

Professional Development 21.0: Teachers, Second Languages, and CALL

Robert C. Kleinsasser*

Arizona State University

DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol6Issue11-10

This manuscript developed from a keynote address focusing on twenty-first Century professional development (PD) for teachers, second languages (L2), and computer assisted language learning (CALL). Participants individually and collectively were challenged to develop 21st Century PD for their language teaching, learning, and technology landscapes. PD features and design elements encouraged opportunities to acknowledge advantages and limitations as participants contemplated their 21st Century PD meaning-making potential, individually and collectively. The keynote was delivered 22 November 2019 at the 3rd UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL 2019 in Jakarta, Indonesia.

Naskah ini dikembangkan dari materi sebagai pembicara inti pada konferensi tentang pengembangan profesionalitas (PP) untuk guru bahasa kedua dan CALL (Computer Assisted Language Learning). Peserta secara individu dan bersama-sama diminta untuk mencanangkan (PP) mereka. Fitur dan elemen disain mendorong kesempatan untuk mengakui kelebihan dan keterbatasan pada saat peserta melakukan kontemplasi atas potensi PP mereka di abad 21, baik secara individu maupun kelompok. Materi ini disampaikan pada tanggal 22 November 2019 pada konferensi ke-3 UICELL (UHAMKA International Conference on ELT and CALL) tahun 2019 di Jakarta, Indonesia.

Prologue

I was fortunate during summer 2019 to visit the National Art Gallery in Canberra, Australia during its exhibition “*Contemporary World Indonesia*” (Babington & Cains, 2019). It was happenstance to perhaps be involved in a “pre-“professional development (PD) experience that would assist the eventual keynote and this article. I was enchanted by possibilities of Indonesian art (in various guises) “from the fall of Suharto in 1998 to the present day” (Mitzevich, 2019, p. 10). The exhibition touted 23 Indonesian artists who shared various

* Corresponding author. Email: Robert.Kleinsasser@asu.edu

ISSN: 2502-292X, e-ISSN 2527-7448.

© 2021, English Education Program, Graduate School

University of Muhammadiyah Prof. DR. HAMKA Jakarta

DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol6Issue1

beautiful, striking, and elegant art mediums exploring “concepts ranging from sexuality, gender roles, and family, to environmental concerns, the art market, new materials, and forms, the everyday [sic] object and how we might listen to and learn from the sounds of Indonesia” (p. 10). The colours, textures, and lighting were inviting, the themes thought-provoking, and the artists’ invitation to interact and make meaning with what they shared mesmerizing. So enthralling that I had to ensure to be part of a guided tour to learn more about the latest in Indonesian artistry after first perceiving the artistry as an individual walking alone through and by the art experiencing wonder, contentment, and challenges before being introduced to themes, meanings, and insights with a collective group tour.

I was encouraged how artistry thrived in Indonesia and wondered if the exhibition’s artistry might serve as a metaphor for those working with PD in Indonesia. My thoughts developed in a way to challenge Indonesian teachers, teacher educators, and researchers to use Indonesian artists as possible examples – even muses – to reach back into history and consider PD of the past as they represent, live, and imagine their PD in the present and future. The artists contextually represented Indonesia in times and places; might those seeking educational PD in Indonesia be challenged to think similarly and share and develop their experiences, collectively and individually? Offering glimpses of potential “Contemporary Professional Development Indonesia”?

Professional Development (PD), Learning, and Informal Everyday Learning

PD occurs locally, nationally, and internationally. Educators at all levels (pre-k-university and beyond) are asked to participate in various PD themes (e.g., Cohen, Spillane, & Peurach, 2017; Parkhouse, Lu, & Massaro, 2019), activities (e.g., Liu & Kleinsasser, 2014; Penner-Williams, Diaz, & Worthen, 2019), and with various motivations (e.g., Richter, Kleinknecht, & Groeschner, 2019). Sighs from faculty and staff are often heard once PD is announced and more than a few seek to see if something else is in their diary or on their calendar to avoid having to attend. Yet, PD in educational environs seeks lofty goals with solid premises. Avalos (2011) reviewed PD in *Teaching and Teacher Education* (honouring its 25th anniversary) and highlighted PD’s salient attributes: “Professional development is about teachers learning, learning how to learn, and transforming their knowledge into practice for the benefit of their students’ growth” (p. 10). Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) defined “effective professional development as structured professional learning that results in changes in teacher practices and improvements in student learning outcomes” (p. 5). Teacher PD and teacher learning are integrally entwined.

In fact, learning is a central component of teacher PD. Russ, Sherin, and Sherin (2016) offered three existing conceptualisations of teaching and teacher learning: 1) process product (i.e., teaching as a set of actions), 2) cognitive modeling (i.e., teaching as a way of thinking and learning as changes in knowledge), and 3) situative and sociocultural (teaching as interacting and learning as chains in interactions within communities). For instance, situative and sociocultural were defined as:

Teaching is fundamentally interactional, and as such telling the full story of teaching requires—for example—telling stories about how teachers interact with their students in the classroom within and across the years; how they interact with one another in their school, district, and national

contexts; and how they interact with tools and artifacts. (Russ et al., 2016, p. 403)

There is a growing body of research that attends specifically to teacher educator professional learning (TEPL). Ping, Schellings, and Beijaard (2018) acknowledged their review of the TEPL literature as a growing field of interest because of the more recent spate of published articles. Ping et al. provided “an overview of the content of professional learning, the learning activities teacher educators undertake, and reasons for professional learning” (p. 102). Their analysis comprised three overarching categories (with subcategories): 1) professional learning content (pedagogy of teacher education, research and reflection, professional identity, knowledge base); 2) professional learning activities (learning through academic engagement, learning through collaborative activity, learning through attending professional development programs, learning from reflective activity); and reasons for professional learning (external requirement, personal ambition, professional role transition) (Ping et al., 2018).

Russ et al. (2016) warned, however, teacher (possibly teacher educator) learning conceptualizations as potentially focusing too heavily on specialized actions (i.e., process product focusing on specialized actions “such as assessing student ideas or grouping students in particular ways”; cognitive modeling where “researchers focus on specialized types of knowledge that teachers must acquire, such as pedagogical content knowledge”; and situative sociocultural when “researchers explore how teachers develop new identities as members of professional communities” (p. 410). Russ et al. suggested everyday knowledge and practices may offer increased insights to teacher (teacher educator) learning. Such everyday knowledge and practices include classroom interactions, interpreting student thinking, providing instructional explanations, and making inferences about meaning, among others. Russ et al.’s intent highlighted the potential of teachers’ (teacher educators’) everyday practices, knowledge, and exchanges. These challenges have as much to do with learning as most PD intentions and practices.

Kyndt, Gijbels, Grosemans, & Donche (2016) considered research on teacher learning to be related to research on teacher identity, teacher induction, and formally organized communities of practice. These authors viewed informal learning much like Russ et al. (2016) examined everyday learning. Kyndt et al. (2016) contended “Teachers learn from the interplay between individual activities and those involving others,” (p. 1138) and characterized informal learning “by a low degree of planning and organizing in terms of learning context, learning support, learning time, and learning objectives” (Kyndt et al., 2014 as cited in Kyndt et al., 2016, p. 1113). Kyndt et al.’s (2016) review identified informal learning activities such as browsing internet and social media, collaboration with colleagues, experimenting, learning by doing/through experience, observation, reading professional literature, reflection, sharing material with others, storytelling, talk with others, and trial and error (Kyndt et al., 2016, p. 1122). Their typology of empirically identified informal learning activities incorporated the following elements: Interacting and discussing with others, Practicing and testing (doing/experiencing, experimenting), Learning from others, no interaction, Consulting (offline/online) information sources, Reflecting in/on action. Engaging in extracurricular activities, and Encountering difficulties (Kyndt et al., 2016, pp. 1125-1129, see Table 4).

A small caveat is warranted to highlight a conundrum of equating *teacher* PD and learning with *teacher educator* PD and learning. Although similarities might exist between the two, there also might be differences. The profession needs to attend to better articulating convergences and divergences to a greater extent as *teacher educator* research and scholarship continue to grow. As Kleinsasser (2017) noted in his quest to understand teacher educator work, “The professional literature continues to grapple with how to discuss and write about these two areas [teacher research and teacher educator research]; nonetheless, the converging, diverging, and inconsistent traits and issues among them require further weaving, and possible untangling” (p. 1045).

PD Features and Design Elements

Formal and informal PD and learning nicely intertwine; there are similarities that focus on knowledge and practice advancement, evolution, and progress. Oft cited teacher PD features include 1) content focus, 2) active learning, 3) coherence, 4) duration, and 5) collective participation (Desimone, 2009, p. 184; see also Desimone & Garet, 2015). These five features have been further refined and expanded upon to include what Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner term seven common design elements of effective PD that encompass 1) PD is content focused, 2) Incorporates active learning utilizing adult learning theory, 3) supports collaboration, 4) uses models and modeling of effective practice, 5) provides coaching and expert support, 6) offers opportunities for feedback and reflection, and 7) is of sustained duration. The features and design elements offer staple building blocks for current teacher and/or teacher educator PD and learning in the early years of the 21st century. Nary a PD study would likely be published without attributions to Desimone’s seminal piece or derivations of the initial five features. The nuts and bolts of these PD features, elements, and attributes require continued sense-making among professional teachers and teacher educators. There is yet room for meaning-making potential around the world as to what and how teachers and teacher educators are professionally developing and learning. As Kennedy (2016a) challenged “...there is little consensus about how PD [PD] works, how it fosters teacher learning, and how it is expected to alter teaching practice” (p. 945).

Situating the Parsing of Teaching

Kennedy (2016a; 2016b) highlighted specifically teacher *practices*, acknowledging that another salient PD focus for teaching centers on teacher *knowledge*. Kennedy reviewed three ways teacher practices are parsed: teachers do activities, teachers make moves, and teachers enact core practices. Offering insights and concerns, Kennedy (2016b) concluded, “we have tried to define the practice of teaching in terms of lists of specific bodies of knowledge or lists of specific behaviors rather in terms of what those behaviors are intended to achieve,” and “[w]e have misplaced our focus on the actions we see; when what is needed is a focus on the purposes those actions serve” (p. 9). Kennedy went on to propose her ideas about parsing teaching that I want to share with you to consider your making-meaning potential in your potential PD and learning in Indonesia.

Kennedy’s (2016b) alternative approach to practice parsing included 1) portraying the curriculum, 2) enlisting student participation, 3) exposing student thinking, 4) containing student behavior, and 5) accommodating personal needs. Kennedy argued these five challenges

are intrinsic and universal to teaching—every teacher encounters these challenges daily. Portraying the curriculum challenges teachers to make curriculum content comprehensible and considers how “that portrait will be constructed from some kind of live activity that takes place in a specific space, used specific materials, and occurs within a specific time frame” (p. 10). Exposing student thinking offers three principles to understand how students retain what they learn and actually understand it, how students understand learning in a specific context, and how students actively remember, learn, and think about central concepts being presented. Exposing student thinking reminds teachers to continually question how they understand, don’t understand, or misunderstand their students. Containing student behavior focuses on ensuring “students are not distracting each other, or distracting the teachers, from the lesson.” (p. 7). Accommodating personal needs attends to how teachers personally address portraying curriculum, enlisting participation, exposing thinking, and containing behavior. To be sure these challenges are but mere sketches about daily teacher and student behaviors. Our task as practitioners and researchers is to further uncover and delineate how we attend to these challenges and what they mean to our daily teaching and learning, along with our students learning. There remains much to understand when developing professionally among these five challenges (see further Kennedy, 2016b).

Empirical Evidence of Parsing Teaching

Kennedy (2016a) reviewed experimental PD research studies within US K-12 general education (core subjects included language arts, mathematics, sciences, and social sciences). Her methodology was innovative and unique offering fine grained insights that characterize “Professional development theories of action by their main ideas and by the way the help teachers enact those ideas” (p. 948). Kennedy proposed four types of pedagogical approaches for teacher PD as a framework for her review. Two were didactic in nature (bodies of knowledge and specific teaching strategies) and two that were rarely used in teacher education (strategies defined by goal or purpose and insights (see Kennedy, 2016a, pp. 955-956). Her findings demonstrated portraying curriculum content as enactment via prescription, via strategy, via insight, and via bodies of knowledge. Kennedy proposed two kinds of hypotheses for how PD influences practices: “One has to do with how programs facilitate enactment of their ideas, the other with how program-assignment methods affect program outcomes” (Kennedy, 2016a, p. 965).

Kennedy (2016a) further identified in her review additional persistent teaching challenges that can lead to student achievement gains she identified and described (Kennedy 2016b) including containing student behavior, enlisting participation, and exposing student thinking. These findings highlighted for Kennedy a concern that PD should examine the content and intellectual work teachers (and teacher educators) engage in, moving past just researching “the concept of learning communities per se” (Kennedy, 2016a, p. 972).

A brief mention needs to be made here about feedback (e.g., Hattie, 2009; Hattie and Timperley, 2007) which seems to pervade issues of what Kennedy terms “parsing the curriculum.” Having recently read “*The Cambridge handbook of instructional feedback*” (Lipnevich & Smith, 2018) there are some areas that seemingly overlap including the simple fact that there is much more that needs to be both studied and professionally developed. William (2018) reminded that “One of the most surprising things about the field of feedback

research is how many studies of feedback pay relatively little attention to the nature of learning and the cognitive processes involved” (William, 2018, p. 16). While Lipnevich and Smith (2019) pointed out: “Researchers agree that feedback is essential for improved performance, but we also know that learners often dread feedback and dismiss it and that the effectiveness of feedback varies depending on specific characteristics of feedback messages that learners receive” (Lipnevich & Smith, 2018, p. xvii). There are theoretical and practical concerns that are not necessarily mutually exclusive between instructional feedback and teaching parsing. PD for the 21st Century creates potential mixtures of theories and practices.

Second Languages and CALL

So far, I have shared with you sketches of PD and teacher (teacher educator) learning (formal and informal). I further offered Kennedy’s (2016b) article illustrating ideas of parsing the practice of teaching with her second reviewing empirical literature seeking evidence from a practice parsing perspective (Kennedy, 2016a). So, what has this to do with second languages and CALL? Everything. The second language and CALL profession might enhance PD knowledge and practice by considering how to situate practice and studies within the notions of Kennedy’s parsing to provide empirical evidence from second language learning environments and the use of CALL in them. This further enhances mixtures of disciplines and perhaps moves both the second language and CALL curriculums forward, as well as offer insights into how various local, regional, and national communities (including Indonesia) expand their and other knowledge and practice bases. Over twenty years ago Freeman and Johnson (1998) argued how second language education usually lagged-behind the education profession; this is no less true today. More recently McKinley (2019) and Rose (2019) signaled (again) the saliency of teacher informed research. The parsing of second language and CALL teaching assists potentially to professionally develop empirical insights. Such likely groundbreaking and teaching-informed knowledges and practices enhance future teachers and teacher educators, second languages education, and CALL for 21st Century learning environments worldwide.

(Future) Individual and Collective PD

Already in the latter decade of the 20th Century Clark (1992) offered up ideas for self-directed (i.e., individual) PD. He developed seven design principles that individually you might use to practice and research your personal professional development. These involve writing your own credo of teaching, starting with your strengths, making a five-year plan, looking in your own backyard, asking for support, going first class, and blowing your own trumpet. Suffice here to highlight that “blowing your own trumpet” might mean writing and publishing your professional development experiences in national and international publications. Among other types of inquiry, self-study and narrative are burgeoning arenas within educational and teacher educator research (e.g., Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001; Kitchen, Berry, Bullock, Crowe, Taylor, Gudjonsdottir, & Thomas, 2020; Kleinsasser, 2013). You might consider among others some future recommendations Kennedy (2016a) developed where you specifically attend to how PD motivates you, how PD intellectually engages you, and what meaning do you get from PD experiences. This would highlight a shift for some research to introduce, or at least incorporate teacher educators’ subjectivities (e.g., Brown, Rowley, & Smith, 2014). Or you

might work with colleagues to figure out how individual and collective learning and professional development has impacted your teaching. As Kyndt et al. (2016) found: “The literature on informal teacher learning acknowledges the existence of both individual as well as organization antecedents for teacher learning. However, little research has explicitly investigated the interaction between these antecedents” (Kyndt et al, 2016, p. 1142). Collectively, you could work with your colleagues and research professional development. In the area of technology, Reich (2020) surmised:

The toxic power of data and experimentation highlights that even if questions about edtech’s possibilities and potential are technical in nature, the questions of what we should do with technology are irreducibly political. In the long run, the best future for improving learning technologies through research will involve greater community involvement in addressing these tradeoffs. (p. 242).

Kennedy (2016a) additionally conjectured: “There is little discussion in the literature about the nature of PD expertise, how PD providers are selected, how they are prepared for their work, or how their efficacy is assessed” (p. 973). There is ample space to study individually and collectively professional development from different perspective using various agencies, materials, and mediums.

Here are some challenges for you to consider, practically and theoretically. How might you participate in 21st Century professional development? How might you join the Indonesian artists in how they invited me to interact and understand recent Indonesian artistry with Indonesian teacher and teacher educator PD and learning? How might you share your teaching knowledge and practices from Indonesia to teachers and teacher educators globally? Personally, I cannot wait for you to share and to be invited to read about and experience your artistry as educational professional developers; teaching, researching, and learning in your various learning environments and organisations, individually and collectively.

Epilogue

I subsequently visited the Indonesian National Art Gallery in Jakarta during my visit in 2019. The reality further developed my understanding of Indonesian art from 1945 to the present and my “pre“-professional development in Australia continued evolving and growing. As I return to teaching, research, and service, I now more often seek to consider individual and collective ways of thinking more deeply. I wish for students to engage both individually and collectively in learning and to understand how the two are distinct, yet overlapping. My interactions with the Indonesian artists (both in Australia and Indonesia) reminded me of the importance of context and how context situates understandings, dreams, and hopes. Walking up to the Indonesian National Art Gallery, I was amazed by the trees that gave further meaning to the various trees expressed through artistry that I saw in the Australian exhibition. I asked questions of my Indonesian hosts that then made them query about the elements surrounding them. As I walked through the various galleries in Jakarta I made connections with the more recent Indonesian artists’ experiences in Australia. The insights, learnings, and queries continued. I am only beginning to appreciate Indonesian art, artistry, and artists.

I hope learners have opportunities to interact and immerse themselves in the artistry of learning. As I develop a new online course I focus on three strands: individual, pair, and team

work (i.e., individual and collective). The individual work focuses on reflections and becoming a reflective practitioner, the pair work focuses partners on two articles where they compare and contrast the articles' content along with their various backgrounds, and the team work involves students in a book club where they read a text, offer each other online discussion posts, and together create a website that further clarifies elements of the historical seminal text for educational learning environments today. I hope students see the importance of involving themselves in processes while also creating learning activities that are interactive, colourful, and textured. I remember an Australian family taking the various textiles made available to them in one of the Australian presentations and wrapping the flowing materials around, between, and among family members in different ways (the exhibition by Yudha 'Fehung' Kusuma Putera, see Babington & Cains, pp. 96-97). I was happy to take pictures on their cell phone. That's the type of experience I yearn for my students and colleagues to have in learning, teaching, and growing—yes, even in professional development. Where we wrap ourselves in vivid fabric patterns available while individually and collectively experiencing them and creating living murals of how we think, act, teach, learn, and live. Where we highlight our backgrounds, experiences, and contexts and make our worlds—locally, nationally, and internationally.

Professional development is now indelibly linked with my experiences with Indonesian artists; when I consider online college courses, develop pedagogy, and craft research and professional development projects, etc. I want those flashy colours and compositions displayed by the Indonesian artists I was fortunate to experience threading through my daily activities. The warmth, excitement, and possibilities help me think beyond what I previously thought, or even thought possible. The Indonesian artists have afforded me new (renewed) capabilities, perspectives, and potential.

REFERENCES

- Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher professional development in *Teaching and Teacher Education* over ten years. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 10-20. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.007
- Babington, J., & Cains, C. (Eds.). (2019). *Contemporary world Indonesia*. Canberra, Australia: National Gallery of Australia.
- Brown, T., Rowley, H., & Smith, K. (2014). Rethinking research in teacher education. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 62(3), 281-296. doi: org/10.1080/00071005.2014.955080
- Bullough, R.V., & Pinnegar, S. (2001). Guidelines for quality in autobiographical forms of self-study research. *Educational Researcher*, 30 (3), 13-21.
- Clark, C.M. (1992). Teachers as designers in self-directed professional development. In A. Hargreaves & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 75-84). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cohen, D.K., Spillane, J.P., & Peurach, D.J. (2017). The dilemmas of educational reform. *Educational Researcher*, 47(2), 204-212. doi: 10.3102/0013189X17743488
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M.E., Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Palo Alto, CA: Learning Policy Institute.
- Desimone, L.M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' professional development: Toward better conceptualizations and measures. *Educational Researcher*, 38(3), 181-199.

- Desimone, L.M., & Garet, M.S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society, and Education*, 7(3), 252-263.
- Freeman, D., & Johnson, K.E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32(3) 397-417.
- Hattie, J.A.C. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. London: Routledge.
- Hattie, J.A.C., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 81-112.
- Kennedy, M.M. (2016a). How does professional development improve teaching? *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 945-980. doi: 10.3102/00346543156268000
- Kennedy, M.M. (2016b). Parsing the practice of teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67, 6-17. doi: 10.1177/0022487115614617
- Kitchen, J., Berry, A., Bullock, S.M., Crowe, A.P., Taylor, M., Gudjonsdottir, H., & Thomas, L. (Eds.). (2020). *2nd international handbook of self-study of teaching and teacher education*. Singapore: Springer.
- Kleinsasser, R.C. (2013). Language teachers: Research and studies in language(s) education, teaching, and learning in *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 1985–2012. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 29, 86-96.
- Kleinsasser, R.C. (2017). A quest for teacher educator work. In D.J. Clandinin and J. Husu (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 1033-1048, Chapter 59). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kyndt, E., Gijbels, D., Grosemans, I., & Donche, V. (2016). Teachers' everyday professional development: Mapping informal learning activities, antecedents, and learning outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 86(4), 1111-1150. doi: 10.3102/0034654315627864
- Lipnevich, A.A., & Smith, J.K. (Eds.). (2018). *The Cambridge handbook of instructional feedback*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liu, M-H., & Kleinsasser, R.C. (2014). Fostering online professional development between EFL preservice and inservice teachers: Affordances and challenges. *English Teaching & Learning*, 38(2), 29-64.
- McKinley, J. (2019). Evolving the TESOL teaching-research nexus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 875-884. doi: 10.1002/tesq.509
- Mitzevich, N. (2019). Director's foreword. In J. Babington & C. Cains (Eds.), *Contemporary world Indonesia* (p. 10). Canberra, Australia: National Gallery of Australia.
- Parkhouse, H., Lu, C.Y., & Massaro, V.R. (2019). Multicultural education professional development: A review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 89(3), 416-458. doi: 10.3102/0034654319840359
- Penner-Williams, J., Diaz, E.I., & Worthen, D.G. (2019). Sustainability of teacher growth from professional development in culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2019.102891
- Ping, C., Schellings, G., & Beijaard, D. (2018). Teacher educators' professional learning: A literature review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 75, 93-104. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.06.003
- Reich, J. (2020). *Failure to disrupt: Why technology alone can't transform education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Richter, D., Kleinknecht, M., & Groeschner, A. (2019). What motivates teachers to participate in professional development? An empirical investigation of motivational orientations and the uptake of formal learning opportunities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2019.102929>

- Rose, H. (2019). Dismantling the ivory tower of TESOL: A renewed call for teaching-informed research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 53(3), 895-905. doi: org/10.1002/tesq.517
- Russ, R.S., Sherin, B.L., & Sherin, M.G. (2016). What constitutes teacher learning? In D.H. Gitomer & C.A. Bell (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching* 5th ed. (pp. 391-438). Washington, DC: AERA.
- William, D. (2018). Feedback: At the heart of—but definitively not all of—formative assessment. In A.A. Lipnevich & J.K. Smith (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of instructional feedback* (pp. 3-28). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Author

Robert C. Kleinsasser (Ph.D., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) is currently Co-Editor in Chief of *Teaching and Teacher Education An International Journal of Research and Studies* (TATE). He recently completed serving as the inaugural Book Review Editor of the *Journal of Educational Research* (2007-2019). He teaches online master level courses and serves on the doctoral level graduate programs in Applied Linguistics and Learning, Literacies, and Technology at Arizona State University. His more recent publications can be found in *Language Teaching Research*, *The Journal of Educational Research*, *Teachers College Record*, *Tech Trends*, *Journal of Formative Design in Learning*, *Journal of ELT Research*, and *Language Learning and Technology*. He also has a chapter in the recent *Sage Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* edited by Clandinin and Husu (2017).