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Abstract
This case study used questionnaires and interviews to explore how teachers reflect on their practice. The sample consisted of twenty-five teachers from three schools in Nottinghamshire. The study found that teachers reflect on their practice based on feedback from senior management, discussions with colleagues and personal experiences. The results indicate that teachers do not allow pupils to evaluate their teaching. It was also found that teachers are reluctant to ask colleagues to evaluate their teaching practice due to the fear of being seen as inadequate. Teachers are more likely to reflect on senior management’s feedback. This study recommends that schools should support teachers to engage in reflective discussions with colleagues in order to increase criticality and should create a classroom climate where teachers are encouraged to share and reflect on their practice. It is further recommended that teachers should utilise pupils’ feedback and opinions as part of their reflective practice.

Introduction.
Teachers reflecting upon their practice is seen as imperative to ensuring high teaching standards (Dewey, 1933; Shulman, 1987; Rodgers, 2002). Day (1999) concludes that there are different theoretical models associated with reflection. Grimmett et al (1990) put forward a framework for reflection that focuses on reflecting through teachers’ values and beliefs about education. Manen (1977) proposes a reflective model that highlights effective reflection is both a collaborative and personal process. Manen’s (1977) framework emphasises that teachers’ reflection is instigated and influenced by self-evaluation, feedback from others, personal experiences in the classroom and other teachers’ experiences. For the purpose of this research, reflection will be defined as a personal and collaborative process.

There is a view from research (Pen-Edwards, Donnison and Albion, 2016; Benade, 2016; Redmond, 2017) that an effective teacher is a ‘reflective practitioner’. The importance of being a ‘reflective practitioner’ is further emphasised in the Teaching Standards (DfE, 2013) and is underpinned by the initial teacher training framework (Ofsted, 2015). A recent report by Carter (2016), which examined teacher training programmes, concludes that excellent reflection results in excellent teaching practice. However, according to McKenzie (2015) there is limited empirical evidence and statistical data to suggest that excellent reflection equates to excellent teaching practice.

Recent government policy (DfE, 2016) places emphasis on teachers reflecting upon their teaching and explicitly calls for a collaborative approach to reflection. Despite this, Ofsted (2016), policy makers (DfE, 2016) and research (Moore and Whitfield, 2008; Coldwell, et al., 2008) acknowledge that there is limited continued professional development (CPD) for reflection, even though its use is regarded as an essential element of teaching. Furthermore, there is evidence (Tok and Dolapciouglu, 2013) to suggest that teachers differ in their approach to and their engagement with reflection.

Citation
This small-scale case study explores how teachers reflect on their practice. In addition, the following sub-questions were used (1) Do teachers reflect on their practice? (2) How does feedback influence teachers’ reflective practice?

**Literature Review.**

The key themes in the literature into teachers’ reflective practice include: feedback from colleagues and senior management; teachers’ self-reflection; a reflective classroom climate; and whole school approaches to reflection.

There is a consensus (Ross and Bruce, 2007; Coldwell, Simkins, Coldron and Smith, 2008; Kaser and Halbert, 2009; Fullan, 2009) that feedback from colleagues and senior management plays an important part of teachers’ reflective practice. Teachers utilise the feedback received from colleagues and senior management to reflect upon and improve their teaching practice (O’Pry and Schmacher, 2012; Pitchler, 2012). A study conducted by Kuh (2016), which interviewed over five-hundred teachers, identified that reflective practice is more sustained when teachers reflect upon feedback from colleagues and senior management. Qualitative studies (Easton, 2008; Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Belvis, Pineda, Armedol and Moreno, 2013) have found that the quality of reflection amongst colleagues is based on how teachers build upon mutual respect. Similarly, Devine, Fatuiu and McGillicuddy (2013) conclude that teachers who are new to a school are less likely to initially engage in reflective dialogue with colleagues because they have not established a professional relationship with them. Grossman (2009) and Alexander (2016) believe that reflecting upon feedback from senior management does not require mutual respect as it forms a part of accountability and performativity within schools. However, Stoll and Seashore (2007) and Resnick (2010) conclude that in order for teachers to implement the feedback received by senior management, there must be a degree of trust that the feedback will improve their practice and pupils’ learning outcomes. The research, therefore, indicates that teachers reflect on their practice by reflecting upon feedback from senior management and discussions with colleagues.

Robertson (2009) identifies that senior management’s feedback is associated with subject knowledge, pupils’ outcomes and pedagogical approaches, whereas feedback from colleagues is centred on pupils’ work and planning decisions. However, it is important to note that the research had a sample size of fifty-five teachers, and, therefore, the findings from the research cannot be generalised to all teachers (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011). Some studies (Opfer, Pedder and Lavica, 2008; Sebba, Kent and Tregenza, 2012) conclude that feedback from senior management is generated from observations and feedback from colleagues is generated through discussions. It is argued by some (Kaser and Halbert, 2009; Fullan, 2009) that feedback generated from discussion is more beneficial as it allows collaborative reflection over emerging issues within the classroom. Contrastingly, a study by Belvis et al (2013) concludes that teachers are eighty percent more likely to implement and reflect on feedback from senior management. This suggests that senior management are more persuasive in instigating teachers’ reflection (Fullan, 2009). On the other hand, Denton (2011) and Kuh (2016) believe that both feedback from colleagues and senior management are equally essential for teachers’ reflective practice. Both studies, however, emphasise that feedback must be explicit and regular, so that teachers can develop a reflective practice that is focused on improving their teaching practice.

There is research (Rodgers, 2002; Tok, Surkran and Dolapciogu, 2013) that concludes teachers’ self-reflection is instigated and influenced by feedback from others. However, a study by Diggelen, Brok and Beijaard (2013) asserts that teachers can successfully reflect on their practice independently, but it acknowledges that feedback from others can support teachers’ self-reflection. The study concludes that teachers’ self-reflection primarily focuses on their teaching, their subject knowledge, pupils’ learning and the context in which all these operate. Self-reflection is centred on the notion that teachers teach best when they deeply understand their own teaching experiences (Rodgers, 2002; Ross and Bruce, 2007; Kurborska, 2011). Schön (1983) asserts that self-reflection is extremely
important as it allows teachers to find solutions in their own practice that cannot be solved through theories. Conflicting research (Little and Horn, 2007; Moore and Whitefield, 2008; Gleeson, 2012; Stoll, 2012) states that in practice teachers’ self-reflection tends to be superficial, narrow and non-critical in nature. It is argued by Day (1999) and Stoll (2012) that criticality is a vital component of effective and meaningful reflection. In order to critically self-reflect on experiences, teachers must utilise a combination of feedback from others, educational research and their own perceptions (Antoniou and Kyriakides, 2011). However, studies by Ross and Bruce (2007) and Wilkins (2011) conclude that there is no set way for teachers to self-reflect as it is a personal experience. Despite this difference in opinion, there is a consensus (Rodgers, 2002; Ross and Bruce, 2007; Kurborska, 2011; Diggle, Brok and Beijaard, 2013) that self-reflection focuses on practical experiences in the classroom and it forms a part of teachers’ reflective practice.

Furthermore, a reflective classroom environment forms an essential part of teachers’ reflective practice (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Ewens, 2014). Tok and Dolapcioglu (2013) state that it is imperative that teachers create a reflective classroom environment, so they can elicit pupils’ views about problems that emerge during a lesson. It further concludes that teachers who reflect on pupils’ evaluations are more effective in tailoring pedagogies that are student-centred. However, it is important to acknowledge that the research was conducted in Turkey and, therefore, the application of these findings may not be applicable to schools in England. Regardless of these methodological concerns, Irving (2004) and Hattie (2012) also identify that student-centred pedagogies have a greater impact on pupils’ learning outcomes.

Empirical studies (McAlpine, Weston and Beauchamp, 1999; Sammons et al., 2007) highlight that it is not possible for a teacher to acknowledge every problem that occurs during a lesson. It is suggested (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Ewens, 2014), therefore, that teachers reflect upon their practice by utilising pupils’ feedback from lesson evaluations. Teachers reflect upon these evaluations and use them to address specific issues. However, seminal studies (Locke, 1974; Flavell, 1974) and more recent research (Leming, Ellington and Schu, 2006; Bolinger and Warren, 2007) conclude that teachers do not allow pupils to express their views through evaluations because of their fear of being perceived as a failure. Similarly, a seminal study by Goodlad (1984), which collected data and observations from thirty-eight schools, one thousand classrooms and seventeen-thousand students, concludes that the sense of authoritarian discipline seen in schools may have prevented pupils’ feedback being utilised and consequently an essential part of reflective practice has been neglected. Tok and Dolapcioglu’s (2013) argument differs as they state that teachers understand the importance of pupils’ feedback, but time restraints and a content heavy curriculum restrict the practice being fully utilised. Contrastingly, research conducted by Jackson (1990), which interviewed seven hundred pupils and teachers, implies that pupils lack the pedagogical understanding to provide meaningful feedback. However, Ewens (2014) emphasises that an effective reflective practitioner examines pupils’ feedback and reflects upon how they can use their pedagogical, curricular and subject knowledge to address specific pupils’ needs. In theory, pupils’ feedback is an essential component of reflective practice, however, literature indicates that it is not being fully utilised. A final note should be made about the value placed on empirical studies as these studies, despite being prized by policy makers due to their relevance to practice, are limited in the sense that every educational setting is unique. Due to teachers’ personal views and school structures that determine the value placed on reflection, there is no single method that can be universally applied.

Conversely, a whole school approach to reflection is seen as central to ensuring high teaching standards are maintained and developed within a school (Clegg, Tan and Saedi, 2002; Bubb and Earley, 2009; Barber, Whelan and Clark, 2010; Resnick, 2010; Bleach, 2014). Research (Pavlovich, 2007; Easton, 2008; Grossman, 2009; Resnick, 2010; Wilkins, 2011) and Ofsted (2006) conclude that whole school approaches to reflection are carefully instigated by senior management through whole school
continued professional development. Harris and Jones (2010) assert that it is the careful analysis of pupil progress data by senior management that helps identify potential areas for further development in teachers’ subject, curricular and pedagogical understanding. Fishman et al (2003) and Bubb and Earley (2007) add that it is the detailed analysis of data which drives many examples of effective whole school reflection because it provides substance for teachers to reflect upon and address weaknesses collectively. Similarly, a study by Fullan (2009) emphasises that a collective commitment to improving practice is more effective than isolated efforts from teachers. The literature suggests that teachers’ reflective practice is influenced by a whole school approach to reflection, although there is research (Butler et al, 2004; Fielding et al., 2005; Little, 2006; William, 2008) that illustrates that senior management are heavily involved in this part of teachers’ reflective practice. 

**Methodology.**

The methodology used was a case study approach which provided an opportunity for teachers’ reflection to be studied in-depth (Bell, 2014). The rationale for using a case study is it enables readers to understand how theoretical principles and abstract ideas, such as reflection, are applied in practice (Cohen et al., 2011). According to some (Thomas, 2009; Cohen et al., 2011) the data produced by case studies is strong in its reliability as it is immediately intelligible. However, the results produced by case studies may not be generalisable (Dawson, 2012; Cottrell, 2014). Currently, there is a growing trend within educational research to use case studies as they reflect the uniqueness of education which is a complex environment (Wissman et al, 2015). In addition, Gorard, Rushford and Taylor’s (2004) research found that key stakeholders, who represented the ‘UK education community’, are disillusioned with educational research due to its overreliance on qualitative data. A measure put in place to address this was by using mixed methods, which included a questionnaire, with qualitative and quantitative elements, and follow-up interviews. Mixed methods provide a more detailed analysis of the issue being researched (Gorard and Taylor, 2004; Denzin, 2008; Creswell, 2009). Furthermore, there is an argument in educational research that it is too simplistic to polarise qualitative and quantitative methods because both styles of data collection are compatible with each other (Brannen, 2005; Trifonas, 2009; Cohen et al., 2011).

During this study, I have rigorously complied with the ethics policy of Bishop Grosseteste University (2016) and the ethics guidance of the British Educational Research Association (2011). I obtained full consent from the corresponding head teachers in order for the research to be conducted in their schools. All participants were made aware that they were participating in research and were assured of anonymity and non-traceability. They were all informed that they had the right to withdraw from the research at any time. The questionnaire included a cover letter that explained what the research project entailed and how the data that they provided would be used. Recordings of the interviews were stored in a password protected file and were destroyed at the end of the study.

The sample of the study was comprised of twenty-five teachers (reception to year 6; age group 5 – 11) working in three primary schools in Nottinghamshire. Twenty-one of the teachers who responded to the questionnaire were female and four were male. The mean for the amount of years teaching was eight years. A non-probability purposive sampling technique was used to understand teachers’ reflective practice. The rationale for using a purposive sampling model was to access those who have an in-depth knowledge about reflective practice (Cottrell, 2014). It is important to note that this study’s sample size (n=25) is small and therefore the findings cannot be generalised to other teachers (Thomas, 2009; Dawson, 2012). However, Cohen et al. (2011) asserts that there is limited benefit in seeking a large sample size in a case study as the primary concern is to acquire in-depth information from those who have a deep understanding of the research area.

Questionnaires are seen as a valuable way of collecting data about teachers’ perceptions, especially in a case study (Denscombe, 2007; Yin, 2009; Cohen et al., 2011; Cottrell, 2014). The data produced
by questionnaires can be extremely reliable as participants tend to give more honest answers than other research methods (Cohen et al., 2011). However, Yin (2009) asserts that the wording of questions can be misinterpreted, which can reduce the study’s validity and reliability. In order to limit the effects of misinterpretation, all questions were piloted with five teachers. As a result of the pilot, the wording of some questions were amended to improve clarity and strengthen the overall research design. In addition, a ‘not applicable’ option was added to the questionnaire, so that participants could explicitly state whether a particular question did not apply to them (Cottrell, 2014). Its implementation further minimised the potential of participants choosing an irrelevant option which may have produced misleading data (Cohen et al., 2011). It is important to note that some of the questions in the questionnaire were taken and adapted from a similar study by Tok and Dolapcioglu (2013).

In addition, a Likert scale was used in the questionnaire to gauge degrees of responses in regards to how teachers reflect on their practice. There is literature (Friedman and Amoo, 1999; Ovadia, 2004) to suggest that rating scales are particularly beneficial when conducting an evaluative questionnaire. Hartley and Betts (2010) state that Likert scales are easy to understand and the data they produce is easy to decode. However, they are to some extent limited as they do not allow participants to expand on their answers (Hartley and Betts, 2010; Cohen et al., 2011).

In order to counter the limitations of the Likert scale questionnaire, the research was triangulated with follow-up interviews. Following the distribution of the questionnaire, five teachers were asked to participate in a follow-up interview. Sharp (2009) believes that follow-up interviews are useful in discussing and comparing common themes that have emerged in questionnaires. Furthermore, it allows a more in-depth answer to be given and the rationale behind a particular response (Cohen et al., 2011). Cottrell (2014) asserts that participants may focus more on providing an answer that placates the researcher, thereby undermining the reliability and validity. Mundia (2010) believes that social desirability, which is where a person is likely to describe themselves in a favourable manner in order to gain respect of others, is closely associated with the teaching profession and is, therefore, present in teachers’ responses in interviews and questionnaires. A measure put in place in order to limit the impact of social desirability was to triangulate the research with questionnaires and follow-up interviews.

**Discussion**

This study has found that teachers use feedback from senior management as a stimulus to reflect on their own teaching practice, as was found in other studies (Robertson, 2009; Opfer et al., 2008). Feedback was generated from formal observations conducted by senior management; participants felt that observations encouraged them to critically reflect on their teaching practice. Participants in this study noted that they are prioritising feedback from senior management due to performance related pay and being accountable to senior management. Similarly, Grossman (2009) and Alexander (2016) found that teachers are reflecting upon feedback from senior management as a part of perforativity, rather than it being a stringent part of teachers’ reflective practice. Nearly all (22 out of 25) respondents noted that they ‘always’ reflect upon feedback from senior management and (23 out of 25) stated that they ‘always’ document how their feedback is being implemented. Similarly, Belvis et al. (2013) identified that teachers are more likely to reflect on feedback from senior management and explicitly document its implementation. Consistent with Kuh’s (2016) findings, one teacher stated, “Their feedback instigates my self-reflection. At the end of a lesson, I regularly reflect on whether I have implemented their feedback from previous observations.”

This study has found that teachers do not necessarily associate discussions with colleagues with their own reflective practice, which contradicts the findings of Denton (2011) and Kuh (2016) who conclude that feedback from senior management and colleagues play an equally important role in teachers’ reflective practice. A large proportion (18 out of 25) of respondents to the questionnaire stated that
they never ask colleagues to give feedback on their teaching practice and they also never reflect on colleagues’ feedback. To a certain extent, this finding contradicts Cooper’s (1999) research that states teachers are willing to provide feedback on other teachers’ teaching practice. This also differs to the findings of similar studies (Kaser and Halbert, 2009; Fullan, 2009) which concluded that colleagues’ feedback, which is generated from discussions, is regularly implemented and reflected upon by teachers. Although this was the case for the teacher who said, “Certainly, I believe that reflecting collaboratively can improve teaching because colleagues can bring new perspectives and expertise.” There was evidence that professional conversations with colleagues did take place and were associated with pedagogical approaches and classroom related problems, which aligns with the findings of O’Pry and Schmacher (2012). One teacher reported, “I personally would not ask colleagues to give me feedback on a lesson. However, I would reflect on a conversation with colleagues about a particular issue.”

As literature suggests (Easton, 2008; Darling-Hammon et al., 2009; Belvis, 2013; Devine et al., 2013), some participants indicated that they initially found it hard to engage in discussions with colleagues about their practice. This was exemplified by one teacher who stated, “I am new to the school, so I find it difficult to discuss educational matters with colleagues. I do not want my new colleagues to think that I am inadequate.” Teachers, who participated in the interviews, commented on the fear of being seen as inadequate by colleagues as a reason for not asking for feedback. This finding resonates with teachers that participated in Tok and Dolapciouglu’s (2013) study who stated they have a fear of being judged as failures by colleagues. During interview, one participant, who was new to the school, stated that they had not established a good rapport with their colleagues, so they currently found it hard to engage in discussions with them. This demonstrates the influence that a good rapport with colleagues has on a teachers’ reflective practice. As noted in the interviews teachers value the importance of reflecting on discussions with colleagues, but like other studies suggest (Darling-Hammond et al., 2009; Belvis et al., 2013) its success is heavily dependent on the teacher’s relationship with their colleagues. The study also found that teachers discussing their practice with colleagues and reflecting on these conversations depends on the school’s approach to whole school reflection. Participants noted that they would feel more confident discussing and reflecting upon their practice with other teachers if there were a whole school approach established. The lack of a cohesive approach to reflection may be another contributing factor to why discussions with colleagues are not associated with teachers’ reflective practice.

Most of teachers who participated in this study (23 out of 25) state that an important element of their reflective practice is creating a classroom climate where pupils are encouraged to express themselves freely. Participants stated that pupils are an extremely important element of their reflective practice. An example of this was the teacher who said, “They are part of my reflective practice as a large proportion of my reflection is associated with supporting their learning.” However, most of the respondents (22 out of 25) also stated that they never allow their pupils to evaluate their teaching. There is evidence from research (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Sammons et al., 2007; Ewens, 2014) that pupils can expose hidden problems within a lesson and provide valuable feedback for teachers to reflect upon. This study, however, has found that teachers are reluctant to use pupils to evaluate their teaching and as a result, teachers rarely reflect upon and change their teaching based on pupils’ evaluations. This finding contrasts with Ewens (2014), who states that teachers value pupils’ feedback on their teaching and use it as a stimulus for reflection. It is important to note that Ewens’ (2014) research did not specifically examine primary school teachers’ reflective practice. Similar to other research findings (Leming, Ellington and Schu, 2006; Bolinger and Warren, 2007; Tok and Dolapciouglu, 2013), the participants felt that allowing children to evaluate their teaching undermines their role in the classroom and their behaviour management strategies. A further finding in agreement with Jackson (1990), is some teachers feel that pupils lack the knowledge and experience to give quality feedback that can be reflected upon. As one teacher said, “Pupils do not necessarily give
feedback that is sufficient to reflect upon as they do not have the adequate pedagogical, curricular and subject knowledge.” There seems to be an opinion amongst the participants that teachers’ reflection is centred on pupils and they form part of their reflective practice. However, the findings obtained state that pupils are not seen as active participants in providing feedback that can be reflected upon. One of the teachers stated, “I suppose they are part of my reflective practice, but I tend to change my practice based on self-reflection.” This may be due to both the teachers’ fears of possible behaviour management ramifications and the pupils’ ability to produce meaningful feedback.

Although teachers in this study see reflection as a collaborative process, they also see it as a personal experience. The results obtained from the questionnaire affirm that there is no set way of teachers reflecting. There is a common theme that self-reflection is not explicitly documented, but teachers state that they often reflect on lessons. This may be due to the lack of training dedicated to reflective practice beyond initial teacher training. The responses from the questionnaires also demonstrated that teachers’ self-reflection focuses on their own subject knowledge, their pedagogical approaches and pupils’ learning. Diggelen et al. (2013) also highlight that teachers’ self-reflection primarily focuses on themselves, their teaching and their pupils. Some studies (Rodgers, 2002; Ross and Bruce, 2007; Kurborska, 2011; Tok et al., 2013) have highlighted that teachers’ self-reflection is instigated and influenced by personal experiences in the classroom, external and internal policies, research journals and feedback from senior management. The findings of this study have also highlighted that teachers reflect on their practice by using personal experiences in the classroom, policies and feedback from senior management. However, it was found that predominantly teachers’ self-reflection is influenced by feedback and targets from senior management. Participants stated that their self-reflection often relates to the feedback given by senior management. Like Belvis et al’s (2013) analysis, this may be a result of teachers placing more emphasis on senior management’s feedback.

Conclusion and recommendations
The aim of the study was to ascertain how teachers reflect on their practice. It is important to note that this was a small-scale case study and, therefore, the findings cannot be generalised to all teachers’ reflective practice. It was found that teachers reflect on their practice in different ways, but the aim of teachers’ reflection is always to improve their teaching. Like Mane’s (1977) reflective framework, teachers’ reflective practice is instigated and influenced by feedback from others, personal experiences in the classroom and other teachers’ experiences. However, this study has found that teachers prioritise senior management’s feedback, when reflecting on their practice.

Participants noted that the rationale for focusing their reflection on senior management’s feedback is due to an accountability and performativity culture within education. It was found that performance related pay could be possibly exacerbating this trend. It could be argued that as a result of this trend other possible collaborators, such as colleagues and pupils, are being overlooked in the process.

Additionally, this study found that some teachers reflect on their practice by engaging in discussions with colleagues. It was found that teachers feel that their self-criticality is improved through this method. Similar to Devine, Fatigue and McGillicuddy’s (2013) study, it was also found that teachers who are new to a school find it difficult to engage in reflective discussions with colleagues. This highlights the need for teachers who are new to a school to establish a good rapport with colleagues, so they can engage in meaningful reflective discussions. This study offers an alternative argument to the one presented in literature (Denton, 2011; Kuh, 2016) that teachers ask colleagues to evaluate their own practice and reflect on the feedback received. Teachers in this study state that they did not want observation feedback from their colleagues, but most of the participants (20 out of 25) often took part in discussions with them. Participants identified that rapport with colleagues, time constraints, fear of being seen as inadequate and lack of training as reasons for not asking colleagues
for feedback. This highlights the importance of schools establishing a whole school approach to reflection which could encourage teachers to ask colleagues for feedback on their practice.

Furthermore, the idea emphasised in literature (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Ewens, 2014; Tok and Dolapcioglu, 2012) that feedback and evaluations from pupils is a way in which teachers critically reflect on their practice is dismissed in this study. In this study, teachers stated that they rarely or never allow pupils to give feedback on their practice. The following were seen as reasons for not allowing pupils to evaluate teachers’ practice: it undermines their role as a teacher, the behaviour management ramification it could possibly produce and doubts about pupils having the appropriate knowledge about pedagogy. The participants acknowledge that pupils are a part of their reflective process, but they failed to see the theoretical argument posed by literature (Hattie and Timperley, 2007; Ewens, 2014; Tok and Dolapcioglu, 2012) that pupils can provide constructive feedback that can be reflected upon.

The findings of this study demonstrate that teachers’ reflection is a varied, intricate, personal and collaborative process. The results indicate that senior management’s feedback is being reflected on more frequently and to a degree other forms of reflection are not being fully utilised. It is, therefore, recommended that schools help teachers that are new to a school establish a good rapport with colleagues, so reflective discussions can be utilised. It is important that schools create a climate, which could be achieved through in-school training, where teachers are encouraged to share and reflect on their practice with other colleagues. Additionally, it is recommended that teachers utilise pupils’ feedback as part of their reflective practice. As other studies conclude (McApline, Weston and Beauchamp, 1999; Sammon et al., 2007), this could be achieved by coaching pupils to provide meaningful feedback that can be reflected upon by teachers.
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