

Professional Practice Research: Ensuring teacher development through a critical approach to professional learning

Tania Aspland

University of Adelaide, South Australia

Professor Tania Aspland is currently Professor in Teacher Education at the University of Adelaide and president of the Australian Teacher Educators Association (ATEA). She has been a leader in course development in teacher education for many years and is currently engaged in a number of research projects in higher education pedagogies in teacher education undergraduate and graduate courses. Professor Aspland has developed an international reputation for community capacity building in Papua New Guinea, Singapore, Hong Kong, The Philippines and Vietnam. She has evidenced-based success with action learning as a project based learning strategy in developing countries and has been employed in offshore contexts in the field of curriculum development and curriculum evaluation and thesis supervision. Professor Aspland has also instigated new models of professional development within schools and universities, to support the process of curriculum development and leadership.

The building of a professional portfolio, the centrality of professional attributes, an investigative orientation to learning and a process of student self auditing are key innovations within teacher education that are central to the programs that Professor Aspland has developed in collaboration with her colleagues, each taking on their own characterisation within local contexts.

Ian Macpherson (co-author)

Queensland University of Technology Queensland

Introduction

Currently the development of a national system for the ongoing enhancement of teacher professionalism across Australia is underway. The initiative led by Australian Institute of Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL) on behalf of the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (now SCSEEC) is progressing rapidly with a finalised set of Professional Standards for Teachers and a set of Professional Standards for Principals approved by Ministers in 2011. It is clear that there is an inextricable link between the newly proposed professional standards and the professional education of teachers and principals across Australia. Further, it is imperative that the education sector will need to work in a unified manner through ongoing consultations to ensure the standards truly reflect what teachers and principals desire of the profession, in terms of teacher preparation, professional learning and training, and professional recognition.

It has been evident for some time that the federal government is keeping a close watch on teachers and educational leaders and that it has a preferred, if not popular view of the nature of teacher preparation, professional development and training. Federal policy linking economic growth and development to education has never been stronger and in many ways teachers and principals are in a prime position to reshape the future directions of this nation. However, within this opportunity is a deeply embedded discourse of regulation, one that could ostensibly threaten the autonomy of teachers and principals to independently regulate their profession. It is true that the consultative approach to developing the sets of standards for teachers and principals is high on the government's and AITSL's agenda and there has been plenty of opportunity for all educators to contribute to the evolving construction of the frameworks that will regulate the shape of the profession for future graduates and practising teachers and principals. Despite this commitment to collaboration, discussions across the sector have raised four serious concerns that are outlined forthwith:

- 1 The conceptualisation of teacher and principal training and development as linear is somewhat problematic. The view that professional educators and leaders can be conceptualised from a developmental perspective is highly contestable. The standards model implies that teachers and principals improve with experience and age. For example, it is envisaged that teachers move from a stage of proficiency with time and experience to unproblematically become lead teachers. This concept of linear development is highly contestable in the profession of teaching.

- 2 While quality and accountability is essential to teacher and principal development, and the notion of professional standards is supported in principle, it is of concern to many educators that the complexity of professional growth, development and training has been reduced to a set of basic competencies that may not truly reflect the complex nature of teaching, the principalship, teacher education and the preparation of teachers and educational leaders for contemporary times and a challenging future.
- 3 Many agencies within the profession, including teachers and principals, are concerned about finding a balance between the compliance discourse that accompanies regulation and the discourse of innovation that is central to the development of rigorous and high quality teaching and educational leadership that is evidence based and context specific. There is a concern that standards will reduce all professional learning for teachers and principals to 'the essentials' that are determined by less than flexible standards, ill-informed politicians and prescriptive or regulatory requirements. For a country striving to position itself in the international setting, such normative thinking towards the preparation and professional development of teachers and principals may be prohibitive.
- 4 What must be placed at the forefront of this debate is that teachers and principals, in preparation and throughout their professional careers, require differentiated pathways through learning. The multiplicity of pathways of teacher preparation and professional development and training currently evident around Australia must be profiled, valued and celebrated with vigour within the education profession. To become regulated nationally in the ways that are suggested, can, if done collaboratively, celebrate diversity while at the same time, can ensure quality, foster public accountability and joint working 'within' the standards discourse. If collaboration is overlooked and the professional development and training become positioned within a prescriptive ethos of re-accreditation, educators across the nation risk working within a 'check-box' mentality that will reduce teacher and principal preparation and professional development to forms of technocratic training that were rejected during the Australian political era circa 1988.

If educational reform, as central to economic reform, is to become a reality in Australia, the funding of innovative and contemporary models of professional development for teachers and principals must become a national priority. Some years ago Macpherson, Brooker, Aspland and Elliott (1998) interrogated the field of professional learning and curriculum leadership. The principles of professional learning and training for teachers and principals that were

advocated valued the centrality of dialogical conversations with educators that are collaborative, critical, action oriented, honest, meaningful, sustained and transformative in orientation (Aspland, Elliott & Macpherson, 1997). More current research (Grattan Institute, 2010; Macpherson, Aspland, & Cuskelly, 2010; OECD, 2009; Doecke et al., 2008; Reezgit & Creemers, 2005) indicates that there is no one model that best prepares and sustains the development of teachers and principals. Rather, as the professional moves forward into the 21st century and the ways of engaging with the educational community becomes reconfigured, a set of Principles of Procedure for professional training and development for principals and teachers can be identified; Principles of Procedure that may be instructive to providers of professional development and training across all sectors of education and Principles of Procedure that are congruent with the mandated frameworks of professional standards published by AITSL. The Principles of Procedure include the following:

- Professional development and training requires support *and* challenge from others, particular curriculum leaders.
- Professional development and training needs to recognise the stages of individuals within their careers and the contexts within which they work.
- Professional development and training generally requires guidance *and* intervention by educational leaders and discipline experts.
- The catalyst for professional development and training can be found in the state of perplexity that often characterises professional educational work – it is not an unproblematic venture as some trainers suggest.
- The different types of perplexities can be recognised as dilemmas or ironies or paradoxes, all of which can be managed as a central component of professional development and training – solutions are not always the answer, rather it is working through the dilemmas that is of significance.
- The central focus of professional development and training for teachers and principals should be the educator (teacher or principal) who as a person lives and works within an educational, social and political context in differing ways and engages in curriculum decision making and leadership in unique ways that must be respected and celebrated – there is no sense in a ‘one-size fits all’ approach to training and development.
- Professional development and training must recognise the complex interplay of factors that are central to and impact upon the uniqueness of teachers’ and principals’ work – no one professional standard can capture these complexities.

- Professional development and training must actively involve teachers and principals in the ongoing generation of professional knowledge. This is best accomplished through professional practice research – the intimate involvement by the professional practitioners themselves in researching, inquiring into, and interrogating their own practice as a basis for illumination and improvement of their practice, for an informed influence on policy development in relation to their practice, and the creation and extension of theory out of their practice.

Teachers and principals who are engaged in professional practice must advocate for professional development and training that is characterised by these Principles of Procedure if authentic and meaningful lifelong professional learning is to occur. Further, this type of professional learning and training is congruent with the Professional Standards advocated by AITSL and increasingly, by regulatory authorities around the nation. Such organisations argue that the professional standards should:

- provide a framework for professional learning
- guide self-reflection, self-improvement and development
- guide the management of self and others (AITSL, 2011: Professional Standards for Principals. <http://www.aitsl.edu.au/school-leaders/national-professional-standard-for-principals/national-professional-standard-for-principals.html>)

Professional development and training programs that capture the Principles of Procedure outlined above will be rigorous and engaging as well as meaningful and authentic. It is development and training of this type that is most successful as it is needs based, context specific and designed and implemented from a practitioner perspective. At the same time it is conceptually based and critically informed on the one hand, and systematically and sustainably undertaken on the other. To engage in professional development that is technocratic or reductionist, based on ‘other people’s knowledge’ rather than one’s own, and embedded in theory that is disconnected from the personal professional world of practice is wasteful and ill informed. As a profession undergoing constant pressure to grow, improve and reconstitute the work of teachers and principals in new times, we must, as a continuing priority, advocate strongly for modes of professional training and development of the type that reflect these Principles of Procedure.

Professional Practitioner Research

Professional development and training of the type outlined in the introduction has been referred to as Professional Practice Research (Macpherson, Brooker, Aspland & Cuskelly, 2010). The conceptual framing of Professional Practice Research is derived from earlier theorising around action research which has its origins in Stenhouse's (1975) view of the teacher as researcher – ideas spawned in the United Kingdom in the mid to late 1970s and in Australia in the late 1970s and into the 1980s (see Kemmis & McTaggart, 1988).

Action Research initiatives that have reported in various renditions over the years have sharpened the focus on professional educators as they have interrogated and investigated their professional practice as a basis for critically informed advocacy and activism as well as transformative/reconstructive action. Somekh's (1995) view of Action Research in social endeavours is still worth reading in this regard. More recent examples include Sachs's (2003) elaboration of the activist professional and Groundwater-Smith's (2010) characterisation of evidence-based practice within knowledge-building/creating schools. Groundwater-Smith (2003; 2010) in conceptualising the 'vital professional' depicts professional learning as "*draw(ing) upon diverse experiences and forms of engagement to organize a body of professional knowledge by actively interrogating what has happened, what has taken place, what has been read, what has been said (2003, p. 1)*". These works and others have been instrumental in envisioning the concept of praxis that is central to teacher development of this type.

The work of Schoen (1983; 1987) was instrumental in bringing to the fore the notions of *reflection-on action* and *reflection-in action* as core processes integral to teacher learning and development. He highlighted for all professional developers the importance of lifting teachers out of the complex worlds of professional practice (the swamp), through reflection, to see anew (from the heights) and, to transform practice through greater clarity and understanding. A plethora of expositions about the nature of reflection and its importance in initiating and sustaining teacher learning in systematic ways was evident in the 1980s and still continues today. Many of these schemata reflect Dewey's original work on reflective thought (Dewey, 1933) and the correlation between reflection and action. Kinsella and Pittman (2012), in their critique of Schoen, remind scholars in this field that reflection is a far more complex process than what is often portrayed in much of the literature, particularly in relation to the process of professional learning. Further, Kinsella and Pittman (2012) purport that Schoen is dismissive of reflexivity and fails to 'fully acknowledge the background and

social conditions that implicitly influence and contribute to ... ways of seeing' (Kinsella & Pittman, 2012, p. 43), focusing instead on individual constructions of reality that are seemingly context-free. Kemmis and Wilkinson (1998) some time ago argued that participatory action research is a collaborative social process of professional growth and development which is participatory, practical, emancipatory, critical and recursive, concerning actual (not abstract) practices. Professional Practice Research of this type does not require participants to follow a pre-determined process (see Kemmis & McTaggart 1988), but rather focus on the development of a strong and authentic sense of development and evolution in practice, and practitioners' understanding of their practice and the situation in which they practice. The more recent work of Kemmis (2005) consolidates the importance of the interplay of socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-historical constructs and teachers' professional thinking and repositioning of their practice through consideration of the material, social or discursive dimensions of practical knowledge. Kinsella and Pittman (2012) argue that it is only through this deeper and more comprehensive form of reflection that enables teachers to 'crack the codes' (Greene, 1995) 'to consider the invisible cloud that pervades everyday life and everyday practice, and from this location to envision new possibilities together' (Kinsella & Whitford, 2009).

What is good reflective practice?

So this raises the questions of what makes good reflective practice as the core to effective professional learning. Do all types of reflective thinking guarantee the reconstruction of better professional practice or does it simply endorse the status quo?

It has been argued for some time now that current educational practices based on simplistic notions of professional learning do not develop true critical thinking (Mangan, 2002) on the part of the professional educator, nor do they ensure transformation of practice. Further, educationalists agree that simplistic reflective practice barely enables 'surface learning' (Biggs, 1987) as teachers engage in endless cycles of reflection, taking up and discarding new educational artefacts as quickly as they are promulgated by sophisticated marketing intelligentsia who based their rationale on little or no educational research. This weakness enables the maintenance of an 'ideological hegemony' by which dominant groups reinforce their legitimacy. As long as educators do not question this ideology they will in fact be reinforcing it and playing into the hands of reductionist educational providers. Educational agents have been identified as one of the central institutions for maintaining this hegemony.

This is a real threat if one is to consider the proposal most recently advocated by AITSL (2012), the Australian Teacher Performance and Development Framework.

Inherent in the original conceptualisation of a simplistic framework for reflective practice can be found Schoen's three key concepts of 'pragmatic usefulness, persuasiveness and aesthetic appeal' (Schoen, 1987). While these concepts imply the importance of teacher decision making based on individual reflective practices that value fit-for-purpose, subjective judgements and professional appreciation, such thinking is limiting if professional learning is to be deep in nature, sustainable and designed to have transformative repercussions for teachers' professional practice. Kinsella and Pittman (2012) argue that reflection that is central to a deeper form of thinking and learning requires a stronger focus on the concept of 'phronesis or practical wisdom' (Kinsella & Pittman, 2012, p. 1). This call for the reconceptualisation of professional learning based on phronesis implies a deeper deliberation of professional practice, framed by an ethical positioning, shaped by professional values and advised by practical judgements that are filtered through sustained and systematic processes of complex professional reflection. Kinsella and Pittman (2012) argue that matters of ethical concern are central to the process of professional learning and deliberative practitioner reflection. Professionals who are cognisant of the centrality of phronesis, foreground ethical matters that are commonly invisible in more technically rationalist approaches. Further, Kinsella and Pittman (2012) entice the reader to think seriously about the place of 'dialogic intersubjectivity' in order to elevate the rigour of reflection and learning beyond reductionist individual preoccupation to a more complex level that recognises 'the negotiation of meaning within practice settings and the role of discourse in the process ... [ensuring] concern with not only his or her own interpretations in practice but also the dialogic possibilities implicit in the recognition of the interpretation of ... others (Kinsella & Pittman, 2012, p. 49). This demands of reflective practice a desire to enable a problematising of the taken-for-granted underpinnings of practice realising the 'transformative potential' of the practitioner and his or her community.

In contrast Kemmis (2012) argues for the centrality of praxis in professional learning and purports that praxis may precede phronesis. Interestingly, he claims that phronesis is a phenomenon that cannot be acquired through instruction. Rather, 'it can only be learned, and then only by experience' (Kemmis, 2012, p. 149). Such experiential learning through phronesis opens the thinking of practitioners to viewing the world differently, from multiple perspectives. This presents opportunities for practitioners to see anew, to initiate new ways of understanding familiar or troubling situations. To do so, argues Kemmis (2012), professional

learning must enable the educator to become open to new experiences in the interests of transforming practice; open to experiences in the fullest sense of the word – socially, politically, culturally and historically. ‘The person who wants to develop phronesis as wisdom and prudence wants to understand the variety and richness of different ways of being in the world’ (Kemmis, 2012, p. 156). In order to raise the consciousness of the practitioner through professional learning characterised by phronesis, Kemmis supports Kinsella’s call for the centrality of ethics and *virtue* in professional learning in order to ‘take moral responsibility for our actions and the consequences that follow from them’ (Kemmis, 2012, p. 156). Importantly, for those interested in the nature of professional learning, Kemmis argues that we should firstly value ‘praxis – individual and collective’, and following this, phronese can be learned from one’s own and others’ practices within professional collectives that ‘commit to the good through its practice as a profession’ (Kemmis, 2012, p. 159). The model of Professional Practice Research advocated in this paper has been designed to reflect these principles.

Professional Practice Research: A model of professional learning for teachers

Developing a culture of professional learning based on ‘phronesis built on praxis’ requires a critical and participatory practitioner research culture. A culture of learning such as this is essential in order to invite professional practitioners to question existing policies and practices and to provide rich data as a basis for transformation through professional learning and development – to build a culture of ‘active interrogation’ (Groundwater-Smith, 2003).

Professional Practice Research of this type does not require participants to become involved in a strategy design to pursue pre-determined processes or outcomes, but in the development of a strong and authentic sense of development and evolution in practice, and practitioners’ understanding of their practice and the situation in which they practice. In their work with graduate students, Aspland and Brooker (1998) concluded that pursuing an approach to teaching and learning that centres on locating the subject in their everyday world of curriculum work, focusing on how everyday experiences are shaped and how they articulate with the larger constructs that determine the everyday world of curriculum work, enables the learning community to be better placed to enter a phase of transformative action and to reshape their practice. It is increasingly being recognised that practitioner research of this type enables participants to understand and change practice; and it invites them to look at

their work in new and insightful ways. Phronesis as professional learning and development can be enabled through Professional Practice Research. From the point of view of professional practitioner researchers the ontological position inherent in this model is one of democratic participation and inclusion; the epistemological stance is associated with socially critical constructions of knowledge; and the methodological approach is a 'working with' rather than a 'working on' people. For professional practitioner researchers, people are learning participants and research colleagues, and not objects of professional development. This overall view of professional learning sits within the view that the purposes are to create and extend theory, to illuminate and inform practice and to influence policy in an informed way. Ethical matters are, of course, of utmost importance in a characterisation of Professional Practice Research within what is a heavily value-laden position.

Professional Practice Research of this type is shaped by the following principles:

- It is an interrogation and investigation of professional practice by the professional practitioners themselves (in collaboration among themselves and with others).
- It is research that is critically informed, politically activist, and action oriented in a transformative sense with a view to illuminating theory, informing policy and improving practice.
- It aims for a deeper understanding of professional practice, an enriched capacity to engage in professional practice and a commitment to an ongoing quest for quality improvement in professional practice on the part of professional practitioners both individually and collectively.
- It does *not* deny the centrality of the practitioners' positioning in the research; rather it highlights the centrality of *both* practitioners *and* their practice. However, it does raise the importance, if not the moral/ethical responsibility, of professional practitioners to be transparent in stating the values and beliefs that motivate their thinking and practice. Such positioning is vital for documenting and disseminating research processes and research outcomes.
- It encourages democratic participation, but it may occur in hegemonic environments which militate against such involvement. An activist stance is therefore very significant in advocacy for this sort of research.
- It is conceived in these terms and seeks to avoid the possibilities of researchers and the research becoming indulgent, introspective, if not incestuous. Rather, professional practice research enables collaborative, authentic and liberating inquiry to be generated for the social good of all participants.

Professional practice research is living research *and* active learning. The form of professional learning moves away from telling or being told towards a genre of investigation. The data collection centres on conversational cycles around a number of key statements about professional practice research. Broadly, the conversation flows from key research questions that have been generated from within professional practice by the community of learners. These become the focus of the interrogation. The questions that are considered together in the first conversational cycle are ontological (and ethical) and epistemological in orientation. Cycles of dialogical conversation continue until multiple perspectives have been achieved and the point of data saturation has been recognised.

Conversation is used as a tool to interrogate participants' ideas about professional practice research in a critically reflective way. Professional learning becomes a sustained conversation designed to interrogate ideas about professional practice research in a critically reflective way. It is through conversation that participants elicit an elaboration of what can be called a tentative construction of a territory for professional practice research. The conversations are carefully framed and structured. The statements and questions are embedded in, and emerge from, the juxtaposition of ideas, concerns and tensions that led to the working definition of professional practice research. During this phase significant points emerge from the conversation, for example:

- Time is required to establish relationships with people engaged in professional practice.
- Negotiation of research agendas within the contexts of professional practice is necessary.
- Authentic blending of theory and practice occurs in interrogations of professional practice.
- It is important to confirm and affirm emergent constructions of professional knowledge.

Networking is a significant requirement of professional practice research for sharing and validating the experiences and outcomes as well as for contributing to the local picture and the larger whole. This type of professional learning designed to achieve phronesis has the potential for giving voice to professional practitioners in areas of advocacy and action at the various levels. How and where professional practitioners position themselves in this sort of research-based professional learning is very significant for considerations of validity, authenticity and worthwhileness as well as for ethical goodness. Further the rigour in this sort of professional learning must be defined differently from the way it is defined in reductionist and more traditional forms of professional learning – it should remain a contested notion with which participants continue to struggle in defining and redefining its focus, purpose, process

and outcomes. It is not concerned with issues of certainty; Professional Practice Research embraces uncertainty.

Professional Practice Research of this type clearly informs professional practitioners about their ever-evolving professional knowledge to the point that is difficult to draw the boundary between theory and policy on the one hand and practice on the other. Further, this type of professional learning challenges hegemonic views about knowledge acquisition, how it is generated and who owns it; and it also raises questions about ethical principles and practices associated with this type of professional learning which, in some ways, is unpredictable and uncontrollable compared with the more traditional or positivist forms of professional development. Ongoing sharing and dialoguing about this emergent professional knowledge is necessary both within the immediate professional practice context and other professional contexts.

Those engaged in Professional Practice Research must advocate for this sort of research-based professional learning in a rigorous way – a way that emphasises that it is conceptually based and critically informed on the one hand, and systematically and sustainably undertaken on the other. Professional Practice Research opens up new possibilities for constructing a territory for professional learning regarding who drives it, who owns it and who benefits from it?

A blending of ongoing advocacies and actions are essential for the field of professional practice research shaped by phronesis to gain increasing acceptance and respect. It is highly complex and demanding; and the challenges which it presents require an ever-vigilant and unrelentingly open and transparent approach to documenting and disseminating professional learning and transformative professional practices.

References

- Aspland, T., & Brooker, R. (1998). A pathway to postgraduate teaching. In B. Atweh, S. Kemmis and P. Weeks (Eds.) *Action research in practice: Partnerships for social justice in education* (pp280-301). London and new York: Routledge.
- Aspland, T., Elliott, B., & Macpherson, I. (1997). Empowerment through professional development. *Australian and New Zealand Councils for Educational Research*. SET, March.
- Biggs, J. (1987). *Student approaches to learning and studying*. Hawthorne, Victoria: ACER.
- Doecke, B., Parr, G., & North, S. with Gale, T., Long, M., Mitchell, J., Rennie, J. & Williams, J. (2009). *National Mapping of Teacher Professional Learning*. DEEWR, Canberra.

- Dewey, J. (1933). *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*. Boston: Health & Co.
- Grattan Institute. (2010). *What teachers want: Better teacher management*. Report released 24 May. (http://www.grattan.edu.au/publications/033_what_teachers_want.pdf)
- Greene, M. (1995). *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. London: Routledge.
- Groundwater-Smith, S. (2000). Evidence-based practice – Towards whole school improvement. Paper presented at the *Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education*, Sydney, December.
- Groundwater-Smith, S. (2003). ‘becoming the vital professional: Learning from the workplace’. Paper presented to the Faculties of Education and Health, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, 29 May, 2003.
- Kemmis, S. (2005). Knowing practice: Searching for salience. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society*, 13(3), 391–426.
- Kemmis, S. (2012). Phronesis, experience and the primacy of praxis. In Kinsella, E. & Pittman, A. (Eds), *Phronesis professional knowledge: practical wisdom in the professions*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (1988). *Introduction: The Nature of Action Research. The Action Research Planner*. Geelong: Deakin University Press.
- Kemmis, S., & Wilkinson, M. (1998). Participatory action research and the study of practice. In Atweh, B, Kemmis, S., & Weeks, P. (1998). *Action Research in Practice: Partnerships for Social Justice in Education*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kinsella, E., & Pittman, A. (2012). *Phronesis professional knowledge: Practical wisdom in the professions*. Rotterdam, The Netherlands: Sense Publishers.
- Kinsella, E., & Whitford, G. (2009). Knowledge generation and utilisation: Towards epistemic reflexivity. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*, 56(4), 249–258.
- Macpherson, I., Aspland, T., Brooker, R., & Elliott, B. (1999). *Places and Spaces for Teachers in Curriculum Leadership*. Canberra: Goanna Print and Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- Macpherson, I., Brooker, R., Aspland, T., & Elliott, B. (1998). Putting professional learning up front: A perspective of professional development within the context of collaborative research about curriculum leadership. *Journal of Inservice Education*, 24(1), 73–86.
- Macpherson, I., Aspland, T., & Cuskelly, E. (2010). Constructing a territory for professional practice research: Some introductory considerations. In A. Campbell & S. Groundwater Smith, *Action Research in Education*, New Delhi: Sage Publication.
- Mangan, J. M. (2002) “Critical Teacher Education: Problems and Possibilities” Paper presented at the *Challenging Futures Conference: Changing agendas in teacher education*, University of New England, Armidale, New South Wales. February 2002
- OECD. (2009). *Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from TALIS*. Paris: OECD.

- Reezigt, G. J., & Creemers, B. P. M. (2005). A comprehensive framework for effective school improvement. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 16(4), 407-424.
- Sachs, J. (2003). *The Activist Professional*. Milton Keynes: The Open University Press.
- Schoen, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schoen, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Somekh, B. (1995). The contribution of Action Research to development in social endeavours: A position paper on action research methodology. *British Educational Research Journal*, 21(3), 339–355.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*. London: Heinemann.