

The International  
JOURNAL  
*of*  
LEARNING

Volume 14, Number 9

Communities of Practice: Innovation in Early  
Childhood Education and Care Teacher and  
Practitioner Preparation

Karen Noble

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEARNING  
<http://www.Learning-Journal.com>

First published in 2007 in Melbourne, Australia by Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd  
[www.CommonGroundPublishing.com](http://www.CommonGroundPublishing.com).

© 2007 (individual papers), the author(s)  
© 2007 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact [<cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com>](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com).

ISSN: 1447-9494  
Publisher Site: <http://www.Learning-Journal.com>

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEARNING is a peer refereed journal. Full papers submitted for publication are refereed by Associate Editors through anonymous referee processes.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system  
<http://www.CommonGroundSoftware.com>.

# Communities of Practice: Innovation in Early Childhood Education and Care Teacher and Practitioner Preparation

Karen Noble, University of Southern Queensland, Australia

*Abstract: In early childhood education and care (ECEC), research indicates that quality experiences for young children are a result of the partnership between committed professionals who facilitate collaborative high quality programs. Furthermore, it is clear that practice within the ECEC sector has become more complex. Indeed, practitioners in this field are now required to heavily focus upon the care and welfare components of their practice because context issues are impacting on their work with young children. As such, practitioners are often required to deal with issues that could be considered to be outside of the realm of traditional educational training. Such issues are impacting on teachers and practitioners in relation to how they see themselves as professionals in the workplace. This situation can be troubling and problematic, as practitioners seek to negotiate the complexities of engaging in practice across social and disciplinary boundaries. This paper explores an innovative approach to preparing students for such complex work, by way of the development of a community of practice, in which students, supervisors and university academic staff engage in a collaborative process of critical reflection to interrogate practice and to make connections to relevant theoretical frameworks that draw on a multidisciplinary approach.*

Keywords: Critical Reflection, Practicum, Beginning Teachers and Practitioners, Community of Practice

## Introduction

**T**HE EARLY CHILDHOOD education and care (ECEC) sector throughout Australia is fragmented, with wide state variation in how ECEC programs are delivered, organised, staffed and funded. Compounding this fragmentation is the issue of availability of places for young children and their families (Bowes & Hayes, 1999; Brennan, 1998; 1999; Noble, 2003; 2005). Throughout this paper, the term ECEC is used to denote formal centre-based early childhood services that provide education and care for young children from zero to eight years of age, including childcare, kindergarten, preschool, preparatory and early primary years in Australia. This definition is supported internationally, evidenced by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) report, *Starting Strong*, (2001), where ECEC is used to describe services such as early primary years, preschool, kindergarten and child care.

The possible reframing of the public provision of such services for young children is receiving much attention by both the state and national levels of governments in Australia (Commonwealth Government, 1999; 2002; 2003; 2004; Council of Australian Government (COAG) Child Care Working Group, 1995; Queensland Government, 2000; 2005). The promotion of the need for systemic reform and the development of more flexible and integrated services are also evident in the international arena (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2001). Such reform directly impacts upon

the professionals and practitioners working within these services. Indeed, whilst much has been written about the tensions that exist in Australian ECEC policy and practice (Fleer, 2000; OECD, 2001; Press & Hayes, 2000), there is a further need to examine closely the knowledge base and practices of ECEC, in order to reflect upon the appropriateness of practitioner preparation. Such endeavours provide an approach to structures and practices that allow for ECEC reform, practitioner preparedness and sustainable, workforce capacity building. Coupled with this, is the need to constantly evaluate university practitioner preparation programs, in order that they continue to provide students with the necessary skills, knowledge and abilities vital for their effective transition into their chosen areas of professional practice. In times of uncertain futures and dramatic policy reform, there are many perceived challenges to the preparedness of students choosing a career working with young children and families across disparate ECEC contexts. Moreover, this paper explores the need for critical reflection due to the disjuncture between the realities of the ECEC practitioner in the field of practice and the need to develop a cohesive “community of practice”, with an aspiration of promoting a more cohesive and internally supportive workforce. Specifically, this paper highlights the ways in which this term is identified, characterised, and practiced, particularly during times of political, social and economic fragmentation for those undergraduate university students preparing to enter the ECEC community.



## Contextual Considerations for ECEC Practitioner Preparation

Within existing literature relating to ECEC practitioner preparation, several important contexts are identified that impact upon the ways in which their education and training affect their practice and future professional development (Cavanagh, 2002; Cliff, 1996). These contexts include the theoretical context, the professional and community context, as well as the personal context. The common, identifiable elements amongst each of these contexts are those of learning and reflective practice.

The theoretical context, in this instance, refers to the knowledge base that students must acquire, in order to inform and guide their practices with young children and their families. Such a theoretical context needs to inform practitioner practice, whilst at the same time, growing and improving over time, with experience and in response to future reform within the sector. This theoretical context also guides the individual's development in both their professional and personal contexts. It is recognised that there are inherent difficulties in translating such theory into practice. Indeed, this is an ethical dilemma that many in the field of higher education, as well as ECEC have highlighted (Dahlberg et al., 2001; Fler, 2000; Moss, 2003; Moss & Petrie, 2002). In response to such dilemmas, an important part of the student's education and training is to facilitate the development of skills in critical reflection. Whilst there is a body of theory on philosophical and ethical standpoints, dilemmas and perspectives, the body of theory about the learning of these reflective skills is less developed. The concept of community has become a catch phrase within the wider societal context. Within this terrain, community is a concept with high ethical content. Community is an easy label to apply, and in recent times, particularly in the education and care sectors, this has been done with regularity (O'Farrell, 2005; Queensland Government, 2002). The idea of community has connotations of collectivism, rather than fragmented individualism. Alternatively, the concept of community can be seen as transitory, that is, constantly shifting and changing, rather than a stable entity. The dilemma is centred within the notion of community for graduate students who are preparing to participate in the ECEC community sector, working with young children and their families, as reflective practitioners. Particularly, how they see themselves transitioning from a student to a professional practitioner.

In recent times, the term "community" has been used widely, particularly in social policy. Indeed, community now appears as a prefix to many government programs and policy reforms. In this sense, the term is used to evoke a sense of togetherness, referring to the notion of holding something in common,

an example being community interests, or a sense of common identity. Community is not a static phenomenon. People make continuous choices about their communal identification and the degree of their affiliation. Therefore, students need to be provided opportunities, knowledge and skills to be able to engage in the cycle of learning and reflection, in order to establish, evaluate and maintain membership of the ECEC community.

How then, do students understand their acquisition of membership to the ECEC community of professional practitioners? How do they acquire the identity of, and sense of belonging to, the ECEC community? Collaboration and partnership are some of the well-established conceptions within the literature in relation to ECEC communities. Indeed, interpersonal and group skills, as well as "groupness" are claimed as essential features of ECEC communities (Goodfellow, 1995; Walsh et al., 2002). The building of partnerships is a key component of effective curriculum practice and community development (Woodrow & Brennan, 1999). In ECEC, these partnerships are essential for the development of ECEC programs which lead to improved outcomes for young children and their families. The development and maintenance of such partnerships, or ECEC communities, is not a prescriptive process, and as such, the future practitioner, i.e. the ECEC student, must emerge from their education program with the capacity to engage in teamwork, to collaborate in curriculum decision-making and to have the ability to develop critical reflective practices. Another important element of the professional context of ECEC practitioner preparation is the way in which the ECEC practitioner is viewed, particularly from within their own community. If we are to examine the notion of community in terms of 'common identity', as previously mentioned, then issues such as professional status and standing, working conditions, training and qualifications need to be discussed and reflected upon also. These issues lead to disparity within the sector, further complicating practices within the field and complicating the way in which the practitioner reflects upon practices as well as personal identity as an effective practitioner.

Within the personal context, the notion of community is seen as a state of mind, rather than something tangible. It is more than a place. It is an acknowledgement of involvement, engagement as well as interdependence. There is an acceptance that despite community being a social concept, it is utterly dependent on the individual person. It is not sameness, but interlocking diversity and respect for specialisation and individual difference. It's unity is that of diversity in which an arena of action is created. Therefore, "community is never static, always negotiated, shifting and adjusting its principles of order,

but always mine and ours, mine to belong to, ours to be ourselves” (O’Farrell, 1994, p.18). For one to develop a sense of belonging to the community of ECEC practitioners, one needs to develop personally and professionally.

### ***Focusing on Reflective Practice***

Scholarship in the field of ECEC has often been underpinned by a focus on reflective practice as a means of evaluating and assessing and improving appropriate practice for work with young children (Moss, 2000; 2003; Moss & Pence, 1994; National Child Care Accreditation Council (NCAC), 2002; Noble, 2003; Noble, Macfarlane & Cartmel, 2004; Perry, 1997) and making connections between theory and practice. As such, the ability to reflect on practice has traditionally been a way for student practitioners to evaluate their own practice and the practice of others, with a view to developing effective skills, abilities and knowledge to inform their future practice with young children and families (Fleer, 2000; Goodfellow, 1995; MacNaughton & Williams, 1998; NCAC, 2002; Patterson & Sumsion, 1996; Perry, 1997; Sumsion, 2003). Reflection on practice therefore is a necessary component of tertiary practitioner preparation programs, as it is the means by which improvement in practice, maintaining professionalism and professional development is promoted when these graduates move into the field.

In the field of ECEC, reflective practice is a “core activity” (Moss & Petrie, 2002, p.145), understood as the ability to evaluate critical incidents within daily work, using this evaluation as a means of improving practice and knowledge about work with young children. The reflective practitioner is one who provides space for “new possibilities to be explored and realised” (Moss & Petrie, 2002, p.145). This practitioner engages in this space to construct, rather than reproduce knowledge. To reflect effectively, practitioners must not see themselves as the “repository of objects of knowledge” (Moss & Petrie, 2002, p.145), but rather, must engage in a process that allows them to construct new epistemological understandings that are informed by theory, research and practice. To engage in small group discussion and reflection where each member is at a similar level of professional development may prove fruitless, in that only a narrow or limited knowledge base can be drawn upon. Instead, participation of practitioners of various levels of experience may actually be more useful in providing an examination of the multiplicity of responses that may be applicable to any given situation.

### **Building Towards Critically Reflective Practitioners**

Romantic notions of idealistic approaches to working with young children have often guided reflection on practice (Sumsion, 2003) across the various ECEC contexts. Such romantic notions do not withstand the complexity, uncertainty and insecurity of working with young children and their families in the current context (Hulqvist & Dahlberg, 2001; Jenks, 1996a, 1996b). The process of reflective practice promotes a culture of evaluation, whereby all practitioners become involved in processes that assist them to constantly review what is happening and what should be happening within a community of practice. According to Wadsworth (1997) such reflection can be built into the everyday activities of practitioners through a variety of means including daily informal self-reflection, as well as through more formalised processes. It can be ascertained that there is a difference between reflective practice and critical reflection, and that this difference exists in the ability of the practitioner to engage with multiple understandings of practice. Critical reflection is understood to be the ability to reflect honestly on one’s practice in a manner that allows multiple perspectives and approaches to inform the work that is done. Sumsion (2003) understands critical reflection as a discursive project using Phelan’s argument, which contests that preservice teachers and practitioners should “be exposed to a wider range of discourses than are traditionally sanctioned by teacher education programs” (Sumsion, 2003, p.83). Furthermore, Phelan states [practitioner] education needs to become a discursive project. There is no escaping discourse. There is no escaping that language/discourse constitutes experience generally, and our experience of place specifically. [Practitioner] educators may need to consider how we can help prospective practitioners to recognize the multiple discourses that shape and often restrict their thinking about experience and place (cited in Sumsion, 2003, p.19).

It is important that participants are accepted for their contribution and recognition is given to the tacit knowledge (Osmond, 2001) that each person already possesses, while at the same time developing the ability to incorporate multiple understandings and perspectives that are presented by others.

### ***Learning Circles: Promoting Critical Reflection as a Means of Building a Community of Practice***

One approach to promoting the adoption of multiple understandings and developing skills of critical reflection is based on the learning circle approach that, in this instance, maximises opportunities for small groups of students to critically reflect upon practice

in the field alongside more experienced practitioners and university academic staff. Learning circles are self-managed learning groups, built on the fundamental principles of adult learning. The best adult learning encourages and supports the critical reflection on what we think we already know (Sumsion, 2003). In this way, learning circles have proven a practical and effective method of learning and supporting change. They are a way for students to form new understandings with regard to important issues, in their own time (Karasi & Segar, 2000). The learning circle approach has been a predominate part of adult education, especially in Scandinavia (Crombie, 1999). Such an approach is understood as *democracy in action*, as it encourages all views to be expressed and explores various merits. An effective learning circle can empower its members to act as they see fit, on the basis of the new knowledge that this process generates.

Such a process to critical reflection further enhances the learning outcomes achieved through practice and enables the development of generic skills necessary to work across many different ECEC contexts. Learning circles present the opportunity for self-directed learning, with learning occurring through shared inquiry and dialogue (Karasi & Segar, 2000), providing all participants with an opportunity to 'think otherwise' (Foucault, 1984; McWilliam, 2002) about how their work with young children and families might 'play out in the real'. A learning circle approach to deconstructing practice in ECEC accentuates the dialogic relationship necessary to the development of the skills of effective critical reflection in students, practitioners and academics alike. This paper argues that critical reflection differs from mere reflective ability by highlighting reflexivity as an essential component of such skills and by understanding professional or social practice as a discursive project (Phelan, cited in Sumsion, 2003).

The learning circle approach allows opportunities to draw on the experiences and knowledge of all participants, thereby allowing the beginning practitioner, or student, more time to extend learning and follow up with information searches in their own time that will extend from the indepth and rich discussion, thereby deepening the learning that is occurring for each individual. As previously outlined, al-

though simplification is an important aspect of the learning circle process, the dialogic relationship that this approach promotes enables the facilitator to move students and experienced practitioners beyond a surface level exploration of experiential learning, encouraging them to become knowledge seekers in the process, regardless of their level of expertise. This self-direction occurs through the equal relationship that is established early in the process that can often not be a part of a traditional student-practitioner learning situation (Haigh & Ward, 2004).

The learning circle approach provides an opportunity to produce practitioners who are problem-solvers, decision-makers, communicators, critical thinkers who have awareness of effective interpersonal skills and group facilitation processes and value the role of lifelong learning in their professional growth and development. Moreover, the notion of a community of practice is integral to the use of learning circles. Thus, by drawing on established knowledge and experience from all participants, the learning circle approach facilitates collaboration within the community and enhances student understanding of the importance of such community work. It is therefore evident that multiple perspectives are likely to be present, as all participants have different knowledge, experience and understandings that they possess and impart to other members of the group.

## Conclusion

As has been previously articulated, the preparation of beginning practitioners to work effectively in the early childhood education and care sector is of particular relevance in times of dramatic policy reform (Fleer, 2000; Noble, 2003; Noble, Macfarlane & Cartmel, 2004). Preparatory ECEC programs need to reflect these changes and ensure that programs that are offered do indeed meet the ever-changing needs of the students that enrol, providing them with the necessary knowledge and skills that are transferable across this broad community sector. This paper postulates that the effective, professional ECEC practitioner requires the ability to reflect, and learn from this reflection. Therefore, an important part of the training and education of ECEC practitioners needs to focus on facilitating the development of skills in critical reflection.

## References

- Bowes, J., & Hayes, A. E. (Eds.), (1999). *Children, families and communities. Contexts and consequences*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Brennan, D. (1998). *The politics of Australian child care: From philanthropy to feminism and beyond*. Melbourne: Cambridge University.
- Brennan, D. (1999). Children and Australian social policy. In J. Bowes & A. Hayes (Eds.), *Children, families and communities. Contexts and consequences* (pp. 281-298). Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Cavanagh, R. (2002). *School improvement: Organisational development or community building?* Paper presented at the AARE Conference, Brisbane.

- Cliff, A. (1996). *Postgraduate students' beliefs about learning and knowledge. Different approaches: Theory and practice in higher education*. Paper presented at the HERDSA Conference, Perth.
- Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services. (1999). *Child Care in Australia. An update of key statistics relating to the Commonwealth Childcare Program*, [report]. Available: <http://www.facs.gov.au> [2003, June, 24].
- Commonwealth Department of Family and Community Services. (2002). *Stronger families and communities strategy*. Available: <http://www.facs.gov.au/sfcs/about.htm> [2003, 9 June].
- Commonwealth Government. (2003). *Towards a national agenda for early childhood*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing.
- Commonwealth Government. (2004). *National agenda for early childhood: A draft framework*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing.
- Council of Australian Governments. (1995). *Discussion paper: A national framework for Children's Services*. Canberra: Australian Government Printing.
- Crombie, A. (1999). *The ABC to learning circles*. Australian Association of Adult and Community Education, Canberra.
- Dahlberg, G., Moss, P., & Pence, A. (2002). *Beyond quality in early childhood education and care: postmodern perspectives*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Fleer, M. (2000). *An early childhood research agenda: Voices from the field*. Canberra: JS McMillan Printing.
- Foucault, M. (1984c). 'Polemics, politics and problematisations'. In P. Rabinow (Ed.) *Michel Foucault, ethics: essential works of Foucault 1954-1984 volume 1*. London: Penguin, 111-119.
- Goodfellow, J. (1995). *A matter of professional style: Implications for the development of purposeful partnerships between cooperating teachers and student teachers*. Paper presented at the PEPE Conference, Broadbeach, Queensland.
- Haigh, M. & Ward, G. (2004). Problematising practicum relationships: questioning the 'taken for granted'. *Australian Journal of Education*. 48 (2), 134-148.
- Hultqvist, K. & Dahlberg, G. (2001). *Governing the child in the new millennium*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Jenks, C. (1996a). *Childhood*. London: Routledge.
- Jenks, C. (1996b). "The postmodern child". In J. Brannen and M. O'Brien, (Eds.) *Children in Families: Research and Policy*. London: Falmer Press.
- Karasi, M. & Segar, C. (2000). 'Learning Circles: An innovative tool for workplace learning for EL teachers', Paper presented at 35<sup>th</sup> SEAMEO RELC Seminar, Singapore, 17<sup>th</sup> - 19<sup>th</sup> - April.
- MacNaughton, G. & Williams, G. (1998). *Techniques for teaching young children*. Melbourne: Addison Wesley Longman Australia.
- McWilliam, E. (2002). *What About Uranus or How Are You on the Whole?* Brisbane: Always Flying.
- Moss, P., & Pence, A. (1994). *Valuing quality in early childhood services*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Moss, P. (2000). "Training of early childhood education and care staff", *International Journal of Educational Research*, 38, pp.31-53.
- Moss, P., & Petrie, P. (2002). *From children's services to children's spaces: Public provision, children and childhood*. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Moss, P. (2003). Getting beyond childcare: Reflections on recent policy and future possibilities. In J. Brannen & P. Moss (Eds.), *Rethinking children's care* (pp. 25-44). Buckingham: University Press.
- National Childcare Accreditation Council. (2002). *Putting children first: Quality improvement and accreditation system handbook*. Canberra: NCAC.
- Noble, K. (2003). "Graduate programs for students working in the ECEC sector". Refereed paper submitted to the *New Zealand Association of Research in Education/Australian Association of Research in Education Conference*, Auckland, New Zealand, 29<sup>th</sup> November - 4<sup>th</sup> December, 2003.
- Noble, K., Macfarlane, K. & Cartmel, J. (2004) Pedagogy in the nursery: Establishing practitioner partnerships in high-quality long day care programs. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood*. 29 (4), 38-44.
- O'Farrell, C. (2005). *Michael Foucault*. London: Sage Publications.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2001). *Starting strong: Early childhood education and care policy*. Canberra: OECD.
- Osmond, J. (2001). The practice of knowledge use. A study of the explicit and tacit understandings of practitioners, Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation. The University of Queensland.
- Patterson, C. & Sumsion, J. (1996). "Linking theory and practice in early childhood teacher education". Paper presented at the *Australian Research in Early Childhood Education Symposium*, University of Canberra.
- Perry, R. (1997). *Teaching Practice: A Guide for Early Childhood Students*. London: Routledge.
- Press, F., & Hayes, A. (2000). *OECD Thematic review of early childhood education and care policy*. Canberra: Department of Family and Community Services.
- Queensland Government. (2000). *Queensland childcare strategic plan*. Brisbane: Department of Families, Youth and Community Care.
- Queensland Government. (2002). *Queensland the smart state. Education and training reforms for the future*. Brisbane: Department of the Premier and Cabinet.
- Sumsion, J. (2003). "Rereading metaphors as cultural texts: A case study of early childhood teacher attrition. *The Australian Educational Researcher*, Vol 30, No.3, 67-88.
- Wadsworth, Y. (1997). *Everyday Evaluation on the Run*. 2nd Edition, Allen & Unwin, Sydney.

Walsh, K., Elmslie, L., & Tayler, C. (2002). *Pairs on practicum (trial): Early childhood students collaborate with peers in preschool/kindergarten*. Paper presented at the AARE, Brisbane.

Woodrow, C., & Brennan, M. (1999). Marketised positioning of early childhood: New contexts for curriculum and professional development in Queensland, Australia. *Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood*, 1(1), 78-94.

### **About the Author**

*Dr. Karen Noble*

Dr Karen Noble brings significant expertise to early childhood education and care, with 17 years experience in the fields of education, child development and human services. During this time she has worked in various practice settings, including childcare, preschool, early primary years and tertiary settings. Karen has undertaken a variety of research across this sector. Some of Dr Noble's most recent research focuses on parental choice of early years services. Additionally, she has published significantly in the areas of child and youth welfare and educational innovation. Aspects of Dr Noble's research have been presented to prestigious research meetings in Australia, New Zealand, Scotland and Cuba. Her work is also being published in the academic and professional literature and stands to make a contribution to policy and practice in the early years.



## THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LEARNING

### EDITORS

**Mary Kalantzis**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

**Bill Cope**, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

### EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

**Michael Apple**, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

**David Barton**, Lancaster University, UK.

**Mario Bello**, University of Science, Technology and Environment, Cuba.

**Robert Devillar**, Kennesaw State University, USA.

**Manuela du Bois-Reymond**, Universiteit Leiden, Netherlands.

**Ruth Finnegan**, Open University, UK.

**James Paul Gee**, University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

**Kris Gutierrez**, University of California, Los Angeles, USA.

**Roz Ivanic**, Lancaster University, UK.

**Paul James**, RMIT University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Carey Jewitt**, Institute of Education, University of London, UK.

**Andreas Kazamias**, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

**Peter Kell**, University of Wollongong, Australia.

**Michele Knobel**, Montclair State University, New Jersey, USA.

**Gunther Kress**, Institute of Education, University of London.

**Colin Lankshear**, James Cook University, Australia.

**Daniel Madrid Fernandez**, University of Granada, Spain.

**Sarah Michaels**, Clark University, Massachusetts, USA.

**Denise Newfield**, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa.

**Ernest O'Neil**, Ministry of Education, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

**José-Luis Ortega**, University of Granada, Spain.

**Francisco Fernandez Palomares**, University of Granada, Spain.

**Ambigapathy Pandian**, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

**Miguel A. Pereyra**, University of Granada, Spain.

**Scott Poynting**, University of Western Sydney, Australia.

**Angela Samuels**, Montego Bay Community College, Montego Bay, Jamaica.

**Juana M. Sancho Gil**, University of Barcelona, Spain.

**Michel Singh**, University of Western Sydney, Australia.

**Richard Sohmer**, Clark University, Massachusetts, USA.

**Pippa Stein**, University of Witwatersrand, South Africa.

**Brian Street**, King's College, University of London, UK.

**Giorgos Tsiakalos**, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

**Gella Varnava-Skoura**, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece.

**Cecile Walden**, Sam Sharpe Teachers College, Montego Bay, Jamaica.

**Nicola Yelland**, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

**Wang Yingjie**, School of Education, Beijing Normal University, China.

**Zhou Zuoyu**, School of Education, Beijing Normal University, China.

Please visit the Journal website at <http://www.Learning-Journal.com> for further information:

- ABOUT the Journal including Scope and Concerns, Editors, Advisory Board, Associate Editors and Journal Profile
- FOR AUTHORS including Publishing Policy, Submission Guidelines, Peer Review Process and Publishing Agreement

### SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Journal offers individual and institutional subscriptions. For further information please visit

<http://ijl.cgpublisher.com/subscriptions.html>. Inquiries can be directed to

[subscriptions@commongroundpublishing.com](mailto:subscriptions@commongroundpublishing.com)

### INQUIRIES

Email: [cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com)