Research engagement and educational decentralization: Problematizing primary school English teachers' research experiences in China

Xuesong (Andy) Gao*, Gary Barkhuizen** and Alice W.K. Chow*

*Department of English, Hong Kong Institute of Education, 10 Lo Ping Road, Taipo, New Territories, Hong Kong SAR, China
** The Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics, The University of Auckland, Private Bag 92019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand

Teachers are encouraged to enhance professional competence through reflective practice and they are also asked to undertake research to generate evidence for their professional practices. This paper reports on an inquiry into a group of primary school English language teachers' research engagement in the province of Guangdong on the Chinese mainland. The inquiry explored the effect of educational reforms on the participants' research engagement through the use of an open-ended questionnaire and group interviews. The inquiry revealed that research engagement had become an important part of the teachers' professional lives. Emerging findings from the inquiry also problematized their research engagement as it was found to have been undermined by a competitive promotion mechanism, the teachers' conceptualizations of research and challenges in the knowledge dissemination process. The paper ends with reflections on how to make teacher research 'educational' for teachers and serve as an effective way for professional development.

Keywords: teacher research, educational decentralization, recentralization, professional development, evidence-based practice

Introduction

In recent years, decentralization has been a dominant reform theme in many educational contexts, even in contexts traditionally regarded as highly centralized such as the Chinese mainland (e.g. Bray 2003; Hawkins 2000; Mok 2002; Wong 2006). Educational decentralization has been widely seen as strengthening teachers' professionalism as teachers are given increasing responsibilities in their professional practices, and schools gain increasing autonomy in managing their operations (Darling-Harmmond 1996; Hargreaves 1999; Wong 2006). However, critics also see educational decentralization in many contexts as a process through which market principles and values are introduced into education and the state retains control of schools and teachers in implicit ways (Ball 2003; Hawkins 2000; Wong 2006). Both proponents and critics view educational decentralization as having a profound impact on teachers' professional roles. Instead of being faithful followers of pre-determined educational policies and curricula, teachers have now been called on to be curriculum developers and inquirers into their own practices, playing 'a central and critical role in generating knowledge of practice by making their classrooms and schools sites for inquiry' (Cochran-Smith and Lytle 1999, 273; see also Allwright 1997; Hall 2009; Hall et al 2006; Hargreaves 1999; Hemsley-Brown and Sharp 2003; Nunan 1997; Stenhouse 1985). Meanwhile, teachers also find it necessary to undertake research since educational decentralization generates enormous pressure on teachers and schools to produce evidence for their professional practices (Elliott 2001; Latta et al 2007; Simons et al 2003).

Drawing on recent critiques of educational decentralization, this paper problematizes an uncritical view that research engagement empowers teachers with a more commanding voice in pedagogical issues and helps enhance their professional

competence. To this end, the paper reports on an inquiry into a group of primary school English language teachers' research engagement in the province of Guangdong on the Chinese mainland. The inquiry was motivated by an urgent need to develop primary school English teachers' professional competence as a result of the government's recent decision to promote English as a primary school subject in China (Wang and Gao 2008; Wen and Gao 2007). To cope with this new educational initiative involving 112.5 million English learners, about half a million English teachers are to be recruited and trained in addition to the current 200,000 practising teachers in China's primary schools (Wang and Gao 2008; Wen and Gao 2007). The need for primary schools to develop English teachers' professional competence has been further exacerbated by the government's ongoing efforts to reform the English language curriculum with the aim of improving pedagogical effectiveness. With teacher research being promoted as an important means for professional development, it is therefore critical to examine teachers' experiences of research engagement as a means to improve their professional competence in the process of educational decentralization. In the following sections, we will first briefly discuss the issues concerning educational decentralization and teachers' research engagement on the Chinese mainland. Then we shall outline the methods used in the inquiry before presenting the findings.

Educational decentralization and teachers' research engagement

Educational decentralization on the Chinese mainland allows local educational authorities to have more say in issues such as retention of teachers and school management while sharing an increasingly larger portion of the educational expenditure (Bray 2003; Hawkins 2000; Mok 2002; Wong 2006). Following this decentralization process, local educational authorities and schools started gaining

more control over the content of schooling, which is 'usually one of the last areas' for educational decentralization in many other educational contexts (Hawkins 2000, 449). At the same time, teachers have also been given greater responsibility in the curriculum development and pedagogic innovation process. For decades they had been expected to obediently implement curricula developed by experts appointed by the state but are now expected to play roles such as researchers and curriculum co-developers with the responsibility of designing and undertaking innovative teaching practices (Zhong 2006). Like many other educational contexts, schools and teachers on the Chinese mainland are now held ever more accountable for their performance and practices (Hawkins 2000; Wong 2006). As a result, schools and teachers are increasingly obliged to produce evidence to demonstrate their educational quality and professional excellence. To these ends, teachers have been encouraged to reflect on their professional practices, often through action research in their professional settings (Barkhuizen 2009; Gao, Barkhuizen, & Chow in press; Gu and Wang 2006; Wang, Zhou and Gu 2005; Zhan 2008).

Educational decentralization is often believed to empower individual teachers in the pedagogical process. However, educational decentralization is seldom a *laissez faire* process and often appears in different forms in different contexts. These forms include deconcentration (the transfer of tasks and responsibilities, but not authority, from the upper to lower levels), delegation (the transfer of decision-making authority from the centre to the boundary units, but authority can be withdrawn at the discretion of the centre), and devolution (autonomy of units at different hierarchical levels) (Hanson 1998). Educational decentralization on the Chinese mainland is characterized as a mixed form of deconcentration and limited delegation (Hawkins 2000). It could also be described as a process of 'recentralization', in which the state's control of

schools and teachers becomes more implicit and indirect and paradoxically even stronger through mechanisms such as market competition and performance appraisal (Wong 2006). In spite of the emphasis on teachers being curriculum developers and expert knowers, teachers have to negotiate with these implicit controls in their pursuit of professional excellence. Wong's (2006) analysis of school teachers' experiences of educational reforms in the same province that the participants in this inquiry come from revealed that a small number of the teachers in her study did in fact manage to improve their professional competence. However, many of them felt deskilled through the state's indirect control of their professional practices, in particular, through market competition. Similarly, teachers' efforts to undertake inquiries into their own pedagogical practices may only serve to confirm the pedagogical reforms initiated from above without necessarily cultivating sustainable capacity for school-based curriculum renewal among individual teachers.

The inquiry

Given the recent educational initiatives stemming from educational decentralization, answers were sought in the inquiry to the following question:

> How do educational reforms mediate primary school English teachers' research engagement in Guangdong China?

We were particularly interested in exploring what challenges the teachers faced in using research engagement as a path towards professional development.

The participants

The inquiry involved 33 primary school English teachers, including two former English teachers who were working in the Research and Teaching Office in their counties. 28 of them had more than five years of teaching experience. The two former English teachers were included because educational authorities at different levels

traditionally have a unit called the Teaching and Research Office (jiaoyan shi), which is responsible for research and pedagogical innovation activities in schools under its administration. In schools teachers are also usually assigned to subject-based 'Teaching and Research' groups, where they prepare lessons together, share their teaching experiences, and support each other in their professional practices.

The participating teachers came to Hong Kong for an in-service training programme which aimed to develop their professional competence to cope with ongoing curriculum reforms in their school settings. Being select teachers from their respective schools, they played important roles in school-based curriculum innovation and professional development. Therefore, they were particularly suitable for providing insights concerning these professional activities, including their research engagement.

Data collection and analysis

In the inquiry, an open-ended questionnaire was administered to gather data about the participants' school settings and their research experiences (Appendix 1). Following this open-ended survey, 10 participants were invited for group interviews in twos and threes, in which they were encouraged to share details of their research experiences (for a list of questions used in the interviews, see Appendix 2). These interviews, lasting more than an hour each, were audio recorded, transcribed, and translated into English for content analysis.

In the inquiry, a 'paradigmatic' approach was adopted to analyze the narrative data (Erickson 2004; Polkinghorne 1995; Smeyers and Verhesschen 2001). First, we tried to obtain an overall picture of the participants' research experiences. Then, we adopted grounded theory procedures to constantly question and compare in order to

see how different processes and factors mediated the participants' experiences (Patton 1990). All three researchers were involved in the analysis and through collegial discussion we resolved different interpretations of the same data. In our view, the quality of data analysis was enhanced through such a collaborative interpretive process.

Findings

The inquiry helped reveal that research engagement had become an important part of the teachers' professional lives. In the questionnaire, all participants reported some research activity in their professional lives, and 17 of the 33 teachers reported a wide range of research engagement experiences, including playing leading roles in school-based projects. The group interview data suggest that a mechanism integrating research as part of schools' and teachers' performance review had been effective in promoting teacher research. The teachers were found to have either voluntarily chosen research as a means to promote professional development or felt obliged to do research because of pressure from their superiors, especially school principals. However, it also emerged from the analysis that the teachers' research engagement as a path towards professional development had been problematized by the competitive mechanism effective in promoting research, their conceptualization of research, and challenges in the relevant knowledge dissemination process. We now discuss each of these in turn.

Teacher research and evidence for professional excellence

One of the major themes emerging from the teachers' narratives of research was related to their orientation towards research engagement. Although the questionnaire

data were implicit about this issue, the group interviews helped generate rich data revealing how and why the teachers were motivated to do research. There is no doubt that some of them were intrinsically interested in exploring pedagogical issues and identifying ways for improving their professional practices (Wong 2006). For instance, Teacher 5 felt that it was normal for teachers to do research because 'those who experience teaching have the most persuasive voices'. In her written questionnaire narrative, she saw herself as an energetic and innovative teacher active in doing research:

> On the one hand, I have to do research because I was given such tasks by others (school principal and/or panel chair). On the other hand, it is my belief that I should do research when I am still young and have enough energy to take the challenge of doing research. I do not care what my principal thinks. I just feel that I have a clear goal and I will assess whether I can do it or not. Now we have great competition because our school charges more tuition than other state schools. Our teachers, as a result, are expected to do a lot. The parents' comments on us and our social reputation mean a lot to us. Nevertheless, my professional performance and attitudes are part of me and I need to improve them [constantly through research]. Although the process is tough, it is worthy. (Teacher 5)

However, the data also indicate that the teachers felt obliged to be involved in research by external pressures. In the above extract, Teacher 5 mentioned that she 'was given such tasks' by her superior. There was also pressure on the school to produce evidence for the quality education that the school was expected to provide for fee-paying parents. Likewise, Teacher 7 experienced similar pressure as she taught in

an elite school which was partially funded by real estate developers to attract middle class buyers who were anxious to send their children to good schools. She confessed: 'we really have a lot of workload because our school has high expectations for teachers'. It is noteworthy that both teachers' schools were products of an educational decentralization process and enjoyed relative financial autonomy.

While teachers in self-financed schools were compelled to do research by market competition, those in government schools were obliged to be research engaged because of a centralized process of performance evaluation. Key government schools also have high expectations of their teachers' professional performance and often include 'research engagement' as one important indicator in their performance reviews. Teacher 12 describes her own experiences as follows:

> Apart from encouraging teachers to do research, we have also a system of rewards. For example, if we are doing some research projects, we will complete these research tasks and have some visible achievements later. When the committee selects teachers to be awarded the 'Excellent Teacher' title, they will consider those who do research. …. We do treasure our personal reputation a lot. (Teacher 12)

In this centralized performance review process, research becomes an important part of the school's performance review. As noted in the interview with Teacher 9, a teacher holding a senior position in his school, 'When our school is evaluated, there is one column in the evaluation form called 'research'. If we have research projects, our school will score high on research'. As a result, school principals, who wanted their schools to be ranked favourably in the evaluation, push their teachers to do more research so that they can be 'rated to be of a particular [high] standard' in regular

performance reviews (Teacher 9). Teacher 10 reinforces the importance of doing research to improve the school's standing:

Teacher 10: We are just like this. If the school is going to achieve certain publicly recognized standard, we must do a lot of work. One of them is to do research.

Interviewer: So the teacher might just do research for the sake of school, not only for their own interests. Or they just want to help their school to reach its goal.

Teachers 9/10: Yes. Yes.

It might be concluded from the above extract that the mechanism of making research an integral part of the school's performance review was effective in encouraging schools and teachers to get involved in research. However, this mechanism is also evidence of the state's indirect control of the teachers' research engagement and professional practices. In other words, research may help teachers develop better understandings of students and curriculum and improve their professional competence, but at the same time educational administrators use the system to hold teachers and schools accountable for their practices. Consequently, rather than being directly compelled to do research, teachers find themselves implicitly obliged to undertake research because of the performance evaluation system.

This process, in our view, may lead to unintended consequences (Elliott 2001; Simons et al 2003). For instance, the mechanism of indirect control is likely to constrain individual teachers' intrinsic interest in improving their professional competence through research engagement. Furthermore, as competition among schools intensifies following the decentralization of the educational system (Wong

2006), teachers may feel increasingly coerced to do research and thus develop negative attitudes towards becoming involved in research projects. In addition, use of research engagement as a performance indicator in evaluations also encourages the use of 'objective' standards to assess schools' and teachers' research engagement so that the evaluation is perceived to be 'fair'. As reflected in the data, the search for 'objective' and 'fair' research standards appears to have mediated the teachers' conceptions of research, as we discuss in the following section.

Centrality of quasi-experiments in teachers' conceptions of research

Defining the nature of teacher research has been a controversial issue among those involved in teacher education. Nunan (1997, 366), for instance, argues that 'teacher research should, first and foremost, be evaluated against the same standards that are applied to any other kind of research'. However, Allwright (1997) points out that the demands for standardizing teacher research in line with academic research may become irreconcilable with the demand for teachers' sustainable research engagement and for this reason he contends that teacher research should be conceptualized differently from academic research. The questionnaire and interview data suggest that the teachers' conceptions of research closely resembled that of 'scientific' research conceptualized by academic researchers.

Among the various research experiences described by the teachers, quasi-experimental research methods were the most popular. At least seven wrote about their experiences of using a quasi-experimental design to investigate aspects of innovative teaching approaches, such as task-based instruction. One teacher described her experience of involvement in a project focusing on primary school English learners' motivation in learning English as follows:

> I did extensive search about papers on how to cultivate interest and motivation among primary school English learners. … We had an experimental class. In the class, we did experimental teaching that utilized what we had learnt about how to cultivate interest and motivation among young learners. (Teacher 11)

Moreover, all the participants in the interviews referred to 'experiment' (i.e. experimental use of particular teaching methods or techniques) as a central part of their research experience. A typical account of such research engagement can be found in the following interview extract:

Teacher 9: After we successfully make the bid for the research project, we will organize a research group. The first thing to do is to make preparations. Then we select a target class and a target teacher who will carry out the experiment. Then we will collect information about the research before the experiment, for example, what kind of teaching materials we should use.

Interviewer: So what kind of information will you collect?

Teacher 9: Some students' work, and for the lesson, the target teacher has already started teaching the class. So we will collect information about students' performance.

The teachers' preferences for quasi-experimental studies as a form of research might have been associated with a recent trend of favouring such a methodological approach among Chinese academic researchers (Gao, Li and Lu 2001; see similar findings in Borg 2009, who points out that experimental designs are commonly recognised by teachers as being more 'scientific'). In the interviews, the centrality of 'experiment' in the teachers' research engagement was related to the way that they

were inducted into doing research. Teachers, like the participants in this study, are often asked to attend seminars or training sessions organized by local educational authorities where 'experts' from universities explain to them what research is and how they could do research for the first time. As 'Chinese AL [applied linguistics] is currently moving toward 'positivism', which perceives language learning/teaching as an objective 'reality' to be scientifically studied, and 'knowledge' thus attained to be absolutely true' (Gao et al 2001, 11), the notion of 'scientific research' has been influential among university academics' conceptualization of research. Through university experts' training sessions, the idea of 'scientific research' is taken up by teachers who attend these sessions. If their schools or local educational authorities are resourceful, they may be able to retain university academics to be consultants for school teachers who undertake their own research projects, further strengthening the influence of positivistic conceptualizations of research on teacher researchers.

One might argue that the teachers in this study, since becoming involved in research activity, were no longer required to deliver a predetermined curriculum. However, their newly gained autonomy has been restrained by the terms of inquiry set by experts who previously decided the curriculum and now set the standards for teacher research. These 'experts' were not in direct control of pedagogical content and practices but they dictated what constitutes evidence for 'best practice'. Without conceptualizing teacher research as different from 'academic' research, it is likely that teachers will see their research as an inferior reproduction of academic research or second-class research and thus have little sense of ownership. In sum, one might argue that their research engagement as a path towards professional development has been undermined by the dominance of a 'scientific research' approach in a centralized top-down structure (Allwright 1997; Elliott 2001).

End-products or process in teachers' sharing of research findings

In the inquiry, we identified the dissemination of knowledge emerging from teacher research as a further challenge undermining teacher research as a path towards professional development. The teachers in the inquiry complained about problems in accessing knowledge produced by other teachers in their research endeavours. For instance, they found it difficult to find detailed information about other teachers' research at the Teaching and Research Office, the office responsible for promoting and supervising teacher research in their local school districts. When Teacher 9 went to her local office to examine previous projects, she was disappointed:

> What I got to know is just the brief content table of the project. We can't know whether they have done certain procedures or what they have done in detail. I just want to check whether they have related information. In fact, we don't know what they have done. (Teacher 9)

The particular Teaching and Research Office in question might have limited resources to maintain an archive of detailed reports for all the completed projects, but the participants also had doubts about whether or not schools wanted to share openly knowledge about their projects. Because of the competition inherent in the research promotion process, schools may be willing to demonstrate their research end products to their own teachers, but they are often less willing to show outsiders how they have achieved such practices.

According to the participants, one of the most frequently mentioned ways to disseminate research findings was to organize demonstration classes open for teachers in other schools to observe, as stated by Teacher 12 in the questionnaire:

> In our multimedia project, … one teacher did a demonstration class showing how he used multimedia to motivate students' learning interests. … We also used students' work, the pictures or storybooks they made as a result of our experimental teaching. (Teacher 12)

Other participants like Teacher 13 recalled how she distributed results from their pedagogical innovations through self-made CD Roms, which stored a collection of teaching materials. Both demonstration classes and pedagogical materials are end products of the research process and often exemplify what 'good' practices are. In particular, demonstration classes are expected to help observing teachers learn about how to implement particular pedagogical techniques and activities and appreciate what kind of impact these techniques and activities may have on students' learning. Meanwhile, these end-products are also considered evidence confirming the educational quality of the school and professional excellence of the teachers involved in the research project. However, despite the sharing that sometimes takes place amongst teachers, even in different schools, specifics of the projects are withheld and it is still difficult for outsiders to know 'what they have done in detail' (Teacher 9).

The lack of detailed documentation of teacher research was also found to be related to the highly competitive process of publication for teacher researchers:

Teacher 7: We all had to write papers and submit them to school every semester. Then the school will choose a few of them as the best articles [to the municipal teaching research committee and certain educational magazines.]

Interviewer: The same to you? [Asking another teacher in the focus group.]

Teacher 1: Essay… it is just kind of [reflection] on what you have done in the semester.

Interviewer: The same to you?

Teacher 3: I [have to] write [such] essays.

Teacher 7: And a lot of articles on our teaching reflections. Many other writings to do.

Interviewer: But you do not need to!

Teacher 1: Yes [we have to].

Teacher 7: Because her school is a state school. Mine, too.

Due to this highly selective nature of the publishing process, many teachers might have written up their research and other professional activities, but most of these products remain unpublished. As can be seen in the above interview extract, the publication process was also tightly controlled by both the internal and external selection processes. Three teachers, in response to the question concerning the writing-up and dissemination of research findings, also mentioned that they wrote internal reports on their research projects which were submitted to their principals and/or the officers who were in charge of the Research and Teaching Office at local educational authorities. In the process, the teachers received no feedback concerning their writing and had little idea about why some of the reports were selected for publication. Therefore, publication appears to be a mysterious process for most of the teachers.

As a result, it is not surprising to see that the teachers had ambiguous attitudes towards publication of their research, though they do appreciate the importance of doing so. Even though it was found in the interviews that schools sometimes financially rewarded those who managed to have articles published, the teachers still reported low motivation to write about their research and publish the reports. Therefore, while the research promotion mechanism was found in the inquiry to be

highly effective in encouraging schools and teachers to get involved in research, it was found to be less effective in promoting teachers' (understanding of) mutual sharing and critical reflection. In particular, lack of teachers' participation in disseminating their knowledge through publication may cause a wealth of context-specific experiences and knowledge to go wasted without benefiting other teachers. It must be noted that the participants also reported other difficulties, such as heavy teaching and non-teaching duties as well as inadequate research writing skills (Barkhuizen 2009; Borg 2009; Gao et al. in press). Moreover, the competition associated with the research promotion mechanism pushed schools and teachers to share their research products but discouraged them from sharing the process in an open and transparent manner with other teachers, which may undermine the intended impact on teachers' professional development in the wider community.

Research as s a path towards teachers' sustainable professional development

So far, the inquiry has revealed that the primary school teachers in this study have had quite extensive research experiences. The findings also problematized the teachers' research as a path to professional development due to the particular features of educational decentralization on the Chinese mainland, often described as having a mixed form of deconcentration and limited delegation or recentralization (Hanson 1998; Hawkins 2000). As revealed in the inquiry, the state's control of teachers' practices appears to have been implicit but tenacious even with regards to their research activity, which should ironically have given them more control of their professional practices. First of all, the top-down approach to promote research might potentially diminish the teachers' initiative in taking a more critical and reflective stance towards their own professional practices. Their conceptualization of research in

line with positivistic research approaches meant that both their research engagement and the form it takes were likely to be constrained by the terms of reference set by 'experts'. Consequently, this might have weakened their pride in and ownership of their own research. Meanwhile, the teachers were faced with challenges in disseminating their findings since fierce educational competition discouraged them from sharing their 'best' practices in an open manner, and a highly selective publication process run by educational administrators further dissuaded them from productively participating in the publication process. In other words, teachers' research engagement, which should have empowered them to develop their professional knowledge and to share their success, appears to have been undermined by the control mechanisms that implicitly engulfed their professionalism. Although a few teachers did improve their professional practices through research engagement, it seems that they were still some way from functioning autonomously.

In this era of educational decentralization, it is unlikely that the indirect control of teachers' professional practices and research engagement, as described in this article, will disappear on the Chinese mainland. Teachers still lack a considerable degree of autonomy 'in how [they] practise and the extent to which they are allowed to exercise their professional creativity and develop their craft' (Hall 2009, 672). Therefore, educational administrators and teacher educators who are responsible for promoting teacher research may consider the following suggestions in order to make research engagement more 'educational' for teachers (Elliott 2001):

- Evaluation of teacher research needs to be more process-oriented rather than product-oriented.
- Teachers need to be encouraged and supported to document and share the process of their research.

- Alternative publication channels need to be created in which teachers could participate in the process as peer reviewers. .

Perhaps the establishment of platforms for mutual sharing and reflection could help teachers overcome some of the challenges undermining their research engagement. For instance, we are aware of an initiative to link all the teachers' blogs together in one county on the Chinese mainland. In these blogs, teachers write about their experiences of implementing new curriculum and trying new pedagogical techniques while their readers, also teachers in the same school district, could comment on these posts and ask for clarification. Such interactions help teachers deepen their understanding of critical and relevant pedagogical issues that are being researched.

In addition, teachers need to be empowered with appropriate research skills, which could be fostered through a university-school partnership. While university academics are in a good position to provide the kind of support teachers need when doing research, it must be noted that they should not colonize the sphere of teacher research with notions restricted to academic research. To make teacher research a path towards sustainable professional development, there is a need for teachers to conceptualize research in terms different from those associated with university-based academic research. In our view, teacher research should help teachers to become vigilant inquirers of their own practices who are 'actively engaging in creating meaning … [and continually] improvising [the] relations between self and others' in an 'organic' professional development process (Latta et al, 2007, 36). In other words, the ultimate purpose of teacher research should be made 'educational' for teachers so that it serves as an effective way for professional development (Elliott 2001).

Notes on contributors

Gary Barkhuizen is Associate Professor in the Department of Applied Language Studies and Linguistics at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of sociolinguistics, learner language, language teacher education and narrative inquiry.

Alice Chow is associate professor in the Department of English at Hong Kong Institute of Education. Her research and teaching interests are in the areas of English language teaching curriculum and methods, applied linguistics, children's literature, school-based teacher development and teacher learning.

Xuesong (Andy) Gao is assistant professor in the Department of English at Hong Kong Institute of Education. His research and teaching interests are in the areas of sociolinguistics, vocabulary studies, language learning narratives and language teacher education.

References

Allwright, D. (1997) Quality and sustainability in teacher-research, *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 368-370.

Ball, S. J. (2003) The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity, *Journal of Educational Policy*, 18, 215-228.

Barkhuizen, G. (2009) Topics, aims, and constraints in English teacher research: A Chinese case study, *TESOL Quarterly*, 43, 113-125.

Borg, S. (2009) English language teachers' conceptions of research, *Applied Linguistic*, 30, 358-388.

Bray, M. (2003) Control of education: Issues and tensions in centralization and decentralization, in: R. F. Arnove & C. A. Torres (Eds) *Comparative education: the dialectic of the global and the loca*l (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield), 204-228.

Cochran-Smith, M.& Lytle, S. (1999). Relationships of knowledge and practice: Teacher learning in community. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 249-305.

Darling-Harmmond, L. (1996) The quiet revolution: Rethinking teacher development, *Educational Leadership*, 53(6), 4-10.

Elliott, J. (2001) Making evidence-based practice educational, *British Educational Research Journal*, 27, 555-574.

Erickson, F. (2004). Demystifying data construction and analysis, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 35, 486-493.

Gao, X., Barkhuizen, G. & Chow, A. (in press) 'Nowadays, teachers are relatively obedient': Understanding primary school English teachers' conceptions of and drives for research in China. *Language Teaching Research*.

Gao, Y., Li, L. & Lu, J. (2001) Trends in research methods in applied linguistics: China and the West, *English for Specific Purposes*, 20, 1-14.

Gu, L. & Wang, J. (2006) School-based research and professional learning: An innovative model to promote teacher professional development in China. *Teaching Education, 17*, 59-73.

Hall, E. (2009) Engaging in and engaging with research: Teacher inquiry and development, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15, 669-681.

Hall, E., Leat, D., Wall, K., Higgins, S.E. & Edwards, G. (2006) Learning to learn: Teacher research in the zone of proximal development, *Teacher Development*, 10, 149-166.

Hanson, E. M. (1998) Strategies of educational decentralization: Key questions and core issues, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 111-128.

Hargreaves, D. H. (1999) The knowledge-creating school, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 47, 122-144.

Hawkins, J. N. (2000) Centralization, decentralization, recentralization: educational reform in China, *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38, 442–454.

Hemsley-Brown, J & Sharp, C. (2003) The use of research to improve professional practice: A systematic review of the literature. *Oxford Review of Education*, 29, 449-470.

Latta, M. M., Buck, G., Leslie-Pelecky, D. &Carpenter, L. (2007) Terms of inquiry, *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 13, 21-41.

Mok, K. (2002) Policy of decentralization and changing governance of higher education in post-Mao China, *Public Administration Development*, 22, 261–273.

Nunan, D. (1997) Developing standards for teacher-research in TESOL, *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 365-367.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2nd ed.*) (Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications).

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis, in: J. A. & Wisniewski, R. (Eds.). *Life history and narrative* (London: Falmer), 5-23.

Simons, H., Kushner, S., Jones, K. & James, D. (2003) From evidence-based practice to practice-based evidence: The idea of situated generalization, *Research Papers in Education*, 18, 347-364.

Smeyers, P., and Verhesschen, P. (2001) Narrative analysis as philosophical research: Bridging the gap between the empirical and the conceptual, *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education,* 14, 71-84.

Stenhouse, L. (1985). *Research as a basis for teaching: Readings from the work of Lawrence Stenhouse* (London: Heinemann).

Wang, W. & Gao, X. (2008). English language education in China: A review of selected research. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 29, 280-299.

Wang, J., Zhou, W. & Gu, L. (2005). Lesson study in China. A paper presented at the first annual conference on lesson study. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Institute of Education, December, 3rd.

Wen, Q. & Gao, Y. (2007) Dual publication and academic inequality, *International Journal of Applied Linguistics,* 17, 221-225.

Wong, J. L. N. (2006) Control and professional development: Are teachers being deskilled or reskilled within the context of decentralization? *Educational Studies,* 32, 17-37.

Zhan, S. (2008) Changes to a Chinese pre-service language teacher education program: Analysis, results and implications, *Asia Pacific Journal of Teacher Education,* 36, 53-70.

Zhong, Q. (2006) Curriculum reform in China: Challenges and reflections, *Frontiers of Education in China*, 3, 370-382.

Appendix 1: The open-ended questionnaire

RESEARCH CULTURE
Write a few sentences which describe the institution in which you work; e.g. its mission, where it is, the students, the curriculum, etc.

YOUR TEACHER RESEARCH STORY
In the space below, please tell us your research story; e.g., your story about how you have been involved in research, any research you have done or would like to do, or why you have not been able to do research. In other words, tell us a story about your experiences of research in your life as a teacher.

Appendix 2: Focus group interview questions

1. Can you briefly introduce yourself? (Your educational and professional experiences. Your current job duties and so on.)

2. Can you talk about your school? (What kind of school it is? Does the school always have collaboration with educational authorities or universities? What about their school policy towards research? Are leaders in your schools supportive? How about teaching and research groups in your school? Why do you think that it is important for primary school teachers to do research?)

3. Can you describe your research experience in more detail? Refer to what they have written on the questionnaire. (Why did you join this research project? What did you actually do in the research process? How did you feel in the beginning? What kind of difficulties and challenges have you encountered in the process? What kind of support do you need? What benefits have you gained from participating in the research process? What kind of dissatisfaction did you have with your research experience?)

4. Imagine you were the person responsible for promoting research in your school. Will your colleagues be enthusiastic about doing research? Why? How about promoting research among teachers in other schools?