



From Experience Sharing to Collective Learning: When Trust Is Not Enough for Collaborative Reflection on Practice

Inger Lise Valstad¹, Duarte Nuno Farbu Pinto², Frode Hermann Henanger³

¹Nord University, Norway

²Nord University, Norway

³Nord University, Norway

Abstract

Research on school development indicates that new teaching methods rarely succeed on the strength of the method alone, but through the professional processes that accompany their implementation [1]. Within professional learning communities, experience sharing among teachers is often treated as the route to collective learning, and trust among colleagues as the condition that makes such sharing possible [1]. Yet systematic and critical reflection on shared practice remains rare [3]. This study examines how 27 teachers across five Norwegian primary schools understand experience sharing as a contribution to professional and collective learning, and which conditions promote or hinder what the study terms collaborative reflection on practice, a concept that foregrounds mutuality, grounding in concrete teaching experience, and professional identity. Data were generated through five focus group interviews and analysed using thematic analysis [14]. Teachers describe experience sharing as an act of learning at both individual and collective level, in which colleagues' experiences are reworked in light of their own practice rather than adopted as ready-made solutions, and they identify systematic time, psychological safety, and fixed arenas as its conditions. What the study adds concerns what happens once trust is in place. The staffs in the study describe high trust and a low threshold for sharing, and still name a pull towards sharing what works and confirming established practice, compounded by a busy working day and fatigue with successive initiatives. The analysis suggests why. Psychological safety has two functions, enabling the sharing of what did not work and the asking of uncomfortable questions about what appears to work. In this material trust delivers the first, while the second appears to depend on conditions beyond trust, namely structures that give sharing time and reach, continuity that counters implementation fatigue, and a culture in which questioning what appears to work is as legitimate as celebrating it. The study qualifies the view of social capital as sufficient for collective learning; trust opens the door to experience sharing but does not determine what passes through it. The study makes no claim to statistical generalisation but offers conditions with analytical transferability for comparable primary school contexts.

Keywords: *collaborative reflection on practice; experience sharing; professional learning communities; collective learning; social capital; communities of practice*

1. Introduction

Research on school development indicates that new teaching methods rarely succeed on the merits of the method alone; success depends instead on the professional processes that accompany implementation [1, 2]. Competence develops collectively, as teachers share experience, ask critical questions, and jointly examine what works in practice. Yet a paradox marks everyday school life. Systematic experience sharing and collective reflection occur rarely, even though they are treated as preconditions for professional learning [2, 3].

Experience sharing among teachers is more than a social practice; it is a professional act of learning. Wenger [4] argues that learning is at its core a social phenomenon, and that knowledge is not carried by the individual alone but continually produced in the encounter between people engaged in shared practice. The knowledge that lives in a teaching staff therefore comes into focus, in particular the experiences not yet put into words and the solutions that work without anyone having asked why, what Schön [5] calls knowing-in-action. Such knowledge remains tacit and unavailable until it is articulated, shared, and subjected to collective reflection. Hargreaves and Fullan [1] frame this as a question of professional capital. The quality of teaching is anchored less in the individual than in the trust, shared knowledge, and mutual obligation that develop among teachers over time, and without the safety to



share what did not work, sharing remains superficial [6]. In this literature trust is treated as the condition that makes experience sharing possible.

These insights have gained renewed relevance under the Norwegian curriculum renewal of 2020, whose core curriculum presupposes that all school staff take part in a professional community and makes experience sharing and the exchange of differing views part of the school's work [7], in line with the international literature on professional learning communities [8]. Even so, the quality of these communities varies widely, and collective reflection on practice is far from self-evident [2]. Segal [3] cautions that reflection in groups does not automatically strengthen individual practice, because collective reflection is qualitatively different and requires attention to identity, interpretive community, and context. That raises the question of what trust delivers once it is in place. On this basis the study addresses the following research question: *How do teachers understand experience sharing as a contribution to professional learning and collective learning, and which conditions promote or hinder collaborative reflection on practice in the professional community?*

The answer the paper develops is that trust opens the door to experience sharing but does not decide what passes through it. The discussion specifies the conditions beyond trust on which the move from sharing to collective learning depends.

2. Theoretical Framework

The study draws on four interwoven strands of scholarship: reflective-practice theory [5, 9], sociocultural and pragmatist theories of learning [4, 10, 11], the scholarship on professional capital [1], and research on professional learning communities [12, 13]. The first two explain how knowledge moves from the individual to the collective; the latter two specify the organisational and relational conditions under which that movement occurs. Together they frame experience sharing as a professional act of learning and justify collaborative reflection on practice as the organising concept developed in section 2.4.

2.1 From Individual to Collective Knowledge

Schön [5] distinguishes knowing-in-action, the tacit knowledge embedded in what the teacher does, from reflection-on-action, in which experience is worked through and made explicit. Experience sharing has its function in this transition, bringing tacit knowledge into view and making it available to colleagues, so that personal knowledge can become a shared concern. Dewey [9] understands reflection as an active, investigative process in which assumptions are tested against experience, and Elkjaer [10] extends this in a pragmatist view where knowledge is provisional and revisable because future experience can always correct what is currently known. When teachers share experience, they engage in a form of collective inquiry, testing their assumptions against those of others and generating knowledge for future action. Argyris and Schön [19] distinguish single-loop learning, which adjusts action within existing frames, from double-loop learning, which questions the frames themselves. Dale [6] adds that this process is strengthened through collegial dialogue, since the collective opens established assumptions to challenge in a way the individual perspective cannot. The move from individual to collective knowledge is thus not given but depends on experience being shared, examined, and placed within a shared space for reflection.

2.2 Professional Learning Communities

The professional learning community (PLC) denotes a collective and sustained mode of learning. DuFour and DuFour [12] describe it as a continuous process of recurring cycles of collective inquiry and action learning, oriented toward the ongoing testing, sharing, and development of practice. Of the five characteristics of effective PLCs that Stoll et al. [13] identify, reflective professional inquiry matters most for the present study, because it is not the sharing of experience in itself that produces change, but the collective examination of what is shared. Experience becomes a resource for development only when it is opened to questioning, when colleagues probe the reasoning behind a practice, test its assumptions against their own, and ask why something works rather than simply adopting it. A community in which teachers only confirm one another's practice, rather than interrogating it, is not a professional learning community in a strong sense. Jenssen [2] shows that the quality of such communities varies considerably in Norwegian schools and that collective reflection requires deliberate facilitation, durable structures, and active leadership.



2.3 The Function and Conditions of Experience Sharing

Wenger [4] understands learning as social participation and operationalises this through communities of practice, with four components: meaning, practice, community, and identity. The shared repertoire of experiences, routines, and tools built over time constitutes the community's collective knowledge. The identity dimension matters here, since sharing is not neutral information exchange but involves professional identity and requires the psychological safety to reveal what has not worked. Unlike the professional learning community, which is deliberately established and led, a community of practice is in Wenger's account an emergent formation that arises from participants' shared engagement rather than from institutional design, a contrast to which the discussion returns. Engeström [11] adds that collective learning is driven by dilemmas and contradictions in practice, particularly when something does not work as expected.

Hargreaves and Fullan [1] frame these relational preconditions as professional capital, in which social capital, the trust and mutual obligation among colleagues, is what turns individual knowledge into collective learning. Without such trust, sharing remains a display of successes rather than an examination of practice. Segal [3] enters a caveat that qualifies all of the above. Collective reflection is not a state that arises naturally once structures are in place, but a qualitatively different process from individual reflection, requiring that identity work, interpretive community, and contextual conditions be taken seriously. Across these strands, research points to four conditions: systematic time [2, 12], trust as social capital [1], an inquiring and critical culture [13], and leaders who model reflection [2]. The fourth lies outside the present material, which consists of teachers' accounts, and is not examined here. The study takes the second as its point of departure and asks what it does and does not deliver.

2.4 Collaborative Reflection on Practice

The study uses collaborative reflection on practice as the concept that names what it looks for, integrating the strands above. Collaborative points to the mutual, egalitarian character in which teachers build understanding together; reflection anchors the term in the Deweyan and Schönian tradition of systematic, critical, forward-looking examination; on practice specifies grounding in concrete teaching experience. In contrast to the narrower collective reflection, which Segal [3] criticises for lacking theoretical precision and overlooking contextual conditions, the concept captures the relational, practice-grounded, and identity-involving character of the sharing this study examines. It is not used as a coding scheme; the themes were generated inductively. It returns in the discussion as the standard against which the sharing teachers describe is assessed.

3. Method

The study takes a qualitative approach and is grounded in an interpretive, social constructionist epistemology, in which knowledge is understood as socially constructed and contextually situated [14]. Participants' experiences are treated not as objective facts but as interpretations shaped by the social practice in which they take part. Data were generated through focus group interviews, chosen because the format itself enacts the collective meaning-making the study examines. Participants converse, build on one another's statements, and negotiate shared understandings [15, 16]. The material consists of five focus group interviews at five schools, with 27 teachers in total. The sample was purposive, selected to yield rich insight into the phenomenon [17]. All interviews took place at the individual school, during ordinary working hours and with leadership approval. The semi-structured guide was organised around three questions addressing the individual, situational, and collective dimensions of collaborative reflection on practice.

The material was analysed using thematic analysis [14]. The analysis was inductive. Codes and themes were generated from participants' accounts, not from the theoretical framework, which was used only afterwards to interpret the themes. The analysis followed the six phases of familiarisation, coding, generating initial themes, reviewing, defining and naming, and reporting. That the identity theme and the pattern of barriers were developed although they had not been prompted by the interview guide indicates that the analysis extended beyond the pre-defined. Quality is assessed through credibility and transferability [18], together with reflexivity as understood in thematic analysis [14]. Credibility rests on a transparent process, close grounding of claims in data extracts, and participant verification, in which



the transcripts were returned to the participants on two occasions so that they could verify that their statements had been correctly rendered and, where necessary, correct or elaborate them. Transferability rests on thick, context-near description that allows readers to judge relevance to their own settings, and reflexivity on the account of epistemological position and analytic choices given above, which makes visible that the themes are the researchers' construction rather than a neutral summary of what was said. A limitation of the format is that group pressure may mute individual voices [16], mitigated through open questions and deliberate facilitation. Interview excerpts were translated from Norwegian for presentation.

4. Findings

The analysis generated three themes, concerning experience sharing as an individual act of learning, as a collective act of learning, and as bound up with professional identity, and two cross-cutting patterns, concerning the conditions for sharing and the barriers to it. The patterns are kept apart from the themes because they collect what teachers said about a topic rather than carry a shared meaning [14]. Table 1 reads in the order of the analysis, from extract to pattern to theme. The themes describe what teachers value in sharing; the patterns describe what it presupposes and what limits it, and the second pattern is the empirical basis of the paper's argument.

Table 1. Themes and cross-cutting patterns in teachers' accounts of experience sharing

Representative extract (source)	Pattern in the material	Theme or cross-cutting pattern
"What he does in maths I take across to Norwegian, and then I carry the idea further." (Interview 2)	Colleagues' presentations activate teachers' own ideas and sharpen awareness of their own choices; knowledge is transferred and adapted across subjects and levels rather than copied.	Theme 1. Individual act of learning
"We are so secure with each other that a question that elsewhere might feel like criticism is understood here as well meant." (Interview 3)	A culture of sharing both success and failure; trust makes questions read as constructive; spontaneous and cross-level sharing widen the repertoire.	Theme 2. Collective act of learning
"When I came here newly qualified, it was the experience of those who had been here longer that I learned most from." (Interview 5)	Repeated sharing builds security in the role, normalises resistance as a normal phase, and activates experienced teachers as a resource.	Theme 3. Sharing and professional identity
"The ceiling is very high here. We all know that whoever asks a question means well." (Interview 5)	Systematic time, psychological safety, and fixed arenas are named as basic conditions, yet rarely all present at once in a busy school.	Pattern A. Conditions for effective sharing
"Implementations can die out because something new comes along that we have to do. It has happened before." (Interview 2)	The busy day pushes reflection aside; sharing drifts towards confirming what works; fatigue with successive initiatives weakens deeper investment.	Pattern B. Barriers to sharing

Note. Interviews 1–5 = focus group interviews with teachers across five schools (April 2024). Extracts translated from Norwegian.

4.1 Experience Sharing as an Individual Act of Learning

Teachers described experience sharing as a source of individual learning. During colleagues' presentations, they immediately translated what they heard into their own subjects and classes, working not as passive recipients but through active processing that linked others' experience to their own situations: *"I catch myself connecting it to my own class. I go straight to thinking about how I could have done that task again"* (Interview 1). Hearing others' reasoning also sharpened awareness of teachers' own choices, and knowledge was actively transferred and adapted across subjects and levels rather than copied: *"What he does in maths I take across to Norwegian, and then I carry the idea further"* (Interview 2).



4.2 Experience Sharing as a Collective Act of Learning

Sharing also functioned collectively, accumulating the community's knowledge over time. Teachers described a culture in which sharing both success and failure was expected; without the willingness to share failure, sharing is reduced to confirming what already works. Psychological safety meant that questions were received as constructive rather than critical: *"We are so secure with each other that a question that elsewhere might feel like criticism is understood here as well meant"* (Interview 3). In the teachers' account it is not sharing in itself that generates learning but the quality of the reflection it invites. Spontaneous exchange in informal settings and sharing across levels and subjects were valued as widening the repertoire beyond the individual team. This reflective, questioning quality corresponds to what Stoll et al. [13] identify as the reflective professional inquiry that distinguishes an effective professional learning community.

4.3 Experience Sharing and Professional Identity

Sharing was bound up with professional identity. Repeated sharing over time gave teachers greater security in the role and helped normalise resistance to new methods as a normal phase rather than a sign of ill will. Experienced teachers were described as a resource, and the meeting of experience and curiosity gave the community a dynamic neither novices nor veterans would have had alone: *"When I came here newly qualified, it was the experience of those who had been here longer that I learned most from"* (Interview 5).

4.4 Conditions for Effective Experience Sharing

Effective sharing presupposed particular conditions. A lack of systematic time was the most frequently named barrier; teachers called for fixed arenas rather than sporadic exchange. Psychological safety was an equally basic condition, since without the safety to show what had not worked, sharing becomes a presentation of successes: *"The ceiling is very high here. We all know that whoever asks a question means well"* (Interview 5). Fixed structures were seen as a condition for lasting effect. Time, safety, and structure are necessary conditions, yet rarely are all present at once in a busy school.

4.5 Barriers to Experience Sharing

The same conditions that promoted sharing also marked its limits. Three barriers were prominent. The busy working day was the foremost obstacle; reflection was deprioritised in favour of what was urgent, so that sharing needed an external commitment to survive. The second barrier is the one that matters most for the argument of this paper. The same material that describes high trust and a low threshold for sharing also contains an awareness that sharing can drift towards confirming what already works, without critical questions being asked. One teacher described the pull towards the positive and what it leaves out: *"We get so pleased with what we think works well. But there may be one thing that does not work well, and if we just make a small adjustment, it could work well next time"* (Interview 4). The third barrier was a fatigue towards successive initiatives, a learned caution built on the experience that today's priority is abandoned tomorrow: *"Implementations can die out because something new comes along that we have to do. It has happened before"* (Interview 2). The barriers were interrelated. Time pressure intensified the risk of superficial sharing, and implementation fatigue weakened investment in deeper reflection. Taken together, the themes and patterns describe staffs that value sharing, have the trust to share failure, and still recognise that sharing can stay on the surface when time is short, initiatives succeed one another, and what works is met with approval rather than questions. The discussion asks what this implies for the view that trust is what turns sharing into collective learning.

5. Discussion

5.1 Experience Sharing as Transformation Rather than Transfer

Teachers describe experience sharing not as transfer but as a process in which others' experience is a starting point for processing, contextualisation, and further development. This is Dewey's inquiry as read by Elkjaer [10], forward-looking and experimental thinking in which knowledge is provisional and others'



experience is a tool for examining one's own assumptions. If sharing always involves transformation, its value depends less on what is shared than on what the recipient does with it. It is not enough to arrange a presentation; everyone present must have the time, energy, and safety to do the cognitive work that transformation requires. Schön's [5] distinction applies here. Sharing brings knowing-in-action into view, but only where structures allow the reflection-on-action through which knowledge can be articulated and developed. The question thus shifts from whether teachers share to what the community does with what is shared.

5.2 Trust Opens the Door but Does Not Decide What Passes through It

Psychological safety does two things at once. It makes it possible to share what did not work, and it makes it possible to ask uncomfortable questions about what appears to work. Hargreaves and Fullan [1] treat social capital as what turns individual knowledge into collective learning, and the teachers' accounts are consistent with the first function; where they describe trust as high, they also describe daring to share what went badly. Yet the findings qualify the claim that social capital is sufficient. The staffs in this study describe high trust and a low threshold for sharing, and still superficial sharing and a culture of confirmation appear as risks the teachers themselves recognise. Social capital opens the door but does not determine what passes through it. High trust can as readily promote the circulation of success stories as the critical examination of practice, and the teacher who observed how pleased colleagues become with what seems to work was describing exactly this pull. Segal [3] supports the point. The conditions that decide whether collective reflection is developmental extend beyond trust to interpretive community, identity work, and explicit norms for critical questioning. This is what the collaborative in collaborative reflection on practice refers to, a mutuality in which colleagues question one another and not only confirm.

Superficial sharing is therefore a risk in its own right, not a by-product of scarce time or insufficient trust alone. Teachers describe a culture in which it is socially rewarding to share what works and in which colleagues respond warmly to such contributions. That dynamic may look like a sign of health, but when confirmation is the dominant response, collective reflection gradually turns towards reproducing the familiar rather than examining the uncertain. The phenomenon can be read through single-loop and double-loop learning [19]. Superficial sharing entrenches single-loop adjustment within existing frames, whereas collaborative reflection on practice requires the double-loop questioning of the frames themselves. Stoll et al. [13] warn that a community which only confirms its own practice is a professional learning community in name rather than in substance, and what separates the two is the reflective, critical inquiry that the second function of safety makes possible. Of safety's two functions, the second is thus the more important, and the more easily neglected in accounts that treat trust as sufficient. In this material trust delivers the first. The evidence for the drift towards confirmation is thinner than for the other themes and rests on teachers' own awareness of the pull rather than on observed sharing, and the focus group format, which rewards agreement, may itself have muted dissent. It is therefore presented as a risk the teachers name, not as a documented pattern. The second function depends on three conditions the findings point to and which the following sections take in turn, namely structures that give sharing time and reach, continuity that counters implementation fatigue, and a critical culture anchored in a secure professional identity.

5.3 Structures that Give Sharing Time and Reach

Teachers describe spontaneous sharing, in the lunchroom or corridor, as no less valuable than formal sharing, and Wenger [4] treats such informal interaction as the way a shared repertoire is built. The findings nonetheless qualify a premise in his theory, that communities of practice arise organically through participants' mutual engagement over time. Effective sharing depended on conditions the teachers themselves identify as necessary, systematic time, fixed arenas, and structures that made sharing a routine part of practice, and these conditions had to be deliberately established rather than emerging on their own. In this sense the professional learning community at these schools appears institutionally enabled rather than organically emergent. This does not so much contradict Wenger as place these communities on the other side of the contrast drawn in section 2.3. They are learning communities in DuFour and DuFour's [12] sense, designed for and given time, and without allocated time and legitimised arenas they would not, on the teachers' account, have taken a form that makes room for collaborative reflection on practice. What Wenger's account explains is what happens once



such a community exists; what it says less about is the structural effort a busy school needs to bring one into being.

Spontaneous sharing is also selective. It reaches those who happen to be present and concerns what happens to be fresh, which contrasts with DuFour and DuFour's [12] systematic cycles that include the whole staff. The finding on cross-level sharing reinforces this. Teachers want to share beyond their own team, yet the structures that organise sharing tend to keep it within teams and levels. As Hargreaves and Fullan [1] note, social capital depends not only on the strength of relationships but on their reach. Structure therefore does two things that trust cannot. It secures the time in which reflection-on-action can take place, and it decides who gets to hear what is shared. The on practice in the concept depends on the latter, since reflection stays grounded in concrete teaching only where those who teach differently are in the room.

5.4 Continuity that Counters Implementation Fatigue

Time is the most pervasive barrier, which is unsurprising given that DuFour and DuFour [12] treat systematic time as basic and Jenssen [2] documents it as among the most frequent barriers in Norwegian schools. What matters analytically is what happens when time is absent. Sharing does not disappear; it is displaced into the break and the corridor, keeping its informal character but losing the structured reflection that converts sharing into changed practice, and with it the force of Dewey's [9] inquiry. Dale [6] argues that schools need systems that reach beyond the immediate and subjective experience the individual teacher is left with alone, and it is such systems that disappear when time is deprioritised. This is compounded by implementation fatigue, a learned scepticism that today's priority will lose relevance when something new arrives, built on a pattern the teachers have observed repeatedly. For Engeström [11], collective learning depends on teachers treating the contradictions of their practice as worth investigating because the outcome will matter. Implementation fatigue undercuts exactly this precondition. When teachers doubt that what they work on will endure, the contradictions that might drive learning are experienced as not worth the effort, and sharing persists as routine without becoming a source of collective learning. The findings also suggest that the culture of safety is itself vulnerable to this. It may hold in good periods and weaken when external pressure increases. Trust, in other words, appears to depend on a continuity that individual teachers cannot secure on their own.

5.5 A Critical Culture Anchored in Professional Identity

The identity finding is the most easily overlooked. Sharing changes what teachers know and also who they are. Over time it gives security in the role and reframes resistance to the new as a normal phase. This is Wenger's [4] identity dimension, in which learning is a process of becoming through participation and belonging. It also explains why experienced teachers still describe sharing as valuable although they have more to draw on. Sharing is less about acquiring missing knowledge than about developing existing knowledge in light of others' perspectives, and it is through such sustained, collegial testing of judgement that teachers build what Hargreaves and Fullan [1] call decisional capital, the capacity to exercise professional judgement in situations of uncertainty.

Identity is also where the second function of safety is decided. Asking why something that appears to work actually works, or what would have produced a different outcome, requires a particular kind of safety, not only the safety to share but the safety to be challenged without experiencing the challenge as a judgement of who one is as a teacher. The identity dimension suggests that teachers can receive such questions as contributions rather than threats only when their professional identity is sufficiently anchored, which is why a critical culture cannot simply be decreed. The dimension also carries a risk the findings imply. If sharing only ever confirms the established, it may reinforce an identity closed to change. A quiet consensus, in which everyone shares and everyone nods but no one asks the critical questions, does not merely reproduce practice; it legitimises it [3].

6. Conclusion

This study examined how teachers understand experience sharing as a contribution to professional learning and collective learning, and which conditions promote or hinder collaborative reflection on practice. Teachers experience sharing as more than the transfer of finished solutions, as an act in which others' experience is reworked in light of one's own practice, closely bound to the development of



professional identity. Systematic time, psychological safety, and fixed structures are each necessary but not sufficient. Psychological safety lowers the threshold for sharing but does not make it critical; time creates space but not depth; structures organise sharing but may confine it to teams and levels. The principal barriers are a busy working day, implementation fatigue, and a drift towards superficial, confirmation-oriented sharing.

The study's contribution is to specify when trust is not enough, and why. Social capital opens the door to experience sharing but does not decide what passes through it, because trust enables the sharing of what failed, while the questioning of what appears to work depends on conditions beyond trust. The move to collective learning presupposes structures that give sharing time and reach, continuity that makes reflection worth the effort, and a culture in which problematising what appears to work is as legitimate as celebrating it. This is where collaborative reflection on practice earns its value, distinguishing the sharing that leads to change from the exchange that confirms the status quo. Teachers value the informal sharing of the corridor as much as the formal, and an account of collective learning must include both, while recognising that only the formal reaches the whole staff [12]. In this respect the study contributes to research on professional learning communities by specifying what separates a functioning community from a formal structure that merely bears the name, which is neither the presence of sharing nor the presence of trust, but a culture in which shared practice is subjected to critical inquiry.

For practice, if the conditions for sharing have to be deliberately established rather than left to emerge, as the teachers' accounts suggest, school leaders and staff together need to protect systematic time and arenas that reach across teams, hold a course long enough for reflection to be worth the effort, and cultivate a culture in which questioning what works is legitimate. The study is limited to five schools and 27 teachers, makes no claim to statistical generalisation, and rests, for the drift towards confirmation, on teachers' own awareness rather than on observed sharing. Within these limits, the conditions identified may offer analytic transferability for readers in comparable primary school contexts [18]. One question the analysis leaves open follows from the time paradox, namely how informal, spontaneous sharing and systematic, structured reflection can complement each other rather than compete for the same scarce time. What matters in the end is not whether teachers share experience, but what the community does with what is shared.

Ethics Declaration

The processing of personal data was assessed by Sikt (the Norwegian Agency for Shared Services in Education and Research) prior to data collection. The research was conducted in accordance with national research-ethics guidelines for the social sciences and humanities and with applicable data-protection requirements. All participants gave informed, written consent to participation and audio recording; participation was voluntary, and participants could withdraw at any time without giving reasons. All data were anonymised and stored confidentially.

AI Declaration

Generative artificial-intelligence tools were used solely for language editing and proofreading of the manuscript. They were not used to design the research, collect or analyse data, or generate the study's findings, interpretations, or conclusions. All AI-assisted revisions were reviewed and edited by the authors, who take full responsibility for the content of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

- [1] Hargreaves A., Fullan M., "Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School", New York, Teachers College Press, 2012.
- [2] Jenssen M. M. F., "Profesjonelle læringsfellesskap i skolen: En mulighet for kollektiv læring og bedre undervisning?", Doctoral dissertation, Inland Norway University of Applied Sciences, 2023.
- [3] Segal A., "Rethinking collective reflection in teacher professional development", *Journal of Teacher Education*, 75(2), 2024, pp. 155–167.
- [4] Wenger E., "A social theory of learning", in Illeris K. (ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning: Learning Theorists in Their Own Words*, London, Routledge, 2009, pp. 217–240.



- [5] Schön D. A., "The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action", London, Routledge, 2017.
- [6] Dale E. L., "Refleksion i den professionelle praksis", in Pædagogik og professionalitet, Århus, Klim, 1998.
- [7] Utdanningsdirektoratet, "Overordnet del – verdier og prinsipper for grunnopplæringen", Oslo, Utdanningsdirektoratet, 2017.
- [8] Roberts S. M., Pruitt E. Z., "Schools as Professional Learning Communities: Collaborative Activities and Strategies for Professional Development", Thousand Oaks, Corwin Press, 2008.
- [9] Dewey J., "How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process", Boston, D. C. Heath, 1933.
- [10] Elkjaer B., "Pragmatism: A learning theory for the future", in Illeris K. (ed.), Contemporary Theories of Learning: Learning Theorists in Their Own Words, London, Routledge, 2009, pp. 82–97.
- [11] Engeström Y., "Expansive learning: Towards an activity-theoretical reconceptualization", in Illeris K. (ed.), Contemporary Theories of Learning: Learning Theorists in Their Own Words, London, Routledge, 2009, pp. 53–73.
- [12] DuFour R., DuFour R., "Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work", Bloomington, Solution Tree Press, 2013.
- [13] Stoll L., Bolam R., McMahon A., Wallace M., Thomas S., "Professional learning communities: A review of the literature", Journal of Educational Change, 7(4), 2006, pp. 221–258.
- [14] Braun V., Clarke V., "Thematic Analysis: A Practical Guide", London, Sage, 2021.
- [15] Kvale S., Brinkmann S., "Det kvalitative forskningsintervju" (trans. Anderssen T. M., Rygge J.), Oslo, Gyldendal Akademisk, 2015.
- [16] Morgan D. L., "Focus Groups as Qualitative Research", Thousand Oaks, Sage, 1997.
- [17] Patton M. Q., "Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods", Thousand Oaks, Sage, 2002.
- [18] Lincoln Y. S., Guba E. G., "Naturalistic Inquiry", Beverly Hills, Sage, 1985.
- [19] Argyris C., Schön D. A., "Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective", Reading, MA, Addison-Wesley, 1978.