

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**AN EXPLORATION INTO THE INVOLVEMENT OF ELT
TEACHERS IN ACTION RESEARCH: THE CASE OF
THREE TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES**

CHERIE MESFIN

June, 2003

Addis Ababa

AN EXPLORATION INTO THE INVOLVEMENT OF ELT
TEACHERS IN ACTION RESEARCH: THE CASE OF
THREE TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES

BY

CHERIE MESFIN

ADDIS ABABA
JUNE, 2003

**AN EXPLORATION INTO THE INVOLVEMENT OF ELT
TEACHERS IN ACTION RESEARCH: THE CASE OF
THREE TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES**

**BY
CHERIE MESFIN**

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
OF ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY**

**IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIRMENTS OF
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS IN TEACHING
ENGLISH AS A FOREIGN LANGUAGE (T.E.F.L.)**

**ADDIS ABABA
JUNE, 2003**

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES**

**AN EXPLORATION IN TO THE OLVEMENT
OF ELT TEACHERS IN ACTION RESEARCH:
THE CASE OF THREE TEACHERS'
TRAINING COLLEGES**

**BY
CHERIE MESFIN**

INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES

Exam Board Members' Approval:

Advisor (Name)

Signature

Examiner (Name)

Signature

Examiner (Name)

Signature

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	
List of Tables	
Abstract.....	i
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
5.1 Background of the Study	1
5.2 Statement of the Problem	3
5.3 Purposes of the Study	4
5.4 Significance of the Study	4
5.5 The Scope of the Study	5
5.6 Limitations of the Study	5
5.7 Definition of Terms Used in this Study	6
5.8 Symbols Used in the Analyses and Transcriptions of the Study.....	6
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE	
1.0 Definition of Action Research	7
2.0 A Brief Historical Account of Action Research	10
3.0 Types of Action Research	12
4.0 The Rationale for Involving ELT Teachers in Action Research	14
5.0 The Beliefs and Attitudes of ELT Teachers Towards Action Research	16
6.0 The Fundamental Characteristics of Action Research.....	19
7.0 Action Research: Steps and Processes	21
8.0 Action Research: A Manifestation of Teacher Development.....	22
9.0 The Pros and Cons of the Validity of Action Research.....	23

10.0 Major Factors in Doing Action Research.....	24
11.0.0 Scholars' Views on Factors Affecting Teachers' Involvement in Action Research.....	25
12.0.0 Scholars' Views on Possible Solutions to Barriers in Undertaking Action Research	27

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD OF THE STUDY

1.0 Samples of the Study.....	29
2.0 Data Collection Instruments	31
3.0.0 Development of Instruments	31
4.0.0 Questionnaire	32
5.0.0 Interview	33
6.0 Data Analyses	36

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSES AND DISCUSSIONS

1.0 Description of the Questionnaire	38
2.0 Results of the Questionnaire.....	41
3.0 A Summary of ELT Teachers' Responses to The Semi-Structured Interview	68
4.0 The Description of the Interview Result Held With ELT Teachers	73
5.0 The Description of the Interview Result Held With Some College Principals	76

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1.0 Summary.....	79
5.8 Conclusions	82
5.8 Recommendations.....	83
BIBLIOGRAPHY	85
APPENDIX A: Questionnaire for ELT Teachers	92
APPENDIX B: Semi-Structured Interview for ELT Teachers.....	100
APPENDIX C: Semi-Structured Interview for College Principals.....	102
APPENDIX D: ELT Teachers’ Responses to the Interview	104
APPENDIX E: Some College Principals’ Responses to the Interview.....	111
APPENDIX F: The SPSS Analyses Results.....	116
APPENDIX G: The Profile of ELT Teachers Who Took Part in this Study	144
APPENDIX H: The Course Catalogue of English Department of Kotebe College of Teacher Education.....	145
APPENDIX I: The Course Catalogue of English Department of Nazereth College of Teacher Education.....	147
APPENDIX J: The Course Catalogue of English Department of Awassa College of Teacher Education.....	149

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
TABLE	
1: ELT Teachers Who Took Part in the Study by Filling in the Questionnaire.....	30
2: ELT Teachers Who Were Interviewed	31
3: College Principals Who Were Participated in the Interview	34
4: A Synopsis of the Different Sections, Proposes, and Number of Items of the Questionnaire.....	39
5: The Qualification Profile of ELT Teachers (Frequencies, Percentage, Mean, SD, and Variance).....	41
6: The Profile of ELT Teachers Total English Language Teaching Experience (Frequencies, Percentages, Mean, SD, Variance, and Range)	43
7: Number of Years That the ELT Teachers Were Involved in Language Teaching Research	44
8: The Computed t-test Value of the Predictor Variable (Qualification) on the Criterion Variables (Espoused Beliefs, Total English Language Teaching Experience, and Research in Action, Where (N=32, and DF= N-2, 30).....	45
9: The Intercorrelation Coefficients Among the Four Variable.	46
10: The Multiple and Step-wise Regression Analyses and Beta Weights for Each Criterion Variable	50
11: The Effect of Each Independent Variable (X_1 , X_2 , and X_3) on the Criterion Variable (Research in Action).....	51
12: ELT Teachers' Responses to 'Yes' or 'No' Questionnaire Items (Items 6,7,8,10,11,12,14,16,17,18,19, and 20)	53
13: The Frequencies and Percentages of Some Serious Action Research Constraints (for Questionnaire Items of 9, 13, and 15).....	54

14:	One Sample t-test Computations of Each Item of the Questionnaire to Check Whether Agreement and/or Disagreement Would be Above or Below Test Value (Mean)= 3, N=33 and DF= N-1 i.e., 32	58
15:	A Summary of One Sample t-test Computations of Table 15 to Check Whether Agreement and/or Disagreement Would be Above or Below Test Value (Mean)= 3, N,33, and DF = N-1 i.e., 32	64
16:	The Profile of ELT Teachers Who Were Participated in the Present Study	144

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Prior to everything, I am mindful of the immense and incalculable contributions made over the years by my present M.A. thesis advisor, Dejenie Leta, whom I remember for his friendly, brotherly, fatherly, and scholarly advice, comments, and criticisms which have become extremely crucial to the successful accomplishment of this M.A. thesis and to my future academic career as well.

I am equally thankful to the ELT teachers of the three teachers' training colleges who patiently participated in completing the questionnaire and cooperated in being interviewed.

My thanks extend further to college principals of the three teachers' training colleges for the good interest they showed to the interviewer.

Finally, I am also mindful of the follow-ups and cares I got from my mother, W/ro Yikanu Abegaz, and my brothers: Ato Dagenew Mesfin, and Ato Tegegne Asnakew.

KEY WORDS

- Exploration
- Involvement
- ELT
- Teachers
- Action-Research
- Three
- Teachers'
- Training
- Colleges

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to examine the extent to which ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges have been possibly involved in English language teaching action research, their attitudes towards action research, constraints which they have possibly encountered in carrying out action research, and some of the solutions to these constraints.

To this effect, the researcher, with the help of his M.A. thesis advisor, developed and administered a questionnaire consisting of four different sections, and conducted an interview. The questionnaire was administered to 33 ELT teachers whereas the interview was held with 8 ELT teachers and 6 college principals. Depending on the nature and types of the different sections of the questionnaire and the interview both descriptive statistics and inferential statistics were employed. As a result, the data gained through the semi-structured questionnaire and the interview were analyzed descriptively on the basis of common themes and issues of the respondents' responses. On the other hand, the respondents' responses to section 1 and section 3 of the questionnaire were analyzed through the help of the following inferential statistics: independent sample t- test, correlations, regression analyses, and one sample t- test.

Accordingly, some of the results, for example, the independent t-test for the mean scores of the samples seem to show a significant difference between the samples' (B.As' and M.As') total English language teaching experience and their practical involvement in action research where the p-value of each is found to be .01 and .04 and statistically significant at 5% level of significance. Besides, the regression analyses appeared to show the number of years that the samples believed to be involved in action research (espoused beliefs) as the main predictor of the criterion variable (research in action).

The pictures of both descriptive and inferential statistical analyses appeared to show that the ELT teachers did not make considerable efforts in undertaking English language teaching action research. However, the ELT teachers seemed to show positive attitudes towards action

research as one could possibly infer from the attitudes scale of one-sample t-test computations as revealed in Table 16. In addition, undermining the role(s) of research, lack of enough research skills, and the insufficiency of English language teaching research courses offered were some of the most serious research constraints reported to hamper the involvement of ELT teachers in English language teaching action research.

Accordingly, summary, conclusions, and recommendations were made based on the insights gained from these research findings. Finally, I forwarded some recommendations with the hope that the involvement of college ELT teachers in English language teaching action research would help to improve the instruction of English language in colleges, in particular, and would contribute to the betterment of English language teaching in Ethiopia, in general.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Like the other disciplines, language teaching classrooms, in general, and English language teaching, in particular, have become attractive areas of research interest among many educators - more specifically among English language teachers who are at the heart of the profession. In other words, classroom-based research works which can be possibly carried out by classroom teachers themselves can be of help to teachers to examine all the strengths and weaknesses of their teaching linked with the teaching of English as a foreign language. That seems to be the reason why action research is becoming a more revealing and relevant type of research to investigate the actual classroom practices of English language teaching in many countries such as Australia, America, Britain, and China as expressed by Nunan (1992), McNiff (1993), Hopkins (1993), Tharone and Qiang (1996), respectively.

In Ethiopia, however, the works of Seyoum Teferra (1998), Adane Tessera (2000), and Yalew Engdawork (2000) are a few of local research inputs which show the involvement of elementary, junior, secondary, and senior secondary school teachers in educational action research.

Despite these research findings, there seems to be a paucity of literature which has been done on the extent to which ELT teachers have been practising action research- more particularly in the context of teachers' training colleges.

The teaching of English language in Ethiopia, however, seems to have many problems. For example, Last (1969) reports that high school students have serious academic problems in using English as a medium of communication, and he adds that

these problems need some kind of systematic approach to be addressed. Later, Tesfaye Gashaw (1982) also indicates that high school students' English language proficiency is low.

Moreover, Mekonnen Disasa (1984), in his investigation of selected English language proficiency variables with particular reference to freshmen in Addis Ababa University, shows that freshmen English language proficiency is poor. According to him, poor quality of instruction, lack of sufficient exposure to the target language, the scarcity of reading resources, and poor reading background are some of the factors which seem to negatively affect freshmen English language proficiency.

Generally, the causes for low level of students' English language proficiency may be many and varied. Arguably, however, the possible causes for students' English language problems may be attributed to factors such as input factors, or teacher factors, or student factors. Apart from these anticipated classroom problems, it seems also worth practising for ELT teachers to investigate all the development which occur in their classroom instruction to further strengthen, promote, update and make effective their method of teaching.

In doing so, it is hoped that English language teachers can contribute their own to the betterment of English language instruction as Johnson (1993:66) puts it: "improved instruction, more reflective learners, professional growth and collegial sharing-all can result from involving teachers in classroom research."

In fact, in due course of harmonizing teaching and research, ELT teachers may have many possible ways of research options. That is to say, ELT teachers could employ different kinds of research in line with their interest, experience, qualification

as well as the nature of classroom problems and the need of the institution where they work. Action research, however, seems to be a feasible type of research to seek immediate and practical solutions to those anticipated academic classroom problems in teaching English as a foreign language (Van Lier, 1988; Jordan, 1997).

Presumably, this seems to be the reason why some scholars advocate the role of action research in ELT classrooms (Tharone and Qiang, 1996; Onel, 1997; Wallace, 1998; Burns, 1999).

Nevertheless, teacher-initiated research, which is action-research, has suffered from the literature of second language pedagogy presumably because of EFL teachers' perception of action research (Allwright and Bailey, 1991). Hardley (n.d.) and Crookes (1993), likewise, reveal the existing gap between research and teaching, on the one hand, and action research and English language teaching, on the other.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

All in all, the claims and counter-claims which have been made so far on the relevance and marginality of action research among ELT teachers have convinced the present researcher to carry out this research on the ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education. Furthermore, there seems to be a paucity of literature which shows the involvement of ELT teachers in action research in TEFL in Ethiopia both at the Master of Arts and Doctoral Dissertations.

Nevertheless, Skerritt (1992:15), citing Kemmis and his associates, states the practicality of action research in higher institution as follows:

At the higher education level action research is not only possible, but practically appropriate for at least five reasons which may be... summarized in the acronym CRASP: Action research promotes a

critical attitude, Research into teaching, Accountability, Self-evaluation and Professionalism all of which are important ... anywhere in the world.

Therefore, the above argument and the marginality of action research in English language teaching in Ethiopia initiated the present investigator to develop an interest in investigating the action-research involvement of ELT teachers in the above-mentioned three teachers' training colleges.

1.3 Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study, as already explained, is to point out how practical action research has been among ELT teachers of these three teachers' training colleges. More specifically, it is designed to find out possible answers to the following research questions:

1. How practical is action research among ELT teachers?
1. What are the attitudes of ELT teachers towards action research?
1. What are some of the major problems which college ELT teachers possibly encounter in conducting action research?
1. What are the possible solutions to these problems?

1.4 Significance of the Study

Investigating the involvement of college ELT teachers in action research is hoped to have invaluable contributions to English language instruction from many perspectives. Accordingly, this study is assumed to have a significant role in contributing to the quality of English language teaching. Then, it is hoped to have importance in raising action-research awareness of ELT professionals in Ethiopia so that action research could be employed in teaching English as a foreign language.

Furthermore, this study may be of help to all those concerned with the teaching of English as a foreign language such as teachers, curriculum experts, higher education research institutions, and educational authorities. Finally, this study may serve as a springboard for people who are interested in conducting further study in action research.

1.5 The Scope of the Study

As stated above, this study is limited to ELT teachers of only three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education. Presumably, it would have been better if the investigation was carried out on senior high school ELT teachers where there are quite a good number of samples.

Nevertheless, there seems to be no effort made by senior high school teachers in carrying out research activities as indicated in recent research findings (Seyoum Teferra, 1998; Yalew Engdawork, 2000). That is why the study has focused on the afore-mentioned three teachers' training colleges.

0.5 Limitations of the Study

In the present study, document analysis was planned to be used as another source of data to check the ELT teaches' practical involvement in English language teaching action research against their personal files across the three teachers' training colleges. However, due to ethical considerations of the law, i.e., right to privacy (Article 26), this was not done. Even then, all possible efforts were made while designing the questionnaire and the interview to gather relevant and adequate data for this M.A.

thesis. Moreover, some college principals were interviewed to check the ELT teachers' responses both to the questionnaire and the interview.

0.5 Definition of Terms Used in This Study

In this study, the terms "action research", "classroom research" and "teacher-initiated research" are used interchangeably. According to Wallace (1998:4), action research: " is done by systematically collecting data on your everyday practice and analyzing it in order to come to some decisions about what your future practice should be. This process is essentially what I mean by the term "action research".

It is from this definition point-of-view that the three terms have to be understood in this paper.

1.8 Symbols Used in the Analyses and Transcriptions of the Present Study

The following symbols were used in the two sections of the present study: the analyses section and the transcriptions section:

QUAL:	Qualification
ESB:	Espoused Beliefs i.e., Years That ELT Teachers Were Involved in English Language Teaching Action Research
TELTEX:	Total English Language Teaching Experience
RA:	Research in Action
T:	Teacher
CP:	College Principal

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

As stated earlier, the purpose of this study is to find out how practical action research has become among ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges. This section of the paper, therefore, discusses basic and relevant issues raised in the available literature.

Briefly, an attempt has been made to highlight the different definitions of action research, the historical overviews of action research, types of action research, the rationale for ELT teachers' involvement in action research, the teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards action research, the fundamental characteristics of action research, steps and processes in action research, teacher development, pros and cons of the validity of action research, as well as major factors in doing action research.

2.1 Definition of Action Research

Since its conception, many scholars with different focuses have defined action research differently at different times. Corey (1953), Widdowson (1990), Woods (1991), Nunan (1992), Cohen and Manion (1994), the International Encyclopedia of Education (1994), Bryant (1996), Scott and Usher (1999), Burns (1999), Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000), and Price (2001) are few of the examples.

As already indicated, these and many other scholars have defined action research, however, a small selection has been made of the definitions of action research which seem relevant to this study. So, an attempt will be made hereunder to give these definitions one by one and the common features they share.

Accordingly, Burns (1994:293) defines action research as, "... the application of fact finding to practical problem-solving in a situation with a view to improving the

quality of action within it, involving the collaboration and cooperation of researchers, practitioners and laymen.”

Similarly, Halsey (1972), as cited in Cohen and Manion (1994:186), defines action research as follows by relating it to a specific context it addresses as a point of reference: “Action research is a small scale intervention in the functioning of the real-world and a close examination of the effects of such intervention.”

Again, citing McTaggart (1986:5-6), Webb (1996:67) puts what has been taken perhaps as the standard definition of action research in most literature by giving focus on its collaborative nature as stated hereunder:

Action research is a form of collaborative self-reflective enquiry undertaken by participants in social situations in order to improve the rationality and justice of their own social or educational practices and the situation in which these practices are carried out. The approach is only action research when it is collaborative though it is important to realize that the action research of the group is achieved through the critically examined action of individual group members.

Furthermore, Corey (1953:6) gives the definition as follows: “Action research is the process by which practitioners attempt to study their own problems scientifically in order to guide, correct, and evaluate their decisions.”

Finally, the present researcher tries to conclude the definitions of action research by quoting Skerritt (1993:47) who gives the following definition: “I have described it as collaborative, critical (and self-critical) enquiry by reflective practitioners who are accountable and ... evaluate their own practice and engage in participative problem-solving and continuing professional development.”

All the definitions cited above seem to share more commonalities than differences which would possibly characterize action research. These common features may be summarized as follows:

3. The aim of action research seems to focus on investigating specific classroom problems to seek immediate and practical solutions,
3. Action research focuses on evaluating a certain teaching program in order to improve, modify or even totally abandon it,
3. It takes place through the collaboration and participation of practitioners in classroom contexts,
3. The improvement of practice seems to be the major objective of action research than the development of theoretical knowledge which is a common concern of other research types,
3. Action research appears to be of help to classroom teachers to build their classroom practices on justifiable grounds, and
3. Collaboration seems to be the most revealing characteristics of action research.

As a whole, some of the definitions seem to lack specification; for example, Corey's definition appears to be more general as he does not specify who those 'practitioners' are and relate that to classroom contexts where learning and teaching take place. The present researcher, however, argues that Webb's definition seems to be attractive for two basic reasons: for one thing, he grounds his definition on educational practice settings and, for another, he justifies the why of action research and emphasizes on the collaborative nature of the research.

Highlighting all these, the present researcher wants to say some relevant points as regards the historical accounts of action research.

2.2 A Brief Historical Overview of Action Research

According to the available literature, the origin of action research goes back to the works of Kolb (1948), Lewin (1948, 1952), Corey (1953), Hodgkinson (1952), Skerritt (1992), Cohen and Manion (1994).

Mckernan (1996), as cited in Burns (1999: 26), argues that the origin of action research dates back to the late nineteenth century as a reaction to “pure research” methods which fail to give practical solutions to what happens in the actual classroom teaching situation. According to him,

The seeds of action research are to be found as early as the late nineteenth century in the science in education movement and a variety of other social form initiatives... It also grew out of the moves by progressive educators, such as John Dewey, in the early part of the twentieth century to challenge the orthodoxy of the scientific research methods current in the field of education.

Similarly, Best and Kahn (1993:24) put the origin and development of action research as follows:

Since the late 1930s, the field of social psychology and education have shown great interest in what has been called ‘action research’. In education, the movement has had as its goal the involvement of both research specialist and classroom teacher in the study and application of research to educational problems in particular classroom setting.

Despite these facts, as O’Brien (1998) underlines, Lewin, a German social and experimental psychologist, is generally considered as the ‘father’ of action research. O’Brien adds that Lewin focuses on social problems through participative group process for addressing conflict, crises, and changes in organizations which were not originally meant for addressing educational problems.

Goodson (1992) as cited in Hargreaves and Fullan (1992) states four factors for the emergence of action research: the irrelevance of contemporary educational

research, the growing of interest among classroom teachers to participate in classroom investigations, the question of accountability to what is going on in the classroom, and the increased awareness of teachers about teaching and research solidarity.

Nevertheless, the significance of action research in language teaching seems to be less understood and thus marginalized (Jordan, 1997; Burns, 1999; Van Lier, 1988; Nunan, 1990 and 1992; and Brumfit and Mitchell, 1990). For instance, according to Van Lier (1988:67), “Although action research has been prominent in the social sciences since 1940s, it has not so far received much serious attention as a distinct style of research in language teaching.”

Thus, according to Van Lier (1988), it may be possible to understand that action research in language teaching—more specifically in teaching English as a foreign or second language—seems to have a very short history. Moreover, he argues that there seems to be a failure among educators to practise action research as a separate genre of research in language teaching.

In fact, many other scholars seem to confirm Van Lier’s argument; for example, Crookes (1993), Nunan (1992), Wallace (1998), Allwright and Bailey (1991), and Bailey and Nunan (1996).

Furthermore, Crookes (1993:130) tries to show the recent relationship of action research and English language teaching. He argues that action research is unfamiliar among ESL professionals in the field of second language studies by stating: “Although action research has a long history, it is a term which has only quite recently become known and used in ESL. It is apparently, therefore, something ‘new’ and predictably has already become a buzz word within the field of second language studies.”

Bryant (1996), on the other hand, argues that the inadequacies of other research types in giving practical solutions to classroom problems seem to make the relationship of teaching and research worse. Bryant argues further that the weaknesses of other research types pave favorable conditions for the development of action research. As a result, action research has become a useful type of research to generate data which are basic and relevant to all phenomena happening in the classroom.

On the whole, from these historical accounts of action research, it may be possible to understand that educational action research and teaching have a very old age compared to the age of action research in language teaching.

2.3 Types of Action Research

There seems to be a consensus among scholars in the division of action research types. Some scholars divide types of action research into three: 'technical action research', 'practical action research', and 'emancipatory action research' (Skerritt, 1992; Scott and Usher, 1999; and McNiff, 1993). All the three types are different from one another in their purposes. For instance, Scott and Usher (1999) argue that technical action research is concerned with improving the efficiency and effectiveness of educational practice and usually carried out individually. Furthermore, they argue that practical action research aims at the improvement and change of practitioners' understanding of classroom practices and it is carried out without collaborative means whereas the emancipatory action research is carried out through the collaboration of practitioners to improve and change educational practices. Moreover, Skerritt (1992) expresses that emancipatory action research helps practitioners to emancipate themselves from the dictates of traditions and self-deception.

According to Scott and Usher (1999), however, emancipatory action research seems to be a feasible type of action research to examine classroom practices. Primarily, it seems to incorporate the purposes of other types of action research in guiding desirable and effective classroom practices. Moreover, it is carried out through the collaboration of practitioners or teacher-researchers.

Moreover, citing Zuber-Skerritt (1996:3) Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000:232) seem to capitalize on the collaborative nature of emancipatory action research as stated hereunder:

Emancipatory action research... is collaborative, critical and self-critical inquiry by practitioners... into a major problem or issue or concern in their own practice. They own the problem and feel responsible and accountable for solving it through teamwork and through... a cyclical process...

In conclusion, Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) have drawn some basic distinctions among the three types of action research. Accordingly, 'technical action research', they argue, is usually designed to examine the effectiveness of the existing educational practice. 'Practical action research', on the contrary, is designed to promote teachers' professionalism on the basis of their informed judgments. Finally, emancipatory action research, they suggest, seems to be more feasible to investigate the structural and interpersonal constraints which hamper the teachers' freedom and autonomy of educational decision- making.

On the whole, there seems to be no clear-cut difference among the three types of action research though some scholars have made efforts to draw some basic distinctions.

2.4 The Rationale for Involving ELT Teachers in Action Research

As already indicated in the introduction section of this study, action research seems to be a revealing and attractive type of research which can be of help to ELT teachers to examine and understand what goes on in the actual classroom. This seems to be the reason why ELT teachers' involvement in action research or 'teacher-initiated research' has been justified by many scholars (Long in Nunan, 1989; Onel, 1997; Burns, 1999; Hoey et al, 2003). For instance, Hoey et al (2003:1) remark that action research is becoming an increasingly important part of English language teachers' duty by stating the following four reasons: "Conducting research, often informal, is a key approach to teacher development. There is an increasing focus on insiders' perspective in research. Potential areas for research in ELT are becoming broader and new areas opening up. Conducting research increases the professionalism of teachers."

According to Hoey et al's (2003) argument, informal research, which seems to refer to action research has become a major task of ELT teachers; hence, teacher research is an avenue to promote teachers' professional development; educators seem to prefer the insiders' perspectives (classroom teachers) to outsider researchers because the insider perspectives (a research which is conducted by classroom teachers) is hoped to help classroom teachers to cope with the complexities of classroom practices.

As a result, it seems to be the reason why Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000) bring out the most common problematic teaching and learning areas including

teaching methods, learning strategies, management and control, professional development, and administration where action research is crucial.

Likewise, Hardley (n.d.:10) confirms that teachers should be involved in undertaking action research because, according to him:

The advantage of having AR in one's "teachers tool box" are clear. Apart from improving one's craft, teachers will gain a greater insight into what is going on in the minds of their students. Clear communication will be fostered between teacher and student... One can become a pro-active teacher through the thoughtful use of action research. Based upon the data gained from his research and that of others, a teacher can seize the moment, moving forward with purpose and clarity about what should be done in his classroom.

Furthermore, Pica (1997:53) cites Crookes (1993) to confirm the movement towards action research among educators. Pica argues: "Language educators are turning towards action-oriented research on their own classrooms. This enables them to distinguish the different ways in which L2 research can and cannot help them with classroom particulars, and to understand, reflect upon, and modify their practices." Moreover, McNiff, Lomax, and Whitehead (1996) and Burns (1999) also seem to confirm Pica's argument.

All in all, though we can have many reasons why ELT teachers should be involved in undertaking action research, Jordan (1997:274) brings out the highlights as follows:

A number of teachers have experienced difficulties in their teaching, or observed that students have particular problems, and try to find solutions...By doing their own research, teachers will be in a better position to help students who...need help in English. Teachers will understand more easily the kinds of difficulties students are likely to experience, and may have very practical relevant advice to offer, linked with English.

On top of all these, Skerritt (1992:15) argues that action research in higher education has immense roles such as making teachers more professionals, more

interested in their teaching career, and more motivated to integrate their teaching with research. According to her, all these would, in turn, lead to greater job-satisfaction, better academic programs, improvement of students' learning, develop the practitioners' insights, and contribute to the betterment of knowledge in higher institution.

2.5 The Beliefs and Attitudes of ELT Teachers Towards Action Research

Scholars believe that language teaching—more specifically, English language teaching—needs to be integrated with research to be conducted at the classroom level. This seems to be the reason why scholars like Nunan (1990, 1992), Brumfit and Mitchell (1990), McNiff (1988), Widdowson (1990) and Edge and Richards (1993) try to confirm the need of action research in English language teaching classroom contexts.

However, non-local studies appear to reveal the ELT teachers' beliefs and attitudes towards action research in some mixed-up and contradictory sort of conclusions.

Bell (1993:2), citing Howard and Sharp (1983:6), tries to explain the existing misconception about the concept of 'research' among many people who think that research is something which can be undertaken only by naturally gifted persons. Bell argues that:

Most people associate the word 'research' with activities which are substantially removed from day-to-day life and which are pursued by outstanding gifted persons with an unusual level of commitment. There is of course a good deal of truth in this view point, but we would argue that the pursuit is not restricted to this type of person and in deed can prove to be a stimulating and satisfying experience for many people with a trained and enquiring mind.

Hardley (n.d.), also suggests that language teachers have perceived the term 'research' as an activity which is carried out by researchers from other fields such as linguistics and second language acquisition disciplines. He adds that ELT teachers are unwilling or unable to undertake action research due to factors such as shortage of time, lack of research background and lack of research experience. Moreover, Nunan (1992) seems to support Hardley's argument by stating that most teachers who are interested in researching into their teaching and learning fail to do so because they are either unable to do so for practical reasons or unwilling for personal problems to carry out action research.

The present researcher also argues that the factors mentioned above such as shortage of time, lack of research background, and lack of research experience appeal to be the most common research constraints which Ethiopian ELT teachers are likely to experience.

In his survey of the professional involvement of ELT teachers in teacher-research, Bennett (1993) shows that most teachers fail to undertake teacher-research due to factors such as lack of administrative support, lack of community support, lack of access to journals, budget cuts, and absence of conferences and seminars. According to Bennett's survey, an overwhelming majority of ELT teachers (90%) report that their administrators and school principals do not give recognition to teacher-initiated research. A few minority, however, respond that their school administrators and principals are cooperative, school libraries are well-furnished with research facilities, and other top officials encourage them to undertake action research.

The factors which are mentioned by Bennett (1993) seem to be serious research constraints that are assumed to hamper the ELT teachers' involvement in undertaking action research in the Ethiopian context.

Nunan (1990) cites Beasley and Riordan (1981) to state that teachers and students rarely participate in doing action research; hence, teachers' knowledge of the classroom has been neglected and teachers themselves do not read and employ action research to shape and inform their methods of teaching. Besides, he argues that classroom teachers seem to distrust the value of action research. Burns (1999) also argues that English language teachers are suspicious of the relevance of action research and little has been known how foreign language teachers perceive and undertake action research. As a result of such ELT teachers' perception, Hardley (n.d.) and Crookes (1993) have revealed the existing gap between research and teaching in general, and action research and English language teaching, in particular. Skerritt (1992 and 1993) and Elliott (1999) also seem to agree with Hardley's and Crookes's argument about the existing gap between language classroom practices and action research. Besides, Skerritt (1992) suggests that action research in higher education is motivating; hence, it helps them to develop their profession and to promote students' learning which would result in job satisfaction and sharing of knowledge among one's staff members.

On the other hand, Crookes and Chandler (2001:131) cite Berne (1998) and to comment on the weaknesses of post-secondary foreign language teacher training program which could not help ELT teachers to undertake language teaching action research by stating the following:

Many... FL degrees are obtained by teachers, but these professionals are nevertheless not prepared to engage in a process of life-long professional development. That is, they neither help teachers to use published research on teaching nor provide them with a reflective problem-solving orientation to their classroom teaching. It implies a serious risk that post secondary level faculty in training today will not develop in their level of professionalism and use of pedagogy...

The International Encyclopedia of Education (1994) argues that teachers, in general, are very much resistant to do action research due to many reasons. Moreover, Cohen and Manion (1994) argue that classroom teachers resist and misunderstand the relevance of action research because their attitudes and expectations seem to emanate from teachers' initial outlook of the inadequacies of other research types.

Despite these misconceptions of teachers about action research in language teaching, McNiff (1988:xviii) defends the application of action research as follows: "Action research presents an opportunity for teachers to become uniquely involved in their own practice, to professionalise themselves, and to give reasoned justification for what they are doing." To finalize this section, the investigator believes that action research may be of help to classroom teachers to examine and build up their classroom practices on justifiable grounds.

2.6 The Fundamental Characteristics of Action Research

McNiff, Lomax, and Whitehead (1996); Cohen and Manion (1994); the International Encyclopedia of Education (1994); Nunan (1992); Scott and Usher (1999); Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000), and Sharma (2000) are amongst those who have presented the detail features of action research.

For instance, Cohen and Manion (1994:186) have the following to say about the basic characteristics of action research:

Action research is situational- it is concerned with diagnosing a problem in a specific context and attempting to solve it in that context; it is usually... collaborative-team of teachers and practitioners work together...it is participatory – team members themselves take part directly or indirectly in implanting the research; and it is self-evaluative-modifications are continuously evaluated within the ongoing situation, the ultimate objective being to improve practice in some way or other.

Similarly, the International Encyclopedia of Education (1994) summarizes the major characteristics of action research emphasizing on self-reflective, participatory and collaborative characteristics-all of which help practitioners to theorize about their classroom practices and to examine their own ideas, beliefs and assumptions. Besides, Skerritt (1992) groups the basic characteristics of action research into five: practical, participatory, emancipatory, interpretive, and critical.

Furthermore, some scholars draw basic distinctions between action research and “pure” or “basic” research (McNiff, Lomax, and Whitehead, 1996; Woods, 1991; and Cohen and Manion, 1994). For instance, McNiff, Lomax and Whitehead (1996:14) draw three points which make action research different from other basic research. According to them, action research: “Requires action as an integral part of the research process itself. It is focused by the researcher’s professional values rather than methodological considerations. It is necessarily insider research in the sense of practitioners researching their own professional actions.”

Woods (1991) also gives a comprehensive distinction between “the main stream educational research” and “action research” under the following four points. Accordingly, “ the main stream educational research” basis its data on large number of samples where this is not always the case in action research. Then, in the former type of research, theory comes first and then practice where the reverse seems to hold true in the case of the latter. Further, the main stream educational research is usually

carried out by “outsider- researchers” who are distant in time and place from classroom practices whereas the latter is undertaken by insider-researchers including teachers and other collaborators in the educational institution. Finally, generalisability of research findings is the main objective of “pure research” whereas this is not a necessary concern of action research.

In addition, Shipman (1985), Bryant (1996), Van Lier (1988) and Nunan (1990, 1992, n.d.) seem to agree with such differences stated by Woods (1991).

Nevertheless, action research has also some commonalities with other research types. For example, McNiff, Lomax, and Whitehead (1996) state that action research and the other research share some characteristics as both types of research contribute to the betterment of the existing knowledge, depend on empirical evidence to justify knowledge, and make a bridge between incoming knowledge and the already existing one.

In general, many of the scholars seem to focus on the practicability and participatory features of action research.

2.7 Action Research: Steps and Processes

Processes, or steps, or stages in carrying out action research have been discussed by many scholars; for example, O’Brien (1998); Sharma (2000); Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2000); Nunan (1992); and McNiff (1988) are a few of these scholars. Despite this fact, there seems to be a variation among scholars in discussing action research processes or steps, both in depth and focus. For instance, an action researcher would follow such as imitation, preliminary investigation, hypothesis(es),

intervention, evaluation, dissemination, and follow up stages (Nunan, 1992); and planning, acting, observing and reflection processes(O'Brien, 1998).

Nevertheless, Cohen and Manion (1994) have come up with perhaps a more convincing and comprehensive action research processes which seem to be that a teacher-researcher would follow as,

The first stage will involve the identification, evaluation and formulation of problem perceived as critical in an everyday teaching. The second stage involves preliminary discussion and negotiations among interested parties-teachers, researchers, advisors, sponsors ... The third stage may... involve a review of the research literature to find out what can be learned from comparable studies, their objectives, procedures, and problems encountered. The fourth stage may involve a modification or redefinition of the initial statement of the problem at stage one. The fifth stage...concerned with the selection of research procedures-sampling, administration, choice of materials,... The sixth... will be concerned with the choice of the evaluation of procedures to be used. The seventh embraces the implementation of the project itself... The... final stage will involve the interpretation of data; inferences to be drawn and overall evaluation of the project...

The present researcher believes that the variation of action research steps from one scholar to the other, both in depth and focus does not seem to be too much important to the practitioner (teacher-researcher). So long as the teacher-researcher follows some systematic procedures in undertaking action research, he/she should not worry about and be a slave to any of the action research steps unless he/she wants to do so. In fact, the present researcher believes that these steps would be important for first-time researchers or beginners.

2.8 Action Research: A Manifestation of Teacher Development

The available literature reveals that teachers' professional and personal developments would be expressed in a number of ways including keeping diaries of ones teaching; reading newspapers, journals, books; preparing portfolio about

teaching, undertaking small-scale classroom research activities, and so on (Head and Taylor, 2007; Graham and Webb, 1994; Wallace 1998; and Burns, 1999)

Citing Elliott (1991), Law and Glover (1996:37) put the role of action research on teachers' professional development as follows: "The links between research based investigations and classroom practice are fundamental if professional development is to be of any lasting value." Besides, Bryant (1996) argues that reflective teaching which includes action research is a major ingredient of teachers' professional development that enables classroom teachers to examine their classroom practice in some systemic ways.

The present researcher, therefore, believes that teachers should be engaged in some systematic classroom-based research so as to develop their profession and ground their teaching on justifiable arguments.

Hopkins (2001:42) concludes: " Action research combines a substantive act with a research procedure; it is action disciplined enquiry, a personal attempt at understanding while engaged in process of improvement and reform."

2.9 The Pros and Cons of the Validity of Action Research

Some scholars seem to be suspicious of the validity of action research since it explains events or activities in specific situations. For example, Scott and Usher (1999), McNiff (1988), Winter (1982), in Cohen and Manion (1994), and Burns (1999) are some of the afore-mentioned scholars. For instance, Scott and Usher (1999:37) cite Cohen and Mainion (1994) to raise the question of generalizability in action research by stating:

There is always a perennial question about action research - Is it really research? ... Stressing its situational and participatory features, ... because it focuses on a specific problem in a specific setting it is not rigorously scientific ... data are situationally specific they cannot be extended beyond the specific case.

A few scholars, nevertheless, suggest that educators-specifically, practitioners-should not worry about the validity of action research: internal validity and external validity (Best and Kahn, 1993; Allwright and Bailey, 1991; and Wallace, 1998).

To strengthen the above view, McNiff (1988:186) cites Lomax (1986) and says the following:

As action researchers we do not find to claim to find the final answer to a question, but we do claim to improve... educational practice through educational development of practitioners. ... The validity of what we claim would seem to be the degree to which it was useful (relevant) in guiding practice for particular teachers and its power to inform... and improving practice in the insider professional community.

Thus, the validity of action research seems to lie not on its generalisability but on the extent to which it refers to how relevant its finding is in a particular situation for that particular purpose. Moreover, Wallace (1998) says that the generalisability of action research findings from one setting to another would not be taken as a primary importance, however, the important thing is the helpfulness of action research findings in the context where they have been carried out.

2.10 Major Factors in Doing Action Research

There seems to be a consensus among scholars in dividing factors which teachers possibly encounter in carrying out their action research into two: blocking or constraints and helping factors or solutions (Price, 2001).

2.10.1 Scholars' Views on Factors Affecting Teachers' Involvement in Action Research

Burns (1999), for example, cites McKernan (1993) who conducted a research on action research constraints among teachers in the USA, UK, and Ireland and classified these factors into three as ranked by these teachers in the three countries. According to Burns, lack of time, lack of resources, school organizational features, and inadequacies of research skills are the most frequently ranked research constraints among participants. Obtaining consent, language of research, pressure of student examinations, and disapproval of the principals are the second serious problems which seem to hamper teachers' undertaking of action research. Then, human factors such as disapproval of the colleagues, misconception of the role of the teacher, professional factors and students' disapproval are the third set of factors which are followed by heavy work-load, limited support, anxiety in sharing classroom practices, anxiety about research skills, suspicious of the usefulness of action research, and timetable pressures are also found to hamper teachers' involvement in action research.

Similarly, Nunan (1992), Van Lier (1988) as well as Allwright and Bailey (1991) confirm that the above constraints, which Burns reports, have also been experienced by most TESOL teachers though such kind of comprehensive study has not been conducted in teaching English as a foreign language. Besides, Burns (1999) expresses that time is a major factor in doing action research. Wallace (1998) also seems to agree with Burns's argument by stating constraints such as time, resource, and research skills in doing action research which are basics for teachers.

In a recent study, Elliott (1999:79) has to say the following on the most prevailing research constraints which teacher-researchers encounter in further education:

Barriers to research... include: under-funding of staff development, inflexible staff contracts, high staff work-load, an absence of research contracts,... the active discouragement of the academic drift in... colleges, prioritization by managers of course development and teaching over research, limited access to library and internet, funding methodologies that do not reward research,...,a competitive... culture that discourages collaborative research.

According to Elliott (1999), it seems reasonable to summarise all the above research barriers into three major classifications: personal barriers, institutional barriers and resource barriers. Nunan (1989) also identifies the prominent constraints in doing action research whether or not the research is individual or collaborative as resource, time, and expertise. Later, Nunan, in his publication of (1990), puts action research constraints which have been experienced by ELT teachers as lack of time, expertise, continuous support, and confidence in making public one's own research finding. In addition, Mann (1999) and Roberts (1988) would seem to support Nunan's and Elliott's identification of action research barriers.

Furthermore, many other scholars also identify the main barriers which teacher-researchers possibly encounter in doing action research such as organizational and resource problems, timetabling problems, school structure and attitudes of teachers (Cohen and Manion); limited time and limited resource (Crookes, 1993); lack of expertise, time, financial resources and personality traits (Wallace, 1998); lack of motivation, training and problem of dissemination of research findings (Brumfit and Mitchell, 1993); and problem of work-load, lack of collaboration and turn-over of teachers from school to school (Roberts, 1988).

2.10.2 Scholars' Views on Possible Solutions to Barriers in Undertaking Action Research

Action research by its very nature requires the professional commitment of classroom teachers. For example, Burns (1999), Wallace (1998), Bramfit and Mitchell (1990) and Edge and Richards (1993) are amongst the noted scholars who argue that language teachers should show commitment in undertaking action research.

Besides, Elliott (1991) suggests that classroom teachers need to develop an interest in investigating their classroom practices, to be equipped with basic research skills, to get the assistance of those authorities who are responsible for education, to get enough time and money to undertake action research, to have the access to different relevant reading materials in research, and have to get the means to disseminate their research findings so as to make effective and up-date their method of teaching.

Finally, the present researcher tries to conclude by quoting Gassner (n.d.:3) who argues the following: “One of the essential factors that defines the starting point of reflective teaching seems to be... positive attitude towards change as it implies openness for new ideas, new ways of thinking, or welcoming undirected... self- guided development.”

On top of all these, the researcher overviewed non- local research findings in terms of research methodology, sampling, and procedure as follows:

0. Most of the research findings conducted abroad are case studies which focus on ELT teachers' awareness about language teaching action research (Nunan, 1992),

0. Only few of these research findings built their research conclusions from samples of ELT teachers where English is taught as a foreign or second language,
0. Few of the research findings have assessed the involvement of ELT teachers in action research in the context where English is taught as a foreign language,
4. Some countries' English language teaching experience shows that action research is a remedy to examine English language learning and teaching problems which would crop up while teaching, for example, Chinese experience is a case in point,
1. It is only a few of the research works which have drawn their findings from both qualitative and quantitative data (Nunan, 1992), and
1. There seems to be also a paucity of literature on how practical action research has become in teaching English as a foreign or second language (Burns, 1999), and

All these points, therefore, I think are central to the current study and this is the reason why the present researcher has carried out this study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD OF THE STUDY

3.1 Samples of the Study

To address the research questions posed in the Statement of the Problem Section (Section 1.2), the investigation was conducted on the ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education. In fact, the original intention was to carry out this study on high school ELT teachers where there would be a good number of samples. However, this was found to be infeasible for two reasons. First of all, it is believed that the term 'action research' would probably be new to these teachers; hence, it is new to the country, too. Moreover, from the experience of the present researcher there seemed to be no effort made by these teachers in undertaking classroom research for various possible reasons. The researcher chose the ELT teachers in these three teachers' training colleges using purposive(convenient) sampling technique because it is believed that these teachers are one possible source to generate data from many perspectives.

Primarily, ELT teachers in these three teachers' training colleges practice similar teachers' training curriculum (Please See Appendices H, I, and J).

Secondly, ELT teachers in these three teachers' training colleges are expected sources assumed to have English language teaching research experiences and some basic research skills; hence, one of the two major tasks of college teachers is to undertake research activities, besides their teaching.

Furthermore, conducting the present research across ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges than on one college ELT teachers is hoped to contribute to the trustworthiness of the research findings.

Above all, as Gall, Borg, and Gall (1996:227) report, a convenient (purposive) sampling is a situation where, "...the researcher selects a sample that suits the purposes of the study and that is convenient ... for a variety of reasons."

Table 1: ELT Teachers Who Took Part in the Study by Filling in the Questionnaire

No	Research Site(s)	Subjects of the Study Who Filled in the Questionnaire	
		f	%
1	Kotebe College of Teacher Education	8	24.2
2	Nazereth College of Teacher Education	10	30.3
3	Awassa College of Teacher Education	15	45.5
Total		33	100.0

As one can see from the above table, thirty-three teachers participated in filling in the questionnaire in the entire three teacher' training colleges. In other words, 8 (24.2%), 10 (30.3%), and 15 (45.5%) ELT teachers were made to be the focus of this study from Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education, respectively.

Table 2: ELT Teachers Who Were Interviewed

No	Research Site (s)	Subjects of the Study Who Were Interviewed	
		f	%
1	Kotebe College of Teacher Education	2	25.0
2	Nazereth College of Teacher Education	3	37.5
3	Awassa College of Teacher Education	3	37.5
Total		8	100.0

With regard to the interview, as noted above, eight ELT teachers were interviewed from the three teachers' training colleges. Regarding their sex, thirty-one (93.9%) of the subjects were males and two of them (6.1%) were females (Please See Appendix G). In terms of qualification, of the 33 samples, 22 were second-degree holders whereas 10 of them were first-degree graduates. Besides, there was only 1 Ph.D. sample.

3.2 Data Collection Instruments

3.2.1 Development of the Instruments

In this study, the development of research tools (questionnaire and interview) was undergone through the following different stages. Firstly, I made attempts to construct all the questionnaire items and interview items from the review of the related literature. After this, the items were given to two of my classmates so as to get valuable comments and criticisms on the strengths and weaknesses of the items. Based on the comments and criticisms gained, I made the necessary modifications. Then, I gave the modified research tools to my present M.A. thesis advisor and he commented

and criticized them more than three times and so that the items were made ready and piloted to 10 ELT teachers at Debre Birhan College of Teacher Education. Furthermore, the samples of the pilot study were asked to write down their comments on any weakness which they came across while filling in the questionnaire, if any. After all these stages, the research tools were again given back to my present M.A. thesis advisor before they were administered to the samples of the main study.

Generally, as indicated above, the researcher made possible efforts to shape and modify the research tools based on the comments that he gained from his colleagues, pilot study samples, and—more specifically from his present M.A. thesis advisor as well .

3.2.2 Questionnaire

Questionnaire was one of the major research tools of this study. It was designed for ELT teachers to generate data on the extent to which ELT teachers in all the three teachers' training colleges have been possibly involved in undertaking English language teaching action research. The nature of questionnaire was structured and semi-structured.

Moreover, the use of the questionnaire is found to be important to elicit information on ELT teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards English language teaching action research. It seemed also crucial to get data on the research constraints which ELT teachers possibly encounter in undertaking action research and to generate data on the possible solutions to these research constraints as well.

The purpose of the questionnaire was explained to the samples right from the outset. A detailed explanation supported by examples was given before it was

administered. In other words, general directions and sub-instructions were included across each section of the questionnaire (Please See Appendix A).

Briefly, ELT teachers across the three teachers' training colleges were asked to think and express their opinions, feelings, beliefs, and attitudes on action research and English language teaching – particularly on issues related to the following questions:

6. How practical is action research among ELT teachers?
6. What are the attitudes of ELT teachers towards action research?
6. What are some of the major problems which college ELT teachers possibly encounter in doing action research?
6. What are the possible solutions to these problems?

In general, designing the questionnaire in line with the above four major questions is hoped to help in measuring the current practice of English language teaching action research among ELT teachers, the ELT teachers' attitudes towards action research, some prevailing research constraints, and to come up with some possible solutions to these constraints.

3.2.3 Interview

Interview was another research tool of this study. It was prepared for both ELT teachers and some college principals. It is believed that the use of the interview may be of help to make the research finding more sustainable. In other words, the use of the interview would seem crucial to counter-check the respondents' responses to the questionnaire.

The interview would also be of help to generate data on ELT teachers' attitudes and beliefs towards English language teaching action research which would be of difficult to canvass through the use of the questionnaire only.

As already indicated, interview was also designed for few college principals whom thought to have information on ELT teachers' involvement in English language teaching research activities, in particular, and the flow of research activities, in general.

Accordingly, three Heads of English Department and three Research and Academic Vice Deans were interviewed in all the three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education.

Table 3: College Principals Who Were Participated in the Interview

N ^o	Research Site(s)	College Principals		Total	
		Dep. Head(s)	Research and Academic Vice Dean(s)	Frequencies	%
1	Kotebe College of Teacher Education	1	1	2	33.3
2	Nazereth College of Teacher Education	1	1	2	33.3
3	Awassa College of Teacher Education	1	1	2	33.3
Total		3	3	6	100.0

The nature of the interview was semi-structured because Bell, Bush, and Goulding (1984:184) have put the strengths of semi-structured interview as follows: “Semi-structured interview tends to be the one most favored by educational

researchers as it allows respondents to express themselves at some length, but offers enough shape to prevent aimless rambling.”

In addition, Burns (1999) confirms that semi-structured interviews can help researchers to get themes and topics which may not have been anticipated while designing the interview.

Before conducting the interview with ELT teachers and some college principals, the interviewer explained the purpose of the present study to each interviewee. Both interviews were conducted in English. The researcher read out each item of the interview to each teacher one by one and recorded the response of each interviewee. The audio-recorded interviewees’ responses is transcribed and the transcription of each interviewee is recorded as T₁, T₂, T₃ ..., and T₈ (Please See Appendix D).

In fact, the same interview procedures were employed with college principals. They were coded as CP₁, CP₂, CP₃..., and CP₆ (Please See Appendix E).

Based on the responses gained from the semi-structured interviews from ELT teachers and college principals, attempts were made to assess the current status of action research in the selected colleges, the attitudes of ELT teachers towards English language teaching action research, the research constraints, and the possible solutions to these constraints as well. In other words, the semi-structured interview was made to validate what the ELT teachers filled in across the four sections of the questionnaire (Please See Appendix A). As a result, there were some similarities among the contents of semi-structured interview and the questionnaire.

3.3 Data Analyses

Quantitative and qualitative data are collected from the ELT teachers and some college principals. As a result, both inferential and descriptive statistical analyses were employed (Please See Chapter 5). The responses of the close-ended questions are tabulated in terms of frequencies and percentages.

In addition, a Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) [Please See Appendix F] was employed for section one and section three of the questionnaire to:

- a) Examine whether or not qualification does have an impact on the samples' total English language teaching experience, espoused beliefs (number of years which samples believed that they were engaged in action research), and research in action (the practical involvement of ELT teachers in action research) as well. To this end, t-test for independent samples of qualification was computed to check whether there existed mean scores difference between the samples' (B.As' and M.As') total English language teaching experience, espoused beliefs, and practical involvement in English language teaching action research. Nevertheless, this computation was done only between those B.A. ELT teachers and M.A. ones; hence, there was only one Ph.D. sample. As a result, he was excluded from this test,
- b) Determine the existing relationship, if any, among the four variables: qualification, total English language teaching experience, espoused beliefs and research in action. For this purpose, intercorelation coefficients were computed,

- c) Investigate the regression analysis. This was computed to see how much each independent variable contributed to the variation in the ELT teachers' practical involvement in language teaching action research (research in action), and
- a) Compute the samples' responses (levels of agreement and/or disagreement to the five-level Likert-scale. To this effect, a one-sample t-test was employed; hence, it is believed that it has more statistical power to see the level of agreement and/or disagreement (Gall, Borg, and Gall, 1996).

Furthermore, the responses of open-ended questions of the questionnaire were organized, summarized, and analyzed descriptively. The ELT teachers' opinions, perceptions and attitudes gathered through the interview are also recorded and analyzed on the basis of the frequency of responses. Moreover, the responses of college principals to the interview were analyzed descriptively on the basis of common themes and topics of the transcribed interviews.

In general, the rationale for using inferential statistical package for many sections of the data is concluded by Klugh (1970: 4) as:"... statistics deals with... inferences about the true nature of the relationship between variables, even though data include chance or random errors."

The discussions and the findings are treated in the following chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR: DATA ANALYSES AND DISCUSSIONS OF RESULTS

3.0 Description of the Questionnaire

To begin with, it is important to recall the four basic research questions which were posed or formulated in Chapter One in the Statement of the Problem section (section 1.2). Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to find out possible answers to the following research questions:

3. How practical is action research among college ELT teachers?
3. What are the attitudes of ELT teachers towards English language teaching action research?
3. What are some of the major problems which college ELT teachers possibly encounter in conducting action research? and
3. What are the possible solutions to these problems?

To address the research questions raised above, the present researcher designed the questionnaire with the help of his present M.A. thesis advisor and administered the questionnaire consisting of four major sections in line with these research questions. The summary report of the four different sections of the questionnaire is stated hereunder in Table 4:

Table 4: A Synopsis of the Different Sections, Purposes, and Number of Items of the Questionnaire Used in the Study.

Section(s) of the Questionnaire	Purpose(s) of Each Section of the Questionnaire	Number of Items in Each Section of the questionnaire	Total
Section One: Background Information	To elicit information on ELT teachers' total English language teaching experience, their maximum qualification, how long they have been involved in language teaching action research, and their practical involvement in action research.	8	8
Section Two: 'Yes' or 'No' Questions	To get information on ELT teachers' practical involvement in action research, their research skills, their work environment, etc.	15	15
Section Three: Degree of Agreement and / or Disagreement on the Basis of a Five Scale Rating	To measure ELT teachers' attitudes and beliefs about language teaching action research, To identify the most prevailing research constraints, and To cross-check the respondents' responses which were given in section one, two, etc.	22	22
Section Four: Semi-Structured Questionnaire	Primarily to counter-check the responses of the samples which were given across the previous three sections of the questionnaire, To assess ELT teachers' beliefs about the role of action research, etc.	7	7
T o t a l		52	52

While designing all these 52 items of the questionnaire, the researcher used different (questionnaire designing) techniques such as negative phrasing, double phrasing, and positive phrasing.

Accordingly, in the first section of the questionnaire, as indicated in Table 4, the samples were asked 8 questions about their English language teaching experience, their maximum qualification in teaching English as a foreign language, the number of years in which they were engaged in undertaking language teaching action research which I called 'espoused beliefs', and their practical involvement in English language teaching action research which I called 'research in action'. This background information was included in the questionnaire to examine the existing multi-interactive relationship, if any, among the variables: qualification, total English language teaching experience, espoused beliefs, and research in action.

In the second section of the questionnaire, on the other hand, the samples were asked some 'Yes' or 'No' questions and some others believing that this could be of help to get information on the samples' feelings, attitudes, and beliefs on issues related to action research and English language teaching within the context of their college life research undertaking and teaching. Moreover, the third section of the questionnaire was designed on the basis of a five-Scale-rating to generate data on ELT teachers' attitudes and beliefs concerning action research and English language teaching.

Finally, 7 semi-structured questions were included in the fourth section of the questionnaire with the hope that it would help the researcher to gather an in-depth information on ELT teachers' feelings, attitudes and beliefs about action research;

hence, it would make the samples freer to write what they want to say. In addition, it would be of help to counter-check the respondents' responses to the questions asked in the first three sections of the questionnaire: section one, section two, and section three.

4.2 Results of the Questionnaire

To remind once again, the present research was conducted on ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazrereth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education. The total number of the target population across the three colleges were thirty-three. Of these, the proportion of samples in terms of sex showed that males made up of an overwhelming majority (i.e., 93.9 per cent); whereas female ELT teachers constituted a small minority (that is, 6.1 per cent). This proportion of ELT teachers in these three teachers' training colleges would seem to be a mere reflection of the imbalance in the proportion of male trainees and female trainees in Ethiopian schools and higher institutions. The bio-data of ELT teachers in terms of qualification is indicated in Table 5.

Table 5: The Qualification Profile of ELT Teachers (Frequencies, Percentages, Mean, Standard Deviation, and Variance).

No	ELT Teachers' Qualification Levels	Nominated Values	Frequencies	Percentages	Mean	SD	Variance
1	B.A./B.ED.	1	15	45.5	1.58	.56	.31
2	M.A.	2	17	51.5			
3	Ph.D.	3	1	3.0			
Total			33	100.0			

As shown in the above table, the samples were 15(45.5%), 17(51.5%), and 1 (3.0%) B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. holders, respectively. As to whether or not qualification would bring an impact on the samples' total English language teaching experience, espoused beliefs, and research in action, nominated values were given to each qualification level as 1,2,and 3 for B.As/B.EDs, M.As and Ph.D. samples, respectively. Accordingly, the B.A. and M.A ELT ELT teachers seem to contribute the largest proportion of the target population (that is, 97 per cent) whereas the Ph.D. only constituted the smallest proportion (that is, 3 per cent).

The samples mean score would be 1.58 with a relative standard deviation of .56 which would suggest the existing little variation among the samples' levels of qualification. In other words, ELT teachers' qualification level seem to show a variation of .56 from B.A. to M.A. and from M.A to Ph.D. from the mean (in this case, 1.58). This small variation among ELT teachers' qualification levels seem to suggest the presence of few member of Ph.D. samples (in this case, 1). This would imply that had three been relatively equal number of Ph.D. samples to be compared with B.As /B.EDs and M.As, there would have been a big variation among ELT teachers' qualification levels. The profile of ELT teachers' total English language teaching experience is given below.

Table 6: The Profile of ELT Teachers Total English Language Teaching Experience (Frequencies, Percentages, Mean, Standard Deviation, Variance, and Range)

No	Total English Language Teaching Experience (in Years)	Frequencies	Percentages	Mean	SD	Variance	Range (in Years)
1	3-10	11	33.3	16.97	11.59	134.21	45
2	11-18	12	36.4				
3	19-26	6	18.2				
4	27-34	0	0.0				
5	35-42	1	3.0				
6	43 years and above	3	9.1				
Total		33	100.0				

As noted in the above table, for the sake of discussion, the samples' total English language teaching experience is divided into six categories: 3 to 10, 11 to 18, 19 to 26, 27 to 34, 35 to 42, and more than forty-three years and above with frequencies and percentages of 11(33.3 %), 12 (36.4 %), 6 (18.2 %), 0 (0 %), 1(3.0 %), and 3 (9.1 %) samples, respectively.

On the average, each ELT teacher had 17 years of total English language teaching experience with a standard deviation of 11.59 which would mean that there would be a big variation among the samples' total English language teaching experience from the mean (in this case, 16.97 years) compared with the standard

deviation of ELT teachers' qualification that was .56 which would predict the presence of little variation among their qualification levels as stated in Table 5. Moreover, the range which would be 45 years tended to show that there would exist a difference between the more experienced ELT teachers (in this case, 48 years) and the least experienced one (in this case, 3 years). The number of years which ELT teachers were involved in language teaching action research (espoused beliefs) is stated below in Table 7.

Table 7: Number of Years That ELT Teachers Were Involved in Language Teaching Action Research - Espoused Beliefs (Frequencies, Percentages, Mean, SD, and Range)

No	Years of Research Involvement	Frequencies of ELT Teachers	Percentages of ELT Teachers	Mean	SD	Variance	Range
1	0-3	19	57.6	3.79	4.70	22.11	20
2	4-7	10	30.3				
3	8-11	1	3.0				
4	12-15	2	6.1				
5	More than 16 years and above	1	3.0				
Total		33	100.0				

Categories of years which would show the samples' involvement in action research, as indicated in Table 7, such as 0 to 3, 4 to 7, 8 to 11, 12 to 15, and more than 16 years and above are followed by the frequencies and percentages 19(57.6 %), 10(30.3 %), 1(3.0 %), 2 (6.1 %), and 1 (3.0 %) of ELT teachers, respectively. A good

number of ELT teachers, (19 or 57.6%) seemed to participate in action research for a few years (0 to 3 years). However, 14 (42.4%) samples would seem to involve in action research from 4 to 20 years. Besides, each sample seem to carry out action research for almost for four years (in this case, 3.79). The standard deviation which would be 4.70 appeared to show a great variation in the number of years which the samples get involved in action research i.e., ranging from 20 years (maximum) and 0 years of involvement (minimum). The detailed information on ELT teachers' total English language teaching experience, qualifications, years they were involved in action research (espoused beliefs), and their practical involvement in action research (research in action) are shown in Table 8 [please See Appendix G].

Below is a computed t-test value of the predictor variable (qualification) for the number of years that the samples were involved in action research (espoused beliefs), total English language teaching experiences, and research in action.

Table 9: The Computed t-test Value of the Predictor Variable (Qualification) on the Criterion Variables Espoused Belief-ESB, (Total English Language Teaching Experience-TELTEX, and Research in Action -RA) (N=32, Degree of Freedom (DF) = N-2(30))

N ^o	Criterion Variable(s)	Predictor Variable	Mean	SD	Variance	T-observed	P-Value
1	Espoused Beliefs (ESB)	B.A./B.ED.	2.00	1.85	3.43	1.98	.06
		M.A.	4.41	4.62	21.38		
2	Total English Language Teaching Experience (TELTEX)	B.A./B.ED.	11.27	5.78	33.35	2.77*	.01
		M.A.	2.18	11.77	137.66		
3	Research in Action(RA)	B.A./B.ED.	1.07	.96	.92	2.23*	.04
		M.A.	2.41	2.26	5.13		

*Significant at 0.05 level with a t-critical value of 1.73.

The t-test for independent samples of qualification, as indicated in Table 9, was computed to see whether or not there is a difference between the mean scores of the samples, (B.As' and M.As') espoused beliefs (ESB) total English language teaching experience (TELTEX), and their practical involvement in action research that would be research in action (RA). In fact, the computation was done only between first-degree holders and second-degree holders. As there was only one Ph.D. sample, he was excluded from this independent t-test computation.

Turning once again to the information given in Table 9, there seemed to be no significant difference between the mean scores of B.As and M.As espoused beliefs because the p-value which would be .06 is greater than 0.05 and its associated t-critical value would become small (1.73). This seems to show that there would not be a significant difference in the mean scores of the two groups (B.As' and M.As' espoused beliefs). In other words, there appeared to be no significant difference in the mean

scores of the number of years which the samples were possibly involved in English language teaching action research. Moreover, being B.A. or M.A. holder (qualification) does not seem to bring a mean difference on the espoused beliefs of the samples. However, the mean of B.As and M.As, would be 2.00 and 4.41 with standard deviations of 1.85 and 4.62, respectively. The mean seems to show that B.As participate for two years in English language teaching action research while M.As for four years though the statistical result seemed to show no difference between the mean scores of B.As' and M.As' espoused beliefs. In addition, the B.As' espoused beliefs appeared to show a variation by 1.85 from the mean (2.00) whereas the M.As' espoused beliefs tended to show a variation of 4.62 from the mean (4.41). In short, there appeared to be no significant relationship between the mean scores of B.As' espoused beliefs and the mean scores of M.As' espoused beliefs. This would suggest that M.As who seemed to be more qualified than B.As would not seem to show better years of research involvement. In other words, being B.A./B.ED. or M.A does not seem to bring a variation in the mean scores of the number of years which the samples were involved in undertaking action research (ESB) because the t-observed was 1.98, which was not significant ($p < 0.05$).

Nevertheless, there appeared to be a significant difference between the samples' mean scores of total English language teaching experience because the 2-tailed significance p-value which would be .01 is less than 0.05 alpha level. As a result, the p-associated value of t-observed would become large (2.77) which seemed to imply that there would be difference between the mean scores of M.As' total English language teaching experience and B.As' total English language teaching experience.

This, in other words, the standard deviations of B.As and M.As of 5.78 and 11.77 seemed to show a big variation in the samples' total English language teaching experience from the means of 11.27 and 20.18 in each case. In fact, there seems to be more variation in M.As' total English language teaching experience than the B.As'.

Generally, this inferential statistical evidence would suggest that second degree holders tend to have more total English language teaching experience compared to first degree holders; hence, both were found to have different mean scores as indicated in the t-test for independent samples of qualification. As a result, qualification appeared to determine the samples' total English language teaching experience; hence, there seemed to be a significant relationship between the samples' qualification and their total English language teaching experiences. Moreover, the t-observed was 2.77, which is significant at 5%.

An independent t-test was also computed to see whether or not there would be a relationship between the samples' mean scores of qualification and their practical involvement in action research, if any. Accordingly, there seems to be a significant difference between the mean scores of B.As' and M.As' research undertaking because the p-value of .04 is less than .05 alpha level and its associated t-value (t-observed) would become large (2.23). This would imply the existence of mean difference because the t-observed was 2.23 which was significant at .05 level.

The mean of the first degree holders and the second degree ones appear to be 1.07 and 2.41, respectively, indicating that the B.As produce 1 English language teaching action research work whereas the M.As produce 2 English language teaching

action research work. In fact, the deviation in research in action for B.As' and M.As' mean scores would be .96 and 2.27 from the means of 1.07 and 2.41, respectively.

The entire picture of the analysis of independent t-test for the mean scores of qualification and research in action would suggest that second-degree holder ELT teachers tend to show better practical involvement in English language teaching action research compared to first-degree holders. This would be partly due to their qualification level and partly due to their total English language teaching experience which was indicated in the independent t-test computation for qualification and total English language teaching experience in column 2 of Table 9.

All in all, the independent t-test computation between the mean scores of samples' qualification as a predictor variable, on the one hand, and the mean scores of the criterion variables (espoused beliefs, total English language teaching experience, and research in action, on the other, appeared to show that:

- 4) Qualification (Being B.A. or M.A. holder) does not seem to bring a significant difference on the number of years which the samples seemed to be involved in action research (espoused beliefs),
- 4) Qualification (being B.A. or M.A. holder) would seem to have an impact on the samples' total English language teaching experience (TELTEX), and
- 4) Being B.A or M.A. holder appeared to contribute to the difference in research in action (RA) among the samples.

As it would be explained, the results of inter-correlation coefficients are given hereunder in Table 10.

Table 10: The Inter-Correlation Coefficients Among the Four Variables (Qualification, Total English Language Teaching Experience, Espoused Beliefs, and Research in Action)

		QUAL	TELTEX	ESB	RA
QUAL	R	1.00			
	N	(33)			
	P	.			
TELTEX	R	0.56*	1.00		
	N	(33)	(33)		
	P	.001	.		
ESB	R	0.51*	0.72*	1.00	
	N	(33)	(33)	(33)	
	P	.002	.000	.	
RA	R	0.47*	0.58*	0.87*	1.00
	N	(33)	(33)	(33)	(33)
	P	.006	.000	.000	.

*Significant at 5% level.

As indicated in Table 10, an overview of the inter-correlation coefficients for all the variables seems to show a significant relationship among the variables, and the coefficients ranged from 0.47 for RA (Research in Action) and QUAL (Qualification) that could be taken as a relatively weak correlation to 0.87 for RA (Research in Action) and ESB (Espoused Beliefs) with the strongest correlation. The relative low correlation between qualification and research in action seemed to support the impracticability of action research in teaching English as a foreign language as indicated in the t-test computation in Table 16 (P. 55)

Besides, RA (Research in Action) appears to correlate highly with ESB (Espoused Beliefs) than with TELTEX (Total English Language Teaching Experience). This could

be an evidence for the impact of the number of years which the samples were involved in action research on their practical involvement in action research or research in action (RA). This would mean that there is a high positive correlation or a close relationship between the two variables (RA and ESB) which would possibly suggest that the more the number of years that the samples get involved in action research (ESB), the better the samples' practical involvement in action research (RA). Moreover, the samples' Espoused Beliefs (ESB) seemed to correlate highly with their total English Language Teaching Experience (TELTEX). This would imply that the more the samples' total English language teaching experience (TELTEX), the better the years of their involvement in action research (ESB). This also seems to hold true in all the remaining variables.

The multiple and step-wise regression analyses results of the four variables are treated below in Table 11.

Table 11: The Multiple and Step-wise Regression Analyses and Beta Weights for Each Criterion Variable

	B	SE B (Standard Error of Beta)	t- value	p- value	Multiple R = .8701 R ² = .7571 F=(3,29)=30.138
Constant A	.41	.563	.72	.47	
X ₁ (ESB)	.39	.057	6.85*	.00	
X ₂ (QUAL)	.24	.399	.59	.56	
X ₃ (TELTEX)	- 0.02	.024	-.84	.41	

* 0. 05 Significant level.

As all the variables were found to correlate highly with one another, the researcher chose multiple and step-wise regression analyses (Gall, Borg, and Gall; 1996). Therefore, multiple and step-wise regression analyses were computed to

determine the correlation between a criterion variable or dependent variable (in this case, Research in Action – RA) and a combination of three more predictor variables (x_1 , x_2 , and x_3). In other words, multiple regression analyses were computed to find out the combined contributions of the predictor variables (x_1 , x_2 , and x_3) to the variation on the dependent variable (Research in Action–RA). Therefore, the equation for the prediction of research in action (criterion variable) is given as:

$$\begin{aligned} &= a (\text{constant}) + b (\text{Espoused Beliefs, } x_1) + c (\text{Qualification, } x_2) + d (\text{Total} \\ &\quad \text{English Language Teaching Experience, } x_3) \text{ which means:} \\ &= 0.41 + 0.39 x_1 + 0.24 x_2 + (-0.02 x_3) \text{ [Please See Appendix G].} \end{aligned}$$

As shown in Table 11, the multiple-correlation coefficient (R) for the above equation is .8701 which accounts for about 76 per cent of the variance on the ELT teachers' practical involvement in language teaching action research (RA). That was first entered into the multiple and stepwise regression and followed by ESB, QUAL, and TELTEX. An F-test of this multiple and stepwise regression would show that $F = 30.138$ which is significant at .05 level. As a result, the stepwise regression analyses chose only one predictor variable (x_1 , ESB) which seems to explain or appears to be the predictor of the criterion variable (in this case, RA).

The individual effect of each predictor variable on the criterion variable is computed as indicated below in Table 12.

Table 12: The Effect of Each Independent Variable (X₁, X₂, and X₃) on the Criterion Variable (RA)

	Constant	B	Correlation	Adjusted R ²	T-value	P-value
X1(QUAL)	-.71	1.66	.47	.22	2.95*	.0060
X2(TELTEX)	.23	.09	.58	.34	3.94*	.0004
X3(ESB)	.52	.37	.87	.76	9.65*	.0000

* Significant at 0.05 level.

In line with the above table, the three variables X₁, X₂, and X₃ appeared to predict the criterion variable by 22 %, 34 %, and 76 %, respectively though the predicting power of X₁ and X₂ seems to be taken by the greatest contributor variable (X₃ ESB) in the stepwise regression analysis.

The analyses and discussions of ELT teachers' responses to some 'Yes' or 'No' questions is given below in Table 13.

Table 13: ELT Teachers' Responses to 'Yes' or 'No' Questionnaire Items (Items 6,7,8,10,11,12,14,16,17,18,19,and 20)

Item No	Each Item of the Questionnaire	Responses					
		'Yes' Responses		'No' Responses		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
6	Have you ever been involved in any kind of research?	22	66.7	11	33.3	33	100.0
7	Have you ever conducted action research in teaching English as a foreign language?	12	36.4	21	63.6	33	100.0
8	Do you have a high interest in doing language teaching action research?	20	60.6	13	39.4	33	100.0
10	Do you believe that your colleagues have been involved in undertaking language teaching action research?	7	21.2	26	78.8	33	100.0
11	Do your colleagues give due emphasis to teaching than to research?	28	84.8	5	15.2	33	100.0
12	Do you feel confident in your research skills in language teaching research?	8	24.2	25	75.8	33	100.0
14	Does your work environment create conducive atmosphere for undertaking language teaching research?	4	12.1	29	87.9	33	100.0
16	Have you taken relevant research courses which are pertinent to English language teaching during your college or university training years or pre-service training?	6	18.2	27	81.8	33	100.0
17	If your response to number 16 is 'yes', do you find that these courses are adequate to enable you to carry out language teaching action research?	4	12.1	29	87.9	33	100.0
18	Do you regularly read different books, journals, and articles on language teaching research?	7	21.2	26	78.8	33	100.0
19	Do you have clear information on your research skills in language teaching action research?	6	18.2	27	81.8	33	100.0
20	Do ELT teachers in your college collaborate with one another to carry out language teaching action research?	3	9.1	30	90.9	33	100.0

Table 13 gives detailed information concerning the respondents' beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions about English language teaching action research. Accordingly, the samples were asked whether or not they carried out any kind of research and action

research in teaching English as a foreign language in the questionnaire Items 6 and 7, respectively. As a result, 22 or 66.7 per cent and 12 or 36.4 per cent of the samples said that they participated in some kind of research and English language action research, respectively. But, the remaining 11 or 33.3 per cent and 21 or 63.6 per cent of the samples responded that they were not involved in any kind of research and action research, respectively. In fact, this finding would seem to be in contradiction with college teachers' role in undertaking action research.

With regard to research interest (Item 8), 20 of the samples (that would be, 60.6 per cent) expressed that they have high research interest; however, 13 of the samples (that is, 39.4 per cent) responded that they do not have a high research interest. This would imply that lack of research interest would harm the samples' involvement in action research; hence, interest could be taken as a basis of practice (in this case, research in action).

Regarding Item 10, double phrasing was used to cross-check the respondents' responses to Items 6 and 7. As a result, few of the samples i.e., 21.2 per cent responded that their colleagues get involved in action research, however, the majority of them (78.8 per cent) replied that their colleagues do not seem to participate in undertaking English language teaching action research. This would suggest that when the samples were asked using the self-addressing pronoun 'you' as shown in questionnaire Items 6 and 7, they seemed inclined to the 'yes' response options. On the other hand, when they were asked using the noun phrase 'your colleagues', they seemed inclined to the 'No' response categories. In other words, in this cross-checking questionnaire design, the respondents do not seem to be aware of the fact that the question would address

themselves indirectly. These mixed up and self-contradictory responses of the respondents to one question of different forms appeared to be an evidence for the absence of any effort made by the samples in undertaking action research.

In relation to Item 11, many of the respondents (84.8 per cent) said that they gave much emphasis to teaching than to research; so, did their college. The remaining 15.2 per cent of the samples claimed that they give equal emphasis to both teaching and research. The emphasis of teaching at the cost of research would be due to practical reasons and personal problems of ELT teachers (Nunan, 1990).

Regarding research skills (Item 12), only few of the samples (24.2 per cent) reported that they feel confident in their research skills whereas many of the respondents (75.8 per cent) responded to the negative. In fact, this response of the samples was counter-checked against the response gained from Item 19. Consequently, the respondents' responses seemed to show consistency because it was only 6 of the samples (18.2 per cent) who reported that they had clear information on (collecting data, analyzing data, interpreting data...) their research skills how to undertake teacher-research when a majority of the samples (27 or 81.8 per cent) reported that they had not. This would imply that the samples seemed to have problems in what Cohen, Manion, and Morrison (2001) called action research undertaking 'processes'.

Concerning their work environment (Item 14), a few minority (4 or 12.2 per cent) of the samples said that their work environment (colleges) appeared to be convenient for them in undertaking action research, however, this result seem to be contradicted by the majority of the respondents (29 or 87.8 per cent) who believed that their work environment (colleges) did not encourage them in undertaking action

research. This seems to confirm Burns's (1999) view which emphasizes the role of good school organizational features as pre-condition for carrying out English language teaching action research.

Moreover, Items 16 and 17 were constructed to assess the beliefs and attitudes of the samples concerning the relevance and adequacy of research courses which the ELT teachers possibly took when they were in colleges or universities. Only 6 (18.2 per cent) of the samples reported that the courses were pertinent to English language teaching research and only 4 (12.1 per cent) of the samples said that the courses were adequate to enable themselves to undertake action research. Despite this fact, 27 (82.8 per cent) (Item 16) of the total samples and 29 of the total samples (87.9 per cent) (Item 17) said that the research courses were neither geared towards language teaching research nor adequate to enable them to carry out action research in their ELT classrooms. All these would partly be evidences for some weaknesses of post-secondary foreign language teacher training programs (Crookes and Chandler, 2001).

Concerning the reading habit of ELT teachers (Item 18), 7 (21.1 per cent) of the samples said that they read different books, articles, journals and some others; nevertheless, 26 (78.8%) of them replied that they did not read such materials. The major reason reported by the respondents was the scarcity of relevant reading materials on language teaching research issues. This result seems to contradict with Law and Glover (1996) who argued that professional development should be continuous.

Finally, the samples were asked whether or not they carried out action research collaboratively (Item 20). Few of them (3 or 9.1 per cent) responded that they did collaborate with one another when they undertook action research. However, almost

all of the samples (90.9 per cent) said that they were involved in action research individually, not collaboratively. In fact, this approach of research undertaking seems to be criticized; hence, it seems to lack the spirit of sharing of ideas (Webb, 1996).

The frequencies and percentages of action research constraints is summarized below in Table 14.

Table 14: The Frequencies and Percentages of Some Serious Action Research Constraints (for Questionnaire Items 9,13, and 15)

No	Each Research Constraint	Total Number of Respondents And Non- Respondents					
		Responded		Non-Responded		Total	
		f	%	f	%	f	%
1	Undermining the role of research	26	78.8	7	21.2	33	100.0
2	Lack of enough research skills	24	72.7	9	27.3	33	100.0
3	Lack of enough teaching research courses offered	23	69.7	10	30.3	33	100.0
4	Lack of money	21	63.6	12	36.4	33	100.0
5	Lack of enough time to undertake action research	20	60.6	13	39.4	33	100.0
6	Heavy work load	18	54.5	15	45.5	33	100.0
7	Lack of updated research materials	17	51.5	16	48.5	33	100.0
8	Emphasizing teaching over research	16	48.5	17	51.5	33	100.0
9	Lack of collaboration	15	45.5	18	54.5	33	100.0
10	Absence of research conferences and work shops on language teaching research issues	14	42.4	19	57.6	33	100.0
11	Lack of encouragement from college principals	13	39.4	20	60.6	33	100.0
12	Lack of research interest	11	33.3	22	66.7	33	100.0
13	Others, for example, lack of photocopy access, research offices, internet facility, computer, printers, etc.	9	27.3	24	72.7	33	100.0

The ranking of research constraints reported above is done by counting the frequencies that each constraint is ticked by the respondents.

Referring to the information given in the above table, undermining the role of research, lack of enough research skills, and lack of enough language teaching research courses were reported to be the most serious research constraints with percentages of 78.8, 72.7, and 69.7, respectively. In fact, these research constraints

were followed by 21.2, 27.3, and 30.3 percentages of respondents who did not give responses to each research constraint, respectively. This finding seems to contradict with Nunan's (1989) identification of serious action research constraints which were lack of resource, lack of money, and lack of expertise.

Lack of money, enough time, heavy work-load, and shortage of updated research materials were the next serious research constraints reported with percentages of 63.6, 60.6, 54.5, and 51.5, respectively, however, these research constraints were not reported as serious research constraints as it could be understood from the percentages of the non-respondents.

The third group of research constraints reported by the samples were emphasizing teaching over research, lack of collaboration, absence of research conferences and workshops on English language teaching research, lack of encouragement from college principals, and lack of research interest.

Finally, the respondents reported that lack of photocopy access, research office, internet, computers, and printers are some of the research constraints that they encountered.

As it would be explained, the ELT teachers' degree of agreement and/or disagreement is treated below in Table 15.

Turning to the information given in Table 15, one could understand that the frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, variances, t-values, and p-values of each questionnaire item. However, some items were deliberately positively worded while some others were negatively worded to cross-check and counter-check the respondents' responses.

Accordingly, Items 11,18,21, and 22 were concerned with the practicability of action research in teaching English as a foreign language. In other words, these items were constructed to measure the samples' beliefs and attitudes towards the practice of action research. Similarly, Item 1 was concerned with ELT teachers' decision making whereas Item 2 was concerned with the problematic nature of English language teaching and the need of classroom-based investigations in ELT classrooms.

Moreover, Items 3,8, and 19 were concerned with the possible gap between English language teaching and action research whereas Items 6 and 7 were designed to assess teachers' research interest and their role in higher institutions.

Questionnaire Items 4,5,9,12,15,17, and 20 were concerned with the action research constraints which could possibly be encountered by college ELT teachers. On the other hand, Item 13 was meant to measure the ELT teachers' professional contact on language teaching action research issues, if any.

Finally, the remaining Items 10 and 14, in the one hand, and Item 16, on the other, were concerned with ELT teachers' teaching load and research skills, respectively.

Therefore, based on the rationale given above, all the 22 questionnaire items are subsumed into 10 categories as indicated in Table 16 below.

Table 16: A Summary of One-Sample t-test Computation of Table 16 to Check Whether Agreement and/or Disagreement Would be Above or Below Test Value (Mean)=3 (N=33, and DF=n-1 i.e., 32)

Summarized Items' Code	Items	Mean Scores	SD	Variance	t-value	p-value	Remark
AVG 1	11,18,21, and 22	2.87	1.61	2.59	-.46	.648	Not Significant
AVG 2	1	2.24	1.06	1.13	6.72*	.000	Significant
AVG 3	2	4.06	1.40	1.93	4.38*	.000	Significant
AVG 4	3,8,19	3.94	1.06	1.12	5.10*	.000	Significant
AVG 5	6	3.61	1.17	1.37	2.97*	.006	Significant
AVG 6	7	4.52	.67	.44	13.05*	.000	Significant
AVG 7	5,4,9,12,15, 17, and 20	3.59	1.49	2.21	2.26*	.030	Significant
AVG 8	13	2.24	1.44	2.06	-3.03	.005	Significant
AVG 9	10 and 14	3.97	1.17	1.37	4.75*	.000	Significant
AVG 10	16	3.79	1.34	1.80	3.38*	.002	Significant

* Significant at 0 .05 level.

With regard to the practicability of action research in teaching English as a foreign language (summarized items AVG1), the samples seem to disagree because the average mean of these items is 2.87 which seems to be less than the average test value, that is, 3. Moreover, the P-value .648 appears to be greater than the 0.05 alpha level. All these evidences seem to suggest the disagreement of ELT teachers concerning the

practicability of action research in teaching English as a foreign language with a variation of 1.61 from the mean score of 2.87.

Concerning AVG2, the samples agree that teachers' decision making should be supported by action research because the average mean score (4.24) is significantly higher than the ideal average (mean) which is 3. Moreover, the p-value of the 2-tailed significance which is .000 seems to be less than the 0.05 significance level which is an additional evidence for the mean score to become significantly higher than the ideal average test value of 3. Supporting this idea, Crookes (1993) expressed that English language teaching is divorced from action research-especially in the context where it is taught as a foreign or second language like in our case (Ethiopia).

Regarding the problematic nature of English language teaching and the need for classroom-based investigations (AVG 3), the samples seemed to strongly agree because the mean score of 4.06 of this item appears to be significantly higher than the ideal average which is 3. Moreover, the p-value of .000 is less than the 0.05 level of significance. This would imply that the samples seem to agree about the need for classroom- based research in ELT classrooms.

AVG4 was concerned with the possibly existing gap between English language teaching and action research. In relative terms, the respondents' responses seem to reveal the absence of a relationship between English language teaching practices and doing action research; hence, the average means score is 3.94 which is greater than the ideal average (3). Moreover, the p-value (.000) is less than .05 which could imply that the mean score (3.94) is significantly different from the average mean (3). This would

suggest that the samples seem to agree that there is no a significant relationship between English language teaching and action research.

With regard to research interest (AVG5), the respondents seem to suggest that they had research interest because the agreement level appears to be greater than the test value that is 3.61 and 3, respectively. Besides, the p-value which is .006 seemed to be less than the 0.05 level of significance which implies that there would be a significant difference between the average mean and the test value that is 3.61 and 3, respectively. This, in other words, would suggest that the samples responded positively regarding their research interest.

In relation to AVG6, the mean score of 4.52 seems to be greater than the average test value (3) thus showing samples' agreement about the role of teachers in undertaking research. Besides, the .000 of p-value is less than 0.05 alpha level. This would suggest that ELT teachers would seem aware of their role in undertaking action research though there seems to be no practical involvement as the result of AVG1 showed. In fact, this role awareness, in turn, would indicate the possibility of action research by these ELT teachers. This would also support Skerritt's (1992) argument about the practicability of action research in higher institutions like teachers' training colleges.

AVG7, on the other hand, is concerned with action research constraints which ELT teachers might encounter when they undertake action research. The average mean score (4.52) tends to be significantly greater than that of the test value (3) and also the p-value that is .000 is less than the 0.05 alpha level. These would be evidences for the presence of strong agreement among the samples' responses about the research

constraints such as lack of relevant reading material, lack of support, lack of time, and lack of money because the mean of this item (4.52) is almost closer to the strongly agreement continuum of the rating scale. However, the standard deviation (1.49) appears to show the great variation among the respondents' responses from the mean which is 4.52.

With regard to AVG8, the respondents seem to agree that their colleagues did not maintain professional contacts on language teaching research issues. For one thing, the mean which is 2.24 seems significantly lower than the test value which is 3 and, for another, the .005 p-value appears to be greater than the 0.05 significance level. This would possibly indicate that ELT teachers do not collaborate with one another on language teaching research issues.

Concerning AVG 9, as one can see from the table, high-teaching load is reported as a factor for not being engaged in research activities, even though there seems to be a variation in teachers' agreement from the mean (3.97). In relation to this, Burns (1999) stresses that work-load could be one of the research constraints which seems to hamper teachers' undertaking of action research.

Finally, as indicated in Table 16, the respondents were asked to express their agreement and/or disagreement on how confident they felt in their research skills. Regarding this, the mean of 3.79 appears to be a little greater than the test value, 3. Besides, the p-value (.002) tended to be less than the 0.05. All these would suggest that the samples' responses are significantly higher than the ideal average test value of 3. In other words, the samples seem to be confident in their research skills. In fact, this finding tends to be consistent with the respondents' responses to the interview

(Item 4) where almost 6 of them said that they felt confident in their English language research skills (P.75). However, it contradicts with the responses of the samples to 'Yes' or 'No' sections of the questionnaire-more particularly to the response of Item 12 (P. 54).

On top of all these, the respondents tended to show a good level of agreement to the questionnaire items. Their responses seem to be inclined towards agreement except in two cases of disagreement. This would suggest that ELT teachers have positive attitudes towards English language teaching action research.

In the section hereunder, the responses of ELT teachers to semi-structured questionnaire item is discussed.

3.2 A Summary of ELT Teachers' Responses to the Semi-Structured Items in the Questionnaire

With the hope of validating the results of the inferential statistical analysis, a qualitative analysis was carried out on the data gathered through the semi-structured questionnaire and on the data gathered through the interviews held with ELT teachers and some college principals. As already indicated in the description of the questionnaire (Section 4.1) , the samples were asked 7 questions. This section of the questionnaire was included with the hope that some of the respondents' responses across the previous three sections of the questionnaire (Section 1, Section 2, and Section 3) would be counter-checked against this section prepared for the purpose. Of the 33 convincing (purposive) samples who participated in filling in the questionnaire, only 20 (of them) gave different responses to this section of the questionnaire. In other words, 13 ELT teachers returned the questionnaire without filling in this part of the

questionnaire where the remaining 20 samples did participate in feeling in this part of the questionnaire. In fact, this could be taken as a revealing figure compared with the number of the samples during the pilot study whereas only 4 of the total population (i.e., 40%) participated in completing this section of the questionnaire.

Accordingly, the samples used their own words, phrases and sentences while writing answers to this section of the questionnaire, nevertheless, the researcher made possible efforts to bring the respondents' responses into some kind of categories. In doing so, the researcher used similar themes and ideas together under each semi-structured questionnaire as discussed, hereunder. This was done to give a clear picture to this qualitative data so that discussions would be clear.

To Item 1 of this section of the questionnaire, more than half of the respondents (60%) said that teaching and research should not be viewed separately; hence, teacher-research would help the classroom teachers to get deep insights about their method of teaching, students' learning, classroom problems, and developments. Mentioning their present practice, however, they said that there would not be a considerable relationship between research and teaching in general. Six of them (30%), on the other hand, believed that they made their own efforts to support their teaching through classroom-based research though there seems to be a failure in putting into effect the results of such research findings. But 2 of them (10%) were very skeptical about the existing relationship between research and teaching.

With regard to the relationship between English language teaching and action research, 8 of them (40%) expressed their doubts about the expected relationship. They added that some teachers would be new to the experience i.e., action research. In fact,

5 of them (25%) replied that they carried out action research to examine their English language teaching and learning process. Four of the respondents said that it would be too early and difficult to talk about the relationship between action research and English language teaching in their own college context and the teaching of English in Ethiopian context. Nevertheless, few of them (15%) reported that it might be said that there could be some sort of relationship between English language teaching and action research by mentioning their own involvement in English language teaching action research. They also said that a few number of ELT teachers in their departments used action research to develop (enrich) their teaching though it seems a recent phenomena and much could not be said about the relationship between the two.

The entire picture of the samples' responses concerning the relationship between teaching and research, in general, and English language teaching and action research, in particular, appears to support Wallace's (1998) view which states the argument that English language teaching is viewed separately from classroom-based inquiries-especially in the context where it is taught as a foreign language.

Concerning their practical involvement in action research, 8 of them (40%) said that they did minor classroom research works to a very limited scale. They also said that the research which they carried out helped them to address some problems linked with the teaching of English as a foreign language though they did not get any of these research works published. However, 50% of them reported that they did not carry out any action research; except the research they did for their first and second degree requirements-even if that could be considered as action research. Two of them (10%)

were not sure of their involvement in action research except some rare cases that they mentioned.

Item 4 of this section of the question was constructed to survey the beliefs of ELT teachers about the role(s) of action research in teaching English as a foreign language. Accordingly, the majority of the respondents (80%) stated that action research in teaching English as a foreign language would be extremely crucial to make informed decisions for everything that the teachers would practice in ELT classrooms. But, only 1 of them (5%) said that action research could reinforce the teachers' teaching even though he/she would not be always expected to undertake this research. Nevertheless, 3 of them (15%) said that they were not certain about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language. According to them, if action research were a solution for problems which could crop up in teaching English as a foreign language, English language teaching would be with out any problem as could be learnt from other countries' experience. This doubt of the samples, in fact, would seem to emanate from teachers' lack of awareness about the role(s) of action research in teaching English as a foreign language.

Broadly speaking, except 3 of the samples (15%), it would be said that the samples had the awareness about the roles of action research in ELT classrooms. This would, in turn, suggest the existing positive attitudes of ELT teachers towards action research, thus, possibly going along the view of Grassner (n.d.) who argues and emphasizes that ELT teachers should develop positive attitudes towards change in teaching.

Regarding the research courses, half (10) of the respondents revealed that they took only 1 research course which would not seem to have relevance to teaching English as a foreign language. Besides, they emphasized its inadequacies; hence, it could not help them to get involved in action research. On the contrary, 3 of them (15%) said that they took 1 research course that seemed to have a link to teaching English as a foreign language. In fact, they emphasized on the inadequacy of the course. Surprisingly, the remaining 7 ELT teachers (35%) revealed that they did not take any research course in education, in general, and in teaching English as a foreign language, in particular.

With regard to the most revealing research constraints, the samples mentioned a number of them; however, a small selection was made on the basis of the seriousness and frequencies of the constraints reported. Consequently, 10 of them highly emphasized on high-work-load, lack of money, research skills, interest in research, self-initiation, support from authorities concerned, and so on. Four of them replied that political problems, lack of permanent budget, incentives, time, and professional accountability are some of the research constraints which they encountered. The remaining 6 (30%) underlined research constraints such as lack of research support (technical and material), suspecting the outcome of research findings, tiresome nature of research, lack of confidence to show one's research findings in seminars and conferences.

Regarding the possible solutions to get more ELT teachers involved in action research, a good number of the samples (55%) stress on basic and adequate research courses which should be designed and offered to any ELT trainee both at the pre-

service, in-service, on-the-job-, and post-service teacher training programs so that trainees would make use of the research design techniques and skills in the world outside. However, 6 (30%) more experienced teachers emphasized the roles of pre-service and on-the-job-teacher-training programs. The remaining 3 (15%) said that what the ELT trainees are exposed to at the pre-service and post service training programs could have a long-lasting effect and that emphasis should be given to these aspects of teacher training programs. To them, these teacher-training programs would be extremely crucial; hence, these training programs could motivate the ELT trainees to explore and relate the theoretical aspect of training with the practical aspect. In relation to this, Brumfit and Mitchell (1990) advise teacher-trainers to give much emphasis to pre-service and post-service training programs.

4.4 The Description of the Interview Result Held With ELT Teachers

As shown in Appendix B, an interview consisting of 5 items was administered to 8 ELT teachers across the three teachers' training colleges so as to cross-check the respondents' responses in the questionnaire. These items focused on the ELT teachers' practical involvement in action research, the possible areas in which they employed action research, their research skills, and their beliefs about the role(s) of action research in teaching English as a foreign language.

As done in the analysis of the semi-structured questionnaire, the researcher made attempts to discuss the results of the interviewees' responses on the basis of common themes of the interview.

Accordingly, the 1st item was designed to assess the ELT teachers' practical involvement in language teaching action research. As a result, 1 of them (12.5%) said

that he carried out only 1 action research, however, 3 of the samples (37.5%) replied that they did not undertake any action research in their lifetime of English language teaching. But, half (4) of them responded that they usually carried out such research in their ELT classrooms.

Concerning the 2nd item, all of the eight respondents strongly argued that ELT teachers should be involved in undertaking action research. Regarding the reasons why ELT teachers should undertake action research, the samples responded that action research would help classroom teachers to enhance their profession, develop their confidence, shape and improve their teaching, find evidences about teaching, and to examine further their method of teaching. In fact, these roles of action research are among the rationale of teacher-research stated by (Hoey et al, 2003).

Regarding the specific language teaching and learning areas where action research is employed, 3 of the respondents (37.5) reported that reading skills tended to be their preferred areas of research interest. Two of them (25%), on the other hand, did not clearly indicate the specific areas where they carried out action research; hence, they were not engaged in action research. The remaining 3 (37.5), indicated that the role of mother tongue, writing skills, and listening skills were some of the areas which they undertook some action research work.

In relation to the 4th item of the interview, 1 of the interviewees (12.5%) claimed that she had the research skills though she did not examine them practically, whereas quite a revealing number of the respondents (6 or 75%) felt confident in their research skills because they carried out some action research work and, according to them, the methodology they employed was appropriate. Moreover, 1 of the

interviewees replied that she did not feel confident in her research skills such as collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...

With regard to their beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language, all 8 of the samples reported that they had the awareness about the role(s) of action research by stating that action research would help classroom teachers to be informed about their method of teaching so as to run teaching and learning smoothly, and to keep teachers alert. In other words, all the interviewees seemed to have the fuller awareness about the role(s) of action research in teaching English as a foreign language despite their little practical involvement in action research. This would seem to suggest that ELT teachers show positive attitudes towards action research. Accordingly, the interviewees mentioned some of the basic roles of action research.

Generally, the interviewees' responses appear to be reliable and valid because what they responded to some questionnaire items show some consistency with what they replied to the interview questions; for example, as indicated in Table 13, only 8 of the samples (i.e., 24.2%) to the questionnaire said that they felt confident in their research skills; so, did 1 of the samples (12.5) to the interview out of the total population of 33 and 8, respectively. This piece of evidence to some extent would be a case in point to support the consistency of the respondents' responses both to the questionnaire and to the interview.

4.5 Descriptions of the Interview Result Held With Some College Principals

Believing that the inclusion of some college principals would throw some light on this study, an interview consisting of 6 items was administered. All these items focused on whether or not there would be specific timetable to do action research, enough budget to undertake action research, recognition given to teacher research, conducive atmosphere, regular seminars and conferences, and the extent of the involvement of ELT teachers in action research compared to other departments across each teachers' training colleges. In terms of their role, 3 of the respondents were Research and Academic Vice Deans while the remaining 3 were Chairpersons of the English Department.

Regarding the presence of specific timetable to undertake action research, the respondents' responses were mixed-up and self-contradictory. As 2 of the college principals (33.3%) said that their colleges did not have timetable which was allotted for doing research, however, 3 of the interviewees (50%) said that their college had specific timetable for every academic staff; hence, teachers' work load is adjusted in such a way that it should not be more than 12 credit hours, which could imply that every teacher should be engaged in carrying out action research. In fact, 1 of the college officials was markedly characterized by indecision. This might suggest the existing role confusion among some college principals; hence, in one college there were two different and contradictory responses from two principals. Moreover, in all the three teachers' training colleges, the researcher found that the responses of the interviewees' (college officials') to be different from and contradictory to one another.

The 3rd item of this section of the interview was designed to find out whether or not there would be enough annual budget for teachers to undertake research. Five of the respondents reported that their college had budget for research purposes though they said that it would be inadequate. On the contrary, only 1 of them (16.7%) replied that his college had no budget for research at all.

Regarding the 4th item, all (6) of the respondents replied that recognition to teacher research could be expressed morally and materially. They also added that every teacher would be given enough time to show up his/her research finding anywhere. This tends in contradiction to Bennett's (1993) finding where 90 percent of the samples revealed that the college principals were not co-operatives and give recognition to teacher-research.

Related to the 5th item, all 6 of them replied that their colleges had conducive atmosphere for teachers to undertake any research. They believed that every research facility is opened to any teacher-researcher. Nevertheless, this finding appears to contradict the responses of ELT teachers to the questionnaire-especially in Table 13 (Item 14) where 88 per cent of them said that their work environment did not encourage them to undertake English language teaching research.

Finally, the colleges' principals were asked about ELT teachers involvement in action research. All 4 of the respondents (66.7%) replied that ELT teachers seem to have low involvement in action research (teaching research). Heavy work-load, lack of professional accountability, engagement in other activities, and so on were some of the reasons mentioned by the interviewees. Nevertheless, as 2 (33.3%) respondents in a college put, it would be said that the lion's share in the area of teacher-research seemed

to be played by English language teachers. In fact, this would seem in some degree of consistency with the responses of ELT teachers to the interview; hence, half (i.e., 4) of the respondents replied that they carried out research activities.

This would suggest to some extent the attempts made by few college ELT teachers in undertaking English language teaching action research.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

As stated earlier, the purpose of the present study was to find out how practical action research is among ELT teachers of three teachers' training colleges, the attitudes of ELT teachers towards English language teaching action research, some major problems which college ELT teachers possibly encounter in conducting action research, and possible solutions to these problems, if any.

To this end, both quantitative and qualitative data were gathered through questionnaire from 33 college ELT teachers, namely, Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazareth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education and the number of samples in each College was 8, 10, and 15, respectively. Both inferential and descriptive statistical analyses of data were employed.

Accordingly, the inferential statistical analyses computation consisted of the following: independent t- test, correlation coefficients, multiple and step-wise regression analyses, and an independent sample t-test were computed. Independent samples for qualification were computed to examine whether or not there would exist a significant difference between the mean scores of B.A.s' and M.As' espoused beliefs, total English language teaching experience, and research in action. The independent t - test for the computation of mean scores tended to show that qualification (being B.A. or M.A. holder) does not seem to bring a significant difference on the samples' mean scores of espoused beliefs. Nevertheless, these computations seem to show a

significant difference between the mean scores of the B.As' and M.As' total English language teaching experience, and research in action.

In other words, there was no a mean difference between first degrees' and second degrees' espoused beliefs whereas the computation seemed to reveal a significant difference between the mean scores of B.A.s and M.As total English language teaching experience and research in action. In short, qualification was not found to have an impact on the samples' espoused beliefs whereas it seemed to contribute positively on the samples' total English language teaching experience, and their practical involvement in action research at 5% level of significance.

Moreover, correlation coefficients were computed for the four variables: Qualification, total English language teaching experience, the number of years which ELT teachers believed to be involved in action research and, their actual practical involvement in action research. The correlation coefficients' result showed a high correlation between the samples' espoused beliefs and research in action which can be numerically expressed as $r = .87$ and a relatively a low correlation between qualification and research in action which was $r = .47$. In fact, the latter would seem to be an evidence that ELT teachers tend to show little practical involvement in action research.

Multiple and step-wise regression analyses were also computed. As a result, a stepwise regression analysis selected only the number of years that ELT teachers were involved in action research (espoused beliefs-ESB) as the greatest contributor for predicting the criterion variable which was research in action (RA) contributing 76 per cent of the variability. In fact, a regression analysis was also alculated for each

predictor variable (qualification - QUAL., total English language teaching experience - TELTEX, and espoused beliefs - ESB) and each was found to predict the criterion variable (research in action -RA) by 22 %, 34 %, and 76 %, respectively.

Besides, one sample t - test was computed to see whether or not ELT teachers' agreement and/ or disagreement would be below or above the test value, 3 (which would represent average level of agreement and /or disagreement of the samples to each item of the questionnaire and the summarized questionnaire items from AVG1 - AVG10). The result of this test computation seemed to show significantly higher levels of agreement among the mean scores of respondents ranging from 4.52 to disagreement that is 2.24 for items AVG 6 to AVG 8.

Descriptive analyses were also done to strengthen the inferential statistical analyses concerning the practical involvement of ELT teachers, how confident they were in their research skills, their attitudes towards English language teaching action research, and so on. Consequently, only 36.4%, 60.6%, and 24.2% of the samples were found to be involved in action research, confident in their research skills, and develop positive attitudes towards action research as indicated in Table 13 in the questionnaire Items of 7, 8, and 12. This descriptive analysis also appeared to show that undermining the role of research, lack of enough research skills, and lack of enough language teaching research courses offered to be some of the most serious research constraints with percentages of 78.8, 72.7, and 69.7, respectively.

The semi-structured questionnaire which was part of the descriptive analysis showed that no relationship exists between action research and English language teaching practices. In addition, out of 20 ELT teachers who participated in filling in

this part of the questionnaire, only 8 were found to be involved in investigating their English language teaching practices. This means that the ELT teachers' practical involvement in action research was not significant; hence, the findings of both the inferential statistics and descriptive statistics did not show a strong relationship between English language teaching and action research.

The interview held with some college principals was also the other aspect of the descriptive analysis. The summary responses of these principals tended to show that the ELT teachers' involvement in English language teaching action research was not significant; hence, only few of the samples were found to be involved in classroom-based investigations.

5.2 Conclusions

The following conclusions could be drawn from the discussions in the preceding sections of this paper:

1. The ELT teachers' involvement in English language teaching action research was not significant,
2. The ELT teachers seemed to have positive attitudes towards action research though their practical involvement was not found to be significant (Please See the t- test computation of AVG1 in Table 16),
3. Undermining the roles of research, lack of research skills, and enough language teaching research courses were some of the most serious research constraints reported as hampering the ELT teachers' involvement in action research, and

4. The samples appear to emphasize the role of relevant and adequate research courses in different EFL teacher-training programs as solutions to get more ELT teachers involved in English language teaching action research.

5.3 Recommendations

The researcher would like to give the following recommendations in line with the findings and the conclusions drawn:

1. Possible efforts should be made to upgrade the ELT teachers' English Language teaching research skills so that they would get involved in systematically addressing some academic problems associated with the teaching of English as a foreign language,
2. English language departments in each teachers' training college should organize seminars, workshops, and conferences preferably which focuses on English language teaching action research,
3. English language departments in higher institutions should design and offer relevant and adequate English language teaching research courses-especially for pre-service ELT trainees so that the trainees would practice research undertaking in their own work places (high schools, colleges, and universities). Moreover, this should be supplemented by successive on-the-job and post-job training sessions,
4. The colleges should give equal emphasis to teaching and teaching research, and also authorities support teacher-researchers to their colleges' capacity,

5. Relevant reading materials on English language teaching research issues should be made available to the teachers,
6. ELT teachers should be aware of the roles of action research and develop the spirit of researching into one's own teaching through collaboration means,
10. In fact, I do not claim that action research is the answer to all the problems of English language teaching, however, my experience make me to believe that the involvement of ELT teachers in English language teaching action research would be useful to relate English language teaching to the dynamism of the philosophies of teaching methods and approaches, and
10. Further investigations should be carried out on this issue which will consist of large number of samples of ELT teachers at the teachers' training colleges; hence, it could help to re-assure the reliability and validity of this research paper.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adane Tessera (2000). "Research Activities, Problems, and Future Directions: An Investigation of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in Educational Research," in Amare Asgdom, Derebssa Duferra, Zenebe Barake (eds.) Proceedings of the National Conference Held in Nazereth, March 10-11,2000. Institute of Educational Research: Addis Ababa University.
- Allwright, D., and Bailey, M.K. (1991). Focus on Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bailey, M.K., and Nunan, D. (eds.). (1996). Voices from the Language Classroom. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, J. (1993). Doing Your Research Project: A Guide for First-Time Researchers in Education and Social Science. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Bennett, K.C. (1993). "Teacher Researchers: All Dressed Up and No Place to Go?" Educational Leadership, Vol. 52/2.
- Best, W. J., and Kahn, V. J. (1993). Research in Education. (7th Ed.). New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Private Limited.
- Brumfit, C., and Mitchell, B. (eds.). (1990). Research in the Language Classroom. ELT Document, 133.
- Bryant, I. (1996). "Action Research and Reflective Teaching," in Scott, D., and Usher, R. (eds.). Understanding Educational Research. London and New York: Routledge.

- Burns, A. (1999). Collaborative Action Research for English Language Teachers.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burns, R.B. (1994). Introduction to Research Methods. Melbourne: Longman.
- Cohen, L., and Manion, L. (1994). Research Methods in Education. (4th Ed.). London
and New York: Routledge.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., and Morrison, K. (2000). Research Methods in Education. (5th
Ed.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Corey, S.M. (1953). Action Research to Improve School Practice. Columbia, New
York: Teachers' College.
- Crookes, G. (1993). "Action Research for Second Language Teachers: Going Beyond
Teacher Education." Applied Linguistics, Vol. 14/2.
- Crookes, G., and Chandler, M. P. (2001). "Introducing Action Research into the
Education of Postsecondary Foreign Language Teachers." Foreign
Language Annals, Vol. 34/2.
- Edge, J., and Richards, K. (eds.). (1993). Teachers Develop Teachers Research: Papers
on Classroom Research and Teacher Development. Oxford: Heinemann.
- Elliott, G. (1999). "Life-Long Learning: The Politics of the New Learning
Environment." Higher Education Policy Series, 44.
- Elliott, J. (1991). Action Research for Educational Change. Milton Keynes: Open
University Press.
- Gall, D. M., Borg, R.W., and Gall, P.J. (1996). Educational Research: An
Introduction. London: Longman Group Limited.

- Gassner, O. (n.d.). "Action Research for Absolute Beginners,": <http://simsim.rug.ac.be/latpflat/CAR/Gassner.html>.
- Goodson, F.I. (1992). "Sponsoring Teacher's Voice: Teachers' lives and Teacher Development," in Hargreaves, A., and Fullan, G. (eds.). Understanding Teacher Development. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hardley, G. (n.d.). "Action Research: Something for Everyone," :http://www.nuis.ac.jp/inhardley/Publication/jaltar/JAL_TAR.html.
- Head, K., and Taylor, P. (1997). Readings in Teacher Development. Heinemann: The Bath Press.
- Hoey, C. et al (2003). "Research in ELT: An International Conference in King Mong Kut's University of Technology Held in King Mong, April 9–11,2003," :<http://arts.Kmutt.ac.th/research-in-elt/>.
- Hopkins, D. (1993). A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research. (2nd Ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- _____. (2001). A Teacher's Guide to Classroom Research. (3rd Ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Johnson, W.R. (1993). "Where Can Teacher Research Lead? Teacher's Daydream." Educational Leadership, Vol. 51/2.
- Jordan, R.R. (1997). English for Specific Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kemmis, S. (1994). " Action Research," in Husén, T, and Postlethwaite, M. T (eds.). The International Encyclopedia of Education, Vol. 8.

- Klugh, E.H. (1970). Statistics: The Essentials for Research. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Last, G. (1969). "Language Problems in Secondary Schools." Journal of the Teachers of English in Ethiopia, No. 5.
- Law, S., and Glover, D. (1996). Managing Professional Development in Education. London: Kogan Page Limited.
- Mann, S. (1999). "Opening the Insider's Eye: Starting Action Research,": Document URL: <http://langu.e.hyper.chubu.ac.jp/jalt/pub/tlt/99/dec/mann.html>.
- McNiff, J. (1988). Action Research: Principles and Practice. London: Routledge.
- _____. (1993). Teaching as Learning: An Action Research Approach. London and New York: Routledge.
- McNiff, J., Lomax, P., and Whitehead, J. (1996). You and Your Action Research Project. London and New York: Routledge.
- Mekonnen Desasa. (1984). "The Determination of the English Language Proficiency of Freshman: An Exploration of Some of the Variables That Contribute to Proficiency." (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University.
- Nunan, D. (1988). The Learner-Centred Curriculum. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1989). Understanding Language Classrooms: A Guide For Teacher-Initiated Action Research. London: Prentice Hall.

- _____. (1990). "Action Research in the Language Classroom," in Richards, C.J., and Nunan, D. (eds.). Second Language Teacher Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1992). Research Methods in Language Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- _____. (n. d.). "Action Research in Language Teacher Education,":
<http://www.les.aston.ac.uk/lisu/research/tdtr 92/ tdtrdn. html>.
- O'Brien, R. (1998). An Overview of the Methodological Approach of Action Research": [http:// www.web. net/~ robrien /papers/arfinal. html](http://www.web.net/~robrien/papers/arfinal.html).
- Onel, Z. (1997). Evaluation of Instruction Within Curriculum Evaluation." English Teaching Forum, Vol. 35/1.
- Pica, T. (1997). "Second Language Teaching and Research Relationship: A North American View." Language Teaching Research, Vol. 1/1.
- Price, N.J. (2001). "Action on Research, Pedagogy, and Change: The Transformative Potential of Action Research in Pre-service Teacher Education." Journal of Curriculum Studies, Vol. 33/1.
- Roberts, J. (1988). Language Teacher Education. London: Arnold.
- Scott, D., and Usher, R. (1999). Researching Education: Data, Methods, and Theory in Educational Inquiry. London and New York: Continuum.
- Seyoum Teferra. (1998). "The Current Status of Research Activities Among Addis Ababa Senior High School Teachers." The Ethiopian Journal of Education, Vol. xviii/1.
- Sharma, A.R. (2000). Fundamentals of Educational Research. Chaturvedi: Meerut.

- Shipman, M.(ed.). (1985). Educational Research: Principles, Policies, and Practices.
London and Philadelphia: The Falmer Press.
- Skerritt, Z. (1992). Action Research in Higher Education: Examples and Reflections.
London: Kogan Page Limited.
- _____. (1993). “Improving Learning and Teaching Through Action Learning and
Action Research.” Higher Education Journal and Development, Vol.
12/1.
- Tesfaye Gashew. (1982). “ The Measurement of English Language Proficiency of
High School Graduates.” (Unpublished M.A. Thesis). Addis Ababa:
Addis Ababa University.
- TGE. (1995). The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia: Article 26. 1st
Year, №, 1.
- Van Lier, L. (1988). The Classroom and The Language Teacher: Ethnography and
Second Language Classroom Research. London: Longman.
- Wallace, J. M. (1998). Action Research for Language Teachers. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.
- Webb, G. (1996). Understanding Staff Development. Buckingham: Open University
Press.
- Widdowson, H.G. (1990). Aspects of Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press.
- Woods, D. (1996). Teacher Cognition in Language Teaching: Beliefs, Decision-
Making, and Classroom Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.

Yalew Engdawork. (2000). "Research Activities, Problems and Future Directions: An Investigation of Elementary and Secondary School Teachers in Educational Research," in Amare Asgedom, Derebssa Duferra, and Zenebe Barake (eds.). Proceedings of National Conference Held in Nazereth, March 10-11, 2000. Institute of Educational Research: Addis Ababa University.

APPENDIX A

***ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES***

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR ELT TEACHERS

Dear Respondent;

As part of a research undertaking leading to an M.A. in the Teaching of English as a Foreign Language (T.E.F.L), this questionnaire is prepared to get the available information on action research at three teachers' training colleges with particular reference to ELT teachers. Thus, the data obtained would be used for research purpose at the level of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

The study is hoped to be of help in getting some insights into the practicability of action research and the current status of action research in Teaching English as a Foreign Language. Therefore, your genuine responses to all the items in all the sections of the questionnaire are of great importance.

You do not need to write your name on any of the page of this questionnaire. The researcher will also like to assure you of the anonymity of your responses.

To refresh your memory, dear respondent; action research in language teaching is a research which is carried out in the context of classroom practices to give practical solutions—especially to the possibly manifested academic problems and developments as well. It is usually specific to particular problems and is not comprehensive like that of the “pure” or “basic research”

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

GENERAL INSTRUCTION: Tick [✓] all the items which apply to you. Some questions indicated in a stroke mark [*] allow you to tick more than one item. Some others allow you to write your views, opinions and beliefs about action research. Dear respondent, do not forget to read the instruction given in each section of the questionnaire.

SECTION ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INSTRUCTION: Please show your response(s) by writing the necessary information as per each question:

3. How many years of English language teaching experience do you have in elementary and junior-high schools?

_____ Year(s)

2. How many years of college English language teaching experience do you have?

_____ Year(s)

3. What is your highest qualification?

4 For how long have you been participating in English language teaching action research?

_____ Year(s)

5. How many English language teaching action research works do you have, if any?

5.1 Published works (anywhere)

5.2 Unpublished works known by your Department

5.3 Would you please list down the research topics you went through and/or you intended to carry out?

_____.

SECTION TWO: PLEASE SHOW YOUR RESPONSE(S) BY PUTTING A TICK MARK [✓] IN THE APPROPRIATE BOX(ES):

6. Have you ever been involved in any kind of research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

7. Have you ever conducted action research in Teaching English as a Foreign Language?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

8. Do you have a high interest in doing language teaching action research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

9. If your response to number 8 is 'no', what do you think of the possible reason(s)?

*** You can tick [✓] more than one.**

A. Time constraint []

B. Money constraint []

C. Undermining the role(s) of research []

D. Lack of enough research skills []

D. Others, please specify: _____

_____.

9. Do you believe that your colleagues have been involved in undertaking language teaching action research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

11. Do your colleagues give due emphasis to teaching than to research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

12. Do you feel confident in your research skills in language teaching?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

13. If your response to number 12 is 'no', what do you think of the possible reason(s)?

*** You can tick [✓] more than one.**

A. Lack of enough language teaching research courses offered []

B. Lack of updated research materials in language teaching []

C. Absence of research conferences and workshops on language
teaching research issues []

D. Others please specify: _____
_____.

14. Does your work environment create conducive atmosphere for undertake language
teaching research?

A. Yes. []

A. No. []

15. If your response to number 14 is 'no', what do you think are the basic reason(s)?

*** You can tick [✓] more than one.**

A. Lack of encouragement from college principals []

B. Lack of research interest []

C. Absence of collaboration among colleagues []

D. Emphasizing teaching over research []

E. Heavy work-load []

F. Others, please specify: _____

_____.

16. Have you taken relevant research courses which are pertinent to English language teaching
during your college or university training years or pre-service training?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

17. If your response to number 16 is 'yes', do you find that these courses are adequate to enable
you to carry out language teaching action research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

18. Do you regularly read different books, journals and articles on language teaching research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

19. Do you have clear information on your research skills on how to do language teaching action research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

20. Do ELT Teachers in your college collaborate with one another to carry out language teaching research?

A. Yes. []

B. No. []

SECTION THREE: DEGREE OF AGREEMENT AND/OR DISAGREEMENT

INSTRUCTION: Dear respondent; Please indicate your views, opinions and beliefs against each idea suggested below by putting a tick mark [✓] in the appropriate box (es): What the numbers 1 to 5 stand for is given in the key, hereunder:

1: Strongly Disagree,

2: Disagree,

3: I Do Not know,

4: Agree, and

5: Strongly Agree.

No	Each Item of the Questionnaire	Degree of Agreement and/or Disagreement				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	I Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
1.	I believe that teachers' decision should be supported by action research.					
2.	English language teaching is problematic and needs classroom-oriented investigations.					
3.	In the college where I work, action research is less understood in the teaching of English as a foreign language.					
4.	Lack of support from college principals is one source of the problem which does not allow me to do action research.					
5.	There are no relevant reading materials on language teaching research in the college where I work.					
6.	Teachers in my department seem not to have research interest in undertaking language teaching action research.					
7.	Teachers' role in college is both to undertake research and to teach.					
8.	I know that there has been a gap between English language teaching and research among my colleagues' method of teaching.					
9.	I have neither time nor money to undertake language teaching research.					
10.	In the college where I work, English language teachers are expected to put many hours of work to teaching rather than to research.					

No	Each Item of the Questionnaire	Degree of Agreement and/or Disagreement				
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	I Don't Know	Agree	Strongly Agree
11.	I have been engaged in investigating my English language teaching practices.					
12.	I do not have the access to timely information on language teaching research.					
13.	Among my colleague, there is a good professional contact on language teaching research issues.					
14.	My teaching load is so high to the extent that I do not have time to do action research.					
15.	The college's organizational environment contributes to my carrying out language teaching action research.					
16.	I do not feel confident in my research competence.					
17.	There is minimal support from the college principals though I would like to carry out action research.					
18.	My colleagues have been using action research as one means to solve academic problems in Teaching English as a Foreign Language.					
19.	My college teaching experience informs me that ELT teachers do not usually get involved in language teaching action research.					
20.	I am not encouraged to undertake action research due to lack of incentives.					
21.	Action research in language teaching has not yet become practical among my colleagues.					
22.	I usually depend on language teaching action research to strengthen my ELT classrooms.					

SECTION FOUR: NON-STRUCTURED QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTION: Please show your attitudes, feelings, opinions, and beliefs by writing on the space provided for the following questions:

1. What do you think about the existing relationship between teaching and research in general?

2. What do you think about the existing relationship between English language teaching and action research?

3. How is your practical involvement in doing language teaching action research, if any?

4. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in language teaching?

5. What is your opinion on research courses which you took, if any, when you were a higher institution student? (Were they adequate and relevant?)

6. What are the most revealing problems or research constraints which you have possibly encountered in carrying out language teaching action research, if any? (Would you please list them down?)

7. What techniques do you suggest to get involved more ELT teachers in undertaking action research?

Thank you once again for filling in the questionnaire!

APPENDIX B
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE

NON-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FOR ELT TEACHERS

Dear Respondent;

The major purpose of this interview is to come up with possible evidence(s) on your involvement in undertaking English language teaching action research as ELT professionals.

As already indicated in the questionnaire, the data gathered will be used for research purpose at the level of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a foreign Language (T.E.F.L).

Therefore, your gentle participation in giving genuine responses on your attitudes, beliefs, feelings, and opinions to all the questions of the interview is hoped to be of great help in seeing the practicability of action research in Teaching English as a Foreign Language within the context of three teachers' training colleges: Kotebe College of Teacher Education, Nazreth College of Teacher Education, and Awassa College of Teacher Education.

Dear Interviewee; before starting the interview, the researcher wants to reassure you of the anonymity of your names and responses. As a result, you will not be asked to reveal your names during the interview.

Thank you for your kind cooperation!

1. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language teaching research?
1. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices besides teaching?
1. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research, for example, teaching methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? etc. (Please explain further?)
1. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?
5. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Thank you once again for your kind participation!

APPENDIX C

*ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE*

NON-STRUCTURED INTERVIEW FOR COLLEGE PRINCIPALS

Dear Respondent;

The main purpose of this interview is to get valid information on ELT teachers' involvement in undertaking English language teaching action research in three teachers' training colleges.

The data generated will be used for research purpose at the level of Master of Arts in Teaching English as a Foreign Language (T.E.F.L).

So, your genuine responses (feelings, beliefs and suggestions) to all the questions of this interview would be of great help to assess the practicability of action research among ELT teachers in the three sites in focus.

Before I start the interview, I would like to assure you of the fact that your name and responses will remain confidential. Accordingly, you will not be asked to disclose your name during the interview.

Thanks for your kind cooperation!

1. What is your role in this college?
1. Does your college have a specific timetable for ELT teachers to undertake action research?
3. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?
4. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-research?
5. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material? (Would you explain it further?)
6. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?
7. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching action research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Cherie Mesfin Gessesse
Department of Foreign Languages and Literature
Institute of Language Studies

Thank you once again for your kind participation!

APPENDIX D

ELT Teachers' Responses to Interview Questions

T₁

2. Q. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language teaching action research?

Ans: Well, reading development is the only research I remember that I did for a post-graduate diploma. That was not in the context of teaching English as a foreign Language. That was done on teaching English for native speakers. So, I suppose that is the only research which I did.

2. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: Yes, because ELT teachers are professionals as well as experts in teaching. If teachers are to implement what other peoples have researched, it means to an extent that they lose their profession, Moreover, I think that it can help teachers to develop confidence, enhance their profession and enables them to play their own part in research.

2. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research; for example, Teaching methods? Learning strategies? Evaluative Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: I did action research on reading skills. And also my area of interest is reading skills. Therefore, I think that could be belonged to teaching Methods.

2. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing English language teaching action research?

Ans: Well, I am sure, I would not be afraid of my research skills. If situations allow me, I think my research skills would help me in undertaking action research.

2. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: Action research will enable teachers to understand teaching better, to develop their particular skills, and to address problems in teaching. Suppose if teaching remains static too long, you know perhaps, the classroom teacher may no be aware of the dynamism of teaching methods, learning strategies, etc. Moreover, action research, I think, will help teachers to be alert, alive, and aware of issues

in teaching. Generally, I argue that a classroom teacher has a lot to learn by doing classroom – based inquiries if you like action research.

T₂

1. Q. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language teaching research?

Ans: Well, so far I do not have any involvement. I have the ambition to do that because as we all know teaching English as a foreign language like in our case is more problematic where serieses of classroom – based inquiries would be crucial.

1. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: Yes. English language teaching would be realized better and became effective as one engaged in research activities. As a result, valuable insights would emanate which would benefit the teacher in shaping and improving his/her method of teaching.

1. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research;

Ans: Well, as I said earlier I did not make any effort in undertaking action research. However, methods of teaching are my potential areas of action research.

1. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: I guess that I have the competence though I do not realize it in practice. Frankly speaking, I have not examine my research competence yet.

1. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: Well, I strongly argue that doing action research is extremely essential- especially in teaching English as a foreign language where a lot of complex variables revolve round. The results of such research which would be carried out by the teacher himself/ herself will have the potential to inform about one's teaching.

T3

3. What is your practical involvement in undertaking action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: Well, I have just involved in a few cases how the teaching and learning of English goes on in senior- secondary schools. Otherwise, I did not do a lot of things related to language teaching research.

4. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigation their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: Certainly, I believe because language teaching is an area of problem particularly in a country like Ethiopia where English is taught as a foreign language and where it is taught as a content like other subjects or, courses if you like. So, in such a case, what is going on as a problem should be supported through action research.

5. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research, for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? etc (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: yes, for example, areas related to how mother tongue languages influence the students' learning in English was one of the areas which draw my research interest.

6. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: As far as I am concerned, I have a few research outputs and in those areas the methods I used are correct. So, I think that I am competent enough in my research competence.

7. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: I think action research has immense roles for those teachers who teach English as a foreign language. It will help teachers to deal with general language problems, classroom management problems, decision-making problems, etc.

T4

1. Q. What is your practical involvement in language teaching action research?

Ans: I am afraid. I am not doing any kind of research. In the college where I work, I am doing only teaching...

2. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: I think so because the involvement of teachers in action research is good, for example, if you do some kind of research about the farmer, you should involve the farmer herself /himself so as to address the problem from its root. Similarly, if the teacher undertakes the research by himself /herself, he/she would get a lot of evidences about his/ her method of English language teaching.

3. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research; for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluating Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: I do not have any involvement in undertaking language teaching action research.

4. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: In fact, I have never assessed my research skills but I think that I can undertake action research. I do not think that I have problems related to my research skills.

5. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: I think the role of action research in teaching English is to tackle the actual classroom problems and to find remedies to these problems. Besides, it is important to get evidences on how classroom teaching is heading.

T₅

1. Q. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language teaching research

Ans: Well, all staff members are overloaded in teaching different ELT courses to our department trainees and to other department trainees as well. As a result, we do not undertake action research, for example, Enla. 101 is given across all departments.

2. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: Sure, I think teaching should be strengthened by insights gained from classroom-research findings; however, due to the problems, I mentioned earlier, we have not yet materialized this idea (doing action research).

3. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research, for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: My potential areas of research interest are teaching methods; for example, I have the intention to carry out action research on Barriers to Reading.

5. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: All what I can say is that I am not entirely good at in it but I would try if conditions are fulfilled or favorable for me. Besides, I can read and develop my research competence.

5. Q. What are your beliefs about the roles of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: I think that action research will have the power to hit the main target i.e., teaching because teaching becomes more practical when the teacher himself/herself engaged in action research.

T₆

5. Q. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language teaching research?

Ans: Frankly speaking, I have no any involvement in carrying out language teaching action research; hence, the environment is not suitable for me.

2. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: Of course, it is good if ELT teachers undertake the research by themselves because it is then that they would become actual practitioners. Moreover, ELT teachers should try and find solutions to different problems by themselves.

7. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research; for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: The only research I did so far and if it is called as an action research is my B.A partial-fulfillment. In fact, I did it on listening problems.

7. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: It is very difficult to talk about my research competence. Any way, I think that I have some understanding on how to undertake language-teaching research.

3. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: I think it is important to move teaching smoothly.

T₇

1 Q. What is your practical involvement in undertaking language-teaching research?

Ans: I have not done many action research works. Though I have some involvement, it is not as such expected.

2 Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom practices, besides teaching?

Ans: My argument is that teachers should undertake action research so as to examine their methods of teaching. In other words, I think such research will help teachers to shape and inform their methods of teaching.

3 Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research, for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: From experience, I think, writing skills are my areas of research interest.

4.Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data... in doing language teaching action research?)

Ans: Well, I cannot say much because I have not devoted much time on research. There is the interest and I think there is the caliber, too.

5. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: Personally, I believe that action research will have the power to tell the classroom teacher about how his/her teaching is heading including all the weaknesses and strengths of his/her teaching.

T₈

1. Q.What is your practical involvement in undertaking language-teaching research?

Ans: Apart from teaching, the teacher in higher institutions is expected to carry out research activities as well. So, to meet this requirement, I have been evolved in some language teaching research activities.

2. Q. Do you really believe that English language teachers should be engaged in investigating their classroom teaching practices, besides teaching?

Ans: As I mentioned earlier, teachers in higher institutions are expected to undertake research, besides teaching. In addition to the practical relevance of action research in the actual classrooms, teachers' academic promotion could be rewarded.

5. Q. If you have ever been involved in doing language teaching action research, in what areas do you employ action research; for example, Teaching Methods? Learning Strategies? Evaluative Procedures? Etc. (Please Explain Further?)

Ans: By the way action research in language teaching is a very recent phenomenon. I am afraid that there is not much that has been done. Actually, reading is my area of interest i.e., teaching methods.

5. Q. Do you think that you have a good research competence (capability in collecting data, interpreting data, analyzing data...) in doing language teaching action research?

Ans: Well, as I told you, I did my Ph.D. dissertation. So, this by itself gives me some knowledge of research. All these helped me to develop my research skills and I think I have a good research skill.

5. Q. What are your beliefs about the role of action research in teaching English as a foreign language?

Ans: I think that action research is really important; hence there are a lot of questions a teacher should pose about his/her teaching. Briefly, it is a tool to see and observe the problems and look for solutions.

APPENDIX E

The Responses of Interviewees (College Principals) to Interview Questions

CP₁

5. Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am a Research and Academic Vice Dean.

5. Q. Does your college have a specific timetable for teachers to undertake action research?

Ans: In fact, the college has three main objections. One of the major objectives is research. The college has a research schedule at a college level. To repeat my self, the college has general schedule (timetable) for teachers to undertake research, besides teaching.

5. Q. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?

Ans: Actually, 'enough' is under quotation. We have external funding agencies like US AID, BESO, and some others. We have budget though inadequate.

5. Q. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-research?

Ans: Yes, for example, we allow teachers to get the required career structure. The other recognition is that the college gives enough time for those teacher-researchers to show up their research findings in different national research conferences.

5. Q. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material? (Would You Explain It Further?)

Ans: Yes, I think , as I tried to indicate in number 1, the college provides the following free services such as computer, internet, photocopy access, telephone and other research facilities to those teachers who undertake teaching research. In short, all of these are open to them (teacher researchers).

5. Q. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Yes, but not to the required. Since its establishment, it has been organizing different research conferences.

5. Q. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: I do not remember a research work that has been done by ELT teachers. It is possible to say that their involvement is too weak. It is the inferior department in carrying out teaching research compared to other departments though there are things

they do well in other areas, for example, preparing on-the-job-training to elementary and junior ELT teachers.

CP₂

1. Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am a Chairman of English Department and an ELT teacher as well.

1. Q. Does your college have a specific timetable for teachers to undertake action research?

Ans: No, we do not have a particular schedule for research.

1. Q. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?

Ans: Well, in the absence of research activities we do not have budget. In fact, it is common to hear from the Dean's and the Research and Academic Vice Dean's report about the research budget at the beginning and end of each academic year.

1. Q. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-research?

Ans: Yes, we do. If college instructors have the plan to do teaching research, I really initiate them, for instance, I advice them to come up with their research proposals and to submit it to the college's Research and Academic Vice Dean and to any finding agencies as well. There is also little incentive in the form of money.

1. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material? (Would You Explain It Further?)

Ans. Yes.

1. Q. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Yes, there are two research seminars, conferences, and workshops if you like which focus on different issues.

1. Q. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: It is very low. It is lower than the other departments. The reason could be lack of commitment and professional responsibility. Personally, I do not think English language teachers' teaching load could be taken as a factor for not doing language teaching research.

CP₃

3. Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am the College's Research and Academic Vice Dean though I am new to the position.

2.Q. Does your college have a specific timetable for teachers to undertake action research?

Ans: We have the timetable to encourage each academic staff. In fact, the timetable is at the college level not at each department level.

3.Q. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?

Ans: I think there is enough annual budget. We have enough fund allotted for research purposes.

4. Q. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-research?

Ans: Well, I can say yes because we have at least computer, internet and printing centers whereby the access is open to every academic staff. Besides, we give permission to teachers to present their research findings in any research conference in the country.

5.Q. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material? (Would You Explain It Further?)

Ans: Yes, we have an established timetable particularly for language seminars because research undertaking is more in that area. The college is willing to assist teachers who undertake teaching research to its capacity.

6.Q. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Yes, we have two regular seminars, in each academic year.

7.Q. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: In our college more research is done in the area of languages both by foreign language teachers and Ethiopian language teachers. Language teaching research is already established. But recently, other departments have come up to the floor.

CP₄

1.Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am a Chairperson of English Department.

2.Q. Does your college have a specific timetable for teachers to undertake action research?

Ans: Well, the college assumes that there is timetable to undertake research for every teacher because every teacher has a maximum teaching load of 12 credit hours per week which implies that the rest of the time should be devoted to research.

3.Q. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?

Ans: I do not know how much is enough but I know that the college has some budget for research.

4.Q. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-research?

Ans: The college provides to its capacity all the research facilities such as computer, internet, free of charge secretary service, access for publication, etc. The college does all these.

5.Q. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material (Would You Explain It Further?)

Ans: As I stated in the above question, I think there is a good support and encouragement from the college officials.

6.Q. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Yes, English Department does have annual language research seminars, besides the college's research seminar.

7.Q. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: Well, it is at the top. It is only up to the language departments that have their own annual research seminars.

CP₅

5. Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am a Chairperson of English Department.

2.Q. Does your college have specific timetable to undertake action research?

Ans: In fact, it is believed that each teacher should be engaged in teaching research; hence, there is a contract consensus when she/he is employed.

3.Q. Does your college have enough annual budget for doing research?

Ans: I think there is some amount even if it is not enough.

4.Q. Do you as a college official given recognition to teacher-research?

Ans: Yes, the college gives some amount of counted money for teacher researchers. Besides, it encourages them materially.

5.Q. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material?

Ans: I think so because the college is ready to help teachers who are/have been undertaking teaching research.

6.Q. Does your college have regular seminars, conferences, and workshops on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Definitely. There are two research meetings in each academic year.

7.Q. How is ELT teachers involvement in language teaching action research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: I think our involvement is not satisfactory; hence, all of us are over-loaded in teaching different courses.

CP₆

7. Q. What is your role in this college?

Ans: I am the College' Research and Academic Vice Dean.

2.Q. Does your college have a specific timetable for teachers to undertake action research?

Ans: So long as I know, there is no timetable allotted for teaching research. However, every teacher has some free time to carry out action research.

3.Q. Does your college have enough annual budgets for doing research?

Ans: Sure, it has despite its insufficiency.

4. Q. Do you as a college official give recognition to teacher-researchers?

Ans: Right. We provide teachers with necessary supports such as material and financial assistance.

5.Q. Is there a conducive atmosphere in your college to do action research in terms of resources and material?

Ans: No question for that.

6.Q. Does your college have regular seminars, workshops, and conferences on language teaching research issues?

Ans: Yes, seminars are held twice a year not only on language teaching research issues but also on other issues, too.

7.Q. How is ELT teachers' involvement in language teaching action research compared to that of other departments in your college?

Ans: Well, I think ELT teachers' involvement in action research is not satisfactory, for example, compared to Education Department.

APPENDIX F
SPSS Analyses Results

QUAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
BA	1.00	15	45.5	45.5	45.5
MA	2.00	17	51.5	51.5	97.0
PhD	3.00	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	
Mean	1.576	Std dev.	.561	Range	2.000

Valid cases 33 Missing cases 0

TELTEX

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	3.00	1	3.0	3.0	3.0
	4.00	1	3.0	3.0	6.1
	5.00	1	3.0	3.0	9.1
	6.00	3	9.1	9.1	18.2
	9.00	2	6.1	6.1	24.2
	10.00	3	9.1	9.1	33.3
	12.00	2	6.1	6.1	39.4
	13.00	2	6.1	6.1	45.5
	14.00	3	9.1	9.1	54.5
	15.00	1	3.0	3.0	57.6
	16.00	2	6.1	6.1	63.6
	17.00	2	6.1	6.1	69.7
	19.00	1	3.0	3.0	72.7
	20.00	1	3.0	3.0	75.8
	22.00	1	3.0	3.0	78.8
	23.00	1	3.0	3.0	81.8
	26.00	2	6.1	6.1	87.9
	39.00	1	3.0	3.0	90.9
	43.00	2	6.1	6.1	97.0
	48.00	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
		-----	-----	-----	
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	
Mean	16.970	Std dev	11.585	Range	45.000

Valid cases 33 Missing cases 0

ESB

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	11	33.3	33.3	33.3
	1.00	2	6.1	6.1	39.4
	2.00	3	9.1	9.1	48.5
	3.00	3	9.1	9.1	57.6
	4.00	4	12.1	12.1	69.7
	5.00	2	6.1	6.1	75.8
	6.00	3	9.1	9.1	84.8
	7.00	1	3.0	3.0	87.9
	10.00	1	3.0	3.0	90.9
	12.00	1	3.0	3.0	93.9
	15.00	1	3.0	3.0	97.0
	20.00	1	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Mean 3.788 Std dev 4.702 Range 20.000

Valid cases 33 Missing cases 0

RA

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	.00	11	33.3	33.3	33.3
	1.00	5	15.2	15.2	48.5
	2.00	7	21.2	21.2	69.7
	3.00	5	15.2	15.2	84.8
	5.00	1	3.0	3.0	87.9
	6.00	4	12.1	12.1	100.0
	Total	33	100.0	100.0	

Mean 1.909 Std dev 1.990 Range 6.000

Valid cases 33 Missing cases 0

t-tests for Independent Samples of QUAL

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
ESB				
BA	15	2.0000	1.852	.478
MA	17	4.4118	4.624	1.122

Mean Difference = -2.4118

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 8.093 P= .008

t-test for Equality of Means

	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	95% CI for Diff
Equal	-1.89	30	.069	1.277	(-5.021, .197)
Unequal	-1.98	21.53	.061	1.219	(-4.943, .120)

t-tests for Independent Samples of QUAL

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
TELTEX				
BA	15	11.2667	5.775	1.491
MA	17	20.1765	11.733	2.846

""

Mean Difference = -8.9098

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 5.130 P= .031

t-test for Equality of Means

	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Dif
Equal	-2.67	30	.012	3.342	(-15.734, -2.085)
Unequal	-2.77	23.93	.011	3.213	(-15.541, -2.278)

""

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
RA				
BA	15	1.0667	.961	.248
MA	17	2.4118	2.265	.549

""

Mean Difference = -1.3451

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F= 10.025 P= .004

t-test for Equality of Means

95%

Variiances	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig	SE of Diff	CI for Diff
Equal	-2.13	30	.041	.631	(-2.633, -.057)
Unequal	-2.23	22.14	.036	.603	(-2.595, -.095)

- - Correlation Coefficients - -

	QUAL	TELTEX	ESB	RA
QUAL	1.0000 (33) P= .	.5608 (33) P= .001	.5100 (33) P= .002	.4685 (33) P= .006
TELTEX	.5608 (33) P= .001	1.0000 (33) P= .	.7169 (33) P= .000	.5773 (33) P= .000
ESB	.5100 (33) P= .002	.7169 (33) P= .000	1.0000 (33) P= .	.8662 (33) P= .000
RA	.4685 (33) P= .006	.5773 (33) P= .000	.8662 (33) P= .000	1.0000 (33) P= .

(Coefficient / (Cases) / 2-tailed Significance)

" . " is printed if a coefficient cannot be computed

Multiple and Stepwise Regression Analyses Results

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable..RA Research in Action

Block Number 1. Method: Enter QUAL TELTEX ESB

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. ESB Espoused Belief
2.. QUAL
3.. TELTEX Total Teaching Experience

Multiple R .87014
R Square .75715
Adjusted R Square .73203
Standard Error 1.03016

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	3	95.95154	31.98385
Residual	29	30.77573	1.06123

F = 30.13841 Signif F = .0000

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
QUAL	.237360	.399323	.066878	.594	.5568
TELTEX	-.020060	.023846	-.116784	-.841	.4071
ESB	.387583	.056553	.915794	6.853	.0000
(Constant)	.407367	.562742		.724	.4749

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

* * * * M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * *

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable..RA Research in Action

Block Number 1. Method: Stepwise Criteria PIN .0500 POUT 1000

QUAL TELTEX ESB

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. ESB Espoused Belief

Multiple R .86618
R Square .75026
Adjusted R Square .74220
Standard Error 1.01041

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	95.07852	95.07852
Residual	31	31.64875	1.02093

F = 93.12956 Signif F = .0000

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
ESB	.366584	.037987	.866176	9.650	.0000
(Constant)	.520516	.227247		2.291	.0290

----- Variables not in the Equation -----

Variable	Beta In	Partial	Min Toler	T	Sig T
QUAL	.036076	.062094	.739871	.341	.7357
TELTEX	-.089929	-.125449	.485984	-.693	.4939

End Block Number 1 PIN = .050 Limits reached.

Multiple Regression Analyses Results of Each Predictor Variable

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. RA Research in Action

Block Number 1. Method: Enter QUAL

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

1.. QUAL (Qualification)

Multiple R .46847
R Square .21946
Adjusted R Square .19428
Standard Error 1.78629

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	27.81161	27.81161
Residual	31	98.91566	3.19083

F = 8.71611 Signif F = .0060

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
QUAL	1.662651	.563170	.468466	2.952	.0060
(Constant)	-.710843	.940322		-.756	.4554

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

* * * * M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * *

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable.. RA Research in Action

Block Number 1. Method: Enter TELTEX

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

2.. **TELTEX** (Total English Language Teaching Experience)

Multiple R .57730

R Square .33328

Adjusted R Square .31177

Standard Error 1.65093

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	42.23512	42.23512
Residual	31	84.49215	2.72555

F = 15.49598 Signif F = .0004

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
TELTEX	.099165	.025191	.577300	3.936	.0004
(Constant)	.226297	.515108		.439	.6635

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

* * * * M U L T I P L E R E G R E S S I O N * * * *

Listwise Deletion of Missing Data

Equation Number 1 Dependent Variable..RA Research in Action

Block Number 1. Method: Enter ESB

Variable(s) Entered on Step Number

3.. ESB Espoused Belief

Multiple R .86618

R Square .75026

Adjusted R Square .74220

Standard Error 1.01041

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	1	95.07852	95.07852
Residual	31	31.64875	1.02093

F = 93.12956 Signif F = .0000

----- Variables in the Equation -----

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	T	Sig T
ESB	.366584	.037987	.866176	9.650	.0000
(Constant)	.520516	.227247		2.291	.0290

End Block Number 1 All requested variables entered.

One Sample t-test Computation for Each Questionnaire Item

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
1. RESPONS	33	4.2424	1.062	.185

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.24	.866	1.619	6.72	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
2. RESPONS	33	4.0606	1.391	.242

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
1.06	.568	1.554	.38	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
3.				
RESPONS	33	4.2121	.781	.136

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
1.21	.935	1.489	8.92	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
4.				
RESPONS	33	4.2727	1.126	.196

**

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.27	.874	1.672	6.50	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
5. RESPONS	33	4.1818	.846	.147

**

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.18	.882	1.482	8.02	32	.000

**

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	-----------------	------	----	------------

6. "*****
RESPONS 33 3.6061 1.171 .204

“

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
.61	.191	1.021	2.97	32	.006

”

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
7. RESPONS	33	4.5152	.667	.116

”

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
1.52	1.279	1.752	13.05	32	.000

”

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
8. "*****				

RESPONS 33 4.0000 .935 .163

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig

1.00	.668	1.332	6.14	32	.000
------	------	-------	------	----	------

""

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	--------------------	------	----	------------

9.*****

RESPONS	33	3.9091	1.466	.255
---------	----	--------	-------	------

""

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig

.91	.389	1.429	3.56	32	.001
-----	------	-------	------	----	------

""

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	--------------------	------	----	------------

10.*****

RESPONS	33	4.3333	.645	.112
---------	----	--------	------	------

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.33	1.104	1.562	11.87	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
11.				
RESPONS	33	2.9394	1.519	.265

""

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
-.06	-.599	.478	-.23	32	.820

""

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
12.				
RESPONS	33	3.5152	1.544	.269

**

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
.52	-.032	1.062	1.92	32	.064

**
One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
13.				
RESPONS	33	2.2424	1.437	.250

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
-.76	-1.267	-.248	-3.03	32	.005

**

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	-----------------	------	----	------------

```

14.*****
RESPONS          33          3.6061          1.435          .250
*****

```

Test Value = 3

```

Mean          95% CI
Difference    Lower    Upper    t-value    df    2-Tail Sig
*****
          .61    .097    1.115    2.43    32    .021
*****

```

""

One Sample t-tests

```

          Number
Variable     of Cases     Mean     SD     SE of Mean
15.*****
RESPONS          33          2.0606          1.298          .226
*****

```

""

Test Value = 3

```

Mean          95% CI
Difference    Lower    Upper    t-value    df    2-Tail Sig
*****
          -.94    -1.399    -.479    -4.16    32    .000
*****

```

""

One Sample t-tests

Number

Variable	of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
16.				
RESPONS	33	3.7879	1.341	.233

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
.79	.313	1.263	3.38	32	.002

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
17.				
RESPONS	33	4.1515	1.093	.190

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.15	.764	1.539	6.05	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	-----------------	------	----	------------

18. *********
 RESPONS 33 2.1212 1.431 .249

""

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
-.88	-1.386	-.371	-3.53	32	.001

""

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean	
					19. *****

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
.61	.146	1.066	2.68	32	.011

""

One Sample t-tests

Number

Variable	of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
20.				
RESPONS	33	3.6061	1.116	.194

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
.61	.210	1.002	3.12	32	.004

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number		Mean	SD	SE of Mean
	of Cases				
21.					
RESPONS	33		4.1212	1.409	.245

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
1.12	.622	1.621	4.57	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number		Mean	SD	SE of Mean
	of Cases				
22.					
RESPONS	33		2.3030	1.212	.211

**

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
-.70	-1.127	-.267	-3.30	32	.002

**

**One Sample t-test Computations for Summarized
questionnaire Items**

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG1.				
RESPONS	33	2.8712	1.608	.280

""

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
-.13	-.699	.441	-.46	32	.648

""

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG2.				
RESPONS	33	4.2424	1.062	.185

""

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
1.24	.866	1.619	6.72	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG3.				
RESPONS	33	4.0606	1.391	.242

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
1.06	.568	1.554	4.38	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Number

Variable	of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG4.				
RESPONS	33	3.9394	1.059	.184

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
.94	.564	1.315	5.10	32	.000

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG5.				
RESPONS	33	3.6061	1.171	.204

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
Difference	Lower	Upper			
.61	.191	1.021	2.97	32	.006

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG6.				

RESPONS 33 4.5152 .667 .116
 //

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
1.52	1.279	1.752	13.05	32	.000

//

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG7.				
RESPONS	33	3.5859	1.486	.259

//

//

Test Value = 3

Mean	95% CI				
Difference	Lower	Upper	t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
.59	.059	1.113	2.26	32	.030

//

//

One Sample t-tests

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
----------	-----------------	------	----	------------

Variable	of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
AVG10.				
RESPNS	33	3.7879	1.341	.233

Test Value = 3

Mean Difference	95% CI		t-value	df	2-Tail Sig
	Lower	Upper			
.79	.313	1.263	3.38	32	.002

APPENDIX G

Table 8: The Profile of ELT Teachers That Took Part in This Study

№	ELT Teachers' Qualification Levels			Sex	Teaching Experience (in Years)			Years Which ELT Teachers Were Participated in Action Research	ELT Teachers Practical Involvement in English Language Teaching Action Research	
	B.A.	M.A.	Ph.D		High School	College	Total		Published Work	Unpublished Work
1	B.A.	-	-	M	3	1	4	0	0	0
2	B.ED.	-	-	M	2	1	3	0	0	0
3	B.A.	-	-	M	8	6	14	0	0	0
4	B.A.	-	-	M	3	3	6	0	0	0
5	B.A.	-	-	M	15	2	17	0	0	0
6	B.A.	-	-	M	9	5	14	2	0	1
7	B.A.	-	-	F	4	2	6	2	0	1
8	B.A.	-	-	M	10	3	13	2	0	1
9	B.A.	-	-	M	1	4	5	1	1	0
10	B.A.	-	-	M	8	4	12	3	1	0
11	B.A.	-	-	M	6	4	10	3	0	2
12	B.A.	-	-	M	12	5	17	4	1	1
13	B.A.	-	-	M	10	6	16	4	0	2
14	B.A.	-	-	M	15	8	23	6	2	1
15	B.A.	-	-	M	5	4	9	3	0	2
16	-	M.A.	-	M	4	2	6	0	0	0
17	-	M.A.	-	M	7	6	13	0	0	0
18	-	M.A.	-	M	13	6	19	0	0	0
19	-	M.A.	-	F	36	3	39	0	0	0
20	-	M.A.	-	M	8	2	10	0	0	0
21	-	M.A.	-	M	10	4	14	0	0	0
22	-	M.A.	-	M	8	2	10	1	2	1
23	-	M.A.	-	M	6	6	12	6	2	1
24	-	M.A.	-	M	1	8	9	4	1	2
25	-	M.A.	-	M	16	10	26	7	1	1
26	-	M.A.	-	M	20	6	26	5	1	1
27	-	M.A.	-	M	12	8	20	4	2	1
28	-	M.A.	-	M	3	12	15	12	4	2
29	-	M.A.	-	M	9	13	22	6	5	1

30	-	M.A.	-	M	27	16	43	10	4	2
31	-	M.A.	-	M	2	14	16	5	1	1
32	-	M.A.	-	M	23	20	43	15	3	2
33	-	-	Ph.D.	M	22	26	48	20	4	2

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, and that all sources and material used for this thesis have been duly acknowledged.

Name: CHERIE MESFIN GESSESSE

Signature: _____

Place: INSTITUTE OF LANGUAGE STUDIES,
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

Date of Submission: JUNE, 2003

Table 15: One Sample t- tests Computation of Each item of the Questionnaire to Check Whether Agreement and /or Disagreement Would be Above or Below Test Value (Mean)= 3 (N= 33, and DF, 32)

Item No	Questionnaire Type	Responses										Mean	DS	Variance	t-value	p-value
		5		4		3		2		1						
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%					
1	I believe that ELT teachers' decision making should be supported by action research.	18	54.5	9	27.3	3	9.1	2	6.1	1	3.0	4.24	1.10	1.13	6.72*	.000
2	English language teaching is problematic and needs classroom-based investigations.	20	60.6	5	15.2	0	0.0	6	18.2	2	6.1	4.06	1.40	1.93	4.40*	.000
3	In the college where I work, action research is less understood in teaching English as a foreign language.	13	39.4	15	45.5	4	12.1	1	3.0	0	0.0	4.21	.78	.61	9.02*	.000
4	Lack of support from college principals is one source of problem which does not allow to do action research.	20	60.6	7	21.2	2	6.1	3	9.1	1	3.0	4.27	1.13	1.27	7.00*	.000
5	There are no relevant reading materials on language teaching research in the college where I work.	11	33.3	20	60.6	0	0.0	1	3.0	1	3.0	4.18	.85	.72	8.02*	.000
6	Teachers in my department seem not to have research interest in undertaking language teaching action research.	10	30.3	7	21.2	10	30.3	5	15.2	1	3.0	3.61	1.17	1.40	3.00*	.006
7	Teachers' role in college is both to undertake research and to teach.	20	60.6	10	30.3	3	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.52	.67	.44	13.10*	.000

8	I know that there has been a gap between English language teaching and action research among my colleagues methods of teaching.	8	24.2	21	63.6	2	6.1	0	0.0	2	6.1	4.00	.94	.87	6.14*	.000
---	---	---	------	----	------	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	------	-----	-----	-------	------

Table 15: (Cont'd)

		Responses										Mean	DS	Variance	t-value	p-value
		5		4		3		2		1						
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%					
9	I have neither time nor money to undertake language teaching action research.	15	45.5	12	36.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	18.2	3.91	1.47	2.15	3.60*	.001
10	In the college where I work, English language teachers are expected to put many hours of work to teaching rather than to research.	14	42.4	16	48.5	3	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4.33	.65	.42	11.90*	.000
11	I have been engaged in investigating my English language teaching practices.	6	18.2	10	30.3	1	3.0	8	24.2	8	24.2	2.94	1.52	2.31	-.23	.820
12	I do not have the access to timely information on language teaching research issues.	12	36.4	8	24.2	5	15.2	1	3.0	7	21.2	3.52	1.54	2.40	1.92	.064
13	Among my colleagues, there is a good professional contact on English language teaching research issues.	5	15.2	2	6.1	2	6.1	11	33.3	13	39.4	2.24	1.44	2.10	-3.03*	.005
14	My teaching load is so high to the extent that I do not have time to do action research.	10	30.3	13	39.4	3	9.1	1	3.0	6	18.2	3.61	1.44	2.10	2.43*	.021

15	The college's organizational environment contributes to my carrying out language teaching action research.	3	9.1	3	9.1	1	3.0	12	36.4	14	42.4	2.10	1308	1.70	-4.16*	.000
----	--	---	-----	---	-----	---	-----	----	------	----	------	------	------	------	--------	------

Table 15: (Cont'd)

		Responses										Mean	DS	Variance	t-value	p-value
		5		4		3		2		1						
		f	%	f	%	F	%	f	%	f	%					
16	I do not feel confident in my research competence.	11	33.3	15	45.5	0	0.0	3	9.1	4	12.1	3.79	1.34	1.80	3.40*	.002
17	There is minimal support from college principals though I would like to carry out action research.	17	51.2	9	27.3	2	6.1	5	15.2	0	0.0	4.15	1.10	1.20	6.10*	.000
18	My colleagues have been using action research as one means to solve some academic problems in teaching English as a foreign language.	5	15.2	1	3.0	2	6.1	10	30.3	15	45.5	2.12	1.43	2.04	-3.53*	.001
19	My college teaching experience informs me that ELT teachers do not usually get involved in language teaching action research.	9	27.3	13	39.4	3	9.1	5	15.2	3	9.1	3.61	1.30	1.70	2.70*	.011
20	I am not encouraged to undertake action research due to lack of incentives.	8	24.2	11	33.3	8	24.2	5	15.2	1	3.0	3.61	1.12	1.25	3.12*	.004
21	Action research in language teaching has not yet become practical among my colleagues method of teaching.	22	66.6	3	9.1	0	0.0	6	18.2	2	6.1	4.12	1.41	1.99	4.60*	.000

22	I usually depend on language teaching action research to strengthen my ELT classrooms.	4	21.2	1	3.0	3	9.1	18	54.5	7	21.2	2.30	1.21	1.47	-3.30*	.002
----	--	---	------	---	-----	---	-----	----	------	---	------	------	------	------	--------	------

* Significant at 5% level

