

Peter Kelly

Using research to improve education practice: The case for methodological pluralism and professional collectivism

Abstract: Widely promoted by international organisations and national governments and their brokers, the use of research evidence from studies modelled on medicine to inform education policymaking is now common throughout Europe. Increasingly, the use of research evidence by practitioners to support school development is also advocated. Yet, the track record of this evidence movement is patchy and, even in optimal environments, practitioners have difficulty mobilising research to improve student attainment. This paper explores some of the opportunities for and barriers that prevent successful research engagement, including the nature and limitations of the evidence movement itself, before proposing a pluralist and communitarian alternative.

Keywords: research evidence, school improvement, methodological pluralism, professional communitarianism

UDC: 37.012

Scientific Article



<https://doi.org/10.63384/spB61z906a>

Introduction

The evidence movement, otherwise known as the »what works« movement, refers to a global, evidence-based policy initiative focused on improving public services and decision-making using rigorous research, data, and evidence. This movement comprises a diverse group united in their advocacy of evidence informed policymaking and practice, who dominate debates about educational improvement in Europe. International organisations like the OECD (2019a) recommend evidence-use by policymakers and practitioners to improve the quality of teaching. National governments across Europe use standardised comparative data to hold schools and teachers to account and research approaches largely borrowed from medicine to identify »what works« and inform educational policymaking (European Commission 2017). However, only a few administrations require school leaders and teachers to use data and research to support the development of practice.

This paper begins by exploring school leaders' engagement with research findings, whether in academic publications or by way of intermediaries, and their relationship with practitioner inquiry. Current accounts underestimate how difficult research use is. By briefly looking at recent research that compares experiences in England, Scotland and Germany, the constraints school leaders face are identified before a pluralist and communitarian alternative is proposed. England has long employed the evidence from high-stake comparative student tests and inspections to evaluate schools and teachers (Kelly et al. 2018) and there is also an established tradition of using research evidence to inform policymaking and practice (Lawn and Furlong 2010). Agencies have developed, which present research to support evidence use, the most significant being the Education Endowment Foundation (EEF), which offers support to policymakers and practitioners. Their *Teaching and Learning Toolkit*¹ has been available to schools since 2011. The National Institute of Teaching² is a more recent

1 <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/education-evidence/teaching-learning-toolkit> (accessed on 1. July 2023).

2 <https://niot.org.uk/> (accessed on 12. November 2024).

government initiative that combines the role of broker and training provider (DFE 2021). It offers professional development programmes for teachers and school leaders that are informed by both existing research and their own studies of »what works« in improving student outcomes. Until recently, Scotland had placed less emphasis on accountability measures than England whilst retaining strong local administration of schools. Instead, there is a strong tradition of using teacher research to support school improvement, which values partnerships between universities and schools. However, recent developments (Muir 2022; Scottish Government 2022, 2023a, 2023b) have sought a greater alignment with England. »What works« research is increasingly valued in Germany (Schriewer 2017). Besides the Clearinghouse Unterricht³ of the TUM School of Education and the Leibniz Institute for Research and Information in Education⁴, which cater mostly for local and regional advisors and administrators who do not have direct influence on practitioners, the development of national brokerage agencies is limited.

Research use in schools: views from the evidence movement

As this brief overview shows, the evidence movement has been most enthusiastically received in England. Even there, however, »it has proven difficult to achieve [research] evidence informed practice at a system level and the debate about how to achieve this continues« (Nelson and Campbell 2017, p. 127). Coldwell et al. (2017) and Walker et al. (2019) confirm that the influence of research informed approaches on school development is limited. As Gorard concludes: »Much of education policy and practice takes place without concern for the growing evidence base. Despite admonitions and encouragement to take account of research, teachers and leaders still report that evidence is a minor factor in their decisions.« (Gorard 2020, p. 17)

This has caused some consternation within the evidence movement. Cooper et al. (2017) indicate that teachers tend to acquire information and ideas from those they work with, whilst LaPointe-McEwan et al. (2017) add that research publications have little influence on practitioners. This is linked to the many barriers that limit practitioners' access to and engagement with research findings. Hemsley-Brown and Sharp (2003) suggest that teachers are deterred from using research by too much jargon or high-level statistics, and Allen et al. (2007) indicate that research findings are often expressed in such a way that it is difficult for potential users to discern what is relevant to their circumstances. Meanwhile, Siddiqui and Wardle (2020) argue that there are too many intermediary bodies presenting summaries of what »the evidence says«, which, they claim, is confusing for potential users. In addition, teachers often regard research as irrelevant, although they are more likely to engage with studies focussed on teaching, learning and improving practice (Cordingley 2000;

3 <https://www.clearinghouse.edu.tum.de/> (accessed on 1. July 2023).

4 <https://www.dipf.de/en/institute/dipf> (accessed on 1. July 2023).

NTRP 2006). Many commentators agree that improvements in engagement and use require (a) increased research and data literacy amongst practitioners, and (b) professional support for developing analytical and evaluative stances, translating research findings into useable practices and conducting professional enquiry, as well as (c) the time and opportunity to work with colleagues in supportive environments (Brown et al. 2017; Carrier 2017; Scott and McNeish 2013; See et al. 2016). Indeed, for Brown and Zhang (2017), school leaders must promote school cultures that recognise the importance of using research to create effective learning environments and encourage collaborative approaches (Greany and Maxwell 2017) and systematic inquiry (Brown et al. 2017), informed by a variety of data and research (Schildkamp 2019).

In summary, despite some significant setbacks, the logic and expectation of the evidence movement remains that accessible and relevant research evidence can be used by skilled practitioners, working together in supportive school communities, to inform their practice and enhance student learning.

Research use in schools: views from other commentators

Those outside the evidence movement proffer alternative reasons for the disappointing uptake of research use by practitioners. A number challenge the suitability of research selected by the evidence movement by asking if the medical assumptions underpinning research informed practice is appropriate for education (Biesta 2007; Hammersley 1997; Philpott 2017). In particular, randomised control trials and systematic reviews, the primary methods used, are considered inadequate and insufficient (Wrigley 2018). A second objection rests on how difficult it is to use research-generated knowledge in practice (Biesta 2007, 2010; Cain 2015; Hammersley 1997). In this regard, Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka argue that the barriers to research use in education are greater than in other contexts because of the »uncertain, ambiguous nature of teaching and schooling that makes it difficult for researchers to identify clear, valid principles and findings based on hard evidence« (Hemsley-Brown and Oplatka 2005, p. 24). It is on the basis of critiques like these that the case for a departure from the evidence movement and move towards methodological pluralism is presented shortly.

Taking a different stance, Allen et al. (2007) argue that, for many potential research users, the day-to-day pressures of responding to multiple demands and targets are likely to override any desire to make decisions using research. Wilkins and Gobby (2021) provide an agnostic-political view that regards educational practice as a site of struggle. This is evident when school leaders and teachers adjudicate between competing priorities, some representing incommensurate values, as they: negotiate how to forward the interests of a diversity of students; take in to account the contrasting views of parents and other education professionals; whilst also meeting mandated requirements. This supports the case for cultural change in schools as those within the evidence movement suggest. Later in this paper, this is advocated in stronger terms as the need for a return to professional communitarianism.

Much of the literature discussed so far is supported by a recent study (Kelly et al. 2025), which asked how research engagement is promoted amongst school leaders in England, Scotland and Germany, and what constraints on research use school leaders in each country encountered. Data was gathered through a documentary analysis of materials related to practitioners' research use followed by a series of interviews of school leaders in each context. Here is not the place for full account of this study, but a few specific findings are worth noting. Inevitably, school leaders and teachers in England give the highest priority research use but lack both the time and understanding to make good use of research findings. Indeed, they often are so overwhelmed with suggestions and suspicious of big claims or assertions that contradict their professional experience that they depend instead on personal recommendation. One amongst many school leaders put it this way:

»We are inundated – there's something new every single week – an idea, a company promoting an approach, a government guidance document, something from a subject organisation or internal things from different people. You are constantly in a situation where you have to decide what to look at and what to ignore, and when things look like what's gone before, you tend to ignore it.« (Kelly et al. 2025, p. 11)

Practitioners in Scotland more often rely on their own experience when deciding what is relevant and potentially useful, whilst many conduct their own enquiries to support school improvement. Practitioner research has also become a core feature of the induction year for probationary teachers, who are required to conduct their own enquiry projects. These can have a wider impact on their workplaces as, for one school leader, they »nudge« the learning of more experienced colleagues: »It led head teachers into a deeper understanding of what research is about«. This contrasts markedly with England and Germany, where only those with a specific interest or who are engaged in postgraduate study undertake practitioner research. Finally, although there is no impetus for research use by school leaders and teachers in Germany, there is recognition that the insights of a plurality of research and not just those of the evidence movement might benefit practice. For example, one school leader suggested:

»Quite a lot happens on an informal level through colleagues who bring in new input and say, 'here's something exciting' or 'here's a text'. And that moves both the management team, we are five, so actually six people, and [non-management] colleagues.« (ibid, p. 16)

To summarise, two changes offer the promise of increasing successful research use in schools: (a) making a wider variety of research available to practitioners and not just that set within medical assumptions about what constitutes rigorous research, whilst recognising the strengths and weaknesses of different research approaches; and (b) building supportive professional learning environments where teachers can collaborate on pedagogic developments, using

research to inform their initiatives and practitioner enquiry to support their enactment. Each of these will now be discussed in turn.

Methodological pluralism

Although some have identified its limitations, the intention here is not to reject research situated in a medical framework; rather it is to suggest the claims made should be softened and considered alongside those of other approaches to research. The call for policymaking and practice to be informed by a wide variety of research is longstanding (e.g. Labaree 1998). Lagemann (1997, p. 15) is one of many who argue that a pluralist approach would help »develop more truly equal, genuinely respectful, and effectively collaborative relationships among the groups most directly involved in the study and practice of education«. Kelly and Hofbauer (2023) offer the following argument. After Isaiah Berlin (2013), no single social research tradition can adequately capture the complexities of our lives and the world in which we live. Following John Dewey (Biesta and Burbules 2003), all research has limitations, some because of the methodological and theoretical frames used. And in light of the insights of Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc Wacquant (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), decision-makers should therefore be reflexive, drawing on a diversity of research whilst taking account of the assumptions and value-positions of researchers and the contexts and methods of individual studies, when evaluating knowledge claims. This call for pluralism in educational policymaking and practice recognises many ways of understanding education, acknowledges imperfection and accepts conflict, but encourages gentleness in disagreement whenever possible by promoting deliberation, moderation and generosity.

Amongst the most significant bodies of educational inquiry outside the evidence movement are sociocultural research rooted in the ideas of post-Vygotskians like Yrjö Engeström, Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger (Engeström et al. 1999; Lave 2011; Lave and Wenger 1991; Wenger 1998), and critical sociological research that draws on the likes of Basil Bernstein, Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault (Bernstein 2000; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Foucault 1977) to analyse relations of power. These are united by their methodological collectivism; that is, their analyses focus on social groups rather than individuals. In so doing they recognise, for example, how the activities of individuals are embedded in and co-constructed by the social and material environments in which they take place (e.g. Lave and Wenger 1991) and how earlier experiences structure the ways individuals respond to social circumstances and events (e.g. Bourdieu and Passeron 1990). By taking social processes seriously, these perspectives challenge universalist accounts, and by recognising the importance of social histories in personal formation they contest the possibility of disinterested research. Given their success in accounting for situated everyday practice, it might also be expected that the findings of methodologically collectivist research resonate with the experiences of practitioners and provide them with helpful explanatory frames.

A second approach to research often ignored by the evidence movement is practitioner enquiry rooted in methodological pragmatism. As was mentioned earlier, this has strong roots in Scotland. Practitioner enquiry differs from the evidence movement and collectivist research, which both employ theories and ideas in deductive analyses. Instead, pragmatic approaches often begin with the identification by practitioners of stubborn professional problems, who then generate and analyse information and data about their practice and its impact before engaging in inductive reasoning to propose solutions (Chapman et al. 2016). Solutions can then be monitored and adapted to improve their effect. Hence, practitioner enquiry focuses on »what works«. However, this is not »what works« in broad and general terms as proposed by some in the evidence movement when analysing comparative student data to allow the less successful to borrow policy from the more successful. Instead, this is »what works« when addressing specific practical concerns set in the contingencies of everyday professional practice in particular settings. Unlike deductive approaches, practitioner enquiry is largely ambivalent about particular ideologies or theoretical frames. Instead, it often seeks multiple local solutions, which are evaluated on their practical effects and may not be more widely applicable.



Figure 1: A map of plural methodological approaches in education.

Figure 1 combines these three approaches to present a model of methodological pluralism in education. This is illustrative rather than exhaustive, as other methodological approaches such as phenomenology do not clearly fit within this model. However, the intention here is to indicate that broader accounts of the research landscape beyond the self-serving restrictions of the evidence movement are both possible and helpful.

Professional communitarianism

There is clearly a strong case for methodological pluralism. As Biesta and Burbules (2003) indicate, it is important that decision making at all levels involves dialogues that draw on multiple perspectives and, to maintain public trust, that this process is open and transparent to allow public scrutiny. Such dialogues are made possible by communities that embrace interdependent notions of expertise and collaborative approaches to teacher learning and development.

The effectiveness of social learning approaches has long been recognised, and collective views of learning such as those of the post-Vygotskians, mentioned earlier, apply as much to teachers as they do to students (Kelly 2006). In this regard, Hargreaves (2000) identifies a period of collegial professionalism in England in the 1990s and early 2000s during which increased efforts were made to create collaborative cultures based on common purposes (e.g. in Acker 2000; Campbell and Neill 1994; Helsby and McCulloch 1997; Lieberman and Miller 2000; Nias et al. 1989, 1992). He suggests this was a largely effective response to the rising complexity and uncertainty of professional life in times of rapid and relentless change, but eventually these collective activities were undermined by reforms that placed independent practitioners in competition with each other in school marketplaces. Since then, independent expertise has taken over from interdependent collegial professionalism as the common craft of reflective practitioners. The school leader or teacher has become the most important person in the school or classroom and everyone else, particularly the students, has a supporting role.

Despite these changes, it remains the case that community participation builds the resilience people need in times of complex social change (PHW 2019). Although we live in societies where often the focus is on individuals rather than collectives, shifting the emphasis from independence towards interdependence will help increase resilience in education and thereby improve the recruitment, retention, wellbeing and practice of school leaders and teachers, which are all affected by the ambiguities and uncertainties of professional life. Collective resilience is much improved in interdependent professional learning communities (OECD 2015, 2019b), where practitioners enjoy the confidence of colleagues and work together to make decisions and act in the interests of students. This can extend to collaborations with students and parents as partners, thereby adding to the diversity of views brought to bear on the most stubborn problems and complex issues. Collaborative school leadership also offers significant benefits, with research on flat hierarchies and the value of distributed leadership claiming that these improve teacher and student performance (Harris 2013; Malloy and Leithwood 2017). This web of interdependencies, embracing all in genuinely collaborative endeavours aimed at improving educational processes and outcomes, is what is meant by professional communitarianism. It goes far beyond the usual configuration of sharing tasks between individuals who then work on them alone.

Sociocultural views of expertise such as those of Wenger (1998) underpin the notion of professional learning communities and much has been written

about their benefits (OECD 2015, 2019b). However, most accounts do not identify the inherent tension between individuals considered experts and the interdependencies that bring about community. In this regard, we can learn much by looking at practitioner research as a way of improving practice. Here, it is the bottom-up process of inductive enquiry that brings about development rather than the top-down assertions of authoritative experts. Often, the outcomes of such enquiries are most useful to the groups of practitioners undertaking them in the everyday contexts in which they happen. The need for dissemination is limited because, for the most part, any findings are of less consequence elsewhere and, in any case, difficult to apply. Indeed, the majority of enquiries are small, relatively simple, and often unremarkable. Nonetheless, incremental improvements in practice can result from many small changes initiated in this way. Inductive practitioner research works best when undertaken using collaborative and inclusive approaches as part of the routine and everyday craft of teaching (Chapman et al. 2016). Whilst collaboration allows practitioners to learn from and with each other, the interdependence provided by inclusive communities affords security in an environment open to flexible experimentation and awash with a diversity of ideas. Inclusive environments that foster collaboration are more enabling of creative and critical practice than arenas characterised by competition and jeopardy or authoritarian control. Yet how to build collaborative school environments that facilitate teacher engagement with a plurality of research and foster ingenuity and rigorous inquiry remains an important agenda for future research.

With the benefit of technology, school clusters and wider networks can also form communities, although again participants should be wary of single-minded authoritative voices dominating debates. Whilst the first may be driven by local needs, both can support teacher research, allow information sharing, facilitate discussions and even include reading groups. Their format doesn't have to be complex and can include informal social media groups and the like. But for the most part, they will be better at supporting critical and creative thinking if they include all staff members as equals, regardless of their role, each bringing a diversity of experiences and perspectives and an open mind.

Conclusion

The analysis provided here hints at what environments that successfully encourage research use by practitioners might look like. First, they should embrace methodological pluralism. Rather than restricting the research available to teachers to that of the evidence movement, giving access to a broader plurality of research studies can bring wider benefits. Second, they should foster professional communitarianism. Engagement with a diversity of research in professional learning communities (OECD 2015, 2019b) underpinned by collaborative school leadership (Harris 2013; Malloy and Leithwood 2017) allows school leaders and teachers informed by research to learn from and with each other, whilst the interdependence provided by inclusive environments affords

practitioners the support and security to do so. Although practitioner research set within such circumstances can take many forms (Chapman et al. 2016), enquiries can be harnessed to explore, adapt, test and evaluate practical translations of existing research findings. And finally, technology can assist, as communities of schools and wider networks support teacher research through information sharing, reading groups and discussions. Each of these changes is substantial; tackling them all together will require a comprehensive overhaul of school organisation and the transformation of professional cultures. But the potential reward is great; educational provision that is capable of considered and purposeful adaptation in order to meet the complex and ever-changing needs of a diverse, unequal and sometimes troubled society.

References

- Acker, S. (2000). *Realities of teaching: never a dull moment*. London: Cassell.
- Allen, P., Peckham, S., Anderson, S. and Goodwin, N. (2007). Commissioning research that is used: the experience of the NHS service delivery and organisation research and development programme. *Evidence and Policy*, 3, issue 1, pp. 119-134.
- Berlin, I. (2013). The pursuit of the ideal. In: I. Berlin (ed.). *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the history of ideas*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, pp. 1–20.
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Biesta, G. (2007). Why ‘what works’ won’t work: Evidence-based practice and the democratic deficit in educational research. *Educational Theory*, 57, issue 1, pp. 1-22.
- Biesta, G. (2010). Why ‘what works’ still won’t work: From evidence-based education to value-based education. *Studies in the Philosophy of Education*, 29, pp. 491–503.
- Biesta, G. and Burbules, N. (2003). *Pragmatism and educational research*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.-C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. London: Sage.
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Brown, C., Schildkamp, K. and Hubers, M. D. (2017). Combining the best of two worlds: a conceptual proposal for evidence-informed school improvement. *Educational Research*, 59, issue 2, pp. 154–172.
- Brown, C. and Zhang, D. (2017). How can school leaders establish evidence-informed schools: An analysis of the effectiveness of potential school policy levers. *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 45, issue 3, pp. 382–401.
- Cain, T. (2015). Teachers’ engagement with published research: addressing the knowledge problem. *The Curriculum Journal*, 26, issue 3, pp. 488–509.
- Campbell, R. and Neill, S. (1994). *Primary teachers at work*. London: Routledge.
- Carrier, N. (2017). How educational ideas catch on: the promotion of popular education innovations and the role of evidence. *Educational Research*, 59, issue 2, pp. 228–240.
- Chapman, C., Chestnutt, H., Friel, N., Hall, S. and Lowden, K. (2016). Professional

- capital and collaborative inquiry networks for educational equity and improvement? *Journal of Professional Capital and Community*, 1, issue 3, pp. 178–197.
- Coldwell, M., Greany, T., Higgins, S., Brown, C., Maxwell, B., Stiell, B., Stoll, L., Willis, B. and Burns, H. (2017). *Evidence-informed teaching: an evaluation of progress in England*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/evidence-informed-teaching-evaluation-of-progress-in-england> (accessed on 1. June 2021).
- Cooper, A., Klinger, D. A. and McAdie, P. (2017). What do teachers need? An exploration of evidence-informed practice for classroom assessment in Ontario. *Educational Research*, 59, issue 2, pp. 190–208.
- Cordingley, P. (2000). *Teacher perspectives on the accessibility and usability of research outputs*. Paper prepared by P. Cordingley and the National Teacher Research Panel for the BERA 2000 conference. Cardiff University, July 7-9. London: TTA.
- DFE (2021). *New Institute of Teaching set to be established*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-institute-of-teaching-set-to-be-established> (accessed on 12. November 2024).
- Engeström, Y., Miettinen, R., and Punamäki, R. L. (1999). *Learning in doing: Social, cognitive, and computational perspectives*. *Perspectives on Activity Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- European Commission (2017). *Support mechanisms for evidence-based policy-making in education*. *Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Random House Vintage Books.
- Gorard, S. (2020). The story so far about the use of research evidence. *Research Intelligence*, 144, pp. 17–18.
- Greany, T. and Maxwell, B. (2017). Evidence-informed innovation in schools: aligning collaborative research and development with high quality professional learning for teachers. *International Journal of Innovation in Education*, 4, issues 2/3, pp. 147–170.
- Hammersley, M. (1997). Educational research and teaching: a response to David Hargreaves' TTA lecture. *British Educational Research Journal*, 23, issue 3, pp. 141–161.
- Hargreaves, A. (2000). Four ages of professionalism and professional learning. *Teachers and Teaching: History and Practice*, 6, issue 2, pp. 151–182.
- Harris, A. (2013). Distributed leadership: friend or foe? *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 41, issue 5, pp. 545–554.
- Helsby, G. and McCulloch, G. (1997). *Teachers and the National Curriculum*. London: Cassell.
- Hemsley-Brown J. V. and Oplatka, I. (2005). Bridging the research-practice gap: Barriers and facilitators to research use among school principals from England and Israel. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 18, issue 5, pp. 424–446.
- Hemsley-Brown, J. and Sharp, C. (2003). How do teachers use research findings to improve their professional practice? *Oxford Review of Education*, 29, issue 4, pp. 449–471.
- Kelly, P. (2006). What is teacher learning? A socio-cultural perspective. *Oxford Review of Education*, 32, issue 4, pp. 505–519.
- Kelly, P. and Hofbauer, S. (2023). Methodological pluralism and the pursuit of the public

- good. In: L. Parker (ed.). *Education in an age of misinformation: Philosophical and pedagogical explorations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 33–53.
- Kelly, P., Egedal Andreasen, K., Kousholt, K., McNess, E. and Ydesen, C. (2018). Education governance and standardised tests in Denmark and England. *Journal of Education Policy*, 33, issue 6, pp. 739–758.
- Kelly, P., Beck, A. and Hofbauer, S. (2025). Comparing school leaders' experiences of research use in England, Scotland and Germany. *Review of Education*, 13, issue 1, pp. 1–29.
- Lawn, M. and Furlong, J. (2010). The disciplines of education in the UK: Between the ghost and the shadow. In: J. Furlong and M. Lawn (eds.). *Disciplines of Education. Their role in the future of education research*. London, Routledge, pp. 1–12.
- Labaree, D. (1998). Educational Researchers: Living with a Lesser Form of Knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 27, issue 8, pp. 4–12.
- LaPointe-McEwan, D., DeLuca, C. and Klinger, D. A. (2017). Supporting evidence use in networked professional learning: the role of the middle leader. *Educational Research*, 59, issue 2, pp. 136–153.
- Lagemann, E. (1997). Contested Terrain: A History of Education Research in the United States, 1890–1990. *Educational Researcher*, 26, issue 9, pp. 5–17.
- Lave, J. (2011). *Apprenticeship in Critical Ethnographic Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberman, A. and Miller, L. (2000). *Teachers transforming their world and their work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Malloy, J., and Leithwood, K. (2017). Effects of distributed leadership on school academic press and student achievement. In: K. Leithwood, J. Sun and K. Pollock (eds.). *How school leaders contribute to student success. Studies in Educational Leadership 23*. Cham: Springer, pp. 61–91.
- Muir, K. (2022). *Putting learners at the centre: Towards a future vision for Scottish education. Scottish Government*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/putting-learners-centre-towards-future-vision-scottish-education/> (accessed on 1. October 2022).
- National Teacher Research Panel (NTRP) (2006). *Teachers using research: What matters in transferring research knowledge into schools?* Retrieved from: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100517074035/http://standards.dfes.gov.uk/ntrp/lib/pdf/bevan3.pdf> (accessed on 1. June 2021).
- Nelson, J. and Campbell, C. (2017). Evidence-informed practice in education: meanings and applications. *Educational Research*, 59, issue 2, pp. 127–135.
- Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Campbell, P. (1992). *Whole school curriculum development in the primary school*. London: Falmer Press.
- Nias, J., Southworth, G. and Yeomans, R. (1989). *Staff relationships in the primary school*. London: Cassell.
- OECD (2015). *Schooling redesigned: Towards innovative learning systems*. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/education/schooling-redesigned-9789264245914-en.html> (accessed on 1. November 2023).
- OECD (2019a). *Strategic education governance: Policy toolkit*. Retrieved from: <https://>

- www.oecd.org/education/ceri/strategic-education-governance-policy-tool.html (accessed on 1. June 2021).
- OECD (2019b). *Teachers' professional learning study: Design and implementation plan*. Retrieved from: <http://www.oecd.org/education/teachers-professional-learning-study/continuing-professional-learning/TPL-Study-Design-and-Implementation-Plan.pdf> (accessed on 1. November 2023).
- Philpott, C. (2017). Medical models for teachers' learning; asking for a second opinion. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 43 issue 1, pp. 20–31.
- Public Health Wales (PHW) (2019). *Resilience: Understanding the interdependence between individuals and communities*. Retrieved from: <https://phw.nhs.wales/files/research/resilience/resilience-understanding-the-interdependence-between-individuals-and-communities/> (accessed on 26. January 2024).
- Schildkamp, K. (2019). Data-based decision-making for school improvement: Research insights and gaps. *Educational Research*, 61, issue 3, pp. 257–273.
- Schriewer, J. (2017). Between the philosophy of self-cultivation and empirical research: educational studies in Germany. In: G. Whitty, and J. Furlong (eds.). *Knowledge and the study of education: an international comparison*. Oxford: Symposium Books, pp. 75–99.
- Scott, S. and McNeish, D. (2013). *School leadership evidence review: using research evidence to support school improvement*. Retrieved from: <https://www.dmss.co.uk/pdfs/evidencereview3.pdf> (accessed on 1. June 2021).
- Scottish Government (2022). *Education – Achieving excellence and equity: National improvement framework and improvement plan 2022*. Scottish Government. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/achieving-excellence-equity-2022-national-improvement-framework-improvement-plan/> (accessed on 1. October 2022).
- Scottish Government (2023a). *Scottish Government's plan for school research 2023-2026*. Scottish Government. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.scot/publications/scottish-governments-plan-school-research-2023-2026/documents/> (accessed on 13. December 2023).
- Scottish Government (2023b). *Centre of Teaching Excellence*. Scottish Government. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.scot/news/centre-of-teaching-excellence/> (accessed on 13. December 2023).
- See, B.H., Gorard, S. and Siddiqui, N. (2016). Teachers' use of research evidence in practice: a pilot study of feedback to enhance learning. *Educational Research*, 58, issue 1, pp. 56–72.
- Siddiqui, N. and Wardle, L. (2020). Can users judge what is 'promising' evidence in education? *Research Intelligence*, 144, pp. 20–21.
- Walker, M., Nelson, J., Bradshaw, S. and Brown, C. (2019). *Teachers' engagement with research: what do we know?* Retrieved from: <https://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/projects-and-evaluation/evaluating-projects/eef-research-papers/> (accessed on 1. June 2021).
- Wacquant, L. (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology: A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 7, issue 1, pp. 26–63.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wilkins, A. and Gobby, B. (2021). Governance and educational leadership: Studies in

education policy and politics. In: S. Courtney, H. Gunter, R. Niesche and T. Trujillo (eds.). *Understanding educational leadership: Critical perspectives and approaches*. London: Bloomsbury, pp. 309–322.

Wrigley, T. (2018). The power of 'evidence': Reliable science or a set of blunt tools? *British Educational Research Journal*, 44, issue 3, pp. 359–376.

Peter KELLY (Univerza v Plymouthu, Združeno kraljestvo)

IZSLEDKI RAZISKAV V FUNKCIJI SPREMINJANJA PEDAGOŠKE PRAKSE: UTE-MELJITEV METODOLOŠKEGA PLURALIZMA IN STROKOVNEGA POVEZOVANJA UČITELJEV

Povzetek: Mednarodne organizacije, nacionalne vlade in njihovi deležniki močno spodbujajo uporabo raziskovalnih izsledkov iz študij, ki so zasnovane po vzoru medicine, za oblikovanje izobraževalnih politik, kar je danes v Evropi že običajna praksa. Prav tako se k rabi raziskovalnih izsledkov vse bolj spodbuja tudi učitelje praktike. Vendar pa te pobude, tudi v zelo optimalnih pogojih, ne dosegajo ciljev, saj imajo učitelji praktiki težave pri prenosu raziskovalnih dosežkov v prakso. Ta članek proučuje nekatere priložnosti in ovire, ki preprečujejo uspešno vključevanje raziskav, vključno z naravo in omejitvami teh zahtev, nazadnje pa predlaga pluralistično in skupnostno alternativo.

Gljučne besede: raziskovalni dokazi, izboljšanje šol, metodološki pluralizem, strokovne skupnosti

Elektronski naslov: peter.kelly@plymouth.ac.uk