

2015

Considering Action Research

Ruth Ravid
National Louis University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie>

Recommended Citation

Ravid, Ruth. (2015). Considering Action Research. *i.e.: inquiry in education: Vol. 6: Iss. 1, Article 1*. Retrieved from: <http://digitalcommons.nl.edu/ie/vol6/iss1/1>

Copyright © 2015 by the author(s)

i.e.: inquiry in education is published by the Center for Practitioner Research at the National College of Education, National-Louis University, Chicago, IL.

Considering Action Research

Spring 2015

Ruth Ravid

National Louis University, Chicago, USA

By now, action research has gained a strong foothold among educational practitioners. Action research is conducted by “practitioner-researchers in their own settings to solve a problem by studying it, proposing solutions, implementing the solutions, and assessing the effectiveness of these solutions” (Ravid, 2015). While the majority of educators conducting action research use tools that are common of qualitative research (e.g., interviews, journals, and field notes), data collection approaches that are typical of quantitative research (e.g., assessment scores, and surveys using Likert-scale response choices) should not be overlooked or ignored. The research question(s), the focus of the study, the researchers’ interests and disposition, as well as other issues related to access and availability of the study participants, should drive the decision about the design and methodology of the study (Efron & Ravid, 2013). Both qualitative and quantitative approaches, as well as mixed-methods approaches, should be included in the proverbial “tool box” of educators. If we support this assumption about the importance of both qualitative and quantitative strategies, then training in the use of multiple methodologies should be an integral part of university programs for preservice and in-service teachers and in programs for school administration and support staff.

My own formal research training was completed in 1979 at Northwestern University. At that time, research was focused on quantitative approaches, and I took several advanced courses in statistics. Assessment and testing were also included in my doctoral training. As an experienced educator, I very much enjoyed learning about designing classroom tests and assessing the quality of the achievement test items. I also learned about designing surveys using a variety of item formats and analyzing the results. However, my graduate training included only one course in qualitative research, which I took as a course by arrangement. In that course, I assisted a professor to interview young students from different demographics regarding their perceptions of money, and analyzed their open-ended responses. This was an eye-opener for me and taught me the value of qualitative research. Thus, I found myself to be a strong supporter of the importance of employing multiple research methods in a variety of settings and inquiries. The growing popularity of mixed-methods research championed by authors such as Creswell (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) demonstrates the power of combining multiple approaches.

Although I started my career in educational research in the role of an outside expert, in later years, as a university professor, I had a chance to learn about and become a champion of action research in education. Because action research is conducted by the practitioner-researchers in

their own settings, qualitative methods predominate this type of research. Traditional research, often conducted by outside experts, has relied more heavily on the use of large samples that are often carefully selected, controlled research settings, and other approaches that are difficult to employ by the practitioner researchers in their own settings. Action researchers went the other way: practitioners in the role of researchers, small sample sizes, no attempt to generalize the findings to other settings, the use of multiple data collection tools in the same study to triangulate the data, and the use of strategies that yield narrative data and thick descriptions.

The problem is that in many teacher education programs, the teaching of statistics—even very basic statistics—is completely absent. Many teacher education programs also lack a strong component of assessment; training in the creation of teacher-made tests and the interpretation of standardized test scores is not included in many teacher training programs. This is reality at a time when teachers are asked to test and assess their students more than ever, and lacking basic knowledge of statistics is a hindrance to their full participation in the student assessment process. For us, as teacher trainers, making statements such as “I do not do statistics” is no longer an option. If we want our students to become informed partners in the multifaceted process of assessing their students and in undertaking action research studies in their own settings, our preservice and in-service programs should include training in both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

This journal exemplifies the use of a variety of research methodologies. We examine the quality of each manuscript without any preconceived notions and preferences. Because studies examine different questions in different settings and under different constraints, they naturally call for different approaches. All are welcomed in this journal! This issue includes three articles:

Terry Husband’s article examines how critical literacy is used in a first-grade social studies classroom in an urban setting. The topic of race and racism was investigated using a nine-lesson unit on African American history. Several data collection strategies were used: video observation, teacher journals, and student writing samples.

Nai-Cheng Kuo explores the use of the technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) framework in preservice teacher education. The study was designed to maximize the potential of TPACK and improve the quality of technology integration in teacher education. Based on the participants’ performance in IRIS modules, Kuo adjusted the in-class activities to improve or reinforce participants’ knowledge.

Our third article, written by Breslow, Crowell, Francis, and Gordon, describes a study about appreciative inquiry (AI), an alternative approach to action education. The facilitators were three early-stage doctoral students, who participated in a three-term seminar led by a faculty member. AI was used in projects carried out at three levels: school, district, and university. The perceptions and experiences of doctoral students, who served as facilitators for the first time, are described in the article.

The book review for this issue was written by Antonina Lukenchuk. The book she chose to review is *The Idea of the Digital University: Ancient Traditions, Disruptive Technologies, and the Battle for the Soul of Higher Education* by F. F. McCluskey and M. L. Winter (2012). The

book's authors discuss the effects of the "digital revolution" on higher education and support the digital university as a new kind of modern institution of higher education. Lukenchuk concludes that she finds the authors' arguments in support of the digital university "both persuasive and well-grounded in contemporary realities."

References

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *A concise introduction to mixed methods research*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Efron, S. E., & Ravid, R. (2013). *Action research in education*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

Ravid, R. (2015). *Practical statistics for educators* (5th ed.). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.