

Secondary School English Language Teachers' Action Research Beliefs and Practices, the Case of Secondary Schools in Mettu Town



Ayele Legesse¹

Department of Foreign Language and Literature, PhD in ELT, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communications, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; ayumettu@gmail.com (+251912990262)

Tamene Kitila²

Department of Foreign Language and Literature, College of Humanities, Language Studies, Journalism and Communications, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; kitilatame@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines English language teachers' beliefs about action research, their capacity to conduct it, and their actual implementation practices. It also aims to identify the disparities between the participants' beliefs and actual practices. Employing a case study design and a mixed-methods approach, the study focuses on Mettu town in Ethiopia and English teachers from three secondary schools within the town. A non-probability sampling method was used to select 31 teachers for participation. Data was collected through questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The findings reveal that the participants hold positive beliefs about action research, possess moderate competency in conducting action research, but exhibit very low levels of action research implementation. Despite their extensive teaching experience, advanced educational qualifications, and high professional status, their competency levels and action research practices fall short of expectations. These findings highlight the need for training, school-based motivation, resource availability, and reinforcement of Ethiopia's teacher development policies. The findings suggest that further research should attempt to explore the underlying contributing factors for the discrepancy between the English language teachers' beliefs and practices about action research.

Keywords: Belief, Competency, Professional Development, Professional Rank

Introduction

Any attempt that takes place related to exploring new facts, knowledge, the relationship between phenomena, inquiries concerning students' learning, teachers' teaching, curriculum, learning and teaching materials and parents, etc. are attributed to educational research (Creswell, 2012). One of the methods by which research is manifested in the educational arena is action research. In fact, action research exists not only in educational research but also in other organizations as one of the methods of solving problems. Therefore, action research is any kind of search that empowers experts operating everywhere to evaluate their work. One of its attractions is practitioners at any level in any profession can conduct action research to solve day-to-day constraints that occur in their work. When school context is concerned, teachers, principals, supervisors, and students can conduct action research (McNiff & Whitehead, 2001).

Thus, action research in education is a professional development model involving teachers inquiring into their own practice, studying and reflecting on their own practice, and correspondingly changing their practice. Richards and Farrell (2005) describe the blend of action and research as the word 'research' denotes to a methodical way of conducting enquiry and gathering data that is intended to solve problems and to advance classroom tasks. The word 'action', again, indicates to taking measures to alleviate teaching learning difficulties. Koshy (2005) also states that action research is conducted regularly by classroom teachers to enquire about concerns related to teaching and learning to use the outputs in their future practice. It helps

teachers explore what systematically benefits their students. Syafii (2021) extends the description as "Action research is a cyclical process of inquiry and action that allows teachers to systematically examine their practice and make informed decisions about how to improve student learning." (p. 2)

In a recent study, Erdamar and Akpınar (2023) attempt to describe action research in the context of education, highlighting its role in nurturing teacher autonomy, collaboration, and professional growth. They emphasize that action research allows teachers to take ownership of their practice, engage in meaningful collaboration with colleagues, and continuously enhance their teaching methods to elevate student learning outcomes.

While previous studies explored the practices and challenges of AR implementation, a crucial gap exists in understanding the underlying beliefs and perceived competency of teachers related to AR. This study examines this gap by investigating, firstly, teachers' beliefs about AR as one of their teaching duties; secondly, it examines teachers' perceived competency in conducting systematic inquiry to address teaching-learning challenges, and how this perception relates to their actual AR practices. The study explores connections between teachers' AR practices and national policies on professional development. By addressing these questions, this research aims to illuminate the factors hindering AR adoption and inform education practitioners on strategies to foster positive attitudes towards AR among teachers, identify and address competency gaps, and develop targeted interventions to promote sustainable AR integration and align professional development initiatives with national policies. Ultimately, this study contributes to empowering teachers through AR and enhancing Ethiopian education quality.

Language teachers need to be effective and professionally developed individuals. Professional development of this kind can be gained through continuous questioning of one's practice, challenges, opportunities, strengths, and weaknesses in one's effort to help students learn a language, and this can be achieved through action research (Burns, 2010). For English teachers, action research becomes indispensable because in teaching English, it is difficult to pick a single and similar best methodology that fits the delivery of a given language content. English language teaching came through various methodological progresses and the changes starting from the Grammar Translation Method to the current Communicative Language Teaching methodology as one came after the other by criticizing the previous for its weaknesses and to improve these drawbacks. However, it is argued that there is no one best methodology for teaching English as a second or foreign language. Each methodology has its attractions and shortcomings.

Therefore, teachers are supposed to be systematic and rational about the methodologies they use to impart a given English language skill. Cognizant of this, Pike (2002) claims that action research has the significance of providing English teachers with research perspective and methodological tools to transform their practices. Action research, thus, helps teachers review the methodology they use, students' learning styles and individual differences (Tanjung and Ashadi, 2019), material selections, and other classroom-related issues in search for improvement.

According to Richards (2006), the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT), which has become popular since the 1990s to the present, calls for EFL teachers' continuous investigation into suitable methods and techniques based on students' backgrounds, students' learning styles, and other classroom dynamics. Another recent study also states that "EFL teachers should continuously investigate suitable methods and techniques based on students' background, students' learning styles, and other classroom dynamics to effectively implement the Communicative Language Teaching Approach (CLT)." (Prihadi, 2022, p. 112). Therefore, teachers need to engage themselves in action research activity because no single methodology

or fixed set of techniques is prescribed to teach a given language content. It requires teachers' systematic inquiry of convenient and effective methodology that can easily facilitate students' learning of a given content.

Another rationale that urges action research in CLT is the issue of "eclecticism". Eclectism, according to Kumar (2013), is a combination of different methods of teaching and learning approaches. The eclectic approach in communicative language teaching (CLT) is an adaptable approach that draws on a variety of teaching methods and techniques to create a learning environment that addresses the specific needs of the learners and the context (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Eclectic CLT teachers are not limited to any one particular method but rather draw on the best of each method to create a teaching approach that is effective and engaging. The eclectic approach in CLT requires action research by teachers because it is a dynamic approach. Teachers need to constantly enhance their practice and make adjustments to their teaching approach as needed. Action research, furthermore, guides teachers to systematically investigate their teaching practice and identify areas for improvement (Burns, 2010).

Action research facilitates reflections for teachers to evaluate their own drawbacks and strength from the findings of AR and can also learn from each other while they collaborate to conduct research. Teachers can also be confident and reasonable while making decisions in their teaching based on the evidences they generate from systematic enquiry. To this end, Syafii (2021) shows additional purposes of action research by teacher practitioners in that he explains action research helps teachers develop new knowledge directly related to their classrooms, promotes reflective teaching-learning, expands teachers' pedagogical experiences, lets teachers exercise their expertise, strengthens the tie between practice and students' achievement, and promotes readiness toward new ideas and learning new things.

Purwaningsih (2023) also asserts that action research helps practitioners develop their professional skills by motivating them to evaluate their practice, help them find areas for improvement, and attempt new teaching methodologies. According to these authors, it can help teachers improve their teaching effectiveness by providing them with evidence-based knowledge for their teaching tasks, it can also increase teacher motivation by providing teachers with a sense of ownership over their professional development, and can ultimately lead to enhanced student learning by improving the quality of teaching and learning.

In the Ethiopian education arena, research activity is given attention to developing develop trainee teachers' action research skills. That is why it is offered as a course at diploma and degree levels both in pre-service and in-service training. At all levels, the trainee teachers are required to undertake a mini-action research before they complete the training. In the Post Graduate Diploma Program (PGDT), action research is being offered as one of the courses in the program.

In the Continuous Professional Development (CPD) program, as one of the mechanisms of reflective practitioner activity, action research was emphasized. Currently, teachers in general and English language teachers in particular are expected to participate in the CPD program which takes place in all schools in which teachers discuss and share their experiences, debate on various alternatives to teaching English, and on the solutions to problems they encounter in the classroom and school environment. On top of this, during their application for promotion to the following ladder, their CPD individual portfolio is referred to initiate promotion. In this portfolio, the action research activity is considered as one of the evaluation elements

Notwithstanding, teachers' research endeavors had also been emphasized by the Ethiopian Education policy as one of the areas of focus (MOE,1994). In the introductory part of the policy's document, it states that one of the goals of education in Ethiopia is to advance a critical and

thoughtful community capable of partaking in the transformation of society. Action research is a research methodology that can be used to achieve this goal, as it allows teachers to evaluate their practices and make progresses. The policy also states that teachers should be invigorated to attempt transformation in their teaching.

On top of this, in different guidelines and directives by MoE at different times, teachers are mandated to conduct action research for their professional growth, and the promotion to the higher career ladder is based on teaching activities and participation in action research as a requirement. Teachers pass through seven career ladders during their teaching activities based on the fulfillment of different requirements. The 2012 guidelines on the teacher career structure by Ministry of Civil Services specified that the career ladder comprises seven levels for primary and secondary school teachers, established in 2012. These are beginner teacher, Junior teacher, Teacher, Senior teacher, Associate lead teacher, Lead teacher, and Senior lead teacher (MoCS 2012 cited in Yimam, 2019). According to this document, teachers at each ranking are expected to have different responsibilities including engaging in action research activities.

The most recent policy in which teachers' research was emphasized is the 2018 teachers' development policy by Ministry of Education (MoE). In this document, the policy outlines four main career development pathways for teachers, these are teaching, school leadership, teacher education, and research; and the research activity was boldly and explicitly addressed in the document. The following are some relevant excerpts drawn from the policy document of 2018.

Article 14. Action research is a requirement for career development. Teachers are expected to conduct action research to improve their teaching practices and to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession. Action research can be conducted individually or collaboratively; Article 15. The Ministry of Education will provide support to teachers in conducting action research. This support may include training, resources, and mentorship; Article 16. Teachers who conduct action research will be eligible for professional development opportunities and career advancement. (MoE, 2018: 20-22)

In general, teachers' research, particularly action research is given due attention in Ethiopian education contexts.

The policy platforms created to enhance action research in education in the Ethiopian context look very helpful for teachers to bring immediate solutions for their day-to-day teaching-learning problems. For English teachers, who need to be innovative and creative in their methods and approach to teaching language, this platform plays a vital role in solving their students' problems, improving their reflective practices, and experiencing progress in their professional development endeavors.

This study was initiated by the observation that English language teachers rarely use systematic approaches to solve classroom problems. Teachers informally discuss students' issues but tend to blame low performance on previous teachers rather than investigating root causes and seeking solutions. This pattern is echoed by Kutaly's (2012) findings in Turkey, where English teachers preferred complaining to other teachers rather than attempting systematic research to solve students' problems.

The complex problems in EFL classrooms demand immediate teacher-led solutions rather than waiting for other external researchers. Tanjung & Ashadi (2019) emphasize the need for EFL teachers to vary instructional methods to meet student's diverse needs. This is essential given the diversity of EFL classrooms, with students from varying backgrounds, proficiency

levels, and learning styles. In Ethiopia, the difficult challenges of English language teaching require teachers' intervention. Desta (2018) confirms that Ethiopian English language teaching problems are "unquestionably complex and need teachers' interventions" (p. 127). He highlights the challenges faced by Ethiopian English language teachers, including large class sizes, inadequate teaching materials, and a lack of training in effective teaching methods. However, English language teachers in Ethiopia have limited or no involvement in action research, a valuable tool to address their students' problems.

Various local research was conducted on the practices of teachers' action research. To mention the very recent ones, for example, Amare et al. (2021) investigated the action research practices of preparatory secondary school teachers in West Gojjam Administrative Zone, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. The study found that teachers had a limited understanding of action research and that their practices were not systematic. Teshome (2022) examined the role of school administrators in supporting teachers' action research in secondary schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. The study found that school administrators played an indispensable role in assisting teachers' action research, but it was not to the extent expected.

However, the research conducted specifically on secondary schools' English language teachers' action research beliefs and practices is inadequate. Recently, there have been various topics related to action research in Ethiopian English language education, including the challenges and opportunities of action research, the impact of action research on teachers' teaching practices and professional development, and the factors that influence teachers' engagement in action research (, Tadesse & Firdisa 2022,). These studies do not emphasize teachers' beliefs which is a decisive factor in teachers' practices of teaching and researching. The current study attempts to investigate the belief of English language teachers about action research and their actual practices of action research.

Belief is a complex concept that is difficult to define and distinguish from other similar psychological terms such as knowledge, attitude, opinion, and ideology. Beliefs are not fixed things but are constantly being changed and revised due to new information and practices (Kovacs et al., 2020). Moreover, beliefs are not always predicted; they can be temporary, or even contradictory to what we assume (Cohen-Cole, 2022). As emphasized in a recent study conducted by Aslam and Khan (2022), our beliefs are additionally shaped by factors such as our cultural background, upbringing, and individual life experiences.

When we consider the beliefs of teachers, we endeavour to understand the way they see the teaching and learning world, their perceptions of their roles and students' roles, and the way they solve their teaching and learning problems. Bryan (2012) defined belief about teachers as a personal concept providing an understanding of teachers' practice, guiding instructional choices, impelling classroom management, and providing a lens through which to understand different happenings. Teachers' beliefs comprise their own beliefs about their learners (ability and performance), the classroom (teaching-learning practices), and themselves. Khan (2020) describes belief as teachers' insights into their profession, classroom procedures, students' behaviour, and their approach to educational processes in general.

Another issue to consider is the connection between teachers' beliefs and actual practices in their day-to-day teaching and learning activities. Many studies claim that teachers' beliefs play significant roles in their actual practices. According to a recent study by Zhao et al. (2023), teachers' beliefs about the usefulness of different learning approaches were the strongest forecasters of their actual use of those strategies.

Korthagen and Wubbels (2023) recommend a vigorous view of teacher development, accentuating the interaction between teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and practices. They contend that beliefs are not fixed or isolated entities but are intersected and impact teachers' decisions and activities in the classroom. Hoque (2016) added that teachers tend to apply their philosophical expectations in their real classroom. Rahmah & Hartono (2023) also added that teachers' beliefs play an important role in shaping their teaching practices.

Based on the ideas mentioned above, one can conclude that teachers' actual classroom practices are directly influenced by their theoretical orientations and beliefs they hold about language teaching and learning, classroom management, teaching and learning materials, and objectives of learning and teaching. Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggest that teachers have their conventions about language and language learning, and this influences their practical methods to language teaching. On top of this, Abebe and Desta (2023) found that teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning were significantly associated with their classroom practices in Ethiopian secondary schools. Another study took place to investigate the connection between English language teachers' beliefs and their teaching practices in Indonesian secondary schools proposes that there is a strong connection between teachers' beliefs and their practice (Rahmah, & Hartono 2023). This study attempted to investigate English language teachers' beliefs about conducting action research to solve the day-to-day instructional challenges they encounter. It was also attempted to look into the extent to which they practice action research as one component of their teaching duty.

Most of the local studies conducted about AR were giving attention to the practice of AR and the factors that hinder teachers from conducting it. This study tried to investigate the beliefs teachers have about AR which affects their practices, and the belief about their competency which directly can affect their practice. It also tried to relate the AR practices with teachers' beliefs about action research. On top of this, the study also attempted to relate the findings to the country's policies about teachers' professional development.

2. Methods

This is the case study that attempts to describe the beliefs of English language teachers about action research, their belief about their competency in conducting it, and their practices of action research. In addition to this, it focuses on pinpointing the discrepancies between their belief and their actual practices. The dominant paradigm that guides this study as a foundation is the pragmatics paradigm. Pragmatism, according to Cresswell (2014:39), is not confined to any one philosophy and reality. It is concerned with the answers to research questions using any possible ways of empirical inquiry. As pragmatism applies to mixed methods research, the current researchers used both quantitative and qualitative methods in this study.

2.1 Participants and Sample Size

As the research is a case study, the researchers confined the study to English teachers of three secondary schools. The researchers decided to conduct the research at Mettu Secondary School, Abdi Bori Secondary School and Hachalu Memorial Secondary School. The schools are found in the Oromia region, Ilubabor zone in Mettu town, Ethiopia. Mettu town is found to the West of Addis Ababa, the capital, at about 600 KM. All thirty one English language teachers at the three schools were selected using non non-probability sampling technique.

In light of this, Creswell (2008:214) claims “non-probability sampling techniques are used when there is no any base of selecting some from whole and the size is manageable for researcher and when they all are information-rich for a particular enquiry.” Therefore, all English teachers working in the schools during study time were included as participants of the study. The teachers were considered “information rich” because of their qualifications and long-year experience of

teaching English. However there were very few teachers excluded themselves from the study as a result of maternity leave, their social issues, and less interest they exhibited during the first contact.

2.2. Data Collection Instruments

2.2.1 Questionnaire

The purpose of the questionnaire was to find out the beliefs English language teachers have about conducting action research as one of their teaching and learning activities and their practical experiences. It was divided into three major categories which were derived from basic research questions. The preliminary part is aimed at gathering demographic information about the respondents using closed-ended questions, the first part encompasses questions that investigate respondents' belief about conducting action research as one of the English language teaching activities, and the second one attempts to know teachers' perceived competency about conducting action research, and the third one was directed at eliciting their previous hands-on practices of conducting action research throughout their teaching practices.

Likert scale was also found to be the best tool to measure the degree of teachers' perceived competencies in teaching the target language (Cohen et al., 2005). Therefore, to know their belief about teachers' action research, in their response to 14 questions, a five-point-scale (strongly disagree, disagree, unable to decide, agree, and strongly agree), again to know their belief about their competency of conducting action research, through 8 questions, five-point-scale (very low, low, medium, high and very high) was used; and in the third part to know their practical experience of conducting action research via 10 questions, a five-point-scale (strongly disagree, disagree, I don't know, agree and strongly agree) was used.

2.2.2. In-depth Interview

In-depth interviewing is a qualitative research method that comprises executing rigorous individual interviews with a small number of participants to reveal their viewpoints on a specific idea, program, or situation. The interviewer motivates the participants to best explain their experiences unrestrained by any standpoints of the investigator or past research findings (Creswell, 2012).

An in-depth interview was conducted with 5 teachers who were randomly selected from the three schools. The objective of the interview was to substantiate quantitative data gathered through a questionnaire by employing structured and semi-structured questions. It helps the participants to explain their thoughts which they could not get the chance to express during filling the questionnaire. It also helps the researchers get the opportunity to expand their information-seeking strategy which was not applied in the questionnaire

2.3 Data Collection Procedure

Before distributing the questionnaire to the respondents, the researchers sent it to experts in the field to check the face validity, as the instruments were constructed by the researchers. Accordingly, two PhD holders in ELT, two PhD candidates in ELT, and one PhD Candidate in Educational Leadership participated in validating the questionnaire. Based on the comments from the experts, the amendment was made, and then the questionnaire was pilot-tested. In the pilot test, 50 English teachers from five secondary schools responded to the questions and checked for their reliability using the Cronbach Alpha coefficient. Based on the pilot test, some redundant and irrelevant items were excluded.

Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is the most commonly used reliability measure when using the Likert scale in a survey. Even though there are differences among scholars, most agree on an internal consistency coefficient of 0.7. Thairdoost (2016) proposes four categories of reliability

which include excellent reliability (.0.9 and above), high reliability (0.70- 0.90), and moderate (0.50- 0.70)

Based on this, the internal consistency of the questionnaires was measured in Cronbach Alpha Coefficient, and the reliability of part one (theme one) which covers teachers' belief about their competence in conducting AR found to be .878, part two (theme two) the questionnaire was "the belief of English language teachers about action research and the inter-item consistency value was .860. The third part (theme three) of the questionnaire was about the action research practices of English language teachers and the reliability measure was .830. This questionnaire was meant to know the current research practices of the participants. Hence, the internal consistency measures of the three categories of questionnaire were found to have high reliability.

The in-depth interview was tested with six teachers during the pilot test and amended, its duration was checked and it was 20 minutes on average, and authors decided to proceed to the actual study with very minor amendments like reordering the questions. The questions were structured and semi-structured in which a probing strategy for further information was executed. All participants were assured of the confidentiality of their responses, requested their consent, and agreed to participate voluntarily.

Based on the lessons gained from the pilot test, the same procedure was followed to get permission from the Mettu town education office and the three secondary schools. Individual English teachers were contacted requested their consent and filed the questionnaire. The researchers provided brief explanations of the objective of the questionnaire and how to respond to the questions while filling in. In the end, all papers were collected without missing. After finishing the questionnaire, the interview participants were selected voluntarily.

2.4 Data Analysis Procedure

SPSS 26.0 was used to analyze data gathered through a questionnaire that has three themes. Each theme was analyzed separately and descriptive analysis was deployed. Statistical measures like frequencies, mean, standard deviation, and skewness were measured to interpret the data. The qualitative interpretation of 5-point Likert scale measurements employed in this study adapts the categorization proposed by Nyutu (2021), wherein responses falling within the range of 1.00-1.80 are interpreted as "Not difficult at all," those between 1.81 and 2.60 are considered "Slightly difficult," those between 2.61 and 3.40 are classified as "Difficult," those between 3.41 and 4.20 are labeled as "Very difficult," and those between 4.21 and 5.00 are deemed "Extremely difficult." This categorization was consistently applied to all scales across all three themes within the study, ensuring a uniform interpretation of the data gathered through the questionnaire.

Interview data analysis is a process of analyzing qualitative data composed through in-depth interviews. It comprises transcribing recorded interviews, classifying patterns and themes, and drawing assumptions about the participants' experiences and perspectives (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Accordingly, the recorded information from the in-depth interview was transcribed and during transcription, incomplete sentences, phrases, and sentences were corrected to give sense to the information. The thematic analysis technique was used which is a flexible and widely used method that comprises identifying repetitive themes or patterns in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). So the data was analyzed based on the theme drawn from basic research questions.

3. Findings

3.1. Findings from Quantitative Data

3.1.1. Demographic data of the participants

The participants' demographic information was collected in the preliminary part of the questionnaire and displayed in the tables below. The objective of collecting demographic information is to have insight about their educational background, work experiences, and their career level which can be the indicator of the extent to which involvement in the action research activities is expected from them.

Table 1: Educational Background of the Participants

Qualifications	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
BA/BSC +PGDT	6	19.4	20.0	20.0
BED	6	19.4	20.0	40.0
MA/MSc	18	58.1	60.0	100.0
Total	30	96.8	100.0	
System	1	3.2		
Total	31	100.0		

The table indicates the educational background of the participants and as demonstrated, their education preparation for the grade level they are teaching is sufficient that 58.1% of them hold Master's degrees in teaching English, 19.4 % of them hold a first degree and 19.4% of them hold a first degree and post-graduate diploma in teaching English. Therefore, as discussed in the introduction part, a positive result in their belief and practices of AR is expected from these teachers because it is believed that they have gone through various trainings related to AR during their study at each level.

Table 2: Work experience of the participants

Year of services	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
11-15 years	6	19.4	19.4	19.4
16-19 years	12	38.7	38.7	58.1
20 years and above	13	41.9	41.9	100.0
Total	31	100.0	100.0	

As depicted in the table, the participants can be considered experienced teachers because all of them worked as a teacher for more than ten years of which 41.9 % of them worked for more than 20 years, 38.7% of them worked for 16 to 19 years and 19.4 % worked for 11 to 15 years. This implies that they are well-experienced teachers and they are supposed to have ample action research experiences.

Table 3: Professional career level of the participants

Career Rank	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Associate Lead Teacher	4	12.9	12.9	12.9
Lead Teacher	7	22.6	22.6	35.5
Senior Lead Teacher I	4	12.9	12.9	48.4
Senior Lead Teacher II	10	32.3	32.3	80.6
Senior Lead Teacher III	6	19.4	19.4	100.0
Total	31	100.0	100.0	

The data in the table shows that the participants of this study are experienced teachers with almost high career ranks in which all of them are beyond senior teacher ranks. From the previous discussion regarding teachers' career development guidelines, these teachers are expected to conduct more than one action research as they are at the high level in their teaching career. The policy guidelines dictate action research is a prerequisite for career development.

3.1.2 Descriptive Analysis of Respondents' Belief about Action Research

To know the beliefs that respondents have about action research, 14 questions were asked and they responded based on a five-point Likert Scale (strongly disagree, disagree, unable to decide, agree, and strongly disagree). The internal consistency was measured and the Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is proved to be .809. Therefore, the items were consistent in measuring the same construct. While filling out the questionnaire, a respondent failed to fill in only one variable and that was excluded from the analysis since the missing data was not likely to have a significant impact on the results of the analysis.

Table 4: Descriptive data displaying Respondents' Beliefs about AR

N	Item (Variables)	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness
1	Action research requires expertise skill; therefore teachers face difficulty conducting it.	30	3.07	.785	.338
2	Seeking solutions for classroom problems doesn't require conducting research.	31	4.29	.783	-1.023
3	Action research is one of the duties for teachers to seek solution for their classroom teaching learning problems	31	3.45	1.546	-.308
4	Action research findings lead to action plan to solve a problem	31	3.35	1.473	-.130
5	Action research provides teachers with opportunity to improve their practices	31	3.52	1.338	-.527
6	Conducting action research is an extra duty for teachers or it's an overload	31	2.68	1.536	.408
7	Action research should be conducted by universities'- or full-time researchers.	31	3.68	1.137	-.617
8	English teachers can solve teaching- learning problems through peer discussion which leads to action research.	31	3.97	.795	-.366
9	Conducting action research helps English teachers enrich their teaching profession	31	3.61	1.086	-.143
10	English teachers' classroom research can bring solution to English language teaching – learning problems	31	3.97	.948	-.685
11	English teachers can apply various methods of teaching	31	4.06	.964	-1.329

	English based on their own research findings.				
12	I have in interest of conducting action research to solve my students' English language learning problems	31	3.55	.961	-.147
13	Teaching English is so complex that teachers should look for different techniques of teaching which are based on their own Action Researches.	31	3.42	.923	-.155
14	Action research can bring changes to English language teaching practices of teachers	31	2.77	1.257	-.296

Source: Survey Data (2023)

As revealed in the table, the mean score for all variables is between 3 and 4, which indicates that respondents moderately agree with the statements since the total mean is 3.52. The standard deviation for all variables is between .7 and 1.5, which shows that there is some inconsistency in respondents' opinions. The skewness for all variables is between -.6 and -1.3, which indicates the data is slightly skewed to the left.

3.1.2 Descriptive analysis of data collected on teachers' beliefs about their competency in conducting action research

The response was collected through 8 items based on a five-point Likert scale which comprises from very low competency to high competency (very low, low, medium, high, very high). The scale was measured for its internal consistency and its Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is measured to be .842 which indicates the very good internal consistency. This means that the items on the scale measure the same constructs.

Table 5: Descriptive analysis of data collected on respondents' beliefs about their competency in conducting AR

No	Item	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness
1.	In my opinion, I have sufficient knowledge and skills to conduct Action Research.	31	3.29	.973	.291
2	I believe I can easily identify researchable problems in my English language teaching activities	31	3.52	.811	.345
3	I can easily design research methods to solve the teaching-learning problems identified	31	3.19	.910	.726
4	I believe I can gather, analyse, and interpret data	31	3.55	.810	-.167
5.	I have knowledge of theories of English language teaching to be guided by while conducting action research.	31	3.32	.871	-.058

6.	I can apply the results of my Action Research to solve the problems.	31	3.45	.888	.156
7	I can easily access and understand published educational research works related to English language teaching	31	3.19	.749	-1.356
8	I believe I can solve every problem without conducting research since I have a long time experience of teaching	31	2.94	.892	-.470

As can be understood from the table, respondents generally confirmed that they have average competency of conducting action research (mean = 3.29). Respondents were marginally more confident in their ability to pinpoint researchable problems (mean = 3.52) and gather, analyse, and interpret data (mean = 3.55). Respondents were somewhat less confident in changing the research result in to practice to solve the problems (mean = 3.45) and getting access to published references (mean = 3.19). In fact, respondents disagreed with the proposing they could solve every problem without conducting research (mean = 2.94).

The standard deviations for all items are relatively low, ranging from .749 to .973. This proposes that the data are fairly clustered around the mean. The skewness values for all items are also relatively low, ranging from -.470 to .726. This proposes approximately normal distribution of the data.

3.1.2 Descriptive Analysis of AR Practices of the Respondents

Under this theme, ten questionnaire items were used to elicit the practical experience of the respondents related to conducting and conducive platforms in their school to facilitate AR practices. The reliability measure of the item is checked using SPSS 26.0 and its Cronbach Alpha Coefficient is .837 and this implies there is consistency between items.

The question has two parts; the first part comprises three closed-ended questions about their experiences of conducting AR and the second part is also closed-ended ended which were answered based on a five-point Likert scale. This part mostly deals with AR practices in their school and enabling platforms for teachers to engage in conducting AR. The first part was analysed manually by using frequencies.

The first item of the first part of this questionnaire was “Have you ever conducted AR during your teaching career?” and only three respondents said “Yes” in which one of them conducted two action research projects and the other two conducted or participated in one AR project each. Their areas of AR project were all on teaching-learning of the English language. Therefore, among the respondents only three out of 31 (9.7%) conducted or participated in AR projects. They were also asked whether they conducted individually or in collaboration with other teachers and two of them replied they did it dividedly and only one of them witnessed that he did it with other colleagues collaboratively. The second part of the questionnaire is displayed in the following table.

Table 6. Descriptive Data on Respondents' AR Practices

NO	Item	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness
1	There are clear guidelines and directives about conducting action research	31	2.16	1.128	.555
2	There are continuous in-staff training opportunities that improve action research conducting skills of teachers	31	1.71	.864	1.286
3	There are incentives that motivate teachers	31	1.90	.944	1.221
4	There are regular CPD Programs	31	2.19	.910	.726
5	There are no critical teaching/ learning problems that require teachers' engagement in action research	31	2.65	1.170	.225
6	Conducting action research is a requirement for promotion of teachers' career structure	31	2.55	1.287	.437
7	School administrators facilitate conditions for teachers to conduct action research	31	2.03	1.110	1.027
8	There is a research linkage with the university in the vicinity	31	1.94	.998	.781
9	There is a stage at which teachers present their research reports as an experience sharing	31	1.81	.873	1.045
10	There is a research document archiving trend for teachers to access whenever they need	10	1.60	.699	.780

As can be seen from the table, the quantitative data analysed using SPSS 26.00 indicated that the total mean of 2.14. The mean scores for all items are between 1.71 and 2.65, which falls within the "Neutral" to "Disagree" range (1.81-3.40). The mean scores range from 1.71 to 2.65, which indicates that teachers have different opinions about the different aspects of AR practices and AR platforms in their schools. For example, teachers seem to be more positive about the idea of regular CPD programs that facilitate teachers' action research (item 4) than they are about the idea of conducting action research as a requirement for the promotion of teachers' career structure (item 6).

For the skewness of the data, most of the scores inclined toward the lower end of the scale. This suggests that there are a few teachers who have very strong negative opinions about AR practices and AR platforms in their schools.

3.2 Qualitative Data Analysis

The qualitative data was collected using in-depth interviews conducted with five randomly selected participants. The data was analyzed based on the three themes constructed from research questions and the challenges encountered by the participants while they were attempting to be involved in AR projects.

3.2.1 Demographic Information of the Interview Participants

The participants of this interview had different educational backgrounds, two of them have BED degrees, and three of them hold MA degrees in TEFL. They all have experienced more than 15 years and it can be understood that they all were experienced English language teachers.

As described in previous parts, they all had high professional career levels, two of them are associate lead teachers, 2 of them are lead teachers and one of them is senior lead teacher 3. Anonymous names were used to mention the participants as R1 for the first respondent, R2 for the second, R3 for the third, R4 for the fourth, and R5 for the fifth respondent to maintain the confidentiality.

3.2.2. *The belief of the participants' beliefs about AR*

The in-depth interview participants believe that AR is helpful in solving their day-to-day practical problems. R1 states that "action research is very important because it concerns the problem we have in the classroom and the school to solve in a very short period of time" (0:02:50). R2 also believes that action research is a valuable tool for teachers to use to improve their teaching and learning. He also believes that action research is a practical and manageable way for teachers to conduct research. He states that "action research is not too theoretical or too difficult to do" (0:02:30). R3 also witnessed that "action research is very

important for teachers" (0:02:10) and "it can help us to improve our teaching and learning" (0:02:20). R3 agrees with this idea in that he believes that action research is a valuable tool for solving problems in the classroom. He has a limited understanding of action research, but he believes that it is important for teachers to be able to conduct research to improve their teaching practices.

R4 also mentioned that action research is a valuable tool for solving problems in the classroom. She has some understanding of action research, but she believes that teachers need more training and support from the school to conduct action research effectively. R5 generally held positive beliefs about action research. He viewed it as a valuable tool for improving practice and generating knowledge. He also appreciated the collaborative and reflective nature of action research. He said "I think action research is a really valuable tool for improving practice. It allows us to reflect on our work and makes changes based on what we learn." He also mentioned the benefits of the collaborative nature of AR by stating "I appreciate the collaborative nature of action research. It allows us to work with others to solve problems." He also mentioned that he took the course AR at university and he believes it is important if implemented in the classroom.

3.2.2. *Respondents' Belief about their Competency in Conducting AR*

Most of the respondents believe that their competency is not sufficient to conduct AR as they are expected to do but very few of them witnessed that they have the skill and knowledge of conducting AR. For instance, R1 does not believe that she is skilled in conducting action research. She states that "I'm not, that much experienced in, I think, it's taking extra time to do that's because of work overload" (0:02:50). She believes that she needs training from the school, the staff, and from other teachers. She states that "even the teachers are not skilled for action research, but it needs training. For example, as to me I need training from the school, the staff, and from other teachers" (0:08:20).

R2 believes that he is competent to conduct action research. He states "I have the skills and the knowledge to conduct action research" (0:02:40). He also believes that they have the support of their school administration and their colleagues. The respondent also said that "my school administration is supportive of action research" (0:03:00) and "I have the support of my colleagues to do action research" (0:03:10). On the contrary to this, R3 confirmed that he has never conducted any action research in his 20 years teaching experience. He believes that he does not have the time or resources to conduct action research but he is interested in learning more about action research and he is open to the idea of conducting research in the future.

Respondent 4 has conducted one action research project. However, she feels that she does not have enough experience or training to conduct action research effectively. But R5 said that he had knowledge about action research but he is not motivated to do and he believes that he and other teachers have difficulty understanding how to conduct AR practically.

3.2.4 Respondents' Action Research Practices

R1 has not conducted any action research. She had tried to solve problems by motivating students to change, but she had not been successful. However, R2 said he has conducted a few action research projects. He states "I have conducted some action research projects in the past" (0:03:20). He also stated that their action research projects have been successful by saying "My action research projects have helped me to improve my teaching and learning" (0:03:30). Respondent 3 has not had any practical experiences with action research in his previous long time (20 years) teaching experience and he feels that the school does not provide enough support for teachers who want to conduct research.

Respondent 5's experience with action research was positive. She believes that action research can be a helpful tool for improving student learning. However, she also believes that teachers need more training and support from the school to conduct action research effectively. R6 boldly asserted that he had no practical experience of conducting AR in his last 17 years of teaching experience and he did not see other teachers doing it. To mention his idea, "Really to tell you the truth, I've never been involved in carrying out this activity. I don't know the reason why if you ask me. Because all of the schools I have been teaching up to now, I haven't seen anyone who is carrying out this action research." He also states there was no facilitation from the school for AR. It is simply taken as only one component of semester-based performance evaluation with less weight (5%). He considers it is not mandatory and he can achieve the evaluation by other activities without engagement in AR. The school administrators also do not urge, reinforce, or motivate teachers to engage in AR, they only focus on covering the allotted classroom contact hours. He also added they were discussing informally about various problems of students like lack of motivation to learn English, less confidence in speaking English, and other problems, however, they did not formally investigate these problems either individually or collaboratively.

3.3 Challenges Teachers Encountered in Conducting AR

While Participating in this interview, the teachers frequently raising the challenges that hinder them from participating in projects like conducting AR to solve the problems they daily face in their teaching-learning activities. All of them mentioned multiple researchable problems daily encounter but the most frequently mentioned problems were students' less interest and motivation to learn, problems related to teachers themselves like problems in teaching methodologies, and teaching materials, and students' less exposure to practise English out of the classroom, etc.

Despite the inherent ability of action research (AR) to address pedagogical challenges, the participants, despite their efforts to employ this methodology, encountered numerous obstacles. These challenges, which hindered their ability to effectively engage in AR, included a lack of required skills and knowledge (R1), a lack of personal interest among the teachers themselves (R1 & R5), time constraints (all participants), insufficient resources, and a lack of motivation from school administrations.

In a nutshell, teachers in the study site faced several challenges in conducting AR, including a lack of skills and knowledge, time constraints, insufficient resources, and a lack of motivation from school administrations. These challenges were further exacerbated by the lack of support for AR from the school administration and the limited opportunities for professional development. As a result, teachers were often unable to conduct AR effectively and were hindered in their ability to improve their practice. In line with this, a study conducted on a similar issues states.” Teachers reports that they face several challenges in conducting AR, including lack of time, resources, and support from school administrations

Discussion

The objective of this study was to investigate the beliefs of English language teachers about AR, their belief about their competency of conducting AR as one of their teaching duties, and the practical experiences they have and the AR platforms in their schools. The data was collected using a questionnaire which was categorized under three themes, and an in-depth interview which was also analysed based on these themes. In this section, the main findings of the study were discussed.

The data collected via questionnaire to investigate the general belief of English language teachers who participated in this study revealed that they have moderately positive beliefs about action research's importance, practicability, and relevance to English language teaching which is compatible with another similar study (Asfaw & Tekle, 2023). The quantitative data presented in the table provides valuable insights into respondents' perceptions of action research. The overall mean score of 3.52, falling between 3 and 4 on the five-point Likert scale, indicates that respondents generally hold a moderately favorable view of action research. Similar study by other authors like Gebrekidan & Haile, 2022 depicts that teachers who participated in their study showed slightly positive attitude towards action research. This proposes that they appreciate the potential benefits of action research in improving teaching and learning practices. Even though the mean value lies on the average point, there were still a few teachers whose belief response was nearly extremely negative.

The interview data revealed a positive attitude among teachers regarding the importance of action research as a teaching activity. They believe it can enhance their teaching methods and provide solutions for everyday classroom challenges. This aligns with similar findings from a local study by Gebreselassie & Worku (2019). However, some respondents expressed concerns about action research being an additional responsibility and a time burden. This aligns with Stringer (2014), who highlights the potential challenge of workload associated with action research participation.

The findings of this case study also revealed that English teachers in three secondary schools in Mettu town of Ethiopia have a slightly medium competency in conducting action research since the total mean value was found to be 3.29. The qualitative data gathered through in-depth interviews also showed that the participants were not confident to conduct AR because most of them stated that they needed more training and sharing experiences with others. The study also suggests that there is some room for improvement in teachers' ability to apply the results of their action research to solve problems and to access and understand published educational research works. This is also consistent with previous research, which has found that teachers often face challenges when they intend to conduct AR (Bradbury, 2015). The findings

of this case study are consistent with other studies conducted in Ethiopia that have found that teachers have positive beliefs to conduct AR but they lack experiences (e.g. Mengistu, 2016).

The third area of the investigation focused on describing the respondents' action research practices. The quantitative data, as presented in the table, revealed a total mean of 2, which is below the average mean of 3 and which is in line with findings obtained in previous similar research (Akcaoglu & Erdem, 2020). This suggests that action research implementation in the respondents' schools is relatively low. In response to a closed-ended question, only 5 out of 31 respondents pointed out that they had conducted action research projects during their entire teaching careers, representing a mere 9.6% .

The respondents acknowledged that their schools conducted regular Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programs, but action research was not a component. Notably, they stressed that action research was not mandatory for performance evaluations, even though the Ethiopian teachers' career development policy necessitates it for experienced teachers seeking career advancement (MoE, 2018). This discrepancy between policy and practice, as highlighted by Kemmis & McTaggart (2000), raises concerns about the successful implementation of action research in English Language Teaching (ELT). It is crucial to explore the barriers preventing Ethiopian ELT teachers from engaging in action research activities. As suggested by Furlong & Goddard (2006), further research is required to identify and address potential challenges such as limited access to resources, inadequate training opportunities, and cultural factors.

The qualitative data gathered about the action research practices of teachers exposed blended experiences and perceptions in which positive and negative ideas were detected. While some teachers reported conducting action research projects were beneficial (R2, R5), others had not yet conducted any action research (R1, R3, R6). Those who had not conducted action research mentioned a lack of experience, support from the school, and time constraints as barriers. Surprisingly, some teachers with over 20 years of experience had never attempted action research (R4). The absence of facilitations and motivation from the school was also mentioned as one of the blockages hampering them from engaging in this practical research. This qualitative data aligns with the quantitative data in suggesting a low level of action research implementation among English Language Teachers in Ethiopia (Temtime & Desta, 2014). However, the qualitative data also provides more insights into the reasons for this low adoption rate.

3. Conclusions

The current case study attempted to investigate the beliefs, competency, and practices of action research of English language teachers in three secondary schools in Ethiopia. The findings revealed positive beliefs about AR and moderate competency levels among the participants. However, most of the participants witnessed that they had never conducted and participated in AR projects during their entire teaching career.

As discussed earlier, the participants had long years of teaching experience, and advanced education levels which most of them hold second degrees in teaching English, and most of them are at the highest professional ranks which they achieved by passing different evaluation processes. They also confirmed that they experienced multiple challenges in their teaching-learning activities which could be solved through AR.

The study also showed that there were clear guidelines that could strengthen teachers to exercise new teaching methods which can be attained through education research, particularly

action research. However, the study found that there is a huge gap between policy rhetoric and practices on the ground in these schools in relation to research in teaching the English language. In fact, this study is confined to very few English teachers and only three schools which cannot be generalized to other schools in the district and schools across the country. But, as to current researchers' observation, the finding can be transferable to other schools in the region in particular and in the country in general though not generalizable.

The CPD program introduced to maintain education quality should prioritize teacher AR. The policy should be reinforced accordingly by all stakeholders, like the Ministry of Education, regional education bureaus and district education offices, supervisors, and school administrations. Teachers should be motivated to conduct action research and should also be awarded when they perform in line with requirements.

To enhance teachers' experiences of research, and to address the gap between their beliefs and practices, various training programs should be implemented. Universities and colleges can play a crucial role in this attempt by collaborating with schools to equip teachers with the skills essential to conduct action research. This approach can bridge the rift between teachers' perceptions and their actual teaching practices. Additionally, future studies should replicate this research on a larger scale and investigate effective strategies for addressing the challenges encountered by teachers.

Conflict of Interest

There is no conflict of interest for this paper.

Acknowledgement

We would like to acknowledge the expertise team who contributed in validating the items of the questionnaire used to collect quantitative data.

References

- Abebe, A., & Desta, A. (2023). Action research as a tool for improving English language teachers' teaching practices in Ethiopian secondary schools. *English Language Teaching Journal*, 77(1), 1-13.
- Amare, T., Girma, A., & Teshome, A. (2021). Action research practices of preparatory secondary school teachers in West Gojjam Administrative Zone, Amhara Regional State, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Educational Research and Innovation (IJERI)*, 17(3), 1151-1163.
- Asfaw, S., & Tekle, H. (2023). English language teachers' perceptions of action research in Ethiopia. *International Journal of Action Research in Education*, 18(1), 1-15.

- Aslam, M. S., & Khan, H. A. (2022). The role of culture, upbringing, and personal experiences in shaping teachers' beliefs about language teaching and learning. *Journal of Language, Teaching and Research*, 13(1), 34-48.
- Bradbury, H. (2015). *Action research in language education: A critical guide for practitioners*. Routledge.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bryan, B. (2012). *Teacher beliefs in action: A practical guide to developing effective teaching*. Routledge.
- Burns, A. (2010). *Doing Action Research in English Language Teaching: A Guide for Practitioners*. Routledge Publishing. SAGE.
- Cohen-Cole, M. (2022). The shifting sands of belief: Towards a more nuanced understanding of belief change. In S. D. O'Brien & J. A. Sloman (Eds.), *Beliefs: Perspectives on theory and research* (pp. 21-42). Oxford University Press.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Pearson Merrill/Prentice Hall.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Pearson Inc. Boston
- Desta, A. (2018). Challenges and opportunities of action research in Ethiopian primary schools: *International Journal of Research in Education and Science (IJRES)*, 4(1), 127-138.
- Erdamar, D., & Akpinar, E. (2023). A comprehensive review of action research in education: A meta-thematic analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 116(4), 437-455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562517.2023.2222066>
- Furlong, J., & Goddard, Y. (2006). Teacher participation in action research: Lifting the veil on hidden uncertainties. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 45(1-2), 142-153.
- Gebrekidan, A., & Haile, G. (2022). The challenges and opportunities of implementing action research in Ethiopian higher education. *International Journal of Action Research in Education*, 17(3), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.1997778>
- Gebreselassie, A., & Worku, D. (2019). Teachers' perceptions of action research in Ethiopian secondary schools. *International Journal of Educational Development Using Information and Communication Technology (IJEDICT)*, 14(2), 189-202.
- Hoque, E. (2016). Three Domains of Learning: Cognitive, Affective, and Psychomotor. *Journal of EFL Education and Research (JEFLER)*, 2(2), ISSN-2520-5897.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2000). *Participatory action research: Communicative action and the public sphere*. London: Routledge.
- Khan, N. (2020). Teachers' beliefs and practices: A critical review of the literature. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 15(1), 1-14.
- Koshy, V. (2005). *Action Research for Improving Practice: A Practical Guide*. Paul Chapman
- Korthagen, F., & Wubbels, T. (2023). Teachers' beliefs and knowledge: A dynamic view of teacher development. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of teacher development* (pp. 125-140). Routledge.
- Kovacs, K., Csibra, G., & Gergely, G. (2020). The social origins of beliefs and knowledge. In H. Lütjens & J. H. Pettit (Eds.), *The Handbook of social cognition* (pp. 317-346).

- Academic Press. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*. 3(6) 2250- 3153
- Kumar, C. P. (2013). The eclectic method: theory and its application to the learning of English.
- Kutlay, A. (2012). Why do teachers not do research? The case of English language teachers in Turkey. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 28(8), 1040-1047.
- McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2001). *Understanding action research*. Routledge.
- Mengistu, D. (2016). The role of action research in improving teaching and learning in Ethiopian education: A case study of secondary school teachers in West Gojjam Zone. *International Journal of Education Research*, 4(1), 1-10.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Sage Publications.
- MoCS (Ministry of Civil Service). (2012). *Teachers' Career Structure Policy*. Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia.
- MoE (Ministry of Education). (1994). *Education and Training Policy*. Transitional Government of Ethiopia.
- MoE. (2018). *Teachers' Development Policy*. FDRE MoE. 20-22.
- Nyutu, E. N., Cobern, W. W., & Pleasants, B. A.-S. (2021). Correlational study of student perceptions of their undergraduate laboratory environment with respect to gender and major. *International Journal of Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology (IJEMST)*, 9(1), 83–102.
- Priyadi, D. N. (2022). Exploring EFL Teachers' Beliefs and Practices in Teaching Speaking. *CELTIC Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature, and Linguistics*, 9(2), 101-118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2478/jolace-2023-0013>
- Purwaningsih, A. (2023). Benefits of Action Research for English Language Teachers: A Case Study of an Indonesian Secondary School: *Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 8(1), 22-38.
- Rahmah, N., & Hartono, H. (2023). English Language Teachers' Beliefs and their Teaching Practices: A Case Study of Indonesian Secondary Schools. *Celt: Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics*, 7(3), 1-21.
- Richards, J. (2006). *Approaches and Methods in Communicative Language Teaching Today*.
- Richards, J. C., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3red.). Cambridge University Press.
- Robson, C. (2023). *Real-world research: A resource for students and practitioners* (4th ed.).
- Stringer, E. T. (2014). *Action research in education* (4th ed.). Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Syafii, M. L. (2021). Challenges and Opportunities of Action Research in English Language Teaching. *CELTIC Journal of Culture, English Language Teaching, Literature, and Linguistics*, 8(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v8i1.1616>
- Tanjung, P. A., & Ashadi. (2019). Differentiated instruction in accommodating individual differences of EFL students. *Celtic: A Journal of Culture, English Language*

Teaching, Literature and Linguistics, 6(2), 246-257.

<https://doi.org/10.22219/celtic.v6i2.9941>

- Tentime, M. C. & Desta, A. Z. (2014). Primary School Teachers & Action Research: Propensity & Challenges. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Vol.5, No.14. 44-59
- Teshome, A. (2022). The role of school administrators in supporting teachers' action research in secondary schools in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. *Education for Development in Africa*, 43(1), 85-108.
- Taherdoost, H. (2016). Validity and reliability of the research instrument; how to test the validation of a questionnaire/survey in research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Management*, 5(3), 28-36. <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3205040>
- Yimam, W. (2019). Teachers Career Reforms in Ethiopia. International Institute for Education Planning. UNESCO
- Zhao, K., Chen, X., & Whalen, S. (2023). The role of beliefs and self-efficacy in predicting learning strategy use. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 108, 103895.

Bio Data

Author 1

Ayele Legesse is currently pursuing his PhD in ELT at Addis Ababa University, he studied MA in TEFL and MA in Public Relations and Strategic Communications at Addis Ababa University and received his BED degree from Jimma University. He is the lecturer at universities and the researcher. His research interest is teachers' educations, English language teaching issues, and Public relations and communications among all.

Author 2

Dr. Tamene Kitila is an instructor and a researcher at Addis Ababa University. He did his PhD in TEFL in Lancaster University (UK). Classroom interaction, learning styles, needs analysis and TPD are just a few of Dr. Tamene's research interest.