STEPHEN KEMMIS

# 12. REFLECTIONS ON HOW THE THEORY OF PRACTICE ARCHITECTURES IS BEING USED IN THE NORDIC CONTEXT

In these reflections, I make some brief comments about how the theory of practice architectures has been used in this volume, and then take up two specific issues. The first concerns the European notion of *Bildung* and its relationship to the English notion of education; the second concerns the nature of the relationship between 'teachers' and 'researchers' in Nordic action research, study circles, and research circles described in Chapters Three, Four, Five and Six.

## PRACTICE ARCHITECTURES OF ACTION RESEARCH, STUDY CIRCLES AND RESEARCH CIRCLES

In Chapter Four, Salo and Rönnerman (2014) deploy the theory of practice architectures to show how particular Nordic practices of study circles and research circles, and of educational action research, have been prefigured by particular histories and particular Nordic traditions. Study and research circles and action research initiatives are widespread in the Nordic countries. They have roots in practices developed for the civic formation of citizens (and nations) in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, educational practices found in the workers' movement at the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, from adult and popular education programs organised in support of policy and civic formation in the welfare state in the mid-twentieth century, and from industrial renewal programs in the mid-twentieth century. Through the specific but interconnected histories of the Nordic countries, these practices were informed by a broadly shared complex philosophical and educational tradition: the tradition of *Bildung*. The complex notion of *Bildung* concerns the simultaneous formation of each person as an active participant in the social life of a community and wider society, each citizen as an active participant in the political life of local government and the nation-state, and, especially in the second half of the twentieth century, each worker as a contributor to enhanced forms of industrial, professional and economic life and organisation through which the different Nordic people, communities and societies could prosper.

In Chapter Four, Salo and Rönnerman (2014) use the theory of practice architectures to describe how the Nordic discourse of action research and study and research circles provides cultural-discursive arrangements that prefigure but do not

determine the way participants think and talk about action research and study and research circles in contemporary times; ideas about processes of democratic will-formation that draw on the experiences of individual citizens, for example. They show how activity-structures familiar from the Nordic tradition of action research provide material-economic arrangements that prefigure but do not determine the activities of contemporary action research and research and study circles; for example, the patterns of meeting in small groups, perhaps weekly, over some months (or longer). And they show how these Nordic traditions create social-political arrangements intended to model democratic social relationships that have prefigured (but do not determine) the relationships to be found in contemporary cases of action research, study circles and research circles (like the relationships between teachers in schools and preschools, on the one hand, and researchers from universities, on the other).

In Chapter Five, Langelotz and Rönnerman (2014) describe the practice architectures of the practice of Peer Group Mentoring (PGM) adopted by a teacher team in a formerly rather monoculturally Swedish inner city school whose members wanted to become more responsive to the needs of students from non-Swedish speaking language backgrounds. They show how the practice architectures of the nine-step model of PGM adopted in the school bore traces of the Nordic practice tradition of study circles described by Salo and Rönnerman (2014) in Chapter Four. In terms of the cultural-discursive arrangements that enable and constrain the practice of PGM in the team, Langelotz and Rönnerman (2014) show, for example, how the discourse describing and justifying the nine-step model of PGM bears traces of the "democratic" ideal of study circles, and how the knowledge developed by participants in the PGM sessions is discursively constructed collectively from participants' own language and experience. They show how the material-economic arrangements of PGM adopted by the team included such things as "the round" in which all participants took successive turns to speak (or to "stand aside" when it was their turn to speak), also similar to the process adopted in study circles. And they showed how the generally democratic social-political social relations of the study circle also governed the social relationships of PGM in the team, with everyone having a turn to speak and be heard, and the role of moderator being shared by members of the group and not vested in a single leader (although the role of scribe or secretary to the group was always fulfilled by the university researcher attending the group) – although interviews with participants also revealed that this democratic ideal was not always attained in the day-to-day practice of the teaching team, which, as is the case in many human groups, was mildly distorted by tensions and conflicts that lay beneath the smooth surface of the team's everyday operations. Participants also reported that the democratic ideal of the group had been strained by the principal who had pushed the team to adopt the practice of PGM; it might have been more democratic, they thought, if they had been free to choose to participate entirely voluntarily.

Using the theory of practice architectures, Langelotz and Rönnerman (2014) also used the theory of practice architectures to describe the changed historical conditions in which this inner-city school found itself, and that led teachers to the view that

their established ways of teaching needed to change to meet the needs of a changed student population: students from non-Swedish speaking backgrounds who were now coming to the school under a government policy of free school choice. The influx of these students had also caused some Swedish-speaking background students to leave the school, exercising their free choice to go to nearby independent schools. These were the conditions under which the teachers in the school came to the view that they needed to learn how to teach more responsively to students from diverse backgrounds. Langelotz and Rönnerman (2014) show that the global migration of refugees, together with the policy of free choice of schools for students and their families, had change the language and culture of the student population of the school so that, in terms of cultural-discursive formation of teachers' practices, they now had to respond to the more diverse language backgrounds of students. The influx of this new student population also, of course, changed the material-economic arrangements that had formerly characterised the school (for example, where the students came from), and the kinds of social-political arrangements that had formerly characterised relationships between students and teachers in the school (previously more monocultural). The influx of migrant students seems also to have precipitated a 'migration' to nearby independent schools of some of the Swedish-background students who had previously been the majority in the school. As Langelotz and Rönnerman show, this flight of Swedish students caused a decline in enrolments at the school, which in turn led to teacher redundancies – a stark reminder of the material-economic costs and consequences of the policy of school choice supported by vouchers ("school money"). The voucher system enabled migrant students from the suburbs to come to the inner-city school; and it also enabled some Swedish-background students to 'migrate' to nearby independent schools. One cultural-discursive consequence that followed from the changed material-economic circumstances of the school was that some teachers began to describe students with greater learning needs as "expensive students" – hoping that the principal would refuse to accept more of these students.

Langelotz and Rönnerman concluded:

> when material-economic arrangements became a reality in the form of declining numbers of students entering the school, and in teacher redundancies, the teachers began to discuss how to exclude these "expensive" students rather than how to include them by increasing their (the teachers') pedagogical knowledge. The tradition of folkbildning is built on an idea(l) of democracy and a pedagogy which highly values inclusiveness [ ... ] when pushed by economic cutbacks, these values were questioned and challenged during the PGM sessions. In other words, democratic practice depends deeply on the existence of the kinds of material-economic arrangements that make democracy possible. (p. 91)

> … In particular, this study shows that regarding schools as competing in a market place, and thus viewing students as customers and costs, poses a threat to inclusive and democratic education. (p. 91)

In the next chapter, Chapter Six, Rönnerman and Olin (2014) analyse research circles in which university researchers facilitate sessions in which preschool teachers and leaders think about their own facilitation of their peers' learning (for example, in local action research projects in their preschools). They also analyse the kinds of cultural-discursive, material-economic and social-political arrangements that together formed the practice architectures that prefigured the work of this particular research circle, and the processes of facilitation that the teachers explored and developed through the research circle.

Rönnerman and Olin described the practice architectures of the research circles each facilitated. Among the cultural-discursive arrangements that enabled and constrained the practices of participants in the research circle was the imperative that teachers learn from their own and others' experiences, shared in the group as a basis for collaborative knowledge production. Among the material-economic arrangements was the provision of funding for time release for participants to attend the research circles: in some cases, participants dropped out because they could not get funding to be released from their work in the preschools. Among the social-political arrangements enabling and constraining the practices of the participants in these research circles was a legal requirement that the quality of each preschool and its work be monitored within each preschool. This prompted the formation of action research initiatives in the preschools as a way to assure quality.

In Chapter Seven, Forsman, Kahlberg-Granlund, Pörn, Salo and Aspfors (2014) describe a variety of forms of continuing professional development initiatives in Finland. They deftly use the theory of practice architectures to show how various different kinds of practices of professional development were enabled and constrained by arrangements present in or brought to the sites in which they occurred. They also show the emergence, over recent decades, of distinctive initiatives of site based education development from earlier initiatives of local school development, which themselves emerged from still earlier initiatives of (skills-oriented) in-service education aimed at the implementation of central government initiatives. In particular, they explore how

> the fundamental challenges of collaborative site based education development are realized and expressed in the interaction and collaboration, between the different institutional traditions and practice architectures of schools and universitiesinvolved. (p. 124)

In their concluding remarks, the authors of Chapter Seven (Forsman et.al., 2014) describe the principal challenge they confronted:

> The challenge we have confronted … is three-folded, and related to the three arrangements of practice architectures. *Firstly,* the material-economic arrangements for educational development on site cannot be taken as given, they have to be negotiated and maintained. *Secondly,* site based educational

development opens up a space for collegial professional meaning making and identity expression. This space (the cultural-discursive arrangements) has to be safeguarded. *Thirdly*, the transition from transmission to participation is anchored and dynamically dependent on the social-political arrangements, to (p. 127). be continuously reinterpreted and yet understood.

To conclude: these chapters – Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven – have explored Nordic traditions in action research, study circles, research circles, and professional development using the theory of practice architectures. As one of the authors who developed the theory (Kemmis and Grootenboer, 2008; Kemmis, Wilkinson, Edwards-Groves, Hardy, Grootenboer and Bristol, 2014), I feel honoured and privileged by the attention the theory has been given in these pages. I also feel as a participant in the international *Pedagogy, Education and Praxis* research network (involving universities in Australia, Finland, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom) that this volume is an exemplary outcome of the *Action Research and Practice Theory* collaborative research program initiated in our research network-meeting year 2011. The present volume speaks clearly and firmly about how action research, research circles and study circles have taken a distinctive shape in the Nordic countries in the light of Nordic traditions that are among the historically given practice architectures that shaped and continue to shape the conduct of action research, study circles, research circles and professional development initiatives described in this volume. Not only is this volume a significant contribution to the international literature of action research, it is also a significant contribution to the growing literature of educational and social research using contemporary practice theory to explore educational and other social practices – including the theory of practice architectures.

## *BILDUNG* AND EDUCATION

In this and the next section, I reflect on two issues that emerged in my reading of Chapters Four, Five, Six and Seven of *Lost in Practice*: the issue of how the European notion of *Bildung* is understood in relation to the notion of 'education' in the English-speaking world, and some questions about the relationships between 'teachers' and 'researchers' in action research in the Nordic tradition of action research. First, then, is the issue of *Bildung* and education.

In Chapter Four, Salo and Rönnerman (2014) distinguish *Bildung* from *education*, calling the latter "an instrumental and institutionalized form of professional action" (p.2). In a footnote to this sentence, they say that, "from an Anglo-Saxon perspective", I (Kemmis, 2012) make the same distinction using the terms *education* and *schooling*. It might have been kinder to readers to have handled this distinction in another way – and, one might say, less Eurocentrically. The confusion over these terms, in which *Bildung* appears on the 'high side' of Nordic usage with 'education' on the 'low' side, while, in Anglophone usage, 'education' appears on the 'high' side with 'schooling' on the 'low' side, preserves the confusion which has

led some people in the northern European and Anglophone intellectual traditions to misperceive and misunderstand one another for many years. On the Nordic usage that Salo and Rönnerman adopt, *Bildung* is the 'high' term, connected over the history of the European Pedagogical tradition to ideas of civilisation, cultivation and "growing as a human being" (Salo and Rönnerman, 2014 p. 54). Siljander, Kivelä and Sutinen (2012), in their comparative study of the Pedagogical tradition in Europe and the Anglophone Educational Philosophy and Theory tradition, make Dewey´s (1955) notion of growth the Anglophone parallel to Bildung. In his (1979) Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature, American philosopher Richard Rorty renders *Bildung* (which he approaches through Gadamer's *Truth and Method*, 1975) as 'edification'. Rorty dismisses the word 'education' as "too flat" (p.360) to adequately render *Bildung* in English, and thus prefers 'edification'. This may be because Rorty has followed Gadamer's appropriation of *Bildung* (which follows Hegel and Heidegger), and is at odds with other critical views of *Bildung* from the latter part of the twentieth century (for example, Klafki, 1975, p.45, who describes *Bildung* in terms of the "reciprocal interrelationship of world and individual"). While I am far from a specialist in the history of *Bildung*, my reading suggests that the notion of *Bildung* always implies a self in a continuing process of forming and more deeply understanding itself in relation to a world (and history) that the self also more deeply understands. I think it is also correct to say that the 'high' meaning of 'education' in the Anglophone intellectual tradition of educational philosophy and theory similarly implies this nexus of a self-forming and more deeply understanding self in relation to the world.

An English speaker can forgive Salo and Rönnerman for preserving this regrettable confusion. We English speakers constantly abuse the word 'education' when we use it in the 'low' sense to mean nothing more than 'schooling', and we too infrequently elaborate or defend the 'high' meaning of education. Indeed, there may not be many educators who are willing to hazard a definition of education these days – in the same way that few Nordic or Germanic educators feel they can adequately encompass the history of the concept of *Bildung* in a single sentence. By contrast, Kemmis, et al. (2014, p.26) offer this definition of education in the 'high' sense:

> … education, properly speaking, is the process by which children, young people and adults are initiated into forms of understanding, modes of action, and ways of relating to one another and the world, that foster (respectively) individual and collective self-expression, individual and collective self-development, and individual and collective self-determination, and that are, in these senses, oriented towards the good for each person and the good for humankind.

It is clear that Kemmis *et al.* also mean that children, young people and adults can initiate themselves into these things, and do so in ways that aim at the good for each person and the good for humankind.

Perhaps I have laboured this point enough, but my wish is that, in their construction of the contrast between *Bildung* and the "instrumental and institutionalized form of

professional action" (p. 54) that they abjure, Salo and Rönnerman had placed *Bildung* and *schooling* as the opposed terms rather than *Bildung* and *education*. In choosing the latter, they preserve the confusion that bedevils mutual understanding between European and Anglophone intellectual traditions in our field, and unnecessarily belittles the Anglophone tradition of educational philosophy and theory of which John Dewey is the paradigmatic representative.

## TEACHERS AND RESEARCHERS

In this section, I explore ambiguities about teachers and researchers that appear in some chapters of this volume. In Chapter Four (p. 57) for example, Salo and Rönnerman (2014) say:

> Study circles are used to construct an arena in which teachers and the researchers can come together, in order to develop an understanding of the practices they are a part of…

Later (p. 64) discussing action research, Salo and Rönnerman quote Lendahls Rosendahl & Rönnerman (2000), who refer to "the tensions and dilemmas between researchers' aims and participants' needs".

Similarly, in Chapter Six, discussing research circles, Rönnerman and Olin (2014) say "Two groups of preschool teachers met during a year in a research circle together with a researcher…" (p. 96) They also make a firm distinction between 'teachers' and 'researchers' from the university (p. 97):

> … Holmstrand and Härnsten (2003, p. 21) point out that in all research circles the participants' knowledge and experiences, the researchers' knowledge about the identified problem, the researchers' competence as researchers (systematic knowledge), and other researchers' knowledge that might throw light on the problem are [all] of importance. The overall aim of a research circle is to contribute to democratization through a model of co-operation between researchers and practitioners acting for a mutual transmission of knowledge.

Again, in Chapter Seven, Forsman et al. (2014) discuss the relationship between these parties in similar terms, as, for example, when they say in the introduction to the chapter (p. 113).

> …we discuss PD from the viewpoint of the cooperation and confrontation between ourselves as researchers with teachers as practitioners, and from the viewpoint of being in the complex role of the researcher as facilitator.

A little later in the chapter (p. 122) the authors describe the tasks of the university researcher in one of the four initiatives they examined (the tasks of the researchers seem similar in at least two of the other cases as well):

> The researcher's role in the network meetings was to act as initiator and facilitator; organizing the meetings, initiating discussions, listening and

reflecting upon experiences and providing feedback on the ongoing work.

The authors of Chapter Seven "focus … on the challenges [they], acting in the professional role of the researcher, have been confronted with on site" (p. 119). In this formulation, the role of the university facilitator of action research in schools has crystallised out as a distinctive "professional" role. It is not clear from the chapter what makes this role 'professional', but the term suggests that the researchers have 'professionalised' relationships with the teachers and principals they work with in schools, characterised by behaving in a disinterested way with the teachers they encounter in the professional development initiatives, and by bringing scientific knowledge to the teacher groups – knowledge grounded in their professional authority as university researchers. Considering the way in which they worked in the four different professional development initiatives, the authors of Chapter Seven remark that

> … the collaborative manner of realizing professional development seems to give rise to very similar ways of "professional behaving and acting", due to the practice architectures of educational sites (p. 124).

In short, it seems that pedagogues who come to professional development initiatives as university 'researchers' behaved towards the teachers and principals they encountered in both teacher-ly and 'researcher-ly' ways. This suggests that the more symmetrical democratic relationships sought in the Nordic traditions of action research, research circles and study circles may not have been secured in the 'researcher'-'teacher' element of the social relationships of professional development in these cases.

In the cases described in Chapters Four, Six and Seven, this way of describing the relationship – between 'teachers' and 'researchers' – draws attention to an enduing issue in the literature of action research, namely, the relationship between *participants* in a setting (for example, various stakeholders in the work of a factory, an organisation or an industry, or teachers and others in a school) and a *researcher* who comes to the setting, often from a university, to facilitate action research initiatives. This way of describing the roles of the people present unmistakeably implies that 'teachers' (or 'participants' more generally) and 'researchers' are two different species of human beings. Coming from universities to participate with teachers in such meetings, perhaps the authors of these chapters here reveal something taken-for-granted about their own experience as participants in research circles and action research; I fear, however, that, in the Nordic literature of action research, the distinction has become embedded as a particular kind of social division of labour.

This presupposition appears in the work of Nordic action research theorists like the historically important researchers into working life Sandberg, Broms, Grip, Sundström, Steen, & Ullmark (1992) and Gustavsen (2001), as well as in such works as Flyvbjerg (2001). In an article 'Research for praxis' (2010), I critiqued

this presupposition, aiming to undermine the distinction between, on the one hand, *researchers* who come from institutions *external* to the settings in which the action and the research are carried out, and, on the other, the *teachers* in schools (and other participants in other organisational and community settings) who are *internal* to – the ordinary inhabitants of – those settings. For many years (see, for example, Carr and Kemmis, 1986), I have argued, in company with many others (for example, Stephen Corey, 1953; Lawrence Stenhouse, 1975; John Elliott, 1976; Susan Noffke, 1992; Bridget Somekh, 2006; Wilfred Carr, 2006, 2007) that teachers can be, and very often are researchers into their own practice. On this view, teachers are not a different species from external educational researchers; rather, they form one subspecies of the species 'researcher', like participant researchers in many other occupations and settings.

I do not believe that the authors of Chapters Four, Six and Seven are deliberately making a point of separating teachers and researchers in the sentences I have quoted. They say that study circles and research circles are (or are intended to be) democratically organised and participatory and collaborative, and that people are engaged in collaborative knowledge building in such circles. If this is so, surely they *do not* mean that a researcher *only* sits at the centre of a study or research circles facilitating or orchestrating knowledge building by everyone else in the circle – though a reader is entitled to see this role distinction as almost indelible. In Chapter Five, by contrast, Langelotz and Rönnerman (2014) recognise that the relationship between teachers and a university researcher in research study circles, as distinct from study circles, can be asymmetrical rather than a symmetrical relationship between equals. They problematise the relationship in these terms (p. 81)

> According to Rönnerman *et al*. (2008, pp. 23–24) for example, the source of knowledge in study circles is the participants themselves, and the process of the study circle always employs methods for sharing participants' experiences. Furthermore, the concept of truth that underpins study circles is not mainly based on the authority of science, but on every human's experience. The development of the individual is not the main focus; the development and increased capacity of the group is seen as the most important (Rönnerman *et al.*, 2008). Sometimes study circles are organized in association with universities. A slight shift in the epistemological approach can be distinguished when the circle leader is a lecturer from the university; under these circumstances, the study leader may become an 'expert' rather than one of the participants. This modified form of study circle is described as a 'research circle'.

In Chapter Six, Rönnerman and Olin describe the researcher as being "in the role of leader of the research circle" (p. 98) It is clear from the case presented in Chapter Five that the researchers from the university were leaders and organisers as well as facilitators of group discussion in the research circles. Perhaps in this case they were

located at the centre of the circle while the teachers (who were facilitators of teams elsewhere but not in this research circle) were arrayed around the circumference of the circle. The relationship appears very like a relationship between researcher-as-teacher in the group (bringing 'scientific' knowledge to the group in the form of academic articles, and facilitating the sessions) and the preschool teachers as adult learners sharing their experiences of facilitation in the other settings where they served as the facilitators.

Despite the words that mark the distinction between 'researchers' and 'teachers', the authors of Chapters Four, Six and Seven no doubt also mean that the 'researcher', like the teachers, is a beneficiary of the collective knowledge building in these settings, and also that other participants in study and research circles are or can be researchers of some kind. But, if their words elsewhere in those chapters imply that teachers also are or can be researchers, it seems a misstep to divide the world into 'teachers' and 'researchers' (from the university) in the ways they have, casting teachers and researchers as members of different species.

In two articles, 'Research for praxis' (2010) and 'Researching educational praxis' (2012), I systematically argue that many teachers (and many participants in other community and organisational settings) can be, are, and have for a long time actually been highly effective researchers into their own practices, their own understandings, and their own situations. Those articles also argue that teachers (and participants in other settings) have privileged access to, involvement in, and capacities for the formation and transformation of their own understandings, practices and situations – access, engagement and capacities that outsiders do not and cannot have because outsiders are not the ones whose understandings, actions and relationships actually constitute insider-practitioners' everyday practices (for example, their practices of teaching, or practices of professional learning). Not only do participants constitute their practices in the sense they are the ones whose activities unfold or happen at particular moments, but, more than this, they also constitute local practice traditions, and they participate in constituting more widespread practice traditions (for example, traditions of professional practice) that give a practice its meaning and significance, and its resilience and malleability over time. In fact, Kemmis, McTaggart and Nixon (2014, especially Chapter Four, 'A new view of research: Research within practice traditions') argue that practitioner research of this kind (research by teachers and other parties involved in educational practices) is essential to *educational* practice, to inform and transform it – particularly critical participatory action research (see also Kemmis et al. 2014, Chapter Eight).

Perhaps new ways to think about the teacher-researcher nexus are needed. On the one hand, this nexus expresses itself in the participatory research of an *individual* teacher who is also a researcher. This person might be a teacher in a school or preschool, or in a university. In this case, the teacher-researcher nexus refers to a relationship between different *roles* performed by an individual person.

On the other hand, the teacher-researcher nexus also expresses itself in the *social* relationship that exists between teachers (who may be teacher-researchers) and (other) researchers (who may be external researchers from a university, for example, or other teacher-researchers). In this latter case, the teacher-researcher nexus refers to a *social* nexus, not just to the relationship between different roles performed by a single person. Now various different kinds of relationships exist between teachers and researchers. Some, but not all, such social relationships are participatory and democratic and aim at collaborative construction of social life and social practice. Despite their misstep in describing the relationship between teachers and researchers as if they were different species, in Chapter Four, Salo and Rönnerman (2014) suggest that research and study circles, and action research initiatives, are of this kind – participatory and democratic collaborations between those involved, in which knowledge is *collectively* constructed from *individuals'* prior knowledge and experiences. There are other kinds of social relationships between teachers and researchers, however, that are of a very different kind: they are hierarchical and autocratic, and aim at control of teachers' practices by external authorities (whether external researchers, policy-makers, administrators or legislators).

Clearly, in Chapter Four, Salo and Rönnerman believe that the relationships between people in action research should be understood as a kind of partnership, even if their formulation of the relationship relentlessly separates the 'researchers' from the 'teachers'. They say (p. 64):

> Action research is conducted in joint partnerships between universities and schools, in collaboration with researchers and practitioners, co-generating knowledge in democratic dialogues. In action research, the relationship between researchers and practitioners is understood as equal and reciprocal, and the production of knowledge and action plans is furthered by mutual recognition.

If I correctly understand Salo and Rönnerman (2014) and their project of renewal and revitalisation of the Nordic tradition of *folkbildning*, however, they are firmly on the side of democracy and the collaborative construction of social life, not on the side of hierarchical control of educational practice by external authorities; they are on the side of collaborative participation in knowledge building rather than on the side of rule by experts; and they are for democracy rather than autocracy. If this is so, then a critical reconstruction of the discourse of 'teachers' and 'researchers' and 'teacher-researchers' is needed, to make it clear that teachers and researchers are not separate species but overlapping and interfertile subspecies who are in a symbiotic relationship with one another – whether in the different roles of teaching and researching performed by an *individual teacher-researcher* in a school or preschool, or in a university, or in *the social nexus* between teacher-researchers and other researchers who may also be teacher-researchers.

## REFERENCES

Carr, W. (2006). Philosophy, methodology and action research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *40*(4), 421–435.

Carr, W. (2007). Educational research as a practical science. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education, 30*(3), 271–286.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research*. London, UK: Falmer.

Corey, S. (1953) Action research to improve school practices. Columbia: New York Teachers' College.

Dewey, J. (1955). *Democracy and education: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York, NY: The Macmillan Company.

Elliott, J. (1976-7). Developing hypotheses about classrooms from teachers' practical constructs: An account of the Ford Teaching Project. *Interchange, 7*(2), 2–20.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2001). *Making social science matter: Why social inquiry fails and how it can succeed again*, S. Sampson (Trans.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forsman, L., Karlberg-Granlund, G., Pörn, M., Salo, P., & Aspfors, J. (2014). From transmission to site-based professional development—on the art of combining research with facilitation. In K. Rönnerman & P. Salo (Eds.), *Lost in practice: Transforming nordic educational action research.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Gadamer, H.-G. (1975). *Truth and method*. London, UK: Sheed and Ward.

Gustavsen, B. (2001). Theory and practice: The mediating discourse. In P. Reason & H. Bradbury (Eds.), *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (pp. 17–26). London: SAGE.

Holmstrand, L., & Härnsten, G. (2003). *Förutsättningar för forskningscirklar i skolan. En kritisk granskning. [Prerequisites for research circles in school. A critical review.]* (Vol. 10). Stockholm: Myndigheten för Skolutveckling.

Kemmis, S. (2010). Research for praxis: knowing doing. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 18*(1), 9–27.

Kemmis, S. (2012). Researching educational praxis: Spectator and participant perspectives. *British Educational Research Journal, 38*(6), 885–905.

Kemmis, S., & Grootenboer, P. (2008) Situating praxis in practice: practice architectures and the cultural, social and material conditions for practice. In S. Kemmis & T. J. Smith (Eds.), Enabling Praxis: Challenges for education (pp. 37–62). Rotterdam: Sense.

Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research. Singapore: Springer.

Kemmis, S., Wilkinson, J., Edwards-Groves, C., Hardy, I., Grootenboer, P., & Bristol, L. (2014). Changing practices, changing education. Singapore: Springer.

Klafki, W. (1975). *Studien zur Bildungstheorie und Didaktik*. Basel: Weinheim.

Langelotz, L., & Rönnerman, K. (2014). The practice of peer group mentoring—traces of global changes and regional traditions. In K. Rönnerman & P. Salo (Eds.), *Lost in Practice: Transforming Nordic Educational Action Research.* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Rosendahl, L. B., & Rönnerman, K. (2006). Facilitating school improvement: The problematic relationship between researchers and practitioners. *Journal of In-service Education*, *32*(4), 499–511.

Noffke, S. (1992). The work and workplace of teachers in action research. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *8*(1), 15–29.

Rönnerman, K., & Olin, A. (2014). Research circles—Constructing a space for elaborating on being a teacher leader in preschools. In K. Rönnerman & P. Salo (Eds.), *Lost in Practice: Transforming Nordic Educational Action Research* Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Rönnerman, K., Salo, P., & Furu, E. M. (2008). Conclusions and challenges. Nurturing praxis. In K. Rönnerman, E. Moksnes Furu & P. Salo (Eds.), *Nurturing Praxis. Action Research in Partnerships Between School and University in a Nordic Light* (pp. 267–280). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Salo, P. & Rönnerman, K. (2014). The Nordic tradition of educational action research—in the light of practice architectures. In K. Rönnerman & P. Salo (Eds.), *Lost in Practice: Transforming Nordic Educational Action Research*

Rorty, R. (1979). *Philosophy and the mirror of nature*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sandberg, Å., Broms, G., Grip, A., Sundström, L., Steen, J., & Ullmark, P. (1992). *Technological change and co-determination in Sweden*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

Siljander, P., Kivelä, A., & Sutinen, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Theories of bildung and growth: Connections and controversies between continental educational thinking and American pragmatism*. Rotterdam: Sense.

Somekh, B. (2006). *Action research: A methodology for change and development*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Stenhouse, L. A. (1975). *Introduction to curriculum research and development*. London, UK: Heinemann Education.

## AFFILIATION

*Stephen Kemmis*
*Research Institute for Professional Practice, Learning and Education (RIPPLE)*
*Charles Sturt University, Wagga Wagga, Australia*