

**Educational professionals' experience of English educational policy; developing  
and promoting inclusive practice through collaborative action research**

A thesis submitted to The University of Manchester for the degree of Doctorate in  
Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psychol) in the Faculty of Humanities

**2016**

**Jo Greenwood**

**School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED)**

## List of Contents

List of Contents.....	2
List of Tables.....	4
Abstract.....	5
Declaration.....	6
Copyright Statement.....	6
Acknowledgements.....	8
The Author.....	8
<b><i>Paper 1: Representing teacher voice within educational policy debate; a literature review of teacher perspectives on English educational reform.....</i></b>	<b>9</b>
Abstract.....	10
Introduction.....	11
The review method.....	16
Findings.....	21
Conclusion.....	34
Limitation of the review.....	37
Acknowledgments.....	38
References.....	38
<b><i>Paper 2: Taking a cooperative inquiry approach to developing person-centred practice in one English high school.....</i></b>	<b>52</b>
Abstract.....	53

Introduction.....	54
A high school context.....	56
Taking an action research approach.....	58
Ethical considerations.....	67
The group’s experience of the inquiry process.....	68
Conclusion.....	76
Acknowledgements.....	78
References.....	78
<b><i>Paper 3: The dissemination of findings to professional practice.....</i></b>	<b>83</b>
Introduction.....	84
Strand 1: The role of first person action research in dissemination.....	85
Strand 2: The role of second person action research in dissemination.....	95
Strand 3: The role of third person action research in dissemination.....	100
The educational psychologist as action researcher.....	101
References.....	104
<b><i>Thesis Appendices</i></b>	
Appendix 1: Author guidelines for Research Papers in Education.....	109
Appendix 2: Author guidelines for Action Research.....	127
Appendix 3: Participant information sheet.....	133
Appendix 4: Participant consent form.....	136
Appendix 5: Ethics approval confirmation.....	137

## List of Tables

### *Paper 1*

Table 1: Overview of selected articles.....	47
---	----

### *Paper 2*

Table 1: Four ways of knowing.....	59
------------------------------------	----

Table 2: Four stages of cooperative inquiry involved in each action research cycle.....	63
---	----

### *Paper 3*

Table 1: The development of person-centred practice within our cooperative inquiry group.....	89
---	----

**Total word count: 22,717**

# **Educational professionals' experience of English educational policy; developing and promoting inclusive practice through collaborative action research**

Jo Greenwood

Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology (D.Ed.Ch.Psychol)

University of Manchester, May 2016

## **Abstract**

The focus of this thesis was to explore educational professionals' everyday experience of English educational policies; narrowing its focus to policy which promotes an inclusion agenda. The findings are presented in three sections with the first two papers prepared in accordance with the author guidelines of the journals proposed for submission.

The first paper offers a review of literature which represents teacher relationship (see Braun, Maguire and Ball, 2010; Fullan, 2006; Luttenberg, Imants and van Veen, 2013; Luttenberg, van Veen and Imants, 2013; Wexler, 2002) with English educational policies. Teacher perspectives illustrate how the implementation and practice of policy heavily guides practice, both in terms of pedagogy and content, and detail the difficulties teachers have in establishing professional identity whilst trying to accommodate policy into practice. It is suggested that in order for teachers to adopt new educational policies they need to be able to take some ownership of both the policies themselves and of their own professional development; but most importantly, that they need the space to engage in dialogue around their practice to do this. The first paper provided a frame for the second by offering a description of the current climate teachers find themselves in and by discussing what might be needed to bring about the professional development necessary to embed policy into practice.

The second paper then presents a description of a collaborative action research project within an English high school; a group of educational psychology, teaching, support and pastoral professionals worked collaboratively to develop person-centred practice through their engagement in an inquiry group. The inquiry group engaged in dialogue around practice; exploring their own personal and professional values as well as the values embedded within person-centred practice. This paper offers an account of the inquiry group's journey, highlighting key themes as identified by the group: ownership of and confidence in the learning process; developing reflective practice; and the challenge of engaging others in the learning process. The findings suggest that an action research approach can facilitate the learning and development necessary to embody collaborative person-centred practice.

The third paper then offers a critical appraisal of the role that educational psychology can have in disseminating findings and promoting teacher development; in particular through the facilitation of collaborative action research within the school context.

## **Declaration**

No portion of the work referred to in the thesis has been submitted in support of an application for another degree or qualification of this or any other university or other institute of learning.

## **Copyright Statement**

- i. The author of this thesis (including any appendices and/or schedules to this thesis) owns certain copyright or related rights in it (the “Copyright”) and s/he has given The University of Manchester certain rights to use such Copyright, including for administrative purposes.
- ii. Copies of this thesis, either in full or in extracts and whether in hard or electronic copy, may be made only in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (as amended) and regulations issued under it or, where appropriate, in accordance with licensing agreements which the University has from time to time. This page must form part of any such copies made.
- iii. The ownership of certain Copyright, patents, designs, trade marks and other intellectual property (the “Intellectual Property”) and any reproductions of copyright works in the thesis, for example graphs and tables (“Reproductions”), which may be described in this thesis, may not be owned by the author and may be owned by third parties. Such Intellectual Property and Reproductions cannot and must not be made available for use without the prior written permission of the owner(s) of the relevant Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions.
- iv. Further information on the conditions under which disclosure, publication and

commercialisation of this thesis, the Copyright and any Intellectual Property and/or Reproductions described in it may take place is available in the University IP Policy (see <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=487>), in any relevant Thesis restriction declarations deposited in the University Library, The University Library's regulations (see <http://www.manchester.ac.uk/library/aboutus/regulations>) and in The University's policy on Presentation of Theses.

## **Acknowledgements**

I am indebted to my co-researchers and co-subjects in this inquiry, Deirdre Quayle, Surandini Ferdinando, Sarah Johnson, Tyler Hyvarinen, Katy Daynes, Alison Nunn, Julie Ferguson, Helen Majerski, Peter Friend and Emma Shaw. In particular, Dr Deirdre Quayle, who was then the Special Educational Needs Coordinator of the school, without her willingness and trust we would not have had the opportunity to develop and reflect on our practice together in this way. The research was funded through England's Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) ITEP award 2013-2016.

I would like to thank my family and friends for their support and encouragement on this journey. Special thanks to Tim, Nyah, Toby and Charlie for affording me the space and time to engage fully. Final thanks to Dr Catherine Kelly for her ongoing supportive and careful consideration of both my ideas and my writing.

## **The Author**

The author holds previous degrees in BSc Psychology (British Psychological Society accredited qualification), MSc Work Psychology and Business (British Psychological Society accredited qualification) and a diploma in Dip.Couns Integrative Counselling (British Association for Counselling & Psychotherapy accredited qualification).



**Representing teacher voice within educational policy debate: A literature  
review of teacher perspectives on English educational reform.**

Prepared in accordance with the author guidelines for Research Papers in Education

(See Appendix 1)

Word count: 9435 (including table and references)

## **Abstract**

A review of literature is described which aims to explore teacher perspectives on, and relationship with, English educational policy from 1997 to the present; covering changes in policy during the two most recent United Kingdom governments. The thematic review uses Garrard's Matrix Method (Garrard, 2013) to bring together a range of literature which represents everyday teacher experiences of educational policy. In doing so, it illustrates that the implementation and practice of policy heavily guides practice, both in terms of pedagogy and content, and details the challenges teachers have in establishing professional identity whilst trying to accommodate policy into practice. The review brought to the forefront an awareness of contradictions both within and between policies; in particular, the dominant influence of performativity upon practice, often described as pushing the inclusion agenda to a backseat. Representation of teachers' perspectives seemed important, looking both to influence the policies in which they have a central role and to promote action. The article concludes by suggesting that in order for teachers to adopt new educational policies they need to have some ownership of both the policies themselves and their own professional development; as well as the space to engage in dialogue around practice to do this.

## **Keywords**

Teacher voice, educational reform, English educational policy, teacher professional development, teacher professional identity.

## **Introduction**

### ***Purpose of the review***

Over the last 40 years there have been numerous attempts to reform the English educational system. The introduction of key reforms by different governments aimed to address specific problems within the educational system; with the explicit intention of raising standards and bringing about school improvement (Machin and Vignoles, 2005). The list of educational policy reform enacted during this time is extensive and has led international researchers to describe England as ‘a laboratory where the effects of market-like mechanisms are more clearly visible’ (Finkelstein and Grubb, 2000, 602). This observed ‘reform agenda’ has consequences and raises a number of complex issues for teachers who have an important and central role in enacting those policies. Leat, Lofthouse and Reid (2014, 7) describe the importance of listening to teachers as they engage in practice in order to enable increased dialogue in education; contrasting what they describe as ‘the monologic voice of policy that insists that “thou shalt”’. As policy makers and politicians look to shape policy, many make claim to a stake in the outcome of those decisions: educational professionals, the children and young people themselves and their parents, as well as future employers and the public in general. However, the consequence of such political and public involvement in the development of policy has been described to have led to the marginalisation of teachers’ views; therefore resulting in their reduced role, and participation in, educational debate (Lefstein and Perath, 2014).

The purpose of this review is to explore the complex relationship between teacher and policy (Luttenberg, Imants and van Veen, 2013; Luttenberg, van Veen and Imants, 2013). It aims to bring together and discuss teacher views within peer-reviewed literature around key educational policies which represent everyday teacher

experiences. In doing so, it aims to better understand the development and implementation of educational policy from the perspective of those enacting the policies themselves. Its aim is not to explore best practice for teachers around policy implementation or to document the policies themselves, but concerns itself with gaining generative insight into the mechanisms at work within everyday teacher experiences. This is something that Bhaskar (1978) describes as the ‘real’: the exploration of mechanisms, events and experiences. The focus of the review is on England in particular because the work of teachers in England could be described to have been subject to more intensive and sustained government intervention than any other (Day and Smethem, 2009). In order to understand teacher viewpoints regarding the implementation of educational policy, it is important to begin by framing them within the wider context of the English educational system and social policy; as both are interdependent (Oliver, 2000). This current piece of research therefore begins with a historical and political overview.

### ***A historical and political context***

The educational reform context in England has changed dramatically over the last 40 years with regards to the positioning of teachers. In the early 1970s, The James Report on Teacher Education and Training (James Lord of Rosholme, 1972) brought to the forefront of educational policy, teachers and their training; acknowledging teachers as education’s key resource to effective schooling and emphasising the importance of ongoing professional learning. The Education Reform Act 1988 brought with it top-down and target-driven expectations for the English state education system; teacher development and efficacy remained a theme, however became ‘very much in the half shadows of the education debate’ (Glover and Law

1996, 19). The list of educational reforms enacted within the UK over the last 40 years is extensive, maintaining a strong focus on raising standards through the promotion of market principles (Ball, 1999). Examples of recent policy changes include:

- The structural reform of national testing, such as the introduction of AS Level examinations as an attempt to broaden the advanced level curriculum (Curriculum 2000; QCA, 1999);
- The requirement of all young people to remain in education or training until 18 years of age by the year 2015 (Education and Skills Act 2008), in particular through the introduction of apprenticeships (see HM Government, 2015) and vocational qualifications (see DfE, 2014a; DfE, 2014b);
- The promotion of excellence in teaching through pathways such as the Advanced Skills Teacher (DfES, 2001a);
- The structural reform of schools, such as the conversion of schools into semi-independent academies and free schools (Academies Act 2010; DfE, 2013a);
- The introduction of large scale national initiatives to promote local school, community and business partnerships, such as Education Action Zones (EAZs), Beacon Schools, Excellence in Cities (EiC), Leadership Incentive Grants (LIG), Network Learning Communities (NLCs) and the City Challenge (see DfE, 2015a);
- The increase in accountability expectations of both students through assessment (Acquah, 2013) and multiple revisions of the National Curriculum (see House of Commons CSFC, 2009), and teachers

through performance related pay (DfE, 2014c).

English educational policy over the last 40 years has also been concerned with a commitment to improving access to, and participation within, education for all. The Warnock Report (DES, 1978) made radical recommendations for the inclusion of the majority of children with special educational needs (SEN) in the mainstream classroom; suggesting that only 2% of the school population may need provision different to what mainstream schools could provide. This gave rise to:

- The Education Act 1981 which required the identification and assessment of SEN for suitable provision;
- The Education Act 1993 which required the issuing of practical guidance around their responsibilities for children with SEN for schools and Local Educational Authorities (LEAs);
- The subsequent amended Education Act 1996 which laid out these responsibilities.

A Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs (DfE, 1994) came into effect on September 1994 requiring schools, LEAs, the health service and social services to adhere to its requirements. From 1997, the New Labour period of government brought with it a combined agenda of improving standards as well as a strong policy commitment to social inclusion. The Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 and the more recent Coalition government's Children and Families Act 2014, outworked in their relative SEN Codes of Practice (DfES, 2001b; DfE, 2015b), embedded inclusion firmly into policy. Further government initiatives aimed to reduce the gap in attainment between

learners with additional needs and other learners, examples including:

- The Every Child Matters framework (HM Government, 2003) underpinned by the Children Act 2004;
- The Achievement for All (AfA) programme (DfE, 2011a);
- Specialist and targeted provision through the National Strategies (DfE, 2011b);
- Other programmes to promote social emotional and mental health in practice, such as the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) (Humphrey, Lendrum and Wigelsworth, 2010) and Targeted Mental Health in Schools (TaMHS) (DfE, 2011c).

Underlying these changes in educational policy is the idea that education is ‘increasingly bound up in the processes of globalisation’ which as a process, promotes and results in the development of neoliberalistic policies (Furlong, 2013, 29). Levin (1998) offers a description of the two main ‘thrusts’ of neoliberalistic policies: ‘market form’ which brings elements of competition and business to education; and ‘performativity’ which uses target and performance indicators to drive, assess and compare educational ‘products’. When these two ‘forces’ come together, governments are presented with ‘a politically attractive and 'effective' alternative to the state-centred, bureaucratic, public welfare tradition of educational provision’ (Ball, 1999). The changes in UK governments over the past 40 years has meant that educational policy change has perhaps been inevitable, however these key ‘thrusts’ have remained evident. The educational climate that teachers find themselves within rests tentatively on the interplay of these political and economic forces, alongside the government’s policy commitment to social inclusion. These

agendas are described by many as contradictory and incompatible in nature (Gewirtz, Ball and Bowe, 1995), with common tensions including: between key social values, such as choice (preference) and equity (fair opportunity); and between raising academic standards and inclusion (Norwich, 2014). These multiple and differing values guide decisions around policy and practice where the assumption is that any conflicting values and tensions will be resolved in practice (Norwich, 2014). Ainscow, Booth and Dyson (2006, 2), however, offer a rendition of school improvement which concerns itself with raising the attainment of children and young people whilst also holding central the value of participation of all in education within their communities; they suggest that ‘an improved school is inevitably a more inclusive school’.

## **The review method**

### ***Research questions***

Beginning with a historical frame aimed to provide some distance from the terrain for the researcher and reader in order to view with more clarity the complex relationship between teacher and policy. It is also helpful to understand the teacher viewpoints presented by situating them within the context of the English educational system and social policy. Informed by the historical description presented, two main objectives or research questions were decided on to guide the search for literature:

Research question 1 (RQ1):

- What are teacher reported experiences and perceptions of engagement with educational policy?



Research question 2 (RQ2):

- How do these perceptions contribute to an understanding of the development and implementation of educational policy?

### *Search process*

The review process began by consulting with both academics and teachers around their experience and knowledge of policies that have impacted teachers during the two most recent UK governments. This served the purpose of making a preliminary list of educational policies meaningful to practitioners' everyday experiences. This was used as a spring board and guide to extensive searching of the UK government websites pertaining to educational research and policy. At this point, the boundaries of what was constituted 'educational policy' was kept open, in order to preclude the exclusion of any articles of interest that may have been relevant to this inquiry. This was done in an iterative manner with further reading and consultation leading to the generation of a final list of 68 English educational policies. These included any government statutory guidance and initiatives or principles of action that were proposed by the UK government and adopted by teachers; this became the definition of educational policy used within this review. The identified list of policies, informed by discussion and research, included those that are driven by market and performativity forces, as well as the inclusion agenda. Inclusion, within this review, is defined in the wider sense; more than the traditional understanding of SEN and acknowledging that additional needs arise from both social and organisational factors as well as from individual differences and disabilities (Dyson, 2015; Oliver, 2000). For example, statutory guidance on the role and responsibilities of the

designated teacher for looked after children (DfE, 2009) was included within the list of identified policies.

The key terms within identified policy titles in combination with the search term 'teacher' were used as part of the advanced electronic search process, searching for the terms within the abstract of the article. In conducting the review of literature, articles were sought which were published in peer-reviewed journals between 1997 and 2015 (the period covered by the two most recent UK governments). The search for articles involved consulting databases containing abstracts of empirical research; ProQuest, Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and Google Scholar. The tables of contents from volumes of education-focused, peer-reviewed journals were also searched; those with a particular interest in educational policy, teacher views and/or English education, including *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *Journal of Teacher Education*, *Teachers and Teaching*, *Research Papers in Education* and *British Journal of Special Education*. Through a process of reading the abstracts of the articles returned, studies containing programme descriptions, editorials and conceptual articles were excluded. Further in depth reading of whole articles led to the inclusion of literature where the authors presented their work on the perspectives of teachers or where there are direct quotations from those practitioners; giving voice to those directly affected by the reform. These criteria privileged the inclusion of studies which used participant interview as the method of data gathering, as these may yield richer data; questionnaires perhaps eliciting views that were concise yet more superficial (Bryman, 2008). Exclusions were also made:

- Where the article did not explicitly address teacher views on and/or experience of the policy described;

- Where further investigation revealed that the policy was not intended to be mainly implemented directly by the teachers, for example, TaMHS;
- Where the description was of teacher experience of policy enacted before 1997;
- Where the article only addressed enactment of aspects within policy, such as ‘personal learning and thinking skills’ (Braun, Maguire and Ball, 2010) and ‘behaviour for learning’ (Maguire, Ball and Braun, 2010).

These rules for inclusion and exclusion significantly decreased the number of articles identified for review. For example, in the search of the Proquest database, 98 articles for ‘teacher’ and ‘national literacy strategy’ were returned. However, after applying the above rules for inclusion and exclusion, only one article was selected for review. There were also many gaps in the research, particularly around documenting teacher voice on key English educational policies, for example, there were no articles found documenting teacher views on academies, and free schools, and Key Stage 3 testing (GCSEs), and limited articles on policy which addresses inclusion of vulnerable learners (those listed by Ofsted, 2000). Research documenting teacher views on recent policy changes had also yet to be published; in particular around the new National Curriculum (DfE, 2014d) and the new SEN Code of Practice (DfE, 2015b). Through a process of reading abstracts, as well reading whole articles for some, and applying the above rules for inclusion and exclusion, seven articles were retained for review (see Table 1).

### *Abstraction and synthesis: The matrix method*

This thematic literature review was undertaken using Garrard's Matrix Method (Garrard, 2013), where using predetermined subgroups, data was extracted from each selected article and compiled into a matrix. The chosen approach provided a process and structure for summarising the complex ideas and detailed accounts within the literature, and provided an overview for analysis; 'This approach provides succinct organization of the literature which facilitates the ability to systematically compare primary sources on specific issues, variables, or sample characteristics' (Whittemore and Knafl, 2005, 550).

After an article was selected for inclusion, following the initial reading of the abstract, a subsequent reading of the whole article was carried out with the purpose of making initial notes to inform the column titles for abstraction; an iterative process following the reading of all selected articles. Column topics were identified to record some of the contextual features of the paper and to draw issues related to RQ1 and RQ2. The chosen column topics were:

- Author/title/journal;
- Year;
- Purpose of article;
- Participants;
- Study design;
- Key findings;
- Teacher reported experiences (RQ1);
- Implications for practice (RQ2).

The seven empirical studies identified were then read again and evaluated in ascending chronological order, where the article was reduced to a single page, using note form, with similar data for each subgroup extracted from each source. The review process did not aim to identify a list of processes or practices that are the result of educational policy under these columns, nor did it aim to fully document or engage with all of the issues raised by the teachers. The specific focus of the notes made and analysis was to document and elaborate on the teacher relationships with policy identified in the literature, in order to consider the processes, moderators and mediators at play. Direct quotations from each article were included in the abstraction to support the themes being documented. Individual columns within the matrix were then scanned for common themes, as well as differences, and research ideas presented in the literature; with ‘informant confirmation’ being a guiding principle for developing and validating the reviewer’s understanding (Boote and Beile, 2005).

## **Findings**

An overview of the identified studies is provided in Table 1, including some discussion of the the trustworthiness of data in representing teacher views. The process of abstraction and synthesis led to the identification of recurring key themes in the selected studies. A quantification of themes is provided to gain an overview of the qualitative material, including an exploration of any variations between studies (Garrard, 2013). These themes are illustrated in the text by direct quotations of those participating in the research. Six themes were identified under RQ1:

1. Policy guiding pedagogical and curriculum focus;
2. A dominant focus of performativity;

3. Difficulties as teachers engage with policy;
4. Contradictions within and between policies;
5. Shifts in professional identity;
6. The difficulty of real world application.

A final summary is included which looks at how the literature reports these factors to have influenced the development and implementation of educational policy, and the suggestions made of how to support teachers through this process (RQ2).

[Table 1 near here]

### ***Teacher engagement with policy (RQ1)***

#### *Policy guiding pedagogical and curriculum focus*

A recurring theme throughout the identified literature was that educational policy is reported to strongly guide both pedagogy and the curriculum delivered within the English educational system. The literature reviewed suggests that engagement in the implementation and practice of educational policy increases the value, held by practitioners, of the principles and elements central to each policy within teacher practice (Hall et al, 2004; Lunn and Solomon, 2000). The majority of teachers interviewed reported an understanding of, and were positive about, the benefits of the underlying principles and elements of each policy. Specifically these included:

- The benefits of increasing awareness of social and emotional aspects of learning in the SEAL initiative (Lendrum, Humphrey and Wigelsworth, 2013);
- The promotion of interactive teaching within the National Literacy Strategy,

encouraging children to ‘become more confident, to clarify their learning’  
(English, Hargreaves and Hislam, 2002, 18);

- The benefits of promoting pupil autonomy within AfL (Marshall and Drummond, 2007);
- Increased confidence around, and appreciation of, specific teaching areas of the National Curriculum, in particular Science in primary schools (Lunn and Solomon, 2000);
- Similar to the focus of SATs, teachers in school shared ‘a belief that the most important skills a school can offer a child is to read, write and be numerate’ (Hall et al, 2004, 804);
- The benefits of increased child and parental involvement in decision making and multi-agency working for pupils with SEN (Cole, 2005).

This engagement, and subsequent promotion of particular values, was also shown to guide curriculum (Hall et al, 2004; Lunn and Solomon, 2000; Creese, 2010), leading to a decrease in value of elements and principles outside of policy; for example, non SAT curriculum such as Physical Education and Music and topics outside of GCSE curriculum. This is characteristically illustrated in the descriptions of two teachers engaged in teaching Year 6 leading up to SATs and Key Stage 3 leading up to GCSEs:

‘The mornings are dedicated to SATs ... sometimes we take some of the foundation subjects out for the time being because we just can't, we just cram as much as we can in.’

(Key Stage 2 teacher; Hall et al, 2004, 813)

‘Ultimately for the Key Stage 3 tests and GCSE Exams you’ve got to cover the material and cover it in such a way that the pupils are able to answer the exam questions ... the curriculum is led by the examinations.’

(Key Stage 3/4 English teacher; Marshall and Drummond, 2007, 146-147)

### *A dominant focus of performativity*

Teacher experience of the English educational reform effort was reported to be heavily influenced by the dominant focus on performativity within policy, and this was reported to have a direct and ongoing effect on teacher pedagogy. English et al. (2002, 19) described how the teachers they interviewed around engagement with the National Literacy Strategy, had a strong awareness of the government dictated targets that left their own pedagogical principles second to that of meeting the learning objectives set by the curriculum; ‘I am trying to give opportunities for interactive teaching within the literacy strategy, although I do feel again that time’s ticking on and that ... you’ve got your learning objective’. A dominant focus of performativity, and accountability in particular, within policy could also be seen to strongly guide the pedagogy of some teachers (Creese, 2010; Hall et al., 2004; Lendrum et al., 2013); for example, the SAT focus promoting pupil practices such as, ‘working quietly and alone’ on written tasks, rather than ‘using other pupils as learning resources or the opportunity to talk and discuss’, and ‘teaching to the test’ (Hall et al., 2004, 812). Furthermore, the literature described how teachers placed the performativity agenda over those of inclusion, with some aligning their professional identity with its focus; ‘I’ve got fifty minutes and my priority is that they leave the room... knowing about particle theory, you know, the fact that they’re emotionally illiterate, well really... it’s not your problem is it?’ (Lendrum et al., 2013, 161). This



governmental emphasis on academic success was described to, at times, force initiatives like SEAL into a less important position; ‘I know that Maths, English and Science will take priority and I know SEAL...is going to be the bottom of the pile’ (Lendrum et al., 2013, 162). Similarly, Creese (2010) discussed the content and subject knowledge focus of the National Curriculum and its reductive affect on the value of effective pedagogical processes that enable learning in the classroom, particularly for those with EAL. He described how subject teachers perceive pedagogical practices such as ‘scaffolding’ and ‘providing opportunities for questioning’, as less important than teaching content and subject knowledge, illustrating his point with teacher views such as: ‘Well, I have expertise in terms of the curriculum, the syllabus, and so I am directing what we are going to study next and plan that in relation to the curriculum’ (Geography Teacher; Creese, 2010, 101).

#### *Difficulties as teachers engage with policy*

What could also be seen from the selected literature was that engagement in implementing top down reform was not always a positive experience. Both Lendrum et al. (2013) and Lunn and Solomon (2000) found that individual teachers reported frustrations such as, long time teachers' resistance to change and annoyance at the implementation of ‘yet another school reform’, illustrated in this description of the SEAL initiative; ‘isn’t it just another one of these ideas from the government that will fade out? We’ll do it for a couple of years and then it’ll be ... we’ve got another idea now’ (Lendrum et al., 2013, 161). The literature reported that many teachers struggle with the lack of freedom and autonomy in their practice afforded by engagement in policy (Hall et al., 2004; Lunn and Solomon, 2000). Again such frustrations were voiced by teachers engaged in performance driven practice:

‘My first two terms were the only [time] when I wasn't having to teach to an exam syllabus ... it was lovely, the freedom that gave you, to just go off at a tangent ... you were doing the sort of subjects that you normally do, but ... if they were particularly interested in something I felt I had the freedom to follow it up ... I now feel I've lost that freedom.’

(Key Stage 2 teacher; Lunn and Solomon, 2000, 1050)

Other reported frustrations included: the time and planning needed alongside high teacher workloads (Cole, 2005; English et al., 2002; Lendrum et al., 2013; Lunn and Solomon, 2000); and difficulty applying a ‘one size fits all’ model for all learners (English et al., 2002; Marshall and Drummond, 2007), particularly evident in comments such as:

‘It is very difficult to use interactive teaching with children with behavioural difficulties—the pace of the lesson is difficult to sustain— difficult to sustain all pupils’ attention—difficult to give them all a fair chance.’

(Key Stage 2 teacher; English et al., 2002, 16)

### *Contradictions within and between policies*

The literature suggests that teachers are aware of, and are able to articulate, contradictions that they see both within and between policy. English et al. (2002) found that teachers were grappling with contradictions apparent within the official advice that they were receiving regarding the practice within the National Literacy Strategy; namely between the expected encouragement for interactive teaching,

‘pupil responses are expected, encouraged and extended’, and the demand for lessons to be ‘well-paced - with a sense of urgency’ (DfEE, 1998, 8). Cole (2005) offered the reflections of Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCo) as they struggle with the discourse within the SEN Code of Practice (2001) around their leading ‘expert’ role; which potentially lies in conflict with the responsibility for SEN and inclusion advocated for all teaching staff. Teachers also described contradictions in the pedagogy advocated between different policies; the hands on, collaborative and dialogic values encompassed in the National Strategies (English et al., 2002) and AfL (Marshall and Drummond, 2007) compared with the prescriptive and content focused nature of the National Curriculum (Creese, 2010; Lunn and Soloman, 2000) and promotion of independent lone working for SATs and SAT preparation (Hall et al., 2004). The literature suggests that teachers recognise these discrepancies and are able to reflect on how they go about resolving tensions, through a process of balance or settlement, for example:

‘I don’t engage enough in conversation and discussion with lower ability groups and I think that could explain why within lower ability groups there is a real lack of progress ... you know I would have to take some responsibility for that because there is a big difference in lessons that I teach with top and bottom groups.’

(Key Stage 3 Mathematics teacher; Marshall and Drummond, 2007, 146)

‘The Literacy Hour is not a Literacy Hour and a half, so it still has to be a pacy hour session ... I don’t think I am unduly aggrieved if perhaps 10 minutes goes into 13 minutes in one session because I may be able to catch

up on the time, but I do feel the hour is critical; it is an hour not an hour and a half. So I think yes the interactive is great ... but you have to watch it.'

(Key Stage 1 teacher; English et al., 2002, 19)

Despite these reflections, the literature repeatedly shared examples of the frustration felt amongst teachers regarding these contradictions, and the difficulty they have resolving them in practice; illustrated in one teacher's views of the Science prescribed by the National curriculum, 'I just haven't felt comfortable with it...it just isn't me' (Lunn and Soloman, 2000, 1049) and another teacher's description of circumstances she feels are beyond her control and inhibit her ability to engage in good practice:

'It all gets in the way. Exam courses, being tied to rules and regulations. Being tied to a set syllabus, because a lot of what is on the curriculum is not applicable to a lot of these kids and we could make them much better learners if we could be more creative in the way we use the curriculum and now the Key Stage 3 strategy is hampering us even more and it's nonsense. Horrible!'

(Key Stage 3 English teacher; Marshall and Drummond, 2007, 147)

These frustrations around differing values between policies were echoed in other aspects of education. Cole (2005) offers the views of SENCOs as they negotiate what they describe as the difficult position of maintaining the SEN Code of Practice (2001) guidance on the statutory framework for inclusion, whilst their schools struggle to maintain their positions in national league tables; with one SENCO noting

that her ‘most difficult challenge is ensuring that the changes are wholly embraced by all class teachers, including the head teacher’ (Cole, 2005, 299).

### *Shifts in professional identity*

A strong theme, central to many of the articles reviewed, was that engagement in the implementation and the practice of educational policy often leads to shifts in practitioner views of themselves as educators. This was observed to further promote the underlying values of policy into practice, as well as becoming embedded into some teacher’s perceptions of themselves as practitioners (Hall et al, 2004; Lunn and Soloman, 2000; Marshall and Drummond, 2007). Lunn and Soloman (2000) provided illustrations of teachers who accepted teaching Science as part of their value system and thus this element became an aspect of their professional self-identity, whilst Hall et al. (2004) provided illustrations of teachers who they describe to have become ‘SATurated’; where SATs have made a powerful impact on identity for some teachers. In contrast, the literature also described teachers whose values and identity lay in conflict with policy; many reporting on the difficulty teachers have in establishing their professional identity through top down reform (English et al., 2002; Hall et al, 2004; Lendrum et al., 2013; Lunn and Soloman, 2000; Marshall and Drummond, 2007). Many teachers were able to articulate the type of teacher that they wanted to be in conflict with the policy agenda, illustrated in one teacher’s description:

‘If I had my way they would be out there collecting, they would know the names of the trees and the flowers, what’s happening in [this] area, why as it has a low water table ... I could teach science if I set my own agenda ... if it

were left to me, I actually would be doing a better job, because I would be more interested, for a start, because it just is interesting, the world you live in ... and if I didn't know something I'd be motivated to send out ... whereas I'm not as motivated as I would like to be because in fact [my agenda is set] for me.'

(Key Stage 2 teacher; Lunn and Soloman, 2000, 1049)

The literature suggests that teachers are aware of the mismatch between their values, practices and identity, and what they are being asked to do through policy (English et al., 2002; Hall et al, 2004; Lunn and Soloman, 2000; Marshall and Drummond, 2007). Lunn and Soloman (2000) interviewed a number of teachers who described the process of accommodating policy into their own practice as developing over time.

#### *The difficult in real world application*

Teacher relationship with educational policy will depend on many different factors including: an interplay of social and political factors; institutional and environmental factors; teacher capabilities and time constraints; and all within the context of reform based change. What emerged from the literature was that there are reoccurring pressures and professional development needs for teachers, as more and more legislation comes into place, impacting their practice. Time constraints, as well as the introduction of multiple initiatives, were described by teachers as limiting factors in implementing policy successfully (Hall et al., 2004; Lendrum et al., 2013; Lunn and Solomon, 2000); illustrated in this teacher's views on the implementation of the SEAL initiative, 'It is all to do with time really 'cause lots of people are interested

and have got lots of ideas, but then it's about when do you do it?' (Lendrum et al., 2013, 161). Competing agendas in school was also highlighted as a tension within policy implementation (Creese, 2010; Hall et al., 2004; Lendrum et al., 2013; Marshall and Drummond, 2007, 162); illustrated by one teacher around SEAL implementation, 'There is so much else coming into school and you can only ask people to do so many things. People are pulled in different directions and dedicated staff are pulled in different directions and that's hard'.

One SENCo described the pressure and potential consequences that comes with ongoing changes in demographics, when working with SEN:

'The number of children who have special needs has increased and their needs are often complex. The amount of time given to SENCOs to deliver the amount of support to these children has not increased—I fear that one day something important is going to be missed.'

(SENCo; Cole, 2005, 298)

Creese (2010) similarly acknowledged the demands on teachers of the increased language needs of a changing and diverse student population, in particular the skills needed to teach both language and content within the curriculum. Other literature offered the voices of teachers around the lack of time to ensure adequate training has been accessed to deliver new initiatives (Lendrum et al., 2013), as well as for teachers to reflect on and develop skills through an ongoing professional development process (English et al., 2002). It was also acknowledged that teachers are aware that such initiatives will take time to filter down to all staff; to become more accepted and embedded into practice (Cole, 2005; English et al., 2002; Lunn

and Solomon, 2000).

Teacher relationship with policy, within a real world context, was described to produce both contradiction and conflict, characterised by a high level of frustration around the amount and diversity of changes suggested. This dissatisfaction with high level of changes, and subsequent workload and administration, can be seen in this SENCo's description:

‘More form filling, more battling with educational psychologists and local education authorities to prove a child's needs. More time spent with parents who ‘know their rights’ but can't get what they want. More counselling of children/parents—wider remit to include, for example, the Index for Inclusion, ‘Excellence’, etc. There are just too many changes.’

(SENCo; Cole, 2005, 298)

### ***The development and implementation of policy (RQ2)***

#### *Current Perceptions*

Recurring themes that emerged in the literature related to both the content and values behind the educational policies described, as well as the professional identities of the practitioners themselves. Engagement in the implementation and practice of policy was seen to guide practice, both in terms of pedagogy and content; with engagement often reported leading to a greater alignment for teachers with the underlying values of that policy. Teacher identity played a central role with regards to the uptake and ownership within practice of each policy; teachers could be seen to be in differing stages in a process of accommodation. This shift in ownership was not reported to be experienced by all practitioners; some described a high level of frustration,



particularly when there was an awareness of a mismatch between the underlying values of individual policies and the practitioner's own values as an educator. Putting policy into practice brought to the forefront an awareness of contradictions both within and between policy. In particular, the dominant influence of performativity upon practice, often described as pushing the inclusion agenda to a backseat (Cole, 2005; Creese, 2010; Hall et al., 2004; Lendrum et al., 2013). For some, the policy agenda could be seen to produce personal conflict, characterised in the descriptions of teachers who criticised current practices and the overarching legislation itself. The literature also offered descriptions of teachers who are working at resolving these tensions, however for some this seemed 'mission impossible' (Cole, 2005).

Although numerous barriers to effective implementation of educational policy emerged throughout the literature, from the descriptions available it could be said that overall teachers were able to speak positively and report on the benefits of the underlying principles and elements of each policy. The barriers and implementation difficulties that arose may therefore be viewed, not as limitations, but rather as informative; to be used to assist the identification of factors needed to support the uptake of policy. The literature reviewed also offered converging themes around what support was needed.

### *Supporting factors*

The literature suggests that teachers need opportunities to critically reflect on practice, in order to facilitate the dialogue needed to help articulate and resolve dilemmas that arise throughout policy implementation (English et al., 2002; Marshall and Drummond 2007). Others described how teachers need to feel supported, as well

as prepared, when implementing policy; in order to gain the confidence and knowledge, skills and self-efficacy necessary (Cole, 2005; Creese, 2010; Lendrum et al., 2013). In particular, Cole (2005) and Hall et al. (2004) mention the importance of collaborating with, and gaining support from, senior management; Lendrum et al. (2013) highlighting that for a policy to warrant the time for curriculum preparation and training to develop sufficient understanding, there needs to be an awareness of the policy's priority within management. Time was considered the most valuable, yet lacking, resource by the majority of teachers interviewed, in particular, time to:

- Improve understanding and skills (Lendrum et al., 2013);
- Modify and try out new practice (English et al., 2002);
- Identify and work through contradictions both within and between policies (Cole, 2005; English et al., 2002);
- To develop meta skills, the 'hows' as well as the 'whats' of teaching (Creese, 2010).

Increased guidance was also advocated for by some within the literature (English et al., 2002; Lendrum et al., 2013; Marshall and Drummond, 2006).

Central to these descriptions of supporting factors for successful implementation of policy lay the teacher themselves and their own self-identity: Marshall and Drummond (2006) making a distinction between those who follow policy to the letter and those who embody the spirit of the reform; and Lendrum et al. (2013) placing teacher 'will and skill' as primary factors.

## **Conclusion**

The literature discussed within this article describes both the complex and

multidimensional nature of teacher relationship with English educational policy. The themes proposed move beyond viewing either policy or teacher in isolation and place both within the organisational, political, psychological and sociological context within which they are situated. In order to understand the uptake of educational policy, it is therefore helpful for teacher relationship with policy to be viewed as a complex multidimensional system rather than a one off event (see Braun, Maguire and Ball, 2010; Fullan, 2006; Lutzenberg, Imants and van Veen, 2013; Lutzenberg, van Veen and Imants, 2013; Wexler, 2002). The many elements described, both within and between these systems, pose significant implications for both the development and implementation of educational policy. Representation of teacher perceptions seemed important. Firstly, looking to influence the policies in which teachers have a central role, and secondly because the existence of and forum for voice in and of itself promotes action. Teacher professional identity, expressed through the personal discourses described throughout, was shown in the literature to have a strong influence on implementation. It can be concluded that in order for teachers to be able to adopt these policies, there needs to be; some degree of ownership of their professional development process (English et al., 2002); provision of high quality practical advice (Marshall and Drummond, 2007); and the backing and support of senior management within school (Cole, 2005; Hall et al., 2004). Where this support from senior management is in place, more time, support and status for policy is given for teachers to develop practice (Cole, 2005; Lendrum et al., 2013).

It is also clear from the literature that in order for schools to adopt these policies, they must be prepared to consider how they might facilitate the space needed for teachers to engage in dialogue around the processes that underpin

learning and practice. Research has shown that effective professional development, that continues beyond the 'classroom', is best situated within a community of professionals who support each other's learning (Garet et al., 2001; Stoll et al., 2006; Wenger, 2000). In the UK, a number of initiatives have looked to facilitate such professional development through encouraging schools to work locally, regionally and nationally to build their collective capacity through the sharing of good practice.

Recent examples have included:

- The Action Learning Sets which formed part of the TAMHS programme (see DfE, 2010) whereby groups of professionals address real life problems through a process of learning from and with others;
- The ongoing Leading Edge Partnership programme (see DfES Innovation Unit, 2004) which encourages high school head teachers to solve difficult problems together;
- Primary Strategy Learning Networks (see DfES, 2004) where teachers in different primary schools work together in networks to share practice.

Both practitioners and researchers have highlighted the powerful contribution that school based professional learning communities (PLCs) have made in empowering teachers and promoting students' learning; through building both individual and collective capacity in schools (Bolam et al., 2005; Cowan et al., 2004; Doolittle, Sudeck and Rattigan, 2008; Hord, 2004; Morrissey, 2000; Stoll et al., 2006). PLCs are groups of educators who meet regularly to share knowledge and work collaboratively to improve their skills and consider pedagogy. It is likely that schools, local authorities and support services would benefit from considering initiatives such as these in order to create and sustain the professional development

required to adopt the official advice in educational policy.

The scarcity of literature documenting teacher voice on English educational policy highlights the need for further research in this area. As teacher professionalism and what it entails is debated in society, it will be important to ensure and represent teacher voice in research, as many different parties fight for representation in the reform agenda.

### **Limitations of the review**

Applying a broad methodological approach allowed for an in-depth analysis of the studies, however, also raised questions around ethics. The process heavily relied on researcher inference and was therefore limited in objectivity by the researcher's own value judgments; meaning making in itself is an act of construction and therefore can never be neutral (Jaworski and Coupland, 1999). The use of literature reviews is an emerging field of research, increasingly in need of tools to help researchers to synthesise results, particularly when reviewing qualitative studies (Garrard, 2013). This particular topic did not lie within a specific body of research based knowledge and therefore was not likely to benefit from a traditional systematic review methodology. However, the review process adopted was successful in identifying a small number of studies where teacher voice was central. These studies which documented the participants' experiences and perceptions of engagement in policy, as well as their understanding of the needs around implementation, provided rich data to address the proposed review/research questions. As searches revealed that literature which documents teacher voice on English educational policy is scarce it became clear that this current review would be limited. Similar to Opfer and Pedder's (2011) review of teacher professional learning, this review should be

considered as partial and contingent; partial in that it is limited by the authors' own understanding and knowledge of the policy that impacts teachers in the UK and contingent in that teachers' experiences of policy will be both transitory and changeable. It would therefore be important for further research to challenge and extend the connections made within this piece of work.

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was funded through England's Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) ITEP award 2013-2016.

### **References**

- Academies (England) Act 2010, Ch. 32. London: The Stationery Office.
- Acquah, D. 2013. *School Accountability in England: Past, Present and Future*. Manchester, UK: AQA Education.
- Ainscow, M., T. Booth, and A. Dyson. 2006. *Improving Schools, Developing Inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Ball, S. 1999. "Global Trends in Educational Reform and the Struggle for the Soul of the Teacher." Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, University of Sussex at Brighton, 2-5 September.
- Bhaskar, R. 1978. *A Realist Theory of Science*. Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Bolam, R., A. McMahon, L. Stoll, S. Thomas, M. Wallace, A. Greenwood, K. Hawkey, M. Ingram, A. Atkinson, and M. Smith. 2005. Creating and Sustaining Effective Professional Learning Communities. *Research Report 637*. London: DfES and University of Bristol.

- Boote, D. N., and P. Beile. 2005. "Scholars Before Researchers: On the Centrality of the Dissertation Literature Review in Research Preparation." *Educational Researcher*, 34(6): 3–15.
- Braun, A., M. Maguire, and S. Ball. 2010. "Policy Enactments in the UK Secondary School: Examining Policy, Practice and School Positioning." *Journal of Education Policy*, 25(4): 547-560.
- Bryman, A. 2008. *Social Research Methods: Third Edition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Children and Families (England) Act 2014, Ch. 6. London: The Stationery Office.
- Children (England) Act 2004, Ch. 31. London: The Stationery Office.
- Cole, B. A. 2005. "Mission Impossible? Special Educational Needs, Inclusion and the Re-conceptualization of the Role of the SENCO in England and Wales." *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 20(3): 287-307.
- Cowan, D., G. Fleming, T. Thompson, and M. Morrissey. 2004. "Study Description: Investigating Five PLC Schools." In S. M. Hord (ed), *Learning Together, Leading Together: Changing Schools Through Professional Learning Communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Creese, A. 2010. "Content-Focused Classrooms and Learning English: How Teachers Collaborate." *Theory Into Practice*, 49(2): 99-105.
- Day, C. and L. Smethem. 2009. "The Effects of Reform: Have Teachers Really Lost their Sense of Professionalism?" *Journal of Educational Change*, 10: 141–157.
- DES (Department of Education and Science) 1978. *Special Educational Needs: Report of the Committee of Enquiry into the Education of Handicapped Children and Young People (The Warnock Report)*. London: HMSO.

- DfE (Department for Education) 1994. *Code of Practice on the Identification and Assessment of Special Educational Needs*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2009. *Designated Teacher for Looked-After Children*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2010. *Learning from Targeted Mental Health in Schools: Phase 2 Action Learning Set for Local Areas*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2011a. *Achievement for All National Evaluation*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2011b. *The National Strategies 1997–2011: A Brief Summary of the Impact and Effectiveness of the National Strategies*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2011c. *Me and My School: Findings from the National Evaluation of Targeted Mental Health in Schools 2008-2011*. London: Department for Education.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2013a. *Academies and Free Schools Programmes: Framework for Assessing Value for Money*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2014a. *2016 Key Stage 4 Performance Tables: Inclusion of 14 to 16 Non-GCSE Qualifications*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2014b. *2016 16 to 19 Performance Tables: inclusion of tech levels*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2014c. *Implementing your School's Approach to Pay: Departmental Advice for Maintained Schools and Local Authorities*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2014d. *National Curriculum*. London: HMSO.



- DfE (Department for Education) 2015a. *Effective School Partnerships and Collaboration for School Improvement: A Review of the Evidence*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) 2015b. *Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0-25 Years*. London: HMSO.
- DfEE (Department for Education and Employment) 1998. *The National Literacy Strategy Framework for Teaching*. London: DfEE.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) 2001a. *Advanced Skills Teachers: Promoting Excellence*. London: HMSO.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) 2001b. *Special Educational Needs: Code of Practice*. London: HMSO.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) 2004. *Primary National Strategy: Primary Strategy Learning Networks*. Norwich: HMSO.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) Innovation Unit 2004. *Learning through Sharing Practice: The Cohort Two Innovation Exchanges June/July*. London: DfES Innovation Unit.
- Doolittle, G., M. Sudeck, and P. Rattigan. 2008. "Creating Professional Learning Communities: The Work of Professional Development Schools." *Theory Into Practice*, 47(4): 303-310.
- Dyson, A. 2015. "Transforming the Role of the Special Educational Needs Coordinator." Keynote address at Manchester Metropolitan University Annual SENCo Conference, Manchester Metropolitan University, 9 July.
- Education (England) Act 1981, Ch. 60. London: The Stationery Office.
- Education (England) Act 1993, Ch. 35. London: The Stationery Office.
- Education (England) Act 1996, Ch. 56. London: The Stationery Office.

- Education Reform (England) Act 1988, Ch. 40. London: The Stationery Office.
- Education and Skills (England) Act 2008, Ch. 25. London: The Stationery Office.
- English, E., L. Hargreaves and J. Hislam. 2002. "Pedagogical Dilemmas in the National Literacy Strategy: Primary Teachers' Perceptions, Reflections and Classroom Behaviour." *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32(1): 9-26.
- Finkelstein, N. and W. Grubb. 2000. "Making Sense of Education and Training Markets: Lessons from England." *American Educational Research Journal* 37(3): 601-32.
- Fullan, M. 2006. "The Future of Educational Change: System Thinkers in Action." *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(3): 113-22.
- Furlong, J. 2013. "Globalisation, Neoliberalism, and the Reform of Teacher Education in England." *The Educational Forum*, 77: 28-50.
- Garet, M., A. Porter, L. Desimone, B. Birman and K. S. Yoon. 2001. "What Makes Professional Development Effective? Results from a National Sample of Teachers." *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(4): 915-945.
- Garrard, J. G. 2013. *Health Sciences Literature Review Made Easy: The Matrix Method: Fourth Edition*. Sudbury, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning
- Gewirtz, S., S. Ball and R. Bowe. 1995. *Markets, Choice and Equity in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Glover, D., and S. Law. 1996. *Managing Professional Development in Education*. London: Kogan Page.
- Hall, K., J. Collins, S. Benjamin, M. Nind and K. Sheehy. 2004. "SATurated Models of Pupildom: Assessment and Inclusion/Exclusion." *British Educational Research Journal*, 30(6): 801-817.

- HM (Her Majesty's) Government 2003. *Every Child Matters*. London: The Stationery Office.
- HM (Her Majesty's) Government 2015. *The Future of Apprenticeships in England: Guidance for Trailblazers: From Standards to Starts*. London: Department for Business, Innovation and Skills.
- House of Commons CSFC (Children, Schools and Families Committee) 2009. *National Curriculum: Fourth Report of Session 2008–09, Volume I Report*. London: The Stationery Office.
- Hord, S. 2004. "Professional learning communities: An overview." In S. Hord (ed), *Learning together, leading together: Changing schools through professional learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Humphrey, N., A. Lendrum and M. Wigelsworth. 2010. *Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) Programme in Secondary Schools: National Evaluation*. London: Department for Education.
- James Lord of Rosholme. 1972. *The James Report: Teacher Education and Training*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
- Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland. 1999. "Introduction: Perspectives on Discourse Analysis." In A. Jaworski and N. Coupland (Eds.), *The Discourse Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Leat, D., R. Lofthouse and A. Reid. 2014. *Research and Teacher Education: The BERA-RSA Inquiry. Teachers' Views: Perspectives on Research Engagement*. London: British Educational Research Association.
- Lefstein, A. and H. Perath. 2014. "Empowering Teacher Voices in an Education Policy Discussion: Paradoxes of Representation." *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 38: 33-43.

- Lendrum, A., N. Humphrey and M. Wigelsworth. 2013. "Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) for Secondary Schools: Implementation Difficulties and their Implications for School-based Mental Health Promotion." *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 18(3), 2013: 158–164.
- Levin, B. 1998. "An Epidemic of Education Policy: What can we Learn for Each Other?" *Comparative Education*, 34(2): 131-142.
- Lunn, S. and J. Solomon. 2000. "Primary Teachers' Thinking about the English National Curriculum for Science: Autobiographies, Warrants, and Autonomy." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 37(10): 1043-1056.
- Luttenberg, J., J. Imants and K. van Veen. 2013. "Reform as Ongoing Positioning Process: The Positioning of a Teacher in the Context of Reform." *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 19(3): 293-310.
- Luttenberg, J., K. van Veen and J. Imants. 2013. "Looking for Cohesion: The Role of Search for Meaning in the Interaction between Teacher and Reform." *Research Papers in Education*, 28(3): 289-308.
- Machin, S. and A. Vignoles. 2005. *Education policy in the UK*. Centre for the Economics of Education D. P. 57.
- Maguire, M., S. Ball and A. Braun. 2010. "Behaviour, Classroom Management and Student 'Control': Enacting Policy in the English Secondary School." *International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 20(2): 153-170.
- Marshall, B. and M. J. Drummond. 2006. "How Teachers Engage with Assessment for Learning: Lessons from the Classroom." *Research Papers in Education*, 21(2): 133-149.
- Morrissey, M. S. 2000. *Professional Learning Communities: An Ongoing Exploration*. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

- Norwich, B. 2013. *Addressing Tensions and Dilemmas in Inclusive Education: Living with Uncertainty*. London: Routledge.
- Norwich, B. 2014. "Changing Policy and Legislation and its Effects on Inclusive and Special Education: A Perspective from England." *British Journal of Special Education*, 41(4): 403-425.
- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) 2000. *Evaluating Social Inclusion; Guidance for Inspectors and Schools*. London: HMSO.
- Oliver, M. 2000. "Decoupling Education Policy from the Economy in Late Capitalist Societies: Some Implications for Special Education". Keynote address at Inclusive & Supportive Education Congress, Including the Excluded, Manchester, July.
- Opfer, V. D. and D. Pedder. 2011. "Conceptualizing Teacher Professional Learning." *Review of Educational Research*, 81(3): 376–407.
- QCA (Qualifications and Curriculum Authority) 1999. *Curriculum 2000*. London: QCA.
- Special Educational Needs and Disability (England) Act 2001, Ch. 10. London: The Stationery Office.
- Stoll, L., R. Bolam, A. McMahon, M. Wallace and S. Thomas. (2006). "Professional Learning Communities: A Review of the Literature." *Journal of Educational Change*, 7(4): 221–258.
- Wenger, E. 2000. "Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems". *Organization*, 7(2): 225–246.
- Wexler, P. 2002. "Chaos and Cosmos: Educational Discourse and Social Change." *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 34(4): 469–79.

Whittemore, R. and K. Knafl. 2005. "The Integrative Review: Updated Methodology." *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5): 546-553.

Table 1: An overview of the selected studies

<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Purpose of the article</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Validation of teacher views</b>
Cole	2005	This paper offered the voices of mainstream Special Educational Needs Coordinators (SENCOs), from two local authorities in the north of England, around their experience of the SENCO role, as described in the Special Educational Needs Code of Practice (DfES, 2001b).	12 mainstream SENCOs (eight primary and four high schools)	An initial survey (58 participants) formed the basis of individual open interviews led by the SENCOs themselves.	The method of using survey data to inform interviews worked towards validating the views (quotations) offered within the research.
Creese	2010	This paper considered the language to content focus in mainstream	Two EAL teachers and	Examples are offered from a geography	Allowing for extended time with few participants gained an in-depth

<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Purpose of the article</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Validation of teacher views</b>
		English high schools where English as an additional language (EAL) and subject curriculum teachers worked together to support students who were studying both the national curriculum whilst also learning English.	one mainstream teacher.	classroom in a high school in London, illustrated by quotations from interview data.	understanding of the topic, however limitations lay in how representative those views were.
English, Hargreaves, & Hislam	2002	This paper reported on teachers' perceptions of and responses to the National Literacy Strategy (NLS).	30 teachers, of which 15 took part in a video-stimulated	Semi-structured interviews and systematic observations. The evidence from systematic observations	The teachers who took part in a VSRD viewed them independently and selected a 20 minute section which best represented their interactive teaching. This put them



<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Purpose of the article</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Validation of teacher views</b>
			reflective	and three case studies is	in charge of the reflective process
			(VSRD)	used to illustrate key	and gave them the
			intervention	points.	opportunity to keep central their
					own theories and views.
Hall, Collins, Benjamin, Nind & Sheehy	2004	This paper sought to explore the school and classroom practices with regards to Standard Attainment Tests (SATs).	Two primary schools	Ethnographic data. Analysis of observational, interview and documentary data	The research team described how the analysis of data within the project was difficult, however, share how they carried out joint discussion and analysis with teachers in order to validate their findings.

<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Purpose of the article</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Validation of teacher views</b>
Lendrum, Humphrey & Wigelsworth	2013	This paper considered the implementation of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL) programme in high schools.	Nine high schools	Multi-case study design. Schools were visited once per term for five terms: semi-structured interviews, observations and document reviews. Data was thematically analysed.	Analysis of data was conducted after each visit allowing for subsequent modification of schedules. This served the purpose of validating representation through the progressive focusing and the generation of case-specific questions.
Lunn & Solomon	2000	This paper examined the experiences of primary teachers as they engaged in teaching science as part of the English National	Seven primary schools	In-depth interviews provided data around their confidence and identity as science	The method of eliciting 'autobiographies' worked towards mutually validating the teachers' current views on the science

<b>Author/s</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Purpose of the article</b>	<b>Participants</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Validation of teacher views</b>
		Curriculum.		teachers, setting their views in the context of their professional life histories.	curriculum.
Marshall & Drummond	2006	This article explored the way teachers enact Assessment for Learning (AFL) practices in the classroom.	One high school	Video recordings of 27 lessons and interviews of focal teachers on their beliefs about learning.	The use of video recordings allowed for multiple and group viewings of the data, therefore although the sample was limited, the analysis was intensive.

**Taking a cooperative inquiry approach to developing person-centred practice  
in one English high school.**

Prepared in accordance with the author guidelines, and with consideration of the quality criteria, for the journal 'Action Research' (see Appendix 2). Ethical approval by the School Research Integrity Committee, University of Manchester (see Appendices 3-5).

Word count: 6997 (including tables, acknowledgments and references)

## **Abstract**

Recent legislation within the English special educational needs arena describes Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans to detail coordinated child and family centred provision. Person-centred approaches are advocated as a central way of working within these new EHC plans, as well as within a whole school approach to planning for Special Educational Needs and Disability provision (DfE, 2015a; DfE, 2014). Pupil voice and participation in planning, however, have not been found to be well embedded in mainstream school practice (Shevlin & Rose, 2008) and are likely to require a high level of understanding and openness, for successful implementation (Corrigan, 2014). A cooperative inquiry (Heron & Reason, 2001) is described where school psychology, teaching, support and pastoral professionals worked together to develop person-centred practice within one English high school. The inquiry group engaged in dialogue around practice; exploring their own personal and professional values as well as the values embedded within person-centred practice. This paper offers an account of the inquiry group's journey, highlighting key themes as identified by the group: ownership of and confidence in the learning process; developing reflective practice; and the challenge of engaging others in the learning process. The findings indicate that cooperative inquiry can facilitate the learning and development necessary to embody collaborative person-centred practice.

## **Keywords**

Action research, cooperative inquiry, education, person-centred practice, teacher professional development

## **Introduction**

Person-centred planning begins when people decide to listen carefully and in ways that can strengthen the voice of people who have been or are at risk of being silenced.

(O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002, p.8)

There has been a growing body of literature advocating for the central role of the voice of the child within decision making in education (Armstrong, Galloway, & Tomlinson, 1993; Martin, Worrall & Dutson-Steinfeld, 2005; Rudduck & Fielding, 2006). English education legislation has emphasised listening to pupils for a number of years (e.g. DfES, 2002; DfES, 2003) with evolving focus from early conceptions of the role of the professional to discover, manage and represent pupil views (May, 2005) to more recent advocacy of person-centred approaches (DfE, 2015). As part of the Children and Families Act 2014, a new system for special educational needs (SEN) assessment was proposed, placing children and young people (CYP) and their families first and at the centre of all individual planning and decision making. The special educational needs and disability (SEND) Code of Practice (CoP; DfE, 2015a) built on this idea by highlighting the importance for, and duty of, Local Authorities (LA) and schools to consult and listen to CYP and their families around their perspective on their needs and what they think provision of services might look like for them. These suggested ways of working alongside CYP and their families hold at their core a set of implicit values, assumptions and ideals: the importance of ongoing listening, shared power, community inclusion, focusing on a CYP's strengths, individualised support and choice (Mount, 2002). At the heart of these person-centred ways of working is the view that CYP are individuals who have the power to

shape the direction that their lives take, with the help and support of those important to them (Sanderson, 2000).

English LAs are required to have embedded these changes into practice over the course of four academic years, in particular through the conversion of Individual Healthcare Plans (IHP), statements of SEN and the statutory assessment process into Education, Health and Care (EHC) plans. In order to promote a person-centred ethos, person-centred planning (see DoH, 2010), a way of working which originated in health and social care fields and special education, has been advocated for as a central way of working within these EHC plans. It has been suggested that person-centred planning 'should not be seen as an “add-on”, rather it should be an integral part of people’s everyday lives' (Sanderson, Jordan & Sholl, 2006, p.1). The SEND CoP (DfE, 2015) responds to this idea by suggesting that planning for SEND provision should take a whole school approach with general education teachers as key practitioners in supporting the person-centred process; supported, guided and led by the Special Education Needs Coordinator (SENCo) and the school's support and specialist staff (DfE, 2014a). The promotion of pupil voice and participation in planning may however be met with a mixed reception by both individual practitioners and at a systemic level. Shevlin and Rose (2008) found that schools in England and Ireland lacked the infrastructure to support student voice and that the involvement of students in decision-making was not well embedded in mainstream school practice. Furthermore, the values, assumptions and ideals implicit within these ways of working may be difficult for those involved to act upon without having some personal alignment with, and personal conviction around, those values. Humphrey, Lendrum and Wigelsworth (2010), in their evaluation of the implementation of the Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (SEAL)

programme in English high schools, highlighted that an incongruence between the beliefs of the implementer and a programme's underlying theory may have a negative effect on the quality of delivery. It is likely that, in order for school staff to develop the skills, as well as values, necessary to engage in person-centred practice there will need to be a high level of openness to the approach, as well as willingness to develop current understanding and practice; both at the individual and the whole school level (Corrigan, 2014).

This current research is concerned with the experiences of one English high school as it transitioned through these government led changes. The account aims to provide a description of how we, a group of practitioners within school, approached the changes within a community of inquiry and action (Reason & Bradbury, 2011).

### **A high school context**

The research took place within a high school in the North of England during this time of policy change. My role within the school during this time was as an onsite trainee school psychologist for three days per week. The school had a population of close to 800 CYP aged 11 to 16, and published statistics stated that 28% of the pupils in school had SEN; this being a significantly higher percentage than the DfE (2015b) reported national average of 15.4%. A recent Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (OFSTED) visit and subsequent report had detailed the school's overall effectiveness as 'requires improvement' and staff morale had been reported as 'very low' following this and subsequent school and LA response measures; as detailed in a recent union survey into the causes of work-related stress (NASUWT, NUT & AT, 2014). Aware of these difficulties, and as a response to the new SEND CoP (DfE, 2015), the school's SENCo and myself



worked together to develop a sensitive and timely approach which could support staff through these changes. We began by circulating a newly written SEN policy to staff for consultation; feedback, as part of the consultation, highlighted that the suggested changes to SEN practice may be difficult for teaching staff to formulate conceptually. Responses to the consultation detailed perceived tensions in school around the competing agendas staff face; in particular, the SEND CoP's focus on the central role of the class teacher to provide high quality teaching, with appropriate differentiation as a first response to possible SEN, and a strong focus on promoting academic achievement. Both improving academic achievement and differentiation had been the central focus for improvement in the recent OFSTED report.

In order to gain further awareness of current understanding of, and openness to, person-centred approaches, the policy changes were presented to different audiences in school:

- A whole staff training session;
- A middle leaders' meeting;
- A SEN lead teachers' meeting;
- A SEN departmental meeting.

A mixture of didactic and participative methods were used; giving opportunity for staff to respond by sharing verbally, and in writing, where they felt current practice reflected person-centred practice and where there were areas in need of development. These initial presentations highlighted differing levels of knowledge and experience of what constituted person-centred practice, and raised further awareness of the need to introduce these changes both sensitively and respectfully.

### **Taking an action research approach**

The focus of any action research project would be to engage organisational members in action that is creative, around issues that are important to them, by supporting and engineering change within a community of inquiry and action (Reason & Bradbury, 2011). Action research could be viewed as an effective approach to teacher professional development (Ponte, Ax, Beijaard & Wubbels, 2004), facilitating opportunities for collaboration, inquiry, structured dialogue and building on teachers' starting points; all elements which are reported to enable high quality teacher professional learning (Cordingley & Bell, 2012). Previous experience of working in the community and training professionals in approaches to organisational change had introduced me to cooperative inquiry (Heron & Reason, 2001). Cooperative inquiry is a participative form of second-person action research, where all involved act as both co-researchers and co-subjects in cycles of action and reflection. Nelson, Slavit, Perkins and Hathorn (2008, p.1271) described the inquiry process as:

Employing dialogue grounded in shared experiences and a shared focus, group members question ideas, actions, and artefacts; examine varying perspectives and beliefs; and work toward a co-construction of understanding about the focus of their collaborative work.

Initially a group comes together around an area of common interest and engage in a number of cycles of action and reflection; constructing an inquiry, planning action, taking action and evaluating action. In line with the traditional extended epistemology of cooperative inquiry, meaningful knowledge is gained by

researching human experience through exploration of all four ways of knowing (See Table 1).

**Table 1.** Four ways of knowing (Reason, 1999, p.211)

<i>Way of knowing</i>	<i>Description</i>
Experiential	Through direct face-to-face encounter with a person, place or thing; it is knowing through empathy and resonance, that type of in-depth knowing which is almost impossible to put into words.
Presentational	Grows out of experiential knowing, and provides the first form of expression through story, drawing, sculpture, movement, dance and so on.
Propositional	Knowing through ideas and theories, expressed in informative statements.
Practical	Knowing 'how to' do something and is expressed in a skill, knack or competence.

Cooperative inquiry approaches have been used within education to:

- Encourage action-reflection and contextually sensitive learning (Bray, 2002);
- Develop theory and practice around student assessment (Gearhart & Osmundson, 2008);

- As self-directed informal professional development for teachers working on the development and implementation of new educational programs (Lom & Sullenger, 2011).

These studies describe the process of cooperative inquiry as being a form of ongoing support for professionals, strengthening both teaching practice and learning, whilst also encouraging a sense of community amongst professionals. The parallels between this kind of participatory and democratic process described in cooperative inquiry and person-centred planning seemed pertinent; both looking to work collaboratively with people through a shared space where opportunities for learning and change can be explored.

The aim within this piece of writing is to describe the group's process, making visible some of our sense making and choices in an attempt to show and not just tell, some of the why, how and what of our inquiry.

### ***Introducing the inquiry to school staff***

Discussions between the school's SENCo and myself had highlighted that, although we both agreed that cooperative inquiry may be an appropriate approach to support school staff through these value-based changes, for us to keep the inquiry process true to its participatory nature we would need to find a way of sharing its value with our colleagues; securing their commitment and genuine but voluntary engagement. Yorks (2015) highlights the importance of maintaining the political principle of voluntary participation throughout a cooperative inquiry, whereby group members are drawn to the inquiry by their shared personal interest in the inquiry question. An integration of the principles of the 'four parts of speech' (framing, advocating,

illustrating and inquiring; Torbert & Taylor, 2011) was used as a framework to plan how the approach would be communicated during a whole staff meeting at the end of the first term of the 2014/15 academic year. I presented the dilemma of how to embed the suggested changes in the CoP into practice, offered a description of an inquiry group approach and presented the following question:

- How can we support each other through these changes?

The relaxed and informal nature of cooperative inquiry was stressed and a date and time for an initial meeting given. An open invite to this initial meeting was offered to all 77 teaching, support, and pastoral staff within school; both during this presentation and via internal email.

Our first inquiry meeting was held in January 2015 with 11 members of school staff who had expressed interest in the group. The school staff who attended included:

- Three members of the pastoral team;
- Three teachers who taught mainstream Mathematics, Science and English, including one who held SEN responsibilities as part of his teaching and another being the school SENCo;
- One Literacy specialist teacher;
- Three Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTAs) who deliver small group and one to one interventions for learners with SEN;
- One trainee school psychologist.

Contracting was an important aspect of establishing the group, in particular to clarify expectations. The initial meeting was an opportunity to define the inquiry agenda

together and map out potential processes that the group might go through (Heron & Reason, 2001). Following exploration as a group of what it means to work in a person-centred way and of the changes laid out in SEND CoP (2015a), whole group discussion led to an agreement of the following research question to underpin our inquiry:

- How can we support each other to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and values to embed person-centred approaches in our practice?

### ***Our cooperative inquiry journey; what happened and why***

The research was carried out over three school terms:

- An initial inquiry meeting exploring both cooperative inquiry and the inquiry questions;
- Four one-hour inquiry meetings held after school at the beginning of each half-term;
- A final session to explore and plan a number of dissemination strategies.

The dissemination strategies included: a presentation to the school's Senior Leadership Team (SLT) on a collation of examples of current good person-centred practice within school (notions of what constituted 'good practice' were explored as an ongoing aspect of the inquiry cycling and process, and were formed as propositions in our final session); a presentation of our inquiry journey at three LA SENCO network meetings; and sharing ideas for person-centred practice in the classroom with SEN lead teachers, the Maths department and the English department within school. All process decisions were made collaboratively during inquiry sessions:

- Agreeing the date and time of the next meeting;
- Deciding on new or refocused inquiry questions;
- Deciding on actions to engage in between sessions;
- Ways of recording and analysing our findings.

An overview of the practical outworking of our cooperative inquiry is provided in Table 2; offering a description of the stages of cooperative inquiry involved in each cycle and illustrated with examples from our inquiry.

**Table 2.** Four stages of cooperative inquiry involved in each action research cycle (from Heron, 1996).

<b>Stage</b>	<b>Description of phase</b>	<b>Example activities from current inquiry</b>
1	The group come together to explore the focus of the inquiry, their own interests and concerns and to develop questions to explore together. Actions are agreed to explore between sessions as well as ways the group will record their own and others' experiences.	<p>The research question was agreed on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How can we support each other to develop the necessary knowledge, skills and values to embed person-centred approaches into our practice?</li> </ul> <p>We decided together that between then and our next meeting we would reflect on/notice where person-centred practice was taking place within school in both our own and other's practice. The group decided to bring to the next session any observations, conversations and/or reflections.</p>

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Description of phase</i>	<i>Example activities from current inquiry</i>
2	This phase involves the application of agreed actions in everyday practice and recording own and others' experiences.	Recording reflections on actions; trying out a new person-centred practice; focusing on person-centred practice with a particular learner with SEN; recording good person-centred practice in school; collating helpful person-centred resources; and observing and recording how others work with SEN.
3	As the group are immersed in, and engage in, new experiences they may become open to new ways of seeing or understanding. This phase involves the construction of understandings which may lead to new actions, questions and creative insights.	Personal reflections/knowings/questions/insights.
4	After an agreed period of time, group members reassemble to consider their original experiences in light	Sharing of experiences in the form of stories. For example, individuals were asked to 'think of a time when you have worked in person-centred way' and interviewed each



<i>Stage</i>	<i>Description of phase</i>	<i>Example activities from current inquiry</i>
	of new experiences. Time is given to reevaluate the original question, and to develop new/refocused questions for a further cycle of action and reflection.	<p>other in a pair; recording ideas on sorting cards that can be grouped into themes by the group; using photo/picture cards to support the sharing of thoughts and feelings. These were developed into propositions and fed back to the whole group at the beginning of the next session.</p> <p>Refocusing of original questions for further cycles, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does working in a person-centred way mean in practice?</li> <li>• What good person-centred practice is taking place in school?</li> </ul>
<p>Stages 2 and 3 also took place within sessions, for example, exploring together person-centred resources.</p>		

Data were gathered and drawn from multiple sources:

- Reflections on and stories around practice shared in each session (our presentational knowings);
- Ideas recorded in note form during group activities (the beginnings of propositional knowings);
- The propositional representations from previous sessions shared at the beginning of each session.

The analysis of data collected (our propositional knowings) was made in collaboration with all group members through a process research cycling; when an idea is explored and developed a number of times within a cycle and in subsequent cycles, as a whole group and in subgroups (Reason & Heron, 1986). Heron and Reason (2001) describe the primary criterion for meaning-making as being coherence between co-subjects; coherence in their stories and reflections (presentational knowings), as well in their felt experience. An example from session 2 is used to illustrate this. As group members reflected in pairs, sharing stories from their own individual practice, a common theme arose: in order for pupils to maintain a positive view of themselves as learners in school, it was felt that there needed to be both an acceptance amongst teachers of the learner's current levels, and celebration of small steps of progress. As members of the group began to share on this theme, others joined in, connecting elements of their experiences together. This building of coherence led to an understanding in the group of what effective person-centred practice might look like that developed over time. Notes were made by different members of the group of these 'moments of coherence' which would then be used in whole group sorting activities to language, strengthen and develop themes; in this case the phrase 'setting appropriate expectations for learners; accepting where CYP are at and celebrating their small steps of progress' formed part of our propositional representation for that session.

Through this type of analysis in each of the sessions, four different propositional representations were formed:

- The values behind person-centred ways of working mapped onto example practices (session 2);

- A representation of what person centred practice means to the group (session 3);
- The group's current perceptions of where school is up to with person-centred practice (session 4);
- A representation of current good person-centred practice within school (session 5).

### **Ethical considerations**

I had the responsibility of reporting these findings in order to meet the external requirements of a doctorate program. My challenge lay in finding a viable way of both initiating a meaningful inquiry and representing 'our' journey as a final product; a topic of much debate within action research as universities look to incorporate aspects of action research into their doctoral programs (Boden et al., 2015). Summers and Turner (2011), in their cooperative inquiry with a teacher training team at a college in England, describe an awareness of the potential of these external expectations to undermine the group's sense of democracy and collaboration. Critical questions being:

- What could/should my role in the process be?
- How do I facilitate genuine collaboration whilst also meeting my own needs to fulfil doctoral requirements?

A number of different practices and factors, as described throughout, were incorporated into both the research design and the writing process in order to be mindful of issues such as these. For example, an early emphasis on voluntary engagement in the group and an emphasis on developing personal interest in the

inquiry topic within sessions. The research project was funded through England's Department for Education, National College for Teaching and Learning ITEP award which allowed for both LA and University based supervision. This supervision acted as both a sounding board and a place to critically reflect, and served the purpose of ensuring that the research met both the University's and the British Psychological Society's (BPS, 2009) ethical standards.

### **The group's experience of the inquiry process**

The nature of cooperative inquiry meant that the research topic, inquiry method and the practice of the researchers were being explored at the same time. The former section was concerned with the external aspects of the inquiry. With both process and content being part of the inquiry, this section shifts its focus to the group's representation of the internal, experiential elements of the inquiry; the group's representation of key elements of the inquiry process, illustrated by examples of the content and practices developed.

One of the dilemmas in writing this account of the research was how to allow group members' voices to come through into the writing whilst being mindful of the responsibility that comes with that representation. During the final meeting (session 6) we engaged in a further process of research cycling to inform this representation. The meeting had a dual purpose as the group had agreed to represent their journey to local SENCOs at three networking meetings and needed to prepare a 20 minute presentation. Similar to other inquiry meetings, we shared our experiences of the cooperative inquiry with each other in pairs and small groups, making notes of key points in the conversation which were then sorted into themes across the larger group. The process of articulating and asserting individual reflections allowed space

for others to make sense of their own experiences and look for resonance and agreement around the topic. The responsibility of organising the group's asserted thoughts into a presentation was left to me, however research cycling occurred in the form of the group members checking and editing the presentation prior to delivery and then presenting in their own words; moving from presentational knowledge, to propositional knowledge and then back to presentational knowledge. This cycling aimed to provide trustworthiness of those consensus constructions which would then inform the writing.

Through this process the group identified three themes which they felt were central to our journey:

- Ownership of and confidence in the learning process;
- Developing reflective practice;
- The challenge of engaging others.

These themes are addressed in the following sections, with descriptions of practices from the sessions illustrated by exemplary quotations taken from transcribed audio recordings of both the final meeting and the presentation.

### ***Ownership of and confidence in the learning process***

The concept of cooperative inquiry was introduced in more detail to the group during our first meeting. One teacher noted, when reflecting on the group's process in our final session:

I was sceptical at first; it was something new, something different. I didn't know everyone who had showed up well but had always been interested in

learning how curriculum support [SEN department] worked so was willing to give it a go.

English teacher

As the group formed and developed we needed to move from my own initial inquiry questions to those of the group. The first session was a chance to introduce the topic as well as the concept of an inquiry group, therefore we began by exploring any questions around person-centred practice that the group may have had. These were explored through an activity where key underlying values of person-centred practice (see Sanderson, 2000) were placed around the room and individuals were asked to annotate them with post-notes detailing examples of how they had seen the value outworked in practice; as well as any questions, thoughts or feelings that arise around each value. This activity served the purpose of mapping out early on the group's propositional knowledge, which later would be refined through further inquiry cycles. The activity led into whole group discussion around our own understanding, and perceived gaps in understanding, of person-centred practice. There was consensus in the group that at this point no one felt confident in their own understanding of what working in a person-centred way meant. When reflecting on our inquiry experience, one group member noted:

Very early on the main purpose of the group became figuring out what these changes meant in our day to day practice; in our planning, in how we talk about things, in how we relate to the learners that we are working with.

HLTA 1

The Code of Practice is a long document; it becomes about taking something that is really abstract and turning it into something practical. The activities in and between our meetings really helped with this; sharing stories, having time out to reflect, trying something new out between meetings.

Maths teacher

Different group members shared that it was not clear at what point in the inquiry process where their confidence in, and understanding of, person-centred practice developed; but that somewhere in the process they had begun to feel confident to share positive experiences of working in person-centred ways and to promote this way of working to others in school. Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (1994) refer to this concept as a 'learning organisation'; learning may start from individuals but may be more accurately described as a social process or a collective phenomenon brought about through interaction. One group member shared that:

Having a minimum agenda in [inquiry] meetings was really important; we would go there with a key question, something we wanted to figure out together and it seemed best to kind of take it from where it went. Talking around experiences with other practitioners seemed to help.

HLTA 2

Similar to Wenger (2000) and the notion of communities of practice, we found that it was not through disagreements that change was brought about, but through the construction and reconstruction of knowledge, and the internalisation of values and norms as individuals began to embrace new mental models through dialogue.

### *Developing reflective practice*

Marshall and Reason (2007) suggested that the quality of an inquiry lies in having, or searching for, a capacity for self reflection; this allowing for full engagement and attention to individual perspectives and assumptions which can be tested out in the group. In our inquiry, the opportunity to reflect on practice was seen as central to our time together:

As teachers and support staff we are trained to be reflective individuals. But if anyone is like me I just forget sometimes to take that step back, to really take a look at what my lesson looked like, to think about what it was like to work one on one with a particular learner and what it was like to identify their individual needs and work with them. [The inquiry group] made me remember how important that is.

Maths teacher

In particular, in one of our sessions individual group members brought a description of a learner that they were ‘having particular difficulty getting through to’ for the group to discuss:

If someone had maybe a really positive or maybe a negative experience with a particular learner...we were able to talk around it and see what we could take from it. We all encouraged each other...you can get bogged down with everything that isn't going well and sometimes conversations, say in the staffroom, can become quite negative about certain learners. If a strategy



worked well...we would pass it on. It meant that I was trying lots of new things that I wasn't doing before.

English teacher

Over time the inquiry group became a safe space to question the values behind our practices and to test out their alignment with, or lack of alignment with, person-centred practice. For example, whether we embody the principles of inclusion and strength based psychology in our practice (see Bozic & Miller, 2013). Bringing to the surface and making explicit different group member's thinking and practices allowed for discussion around what might need to happen to bring about change. For example, the group felt that they needed to challenge the boundaries of their practice and become more intentional about incorporating person-centred practice day-to-day.

Another practice common to each inquiry session was the sharing of personal stories. These served to energise the inquiry and promote group understanding, as well as encouraging creative person-centred action:

Sharing and listening to stories of good practice made me think more creatively about my own practice. You don't want to be the only one who is stuck there not having anything to say so you were thinking, 'I've really got to step up to this and plan something new to do with a learner, or my class, that I would be proud to talk about'.

English teacher

Those involved described how the group had provided opportunities to reflect on their day-to-day practice. It has been suggested that developing reflective practices such as these can enhance capability for action, in the moment, that is effective in complex social situations (Marshall, 2001).

### ***The challenge of engaging others***

The community of inquiry that developed was described by group members to have brought about personalised professional development. Despite the described successes, a question that repeatedly arose during inquiry sessions was:

- How do we bring others in school on the journey with us?

As a first step, the inquiry group served the purpose of eliciting teacher voice within a trusting, collaborative and explorative environment. Bragg (2007) describes the importance of addressing teaching voice alongside pupil voice for dialogue to be meaningful in a whole school context, as well as for successful professional and curriculum development. We looked to find ways to inspire others and promote further dialogue within school:

We took it upon ourselves to get everyone in school excited about it – we tried as many avenues as possible. We shared our work with SLT and we told them what we had done and also shared with them some visuals, like the one page profiles we had developed...what had worked with us. We also offered for others to join us.

HLTA 2

There was a strong agreement in the group that support and commitment was needed from the school leadership to embed person-centred practice into the school's common practice. Howes, Davies and Fox (2009) describe six collaborative action research projects within English high schools which aimed to bring about a productive context for inclusion. Present in the descriptions of each project was the challenge of facilitating teacher engagement in the high school context. In our study, group reflections noted that similarly we were struggling to engage others:

The [inquiry] group appealed to those who were already interested in working in a person-centred way – those who were already passionate and had some understanding of what working in that way meant. You can't force others who don't work in that way, when it isn't their ethos. The pressure from Ofsted has meant that teaching staff and the SLT are focused on performance and the fear of failure has meant that there is no room for innovation. We were wanting to promote innovative practice.

Science teacher/SENCo

Watzlawick, Weakland and Fisch (1974) suggest that even when there is a change in the fundamental assumptions in a group, an external pressure is required, as well as a readiness of the wider organisation, for desired change to be brought about. Our hope was that others in school would recognise the value of person-centred practice, not only for their own professional development but also at an organisational level.

## **Conclusion**

Action research, as the collaborative venture described within this study, was conducted with the purpose of providing an effective approach to the implementation and development of new practices within a high school context. As documented, it provided a creative space to develop reflective practice which in turn facilitated personalised professional development for those involved. The collaboration between trainee school psychologist and educational practitioners through action research also offered a genuine opportunity for reducing the gap between policy, theory and practice; as well as in building capacity and actionable knowledge. This is the purpose of any co-operative inquiry: to help people create their own knowledge, living and actionable knowledge that can be used practically in their lives. It seemed important that those engaged were able to be meaningfully involved in decision making within the group and felt empowered to author knowledge that could be used to make changes in their own practice; thus drawing a strong parallels with the values embedded within the person-centred approaches which were being developed. This suggests that at a time of heightened pressure and change in English educational system, teachers and educational practitioners can better shape their future when they are able to take ownership of their own professional development and are afforded the time to engage in reflection and dialogue around practice (Cordingley & Bell, 2012).

Whilst many of our experiences were positive, both within the group and in our practice, there were also many difficulties. The reflections on, and thoughts around, practice within this article are offered as glimpses of issues that were in process. Some of our greatest challenges lay not in adopting person-centred approaches in our own practice but in learning to live in this place of process; both

individually and within the wider school context. As a group, we examined our own values, intentions and ways of working, in order to be curious about and respectful of those who worked differently. For many in the group, our own personal inquiries became focused on our role in facilitating change within the wider school context; looking to change practice within the confines of an organisation with its own assumed values, not all aligning with those implicit with person-centred approaches. As we attempted to draw others in school into our inquiry, it became apparent that some did not see the ideas and insights that we were wanting to share as important, and therefore would not have the same motivation to change their practice. As a group we felt that unless there is genuine support, in terms of both participation and in securing appropriate time, space and resources, from school leadership, action research such as described here would ultimately not prove effective in its wider aims.

In writing this account, I had not wanted to take either a pessimistic or optimistic stance about our attempts at bringing about change within the school. I had not wanted to take a disheartened position, or spend time detailing the difficulties that were beyond our control. I also did not want to tell an overly positive story of how the future might look with regards to the described government led changes; this perhaps giving off unfounded expectations for others who might read about our journey. A more valid portrayal of our journey together was one of hope. Our hope was that in the process of working, reflecting and communicating together, and through being genuinely curious, patient and accepting of difference, that the school as a system might have flourished in some way. Embedding person-centred ways of working within the practice of a small number of educational professionals

within one high school seemed an important first step in facilitating shifts in practice across the whole school.

### **Acknowledgements**

I am indebted to my co-researchers and co-subjects in this inquiry, Deirdre Quayle, Surandini Ferdinando, Sarah Johnson, Tyler Hyvarinen, Katy Daynes, Alison Nunn, Julie Ferguson, Helen Majerski, Peter Friend and Emma Shaw. In particular, Dr Deirdre Quayle, who was then the Special Educational Needs Coordinator of the school, without her willingness and trust we would not have had the opportunity to develop and reflect on our practice together in this way. This project was funded through England's Department for Education (DfE) National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) ITEP award 2013-2016.

### **References**

- Armstrong, D., Galloway, D. & Tomlinson, S. (1993). Assessing special educational needs: The child's contribution. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(2), 121–131.
- Boden, R., Greenwood, D. J., Hall, B., Levin, M., Marshall, J. & Wright, S. (2015). Action research in universities and higher education worldwide. In H. Bradbury (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of action research, third edition*. London: SAGE.
- Bozic, N. & Miller, A. (2013). Guest editorial: Strength-based practice. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 30(4), 5-6.
- Bragg, S. (2007). But I listen to children anyway! Teacher perspectives on pupil voice. *Educational Action Research*, 15(4), 505–518.
- Bray, J. (2002). Uniting teacher learning: Collaborative inquiry for professional

- development. In L. Yorks and E. Kasl (Eds.), *Collaborative inquiry as a strategy for adult learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- BPS (British Psychological Society) (2009). *Code of ethics and conduct*.  
Leicester: BPS.
- Children and Families (England) Act 2014, Ch. 6. London: The Stationery Office.
- Corrigan, E. (2014). Person centred planning ‘in action’: Exploring the use of person-centred planning in supporting young people’s transition and re-integration to mainstream education. *British Journal of Special Education*, 41(3), 268-288.
- Cordingley, P. & Bell, M. (2012). *Understanding what enables high quality professional learning: A report on the research evidence*. London: Pearson.
- DfE (Department for Education) (2014). *A DfE presentation pack for school leaders: The 0-25 special educational needs and disability reforms*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) (2015a). *Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years*. London: HMSO.
- DfE (Department for Education) (2015b). *Special educational needs: An analysis and summary of data sources*. London: HMSO.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2002). *Listening to learn: An action plan for the involvement of children and young people*. London: DfES.
- DfES (Department for Education and Skills) (2003). *Every child matters*.  
London: DfES.
- DoH (Department of Health) (2010). *Personalisation through person-centred planning*. London: DoH.
- Gearhart, M., & Osmundson, E. (2008). *Assessment portfolios as opportunities for teacher learning (CRESST Report 736)*. Los Angeles: CRESST.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the human condition*.  
London: SAGE.

- Heron, J. & Reason, P. (2001). The practice of co-operative inquiry: Research 'with' rather than 'on' people. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds.). *The handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice, 2nd edition*. London: SAGE.
- Howes, A., Davies, S. & Fox, S. (2009). *Improving the context for inclusion: Personalising teacher development through collaborative action research*. London: Routledge.
- Humphrey, N., Lendrum, A. & Wigelsworth, M. (2010). *Social and emotional aspects of learning programme in secondary schools: National evaluation*. London: DfE.
- Lom, E. & Sullenger, K. (2011). Informal spaces in collaborations: Exploring the edges/boundaries of professional development. *Professional development in education, 37*(1), 55–74.
- Marshall, J. (2001). Self-reflective inquiry practices. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.) *The handbook of action research; participative inquiry and practice, second edition*. London: SAGE.
- Marshall, J. & Reason, P. (2007). Quality in research as 'taking an attitude of inquiry'. *Management Research News, 30*(5), 368–380.
- Martin, N., Worrall, N. & Dutson-Steinfeld, A. (2005). Student voice: Pandora's box or philosopher's stone? Paper presented at the *International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement*, Barcelona, 2–5 January.
- May, H. (2005). Whose participation is it anyway? Examining the context of pupil participation in the UK. *British Journal of Special Education, 32*(1), 29–34.
- Mount, B. (2002). More than a meeting: Benefits and limitations of personal futures planning. In J. O'Brien and C. O'Brien (Eds.), *A little book about person-centered planning*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.
- NASUWT (National Association of Schoolmasters Union of Women Teachers),



- NUT (National Union of Teachers) & ATL (Association of Teachers and Lecturers) (2014). *Joint union survey: Causes of work-related stress*. October 2014.
- Nelson, T. H., Slavit, D., Perkins, M., & Hathorn, T. (2008). A culture of collaborative inquiry: Learning to develop and support professional learning communities. *Teachers College Record*, 110(6), 1269–1303.
- O'Brien, J. & O'Brien, C. (2002). Introduction. In J. O'Brien and C. O'Brien (Eds.), *A little book about person-centred planning*. Toronto: Inclusion Press.
- Ponte, P., Ax, J., Beijaard, D. & Wubbels, T. (2004). Teachers' development of professional knowledge through action research and the facilitation of this by teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(5), 571–588.
- Reason, P. (1999). Integrating action and reflection through co-operative inquiry. *Management Learning*, 30(2), 207-226.
- Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (2011). Introduction. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The handbook of action research; participative inquiry and practice, second edition*. London: SAGE.
- Reason, P. & Heron, J. (1986). Research with people: the paradigm of cooperative experiential inquiry. *Person Centered Review*, 456-476.
- Rudduck, J. & Fielding, M. (2006). Student voice and the perils of popularity. *Educational Review*, 58(2), 219-231.
- Sanderson, H. (2000). *Person-centred planning: Key features and approaches*. UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Sanderson, H., Jordan, L. & Sholl, C. (2006). *Person centred transition*. Cheshire: Helen Sanderson Associates.
- Senge, P., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Shevlin, M. & Rose, R. (2008). Pupils as partners in education decision-making:

- Responding to the legislation in England and Ireland. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 23(4), 423 – 430.
- Summers, D. & Turner, R. (2011). Outside the green box: Embedding education for sustainable development through co-operative inquiry. *Educational Action Research Journal*, 19(4), 453-468.
- Torbert, W. & Taylor, S. (2011). Action inquiry: Interweaving multiple qualities of attention for timely action. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (eds), *The handbook of action research; participative inquiry and practice*, second edition. London: SAGE.
- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7(2), 225–246.
- Yorks, L. (2015). The practice of teaching co-operative inquiry. In H. Bradbury (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of action research, third edition*. London: SAGE.

## **The dissemination of findings to professional practice**

**Word count: 4887 (excluding references)**

## **Introduction**

In many forms of research, the researcher proposes a research question, designs a method which will prove or disprove a hypothesis and then data is collected, analysed and the findings disseminated to interested parties. Dissemination within the practice of action research often takes a different path. The current research did not follow a linear route through design, implementation and dissemination; dissemination happened throughout through the exploration of a cyclical process of theorising, action, widening participation, theorising and so forth. This piece of writing emerges out of that complex and continually adapting process. An exploratory approach was adopted to dissemination, both within the research site where the author continues to work and wider afield.

There are three aspects to my dissemination strategy which will be described within this piece of work. One strand is the ongoing development of person-centred practice for both myself and my co-researchers as adopted throughout our cooperative inquiry (our first person action research); another is how myself and my co-researchers inquired with others, outside of our cooperative inquiry, both within school and within the Local Authority (LA) around both person-centred practice and methods of developing practice (our second person action research); and finally, my own attempts to stimulate engaged and persistent inquiry within wider communities - locally, regionally and nationally (third person action research). Action research is concerned with both action and reflexivity (Bradbury, 2015), therefore in line with these practices this writing looks explore:

- What ‘actionability’ came from this research and what cycles of inquiry continued;
- What may have limited or enabled both my own and others’ participation in further inquiry.

As this writing forms part of submission for a professional doctorate in Child and Educational Psychology, it seemed relevant to conclude with a consideration of how dissemination through action research fits with the role of the Educational Psychologist (EP).

### **Strand 1: The role of first person action research in dissemination**

I, and those who partnered with me in this research, adopted an inquiring approach to dissemination; exploring our ‘own assumptions, perspectives and action, seeking to behave awarely and choicefully in a given context, and to develop [our] practice in some way’ (Marshall 2011, p.175). This was our first person action research. Our pursuit of practical knowledge around person-centred ways of working had initially led us to forming our cooperative inquiry, and in doing so to challenge our own values and current practice. Similar to descriptions by Argyris and Schon (1978), our process of group learning and the co-creation of knowledge was brought about through dialogue. The community of inquiry that developed over time provided a context for shared learning and the transfer of knowledge within the group; learning is not just an individual activity but exists within a community of shared social practice (Wenger, 2000). Argyris (2004) argued a theory of learning that centres around a person's 'theory

in action' (what they do), rather than knowledge that is theoretical (their 'espoused theory' or what they say they are doing). He suggested that theoretical knowledge is not learning unless it is developed into practice; we have not learnt unless our behaviour has changed. With this in mind, the focus of this current research shifted from looking for truth and knowledge within the group to developing meaningful questions around current knowledge and learning through and in practice.

The group shared their current experiences, their thoughts and their theories, and then used these to prepare an action plan to put into practice. Following further experiences, they were then able to go back and look at what was working in practice and what was not working; and from that place, question the theories that their actions were based on. This dialectical process both validated the grounding of the knowledge produced and allowed celebration of the consummation of that knowledge (Heron, 1996). Our practice of cooperative inquiry held the assumption from the beginning that the linear dissemination of knowledge as assumed in traditional research would not be the whole process; holding the belief that one has to experience something to gain full knowing (Heron, 1996). Our engagement in the research brought about meaningful actions which were a form of dissemination of our developed knowledge, generated during our time together. It is this democratic and participative nature of action research which calls for a radically different approach to dissemination:

Action research is a democratic and participative orientation to knowledge creation. It brings together action and reflection, theory and practice, in the

pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern. Action research is a pragmatic co-creation of knowing *with*, not *about*, people. (Bradbury, 2015, p.1)

The valuable role that action research can have in teacher professional development through this type of active collaboration and co-creation of knowledge is widely accepted within educational research (see Butler, Novak Lauscher, Jarvis-Selinger & Beckingham 2004; Borko & Putnam 1998; Cordingley, Bell, Rundell, & Evans 2003; Ponte, Ax, Beijaard & Wubbels 2004). Action research allows for dissemination by placing equal value on the knowledge produced by academics and that produced by the teachers themselves (Meirink, Imants, Meijer & Verloop, 2010; Vescio, Ross, & Adams 2008).

In this section I look to describe some of the areas of interest and practice that I and other group members explored throughout the research. Whilst our experiences were highly varied, most had a number of early phases of experimentation around person-centred practice whereby reflections and examples of practice were brought back to the group for joint reflection and consideration. A number of examples are described of how our inquiry contributed to our own personal knowledge and action.

***Example 1*** - Our initial conversation in the first inquiry meeting demonstrated a diverse understanding in the group of what working in a person-centred way meant. As members of the group began to share stories, others joined in, connecting their experiences together with common themes. Those stories gained the attention of others in the room, causing different perspectives to be aired for discussion. Exploring our own

understanding of person-centred practice and our own personal values as practitioners became an increasingly important mechanism for making sense of what these practices might look like in our own work. During the initial sessions there appeared to be realisation amongst group members that there was some coherence between their own personal values and principles that they apply to their work and the underlying values and principles of person-centred practice. A significant moment arose in our final session together when one group member shared that they had initially been sceptical about whether they aligned with the values of person-centred practice, however, felt that they had been on a journey of acceptance themselves, as they had more and more positive experiences of that way of working. Others also acknowledged that they too were on a journey of coming to appreciate the benefits.

***Example 2*** - During our cooperative inquiry journey, group members explored different person-centred ways of working which were personalised to their own values, job role and strengths. Examples of ongoing and developing person-centred practice explored through engagement in the cooperative inquiry are described in Table 1.



Table 1: The development of person-centred practice within our cooperative inquiry group (Cooperative Inquiry, 2015a)

Identified area of practice	Example of practice developed
<b>The development of personalised learning and plans</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Checking in with young people regularly to see how their learning is going;</li> <li>• Promoting young person led goal setting;</li> <li>• Communicating a young person’s goals with parents and other teaching staff;</li> <li>• Allowing young people to express their personalities and allowing for more personal creativity in lessons;</li> <li>• Developing one page profiles for all young people with Special Educational Needs;</li> <li>• Practice and development of how we carry out Person-Centred Planning Meetings.</li> </ul>
<b>Meeting social and emotional needs</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having more patience with young people - humouring learners!;</li> <li>• Student Services maintaining its open door policy to meet social and emotional needs;</li> <li>• Providing pastoral support for parents as well as for young people;</li> <li>• Asking young people about their day more regularly;</li> <li>• Having time to listen;</li> </ul>

<b>Identified area of practice</b>	<b>Example of practice developed</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being mindful of maintaining genuineness in interactions with young people.</li> </ul>
<b>Promoting learner engagement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping learning interesting, for example spending time choosing interesting texts;</li> <li>• Keeping learner engagement central in lesson planning.</li> </ul>
<b>Working collaboratively with parents</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping an open door policy for parents;</li> <li>• Maintaining regular contact and meeting with parents;</li> <li>• Updating the school information for parents, for example sharing practice in the school newsletter, updating the school website etc.;</li> <li>• Ensuring that time has been spent with parents explaining why and what is being done to intervene with their young person e.g. behaviour plans, interventions. Having parent and YP on board so we can work as a team;</li> <li>• Allowing parents to express their views.</li> </ul>
<b>Working collaboratively with young</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Opening up dialogue with teachers regarding young people with special educational needs;</li> <li>• Writing notes in young person’s planner for other staff members</li> </ul>

Identified area of practice	Example of practice developed
people and staff	to read.
<b>Celebrating Success</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Postcards home with specific praise for young people with special educational needs;</li> <li>• Phone calls home to share successes;</li> <li>• Certificates and regular specific praise for students – behaviours that we want to continue to see them showing.</li> </ul>

Further research might look to examine the impact of these developed practices in school on the young people involved.

*Example 3* - Another element to dissemination would be how engagement in the inquiry process shaped my own thinking. When embarking on a piece of action research, it can be taken as self evident 'that the inquirer is connected to, embedded in, the issues and field they are studying' (Marshall & Reason, 2007, p.368). In some sense, all writing is autobiographical (Marshall, 1999), therefore I want to acknowledge this as I draw on my own understanding as a sense making process. During previous employment as a counsellor, rooted in person-centred ways of working, I had the privilege of watching others find their voice, seeing something of their story reflected back to them, and them in their own way finding a place of peace in that. These observed changes in other people's lives instilled a belief in person-centred ways of working that developed over

time. As a trainee educational psychologist embarking on working within a high school context and looking to facilitate this cooperative inquiry, a number of questions arose for me around the person-centred approaches advocated for within the new special educational needs (SEN) Code of Practice (DfE, 2015); both for the young people involved and for professionals, including myself. The outworking of the cooperative inquiry itself provided opportunities to develop my own person-centred practice; further developing and consolidating my beliefs in the effectiveness of working in this way. When embarking on training others in school around person-centred practice, I was presented with the dilemma of how to pass on this understanding to other professionals, particularly when they have other views on how to help others. I began to consider the varying conceptualisations of different ways of working as reflecting a phase in social development around what 'help' looks like; perhaps from one of looking to experts for the answers and another of looking within ourselves. These differences could be observed in school with regards to how different teachers approached teaching in the classroom; some believing in and practicing a highly participative and active classroom and others believing in the importance of delivering high quality expert information to students.

With these observations and reflections in mind, I became aware of the importance of 'meeting teachers where they are at' and of modelling person-centred ways of working through a non-expert style of training delivery. I worked at incorporating practical activities which would draw on the training groups' pre-existing knowledge and open up space to allow sharing and reflection. I felt that it was more important to facilitate these learning spaces and conversations than to include lots of

information given didactically from the front. Activities included in training sessions looked to examine genuine problems/situations encountered in teaching, in order to relate learning directly back to practice; for example, groups were given case studies of young people with SEN, asked to think of what person-centred quality first teaching might look like for this student, and to discuss their thoughts informally in small groups. This activity built on the person-centred theory presented and allowed space for group members to consider their current practice/understanding with others who also are encountering similar problems. This kind of learning, within a community who share similar problems in their professional practice, has been shown to be effective in engaging individuals to work together to solve work based problems (Boud & Middleton, 2003; Burbank & Kauchak, 2003; Oakes & Rogers, 2007).

***Limitations*** - In this context, the practices developed and thoughts around that practice were offered as glimpses of issues that are in process. My own personal inquiry, as well as for others at many different points in the research, focused on our role in facilitating change within the wider school context. Cooperative inquiry group members worked at changing practice within the confines of an organisation with its own assumed rules; not all aligning with person-centred ways of working. Many in the group shared frustrations around how their attempts at changing practice felt at times blocked by the wider purposes within the school. For example, over the course of an academic year every young person sits a number of progress tests for each subject, the results of which are mapped against expected progress based on Year 6 Standard Attainment Test (SAT) scores. The cooperative inquiry group had many discussions around what person-

centred practice, in particular strength based practice (see Bozic & Miller, 2013; Sanderson, 2000), might look like in the contexts of these tests. We agreed as a group on the importance for young people, particularly those with SEN, to feel success in these tests by being given the opportunity to demonstrate the knowledge that they currently have. However, current practice in school meant that the tests were not differentiated, and young people with SEN often scored less than ten percent. Different members of our cooperative inquiry group took this dilemma back to their relative departments to begin conversations. Despite the reported high levels of stress and tensions in practice within the group, we decided as a group to ‘have courage in putting what we have developed into practice’ by; ‘following what you feel is right for each young person regardless of school culture or leadership’ (Cooperative Inquiry, 2015b). Our attempts to stay true to the values developed in the group could be described to fit the notion of becoming ‘Tempered Radicals’. Tempered radicals, as described within the Action Research literature, are ‘people who want to succeed in their organizations yet want to live by their values or identities ... They want to fit in and want to retain what makes them different. They want to rock the boat and they want to stay in it’ (Meyerson, 2003, p.11). ‘Tempered Radicals’ have been described to make a difference in organisations through:

- Resisting change quietly by staying true to one’s self;
- Turning threats into opportunities;
- Broadening impact through negotiation;
- Leveraging small wins;
- Organising collective action.

(Meyerson & Scully, 1995)

## **Strand 2: The role of second person action research in dissemination**

My, and those who partnered with me in this research, main audience in the endeavour to disseminate findings was the staff within the school. A second target group was anyone who was concerned to understand or develop their person-centred practice within the LA. The purposes of dissemination at the second person level would be to bring others, 'together to inquire into issues of mutual interest. There may be an initiating researcher, but their intention is help create a community in which all join in decision-making about inquiry processes as well as the content of the research and action' (Marshall 2011, p.176). Finding others within local systems who have, or could be inspired to have, shared interest around this topic became our strategy for dissemination. Similar to the principles of person-centred practice, we relied on the notion of people's interdependence (O'Brien & O'Brien, 2002); that organisational learning will occur when we realise that we need each other, so that seemingly divergent interests might develop into a system of interdependency. This process is referred to by Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross and Smith (1994) as a 'learning organisation'. This learning may start from individuals but may be regarded more accurately as a social process or a collective phenomenon brought about through human interaction. Hedberg (1981, p.6) suggests that:

Although organizational learning occurs through individuals, it would be a mistake to conclude that organizational learning is nothing but the cumulative result of their members' learning. Organizations do not have brains, but they have cognitive systems and memories. As individuals develop their personalities,

personal habits, and beliefs over time, organizations develop world views and ideologies. Members come and go, and leadership changes, but organizations' memories preserve certain behaviors, mental maps, norms and values over time.

Ford and Ford (1995) suggest that this type of learning is socially constructed through the interactions of people, therefore, group members set out to think creatively about how they might interact with and inspire others to think about person-centred practice.

In this section I look to describe some of the ways that I, and other group members, encouraged others to inquire with us around person-centred practice. A number of examples are described of how we used the knowledge generated in our cooperative inquiry to promote joint inquiry with others locally.

***Example 1*** - There was a strong agreement in the group that support, in terms of both participation and in securing appropriate time, space and resources, from the school leadership would be necessary to allow person-centred practice be embedded successfully. An action agreed in the final cooperative inquiry session which formed part of this research, was to present our findings to the leadership team; to gain their support and include them in further inquiry. Mindful of possible differences in values and practice, we decided to take a strength based approach to our dissemination; naming our presentation – ‘Current Good Person-centred Practice in School’. Five members of the cooperative inquiry group attended a senior leadership team meeting, and were given 20 minutes to present. We shared both the strategy to our own professional development in this area (our inquiry group) as well as person-centred resources that we had



developed or currently use within the classroom. These included, one page profiles for SEN learners, examples of positive behaviour strategies used in the classroom (e.g. laminated 'behaviour for learning' lists written with student) and specific positive praise postcards which are sent home. We felt that the presentation was received positively as the senior leadership team extended the session into the rest of their one hour meeting in order to ask us questions about how our practice had developed through participation in the inquiry group.

**Example 2** - Throughout our cooperative inquiry sessions together, the theme of developing appropriate expectations and assessment for learners with SEN had remained central. The English and Maths teachers participating in the inquiry group had shared that they had benefitted from hearing how the SEN department worked with and assessed learners. They also shared how hearing about and seeing person-centred resources that are used in the SEN department had impacted their practice and encouraged them to think more creatively in lesson planning. Further consultation with the special educational needs coordinator (SENCo) resulted in the commissioning of a piece of work with the Maths department to explore how they might work more collaboratively with the SEN department and to share person-centred practices and resources. This was carried out using Appreciative Inquiry. Appreciative Inquiry, in principle, is a search for the best in a group of people, their organisation and the community they exist within (Cooperrider & Whitney, 2005). The act of deliberately asking positive questions serves to facilitate constructive dialogue and inspire action within an organisation (Ludema, Whitney, Mohr & Griffin, 2003). The aim of our

Appreciative Inquiry, similar to our cooperative inquiry, was to bring the system together so that it could learn more about itself from itself; drawing from those in the system who are already practicing person-centred approaches to learning and have already resolved problems that others have not been able to. For example, discussion in one appreciative inquiry session centred around the benefits of using tactile and visual structured approaches to learning to develop early number skills; an approach used in the small group intervention for students in the SEN department. At the request of mainstream Maths teachers, time was given for demonstration and to ‘have a go’, as well as time to consider how activities such as these might be incorporated into the mainstream classroom. Plans were also made to carry out a similar piece of work with the English department.

**Example 3** – Our cooperative inquiry group had been invited to share our practice at a local SENCo network meeting. As a group, we decided that it would be helpful to share with the SENCos the process that we went through, in order to inspire them to do something similar in their schools. Seven members of our cooperative inquiry group went to three different network meetings to present for 20 minutes on our findings. We did not feel that they needed to do something the same as we had, therefore shared our story and offered the questions:

- How are you already supporting conversations around person-centred practice in your school?
- How are going to inspire further conversations?

We also offered support to anyone who would like to set up something similar to our inquiry in their school. Following this offer, I was contacted by a SENCo of a primary school in the LA and through a series of meetings and email conversations, supported her with setting up and developing a similar group in her school. I shared with her the principles of the inquiry group and examples of the stimuli and activities that we had used in sessions. I encouraged her to develop her own practice, and the practice of those who participate in her group, through ways that are meaningful to them. My hope is that she also encourages other SENCos/schools to develop their own forms of inquiry around person-centred practice.

***Limitations*** – As I, and others from our inquiry group, attempted to draw others into our inquiry around person-centred practice, it became apparent that we were working with a wide range of core beliefs about the practices and purposes of education. Ranging, for example, from those who believe that education is about supporting those who show talent and ‘intelligence’ to those who promote the ideals of a pluralistic society where education is there for all (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2006). Our attempts to inspire and connect with others around person-centred ways of working was met with an awareness of these differences which then themselves became subjects of conversation. Our quest however remained; to invite others to inquire with us and to develop a school wide community of shared interest and practice.

### **Strand 3: The role of third person action research in dissemination**

Our third-person action research sought to stimulate inquiry around person-centred practice in wider communities, over time (Gustavsen, 2001); not necessarily through direct personal contact to those with shared interest. In the context of this research, those wider communities might include; academics, policy makers, educational practitioners and schools. The following dissemination strategies at the third person level have been, or are in the process of being, carried out:

- Submission of thesis papers 1 and 2 to journals;
- Application to present the thesis paper 2 at an international conference;
- Presentation of our method of professional development (cooperative inquiry) at three different SENCo network meetings in the LA and also one in a neighbouring area;
- The development of a resource to help prepare for Person Centred Planning meetings given to all SENCos in the LA;
- The delivery of training to educational practitioners in the region on the development of person-centred practice in a high school context;
- In school training delivered to SEN lead teachers on person-centred practice;
- In school training delivered to teaching assistants on person-centred practice;
- Sharing person-centred resources in school with all teaching staff;
- Sharing person-centre resources with other schools in the LA.

Dissemination through publication would look to inquire with others into how society is coping with changes in educational policy in the United Kingdom. The aim would be to

contribute to a body of literature: paper one on the development of educational policy in the UK, addressing issues around teacher voice, educational reform, British educational policy, teacher professional development and teacher professional identity; and paper two on developing person-centred practice in a high school context through action research, addressing issues around teacher professional development, communities of practice, action research, cooperative inquiry and person-centred practice.

Dissemination through publication would also look to provide information for other professionals, such as EPs, on how they might carry out similar action research within different contexts.

***Limitations*** – The third person dissemination strategies described may be viewed as important for developing practice for those not in direct contact with the researchers. However, a limitation when trying to describe these types of action research in writing or for presentation is in whether the vitality, depth and breadth of the knowledge generated has been captured and in turn received. I felt this limitation was evident throughout this piece of work, in particular through an awareness of the limitations of language to capture the group's moments of coherence and my own ability to best represent our learning process.

### **The educational psychologist as action researcher**

In this study, the trainee educational psychologist adopted the role of both facilitator and co action researcher. Educational psychology as a profession could be considered well placed to fulfil both of these roles. The most recent SAGE handbook of action research

states that ‘action researchers are concerned with the conduct and application of research ... [and] engage stakeholders in defining problems, planning and doing research, interpreting results, designing actions, and evaluating outcomes’ (Bradbury, 2015, p.3). This role has parallels with the description offered by Fallon et al. (2010, p.4) of the core functions of the EP:

EPs are fundamentally scientist-practitioners who utilise, for the benefit of children and young people (CYP), psychological skills, knowledge and understanding through the functions of consultation, assessment, intervention, research and training, at organisational, group or individual level across educational, community and care settings, with a variety of role partners.

Using the knowledge and understanding of psychological frameworks, and drawing on evidence from research as a basis for practice, Educational Psychology as a profession is able to support schools in developing a better understanding of need (Dunsmuir, Brown, Iyadurai & Monsen, 2009). Evidence based practice, as a political and conceptual framework, has been described as a powerful tool for moving the profession forward (Fox, 2011). Collaboration between educational psychologists and educational practitioners through engagement in action research seemed to offer a genuine opportunity for reducing the gap between theory and practice, as well as building capacity; supporting others at an organisational level, in particular through staff training, supervision, co-working and consultation (Wagner, 2000). Furthermore, supporting

practitioners as they look to embed person-centred approaches into practice seemed to fit well with the notion of ‘giving psychology away’ (Miller, 1969).

In the real world context, for the EP who practices action research within its fundamental values and epistemologies (Reason & Bradbury, 2011), the application of theory is likely to benefit from the use of a flexible response where approaches are selected based on their appropriateness to specific contexts (MacKay & Greig, 2007). Fox (2011) suggests that it is important to strengthen one’s own evidence base as an EP through practice-based evidence, and therefore turning one’s own experience into expertise; drawing on reflections on and in action to develop knowledge from which to work. This is in line with the role of EP as reflective practitioner (BPS, 2005) which encourages appraisal and reflection on practice and also fits well with the practice of reflexivity central to action research. Quality in action research or practice becomes about ‘having, or seeking, a capacity for self reflection, so that we engage our full vitality in the inquiry and attend to perspectives and assumptions we are carrying.’ (Marshall & Reason, 2007, p.3). The inquiry process described, both in the research and throughout dissemination, provided a space for such reflexive practices; where both myself and those who participated were able to test out our own perspectives and assumptions. The EP role in itself is one where professionals have to deal with complex interpersonal situations where knowledge needs to be drawn on in a reflexive way. Throughout this research, the practices engaged in provided a space for collaborative reflection with role partners, this in turn built capacity in those who participated; capability for action that would be effective in complex social situations. Reason and Torbert (2001, p.5-6) argue that:

Since all human persons are participating actors in their world, the purpose of inquiry is not simply or even primarily to contribute to the fund of knowledge in the field, to deconstruct taken-for-granted realities, or even to develop emancipatory theory, but rather to forge a more direct link between intellectual knowledge and moment-to-moment personal and social action, so that inquiry contributes *directly* to the flourishing of human persons, their communities, and the ecosystems of which they are part.

## References

- Ainscow, M., Booth, T. & Dyson, A. (2006). *Improving schools, developing inclusion*. London: Routledge.
- Argyris, C. (2004). *Reasons and rationalizations: The limits of organizational knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Argyris, C. & Schön, D. A. (1978). *Organizational learning: A theory of action perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Borko, H., & Putnam, R. (1998). Professional development and reform-based teaching: Introduction to the theme issue. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14(1), 1–3.
- Boud, D., & Middleton, H. (2003). Learning from others at work: Communities of practice and informal learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 15(5), 194–202.
- Bozic, N. & Miller, A. (2013). Guest editorial: Strength-based practice. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 30(4), 5-6.
- BPS (British Psychological Society) (2005). *Subject benchmarks for applied*



- psychology*. Leicester: BPS.
- Bradbury, H. (2015). Introduction. In H. Bradbury (Ed.). *The handbook of action Research: Participative inquiry and practice, third edition*. London: Sage.
- Burbank, M. D., & Kauchak, D. (2003). An alternative model for professional development: Investigations into effective collaboration. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 499-514.
- Butler, D. L., Novak Lauscher, H., Jarvis-Selinger, S. & Beckingham, B. (2004). Collaboration and self-regulation in teachers' professional development. *Teaching and Teacher Education 20*(5), 435–455.
- Cooperative Inquiry (2015a). Session 5: The development of person-centred practice within the group. Research site: Manchester University
- Cooperative Inquiry (2015b). Session 4: The group's current perceptions of where school is up to with person-centred practice. Research site: Manchester University.
- Cooperrider, D. & Whitney, D. (2005). *A positive revolution in change: Appreciative inquiry*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Cordingley, P., Bell, M., Rundell, B. & Evans, D. (2003). The impact of collaborative CPD on classroom teaching and learning. In *Research Evidence in Education Library*. Version 1.1. London: EPPI Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education.
- DfE (Department for Education) (2015). *Special educational needs and disability code of practice: 0 to 25 years*. London: HMSO.
- Dunsmuir, S., Brown, E., Iyadurai, S. & Monsen, J. (2009). Evidence-based practice

- and evaluation: From insight to impact. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 25(1), 53-70.
- Fallon, K., Woods, K., & Rooney, S. (2010). A discussion of the developing role of educational psychologists within children's services. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 26(1), 1-23.
- Ford, J. and Ford, I. (1995). The role of conversations in producing intentional change in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 541-570.
- Fox, M. (2011). Practice-based evidence: Overcoming insecure attachments. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 27(4), 325-335.
- Gustavsen, B. (2001). Theory and practice: The mediating discourse. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of Action Research: Participative Inquiry and practice*. London: Sage Publications
- Hedberg, B.L.T. (1981). How organizations learn and unlearn. In P. C. Nystrom and W. H. Starbuck (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational design, vol 1: Adapting organizations to their environments*. Oxford: OUP.
- Heron, J. (1996). *Co-operative inquiry: Research into the human condition*. London: Sage Publications.
- Ludema, J.D. Whitney, D. Mohr, B.J. & Griffin, T.J. (2003). *The appreciative inquiry summit. A practitioner's guide for leading large group change*. Berrett-Koehler.
- Mackay, T. & Greig, A. (2007). Editorial. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 24, 4-6.
- Marshall, J. and Reason, P. (2007). Quality in research as 'taking an attitude of inquiry'. *Management Research News*, 30(5), 368-380.
- Marshall, J. (1999). Living life as inquiry. *Systemic Practice and Action Research*,

12(2), 155-171.

- Marshall, J. (2011). The practice and politics of living inquiry. In M. Pedler (ed.), *Action learning in practice*. Farnham, Surrey: Gower.
- Meirink, J. A., Imants, J., Meijer, P. C. & Verloop, N. (2010). Teacher learning and collaboration in innovative teams. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 40(2), 161–181.
- Meyerson, D. (2003). *Tempered radicals: How everyday leaders inspire change at work*. New York: Harvard Business School Press.
- Meyerson, D. & M. Scully (1995). Tempered radicalism and the politics of ambivalence and change. *Organisation Science*, 6(5), 585–600.
- Miller, G. A. (1969). Psychology as a means of promoting human welfare. *American Psychologist*, 24, 1063–1075.
- Oakes, J., & Rogers, J. (2007). Radical change through radical means: Learning power. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8, 193–206.
- O'Brien, J. & O'Brien, C. L. (2002). Introduction. In J. O'Brien and C. L. O'Brien (Eds.), *A little book about person-centred planning*. Toronto, Ontario: Inclusion Press.
- Ponte, P., Ax, J., Beijaard, D. & Wubbels, T. (2004). Teachers' development of professional knowledge through action research and the facilitation of this by teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(5), 571–588.
- Reason, P. & Bradbury, H. (2011). Introduction. In P. Reason and H. Bradbury (Eds.), *The handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice, second edition*. London: Sage.

- Reason, P. & Torbert, W. (2001). The action turn: Toward a transformational social science. *Concepts and Transformation*, 6(1), 1-37.
- Sanderson, H. (2000). *Person-centred planning: Key features and approaches*. UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., & Smith, B. (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Vescio, V., Ross, D. & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(1), 80–91.
- Wagner, P. (2000). Consultation: Developing a comprehensive approach to service delivery. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 16(1), 9-18.
- Watzlawick, P., Weakland, J. H., & Fisch, R. (1974). *Change: Principles of problem formation and problem resolution*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Wenger, E. (2000). Communities of practice and social learning systems. *Organization*, 7(2), 225–246.

## **Appendix 1: Author guidelines for Research Papers in Education**

### **Aims and Scope**

Research Papers in Education has developed a reputation for publishing significant educational research findings of recent years. Up-to-date and authoritative, the journal has given researchers the opportunity to present full accounts of their work; its rationale, findings and conclusions. Its format now includes shorter papers and review articles. Research Papers in Education is not only a vital source of pertinent information for educational researchers, but also required reading for educational policy-makers and planners.

The journal publishes high quality articles in the fields of educational policy and practice, and research that links the two.

<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?show=aimsScope&journalCode=rred20> accessed on 24.04.16

### **Instructions for Authors**

#### 1. General guidelines

- Manuscripts are accepted in English. British English spelling and punctuation are preferred. Please use single quotation marks, except where 'a quotation is "within" a quotation'. Long quotations of 40 words or more should be indented with quotation marks.
- A typical manuscript will not exceed 5,000 to 10,000 words including tables, references, captions, footnotes and endnotes. Manuscripts that

greatly exceed this will be critically reviewed with respect to length.

Authors should include a word count with their manuscript.

- Manuscripts should be compiled in the following order: title page (including Acknowledgements as well as Funding and grant-awarding bodies); abstract; keywords; main text; acknowledgements; references; appendices (as appropriate); table(s) with caption(s) (on individual pages); figure caption(s) (as a list).
- Abstracts of 200 words are required for all manuscripts submitted.
- Each manuscript should have 4 to 6 keywords.
- Search engine optimization (SEO) is a means of making your article more visible to anyone who might be looking for it. Please consult our guidance here.
- Section headings should be concise.
- All authors of a manuscript should include their full names, affiliations, postal addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses on the cover page of the manuscript. One author should be identified as the corresponding author. Please give the affiliation where the research was conducted. If any of the named co-authors moves affiliation during the peer review process, the new affiliation can be given as a footnote. Please note that no changes to affiliation can be made after the manuscript is accepted. Please note that the email address of the corresponding author will normally be displayed in the article PDF (depending on the journal style) and the online article.
- All persons who have a reasonable claim to authorship must be named in the manuscript as co-authors; the corresponding author must be

authorized by all co-authors to act as an agent on their behalf in all matters pertaining to publication of the manuscript, and the order of names should be agreed by all authors.

- Please supply a short biographical note for each author.
- Please supply all details required by any funding and grant-awarding bodies as an Acknowledgement on the title page of the manuscript, in a separate paragraph, as follows:
  - For single agency grants: "This work was supported by the [Funding Agency] under Grant [number xxxx]."
  - For multiple agency grants: "This work was supported by the [Funding Agency 1] under Grant [number xxxx]; [Funding Agency 2] under Grant [number xxxx]; and [Funding Agency 3] under Grant [number xxxx]."
- Authors must also incorporate a Disclosure Statement which will acknowledge any financial interest or benefit they have arising from the direct applications of their research.
- For all manuscripts non-discriminatory language is mandatory. Sexist or racist terms must not be used.
- Authors must adhere to SI units. Units are not italicised.
- When using a word which is or is asserted to be a proprietary term or trade mark, authors must use the symbol ® or TM.
- Authors must not embed equations or image files within their manuscript

<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?journalCode=rred20&page=instructions#.VxyeSqODGko> accessed on 24.04.16

## 2. Style guidelines

- Font: Times New Roman, 12 point. Use margins of at least 2.5 cm (1 inch).
- Title: Use bold for your article title, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Authors' names: Give the names of all contributing authors on the title page exactly as you wish them to appear in the published article.
- Affiliations: List the affiliation of each author (department, university, city, country).
- Correspondence details: Please provide an institutional email address for the corresponding author.
- Full postal details are also needed by the publisher, but will not necessarily be published.
- Anonymity for peer review: Ensure your identity and that of your co-authors is not revealed in the text of your article or in your manuscript files when submitting the manuscript for review. Advice on anonymizing your manuscript is available [here](#).
- Abstract: Indicate the abstract paragraph with a heading or by reducing the font size. Advice on writing abstracts is available [here](#).
- Keywords: Please provide five or six keywords to help readers find your article. Advice on selecting suitable keywords is available [here](#).
- Headings: Please indicate the level of the section headings in your article:
  - First-level headings (e.g. Introduction, Conclusion) should be in bold, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.



- Second-level headings should be in bold italics, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Third-level headings should be in italics, with an initial capital letter for any proper nouns.
- Fourth-level headings should also be in italics, at the beginning of a paragraph. The text follows immediately after a full stop (full point) or other punctuation mark.
- Tables and figures: Indicate in the text where the tables and figures should appear, for example by inserting [Table 1 near here]. The actual tables and figures should be supplied either at the end of the text or in a separate file as requested by the Editor. Ensure you have permission to use any figures you are reproducing from another source.
- Running heads and received dates are not required when submitting a manuscript for review.
- If your article is accepted for publication, it will be copy-edited and typeset in the correct style for the journal.

[http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/layout/tf\\_quick1-4.pdf](http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/layout/tf_quick1-4.pdf) access on

24.04.16

### 3. Reference guidelines

#### In the text

- Placement
  - Sources are cited in the text, usually in parentheses, by the author's surname, the publication date of the work cited, and a page number if

necessary. Full details are given in the reference list (under the heading References). Place the reference at the appropriate point in the text; normally just before punctuation. If the author's name appears in the text, it is not necessary to repeat it, but the date should follow immediately: Jones and Green (2012) did useful work on this subject. Khan's (2012) research is valuable. If the reference is in parentheses, use square brackets for additional parentheses: (see, e.g., Khan [2012, 89] on this important subject).

- Within the same parenthesis
  - Separate the references with semicolons. The order of the references is flexible, so this can be alphabetical, chronological, or in order of importance, depending on the preference of the author of the article. If citing more than one work by an author, do not repeat the name: (Smith 2010, 2012; Khan 2012) (Smith 2010, 2012, 84; Khan 2012, 54–60) (Smith 2012a, 2012b, 82; Khan 2012, 9)
- Repeat mentions in the same paragraph
  - Place the parenthetical citation after the last reference in the paragraph or at the end of the paragraph before the final full stop (period). If the reference is to a different page, however, put the full citation at the first reference and then include only the page number at the next mention: Text (Smith 2012, 54) ... more text ... “quoted text” (68).
- With a quotation
  - Citation of the source normally follows a quotation, but may be placed before the quotation to allow the date to appear with the

author's name: As Smith (2012, 67) points out, "quoted text." As Smith points out, "quoted text" (2012, 67). After a displayed quotation, the source appears in parentheses after the final punctuation: end of displayed quotation. (Smith 2012, 67)

- Page number or other locator
  - (Smith 2012, 6–10) (Jones 2012, vol. 2)
- One author
  - Smith (2012) or (Smith 2012)
- Two authors
  - Smith and Jones (2012) or (Smith and Jones 2012)
- Three authors
  - Smith, Jones, and Khan (2012) or (Smith, Jones, and Khan 2012)
- Four or more authors
  - Smith et al. (2012) (Smith et al. 2012) If the reference list contains two publications in the same year that would both shorten to the same form (e.g. Smith et al. 2012), cite the surnames of the first author and as many others as necessary to distinguish the two references, followed by comma and et al. (NB: you cannot use et al. unless it stands for two authors or more.). If this would result in more than three names having to be used, cite the first author plus a short title: (Smith et al., "Short Title," 2012) (Smith et al., "Abbreviated Title," 2012)
- Authors with same surname
  - G. Smith 2012 and F. Smith 2008
- No author

- Cite first few words of title (in quotation marks or italics depending on journal style for that type of work), plus the year.
- Groups of authors that would shorten to the same form
  - Cite the surnames of the first author and as many others as necessary to distinguish the two references, followed by comma and et al.
- Organization as author
  - The organization can be listed under its abbreviation so that the text citation is shorter. If this is the case, alphabetize the reference under the abbreviation rather than the full name: In the text: (BSI 2012) In the reference list: BSI (British Standards Institution) 2012. Title ...
- Author with two works in the same year
  - Put a, b, c after the year (Chen 2011a, 2011b)
- Secondary source
  - When it is not possible to see an original document, cite the source of your information on it; do not cite the original assuming that the secondary source is correct. Smith's diary (as quoted in Khan 2012)
- Classical work
  - Classical primary source references are given in the text, not in the reference list.
- Personal communication
  - References to personal communications are cited only in the text: A. Colleague (personal communication, April 12, 2011)
- Unknown date
  - (Author, n.d.) (Author, forthcoming)
- Two dates

- List the original date first, in square brackets: Author ([1890] 1983)
- Multivolume works: (Author 1951–71)

#### Notes

- Endnotes should be kept to a minimum. Any references cited in notes should be included in the reference list.

#### Tables and Figures

- References cited in tables or figure legends should be included in the reference list.

#### References

- Use the heading References. Do not use a 3-em dash to replace author names.
- Order
  - Alphabetically by last name of author. If no author or editor, order by title. Follow Chicago's letter-by-letter system for alphabetizing entries. Names with particles (e.g. de, von, van den) should be alphabetized by the individual's personal preference if known, or traditional usage. A single-author entry precedes a multi-author entry that begins with the same name. Successive entries by two or more authors when only the first author is the same are alphabetized by co-authors' last names. If references have the same author(s), editor(s), etc., arrange by year of publication, with undated works at the end. If the reference list contains two or more items by the same author in the same year, add a, b, etc. and list them alphabetically by title of the work: Green, Mary L. 2012a. Book Title. Green, Mary L. 2012b. Title of Book

- Form of author name
  - Generally, use the form of the author name as it appears on the title page or head of an article, but this can be made consistent within the reference list if it is known that an author has used two different forms (e.g. Mary Louise Green and M. L. Green), to aid correct identification.
- Punctuation
  - Headline-style capitalization is used. In headline style, the first and last words of title and subtitle and all other major words (nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs) are capitalized. For non-English titles, use sentence-style capitalization.

## Book

- One author
  - Smith, John. 2012. Book Title: The Subtitle. Abingdon: Routledge.
  - Smith, J. J. 2012. Book Title. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Two authors
  - Smith, John, and Jane Jones. 2012. Book Title: The Subtitle. Abingdon: Routledge.
  - Smith, J. J., and J. B. Jones. 2012. Book Title: The Subtitle. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Three authors
  - Smith, John, Jane Jones, and Mary Green. 2012. Book Title: The Subtitle. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Four to ten authors
  - Give all authors' names
- More than ten authors

- List the first seven authors followed by et al.
- Organization as author
  - University of Chicago Press. 2012. *The Chicago Manual of Style*. 16th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- No author
  - Begin the bibliography entry with the title, and ignore “the”, “a” or “an” for the purposes of alphabetical order.
- Chapter
  - Chapter in a single-author book: Green, Mary. 2012. “Chapter Title.” Chap. 5 in *Style Manual*. Abingdon: Routledge. Chapter in a multi-author book: Jones, Sam. 2012. “Chapter Title.” In *Book Title*, edited by John Smith, 341–346. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Edited
  - Smith, John, ed. 2012. *Collected Style Manuals*. Abingdon: Routledge. Smith, John, and Jane Jones, eds. 2012. *Collected Style Manuals*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Edition
  - University of Chicago Press. 2012. *The Chicago Manual of Style*. 16th ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reprinted work
  - Maitland, F. W. (1898) 1998. *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*. Reprint, Union, NJ: Lawbook Exchange.
- Multivolume work
  - Green, M. L. 2012. *Collected Correspondence*. Vol. 2 of *The Collected Correspondence of M. L. Green*. Abingdon: Routledge,

2000–. Khan, Lisa. 2009–12. *Collected Works*. 2 vols. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Translated
  - Smith, John. 2012. *Collected Style Manuals*. Translated and edited by Jane Jones. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Not in English
  - If an English translation of the title is needed, it follows this style:  
Piaget, J., and B. Inhelder. 1951. *La genèse de l'idée de hasard chez l'enfant* [The Origin of the Idea of Chance in the Child]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Online
  - If you used an online version, cite the online version, include the URL or DOI: Smith, John. 2012. *Book Title: The Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge. doi:xxxxxxxxxx. Smith, John. 2012. *Book Title: The Subtitle*. Abingdon: Routledge. <http://xxxxxxxxx/>.
- Place of publication
  - Where two cities are given, include the first one only. If the city could be confused with another, add the abbreviation of the state, province, or country: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press Cambridge: Cambridge University Press Oxford: Clarendon Press New York: Macmillan Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press When the publisher's name includes the state name, the abbreviation is not needed: Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press
- Publisher



- Omit initial “the”, and “Inc.”, “Ltd”, “Co.”, “Publishing Co.”, etc

## Journal

- If you used an online version, cite the online version, include a DOI (preferably) or URL.
- One author
  - Smith, John. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 30–40. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx. Smith, J. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 30–40. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx.
- Two authors
  - Smith, John, and Lisa Khan. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 200–210. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx. Smith, J. J., and L. M. Khan. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 200–210. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx.
- Three authors
  - Smith, John, Jane Jones, and Mary Green. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 33–39. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx. Smith, J. J., J. P. Jones, and M. G. Green. 2012. “Article Title: The Subtitle.” Journal Title in Full 10 (1): 33–39. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx.
- Four to ten authors
  - Four to ten authors Give all authors’ names. More than ten authors List the first seven authors followed by et al.
- Translated
  - Khan, Lisa. 2012. “Article Title in English.” [In Hindi.] Journal Title in Full 10 (3): 10–29. doi:xxxxxxxxxxxx.
- Not in English

- Capitalize sentence-style, but according to the conventions of the relevant language.
- Other article types
  - Smith, John. 2012. "Title of Book Review." Review of Book Title, by Lisa Khan. *Journal Title in Full* 10 (1): 33–39. doi:xxxxxxxxxxx.
- Issue numbers
  - The issue number can be omitted if the journal is paginated consecutively through the volume (or if month or season is included), but it is not incorrect to include it. When volume and issue number alone are used, the issue number is within parentheses. If only an issue number is used, it is not within parentheses: *Journal Title*, no. 25: 63–69. If using month, abbreviate as Jan., Feb., etc. If using season, spell out in full.
- Online first publication
  - Use year of online publication and include 'Advance online publication'. Remove any version type, eg Rapid online or epub, e.g.: Yoon, Ee-Seul. 2015. "Young people's cartographies of school choice: the urban imaginary and moral panic." *Children's Geographies*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/14733285.2015.1026875. If you can update the reference to include published volume and issue numbers before publication, please do so

#### Conference

- Proceedings

- Individual contributions to conference proceedings are treated like chapters in multi-author books. If published in a journal, treat as an article.
- Paper
  - Smith, John. 2012. “Title of Paper.” Paper presented at the annual meeting for the Society of XXXX, Oxford, November 21–24.
- Poster
  - Smith, John. 2012. “Title of Poster.” Poster presented at the annual meeting for the Society of XXXX, Oxford, November 21–24.

#### Thesis

- Smith, John. 2008. “Title of Thesis.” PhD diss., University of Chicago.

#### Unpublished work

- Book or journal article
  - Use Forthcoming instead of the date. If an article is not yet accepted, treat as a thesis.

#### Internet

- Internet Website
  - In text only: (“As of July 19, 2012, the BBC listed on its website . . .”).
- Document
  - Reference depending on the type of document. Access dates are not required unless no date of publication or revision can be found. Where date of publication is given access dates are not required, but should be retained when supplied by the author, e.g.: Dorling, Danny. 2013. “Are today’s second-year students the unluckiest cohort ever?”

The Guardian, October 28.

[http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/oct/28/dannydorling-](http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/oct/28/dannydorling-letter-to-students)

letter-to-students OR Dorling, Danny. 2013. "Are today's second-year students the unluckiest cohort ever?" The Guardian, October 28.

Accessed 13 April 2015.

[http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/oct/28/dannydorling-](http://www.theguardian.com/education/2013/oct/28/dannydorling-letter-to-students)

letter-to-students If citing an undated online document, give an access date and use the year of access as year of publication: Oxford Library.

2012. "Library Strategy." Oxford Library. Accessed June 3 2012.

<http://www.ol.org/library/strategy.html>

- Electronic mailing list
  - In text only (name of list, date of posting, URL).
- Blog
  - In text only.
- Multimedia
  - Include date that material was accessed if no original date can be determined. Include information about original performance or source, e.g. of a speech or performance. Include indication of source type.

#### Newspaper or magazine

- Newspapers and magazines are cited in the text, and no entry is needed in the bibliography: "quotation from newspaper" (Sunday Times, April 8, 2012) ... as noted in a Guardian article on February 27, 2012 ... If a reference is needed or preferred, use this style: Author. 2012. "Article Title." Sunday

Times, April 8. <http://xxxxxxxxxxxxxx>. (If no author is identified, begin the citation with the article title.)

#### Report

- Treat pamphlets, reports, brochures and freestanding publications such as exhibition catalogues as books. Give sufficient information to identify the document.

#### Personal communication

- Letter, telephone conversation, or email
  - Place references to personal communications such as letters and conversations within the running text, not as formal end references:  
... as mentioned in a letter to me from Joe Grant, March 4, 2003 ...  
Letters in published collections are cited by date of the collection, with individual correspondence dates given in the text: In a letter to Mary Louise Green from Cambridge, June 24, 2010 (Green 2012, 34), ...

#### Other reference types

- Patent
  - Green, Ann. 2000. Patent description. US Patent 12345, filed March 23.
- Audio and visual media
  - Bernstein, Leonard, dir. Symphony no. 5, by Dmitri Shostakovich. New York Philharmonic. CBS IM 35854. Auden, W. H. Poems. Read by the author. Spoken Arts 7137. Compact disc. Cleese, John, Terry Gilliam, Eric Idle, Terry Jones, and Michael Palin. 2001. "Commentaries." Disc 2. Monty Python and the Holy Grail, special

ed. DVD. Directed by Terry Gilliam and Terry Jones. Culver City,  
CA: Columbia Tristar Home Entertainment. Database Name of

- Database
  - Name of Database (details; accessed Month Day,  
Year).<http://xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx/>.

[http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/reference/tf\\_ChicagoAD.pdf](http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/authors/style/reference/tf_ChicagoAD.pdf) accessed  
on 24.04.16

## **Appendix 2: Author guidelines for Action Research**

### **Aims and Scope**

Action Research is a new international, interdisciplinary, refereed journal which is a forum for the development of the theory and practice of action research.

Our purpose with this international, peer reviewed journal is to offer a forum for participative, action oriented inquiry into questions that matter – questions relevant to people in the conduct of their lives, that enable them to flourish in their organizations and communities, and that evince a deep concern for the wider ecology.

The aim of the journal is to offer a viable alternative to dominant 'disinterested' models of social science, one that is relevant to people in the conduct of their lives, their organizations and their communities. The journal publishes quality articles on accounts of action research projects, explorations in the philosophy and methodology of action research, and considerations of the nature of quality in action research practice.

Action Research is essential reading for both academics and professionals engaged within the fields and disciplines of:

- Healthcare
- Education
- Development
- Management
- Social Work
- The Arts
- Gender and Race

<https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal/action-research#aims-and-scope> accessed on 24.04.16

## **Instructions for Authors**

### Authorship

- All parties who have made a substantive contribution to the article should be listed as authors. Principal authorship, authorship order, and other publication credits should be based on the relative scientific or professional contributions of the individuals involved, regardless of their status. A student is usually listed as principal author on any multiple-authored publication that substantially derives from the student's dissertation or thesis.

### Article types

- The journal publishes quality articles on accounts of action research projects, explorations in the philosophy and methodology of action research, and considerations of the nature of quality in action research practice.
- All papers submitted ought to link theory and practice, in whatever way the author deems appropriate. It is assumed that the author, in seeking to share their work more broadly will consider the issue of how their contribution builds upon and advances the theory and practice of action research. In most cases we prefer to see theoretical and practical insights intertwined.
- The journal will include:
  - A strong editorial comment column
  - An Open Forum for readers to initiate and sustain debate (see also the Action Research Community blog: <http://arj-journal.blogspot.com/>)



- Peer reviewed articles that contribute to the practice, theory and method of action research
- Articles should be between 5,000 and 7,000 words inclusive.

#### Acknowledgements

- All contributors who do not meet the criteria for authorship should be listed in an Acknowledgements section. Examples of those who might be acknowledged include a person who provided purely technical help, or a department chair who provided only general support. Please supply any personal acknowledgements separately to the main text to facilitate anonymous peer review.

#### Funding Acknowledgement

- requires all authors to acknowledge their funding in a consistent fashion under a separate heading. Please visit the Funding Acknowledgements page on the SAGE Journal Author Gateway to confirm the format of the acknowledgment text in the event of funding, or state that: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

#### Manuscript style

- All submissions should be made online at the Action Research SAGE Track website.
- Please ensure that you submit editable/source files only (Microsoft Word or RTF) and that your document does not include page numbers; the Action Research SAGE Track system will generate them for you, and then automatically convert your manuscript to PDF for peer review.

#### Journal Style

- Action Research conforms to the SAGE house style. Click here to review guidelines on the SAGE UK House Style (see [http://studysites.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/SAGE\\_UK\\_style\\_guide\\_short.pdf](http://studysites.uk.sagepub.com/repository/binaries/pdf/SAGE_UK_style_guide_short.pdf))

#### Reference Style

- Action Research adheres to the APA reference style.

#### Manuscript Preparation

- The text should be double-spaced throughout and with a minimum of 3cm for left and right hand margins and 5cm at head and foot. Text should be standard 10 or 12 point.

#### Your Title, Keywords and Abstracts: Helping readers find your article online

- The title, keywords and abstract are key to ensuring readers find your article online through online search engines such as Google. Please refer to the information and guidance on how best to title your article, write your abstract and select your keywords by visiting SAGE's Journal Author Gateway

Guidelines on How to Help Readers Find Your Article Online.

<https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/journal/action-research#submission-guidelines>

accessed on 24.04.16

#### **Quality Criteria for Action Research Journal**

The following seven criteria are the product of ARJ associate editor board members' 'collogue' on what constitutes 'quality in action research.' They represent the criteria upon which there was the highest degree of consensus. Our objective in making these criteria explicit is to be transparent about the qualities that are critical to us as a

board of associate editors in evaluating papers. We regard this articulation as a living document that will be reviewed annually. We therefore intend to track the use and usefulness of the criteria for ourselves and our stakeholders. The criteria will replace the set in current use on manuscript central. A much more detailed document about the colloque is available here, along with the ARJ submission guidelines, available here.

Intended Audience: authors and reviewers

#### 1. Articulation of objectives

- The extent to which the authors explicitly address the objectives they believe relevant to their work and the choices they have made in meeting those.

#### 2. Partnership and participation

- The extent to and means by which the paper reflects or enacts participative values and concern for the relational component of research. By the extent of participation we are referring to a continuum from consultation with stakeholders to stakeholders as full co-researchers.

#### 3. Contribution to action research theory/practice

- The extent to which the paper builds on (creates explicit links with) or contributes to a wider body of practice knowledge and or theory, that contributes to the action research literature.

#### 4. Methods and process

- The extent to which the action research process and related methods are clearly articulated and illustrated. By illustrated we mean that empirical papers “show” and not just “tell” about process and outcomes by including analysis of data that includes the voices of participants in the research.

#### 5. Actionability

- The extent to which the paper provides new ideas that guide action in response to need.

#### 6. Reflexivity.

- The extent to which self location as a change agent is acknowledged by the authors. By self location we mean that authors take a personal, involved and self-critical stance as reflected in clarity about their role in the action research process, clarity about the context in which the research takes place, and clarity about what led to their involvement in this research.

#### 7. Significance

- The extent to which the insights in the manuscript are significant in content and process. By significant we mean having meaning and relevance beyond their immediate context in support of the flourishing of persons, communities, and the wider ecology.

[http://arj.sagepub.com/site/author\\_resources/ARJ\\_Quality\\_Criteria.pdf](http://arj.sagepub.com/site/author_resources/ARJ_Quality_Criteria.pdf) accessed on

24.04.16

## Appendix 3: Participant information sheet



The University  
of Manchester

### ***Co-operative inquiry in the development of person-centred practice by educational professionals working with Special Educational Needs*** **Participant Information Sheet**

You are being invited to take part in a research study as part of student research on the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Please ask if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part. Thank you for reading this.

#### **Who will conduct the research?**

Jo Greenwood  
School of Environment, Education and Development  
The University of Manchester  
Oxford Road  
Manchester  
M13 9PL

#### **Title of the Research**

Co-operative inquiry in the development of person-centred practice by educational professionals working with Special Educational Needs.

#### **What is the aim of the research?**

This piece of research aims to explore how a group of educational professionals who work with Special Educational Needs are understanding person-centred ways of working and how they see it is being put into practice within their school. I also hope to explore how the role of collaborative processes might facilitate a better understanding of person-centred practice and its implementation.

#### **Why have I been chosen?**

Discussions with the school SENCO about person-centred practice, particularly in light of the advocacy of the use of Person Centred Planning (PCP) within Education, Health and Care (EHC) Plans, brought up the need to raise awareness around person-centred ways of working and its conceptualisation amongst staff.

**What would I be asked to do if I took part?**

My hope is that the group will engage in four 1 hour sessions and a 30 minute concluding session, where the group would begin by exploring the question, 'how are we understanding the theory of and putting into practice person-centred ways of working within our school?'. The sessions (these will be audio recorded and transcribed) would take the form of co-operative inquiry; whereby the group would explore the question together, sharing experiences, representing their ideas visually (perhaps through mind-mapping exercises). At the end of the first session, the group would then agree some actions to engage in between sessions, in order to further their understanding of person-centred practice and its application. For example, this could take the form of personal reflections, conversations with others involved in person-centred practice or research into the theory behind it.

**What happens to the data collected?**

The data will be used within the write up of a thesis as part assessment towards the Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology.

**How is confidentiality maintained?**

I will maintain confidentiality by anonymising all names and places within the piece of work. No-one other than the researcher will listen to the audio recordings without your explicit permission. All recordings and transcriptions will be kept securely in a locked filing cabinet or on an encrypted data stick. The audio recording of your interview will be destroyed on completion of the researcher's doctorate course in September 2016.

**What happens if I do not want to take part or if I change my mind?**

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.

**Will I be paid for participating in the research?**

There will be no payment for participating in this research.

**What is the duration of the research?**

5 x 1hr sessions  
1 x 30 minute ending session

**Where will the research be conducted?**

Castlebrook High School, Parr Ln, Bury, Lancashire BL9 8LP

**Will the outcomes of the research be published?**

The research will be written up into a thesis that will be assessed as part of the researcher's Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology. At present there are no plans to publish this research in a scientific journal, however should this situation change your permission will be sought to use the data from your interview for this purpose.

### **Contact for further information**

If you have any questions about this research the researcher and supervisor of the project can be contacted for further discussion on any aspect of this study.

#### **Jo Greenwood** (researcher):

Address: Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology, School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED), School of Education, Ellen Wilkinson Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL .

Email: [joanne.greenwood@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk](mailto:joanne.greenwood@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk)

Telephone: 0161 275 3511 or 3460 (Please leave a message with Jackie Chisnall - Programme Secretary)

#### **Catherine Kelly** (supervisor):

Address: Address: Doctorate in Educational and Child Psychology, School of Environment, Education and Development (SEED), School of Education, Ellen Wilkinson Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, UK, M13 9PL .

Email: [Catherine.Kelly@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:Catherine.Kelly@manchester.ac.uk)

Telephone: 0161 275 3511 or 3460 (Please leave a message with Jackie Chisnall - Programme Secretary).

### **What if something goes wrong?**

If there are any issues regarding this research that you would prefer not to discuss with members of the research team, please contact the Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator by either writing to 'The Research Practice and Governance Co-ordinator, Research Office, Christie Building, The University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL', by emailing: [Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:Research-Governance@manchester.ac.uk), or by telephoning 0161 275 7583 or 275 8093.

***Co-operative inquiry in the development of person-centred practice***

**CONSENT FORM**

If you are happy to participate please complete and sign the consent form below

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I confirm that I have read the attached information sheet on the above study and have had the opportunity to consider the information and ask questions and had these answered satisfactorily.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Please<br/>Initial<br/>Box</b></p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto;"></div> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I understand that my participation in the study is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason.</li> </ul>   | <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I understand that the sessions will be audio-recorded and transcribed</li> </ul>  | <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>  |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree to the use of anonymous quotes</li> </ul>   | <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 60px; height: 60px; margin: 0 auto;"></div>  |

I agree to take part in the above project

Name of participant	Date	Signature
Name of person taking consent	Date	Signature



## Appendix 5: Ethical approval confirmation

---

### **FW: Ethics Approval Application - CONFIRMATION for Medium Risk**

1 message

---

**Ethics Education** <ethics.education@manchester.ac.uk>

18 November 2014 at 13:06

To: Joanne Greenwood <joanne.greenwood@postgrad.manchester.ac.uk>

Cc: Deborah Kubiena <debbie.kubiena@manchester.ac.uk>, Catherine Kelly <Catherine.Kelly@manchester.ac.uk>

**Dear Joanne**

**Project Title:** Co-operative inquiry in the development of person-centred practice by educational professionals working with Special Educational Needs

I am pleased to confirm that your ethics application has now been approved by the School Research Integrity Committee (RIC) against a pre-approved UREC template.

If anything untoward happens during your research then please ensure you make your supervisor aware who can then raise it with the RIC on your behalf

**This approval is confirmation only for the Ethical Approval application.**

Regards

Georgia Irving