A Podcast Format for Expanding Knowledge Through Engaging With Expertise

Matthew W. Turner
Tokyo University of Science

Matthew Y. Schaefer
Sophia University

Robert J. Lowe
Ochanomizu University

Podcasts can be used by language-teaching peers to facilitate collaborative and co-constructive reflection and knowledge development. Not only are podcasts a popular form of open scholarship and science communication, but they can act as a creative method of critical inquiry, while operating as a space for action-research activities. In this paper, we investigated our podcasting format which involves hosts participating in reflective conversations with each other and with outside experts. In this pilot study, we used interaction from three podcast episodes to reveal how the collaborative expansion of knowledge can be traced through an experimental format. Through identifying developmental processes as critical learning episodes, the study yielded some data-led insights into the significance of this initiative on professional learning. We hope to give readers a practical overview of podcasts in use as self-directed continuing professional development tools.

ポッドキャストは、言語教師が互いに考察し、知識を共同構築し、発展させるために利用されている。ポッドキャストは、開かれた学問や科学コミュニケーションの一種であり、探求の方法としてますます利用されるようになり、なおかつアクション・リサーチ活動を行うための空間としても機能している。本論は, ホストが互いに, あるいはまた専門家と、内省的な議論を行うポッドキャストのフォーマットを探求する。この質的研究は、実験的なフォーマットを通じて、知識の共同的な開発がどのように追跡されるかを探るものである。結果として、クリティカル・ラーニング・エピソードの分析を通じて、参加者の職業生活と成長に与える意義について、データに基づく洞察を得ることができた。本論は、継続的専門能力開発のための自己活用ツールとしてのポッドキャストの実用的な説明を提供することを目指している。

I n 2021, the authors started using a three-part episode format for *The TEFLology Podcast*, their EFL professional development-focused podcast. In this format, discussions between the presenters are complemented by interviews with guests. The goal of this format change was to better integrate professional development and knowledge expansion between the presenters and invited guests as well as for the audience. Focusing on the presenters, we evaluated how the revised format of the podcast contributed to knowledge development. Through an analysis of recorded data, specific examples are provided of how the presenters' conceptual knowledge developed through recorded interactions on the podcast. This project answers the need for more language-based and insider descriptions of podcasting practice and is aimed at reflecting on the authors' development through the initiative.

Podcasts in Academic Engagement

Podcasts have a well-documented role in foreign language learning (e.g., Hasan & Hoon, 2013) and as an educational apparatus in various fields of study, such as medicine (Berk et al., 2020). They are also receiving attention as a scholarly tool across academia (e.g., Cook, 2023), especially as a professional development enterprise for foreign language teachers (e.g., Hawkins & Johnson, 2020). As podcasting practitioners, we have explored how the medium may function alongside conventional action-research cycles in both spurring potential inquiry and sustaining a collaborative research community (Lowe et al., 2021). We have also considered the use of podcasting for peers as an

accessible audio learning resource (Turner et al., 2021), as well as experimented with podcast production as a participatory and creative research method (Turner et al., 2019). Podcasts invoke spaces for educators to engage in spoken dialogic reflection, with one function of these interactions being to co-constructively engage in knowledge work (Hayes, 2019). Over time, "critical co-presenter" relationships also have emerged among group members. Given the idiosyncratic nature of reflecting on-air with a listening audience, this specific setup is influenced by "the impact of the audience, the creativity engendered by the limitations of the form, and the meaning and message-making that result from connecting the particular to the universal" (Schaefer & Lowe, in press). Although podcasts are a popular professional and recreational pursuit, some scholars, such as Lundström and Lundström (2021), argue that "methodological discussions on the podcast phenomenon are not at all in parity with its rampant cultural impact" (p. 290). Additionally, although reflective practice among language teachers is a staple throughout the profession, more data-led accounts of how spoken dialogic reflection occurs, particularly in "in the wild" beyond formal education environments (Mann & Walsh, 2017), are lacking. In this study, we attempted to address these shortcomings, through observing our own exercises with the medium.

In a similar way to other deliberate and protocol-led practices, such as cooperative development (e.g., Edge, 2002), podcast production helps to ensure intentional spaces for reflection. Through creating recordings, we aim, among other purposes, to co-construct knowledge with one another by utilizing the podcast format's staggered setup, the interactive conventions that have been cultivated together over time, and the introduction of a more informed guest to guide the learning of specific themes. This potentially gives rise to conditions in which meaningful development can readily take place. Epistemologically speaking, a sociocultural perspective of learning underpins both our podcast and research of the phenomena. This perspective places emphasis on the way that developmental movements can happen through collaborative exchanges in dialogic spaces (Johnson, 2009). Although the podcast-related processes, such as preparation, participation, production, and re-listening, are worthwhile professional development activities in and of themselves, it may only be through examining conversations more closely and empirically that we can identify the specific journeys in thought that are occurring. Through examination, a start can be made to pinpoint and acutely articulate how the podcasting tool is offering concrete influences on our development.

Scholars interested in teachers' dialogic knowledge co-construction have explored similar areas. For example, Kuusisaari (2014) identified elements of collaborative actions in topic talks of teacher teams. Seven general categorizations of collaborative actions were formulated, which included *presenting an idea, developing the idea further*, *questioning*, *suppressing of development*, and *reifying* (p. 50). A focus on trajectory informed by these categories was then used to demonstrate the level of success and innovation in these collaborative exchanges. Similarly, Lee and Abbott (2021) looked at the quality and quantity of teachers' contributions to knowledge co-construction in reading group discussions. They presented a set of mechanisms through which knowledge co-construction may take place. These 16 language functions include moves such as *challenging*, *generating insight*, and *seeking consensus* (p. 4).

Additionally, in Orland-Barak (2006), representative excerpts from convergent, divergent, and parallel dialogues were categorized to establish the processes of learning. Verbs such as *remarking*, *challenging*, *probing*, *remarking*, *inviting*, and *sustaining* are used to interpret the conversational maneuvers utilized. With these interactional processes in mind, the aim of this study was to answer the following questions:

- How does the understanding of an area of professional interest develop among peers through reflective talk in a podcast format?
- What processes of interactional development can be identified to categorize this development of understanding?

Methodology

Context: The Podcast Format

Our podcast was founded in 2014 and since mid-2021 has adopted a format in which discussions between the hosts are combined and complemented with dialogues with guest experts. In the first part of each episode, the goal is to articulate existing knowledge and raise questions that we as presenters have about the topic. In the second part of the episode, a guest joins the discussion, helping us (and the audience) to understand these issues more coherently. In the final part of each episode, the three of us take stock of what was discussed and identify any changes in understanding around the issues in question. In sum, the three-part format functions as a journey of professional development for the presenters, and one that the listeners can follow too. At the time this study took place, five episodes had been produced using the current format.

Conceptual Framework

Critical learning episodes (CLEs) were used to conceptually frame this investigation of the revised format. Kiely and Davis (2010) defined CLEs as incidents of interaction

which have a focal center (such as a keyword, topic, or response to an incident) and a clear beginning and end and which take on significance for learning. Although usually applied to the analysis of classroom data as a way for teachers to reflect on their practice, we use the term CLE to refer to incidents that emerged during podcasts in which discrete processes of development were identified, thus becoming critical through conscious and formal analysis (Farrell, 2013). In this study, we attempted to identify CLEs in the context of our podcast by tracking changes in the stated beliefs and understandings of the presenters over the course of individual episodes.

Analysis

An iterative approach to coding (Saldaña, 2021) was adopted for isolating and settling upon CLE themes within three episodes selected based on the guests giving their informed approval. In the data below, guests have been anonymized. We began by listening to Part 1 of each episode, specifically for initial declarations of beliefs or practices by the presenters. Next, we listened for instances of these beliefs being addressed in discussion with the guests in Part 2. We then identified examples of these threads continuing in Part 3, particularly focusing on changes or progressions in understanding over the course of the episode.

After a process of corroborating each other's interpretations, we collectively categorized the examples found into three different CLEs, which we termed "processes," based on what seemed to be developing over the podcast's three parts. In terms of taking an interpretive approach to our analysis, a hermeneutic stance (e.g., Alsaigh & Coyne, 2021) was broadly adopted, in which we exercised an open and subjective reading of our data, given the shared autoethnographic and lived experience of the material.

Results and Discussion

In the three episodes, we were able to identify three CLEs of distinct knowledge development processes, which we subsequently termed *destabilization*, *expansion*, and *reinforcement*. To illustrate each process, we have provided representative extracts from the three episodes, along with explanatory commentary. Throughout, we have referred to ourselves as Host 1, Host 2, and Host 3 and the guests for each section as Guest 1 to 3 respectively. The extracts have been edited for clarity. Links to the complete audio extracts can be found in the appendix.

CLE 1: Destabilization

The first CLE was identified as a "destabilization" process. In this process, one or more of the presenters exhibited an understanding of a particular concept and then, over the course of the episode, encountered information which led to them losing confidence in their understanding. Instances of destabilization do not necessarily end with a new, fully formed idea, but rather present a starting point for transformed conceptual knowledge.

We illustrate this with an example from Episode 112 on the topic of testing and assessment, which shows how Host 1 moved from a vague notion of the relationship between these concepts to a clearer understanding and a recognition that their practice could be updated to reflect this.

In the first section of the podcast, one main point of discussion was the purpose of assessment and its use for assigning grades and giving feedback. We suggested assigning a grade was the realm of testing, while giving feedback was the role of assessment. Host 1 described their own views and use of assessment, as seen in the following extract:

Extract 1:

> HOST 1: I use tests to assess. There are other ways to assess my students, but the way that tests function for me are as a form of assessment.... The tests that I'm most familiar with at the moment are kind of vocabulary tests where you have discrete items, cloze-style sentences, but that doesn't entail any form of assessment afterwards. The students get their score, they find out what they got incorrect, but as a teacher ... it's difficult to follow up with some sort of feedback.... I guess I'm contradicting myself now, but it's more used as a way to assign a grade to the students.

In the second section, we asked our guest to address two topics from our initial discussion: the purpose of testing and the topic of testing as compared to assessment. Our guest described in detail the difference between testing and assessment:

Extract 2:

> GUEST 1: Assessment is any kind of broad information gathering about, for example, language ability ... and there are many many different kinds of assessment, as you noted in your initial discussion, so some examples include portfolios, ... observations, you might have some kind of journaling, interviews, quizzes, or some

kind of project, … The one that is the highest profile, of course, is a test.… The term "test" is much narrower in scope, and it denotes a particular kind of assessment.

In the third section, the three presenters reflected on this topic. As a result of hearing our guest's description of the relationship between testing and assessment, Host 1 displayed an awareness that they had been conflating the concepts, and that as a result of this conflation, they potentially overuse tests in decision-making, while also not taking advantage of other possible elements of assessment. This destabilized understanding is evident in the following extract:

Extract 3:

HOST 1: [Guest 1] mentioned … a quantifiable performance. It elicits a score, … which leads to a decision of some sort.… So, I wonder if that decision is a decision on a grade, or a decision on a feedback point. I think it can be both maybe … I'm still kind of torn between that. Am I testing just for a grade? Or am I trying to produce some sort of portfolio of what they can achieve, of what my students can do? And I think I'm still using tests as a way to decide a grade. I don't know if that's necessarily the wrong thing to do, but I don't think I'm fully utilizing them.

Throughout this episode, Host 1's understanding of testing and assessment became destabilized. Initially, they demonstrated a vague understanding in which the two concepts were conflated. However, after listening to this episode's guest speaker, they began to see that their understanding of these concepts was incomplete and that they had not appreciated the nature of testing as simply one form of the larger concept of assessment. Further, they connected this understanding to their practice, suggesting that they might have been overusing discrete tests. They later went on to express concern their grades might be "misapplied" and "misrepresented" as more than just a snapshot of performance and suggested they could explore other avenues of assessment to provide a holistic view of their students' competence. This process of destabilization does not arrive at a clear conclusion, but it signals a rupture in a previous understanding and may function as the first step towards a reconstructed view, potentially influencing their teaching practice.

CLE 2: Expansion

A second category of possible effects of engaging in expert engagement and peer discussion is what we termed an "expansion" of the understanding of a topic. This

effect may occur when the expert provides information (e.g., a historical fact or piece of research), ideas, or opinions previously unknown to us that we as the non-experts then juxtapose with our own thoughts, often aided by exploratory discussion. Though this has similarities with the destabilization process described above, here we address perspectives being deepened rather than undone or replaced.

To illustrate this, we examined a CLE from Episode 114, the topic of which was narrative inquiry. Host 3 was not present for the first two parts of the episode. In the interview section, the other hosts asked the guest for a definition of "narrative" and "narrative inquiry." As the guest had recently published an academic book using narrative inquiry, they were able to communicate their conception of it clearly:

Extract 4:

GUEST 2: Narrative is the choice of which events to relate and in what order to relate them, so it's a representation or specific manifestation of a story rather than the story itself. Hence, "narrative inquiry" rather than "story inquiry." In other words, narrative turns story into information or more importantly into knowledge for the recipient, be it the audience or the reader.

Host 3 joined Hosts 1 and 2 for the final discussion and was first asked for their reflection on what they had heard in the previous discussions. Host 3 raised an issue they had with how the guest had defined narrative inquiry. However, rather than jumping to outright dismissal or wholesale agreement, Host 3 framed the issue as a point of discussion by asking the others for their opinions based on their perspectives from having taken part in the first two sections:

Extract 5:

HOST 3: There were also some words in Part 2 that stuck out to me a little bit, which was [Guest 2] said that a narrative turns a story into information or into knowledge for the reader. And I was a little bit uncomfortable with those words—"information" and "knowledge"—because both seem quite final, they both seem objective. But like you [Host 2] said, it's a process of interpretation that's going on. You're bringing a particular story in line with wider societal discourses, you're looking for resonances with wider social understandings, and that to me is a creative act, it's something the researcher is doing… So I thought the idea of turning a story into information or knowledge seemed like not the best way to frame the idea of narrative. I was wondering what you guys thought of that, having been part of the discussion.

HOST 2: Later on, [Guest 2] talked more about meaning-making, about how the narrative is interpreted. I agree with you about the information thing, but maybe in terms of the knowledge, I think maybe it could work on the level of the narrator presenting or representing the story in a way that turns it into the potential for knowledge. Or maybe the narrator has some knowledge that they want to communicate, but also how the audience interprets it is a kind of knowledge-making or meaning-making. So, the audience for the narrative puts their own understanding on it to create their own knowledge based on that story.

HOST 3: I guess to an extent all knowledge is socially constructed. Information is not. It's supposed to be the raw stuff going in. But if we think of knowledge as our understanding of the social world, then I guess that makes sense. That helps me understand that.

After hearing Host 2's interpretation of both the issue raised and the guest's perspective, Host 3 acknowledged and emphasized an expansion of their understanding, a development that likely would not have occurred had they not instigated a discussion of the guest's idea. In this case, a possible benefit of Host 3 not taking part in the first two sections of the podcast was that they were able to listen to both audio texts sequentially and then draw out meaning by connecting points between the two. This was supplemented through Host 2's response to Host 3's question and led to further expansion of understanding for Host 3 and, potentially, for the other two participants as well.

CLE 3: Reinforcement

Although the podcast's format allows for initial perspectives to be reconsidered, changes in positions may not necessarily take place by the end. The podcast format of sharing existing perspectives, having a more informed guest join, ending with a reflection on what was learnt, may also work to strengthen pre-existing views on a topic. This was the case with Host 3 in Episode 110, on the topic of environmental issues. We used the term "reinforcement" to describe the process of this CLE.

In Part 1, Host 3 expressed an impassioned view that they felt not only uncomfortable bringing up environmental issues in the classroom, but also that the materials available to teachers on the matters were underwhelming. Host 3 articulated their view in the following extract:

Extract 6:

HOST 3: I think, possibly more than both of you just based on other outside discussions, my feelings about climate change are quite strong, and despairing.... The reason I don't really talk about it in class is because it's not very connected to what I teach for the most part.... But because I consider it a very, very serious issue, I would feel bad if I was only addressing it in class in a very superficial way ... I think ELT materials try not to take a side, they try not to be too controversial. And you end up not addressing the issue properly in a way that actually minimizes the issue and does more harm than good in a lot of ways.

In Part 2, the guest was afforded an opportunity to respond to what the hosts had discussed previously. They expressly chose to address the hosts' (particularly Host 3's) views that materials (such as coursebooks) are counterproductive, superficial, and potentially misinformative. As someone working in this area, the guest took a more positive position on the matter. To offer assurances on these issues, they chose to draw attention to the teachers' roles:

Extract 7:

GUEST 3: There are lots of programmes that you can engage in, you can connect with. But it's your job as a teacher to get your students engaged [even if] they're not very interested in the environment.

In the following extract from Part 3, two things occur. Host 3 acknowledged that there may be worthwhile ELT materials about environmental issues that he had not known about, but was also able to say confidently that their thoughts were largely unaltered:

Extract 8:

HOST 3: I thought that [Guest 3]'s descriptions of his activities and the things he does in class, his enthusiasm—I'm sure it has a big impact on them. But my concern is that, I guess it's unchanged from the first discussion to some extent. It's still a little bit piecemeal for me. At least, it's very delayed, even if all of the students learn about these topics in great depth. It sounds like the kind of things that he's talking about in terms of materials are much better, much deeper, much more involved than the kinds of things that I've seen before. So I was really happy to hear that.... I think teachers like seeing ourselves as organizations with interests that support certain practices, and thinking how as an organization we can try to challenge those

practices is something that especially environmental green groups in ELT could look at.

This exploration of environmental issues in ELT over the course of the episode's three-part format did not lead Host 3 to make substantial changes to their perspective, but instead contributed to their existing critical position about the topic in question. Although some of their central concerns remained in place, the interaction with the guest potentially provided Host 3 with some fresh avenues of consideration that they had previously not engaged with at the time of Part 1's recording.

Limitations

As one of the goals in this study was to begin to construct categories of interactional development, we intend to investigate the categories identified here in further studies when more data is available. As such, this can be seen as a pilot study, the results of which will be deepened, and given further validity through future work. In this study, we were working with our own words as data, so there is a potential lack of objectivity in our analysis. However, this is unavoidable, as the study was inspired by an intention to understand our experiences in more detail. Despite this, it should be noted that the data was not generated for research purposes and was only chosen for such analysis later. As such, the utterances were not influenced by the knowledge that it would be used as data, thus increasing the validity of the analysis.

Conclusion

In this paper we have explored how our professional and conceptual knowledge developed as a result of reflective discussions utilizing the podcast format. By articulating our ideas in Part 1 of the episodes, we brought existing beliefs and assumptions to a level of consciousness. Through engaging with an expert in Part 2, we were able to incorporate new ideas and information and formulate augmented understandings, which we articulated and took stock of in Part 3. Through analyzing these CLEs, we were able to identify different processes of development: destabilization, expansion, and reinforcement of ideas. Our podcast is an emergent example of a reflective enterprise for teacher interaction, and the CLEs we identified and subsequently categorized help to evaluate the efficacy and viability of such projects. This is something Merchie et al. (2018) advocated for when considering professional development initiatives.

Through this study, we have taken steps to add data-led insight to our claims that podcasts can play a useful role in the ongoing development of language teaching

professionals, by pinpointing evidence that shows tangible changes in knowledge. Although this is a pilot study that examined a limited set of episodes, we hope that readers are able to see the value in participating in recorded, publicly available, co-constructive dialogues with peers. This could be arranged as an intra- or interdepartmental faculty development program, or as something broader, for example in the same vein as our podcast project. Overall, we believe that there are benefits in understanding that one's collegial interactions with other educators are fertile opportunities for returning to and considering their significance as CLEs for future growth.

Bio Data

Matthew W. Turner is a lecturer in the Institute of Arts and Sciences at the Tokyo University of Science. His research interests include language teacher education, continuing professional development, reflective practice, and podcasting in academia. <turner@rs.tus.ac.jp>

Matthew Y. Schaefer is a lecturer in the Center for Language Education and Research (CLER) at Sophia University. He has published academic articles and book chapters on the topics of supporting students with special educational needs, program evaluation, and teacher development. His research interests are course design and narrative theory. <myschaefer@sophia.ac.jp>

Robert J. Lowe is an associate professor in the Department of Languages and Culture, Ochanomizu University. His research focuses on the critical sociology of ELT, and recent publications include papers in *Language Teaching*, *Applied Linguistics Review*, and *ELT Journal*. <lowe.robert.james@ocha.ac.jp>

References

Alsaigh, R., & Coyne, I. (2021). Doing a hermeneutic phenomenology research underpinned by Gadamer's philosophy: A framework to facilitate data analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, *20*. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069211047820

Berk, J., Trivedi, S. P., Watto, M., Williams, P., & Centor, R. (2020). Medical education podcasts: Where we are and questions unanswered. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *35*(7), 2176–2178. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11606-019-05606-2

Cook, I. (2023). *Scholarly podcasting: Why, what, how?* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003006596

Edge, J. (2002). *Continuing cooperative development: A discourse framework for individuals as colleagues.* University of Michigan Press. https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.8915

Farrell, T. S. C. (2013). Critical incident analysis through narrative reflective practice: A case study. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, *1*(1), 79–89.

Hasan, M., & Hoon, T. B. (2013). Podcast applications in language learning: A review of recent studies. *English Language Teaching*, *6*(2), 128–135. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/elt.v6n2p128

Hawkins, M., & Johnson S. M. (2020, July 22). *Podcasts for language teachers: Supercharge your professional development!* [Conference session]. NFLC Virtual Summit 2020. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UM156igjWs8&feature=emb_title

Hayes, D. (2019). Continuing professional development/continuous professional learning for English language teachers. In S. Walsh & S. Mann (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of English language teacher education* (pp. 155–168). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315659824

Johnson, K. (2009). *Second language teacher education: A sociocultural perspective.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203878033

Kiely, R., & Davis, M. (2010). From transmission to transformation: Teacher learning in English for speakers of other languages. *Language Teaching Research*, *14*(3), 277–295. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168810365241

Kuusisaari, H. (2014). Teachers at the zone of proximal development—Collaboration promoting or hindering the development process. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *43*, 46–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2014.06.001

Lee, K. K., & Abbott, M, L. (2021). Knowledge co-construction in professional reading group discussions, *ELT Journal*, *75*(4), 471–481. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccab025

Lowe, R. J., Turner, M. W., & Schaefer, M. Y. (2021). Dialogic research engagement through podcasting as a step towards action research: A collaborative autoethnography of teachers exploring their knowledge and practice, *Educational Action Research*, *29*(3), 429–446. https://doi.org/10.1080/09650792.2021.1908905

Lundström, M., & Lundström, T. P., (2021). Podcast ethnography. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *24*(3), 289–299. https://doi.org/10.1080/13645579.2020.1778221

Mann, S., & Walsh, S. (2017). *Reflective practice in English language teaching: Research-based principles and practices*. Taylor & Francis. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315733395

Merchie, E., Tuytens, M., Devos, G., & Vanderlinde, R. (2018). Evaluating teachers' professional development initiatives: Towards an extended evaluative framework, *Research Papers in Education*, *33*(2), 143–168. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1271003

Orland-Barak. L. (2006). Convergent, divergent and parallel dialogues: Knowledge construction in professional conversations. *Teachers and Teaching*, *12*(1), 13–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/13450600500364547

Saldaña, J. (2021). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers.* SAGE Publications Ltd.

Schaefer, M. Y., & Lowe, R. J. (in press). Critical co-presentership: Podcasting as reflective practice. In A. Verla Uchida & J. Roloff Rothman (Eds.), *Cultivating critical friendships through reflective practice: Cases from Japan*. Candlin & Mynard.

Turner, M. W., Schaefer, M. Y., Lowe, R. J., Alizadeh, M., Bao, D., & O'Loughlin, J. B. (2019). Diversity through interaction: An interview forum. In P. Clements, A. Krause, & P. Bennett (Eds.), *Diversity and inclusion* (pp. 57–66). JALT. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2018-08

Turner, M. W., Schaefer, M. Y., & Lowe, R. J. (2021). Teacher development through podcast engagement. In P. Clements, R. Derrah, & P. Ferguson (Eds.), *Communities of teachers & learners* (pp. 53–60). JALT. https://doi.org/10.37546/JALTPCP2020-07

Appendix

Links to Podcast Extracts

- Episode 110 extracts: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/10HyqKfMGU7xSn1XPmL1Yr-3iOaKpVp90?usp=share_link
- Episode 112 extracts: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1ozCLD4sty9lZpZDprK0AyBcKnChq7lQ5?usp=share_link
- Episode 114 extracts: https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1mUntdXAzLCB94TlyG_o0LI25Osg_Y5LY?usp=share_link