

Review of: "Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) for English Teachers as an Effective Alternative Framework for Professional Development"

Päivi Portaankorva-Koivisto¹

¹ University of Helsinki

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The topic of the article is important, while many universities across the world are organizing in-service teacher training and developing it. Teacher education programs are not long enough to give adequate knowledge and sufficient practices for teachers to cope with their whole career. As mentioned in the introduction section, the 21st century skills and changing curricula are expecting changes in teaching and learning. I also think, that the findings of Your research are interesting.

The abstract is clear, and so is the introduction section. The only thing I recognized was that in the sentence: During the pandemic period this need for a PLC for EFL teachers was felt even more. Chi, 2016). You mentioned EFL and although it might be an acronym known to many, I suggest that You write it open. Word "panademic" ---> pandemic.

However, I suggest that You to consider making some changes in the literature review section. It somehow seems to be unfinished. For example, on the second row some reference data jumps out.

The first sub-chapter presents the definition of the PLC. There is much information, but it is scattered. Many definitions but no clear red thread. Please think of rewriting it and organizing it more clearly. I suggest that in this sub-chapter the first paragraph is about the definition as it is now, but because PLC has many definitions depending on the purpose of it. Write more clearly when there is a question about strengthening teachers' knowledge base, sharing their experiences, or building communities?

You write in the third paragraph:

"Teachers were reported as valuing CPD that involves current collaborative inquiry-based activities including experimenting with classroom practices, working together and adapting practice due to peer feedback and self-evaluation (Pedder 2008 in Frost 2012)." Again, an acronym (CPD) I wish You open.

The second paragraph could be about the benefits or effects or purposes of PLC and the third chapter about prerequisites.

The comparison between traditional professional development and PLC could be moved in the beginning closer to the definitions. It might also start this whole chapter.

Perhaps You can also add some words about how these learning communities are founded. In mathematics teacher

education, that is familiar to me, universities are usually the initiator of education, and quite often university professors are also involved with the training and give their know-how about those scientific aspects and backgrounds.

I also suggest that You combine those small chapters where You explain the PLC in Israel in one more integrated chapter. I mean that the chapter 'The development of PLCs in Israel' has only one paragraph so this paragraph could be connected to the next paragraph 'Two models of PLCs in Israel'. The chapter 'PLCs for English teachers' can be part of the larger chapter too, or it can be integrated into the chapter 'A study on English PLCs by Ramah, Israel Ministry of Education in 2017'. I don't think they have to be on their own.

... the in-service training for PLC leaders in the form of their own PLC is 30 hours. Perhaps is is not the best word, maybe consists of.

Page 3

'These lead teachers were trained throughout the year culminating in a two-day summer seminar In 2020 the in-service training for PLC leaders in the form of their own PLC is 30 hours.'

Perhaps 'is' is not the best word, maybe consists of and 'In 2020' should be 'in 2020'.

Chapter Materials and Methods:

Did You mention how many LTs and how many Ps there were altogether?

Page 3

'Were the teachers actively involved in the sessions and did they share responsibility for the content of the PLC? Did meaningful collaboration take place? list of the questions asked is included in the appendix.'

'list' should be 'List'.

By the way, the Appendix was not available here.

I wonder if You can call these interviews in-depth, because they lasted only 20 minutes and there were a lot of questions, so the answers might have been quite short. Moreover, I wonder if You can talk about experiences when You use observations as some part of Your analysis. But maybe this is just a semantic aspect.

Chapter Discussion

I think this chapter could be called Results.

The small paragraph starting with 'Some of the above themes were already identified by ...' could fit better in the discussion chapter which can be added in the end of the article.

Page 4

'Unlike the findings of the Ramah survey (2017) h, the ...' There is a strange h after the year.

'This researcher joined Elana's WhatsApp group and witnessed examples of help and collaboration.' I don't understand this sentence.

You decided to have references already in between Your findings. I know that this is one way of doing it, but in many papers the authors first describe their own findings (Results section) and then compare their findings with previous research (Discussion or Conclusions section). I find it more informative. Moreover, because Your study is using the phenomenological methodology, it is not in line with referring all the time on literature.

Was Linda a LT or a P?

I wonder could You make a small table where You first introduce these participants, like Group 1 Elana (LT), Aliza, Atara and x and y as participants.

I wish You check if You have marked the observation findings clearly so that the reader always knows when the finding is from the observation data and when it is from the interview data. Perhaps if you start every sub-chapter with observation data and then turn into interview data. I also would have liked to read more quotes.

Many times You use a phrase 'This researcher found ...'. I found it confusing. Could it be 'in our study' or 'in this study'. Because there are two authors in this paper.

Can You explain somewhere, perhaps in the method section, why the participants had to use English only while speaking. It seemed to have a strong influence on collaboration. Those who were not native English speakers were more silent.

After reading the Limitations and recommendations chapter I wondered if You could call this study a case study or is it so that some of Your findings must then be left off.

I liked Your Conclusions chapter!

However, if You choose to move those sentences where You have references in results section, it might be even more informative. Perhaps You can also add some recommendations for future PLCs still. I think You had quite many good notions in results section.