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In September 2011 the authors presented a paper to the European Early Childhood Research Association. It reported on research which examined the tensions involved in researching active lived experiences as both tutors and researchers, asking if this made a difference to the research process. It revealed how a community of student practitioners were encouraged to publish the findings of their own research and describes how this process led to transformational learning from both students and tutors.

Summary:

Students studying for a Foundation Degree in early years education came together to publish the results of their practice based investigations. These were small scale dissertations based on their work as early years practitioners. The participants formed what may be termed a ‘community of practice’. This is examined in terms of its purpose and the learning processes that took place within that community. Also explored are the tensions involved in researching active lived experiences as both tutors and researchers: in particular, the movement between being ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’. A qualitative approach was used to consider how participants were making sense of their world and the researcher attempting to make sense of the process and critically examine their own role. Methods of data collection included phenomenological interviews, participant observation, journal entries, content analysis, and the use of critical companions. The investigation revealed issues about student practice and student research in particular, that we should not see the terms as mutually exclusive, but as mutually responsive. It provided insights into what motivated the ‘community’ to engage in practice based enquiry and what sustained their engagement. It suggests that the community fostered learning that was transformative. In terms of methodological approach, it underlines the importance of positioning oneself as a researcher as well as recognising the ‘insider outsider’ phenomenon. Importantly, asking if this makes a difference to the research process.

Background:

The research was conducted over a 14 month period. It explored the process by which experienced early years practitioners, having completed their Foundation Degree programme at the University of Worcester (hereafter the University) came together as a community of practice to edit and publish the results of their practice based investigations. The degree was taught in the local community in partnership with a Local Authority which
provided the impetus to publish and disseminate the results of the students’ work based investigations within the local professional community. Our aim was to actively participate in the process, to understand how the participants evolved within a community of practice and to reflect upon our role as researchers.

The approach:

This was based on a dual interpretation (double hermeneutic) approach where participants are making sense of their world and the researcher is attempting to make sense of the process and critically examine their own role (Smith and Osbourne, 2003; Smith, 2009; Biggerstaff and Thompson, 2008). This allowed us to consider how we were both insiders and outsiders in the process. We were in part tutors, helpers, confidants, colleagues, critical friends, editors and researchers which resulted in us having to make transitions between the positions of insider and outsider (Dobson 2009). Professional propriety and ethicality were embedded into the process from the outset. Consent and assent were obtained from participants and the Local Authority. Methods of enquiry included phenomenological interviews with students, content analysis, journal and diary entries, researcher notes, minutes of meetings and participant observation. Critical companions (University colleagues) assisted throughout in developing a reflective stance. An examination of published work in the field was carried out and organised into a matrix, following the process recommended by the National Foundation for Educational Research (Lawson and Benefield 2007). Data was cross correlated with content analysis taken from written responses from students’ pre- and post-inquiry. The quality of the research process was compared with the CASP Self Review of Qualitative Research (2002) and the work of Furlong and Oancea (2005). We used these review guides to ensure we were positively engaged in the process and to guide us towards areas we needed to revisit to shed light on particular issues. We were therefore investigating a complex weave of issues involving a desire to share good practice, ethicality, approaches to teaching and learning, interpersonal dynamics and professional status.

What did we learn?

Our investigation revealed how students valued the opportunity to develop a publication which was designed, created and published within the Local Authority. It has inspired other students and had a profound effect in sharing good practice with others. It was innovative and underlined the risk that novice researchers took in publicly sharing their work based investigations. Student motivation to be involved ranged from wanting their University research to be seen as more than a typed dissertation – as one student suggested – “not resting on a shelf”. Other perspectives included valuing being published and receiving recognition from the Local Authority. Above all, a central motivating theme was a desire to be viewed as professionally qualified and competent, serving the needs of children and families. Such motivating forces were important as students had to give time for additional study, deal with the fatigue created by drafting and editing work and producing as one student said: “even more written material”. Nevertheless, the group actively supported each other and developed a genuine desire for mutual success. It was this coupled with being part of a ‘group’ which was an important facet of their own lived community of practice. There was also evidence that the group had learnt how to learn when they reported the editing and publishing process to other students who were commencing their own work
based enquiry. They encouraged colleagues to take care, be rigorous, plan carefully, justify their methodology and use a critical friend. In particular, the research revealed how students began to perceive their practice in the workplace and their practice based research, not as mutually exclusive, if anything, mutually responsive. This was important in informing us about the way that future teaching and learning can be adapted and refined to accommodate purposeful and reflective practice based enquiry. Participants transformed their views, sometimes their actions and certainly their position. Sometimes this could be seen in the way competence shaped their experience and the community helped to develop and re-forge that competence.

In terms of ourselves as researchers, being both part of the process and researching the process; it became clear that students were intrigued by the role of tutors as researchers especially the way we had to revisit and reform data to ensure the accuracy of our research. They saw how the tutors were modelling research practice and this underlined what Ashton and Newman (2006:832) consider as students becoming ‘heutagogues’, learning from others and learning to learn. The methodological approach underlined the importance of positioning oneself as a researcher, recognising the insider outsider phenomenon and asking if this makes a difference to the research process. We feel it did as we realised how easy it was to take up an insider outsider position and perceive the research as something to be written up for others, for ourselves and perhaps least of all with students. On reflection, we have to concede that on occasions we fell into an almost laboratory perception of research. In this way, we saw how the process highlighted how we as researchers must consider our position at the outset of any inquiry into practice including our background and professional viewpoints. We needed to listen carefully to the voices of participants and review our pre-existing opinions – one example being the way we perceived the separation between practice based research and practice. Critical reflection was an ongoing necessity including exploration of professional and personal perspectives within the process. As for the critical question: did we leave the research area the same? We think not and recognise this as unavoidable because we see our actions and those of others as transformative. It has changed our views and we think changed the perspectives of the participants. It could be seen as just working with students, but perhaps it was more like transforming the ordinary into something quite special. (Le Gallais 2004).
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Supporting early childhood educational provision within a cluster of deis. Preschool and primary school settings with a specific focus on transition. Between the two educational settings. Within the areas of research, practice, and policy in Ireland, the rights of the child to have her voice heard are becoming widely recognised (Hogan & O’Reilly, 2007). The National Children’s Strategy (DHC, 2000) followed by the establishment of the Children’s Ombudsman’s Office and the Office of the Minister for Children have most notably focused on the need to empower and consult with children in matters relating to their own lives. Such multiplicity of meanings creates both confusion and enrichment in research on child development and in the practice of early childhood education. In this chapter I will therefore try to minimize the former and enhance the latter by being as explicit as possible about the sorts of development is being discussed. Exactly how these rather social-looking skills evolve within a child, and how they are supported by the child’s world is not always clear from existing research. But several plausible hypotheses and interpretations exist, and they are explained later in this section. To make sense of such pretenses, a child needs to supply the missing elements cognitively. Early childhood transitions research: A review of concepts, theory, and practice. By Pia Vogler, Gina Crivello and Martin Woodhead. May 2008. Good applied research depends upon theoretical work both at the stage of developing a research project and when results are being analyzed (Boyden and Ennew, 1997: 10). The UN Committee on the Rights of the Child corroborates the importance of theory in informing rights-based work with children. He suggested that children develop schemata to represent their understanding of the world, and that they try to assimilate the world to these schemata until too much external contradiction forces a change and re-equilibration of their world view (Lourenço and Machado, 1996: 149). Early childhood attachment processes that occur during early childhood years 0–2 years of age, can be influential to future education. With proper guidance and exploration children begin to become more comfortable with their environment, if they have that steady relationship to guide them. In reality, play is the first way children learn to make sense of the world at a young age. Research suggests that the way children play and interact with concepts at a young age could help explain the differences in social and cognitive interactions later. When learning what behavior to associate with a set action can help lead children on to a more capable future. As children watch adults interact around them, they pick up on their slight nuances, from facial expressions to their tone of voice. EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT—BASIC CONCEPTS iii. RESOURCE GUIDE 2: INTRODUCTION TO EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT Resource Guide 2 is one of six ECD Resource Guides from the CRS SCORE ECD curriculum. Early childhood development is defined with many different terminologies by different programs or institutions. Here is how the ECD policy documents of the governments of Malawi, Kenya, and Zambia define early childhood. Early childhood development—basic concepts 1. Most of the neurological cell connections are made during the first three years of life. By three years of age, a child’s brain is twice as active as an adult’s brain.