

Quality teaching: means for its enhancement?

John Buchanan

University of Technology, Sydney

The pursuit of enhancing quality in tertiary education and educators is noble. Increasingly, however, universities are resorting to stark, reductionist representations of educational quality, such as decontextualised mean figures generated by student surveys, to measure and report on this. This paper questions the validity and reliability of such mean scores. Universities are using these results for high-stakes ends, and disclose them to ever-broader audiences. This paper focuses on the broader publication of these mean scores pertaining to individual staff members. The paper investigates forces that drive such an approach and the attractions thereof, and enumerates its outcomes and effects, while investigating potential theory-method mismatches. The paper evaluates this evaluation method against four criteria: (measurement of) quality teaching; ethical practice; managerial relations; and research methodology and methods. The paper also proposes some alternative approaches to interrogate and enhance teacher quality.

Introduction

The North Wind and the Sun were in dispute as to who was the more powerful. They decided to have a contest to see who could remove the coat from a man they saw walking beneath them. The wind blew harder and stronger, but all this did was to make the man clutch his coat all the more tightly around him. The sun then shone with all its strength and warmth. The man removed his coat.

Adaptation of a tale attributed to Aesop (Morpurgo & Clark, 1988, pp. 40, 41).

Enhancing the quality of education and of educators in tertiary contexts is a noble pursuit. Increasingly, however, universities are turning to stark, reductionist (mis?)representations of educational quality, such as those generated by student surveys, to measure and report on this. In particular, there is an increasing preoccupation with the use of decontextualised mean Likert-scale scores to adjudge the quality and performance of teaching and teachers. As the title of this paper suggests, the validity and reliability of such mean scores is under question here. In particular, uni-

versities are tending to use these results for high-stakes ends, and to disclose them to ever-broader audiences. It is the broader publication of these mean scores that is a particular concern of this paper.

The paper sets out to interrogate the forces that drive such an approach and the attractions thereof, and to enumerate its outcomes and effects, while investigating some theory-method matches and mismatches. The paper measures this evaluation method against four criteria:

- (Measurement of) quality teaching
- Ethical practice
- Managerial relations
- Research methodology and methods.

The above four criteria interrelate and overlap considerably; a number of observations are at home in more than one of them.

Universities' growing preoccupation with student feedback as a, if not the, means of determining (in both senses of the word) quality in higher education, fails many of Trowler's (2009, p. 2) characteristics of theory: it fails to identify relationships, to develop and interrogate 'systematically and logically related propo-

sitions', and to illuminate or even acknowledge causes or contexts. Moreover, it presumes a consistency in students' capacity and willingness to assign quality to their learning experiences. In short, such processes appear to reduce research into educational quality to Trowler's (2009, p. 3) "market research' approach'.

At a surface level, a practice of evaluating education then making public the results, propounds a very plausible logic:

- Students, the 'consumers' of education, are the best, if not the only arbiters of the quality of their experiences and the performance of their teachers;
- Raising the stakes will 'keep educators honest', holding them accountable;
- The above process is therefore not only efficient, but also just; anyone resisting this process can be presumed to be hiding something.

Such an approach constitutes a 'poor thin way of doing things' (Carroll, 1982, p. 228) in terms of coming to understand (the quality of) education and of research, these being two of the core businesses of universities. Moreover, industrial and managerial issues conflate with pedagogical ones, resulting in an ill-fitting amalgam. As Ball (1995, cited in Trowler, 2009, p. 3) points out, 'the absence of [explicit] theory leaves the researcher prey to the unexamined, unreflexive preoccupations and dangerously naïve ontological and epistemological a praxis'.

As with teaching or any form of communication, audience and purpose are crucial considerations in evaluation. Ramsden and Dodds (1989) offer several warnings about such data: the evaluation of teaching does not equate to 'performance in the lecture hall or tutorial room' (p. 33); the information 'must not be used as a covert means of staff appraisal' (p. 28); 'no teacher should feel threatened by the process or feel that the information could be used punitively' (p. 27) and 'a member of staff should be given the option of having no one but him/herself see these results, or of approving the release of these results to others (including heads of departments)' (p. 28).

Investing such confidence in student feedback scores presumes that students know more about educational quality than do their teachers. In the field of education in particular, however, this logic appears to falter. Presumably, education staff members are more learned than their students in the domains of learning and teaching. By extension, the practice contributes to pressure on staff to conform to real or perceived student ideals of teaching, learning and content. These

may be at odds with less popular but more beneficial decisions made by staff, who presumably have more expertise in the matter. The Principle of Minimum Differentiation (Hotelling, 1929) illustrates another possible consequence of this practice. In an effort to please and appease students, staff members' teaching methods may tend to become indistinguishable from one another, as they each strive to achieve the same outcome - student satisfaction with their teaching.

More broadly, public dissemination of such data appears to feed and be fed by two other unsettling trends in education:

- The 'student as client' mentality. Apart from problems of conformity mentioned above, this mentality impedes the growth of student autonomy and responsibility.
- The 'client-must-know' mentality. Privacy is increasingly being eroded and disregarded.

The above dynamics are further exacerbated by the commercialisation of education. As Fitch and Loving (2007, p. 85) point out, however, 'the consumer process does not necessarily identify the best idea. It simply indicates the most popular'. This process is part of a worldwide trend that has been gathering momentum for some time. Of the 1990s and its preoccupation with basic skills testing of school students, Slee and Weiner (2001, p. 87) observed that, 'reductionist analogies and 'quick-fixes' appeared to be preferred by a polity that had grown impatient with careful research analyses of complex educational and social issues'.

The effects of such approaches to the collection and dissemination of data on individual teachers are multiple. Moreover, these approaches to measuring the quality of teaching are found wanting in the domains of quality education, ethics, decency in management of staff, and well-conceptualised research, as the following sections illustrate.

Quality in education

The practice of making public individual staff members' mean performance data constitutes an impoverished model of teaching and learning, and undermines the qualities it purports to promote. It reinforces popular and populist, lay notions of teaching equating to performance. As such, it frustrates much of the work teacher educators in particular attempt to do with their pre-service teachers, in pointing out that the burden for learning is one shared between teacher and learner, and that a quest for popularity

can be a seductive diversion from this responsibility for the teacher and for the institution. The model has more in common with popular, naïve conceptions of education and its evaluation, or for that matter with popularity contests, than with rigorous research or educational endeavours.

The practice provides students with a most reductionist component, that is, the mean score, from a very limited and decontextualised data set. It suggests that the absolute and comparative expertise of a member of teaching staff can be reduced to a number to two decimal places. Apart from its demoralising nature and research design problems (see below) this also thwarts our attempts to assist preservice teachers in appreciating the subtleties, and the fractal intricacies and complexities of teaching and learning (Schuck, Gordon & Buchanan, 2008). In addition, a central facet of teaching is the promotion of skills and dispositions related to critical literacy. Calls for student exercise of critical literacy will be shouted down by a practice such as the release of such a simplistic set of figures devoid of context.

Brookfield (1995) discusses the angst for perfectionists when attaining imperfect scores, and concludes that what he calls the 'perfect ten' system does not work in the interests of either students or teachers. To this I respond with a confession. Regrettably, I can recall the highest mean score I have ever attained from a student feedback question, almost as if that equated to the best one. I won't dignify the number by quoting it here. All I can confidently claim is that I was more satisfying that semester than ever before or since. Even though, for reasons I don't fully understand, I am less satisfying now, I do not believe I am an inferior teacher to the one who attained that higher score. Nor do I believe that any given semester's results correspond arithmetically to the quality of my teaching, or to that of my peers. And yet, it is virtually inevitable that such comparisons will be made. The process establishes a 'quest for an unholy grail'; I am a fervent and evangelical non-believer in the 'perfect ten' teacher or lesson, yet I find myself striving for such a score, and disappointed upon failing to attain it yet again.

Many teachers are well aware of a number of tactics that they could employ to raise their satisfaction ratings, that are apedagogical or even counter-pedagogical in nature. According to Campbell's Law (Harvard Education Letter, 2010, para. 4) the high-stakes nature of testing such as this may be the means for its own corruption. According to Campbell,

the more any quantitative social indicator is used for social decision-making, the more subject it will be to corruption pressures and the more apt it will be to distort and corrupt the social processes it is intended to monitor.

Teachers and others may be tempted to subvert the process and thereby denude it of the very transparency such a process boasts. Naturally, this is as much an ethical, as it is an educational issue.

Publicising student satisfaction data has the potential to 'poison the teacher-student relationship before it begins' (Russell, 2010a). The opportunity for a reputed poor-scoring teacher to engage her or his new students may be stillborn. Those teaching staff who score highly in such arenas may create unfulfillable expectations in the imaginings of prospective students. In short, this practice serves to 'stream' teachers, with all the expectations and assumptions on performance that emerge therefrom. Further, the process may compromise or corrupt students' motives for choosing or avoiding particular subjects or teachers.

More fundamentally, is this the future of teaching preferred by teachers-to-be? Will our graduate teachers be comfortable with their own students generating Likert-scale satisfaction scores, reading them and then making comparisons between all the (say) year 6 teachers or all the maths teachers, or for that matter between a maths and a geography teacher? This is but one unintended consequence that may be hastened by student acceptance of or indifference to the publication of such data at university. What effects might such a situation have on the way teachers approach their teaching, and on the morale of the profession? Gunzehnauser (2007) brings attention to 'our role as professional educators to prepare teachers, administrators, and other school personnel for resistance to normalisation ... social resistance and ethical resistance' (p. 24).

Such a regime will make us fearful of the experimentation and innovation necessary for the pursuit of educational enhancement and renewal. In her study of responses to imposed accountability, Findlow (2008) noted 'the environment - both institution and scheme - demanded subscription to a view of accountability that impeded real innovation; that is the sort of accountability that is modelled on classic audit' (p. 5 electronic version). Teachers may be driven to perform stunts, to entertain, rather than devolving to their students due responsibility for the heavy lifting of learning. The work of the teacher is not primarily to entertain, not even to inform, if by 'inform' we mean to convey factual knowl-

edge. One of the primary functions of a teacher is to disrupt; to meddle with their students' (and their own) presuppositions and securities. As a general rule, students (like teachers!) dislike disruptions.

Ethical practice

The misappropriation and misuse of standardised testing regimes compounds the misunderstanding thereof (Gunzenhauser, 2008). Arguably, the process of collecting (and disseminating) student satisfaction data on teachers stands outside the realm of research, and constitutes part of the process of improvement in practice. Accepting that this holds true, the process must nonetheless conform to acceptable ethical standards, as must any interaction between staff and management. In any other research context, data pertaining to an individual would only be made public in any easily identifiable way with the informed consent of the 'subject'. One argument in support of making such data available to students is the convention of respecting the time taken by participants to furnish information. Nevertheless, research also sets out to respect the subjects of the research, in this case, teaching staff. In any case, the release of aggregated data satisfies this requirement; having completed a national census form, I expect to see aggregated data, but not to learn how next door is doing.

As mentioned previously, the publication of satisfaction data leaves unquestioned their contexts - their ecologies and antecedents; these data will tend to be interpreted by prospective students as the absolute mark of a particular teacher's expertise in teaching, and teacher comparisons by students will be made accordingly. The process amounts to the dissemination of misleading information about individual employees and their performance.

This practice fails multiple ethical obligations. It is more likely to undermine than enhance quality education for the following reasons:

- It is a humiliating, demoralising and dismissive way for a university to treat staff and their expertise.
- It diminishes the team, driving staff from the collaborative to the competitive end of the continuum; staff may become less predisposed to helping, supporting

and working with one another. It may breed resentment towards those staff seen to be 'students' pets'.

- It may have a similar debilitating effect on staff members' goodwill towards their students and management.
- As mentioned above, it privileges the showy over the substantial, the student over the teacher. School league tabling systems have been criticised for their tendency to drive schools and teachers to 'teach to the test' (e.g. Irvine, 2010). Similarly, this process will push staff towards teaching to the test. Here, though, the test is not even relevant in curricular terms.

It has been argued that student 'corridor conversations' about the quality of their learning experiences will take place in any case, and that social and other online sites permit such communication among students. Some content of 'What I hate about [insert name here] University' sites hardly appears consistent with ethical practice; for a university to use this as a basis for establishing its own platform for dissemination to students of information appears dubious at best. In

...the publication of satisfaction data leaves unquestioned their contexts ... these data will tend to be interpreted by prospective students as the absolute mark of a particular teacher's expertise in teaching, and teacher comparisons by students will be made accordingly.

any case, the publication of such data is more likely to conflagrate rather than contain such communication. I am not soliciting my employer's protection from such material. Nor can they offer it.

In short, the information made public is so stark as to be misleading. This hardly seems ethical, and would not appear to serve any purpose for students, staff or education.

Decency in management

'Good' management is probably as elusive a concept as good teaching, and so the term 'decency' - admittedly also a subjective term - is used here. Much of what constitutes a good teacher-student relationship applies equally to managerial relationships. Fitch and Loving (2007, p. 83) speak of

Dewey's 'amicable cooperation' in the classroom. Widely recognised as indispensable for cultivating multicultural democratic citizenship, no other approach has proven as effective in promoting positive inter-group relations, increasing academic achievement, and building bridges across borders of difference.

These principles apply in the boardroom as in the classroom.

Publishing student feedback scores transgresses the bounds of decency in management; it degrades and demeans the profession and its members. As argued above, it has the potential to be highly demoralising to staff, sets them up in competition with one another, and demonstrates a lack of professional trust. Echoing Foucault's (1995) metaphorical panopticon, Pignatelli (2002) refers to a 'blanket of surveillance, shrouded in a haze of frightfully crude and narrowly defined performance indicators' (p. 171), which serves to smother schools' collective needs and aspirations. Marshall (2001, p. 77) calls for 'thoughtful disobedience' as part of a constant vigilance against subjugation. This may include vigilance against our passive, regressive selves Gunzenhauser (2008), a vigilance that matches that of management.

The counterproductive and demoralising effects of this 'culture of compliance' (Buchanan, Gordon & Schuck, 2008, online version) and its attendant 'instruments of discipline' (Gunzenhauser, 2008, p. 4, online version) have already been mentioned. There is a certain logic here. This process feeds and feeds on the angst that it generates. The metaphor of a game of poison ball comes to mind. S/he who jumps lowest or last is 'out'. Does management believe that but for such scrutiny, staff would lack the will and wherewithal to interrogate and improve their teaching? Gunzenhauser (2008) also notes the increasing centralisation of control and surveillance attendant to this process of 'snoopervision' (National Symposium, 2010). Drawing on the work of Marlow, Ramsden (1998) outlines a 'downward spiral of distrust' (p. 200) emanating from perceived suspicion on the part of management.

One argument for making such data public is that it empowers students, who might otherwise be, or feel, impotent in the teaching/learning equation. A question in response is 'empowers them to do what? To further humiliate those staff, who, by definition, are already attaining results their university and students regard as poor?' Slee and Weiner (2001, p. 90) refer to the 'discourses of derision' inherent in such power ecologies. The process generates considerable amounts of angst and resentment amongst at least some in the profession. That real or imagined rump of staff who care not about their teaching - perhaps even defensively so, if they feel they can do little about it - will presumably continue not to care, at least outwardly so, and will tread further the path of disillusionment and dysfunction.

Unless such a practice proceeds to its logical conclusion, that of students demanding and securing the dismissal of teaching staff who displease them, it would seem that student anger in this matter will not be assuaged.

Brookfield (1995, p. 18) claims that a preoccupation with 'scoring' teaching and teachers, 'serves individuals with a reductionist cast of mind who believe that the dynamics and contradictions of teaching can be reduced to a linear, quantifiable, rating system'. His fury unspent, he proceeds to say that, 'such epistemologically challenged people sometimes find their way into positions of administrative and legislative power'. In fairness, Brookfield almost certainly oversimplifies the demands of administration and legislation, but one wonders what score he would accord such individuals.

Methodological issues

A heavy reliance on student feedback data is beset with multiple methodological weaknesses, including undertheorised, inappropriate methods. It appears to ascribe validity and reliability to results furnished by one cohort of, say, 35 students who complete a survey, and another group of 35 (or some other number, with similar or significantly different demographics, of) students, at a different time of day and week, in different classrooms, subjects etc, in terms of comparing results. Differences in class sizes constitute a double whammy here; apart from undermining confidence in result comparisons, class size variations are one variable likely to affect satisfaction levels. Data-gathering instruments are being used as devices to achieve two tasks that are, potentially at least, mutually corrosive; a tool for providing diagnostic feedback for teaching staff and perhaps their supervisors (who are bound by privacy provisions), has now been pressed into the service of a publicity and controlling mechanism.

The mean scores of typical student feedback surveys constitute opinions, but will be interpreted by many as bearing some relationship to objectivity or reality. Moreover, these mean figures attempt to capture levels of satisfaction. How well they do so is unknown. They do not purport to capture teaching and learning quality. Nevertheless, they appear to be widely interpreted as measures thereof. Anecdotally, there appears to be widespread mistrust in the accuracy of such figures, even among publication proponents. That being the case, why would one then proceed to publicise such

figures? Those who use these figures believing them to be 'true' are arguably being defrauded, and surely those who use them knowing or presuming them to be false, are being fraudulent.

A move from pen-and-paper completion of student satisfaction data to online versions at a number of universities further complicates the issue. While an online method carries time and resource efficiencies, it also removes the possibility of correlating individual numeric ratings, including outliers, with a student's comments. Anecdotally, in-class paper responses also appear to generate higher response rates. Moreover, a system whereby each response was eventually returned to the lecturer, afforded a higher degree of teacher-confidence of errors or tampering detection.

Methodological anomalies may be tolerable in the context of feedback to a restricted audience, that is, to staff and perhaps management. Even here, however, they are not without danger. No methodology appears capable of addressing the problems associated with publicising such results. The instances of inappropriate use of such data, according to Wilson, Lizzio and Ramsden (1996, p. 4) include, 'individual teacher/subject evaluation' and 'single criterion for student decision making about course enrolment'.

Gunzenhauser (2008) refers to a 'technology of normalisation in which the norm takes on outsized proportions' (p. 1 online version). The resultant sets of figures, to two decimal places, may convince and seduce us as to their bona fides, perhaps beyond our point of resistance. As Trowler (2009, p. 2) notes, 'despite the etymology of the term, data are not 'given' but are 'contrived'. He adds that it is difficult to escape our domain assumptions 'because normalisation lends them invisibility'. Ramsden and Dodds (1989, p. 18) describe the validity ascribed to such figures based on their apparent objectivity as 'entirely spurious'.

None of this is to decry student feedback surveys per se. They have their place, and offer useful windows into our students' thinking and assumptions, insights and blindspots, as well as our own, while providing us at times with helpful, practical ideas for innovation and alternative practices. Increasingly, however, they are being accorded the status as the absolute arbiters if not straightjackets of educational quality, and publicly so. As Atkinson (2000) observes, 'a narrow focus on 'what works' belies the complexity of the art and science of teaching' (p. 322, emphasis in original). A challenge now is perhaps for managers and administrators,

particularly those who aspire to be publicly judged in this way on a six-monthly basis, to defend this practice.

Of sunshine, heat and mansuetude: possible alternatives?

The coda or moral often attached to the Aesop fable at the beginning of this paper is that of gentleness. What the wind couldn't achieve by force, the sun did. It seems that coercive forms of productivity or performance improvement overlook an important factor: human motivation.

If we profess that 'good' education centres on (knowledge of) the learner's needs, and engenders deep, long-lasting thinking and change, why do we not apply this wisdom to the teacher-as-learner? Curry, Jaxon, Russell, Callahan and Bicais (2008, p. 3 [online version]) observe that, 'teachers learn through *situated and social interactions* with colleagues who *possess distributed expertise* and with whom they have opportunities for sustained conversations related to mutual interests' (emphases added).

Having simple measures to determine quality in education is highly compelling and seductive. Our quest for meaning and causality can lead us into oversimplification and error. As Slee and Weiner (2001) point out, the abandonment of a belief in a single cause or set of causes of quality education 'unsettles our explanatory frames' (p. 94).

As intimated earlier, the reductionist preoccupation with numbers is reminiscent of scoring a talent quest or perhaps a dance-off. Hole (2001) muses that teaching is akin to doing a rain dance; you never know if you're successful until or unless you get rained on. He goes on to say (p. 84),

I'm beginning to understand how futile it is to mimic the chants and movements of the rain dancer. Even if I could get the steps right, could I bring forth the rain? ... being a rain dancer is so much more than just knowing the dance.

I would add that even if rain ensues, one should be diffident in ascribing cause and effect. Moreover, superficial aping of behaviours is a particularly dangerous model for teacher education. As Russell (2010b) observes, 'learning to think pedagogically is at the core of learning to teach, just as learning to think mathematically is at the core of learning mathematics' (p. 1).

I am gradually learning in my teaching that there are times when I need to 'relinquish control to gain

influence' (Senese, 2002, p. 51). This is perhaps one such time for university managers. This is not to say that there is no place for guiding (perchance chiding?), supporting and otherwise assisting teaching staff in value-adding to their pedagogy.

What metaphor might we ascribe to teachers? Neither performing seals, impressing the crowd with their antics, nor walking encyclopaedias, full of knowledge to impart. A more apt metaphor might be that of the catalyst, precipitating a response (except that teachers are consumed by the process). This is not necessarily pretty. It is not unfailingly agreeable or comfortable. I contend that good teaching, especially in my field, social and environmental education, should 'get under your skin' at least to some extent. Any process that encourages us to cower from this is, I believe, toxic to good teaching, and will lead us to a safe, soporific sameness, an uninspiring and uninspired future that dignifies neither teaching nor teachers. Effective, quality management supports and exhorts its teachers in marshalling and mobilising the vision, energy, creativity, confidence and courage necessary for educational renewal. Surely this lofty aspiration outperforms a regression to the mean.

Dr John Buchanan is a Senior Lecturer in the Education Group and a Core Member of the Centre for Research in Learning and Change at the University of Technology, Sydney, NSW, Australia

References

- Atkinson, E. (2000). In defence of ideas, or why 'what works' is not enough. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21(3), 317-330.
- Brookfield, S. (1995). *Becoming a critically reflective teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Buchanan, J., Gordon, S. & Schuck, S. (2008). From mentoring to monitoring: The impact of changing work environments on academics in Australian universities. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(3), 241-250.
- Carroll, L. (1982). *Alice's adventures in Wonderland and Through the looking glass*. Oxford: OUP.
- Curry, M., Jaxon, K., Russell, J., Callahan, M. & Bicais, J. (2008). Examining the practice of beginning teachers' micropolitical literacy within professional inquiry communities. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 24(3), 660-673.
- Findlow, S. (2008). Accountability an innovation in higher education: a disabling tension? *Studies in Higher Education*, 33(3), 313-329.
- Fitch, F. & Loving, G. (2007). Competition and cooperation: Evil twins or fated lovers? *Philosophical Studies in Education*, 38, 83-93.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. (A. Sheridan, Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
- Gunzenhauser, M. (2008). Care of the self in a context of accountability. *Teachers College Record*, 110(10), 2224-2244. Retrieved 7 July 2010 from <http://www.tcrecord.org>
- Harvard Education Letter (2010). Retrieved 21 September 2010 from <http://www.hepg.org/hel/article/237>
- Hole, S. (2001). Teacher as rain dancer. In Mintz, E. & Yun, J. (eds). *The complex world of teaching: Perspectives from theory and practice*. Cambridge MA: Harvard Educational Review. Pp. 79-86.
- Hotelling, H. (1929). Stability in competition. *Economic Journal*, 39(153), 41-57.
- Irvine, J. (2010). A little rote learning is a dangerous thing when ideas are in short supply. *Sydney Morning Herald*, 26 February 2010, p. 7.
- Marshall, J. D. (2001). A critical theory of the self: Wittgenstein, Nietzsche, Foucault. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 20, 75-91.
- Morpurgo, M. & Clark, E. (1988). *The orchard book of Aesop's fables*. London: Orchard Books.
- National Symposium – Advice for Ministers and ACARA on NAPLAN, the use of student data, My School and league tables. Sydney, 23 July 2010. Unknown audience questioner.
- Pignatelli, F. (2002). Mapping the terrain of a Foucauldian ethics: A response to the surveillance of schooling. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 21, 157-180.
- Ramsden, P. (1998). *Learning to lead in higher education*. London: Routledge.
- Ramsden, P. & Dodds, A. (1989). *Improving teaching and courses: A guide to evaluation*. Parkville, Vic: Centre for the Study of Higher Education.
- Russell, T. (2010a, pers. comm.). Conversation with Tom Russell, April 2010.
- Russell, T. (2010b). *Innovation and self-study: Lessons learned*. Retrieved 27 July 2010 from <http://sites.google.com/site/innovationandselfstudy/home/lessons-learned>
- Schuck, S., Gordon, S. & Buchanan, J. (2008). What are we missing here? Problematising wisdoms on teaching quality and professionalism in higher education. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 13(5), 537-547.
- Senese, J. (2002). Opposites attract: What I learned about being a classroom teacher by being a teacher educator, in: Loughran J. & Russell, T. (eds). *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (London, Routledge Falmer) 43-55.
- Slee, R. & Weiner, G. (2001). Education reform and reconstruction as a challenge to research genres: reconsidering school effectiveness research and inclusive schooling. *School effectiveness and improvement*, 21(1), 83-98.
- Trowler, P. (2009). *Wicked issues in situating theory in close up research*. Retrieved 6 December 2009 from <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fss/events/hecu5/thinkpieces.htm>
- Wilson, K., Lizzio, A. & Ramsden, P. (1996). *The use and validation of the Course Experience Questionnaire*. Brisbane: Griffith University.