each other and to observe practice, consider changes, try new approaches, and document, reflect, and interpret the results. Those who agree to participate should know that they will be involved with the project for a year or more, and that the time commitment is a factor that all participants should consider carefully.

Collaboration. In action research, the power relations among participants are equal; each person contributes, and each person has a stake. Collaboration is not the same as compromise, but it involves a cyclical process of sharing, of giving, and of taking.

The ideas and suggestions of each person should be listened to, reflected upon, and respected.

Concern. The interpretive nature of action research (for example, relying on personal dialogue and a close working relationship) means that the participants will develop a support group of "critical friends." This kind of relationship requires risk taking, and a kind of vulnerability exists. Trust in each other and in the value of the project is important.

Consideration. Reflective practice is the mindful review of one's actions specifically, one's professional actions. Reflection requires concentration and careful consideration as one seeks patterns and relationships that will generate meaning within the investigation. Reflection is a challenging, focused, and critical assessment of one's own behaviour as a means of developing one's craftsmanship.

Change. For humans, growing and changing are part of the developmental cycle of life. Change is ongoing and, at times, difficult, but it is an important element in remaining effective as a teacher. Change is possible if one has the right nurturing and support, and the results are worthwhile.

Regarding the factors suggested above and the constraints in conducting AR projects especially time and collaboration factors, it is inevitable that changes are not going to happen instantaneously. Teachers who are not familiar with AR, or who are just beginning their research are likely to feel overwhelmed, as there are so many things to do. Repeating and publicising this kind of AR study, then, become important so that teachers become more familiar with the ideas of ongoing learning through AR. It is other teachers who can encourage teachers to take the first step by discussing and presenting their research and by encouraging colleagues new to AR to work collaboratively. There is some evidence in the literature that teachers sharing accounts of their AR/teaching with other teachers

is more effective than reading the professional literature (Crookes, 1993).

6.2.2. Implications for schools

The findings of this study reveal that teachers required support from the school during the time they conducted their research. This study also showed that the schools as well as the teachers perceived PD traditionally, a transmissive learning in which they, as educators, are passive receivers of delivered knowledge. Current debates about PD suggest that effective educational environments for teachers should go beyond that approach so that they are able to, *“incorporate time for reflection, inquiry, and collaboration that derive from the problems and issues of day-to-day practice”* (Anstrom & Barrera-Capistran, 1995: 1). Instead of relying on teacher PD provided by the government and pre-service or in-service teacher education run by the universities, more effective schools will need to take part actively in providing and supporting learning opportunities for teachers. Attempts for improvement conducted by schools, such as restructuring the system and the resources available in schools are necessary. Schools could reanalyse programs or activities which already exist and identify their potential to promote or hinder PD. Some activities which need reanalysing, as Anstrom and Barrera-Capistran (1995: 1) suggest, include,

operating department meetings as short seminars where teachers examine and discuss materials, curriculum, and student work; ...and regarding committee work as an opportunity to critique accepted practice and generate ideas for new and innovative methods.

The discussion above about attempts by the schools to provide learning opportunities for teachers can also be appealed to the MGMP, a body which has the authority to organise PD programs for subject matter teachers. The English MGMP that is in charge of PD activities of English teachers should critically reflect on its current PD programs. The complaints from teachers revealed this study that the English MGMP is more concerned with administrative matters than academic ones should be taken seriously. From this study it was revealed that the activities that were offered by the English MGMP were not considered by the teachers to be productive and even a waste of money, time and resources. Yet, in order to attend MGMP activities, the teachers are provided with a whole day, Tuesday, free from teaching, for which there did not appear to be any accountability on them to participate. The opportunity for critical reflection to analyse, and evaluate their current PD programs could be taken during this time in order to provide better PD programs. Building empowerment among the teachers as members of the English MGMP is an important PD aim that should be considered.

There are several things that could be done related to building teacher empowerment. For example: encouraging teachers to discuss curriculum ideas, important teaching and learning issues, or research reports in their meetings as an alternative to external speakers; selecting books relevant to their needs and appointing some teachers to deliver oral book reviews as an attempt to encourage reading; and asking teachers who have just finished attending a PD program to report on it in the MGMP meeting. The one day off provided weekly to the

English teachers could be considered a luxury when compared with PD systems for English language teachers in other countries. Hence, optimising it to provide effective and high quality of PD programs should be prioritised.

To be more motivated to participate in PD courses teachers need an encouraging atmosphere, support, and acknowledgement from the school. Northfield (1996: 3) states that, *"Teachers are unlikely to develop a respect for their own experience and knowledge unless they can find wider support and acknowledgement for the value of their experience and understanding"*. The principals as the leaders who are in charge in the professional development program in their schools have significant roles to facilitate teachers so that they are able to communicate their research to others. Although this study did not show direct support from the principals for AR, the reports from the teachers indicated that they needed conducive school atmosphere, and more concrete support from their principals. This kind of atmosphere, support, and acknowledgement are also needed by teachers who have just attended or conducted PD activities. Teachers who have finished their research or attended a seminar, for example, could be encouraged to share their findings or knowledge with other teachers in any of the regular school meetings. Sharing research findings should also mean disseminating their research in a relatively safe and non-threatening forum since the audience are their own colleagues. In addition, if there is awareness among teachers to share their knowledge, it increases their responsibility to be more focused during the time they conduct their PD activity. As reported in much literature on teacher AR, and also highlighted in this study

as one of the key findings, teachers value highly the opportunity to discuss their work, problems and issues and to discover that they are not alone, have common challenges and can learn a lot from each other. This kind of activity can bring about a stronger learning culture in the school, break isolation among teachers, and lead to further collaboration among them, as well as have an impact on learning outcomes. Fullan (1999) suggests that an environment that promoted collaboration among teachers would lead to improved student achievement.

While the above discussion describes attempts which the school can make to offer learning opportunities for teachers from within the school, other attempts to engage teachers in learning opportunities outside the school setting are not less important. Anstrom and Barrera-Capistran (1995) suggest strategies that can promote teachers' learning, including: establishing collaboration between schools and universities to develop curriculum, implement changes, or conduct research; and networking among teachers and schools to share ideas and reflect upon new practices. Initiatives from both inside and outside schools can lead to the improvement of the learning culture of the school.

6.2.3. Implications for researchers

Much of AR literature state that although AR can be conducted individually, it is recommended that the research is undertaken collaboratively, for example with teacher colleagues, or with university teacher educators (Burns, 1999; Macintyre, 2000; Tinker-Sachs, 2002). The study makes suggestion related to issues which

might happen in the collaboration.

Related to types of AR, the role of a facilitator in the *technical* type of AR is dominant, in the *practical* type of AR is relatively balanced, and in the *emancipatory* type of AR, it is the practitioners' role which is more dominant than that of the facilitators (see section 2.2.3). In the *practical* type of AR, which was adopted in this study, the role of facilitator is to "*provide a sounding-board against which practitioners may try out ideas and learn more about reasons for*

their own action, as well as learning more about the process of self-reflection" (Carr & Kemmis, 1986: 203). In operation there are some potential problems that might occur. Kember et al. (1997) argues that the problems can be triggered by the facilitator uncertainty in providing assistance. The implication is that the facilitator should be able to identify the type of AR adopted so that he or she will be able to provide the appropriate assistance. In this study the challenge was to keep the line and to make the balance between empowering teachers to dictating, and between assisting to spoiling. While teachers needed support and step-by step assistance, for example, in formulating and focusing research questions, the facilitator should be aware of not to dictate teachers in deciding topics which they ultimately chose. As another example, although it was obvious that teachers were not used to reading academic journals/literature, and that they did not have much time to spare, it was not recommended for the facilitator to supply and to deliver the knowledge to them, without attempts to encourage them to learn.

Another problem might surface because of the power and authority in this association between teachers and the facilitator. In collaboration between a university TE and teachers, teachers tend to feel less confidence in academic expertise. Hence, the facilitator should have a sense of sharing expertise rather than dominating. As Guyton and Birth (1999: 7) suggested, collaboration is, “... viewed as ... involving shared decision-making, and in doing so, creating new roles, relationships, and responsibilities for all participants; and focusing on outcomes that are intended to benefit the personnel and the programs at both institutions”. Attempts from the facilitator, initiated to break the barrier are necessary so that teachers can be more relaxed. The facilitator needs to have a high level of awareness that in providing support for teachers, it is important to foster their professional growth, so that they can acquire the expertise and confidence to be effective teachers.

6.2.4. Implications for teacher education

The findings of the study reveal that the teachers developed their reflective practice in various ways as they underwent significant improvements in teaching and made crucial expansions in their roles away from being technicians and into the direction of being decision-makers in their class. The findings relates to the educational literature which discuss the notion that reflective practice is an important part of being a teacher. Current approaches to SLTE suggests that while ensuring that STs gain a teaching knowledge base through a variety of experiences and activities is necessary, a reflective practice component must be

included in the SLTE program (Day, 1992; Zeichner, 1999). *“Reflection is seen as a process that can facilitate both learning and understanding, and play a central role in several recent models of teacher development”* (Richards, 1998: 21). Hence, this study suggests that teacher education in Indonesia in its various national and situational contexts, especially SLTE programs need to evaluate and alter the knowledge base and the ways STs are prepared so as to teach more effectively and reflectively. Richards (1998) suggests that there should be a shifting orientation in SLTE from *“training”* to a *“holistic approach”* to teacher development based on the belief of the teacher as *“critical and reflective thinker”*. Implementing this in the SLTE curricular content, Richards (1998: 1) suggests that the knowledge base of SLTE should cover six domains, *“theories of teaching, teaching skills, communicating skills, subject matter knowledge, pedagogical reasoning and decision-making, and contextual knowledge”*. He elaborates each domain through curricular goals in SLTE programs. For example, Richards (1998: 15) argues that theories of teaching should include goals such as,

to develop a critical understanding of major theories of second language teaching and their implications for language teaching practice; to develop a personal theory of teaching and a reflective approach to one’s own teaching.

Richards (1998: 17) explains that to develop the six domains of knowledge base above teacher educators can offer various learning and teaching options, such as,

information-oriented approaches, communication activities, proficiency-focused activities, observing teaching in different settings, experiencing teaching in different settings, reflecting on teaching and learning, investigating teaching and learning, focusing on critical events in teaching, and carrying out project

work [such as action research].

Richards (1998) recommends that engaging STs in critical reflection can be done through a “*three-part process*” which includes: the event itself (such as a teaching or learning episode), recollection of the event (producing an account of what actually happened), and review and response to the event (reviewing or questioning the events). This is conducted through various procedures such as, “*autobiographies, reaction sheets, journals, language learning experiences, and audio or video recording*” (Richards, 1998: 22-23).

Besides restructuring the system, knowledge base, and approaches from within as described above, teacher education faculty need to be more proactive in promoting collaboration with high schools. Guyton and Birth (1999) argue that traditional arrangements between the teacher education faculty and the school were more co-operative than collaborative as initiations frequently came from the faculty rather than from the schools. To promote collaboration rather than co-operation, Guyton and Birth (1999: 7) suggest that the association between the teacher education faculty and the school should adopt the following characteristics.

... being true partnerships between colleges or universities and public schools; involving shared decision-making, and in doing so, creating new roles, relationships, and responsibilities for all participants; and focusing on outcomes that are intended to benefit the personnel and the programs at both institutions.

To extend collaboration, there are several important roles that teacher education faculty can take relating to promoting a learning culture, in particular in engaging

teachers with AR. For example, due to the typically limited access of schools to disseminate research findings, the teacher education faculty could offer to publish teachers' research in the journals that the faculty and the university publish. Other roles of the teacher education faculty in relation to the school are described by McKernan (1994) as follows: conducting in-service activities in the school which provides teachers with the natural surroundings of the teachers' work, rather than teachers returning to university for professional courses; facilitating and supporting teachers who undertake AR; offering access to journals, books, and other references as it is not always easy for schools to access reference materials for AR. In addition, McKernan (1994: 108-110) suggests that collaboration with teacher education faculty can facilitate schoolteachers to reconstruct theory,

Teachers believe ... that teacher-produced theory and knowledge is invalid – ruling out the insider connection with knowledge production. This suggests that external objective researchers from within the disciplines ought to work alongside teacher researchers to refute and reconstruct theory.

Findings in this study reveal that this lack of confidence in conducting and appreciating their own research is often triggered by teachers' own assumption that research is usually done by university lecturers, that if they conducted research, their research was not "proper" because it was less academic. Auger and Wideman (2000: 6) declare that, "*There can be a danger if what constitutes 'proper' research is seen to be solely in the realm of the academic and to exclude the practitioner*". Therefore, Auger and Wideman (2000: 6) suggest that "*Faculties of education need to make a concerted effort to support teacher*

candidates in their research efforts and to break through teacher candidates' perceptions about the 'ownership' of research". Teacher education, in this case the pre-service program in SLTE, can provide a starting place to develop STs' awareness, understanding, appreciation, and confidence of AR. In addition, if during the pre-service, STs are inducted into a transformative view of their own PD and teacher education programs stresses that learning about their practice is a lifelong process, this might provide a different mind-set to carry into teaching. These aspects of building research capacity developed during the pre-service can provide a platform for them to undertake AR in their classrooms, *"thus furthering their professional growth"* (Ginns, Heirdsfield, Atweh, & Watters, 2001: 130).

The teacher education faculty role should go beyond the university boundary. Traditionally, there has been a separation between the university as the "ivory tower" and the school as the "real world". Relative to the responsibilities of teacher PD, Atweh and Heirdsfield (2001 : 7) argue that the university, *"is often seen as responsible for the initial training that ceased at graduation"*. Instead of preparing teachers within the university boundary only, teacher education faculty should also take part in evaluating teachers as the "products" of its education. Guyton and Birth (1999: 12) suggest that,

The campus-based teacher educator is ultimately responsible for evaluating the teacher candidate and should provide regular feedback to the teacher candidate, involve the school-based teacher educator, facilitate formative and summative evaluations, and provide holistic evaluation.

This kind of arrangement from the teacher education faculty is, *“useful in connecting what has been learnt during pre-service training with what is happening in the school”* (Atweh & Heirdsfield, 2001 : 7).

Another implication for teacher education refers to the notion of *“do what you preach”* (Johnston, 1992; Loughran & Northfield, 1988). In the context of AR which promotes teacher and school change, Russell (1999: 6) says that,

If genuine change is to occur in schools, then those changes may have to occur FIRST in teacher education. It is certainly not enough for teacher educators to advocate changes that they have not achieved in their own practices. I have long regretted the tendency of teacher educators, situated in universities, to criticise

teachers, situated in schools, for faults that the teacher educators themselves cannot show, with evidence, that they avoid in their own classrooms. Teacher educators must lead by example, not by words. My recent and intense experience of change suggests that teacher education must make changes first before we can expect schools to consider them.

TEs, as criticised by Short (1993: 157), *“rarely present or view themselves as learners because they focus on telling, not doing”*. In the context of the teacher education faculty where I teach, it was ironic that most lecturers who supervised STs to undertake AR projects for their final assignment did not have experience of conducting AR themselves. While the fact that in Indonesia AR was new can be used as an excuse, the bottom line is, as Johnston (1992: 1) insists,

If we are to be taken seriously as teacher educators and to have an influence on the teachers we work with, we must in a very direct sense practice what we preach--that is, model reflective teaching in our own work rather than simply talking about it and expect others to do it.

Hence, the implications of this study are that it is inevitable for the field of SLTE to encourage TEs to teach reflectively and to undertake their own AR projects. At the heart of practising *do what you preach* is to show STs and other teachers we usually work with that TEs can be role models who establish and perform the idea of lifelong learning.

6.3. Suggestions for further research

This study investigated HS English teachers' perceptions of their involvement in AR toward their PD. As AR is relatively new and there is a very small availability of references about teachers' professional development in Indonesia, this study is expected to contribute important knowledge and provide a valuable reference to develop and support teacher professional development in the Indonesian context. On the other hand, since studies engaging teachers in AR for their PD are still so rare in Indonesia, the findings of this study are considered preliminary, which essentially leads to further investigations. In addition, there are several aspects specific to this study, which justify further studies. First, given the AR approach adopted in this study, the findings "*are not intended for generalisation but for understanding and improving practice in a specific context*" (Priyana, 2002: 370). Second, the total number of AR cycles conducted by the researcher in this study is only one. Third, while there are various ways of promoting reflective practice, diary writing was chosen in this study and was conducted by the teachers. Fourth, considering that the teachers were not used to conducting research, there were attempts to simplify research in particular the

literature review, data collection, and data analysis, and to simplify report writing conducted by the teachers. Fifth, the length of time available to the teachers to conduct their research was limited into one school term (four months). Sixth, the collaboration in this study was more between the researcher and each individual teacher and vice versa. Each teacher conducted the research by him or herself and was facilitated the researcher, rather than working collaboratively with other teachers. Seventh, the participants of this study were limited to ten high school English teachers. Eighth, there is an absence of discussion of cultural background, although some findings related to teachers' behaviours could be discussed from a cultural approach. Finally, one of the findings reveals that teachers underwent dynamic processes of learning which led to improvement and change. This finding supports and is relevant to the outcomes of other similar studies of AR that highlight AR as a prominent means to bring about changes in teachers. However, this study did not discuss specifically attempts or strategies to maintain changes.

Considering the outcomes and the limitations of this study, further studies as described in the following are necessarily recommended.

Fischer (2000) states that since the findings from an AR study are highly contextual, the validity of AR refers to transferability rather than generalisability. Hence, to elucidate the findings of this study, similar studies with comparable participants need to be conducted, for example an AR study involving more English teachers in comparable HS. A replication through a similar study of

teachers conducting AR is also recommended which engages teachers with different techniques of exercising their reflective thinking, such as video/audio recording, or classroom observation. If these further studies of English teachers showed similar findings to this study, they would strengthen the case for AR in English teachers' PD. The replication as Rudduck (1985: 58) suggests is to justify the findings,

Finally I believe that a theory of education derived from AR should be testable through AR. That is, teachers should, within the limits of their research, be able to test the results of action research by monitoring their own practice, its context and its results. It is the strength of AR in curriculum and teaching that its utilisation does not depend upon teachers' accepting its hypotheses, but on their testing them.

The replication studies would also add to the evidence on the effectiveness of AR for English HS teachers in the Indonesian context; they would also add to the body of literature on AR internationally.

All the teachers underwent changes in their practice while conducting AR in their classes for only one term. To investigate longer-term changes in teachers' knowledge, practice, and the impacts on student learning, further longitudinal studies engaging teachers in AR are needed. In addition, the AR design which is used to approach such studies could be developed into more than one cycle. This would mean obtaining more elaborate findings.

Despite the benefits that the teachers gained during their engagement in AR, there were obstacles that hindered the process of their research. Lack of time,

lack of references to support their research, and lack of funding are among other challenges in teacher research. The findings also suggest that teachers need supports from schools, and assistance in conducting their research. Further studies addressing alternatives to overcome those challenges and to accommodate the need for support, such as structuring time, managing and distributing funding, and reallocating and collaborating with other institutions to optimise resources need to be conducted in order to better support teachers' AR.

A missing element from this research as suggested above is the cultural factors implicit in the process. Further studies which address cultural background and factors need to be performed, as these would offer more variety and richer discussion which could provide further understanding of underlying teacher behaviour, challenges and difficulties from cultural view. The addition of a cultural dimension would offer more options in finding solution to teachers' problems, instead of considering them from academic or pedagogic perspectives only.

6.4. Concluding remarks

AR is becoming a dominant issue in teacher education programs around the world (Altrichter et al., 1993; Richards & Ho, 1998). Studies and literature on AR in education claim that AR is an effective tool to enhance professional development and research skills. This study was conducted to investigate to what extent this effectiveness existed in the AR projects which were conducted during

one term by ten high schools English teachers in Surakarta Indonesia.

In general teachers' conclusions about their involvement in AR projects were positive. The evidence collected during the study shows that AR provided a strategy to examine their teaching practice that could enhance their PD. Overall, teachers individually experienced changes and improvements at varied levels. Their involvement in this study as reported provided different kinds of experience compared to other kinds of PD activities they attended before. It included a sense of ownership toward PD, as it was they themselves who initiated the research, addressing their own classroom issues, and conducting it in their own classrooms and in their own available time. Additionally, the results could always be evaluated and modified, and tested immediately through similar studies in their classroom context. Hence, the AR process fostered reflective practices which led to improvement in teaching and learning. It was also reported that AR brought improvement in their ways of seeing students, from being authoritative and dominant into being friendlier and more accommodative to the students' needs. The finding suggests that there was transformation in the roles of some teachers. This role shifting was a breakthrough from being technicians who presented lessons rigidly as laid out in the curriculum, into decision-makers where teachers were able to see the bigger picture in their classes and to decide on appropriate teaching approaches to promote their students' learning. The findings from the post-AR aspect of the study suggest that most teachers wanted to adopt AR approach in their teaching although not as rigidly as when the main AR study was conducted. This kind of responses from the teachers implied that

there was a transformation in their attitudes, from a traditional concept of PD into a more transformative one. However, these conclusions might be too premature in nature, as they need further investigation. Nevertheless, these findings provide evidence that AR had promoted professional growth for teachers.

As the findings of the study increasingly revealed the teachers' limited experience and skills in AR, it was considered unrealistic to expect the teachers to perform their research with advanced degrees of sophistication. Providing teachers with AR experiences, then, became more important than focusing on rigorous research procedures. Some factors in the process of the teachers' research were deliberately de-emphasised. Collecting data, analysing data, writing reports, and disseminating the outcomes of their AR projects were intentionally simplified. Additionally, the extent of the teacher's reflection did not show evidence of a high critical level. However, considering AR is new in Indonesia and the system of teacher PD is still predominantly transmissive, the positive outcomes as reported in this study are promising. Improvement and changes, in this regard will need time and shift in attitudes and perceptions. As Fullan (1982: 42) points out, "*Change is a process, not an event. Bringing about any kind of educational change is an extremely long, complex and difficult business*".

Improving teacher quality through AR brings its own paradigm which is different from a top-down model of teacher PD. If an AR approach is to be implemented in the Indonesian teacher education, it will be required substantial shifts. In this

respect principles of adult learning, reflective on teaching, and life-long learning are considered essential characteristics underlying teacher PD programs.

Finally, I would like to conclude that this study was an impressive experience for the ten English teachers and for me as the researcher and facilitator. The teachers underwent challenging, yet rewarding experience in which they struggled and learned through their AR projects and moved closer to improvement of their teaching and learning practices. As for the teachers, the experience of this study also provided me, as a researcher, with a significant learning experience, a growth of knowledge and a development of teacher education skills. Action researching teacher AR study improved my understanding of AR conceptually as knowledge, and practically as a research process. This study developed my research skills in my capacity as a facilitator who taught AR, helped and supported STs and teachers who undertook AR.

Above all, the study highlighted the importance of collaboration to effective teaching and AR: collaboration between researcher and teacher, collaboration between teachers and schools, collaboration between teachers and most importantly collaboration between teachers and their students were all significant factors in the study. From this study, it could be said that continuing collaboration through AR will contribute to breaking down barriers, establishing open communication, and distributing expertise among those involved in the field of English language teaching.

References

- Adelman, C. (1993). Kurt Lewin and the origin of action research. *Educational Action Research*, 1(1), 7-23.
- Altrichter, H., Posch, P., & Somekh, B. (1993). *Teachers Investigate their Work: An Introduction to the Methods of Action Research*. London: Routledge.
- Anderson, G. L., Herr, K., & Nihlen, A. S. (1994). *Studying Your Own School: An Educator's Guide to Qualitative Practitioner Research*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Anstrom, K., & Barrera-Capistran, J. R. (Fall 1995). Redefining the role of professional development. *Forum*, 18(3).
- Atweh, B., & Heirdsfield, A. (2001). *Beginning women teachers using action research towards inclusive mathematics*. Available: http://www.britannica.com/frm_re_dir.jsp?query=action+research+for+language+teachers&redir=http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/csme/meas/papers/atweh.html11-7].
- Auger, W., & Wideman, R. (2000). Using action research to open the door to door to life-long professional learning. *Education*, 01.
- Bailey, K. M., & David, N. (Eds.). (1996). *Voices from the Language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bain, A. (1879). *Education as Science*. New York: Appleton.
- Bassey, M. (1990). On the nature of research in education. *Research Intelligence*, Parts 1-3.
- Bauder, M. (1997). *Breaking away from the standart teaching format: an action research report*. Available: http://educ.queensu.ca/projects/action_research/matt-b.htm [2001, 26-4].
- Benton, J., & Wasko, J. (1999). "Anything WorthwhileTakes Time": Eight Schools Discuss Impacts and Impressions of Doing Action research. *Networks: An On-line Journal for Teacher Research*, 2(2), 1-11.
- Blandford, S. (2000). *Managing Professional Development in Schools*. London: Routledge.
- Boland, J. (2001). *Method and Methodology: Action Research and Case Study Approaches to Site-Specific Dramatic Performance*. Available: <http://www.csu.edu.au/faculty/arts/commun/devising/jerry3a.htm> [2001, 27-8].
- Boone, R. G. (1904). *Science of Education*. New York: Charles Scribner's.

- Borgia, E. T., & Schuler, D. (1996). *Action Research in Early Childhood Education.ERIC Digest (ED401047)*. Available: <http://www.ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed401047.html>.
- Brindley, G. (1992). Becoming a researcher: Teacher-conducted research and professional growth. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Issues in Language Teacher Education* (pp. 89-105). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Brown, C. (1995). A Question of Action. In C. Riddell (Ed.), *Journeys of Reflection: ESL Action Research in TAFE*. Melbourne, Victoria: Office of Training and Further Education and Western Metropolitan of TAFE.
- Brown, L., Henry, C., Henry, J., & McTaggart, R. (1988). Action Research: Notes on the National Seminar. In - (Ed.), *The Action Research Reader* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Buckingham, R. B. (1926). *Research for Teachers*. New York: Silver Burdett Co.
- Bunning, C. (1995). *Professional Development Using Action Research (On Line)*. Available: <http://www.mcb.co.uk/services/conference/nov95/ifal/paper1.html> [2000, 30-7].
- Burns, A. (1999). *Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, A. (2002). Collaborative action research: An Australian experience. In G. Tinker-Sachs (Ed.), *Action Research in English Language Teaching*. Hong Kong: Department of English and Communication City University of Hong Kong.
- Burns, A. (in press). Action Research: Contributions and future directions in ELT, *Kluwer Handbook of Action Research (in preparation)*.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Social Paradigms and Organisational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*. Great Britain: Gower Publishing Company Limited.
- Calhoun, E. F. (1994). *How to Use Action Research in the Self-Renewing School*. Alexandria, Virginia: ASCD.
- Caro-Bruce, C., & Zeichner, K. (1998). *The Nature and Impact of an Action Research Professional Development Program in One Urban School District*. Final Report to Spencer Foundation. Available: <http://www.madison.k12.wi.us/sod/car/spencer.htm> [2000, 6-10].
- Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical: Education, Knowledge and*

Action Research. London: The Falmer Press.

Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Massachusetts: The M.I.T. Press.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research Methods in Education* (5th ed.). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1998). Reforming teacher education through self-study. In A. L. Cole & R. Elijah & J. G. Knowles (Eds.), *The heart of the matter: teacher educators and teacher education reform*. San Fransisco: Caddo Gap Press.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1995). Methods and issues in a life history approach to self-study. In T. Russell & F. Kortagen (Eds.), *Teachers who teach teachers: reflections on teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.

Cook, C. (1991). *Professional development interview/survey questions*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Educational Laboratory. Available: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/educatrs/profdev1/pd2exami.htm> [2000, 9-2].

Craft, A. (1996). *Continuing Professional Development: A Practical Guide for Teachers and Schools*. London: Routledge.

Crookes, G. (1990). Grassroots action to improve ESL programs. *UH Working Papers in ESL*, 8(2), 45-62.

Crookes, G. (1993). Action research for second language teachers: going beyond teacher research. *Applied Linguistics*, 14(2), 130-144.

Crookes, G. (1997). What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach? *Modern Language Journal*, 81(1), 67-79.

Crookes, G., & Arakaki, L. (1999). Teaching idea sources and work conditions in an ESL program. *TESOL Journal*, 8(1), 15-19.

Crookes, G., & Chandler, P. (1999). Introducing action research into post-secondary foreign language teacher education.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). *The meaning of Professional Development in the 21st Century*. Available: <http://www.ncrel.org/sdr/areas/issues/educatrs/profdev1/pd200.html> [2000, 8-2].

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership*, 55(5).

Davis, C. C. (1985). *Action Research: An Investigative Approach for Personal and School Development*. Wattle Park: Wattle Park Teachers Centre.

- Day, C. (1999). *Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Day, R. R. (1992). Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher education. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Issues in Language Teacher Education* (pp. 38-48). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Depdikbud. (1984). *Kurikulum 1984 Sekolah Menengah Umum Tingkat Atas (SMA): Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Materi Pengajaran Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Kelas I Semester 1 dan 2*. Jakarta.
- Depdikbud. (1995). *Kurikulum Sekolah Menengah Umum: Garis-Garis Besar Program Pengajaran Mata Pelajaran Bahasa Inggris Kelas I, II, III*. Jakarta
- Delong, J. (1996). *Facilitating and Supporting Action Research by Teachers and Principals: Self-Study of a Superintendent's Role*. Paper presented at the The International Seminar 'Self-Study in Teacher Education: Empowering our Future, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England.
- Dewey, J. (1910). *The Research Act in Sociology*. London: Butterworths.
- Dick, B. (1993). *You Want to do an Action Research Thesis? How to Conduct and Report Action Research*. Available: <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/art/arthesis.html>.
- Edge, J. (2001). *Action Research*. Alexandria, Virginia: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Edwards, R. (1993). The inevitable future? Post- Fordism in work and learning. In R. Edwards & S. Sieminski & D. Zeldin (Eds.), *Adult Learners, Education and Training*. London: Routledge.
- Elliot, J. (1991). *Action research for educational change*. Milton Keynes, Philadelphia: Open University press.
- Feldman, A. (2002). Existential Approaches to Action Reseach. *Educational Action Research*, 10(2).
- Fischer, D. (2000). The curtain rises: teachers unveil their process of transformation in doing classroom inquiry. *T. Networks: An On-line Journal for Teacher Research*, 3(1).
- Freeman, D. (1998). *Doing teacher research: From inquiry to understanding*. San Francisco: Heinle & Heinle.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K. E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3), 397-418.
- Freppon, P. A. (2001). *What it takes to be a Teacher: the Role of Personal and*

Professional Development. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

- Friesen, D. W. (1994). The action research game: Recreating pedagogical relationships in the teaching internship. *Educational Action Research*, 2(2), 243-258.
- Fullan, M. G. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1993). *Changes Forces*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Fullan, M. G. (1999). *Change Forces: The Sequel*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Gabel, D. (1995, April). *An introduction to action research*. Paper presented at the Presidential Address at the National Association for Research in Science Teaching (NARST), San Francisco.
- Garrido, E., Pimenta, S., Moura, M. O., & Fusari, M. F. R. (1999). Collaborative research as an approach to foster teacher development, teachers' production of knowledge and changes in school practices. *Education Action Research*, 7(3).
- Ghaye, A., & Ghaye, K. (1998). *Teaching and Learning through Critical Reflective Practice*. London: David Fulton Publishers.
- Ginns, I., Heirdsfield, A., Atweh, B., & Watters, J. J. (2001). Beginning teachers becoming professionals through action research. *Educational Action Research*, 9(1), 111-133.
- Glanz, J. (1999). A primer on action research for the school administrator. *The Clearing House*, 72(5), 301-304.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction*. London: Longman.
- Graham, C. (1993). *Grammarchants: more jazz chants*. New York: Oxford university Press.
- Grundy, S. (1987). *Curriculum: product or praxis*. *Deakin Studies in Education Series 1*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Grundy, S., & Kemmis, S. (1988). Educational Action Research in Australia: The State of the Art (an Overview). In - (Ed.), *The Action Research Reader* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth Generation Evaluation*. Newbury Park, Ca: Sage.
- Guskey, T. R. (2000). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press Inc.

- Guyton, E., & Birth, D. (Eds.). (1999). *Standards for Field Experience in Teacher Educators*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Henry, J., & Henry, C. (1988). The Deakin/Wimmera School-based in-serviced Education Project. In - (Ed.), *The Action Research Reader* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Holter, I. M., & Schwartz - Barcott, D. (1993). Action Research: What is it? How has it been used and how can it be used in nursing? *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 128, 298-304.
- Hopkins, D. (1993). *A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hymes, D.H. (1978). On Communicative Competence. In Brumfit, C.J. and Johnson, K. (Eds) *The Communicative Approach in Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Imel, S. (1998). *Transformative Learning in Adulthood*. ERIC Digest No. 200. Available:
http://www.ericfacility.net/databases/ERIC_Digests/ed423426.html.
- Isakson, M. B., & Boody, R. M. (1993). Hard questions about teacher research. In L. Patterson & C. M. Santa & K. G. Short & K. Smith (Eds.), *Teachers are Researchers: Reflection and Action*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Jalal, F., & Supriadi, D. (Eds.). (2001). *Reformasi Pendidikan dalam Konteks Otonomi Daerah*. Yogyakarta: Depdiknas - Bappenas - Adicita Karya Nusa.
- Johnson, B. (1992). *Teacher-as-Researcher*. ERIC Digest and Publication. Available: http://www.ericsp.org/pages/digest/teacher_researcher_92-7.html [2003, 17-12].
- Joyce, B., & Calhoun, E. (1995). School renewal: an inquiry, not a formula. *Educational Leadership*, April 1995.
- Kember, D., Ha, T.-S., Lam, B.-H., Lee, A., Sandra Ng, Yan, L., & Yum, J. C. K. (1997). The Diverse role of critical friend in supporting educational action research projects. *Education Action Research*, 5(3), 463-481.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (Eds.). (1988). *The Action Research Planner* (3rd ed.). Geelong, Victoria: Deakin University Press.
- Knowles, M. S. (1970). *The modern practice of adult education: Andragogy versus pedagogy*. New York: New York Association.
- Laferriere, T.(1999). *Working Group on Professional Development: In-service Teacher Professional Development Models in the Use of Information and*

Communication Technologie. A report to the SchoolNet National Advisory Board. Available: <http://www.tact.fse.ulaval.ca/ang/html/pdmodels.html> [1999, March 15].

- Lie, A. (1996, October, 7-10). *Continuing Education Program to Enhance EFL Instructors' Professional Development*. Paper presented at the Implementation of the 1994 English Curricula of Higher Education Institutions and of High Schools, and ELT Development at the TEFLIN Seminar 44, Fakultas Sastra, Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Surabaya.
- Little, J. W. (1997). *Excellence in professional development and professional community. Working Paper. Benchmarks for Schools*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Littlewood, D. (2003). *Collaborative Approaches to Philosophical Discussion*. Available: <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/depts/philosophy/awaymave/onlineresources/collabdave.htm>.
- Lomax, P., Evans, M., & Parker, Z. (1996). *Working in Partnership to enhance self-study within teacher education*. Paper presented at the AERA, New York.
- Loughran, J., & Northfield, J. (1988). *A framework for development of self-study practice*. In Hamilton, M.L. (1998). London: Falmer.
- Macintyre, C. (2000). *The Art of Action Research in the Classroom*. London: David Fulton Publisher.
- Macpherson, I., Arcodia, C., Gorman, S., Shepherd, J., & Trost, R. (1998). Collaborative action research: learning from a social science project in a secondary school. In B. Atweh & S. Kemmis & P. Weeks (Eds.), *Action Research in Practice: Partnership for Social Justice in Education*. London: Routledge.
- Marshall, J., & Reason, P. (1993). Adult learning in collaborative action research: reflections on the supervision process. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 15(2), 117-132.
- Masters, J. (1995). *The history of action research*. Available: <http://www.behs.cchs.usyd.edu.au/Reader/rmasters.htm>.
- Mckay, J. A. (1992). Professional development through action research. *Journal of Staff Development*, Winter 1992.
- McKernan, J. (1994). Teaching educational action research: a tale of three cities. *Educational Action Research*, 2(2), 95-112.

- McKernan, J. (1996). *Curriculum action research: A handbook of methods and resources for the reflective practitioner*. London: Kogan Page.
- McNiff, Lomax, P., & Whitehead, J. (1996). *You and Your Action Research Project*. London: Hyde Publication.
- McNiff, J. (1988). *Action Research: Principles and Practice*. London: Routledge.
- McNiff, J. (1993). *Teaching as Learning: an Action Research Approach*. London: Routledge.
- McTaggart, R. (1991). *Action Research: A Short Modern History*.
- Melrose, M. J. (1996). Got a Philosophical Match? Does it Matter? In O. Zuber-Skerritt (Ed.), *New Directions in Action Research*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Melrose, M. J. (2001). Maximizing the Rigor of Action Research: Why Would You Want To? How Could you? *Field Methods*, 13(2), 160-180.
- Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, D. M., & Pine, G. J. (1990). Advancing professional inquiry for educational improvement through action research. *Journal of Staff Development*, Summer 1990.
- Mingucci, M. (1999). Action research in ESL staff development. *TESOL Matters*, 9(2).
- Mizell, H. (1997, December 9). *Is Staff Development a Smart Investment?* Paper presented at the National Staff Development Council, Opryland Hotel in Nashville, Tennessee.
- Mundy, H., & Russell, T. (1994). The authority of experience in learning to teach: message from Physics Methods Class. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45(2), 85-95.
- Newman, J. (1998). *Tensions of teaching: Beyond tips to critical reflection*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Northfield, J. (1996, November 25 -29). *The Nature and Quality of Teacher Research*. Paper presented at the Symposium "Learning from teachers ... Examples of teacher research" at the Conference "Educational Research: Building New Partnerships", Singapore.
- Northfield, J., & Loughran, J. (1996, August, 5-8). *Learning through self-study: Exploring the development of knowledge*. Paper presented at the

International Conference, Self-study in Teacher Education: Empowering our future, Herstmonceux Castle, East Sussex, England.

- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (1998). *Some Alternatives to Short-Term, "One-Size-Fits-All" Workshops*. Available: http://www.esc2.net/title_I/ias/21TE/NWREL/article10.htm
- Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. (2001). *What is Effective Professional Development?* Available: http://www.esc2.net/title_I/ias/21TE/NWREL/article3.htm
- Nunan, D. (1989a). *Understanding Language Classroom: A Guide for Teacher-Initiated Action*. New York: Prentice Hall.
- Nunan, D. (1989b). The teacher as researcher. In C. Brumfit & R. Mitchell (Eds.), *Research in the Language Classroom*. London: Modern English Publications in association with The British Council.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *The Learner-Centered Curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Nunan, D. (1992a). *Research Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nunan, D. (1992b). *Action research in language education*. Available: www.les.aston.ac.uk/lisu/research/tdtr92/tdtrdn.html [2002, 19 -08].
- Nunan, D. (2001). Action research in language education. In D. R. Hall & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English Language Teaching: A reader* (pp. 197-207). London: Routledge in association with Macquarie University and The Open University.
- Nurkamto, J. (2000). *Pendekatan Komunikatif: Penerapan dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Pemelajaran Bahasa Inggris, kajian etnografi di SMU Negeri Surakarta (1997/1998)*. Unpublished Doktor Pendidikan, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta.
- O'Brien, R. (1998). *An Overview of the Methodological Approach of Action Research*. Available: <http://www.web.net/~robrien/papers/arfinal.htm> [2000, 23-10].
- Osler, J., & Flack, J. (2002). Tales from the poppy patch. In J. Loughran & I. Mitchell & J. Mitchell (Eds.), *Learning from Teacher Research* (pp. 222-245). Crows Nest NSW: Allen & Unwin.
- Patterson, L., & Shannon, P. (1993). Reflection, inquiry, action. In L. Patterson & C. M. Santa & K. G. Short & K. Smith (Eds.), *Teachers are Researchers: Reflection and Action*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

- Priyana, J. (2002). *Developing EFL Task-based Language Instrrcution in an Indonesian Primary School Context*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, Macquarie University, Sydney.
- Reeves, T. (1996). *Educational Paradigms*. Available: http://www.educationau.edu.au/cp/REFS/reeves_paradigm/htm [2001, 6-8].
- Richards, J. C. (1991). Reflective treaching in Tesol teacher education. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Issues in language teacher education. Anthology Series 30*. (pp. 1-19). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.
- Richards, J. C. (1998). *Beyond Training: Perspectives on Language Teacher Education*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Ho, B. (1998). Reflective thinking through journal writing. In J. C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond Training: Perspectives on Language Teacher Education*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Lockhart., C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Nunan, D. (Eds.). (1990). *Second Language Teacher Education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C. and Rodgers, T. S.(1993). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching: A Description and Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Richert, A. E. (1990). Teaching Teachers to Reflect: A Consideration of Programme Structure. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22(6), 509-527.
- Rochsantiningsih, D., Nurkamto, J., Ngadiso, Martono, & Pujobroto, H. (1997). *Pelaksanaan pengajaran Bahasa Inggris di SMU: Studi Kasus Penerapan Kurikulum SMU di Surakarta*. Surakarta: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Rochsantiningsih, D., Nurkamto, J., Suparno, & Suyitno. (1998). *Masalah-Masalah Belajar dan Pembelajaran Bahasa Inggris, Penyebab, dan Upaya Pemecahannya: Penelitian Tindakan di Sekolah lanjutan Tingkat Pertama Negeri 10 Surakarta*. Surakarta: Fakultas Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Universitas Sebelas Maret.
- Rock, T. C., & Levin, B. B. (Winter 2002). Collaborative action research projects: Enhancing preservice teacher development in professional development schools. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29(1), 7-21.
- Rodgers, E. M., & Pinnell, G. S. (2002). Professional Development Scenarios. In E. M. Rodgers & G. S. Pinnell (Eds.), *Learning from Teaching in*

Literacy Education: New Perspectives on Professional Development. Portsmouth, USA: Heinemann.

- Ross, D. D., Bondy, E., & Kyle, D. W. (1993). *Reflective Teaching for Student Empowerment: Elementary Curriculum and Methods*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.
- Russell, T. (1999, February 5-6). *The Challenge of Change in (Teacher) Education*. Paper presented at the Conference of "The Challenge of Change in Education", University of Technology, Sydney.
- Russell, T., & Korthagen, F. (Eds.). (1995). *Teachers who teach teachers: Reflections on teacher education*. London: Falmer Press.
- Sagor, R. (1992). *How to Conduct Collaborative Action Research*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Sagor, R. (2000). *Guiding School Improvement with Action Research*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Sanford, N. (1970). Whatever happened to action research? *Journal of Social Issues*, 26(4), 3-23.
- Sarason, S. B. (1996). *Revisiting the Culture of the School and the Problem of Change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Schlechty, P. (1990). *Schools for the 21st century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Short, K. G. (1993). Teacher research for teacher educators. In L. Patterson & C. M. Santa & K. G. Short & K. Smith (Eds.), *Teachers are Researchers: Reflection and Action*. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.
- Smyth, J. (1982). A teacher development approach to bridging the practice-research gap. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 4, 331-342.
- Stenhouse, L. (1971). The humanities curriculum project: the rationale. *Theory into Practice*, X(3), 154-162.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.
- Supriadi, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Guru di Indonesia: Pendidikan, Pelatihan dan Perjuangannya sejak Zaman Kolonial hingga Era Reformasi*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Direktorat Tenaga Kependidikan.
- Supriadi, D., & Hoogenboom, I. (2003). Guru di Indonesia dari masa ke masa. In D. Supriadi (Ed.), *Guru di Indonesia: Pendidikan, Pelatihan dan*

Perjuangannya sejak Zaman Kolonial hingga Era Reformasi. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, Direktorat Jenderal Pendidikan Dasar dan Menengah, Direktorat Tenaga Kependidikan.

- Surachmad, W. (2000). Didaktika: guru dan mutu. *Kompas*: 24 April
- Sutton, R. (1997). *The learning school*. Salforth: John Roberts.
- Taba, H., & Noel, E. (1957). *Action research: A case study*. Washington, DC: ASCD.
- Tinker-Sachs, G. (1999). Action research file: An interview with Anne Burns. An interview and book review. *Networks: An On-line Journal for Teacher Research*, 2(2).
- Tinker-Sachs, G. (2000). Teacher and researcher autonomy in action research. *Prospect*, 15(3), 35-51.
- Tinker-Sachs, G. (Ed.). (2002). *Action Research in English Language Teaching*. Hong Kong: Department of English and Communication City University of Hong Kong.
- Wallace, M. J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: a reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wallace, M. J. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Wells, G., et al. (1994). Changing schools from within: creating communities of inquiry. in The curtain rises: teachers unveil their process of transformation in doing classroom inquiry. *Networks: An On-line Journal for Teacher Research*, 3(1).
- Whitehead, J. (1989). Creating a Living Education Theory from Questions of the Kind, 'How do I improve my Practice?' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 1989(1).
- Wilkins, D.A. (1987). Grammatical, Situational and Notional Syllabuses. In Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K. (Eds). *The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Zeichner, K. (1999). The new scholarship in teacher education. *Educational Researcher*, 28(9), 4-15.
- Zeichner, K. M. (2003). Teacher research as professional development for P-12 educators in the USA. *Educational Action Research*, 11(2).
- Zuber-Skerritt, O. (1992). *Action Research In Higher Education: Examples and Reflections*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.

Zuber-Skerritt, O. (Ed.). (1996). *New Directions in Action Research*. London: the Falmer Press.

Appendices

Appendix 3.1. Questionnaires Concerning Teachers' Perception about Professional Development

1. What do you think professional development is?
2. How would you describe the nature of professional development in your school?
3. How would you describe the professional development formats that are currently being used in your school?
4. Who, within the school community, is currently participating in learning through professional development projects and activities?
5. When are professional development activities currently taking place within the day? week? year?
6. Who decides whether someone is to participate in professional development and what is the decision based on?
7. Think of a recent professional development experience and tell me who determines the focus of professional development activities, including the plan, design, and implementation of a particular project?
Are teachers involved in this planning and implementation?
If yes, in what ways?
8. What is the content focus of professional development projects and activities?
9. How is professional development likely related to students' learning and the curriculum?
10. How do you think professional development is linked to the school improvement?
11. How is professional development currently funded in your school?
12. Besides your school, are there any other institutions that provide support for professional development in your school?
13. Do you actively participate in professional development? If yes, in what ways?
14. Think about a satisfying personal or professional learning experience that you have had. What do you think made it particularly significant? Why?
15. Does the culture within your school support your on going learning and professional growth? If yes, in what ways?
16. Would you like to see any changes about professional development in your school?
17. Do you have any specific suggestion for the improvement of professional development in your school? If yes, what are they?
18. Do you have a professional development plan?
19. Can you see any obstacles to your professional development plan? If so, what are they?
20. What ideas or strategies do you have for overcoming those obstacles?

Adapted from Cook (1991: 1)

Appendix 3.2. Questionnaires Investigating Teachers' Prior Knowledge of Action Research

1. Have you ever heard about action research before?
2. If yes, where, when and from whom did you have it?
3. If yes, did you ever conduct AR before?
4. If yes, where, how, with whom did you do it?
5. If yes, how was your role in the research?
If yes, who funded your research?
6. If yes, tell me your experience with AR?
7. If yes, did you find it helpful for your teaching?
8. If no, would you like to conduct AR?
9. If no, are you interested to know about action research?

Appendix 3.3. Evaluation after Action Research Study

The following questions are meant to gain information of your perceptions of action research and your experience of conducting of action research lately. Answer the questions or complete the following statements based on your perceptions and understanding.

A. Complete the following statement and answer the question.

Action research is carried out in order to

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

After conducting action research lately, did you conduct action research in your new classes for this term?

YES €

NO €

Please explain your answers.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

- C. Complete a checklist to show how your teaching had changed as a result of your involvement in the action research project lately.

Since I have been doing action research, I find that when I teach I now ...

	Less	Same	More
try to use a greater variety of behaviours.			
praise students.			
criticise students.			
am aware of students' feelings.			
am conscious of my non-verbal communication.			
use the target language in class.			
am conscious of non-verbal cues of students.			
try to get students to participate.			
try to incorporate student ideas into my teaching.			
spend more class time talking myself.			
try to get my students working in groups.			
try to get divergent, open-ended student responses.			
try to get students to participate.			
try to build good atmosphere between teacher and students.			

Adapted from Nunan, (1992b: 8)

Appendix 4.1. An example of a teacher's research proposal

Research Proposal

[Teacher H]

Topic: Negotiating lessons with the students

Initial reflection: On Monday, I usually worked for seven hours, teaching from morning until the last hour. At the last hour I taught reading in Class III Sociology 4 which had 38 students. Most students of this class looked tired and bored when I came. They did not show any interest in my lesson. Any strategies which worked in other classes were not always successful in this class. In addition, this class had five students who had discipline problems.

All the students only looked interested when I “did not teach”, as we talked and discussed about music, life, future and hot issues in our country rather than discussed reading materials from the textbook. I had questions in my mind about the causes of this situation: was it because the class was conducted on Monday, at the late hour (students are tired, sleepy, and hungry; and I was tired too)? was it because of the materials which I presented? or the teaching approach? or didn't they like me? I had these question for quite a while, so when I had the opportunity to participate in this AR project, I would choose this class as my AR class. Through this research I would like to be able to help my students to learn better.

Proposed solutions: This proposal was developed during my participation in AR

workshops as part of the AR projects. While I was thinking of finding the right solution for my problems, I had the answer from the workshops themselves. The equity atmosphere where the participants could talk without burden had inspired me to adopt this in my class. So the proposed solution was to ask my students talk together discussing the situation and at the same time I would ask them to give solutions. The following steps would be taken in my research.

1. Distributing questionnaires to obtain my students' ideas about their need in the class.
2. Analysing the questionnaires
3. Communicating the results with the students
4. Discussing with the students about the results and plan further strategies for the teaching and learning process.

oo000oo

Negotiating Lessons with the Students

[Teacher H]

I found difficulties in handling a class of 38 students which was conducted at the last hour on Mondays. Apart from the 'unfavorable day and time' to study, most students were passive and looked tired. Although they did my instructions to do tasks in the lesson, from my observation I knew that most students conducted these tasks unenthusiastically. Furthermore, this class had five 'special' students who did not always attend all the lessons. If these students came to the class in the morning, they could not be expected to come in other classes in the afternoon. So, they could be in the Mathematics class, but there was no guaranty that they would be available in the next class. In the class, they did not show much interest to the lessons, as sometimes they fell asleep in the class. I was really concerned with these students. Overall situation in my class, including these five students encouraged me to present my lesson more interestingly. I would like to attract them, to increase my students' motivation in attending my class so that they could learn better.

Having inspired by good experience of equity during my participation in the current AR workshops, where the participants had the opportunity to talk and share ideas, I would like to adopt this in my class. I talked to my students and discussed about the situation in the class. I offered them open dialogues discussing what they would like to do and their expectation in my class. I could

say that they liked this idea. During half period of the class, there were many ideas coming from the students. To have concrete picture of their needs, I closed the class by asking them to complete a 'simple questionnaire'.

During the week, I analysed the questionnaire. The results showed that 80% of the students wanted to change the situation of the study; 20% of them needed to have various lesson materials, some of them required materials which related to their hobbies. I also gained some feedback about my performance in the class. To my relief, 80% of the students were happy with my performance. Based on this data, I planned some strategies to accommodate their needs. These strategies were elaborated in the following cycles.

CYCLE I

Planning: From the result of the questionnaire I then knew what I should do with my students. I planned to have different places of study, to give more variation of the materials, to do more preparation before teaching and also to be more patient to the students. But before conducting my plans, I would let my students know about the results of the questionnaire, my plans, and negotiate the plan with them.

Action: I came to the class and told my students about the results of the questionnaire, and my plans of teaching based on these results. We discussed about it and I let the students decide the place of study. From the discussion, we made some deals related to what we are going to do in class. For location, we

chose outdoors, under the orange tree behind the class; and indoors, at the library and in the hall. Concerning the materials, the students let me choose for them. Beside this, we also talked about the consequences of their choices. They should come to the place of study on time and prepare everything before the class began. They should not disturb other classes and do the homework I gave.

Observation: Initially it was very slow to have the students' opinion to decide where to go as the alternative of the current classroom. But when some students began to talk, other students also spoke up their ideas. When I asked them to set up the rules, they looked excited. Some students kept silent and looked shy to give their ideas. I do not think that they did not want to take part. I guessed it was because they were not familiar with this.

Reflection: The good atmosphere in my English class was very inspiring. Presumably, there was a feeling of empowerment for the students that it was they themselves who created the rules and not just obeyed the rules as usual. Asking them to choose, to decide and to do what they want to do for the lesson was a kind of 'a new and surprising thing'. I felt delighted giving a chance to express the students opinion about the class made my students happy too. I hardly could wait how it will be with my students when they study outdoors.

CYCLE II

Planning: Next meeting the class would be conducted outdoors to study reading and the topic would be about *Energy*.

Action: We studied outdoors, under the trees. The students worked in four groups (two groups of boys and two groups of girls). They chose the members of the group themselves. I gave each group handouts about the materials with some vocabularies related to the text on the handouts. Then they discussed it and answered some questions. Going back to class, the students wrote the result of their discussions. At the end of the lesson, I gave them homework.

Observation: The students were excited. They expressed their opinions more freely. However, the girls were a bit annoyed by a group of boys, who according to one girl, were still “too busy with themselves”. Those boys seemed amused by the new situation. They could not focus their attention to the lesson all the time. During the lesson they often looked around noticing the environment rather than focusing to the lesson. They were also not as active as the girls were. A note from this meeting was that we wasted too much time for the preparation.

Reflection: My students responded differently to the new situation of the study. For most students, the new situation really encouraged them to be more active which enabled them to speak up their ideas. For some students, on the other hands it was “a surprise”. Studying outdoors, which was so closed to nature, to some extends distracted my students' attention. Although it was understandable, as they were not familiar with this situation, I believed I need to remind them about the rules we set up before.

CYCLE III

Planning: I would remind my students about the agreements: the rules that we

had made at the first cycle. The next meeting will be at the library. In order to provide the students with different materials, we would listen to the music.

Action: When the bell rang to begin my class, all the students were ready in the library. I divided the students into six groups. Each group consists of six students, boys and girls (two students were absent). I gave them handouts of the song's text. There are some missing words that must be filled while they were listening to the cassettes. We listened to it three times. When I was sure that all groups have correct answers, I let them discuss the whole text in their groups. There was also times for the students and I to sing the song along with the completed lyrics. In the end, each group reported the result of their discussion.

Observation: The students showed their efforts to keep the rules about being discipline. The boys especially were more discipline. The Boys and the girls were able to co-operate to each other. All students were coming to the class, even the five 'special' students who did not always attend the class. The other students welcomed them friendly. Everything ran well at this cycle.

Reflection: Teacher should and always be patient in establishing discipline to their students. In my case I think I was lucky, since it was the students who set the rules. So it was easier for me to remind the students to keep and follow their own rules. The different kind of lessons (listening to a song) brought excitement for the students. The pain of preparing the song and how to develop it in teaching outweighed the excitement I obtained, such as the increasing participation from the students and the relaxing atmosphere in the class.

Overall Reflection

Negotiating the teaching-learning process with the students did not just make me happy but the students were happy too. It was increased my students' motivation to study English. They became more active in participating in the lessons, showed more interests, and the atmosphere become dynamic and alive. On the other hands, I was more relax and focused in doing the preparation. It was because I knew what my students really wanted to do. Besides that, I could exercise my roles as a teacher. Now I could place myself as a friend in teaching; not only as the one who always "orders and instruct" my students to do the tasks. Positioning the students as "human" not just as "an object" made my works lighter and easier.

oo000oo

NEGOSIASI PROSES BELAJAR MENGAJAR DENGAN SISWA

MASALAH

- 1. Siswa pasif dan kurang semangat**
- 2. 5 siswa bermasalah jarang hadir**
- 3. Siswa bosan belajar di kelas**

SOLUSI

Tawar menawar dengan siswa mengenai pelaksanaan KBM



SIKLUS I

Rencana :

Memberitahu hasil kuesener dan membicarakan tindak lanjut

Tindakan :

Menentukan tempat belajar, variasi materi dan aturan main

Observasi :

Awalnya siswa kesulitan mengungkapkan ide, setelah adaptasi mulai bersemangat, meskipun ada beberapa yang masih malu-malu

Refleksi :

Situasi di kelas menyenangkan untuk siswa dan guru, memberi kesempatan siswa menentukan aturan sendiri merupakan hal baru dan menyenangkan

SIKLUS II

Rencana :

Belajar diluar ruang membahas bacaan dengan judul ENERGY

Tindakan :

- Belajar dibawah pohon
- Membentuk 4 kelompok
- Memberikan handout
- Diskusi dlm kelompok
- Menuliskan hasil diskusi

Observasi :

- Siswa menikmati suasana baru
- Keaktifan kelompok bervariasi (wanita lebih aktif dari laki-laki)
- Banyak waktu terbuang pada persiapan

Refleksi :

Situasi baru memberikan reaksi yang berbeda

Banyak siswa bereaksi positif, beberapa lainnya kelihatan belum begitu biasa dengan hal ini sehingga kurang fokus dalam pelajaran

SIKLUS III

Rencana :

- Mengingatkan siswa atas aturan main bersama
- Belajar di perpustakaan dg materi mendengarkan musik

Tindakan :

- Membentuk 6 kelompok campuran
- Memberikan handout
- Mendengarkan kaset dan mengisi lirik yang kosong
- Mendiskusikan
- Menyanyikan dan melaporkan hasil

Observasi :

- Siswa berusaha mematuhi aturan
 - Anak laki lebih disiplin
 - 5 anak bermasalah hadir

Refleksi :

- Saya harus sabar menerapkan disiplin
- Materi yang menarik disukai siswa
- Siswa aktif sepanjang pelajaran

REFLEKSI AKHIR

- KARENA TAHU APA YANG DIKEHENDAKI SISWA, Saya lebih santai dan fokus dalam persiapan
- Negosiasi membawa kebahagiaan bagi kami
- Menempatkan diri sebagai “teman” belajar siswa memudahkan kbm
- Memanusiakan siswa akan meningkatkan motivasi belajar mereka

Appendix 5.1. An Example of a teacher’s diary

<p>Monday, 1 April 2002</p> <p>As I said at the last meeting, today I ask them to study out of their class, to the place they want to go. We sit in the back of the class, near the orange tree. They look happy but it seems that they “enjoy” the situation too much. They likes orang desa masuk kota alias gumun. Fortunately, “kegumunan mereka” not too disturbed other classes, because we have a good place to study outside. Some boys still noisy with their position (berjalan dan berpindah tempat beberapa kali) and it make some girls annoyed (koyo bagus-baguse wira wiri wae, they said). It needs 20 minutes to make the situation “calm down” again. Then I remind them about the rules that we should obey on doing outside class. We talk about energy. The discussion still dominated by the girls, while the boys are not completely participated (beberapa anak laki-laki masih saling berbisik, mengomentari situasi belajar mereka yang baru, sedang 1 grup, 6 orang laki-laki, sudah aktif dalam diskusi). In general, I’m happy with the first meeting outside the class. Because setelah kembali masuk kelas, 30 menit sebelum bel pulang, the students bias saya ajak bersama-sama merumuskan hasil diskusinya. Dan kemudian all students mau menyalin di buku tulis mereka. Then, I’ll just wait and see wether they’ll do their homework or not, next week.</p>	<p>I’m happy, because most of them have responsibility to do the best related to their own choices; study outside their classroom</p>
--	---

Monday, 8 April 2002

Today, we are going to the library. We want to listen to music. At the break time, two boys have prepared the tape recorder. When the bell rang, all students have been here at the library. It doesn't waste time too much. We just need 5 minutes for preparation. First, I check their homework. Most of them done their homework. Some students ask, then I explain for a whole class. This activities held for an hour. One more hour, we use it to listen to music. I divided them into 6 groups. I give them uncomplete text of the song, I ask them to listen to the song carefully and fill the missing words in the blanks (I've prepared some missing words below the text). We listen to the song twice and then we check together. Then I asked to discuss the content of the song in their own groups before discussing it together in a whole class. Most students seem so excited with this activities. They look happy and enjoy it much. Only two boys (who are said "the trouble maker", begitu biasanya teman-temannya menjuluki) yang kelihatannya masih sering usrek sendiri. Fortunately, they are in different groups so I can minimize the disturbance that may be arise. The lesson today goes well. Some students give their comments :

Dewi : it's very exciting

Suryono : I'm happy and enjoy much

Irwan : I hope we can do it again next time

I am proud of them since they show their responsibility to do the best related to their own choices; study outside their classroom. Memanusiakan siswa dengan melibatkan mereka untuk mengambil policy apa yang ingin mereka lakukan sehubungan dengan belajar mereka, agaknya merupakan hal yang tepat. Students lebih excited, percaya

Monday, 25 Marc 2002

I ask my students at III IPS 4 to fill the questionnaire I made for them. Most of them said “okay” with my performance (and my approach) in front of the class, but they need different situation to make them more interested in my lessons. One of them (the cleverest student at this class) told that I should be more patient to the students who are not able to answer the questions. It’s better for me to help them than give their turns other students.