



Working together
www.rcis.ro

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială

ISSN: 1583-3410 (print), ISSN: 1584-5397 (electronic)

Selected by coverage in Social Sciences Citation Index, ISI databases

Collaborative Action Research at the Training Center for Inclusive Education and Accessibility

Gilberto Ferreira da SILVA, Marta NORNBORG, Natacha SCHEFFER

Revista de cercetare și intervenție socială, 2016, vol. 53, pp. 67-79

The online version of this article can be found at:

www.rcis.ro, www.doaj.org and www.scopus.com

Published by:

Expert Projects Publishing House



On behalf of:

„Alexandru Ioan Cuza” University,

Department of Sociology and Social Work

and

Holt Romania Foundation

REVISTA DE CERCETARE SI INTERVENTIE SOCIALA

is indexed by ISI Thomson Reuters - Social Sciences Citation Index

(Sociology and Social Work Domains)



Collaborative Action Research at the Training Center for Inclusive Education and Accessibility

Gilberto Ferreira da SILVA¹, Marta NORNBORG², Natacha SCHEFFER³

Abstract

The paper reports on action research conducted with professionals from a training center in inclusive education and accessibility. It presents the empirical context and the theoretical-methodological design that guides the research, then goes on to discuss preliminary data obtained through a questionnaire applied during the diagnostic stage. The study shows the leading role of a group of education professionals committed to building a different model of education and inclusive practices, who created a center for specialized care before the existence of any specific legislation for inclusive education. The structural limitations of the center are not understood as impediments for the professionals to promote actions and pedagogical processes that ensure the right to learning for children and youths with disabilities.

Keywords: action research, teacher training, inclusive education, in-service training, school routine, educational practices.

Introduction

Human rights, education for citizenship, inclusive society, inclusive school and inclusive education are terms that seem to represent very well concerns that have entered the XXI century, as well as a discourse gradually gaining ground in academic circles and the educational field. Permeated by the concerns that these terms herald, this article presents and locates the discussion about the process of creating and consolidating a center for specialized education in the city of Canoas (Brazil). Although the center started its activities in a completely unplanned

¹ La Salle University Center. Program Postgraduate Education of the Centro Universitário La Salle/Unilasalle, Canoas, BRAZIL. E-mail: gilberto.ferreira65@gmail.com

² Federal University of Pelotas. Program Postgraduate Education of the Universidade Federal de Pelotas/UFPEL, Pelotas, BRAZIL. E-mail: martaze@terra.com.br

³ Instituto Porto Alegre (IPA) and Municipal School System of Porto Alegre, BRAZIL, E-mail: natacha.scheffer73@gmail.com

manner, it found endorsement in contemporary Brazilian legislation on inclusive education – more specifically, the National Plan for Inclusive Education – to regularize an approach organized spontaneously by a group of educators from the municipal school system.

In this article we present the process of action research carried out at the Training Center for Inclusive Education and Accessibility (CEIA - *Centro de Capacitacao em Educacao Inclusiva e Acessibilidade*) since 2009. We consider both the specific aspects of this research methodology, and also elements encompassing organization processes for the continuing education of teachers (Elliot, 2000; Kemmis & McTaggart, 1992; Schön, 1998; Salazar, 2006; Boggino & Rosekrans, 2007). In this respect, the reflections by researcher Santoro (2005), who reviews the different approaches commonly employed to designate action research, synthesize three dimensions: (a) when the request for transformation is made by the reference group to the team of researchers, the action research is defined as collaborative, in which the researcher's role involves participating in and building a scientific framework for a process of change previously started by the members of the group; (b) if this transformation is perceived as necessary following the initial work of the researcher with the group, arising from a process that values the cognitive construction of the experience, sustained by collective critical reflection, aiming at the empowerment of the involved individuals and the elimination of the conditions that the collective considers oppressive, this research takes on the character of criticality and is then conceptualized as critical action research; (c) if, on the other hand, the transformation is planned beforehand, without the participation of the involved individuals, and only the researcher monitors the effects and evaluates the results, this research is no longer qualified as critical action research, but can be called strategic research action (Santoro, 2005: 485-486). We find resonance in the concept of *collaborative action research* because in this approach the object of investigation is a movement from within and outward. As recommended by the methodological principles adopted as reference, the research does not present a defined object of study from the outset, but sets off methodological steps in which the object is gradually revealed, based on the needs of the group of professionals involved (Pantaleao, Almeida & Meyrelles, 2015; Tardif, 2002; Josso, 2010). Initially we present the research context, along with the theoretical and methodological framework that guided the implementation of the research. We then go on to explore some preliminary data obtained during the diagnostic stage. The data was collected by means of a questionnaire and its subsequent discussion during formative meetings with the group of respondents, who were professionals working at CEIA.

Research context

CEIA is located in a former municipal school shut down in 2003 after a new school was built on a plot nearby. Originally, it was conceived as a Solidarity Space of Care for Children and Teenagers. Since 2007, CEIA has had the status of a training center, even though its workforce (professionals from different areas of education) until now remains officially allocated to the payroll of another municipal school. More recently, the challenge of the team consisting of twenty professionals has been to build its institutional identity and mission. CEIA recently obtained its registration and approval by the City Board of Education, and has been developing its strategic plan of educational action. In the wide-ranging scope of its activities, three dimensions stand out. The first is focused on monitoring individual students at all levels of education that have some type of learning disability; the second consists of providing an area of continuing education and advice for educators working in all teaching modalities in the city of Canoas; the third, construed as a mediating element between the previous ones, involves working with the community. For the team responsible for the center, these dimensions should not be understood in an isolated manner, but in combination.

On the theoretical and methodological design of the research

The investigation is situated within the scope of studies anchored on the collaborative action research approach (Pimenta, 2005; Santoro, 2005; Brandao, 2006; Kemmis & McTaggart, 1992; Imbernon, 2010). Its underlying theme is teacher training and the transformation of everyday practices, a process resulting from the gradual integration of researchers in schools. A core assumption of the study was working directly with the staff of the center. Considering that the applied methodology is collaborative action research, the definition of the object of study by the group of researchers (students and education professionals) was outlined in the actual process of carrying out the research. During the first stage of the research, the diagnostic phase, one of the activities involved developing and applying a questionnaire for the professionals working at the center, with the aim of uncovering and locating problem situations concerning the context and the purpose of CEIA within the municipal school system (Monceau, 2005; Miranda & Resende, 2006; Novoa, 1995). The data presented and analyzed below came from the questionnaire. The questionnaire was organized along some indications from the *Inclusion Index* developed by Ainscow and Booth (2000), which proposes three dimensions: a) Creating Inclusive Cultures; b) Preparing Inclusive Policies; c) Developing Inclusive Practices.

Besides the specific arrangements involving the definition of a work schedule consisting of training meetings and applying a questionnaire for diagnosis, it also

became necessary to build a practice of collaborative research that would allow questioning and discussing any problematic issues. One of the various issues raised was the concern of teachers about the day-to-day work of the center and their own qualification. To deal with this, they suggested that discussion meetings with the researchers could also constitute a space for training and planning.

The construction of a space for sharing and socializing experiences with their colleagues was based on the idea that one could thus expand the reflections beyond the individual sphere - my room or the group of children and young people with whom I work. This initiative gave rise to what Compiani (2006) identifies as a stimulus to rethink the collective practice, in this case a collective of education professionals. A partnership process among CEIA professionals and the researchers had to be formed, a task at the same time projective (construction of strategies for the CEIA action plan) and self-formative.

One of the first aspects that emerged from these early talks was the desire and the will to go beyond the day-to-day activities, establishing a dialog with someone who accompanied the process without being directly linked to it. For researchers and CEIA professionals alike, it became necessary to learn to leave one place and then put oneself in another. This led to some tension, especially when researchers were expected to indicate possibilities and paths in a more specific and prescriptive manner. Conflict arose when diverging views about inclusive processes were manifested and had to be confronted and discussed, both from a theoretical and a practical point of view.

The experience of systematically discussing the aspects that make up the teaching practice contributed to the continuing education process because the interactions were elicited in the perspective of *action research*. As we understand it, the processes of continuing education must be constituted from the instances that articulate and promote public educational policies, whether at the national, state or municipal level (Garcia, 2010; Tardif & Lessard, 2012; We support and believe in training practices that ensure the participation and leading roles of basic education professionals in their formative processes. We understand that it is necessary to invest in a project of systematic and extended follow-up (Bartolome Pina, 2004; Rodriguez, 2002; Silva & Penna, 2006; Vargas Pena, 2007) Hence the importance of creating production mechanisms for pedagogical competences and knowledge that can effectively qualify and transform the educational practice.

Results and discussion

Bringing the collected data to light, from within the perspective of inclusive education, makes us reflect on the temporalities that constitute space and institutional relations (Mendes & Pletsch, 2015). As Skliar (2003: 38) proposes, there is “a time from the other which bursts into our own time and becomes irreducibly unexpected”. As authors / researchers, we also have this experience of moving into another timeframe, the time from the other, namely the individual to whom all efforts undertaken in the construction of CEIA are directed. Thus, we locate three temporalities that meet each other, overlap and face off: that of the researching/training teachers, that of the professionals at CEIA, and that of the children and youths with disabilities served by the professionals at CEIA. In this awareness, we collected the data to be read and interpreted.

Let us initially present some information about the profile of the professionals working at CEIA. Out of a total of 20 employees who worked at CEIA in 2010, 15 answered the survey. Three are male and 12 female. In terms of age bracket, around 73% are between 40 and 50, 20% between 30 and 40 and 7% are older than 50. In terms of professional background, all (100%) have a university degree: two (13.3%) have a Master’s degree; eleven (73.3%) hold a graduate certificates of specialization and two an undergraduate degree. Pedagogy is the course with the highest concentration of professionals (33%), followed by Physical Education (20%). Other areas, such as *History, Speech Therapy, Law, Language Arts, Psychopedagogy, Visual Arts and Literacy* are each represented by one professional. Interestingly enough, there is no professional from Social Work and Psychology, areas that have historically helped in the discussion and formulation of policies for special education and, more recently, inclusive education. Regarding the length of teaching experience, 60% of the teachers have been working for over 20 years; 40% between 10 and 20 years.

CEIA has an experienced group of professionals when we take training and teaching experience as indicators. According to studies by Huberman (1992), experienced professionals are those who lead their career with some confidence in terms of the technical aspects of the teaching activity. This, according to the author, lends them greater peace of mind and confidence to innovate and reinvent educational processes, as they already have the ability to act with greater ease in situations of conflict or deal appropriately with such situations, readapting or going over actions and procedures again in order to ensure learning.

The two aspects that make up the group - the diverse initial training and the length of teaching practice of its members - meet the demands that a proposed specialized care requires, but they also allow for action projects marked by an interdisciplinary approach in the treatment of the educational needs of students to whom the center directs its actions.

In organizing the questionnaire, the first questions dealt with Dimension A: *Creating inclusive cultures*. These questions explored aspects that made it possible to locate and stimulate the creation of a welcoming, collaborative and stimulating educational community. According to Ainscow and Booth (2000: 18), “the principles derived from this school culture are those that guide the decisions specified in the school policies of each school and in their daily work, to support learning for all through a continuous process of innovation and school development”.

As for their engagement toward building the overall purpose of CEIA, 73.3% of the respondents said they are committed to the process, 20% did not answer and 6.7% chose to obtain further clarification. A pattern can be observed in the responses, where the proposal of building a new model of education is affirmed with conviction, a model characterized by inclusion, access and assured education for all, as well as the belief that learning is a central aspect for children with disabilities.

With regard to feeling prepared to contribute to the formulation of public policies, teacher training and the development of teaching materials for inclusive educational practices within the school system of Canoas, 93,3% agreed with the statement, while 6,7% did not answer. On an experimental basis, CEIA professionals have been undertaking a few training activities for teachers of regular classes, with the aim of providing assistance in the process of planning activities for the children and young people who are included in regular classrooms, developing an Individual Learning Plan for each one (*Plano de Ensino Individualizado* - PEI).

Although there is no evidence to date that such practice have an effective outcome on the children and youths in terms of their learning and development, such activity is consistent with what Zeichner and Diniz-Pereira (2005) analyzed in action research programs in the United States. The authors confirmed the extent to which teachers involved in a shared process of research and continuing education seek out instruments to deal with everyday situations of teaching practice in a more qualified and critical manner, thereby allowing them to recreate their teaching practice from the perspective of the new assumptions they have learned in the process.

When asked if they felt good about their daily work at CEIA, 73.3% agreed, 20% did not answer and 6.7% disagreed. 93.3% agreed with the statement that the workers at CEIA strive to maintain a good working environment and a spirit of partnership among colleagues, while 6.7% disagreed. As regards the assessment on whether the relations among professionals who work at CEIA are collaborative in nature, 93.4% agreed and 6.6% disagreed. The ensuing questions continued in this perspective, also covering managerial aspects and the relationships within the group. Asked to comment on whether the CEIA management and its educational staff work as a team, 93.3% agreed and 6.7% disagreed. All respondents agreed with the statement “I am satisfied with the work I do at CEIA”.

This set of information about the workplace environment and relations summarize the initial findings of our encounters with the staff. A friendly, respectful and relaxed atmosphere could clearly be observed. The group identified attitudes of partnership and collaboration as their unique characteristic and stated explicitly, whenever possible, that the staff at CEIA is identified by this feature in the school system.

Asked whether the educational material available at CEIA is sufficient for the professional needs, 100% disagreed with the statement. Considering that the physical space in which the activities of CEIA are carried out is a legacy of an “abandoned” public school, the architectural and infrastructural conditions are undeniably in poor condition and the facilities are not maintained on a regular basis. Nevertheless, as we could observe, in spite of the inadequate working conditions, the group is excited and willing to continue investing in the construction of the educational and political project of the center, and has been demanding from municipal agencies that the activities be allocated to premises with better infrastructure and facilities.

It would be appropriate to make a comment here on the fourth open-ended question for Dimension A: “Based on your training and professional experience, which are the most deficient aspects that need to be addressed so as to allow the group of professionals at CEIA to become a reference center for the city of Canoas in terms of inclusive educational practices? List five items.” The responses could be summarized along six broad axes: (1). Raise salaries; (2). Invest on staff training; (3). Overhaul the premises, premises at risk; (4). Provide specialized library and adequate space for accessing digital technology (Telecenter). Materials, equipment, technological resources, games; (5). Establish partnerships with health professionals; (6). Hire cleaning staff.

Comparing and contrasting the responses to the closed and open-ended questions, the centrality of those aspects related to ensuring better physical infrastructure and more materials are very evident. Likewise, demands such as salary increases and funding for professional training, an issue that raises a question: are these demands limited to the staff at CEIA, or do they extend to all professionals in the Canoas school system? If this is a restricted movement, would a salary raise not amount to introducing a differentiation between regular school professionals and the staff at CEIA? So far, we have no indicators that allow a more precise analysis.

Four open questions made up the last part of Dimension A - *Creating inclusive cultures* – seeking elements to indicate the understanding of inclusive education, the role of the institution in the school system regarding inclusive education, its mission and, finally, the definition of deficient aspects deficits that need to be addressed in order for CEIA to become a reference center in inclusive educational practices.

The responses to the question “What do you understand by inclusive education?” were grouped along five thematic axes: 1. Education for all; 2. Education applied to the individual while developing his/her potential; 3. Respect for all (difference and diversity); 4. Social inclusion; 5. Assured access and right to schooling. A first impression resulting from the analysis of this synthesis shows an understanding guided by the discourse of policies for the universalization of education and the assurance of the right for education and enrollment in regular schools.

According to the studies carried out by Torres (2001), the more expressive claim could be made that there is a prevalence among the professionals at CEIA of an understanding of inclusive education as the assurance of rights involving access to schooling, participation and respect. And, more broadly, the understanding of assurance to learning, with a view to developing individual potentials. Such an understanding, according to Torres, resulted from the broad movement to expand the supply of education, which was necessary in order to ensure the universalization of education. In this sense, the understanding of the professionals falls within the political discourses and the movements undertaken by governments and education systems in the field of inclusive education (Alarcao, 2010; Brzezinski, 2008).

Four thematic axes summarize the responses to the question “What role should CEIA play in the municipal education of Canoas as regards inclusive education”: 1. A reference point for inclusive education in the municipality and the state; 2. Development of policies for inclusive education; 3. Center for training and continuing education of teachers for inclusive education; 4. A place that provides support for students, families and teachers.

The third open-ended question, “What is the mission of CEIA for you?”, elicited three broad responses: 1. Serve as a place for training and qualification of teachers for inclusive education in the municipality; 2. Formulate policies of inclusive education; 3. Make school inclusion a consolidated fact via the support provided to students, families and educators.

Articulating the answers to the questions concerning the role and mission of CEIA, a certain centrality can be perceived to a discourse that supports policies and actions which still bear the influence of concepts that were characteristic of special education programs. The institutional role is still understood as that of providing elements and conditions that allow inclusion in the school system to take place. Here we draw attention to the reference made in both questions that present CEIA as a place for providing support to students, families and teachers / educators in order to *make inclusion a consolidated fact*.

Such an understanding goes against what scholars in the field advocate. As one among these, we point out the propositions made by Mantoan (2003). For this researcher, the practices of inclusion must be built in specific contexts, which means the institution itself, whether it is educational or not. The author maintains

that inclusive practices and processes are built and made evident out of those small experiences of day-to-day relationships that take place in every classroom or educational environment. Only so is it possible to ensure and put into evidence the learning of children and youths with disabilities, thereby effectively ensuring the construction of inclusive actions. Later on, such experiences may or may not become references for other experiences, favoring what Compiani (2006) indicates as the location of similar aspects that serve as a stimulus to rethink the practice itself within a collective, that is, in the institutional environment where inclusive pedagogical practices are carried out.

What becomes apparent in the responses to both questions is the understanding that specific forms of care for children and youths with disabilities take place at CEIA. Later on, by means of training and information passed on to teachers in regular classes, these practices are then carried out with the children at each of the municipal schools. Based on studies conducted in contexts where inclusion practices have been built within the school, however, (Silva, Nornberg & Pacheco, 2012) we argue that risks may arise from this understanding of the institutional role. We suspect that the assurance of learning may become limited only to what the child or young person does at CEIA, with little relation between that assurance and what the child does with his/her classmates and teachers in the regular class. Even though the activities developed in his/her class derive from the articulation between professionals of both institutions - CEIA and the school - it seems that the educational work aimed at ensuring learning, in particular those aspects related to literacy skills, for example, would be the sole responsibility of the professionals at CEIA.

In dimension B, *Preparing inclusive policies*, Ainscow and Booth report that this dimension should ensure that inclusion is at the core of development of the school, permeating all policies so as better to ensure the learning and participation of all students. They also point out that all activities that increase the capacity of a school to respond to student diversity are considered “support”. All forms of support are grouped within a single framework and are conceived from the perspective of the development of students, and not from the perspective of the school or the administrative structures (Ainscow & Booth, 2000: 18).

When asked: “Is there a sector, a coordinating body or a unit responsible for preparing proposals, training and qualification projects, and providing assurance of inclusive educational practices in the municipal school system of Canoas?”, 73% agreed and 27% did not answer. All respondents agreed with the statement “Every new professional that joins CEIA is made welcome by the team”. 93.3% agreed with the question “Is there broad participation of all professionals in CEIA workshops”, while 6.7% did not. 80% agreed, and 20% disagreed with the statement “The education professionals at CEIA know each other well”. As regards the existence of opportunities for sharing experiences, 80% agreed and 20% did not. In terms of being familiar with projects in the municipal school system of

Canoas where educational activities from the perspective of inclusive education are developed, the overwhelming majority mentioned CEIA itself, followed by the Center for Educational Support, the Resource Room, the Itinerant Program, the Youths and Adult Education program, as well as a few actions aimed at teacher training.

All respondents answered affirmatively to the question, “In your estimation, are there any programs, events, conferences, courses aimed at training teachers for qualification in the work of inclusive education?” (100%). The question also asked the respondents to describe which programs or events are known by the group. Among those mentioned was the seminar “*The school makes the difference*”, promoted by the Municipal Education Board and counting on the significant participation of CEIA professionals in its organization. In second place they referred to the resource room, and thirdly, the initiative of training teachers specifically for the Education of Youths and Adults.

We asked respondents if they knew how many children, youths and adults are not included in the schooling process. The aim was to verify to what extent the team was aware of the reality of the city. In response, 80% said they did not know, 13.3% said they did, and 6.7% did not answer. Another question explored their knowledge about the legislation in the area of inclusive education: 100% said they mastered the content of the documents, citing the LDB, ECA, guidelines drawn up by MEC and lastly, the Federal Constitution.

Dimension C, *Developing Inclusive Practices*, focused on didactic activities and educational practices. As stated by Ainscow and Booth: “This dimension refers to the extent to which the educational practices reflect the culture and inclusive policies of the school. It is about ensuring that activities in the classroom and extracurricular activities promote the involvement of all pupils and take into account the knowledge and experience acquired by students outside of school” (2000: 18). For the reality at CEIA, we attempted to approximate the objective proposed by the authors to the work carried out by the professionals at the center. The first question of this dimension was answered affirmatively by all respondents: “Do you consider the opportunities for educational improvement (pedagogical meetings, courses, seminars, workshops, etc.) important for your training?” Responding to the question “Are there opportunities/periods included during the working hours at CEIA for training”, 60% agreed and 40% disagreed. The next question was: “Do you consider the allocated time sufficient for continuing education?”, which 53.3% agreed, and 46.7% disagreed with. Responding to the question “Are there opportunities/periods for the development of teamwork and for sharing experiences among the professionals at CEIA”, 53.3% agreed and 46.7% disagreed. All respondents agreed with the question “Is there commitment among CEIA professionals when it comes to solving problems together?” When asked “Do CEIA professionals seek to obtain training and qualifications to enhance the work in the center?”, 86.7% agreed, 6.7% did not, and 6.7% requested more information.

The set of data presented allows us to conclude that the group has in a manner placed a bet on the work they perform daily. It is a revealing wager on a project that has already become internalized and is driven by collaborative work. The initiative of the professionals seems to reflect a desire to render their conceptual commitment into concrete actions.

Conclusion

Let us take up once again a few aspects that, once made visible, serve as indicators for the process of planning, strengthening and establishing inclusive practices in the municipal school system of Canoas. The first concerns the crucial role of the group of professionals who conceived and created the specialized care center. It is worth repeating that this initiative took place well before the specific municipal legislation went into effect, which would later come to regulate and formalize inclusive education in the city of Canoas by public agencies such as the Municipal Board of Education.

A second aspect reveals a group of education professionals intensely involved in a daily activity permeated by the belief and commitment to building a unique model of inclusive education. This is a group that aspires to set off a signification process of inclusive education within the school system, investing primarily in the provision of consultation and training activities for teachers in regular classes.

A third aspect is the expansion of the processes for discussing activities carried out with children and adolescents, which has been leading to more dynamic processes of pedagogical practices. Even though not very frequent, these are moments when the group discusses possibilities and alternatives for qualifying the teaching actions conducted with the children.

A fourth point demonstrates that structural and physical limitations do not amount to obstacles for the creation of activities and pedagogical processes that ensure the right to learning. CEIA seems to reaffirm that processes relying on building relations and strengthening the pedagogical bond are what truly makes the difference.

A final aspect is the commitment of the staff to socialize the processes carried out at CEIA with teachers in municipal schools. Although aware of the limits of their scope of action, these professionals feel they have amassed a certain amount of experience in constructing teaching initiatives from a perspective of educational inclusion that can and should be shared with the teachers of the municipal school system.

References

- Ainscow, M., & Booth, T.M. (2000). *Indice de Inclusion. Desarrollando el aprendizaje y la participacion en las escuelas*. Bristol: UNESCO.
- Alarcao, I. (2010). *Professores reflexivos em uma escola reflexiva*. (7ª. ed.) Sao Paulo: Cortez.
- Boggino, N., Rosekrans, K. (2007). *Investigacion-accion: reflexion critica sobre la practica educativa*. Sevilla: Ediciones Homo Sapiens.
- Brandao, C.R. (2006). A pesquisa participante e a participacao da pesquisa. Um olhar entre tempos e espacos a partir da America Latina. In Brandao, C., Rodrigues A. & Streck, D.R. *Pesquisa participante. O saber da partilha* (pp. 21-54). Sao Paulo: Ideias e Letras.
- Brzezinski, I. (2008). Politicas contemporâneas de formacao de professores para os anos iniciais do ensino fundamental. *Educacao e Sociedade*, 29(105), 1139-1166.
- Compiani, M. (2006). A pesquisa em formacao continua indicando passos na extensao e formacao continua. In Barbosa, R. & Lazzari, A.L. (eds.). *Formacao de Educadores* (pp. 470-485). Artes e tecnicas- Ciencias e Politicas. Campinas: UNESP.
- Elliot, J. (2000). *El cambio educativo desde la investigacion-accion*. Madrid: Ediciones Morata.
- Garcia, M.C. (2009). Desenvolvimento Profissional: passado e futuro. *Sisifo - Revista das Ciencias da Educacao*, 8, 7-22.
- Huberman, M. (1992). O Ciclo de Vida Profissional dos Professores. In Novoa, A. (ed.), *Vidas de Professores*. (pp. 31-62). Porto: Porto Editora.
- Imbernon, F. (2010). *Formacao continuada de professores*. Porto Alegre: Artmed.
- Josso, M.C. (2010). *Experiencias de vida e formacao*. Sao Paulo: Paulus.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R. (1992). *Como planificar la investigacion-accion*. Barcelona: Laertes Ediciones.
- Mantoan, M.T.E. (2003). *Inclusao escolar. O que e? Por que? Como fazer?* Sao Paulo: Moderna.
- Mendes, G.M.L., & Pletsch, M.D. (2015). Entre Politicas E Praticas: Os Desafios da Educacao Inclusiva No Brasil. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analiticos de Politicas Educativas*, 23, 1-12.
- Miranda, M.G., Resende, A.C.A. (2006). Sobre a pesquisa-acao na educacao e as armadilhas do praticismo. *Revista Brasileira de Educacao*, 11(33), 511-518.
- Monceau, G. (2005). Transformar as praticas para conhece-las: pesquisa-acao e profissionalizacao docente. *Educacao e Pesquisa*, 31(3), 467-482.
- Novoa, A. (1995). *Vida de professores*. Portugal: Porto Editora.
- Pantaleao, E., Almeida, M.L., Meyrelles, D.J. (2015). Formacao Continuada de Gestores Publicos de Educacao Especial: Politicas Locais Para a Inclusao Escolar. *Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analiticos de Politicas Educativas*, 23, 1-23.
- Pimenta, S.G. (2005). Pesquisa-acao critico-colaborativa: construindo seu significado a partir de experiencias com a formacao docente. *Educacao e Pesquisa*, 3(31), 521-539.
- Pina, B.M. (2004). Dialogo entre las diferencias: Aportes de la educacion critica a la formacion de sujetos democraticos. *Anuario Pedagogico* 8, 35-62.

- Rodriguez, C.F.A. (2002). Hacia una nueva concepcion de la ciudadania en una sociedad multicultural. In: Pina, B.M. (ed.). *Identidade y ciudadania. Un reto a la educacion intercultural*. (pp.79-104). Narcea: Barcelona.
- Salazar, M. C. (2006). *La investigacion-accion participativa. Inicios e desarrollos*. Madrid: Editorial Laborativo Educativo.
- Santoro, M.A.F. (2005). Pedagogia da pesquisa-acao. *Educacao e Pesquisa*, 3(31), 483-502.
- Schön, D.A. (1998). *El profesional reflexivo. Como piensan los profesionales cuando actuan*. Barcelona: Paidos.
- Silva, G.F., & Penna, R. (2006). Discursos e trajetorias de estudantes brasileiros afrodescendentes no ensino superior. *Revista Internacional Interdisciplinar INTERthesis*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Silva, G.F., Nornberg, M., Pacheco, S.M. (2012) Processos formativos a partir de praticas inclusivas na Educacao Basica. *Inter-Acao*, 37(1), 91-112.
- Skliar, C. (2003). *Pedagogia (Improvavel) da diferenca e se o outro nao estivesse ai?* Rio de Janeiro: DP&A.
- Tardif, M. & Lessard, C. (2012). *O trabalho docente. Elementos para uma teoria da docencia como profissao de interacoes humanas*. Petropolis: Vozes.
- Tardif, M. (2002). *Saberes Docentes e formacao profissional*. Petropolis: Vozes.
- Vargas Pena, J.M. (2007). La diferencia como valor: Hacia una ciudadania intercultural. Conceptualizacion de la diversidad cultural e intervencion educativa. *Profesorado. Revista de Curriculo y Formacion del Profesorado*, 11(2), 1-11.
- Zeichner, K.M., & Diniz-Pereira, J.E. (2005). Pesquisa dos educadores e formacao docente voltada para a transformacao social. *Cadernos de Pesquisa*, 35(125), 63-80.