

Impacts of teacher development programmes on participants' development are often measured using questionnaires that gauge approaches to teaching and self-efficacy beliefs. While important in gaining a sense of the efficacy of such programmes, they tell only of a development that has occurred in parallel with TDP participation. They do not tell how this development came about. In this study we use time-line interviews to inquire into how TDP participants match their development as teachers with meaningful engagement in other important work-life practices. We find that they do so by constituting the notion of 'the good teacher' in an array of qualitatively different ways. Importantly, we find that a teacher can be student focused and feel confident about their ability to facilitate quality student learning, but in a multitude of different ways. These findings have implications for the prioritizing of TDP contents and activities and also suggest new avenues for exploring how quality student learning relates to teacher development.

## **Teacher development programme and worklife practice in interplay: An inquiry into the transition from experienced to established teacher.**

### **Theory and aim**

Numerous studies have shown that teaching development programs (TDPs) have an impact measured with respect to different quality dimensions (cf. Stes *et al.* 2010; Trigwell *et al.* 2012). Several studies use the Approaches to Teaching Inventory (ATI) developed by Trigwell and Prosser (2004) that measures 'Conceptual Change Student Focus' (CCSF) and 'Information Transfer Teacher Focus'. In addition, studies by for instance Postareff *et al.* (2008) and Rump *et al.* (2013) combine the ATI with a pre/post measurement of teachers' self-efficacy beliefs. The latter study, by Rump *et al.* (2013), confirmed a significant improvement along both CCSF and self-efficacy beliefs. These studies show that TDPs impact participants along these dimensions. Yet, they tell little about how teachers perceive of their own development or how they develop their teaching in concord with their TDP participation. In this study, we use timeline interviews (cf. Adriansen 2012) to explore how participants experience their development as teachers, while also accounting for this development in the context of their work-life practices at various research departments at university.

### **Method**

15 participants (out of 31) from a TDP held during 2012-2013 were interviewed about their teaching during the preceding 1½ years, six months after they had completed the programme. To initiate individual interviews, participants were asked to note down their teaching on a time-line and to draw a graph indicating feelings of highs and lows during this period. While participants were drawing and explaining, a semi-structured interview was conducted emphasising aspects indicative of how participants ascribe importance to their teacher development, how they approached their teaching, their self-efficacy beliefs, their teaching context, and how elements in the TDP had supported their development as teachers. Analysis has been carried out to capture qualitatively different ways of constituting the idea of 'the good teacher' in the context of work-life practices (including TDP participation).

### **Results**

The interviews confirmed gains observed on pre/post ATI and STEBI-B questionnaires. In this respect, a number of the interview participants are 'good teachers'. More importantly, we found that irrespective of questionnaire results, strategies for constituting or positioning oneself as a good teacher differ widely, but meaningfully, relative to departmental contexts. Three examples:

- **Outshining:** working individually but purposefully to be recognized as an outstanding teacher among colleagues, using student evaluations systematically to improve teaching but also to document quality of teaching to colleagues.

- Team-playing: Working collaboratively with colleagues in quality development of courses by, successfully providing new solutions to generally acknowledged problems in the teaching at the department.
- Networking: moving strategically to be involved in core courses, helping out colleagues, taking over commitments, to be embedded centrally in department-wide networks of teachers to ultimately constitute 'the good teacher' as indispensable – practically, pragmatically and actually.

Another important preliminary finding concerns the participants' emphasis of *timing* with respect to particular elements of the TDP and their own development as teachers. Although participants did not have their teaching sequenced in exact concord with TDP recommendations, they still emphasized the timely and meaningful provision of these elements relative their own development. The next step in our analysis of interviews is to understand how this sense of timeliness with respect to individual elements in the TDP relates to particular 'good teacher' constitutions.

## Discussion

Not surprisingly, we found that teacher development is a process intimately imbedded with the process of establishing and/or positioning oneself for a permanent staff position (most participants are non-tenured). Permanent staff practices, habits and commitments differ widely across departments, and do not necessarily share characteristics with the motifs that drive 'good teaching'. Consequently, teachers need to realize uniquely suitable ways to combine good teaching with being a good colleague. The interviews make clear that while high conceptual change student focus and high self-efficacy beliefs with respect to teaching are relevant dimensions of good teaching (Rump et al, 2013) they say little about how good teaching is constituted in the work-life practice of the participants. From the perspective of TDP planners, this find is an important argument for strengthening the peer-supervision components of TDP courses. Yet, from the perspective of researchers into student learning, an exciting question arises: How do different 'good teacher' constitutions impact the quality of student learning *during* teaching?

## References

- Adriansen, H. K. (2012). Timeline interviews: A tool for conducting life history research. *Qualitative studies*, 3(1).
- Postareff, L., Lindblom-Ylänne, S., & Nevgi, A. (2008). A follow-up study of the effect of pedagogical training on teaching in higher education. *Higher Education*, 56(1), 29-43.
- Rump, C. Ø., Christiansen, F. V., & Trigwell, K. (2013). *The impact of teaching development programs: Assessing different dimensions of progress*. Paper presented at EARLI 15th Biennial Conference EARLI 2013, Munich, Germany.
- Stes, A., Min-Leliveld, M., Gijbels, D., & Van Petegem, P. (2010). The impact of instructional development in higher education: The state-of-the-art of the research. *Educational research review*, 5(1), 25-49.
- Trigwell, K., Caballero Rodriguez, K., & Han, F. (2012). Assessing the impact of a university teaching development programme. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 37(4), 499-511.
- Trigwell, K., & Prosser, M. (2004). Development and use of the approaches to teaching inventory. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 409-424.