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

Lesley de Putter-Smits[1]

1 Eindhoven University of Technology

To me this study is interesting and heartening; the researchers have looked into the experiences of teachers with a PLC and describe the outcome with some detail. It adds to the research on teacher-learning in groups in practice, rather than theorizing new models. I do feel some rewriting is necessary for the reader to better understand what had been done.

Minor things:

EFL is used as an abbreviation, but not explained. I take it to mean English as a foreign language.

Not all references have the correct number of brackets.

Introduction

To better introduce the need for this study, I would suggest the authors start with the reasons for starting the PLC's for in-service English teachers. The introduction now starts far back in the past, and leans on both PD and PLC and all kinds of items, while the subject of study follows much later. I don't mind reading on what and why you have done the study here directly ☺

I would start with the sentence used later on:

Teachers need valuable, ongoing professional development (PD) programs that will be worth their investment of time and have a practical impact on their teaching and help them to establish new practices (Fisher 2011). Teachers of English as a foreign language (EFL) often feel isolated and in need of a community (Yeh 2005). A professional learning community as initiated in the United States (DuFour, 2004) could be a solution for both their PD and their need for a community. Israel adopted two models of PLC's in 2016 and developed two alternative professional development programs for teachers *[place ref here]*. One program aims to develop a new professional culture in schools through teacher learning communities led by lead teachers in the schools themselves. This professional development is inquiry based and the teachers collaborate in a reflective, analytical process in which they examine their own teaching experiences and prior knowledge in a multi-disciplinary community in their own school. The second model of PLCs is discipline based, where teachers from different schools in the same area meet to exchange ideas for professional growth and are led by a lead teacher. After four years of establishing PLC's (the second model) for EFL teachers the effects of the program are

evaluated, to uncover its effects on in-service teachers and their learning.

Theory

The literature review (or Theory) could then start with the sentence: A professional learning community can be defined as [….].

I would suggest to name the heading The development of PLC's in Israel **Context to the study**"

I would leave the paragraph directly after this heading about America out; it does not add anything to the context and for me begs the question whether specifically naming America so many times in a publication has a non-scientific goal. There are more countries that are working with PLC's, besides America. The article would read just fine, starting with "Israel adopted […]" I need a little information on the kind of training of the lead teacher here, what does it entail?

The sub-headings about EFL teachers and the previous study can also be left out, as it directly goes with the context to the study anyway. The text reads fine without them.

The research question I would have expected here: What are the experiences of EFL teachers working in a PLC after four years? Or How do EFL teachers experience working in a PLC after four years?

The **materials and method** section, I would expect to be called just Method, since no materials are used. The build up of the method section seems upside down to me.

- Who are you studying? (people, numbers, locations etc.)
- How is safety in terms of privacy, freedom to speak arranged for participants?
- What are you using to study them (interviews, transcriptions)

  - Please place questions in a table or bulleted list
  - Please state whether the interviews were transcribed verbatim, or relevant quotes only.

- Describe the coding process and give a table with codes found, description of the code and an exemplary quote. (now mentioned in discussion section)
- Describe the observation process and how this was analyzed
- How did you ensure the validity and reliability of your study? (mixing the observations, interviews and privacy/safety issues).

Results would be the next heading I expect, rather than discussion. Please tell the reader how your results are organized (mixing observations with interview results etc.).

Conclusion and discussion

The Limitations can be a subheading here.

Good luck!