

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

Jayson Richardson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Denver

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I appreciate how the authors tried to contextualize the research in Israel, but the problem is not clear. I was left wondering what problem the PLCs were trying to address in this context. The abstract left me wondering about how many teams were in the study, how many teachers were in each team, how many interviews were conducted, and what data the observations yielded. The authors note how the "findings overwhelmingly supported...", however in qual research, this statement is likely an overreach as the study is contextual, point in time, and uses self-reported data. All good data, but there are limitations to what we can say about the findings. I urge the reader to check out Creswell.

I am unclear of the research problem at the onset. The authors used old literature to support the need for PD of teachers, but only weakly link that to PLCs. A tighter link to PLCs to the problem and to the literature would help the introduction. Focusing on the empirical literature on this topic would help as well.

The literature review is descriptive rather than analytical. As a reader, I wonder what the field knows about the impacts of PLCs on teachers and students. A deeper dive into the empirical research around the topic would be useful.

I appreciate how the authors tried to contextualize the study, but the opening paragraph under "The development of PLCs in Israel is about the US. It is unclear why the study is focused on English PLCs. The authors lay out a previous study (i.e., Ramah) on this effort, but do not integrate that into the literature but rather lay out that study. At this point, I wonder if the authors are revisiting that study to determine shifts over time.

With regard to methods, I am still unclear about the population and the sample. The authors note in the abstract that observations were used, but these did not appear in the methods section. The authors note that they used phenomenological methodology but did not defend this. How is this a phenomenological study versus a case study or an evaluation study? Finally, the research questions seem to be more about evaluating the effort rather than understanding constructs. The authors even noted this fact. At this point, I wonder if this study is an evaluation.

The findings do not seem to answer the research questions. I wonder if the authors would be served by doing a deeper dive into the research questions and aligning those with the findings. As is, the findings section does not seem to address the study's focus.

The authors seem to overstep the findings in the discussion. For example, they note how the observations brought out

challenges, yet observations were not discussed in the methods or findings. The authors also link back to the Ramah study. Hence, is this study a replication study? In my experience, the discussion should link the findings to previous studies and help the reader understand how this study mirrors, contradicts, or adds to the current body of literature. These elements are missing. Finally, given that the focus of the study is unclear, I am not sure if the discussion brought us full circle and addressed the research questions.

This study might be illustrative as an evaluation of a national effort. More work would need to be done to lay out the research problem, explore the current empirical literature on that problem, lay out a clear methodology, clearly identify research questions, align the findings with those questions, then discuss those findings juxtaposed with what we already know.