Oxford Review of Education, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2002

Carfax Publishing
Taylor & Francis Group

What is Teacher Development?

LINDA EVANS

ABSTRACT *Teacher development has emerged over the last decade as an identifiable area of study and much has been written on the subject. The teacher development literature has served to disseminate information on and ideas for improving teachers' and, by extension, schools' performance. It has provided the forum for discussion about the future of the teaching profession and the nature of teaching as a job. Yet, as an area of study, teacher development tends for the most part to be dominated by issues, while the concept itself and the methods that may effect teacher development remain comparatively neglected. In the teacher development literature, for example, very few definitions of teacher development may be found. This article examines the concept of teacher development and presents the author's own interpretation and definition, as well as her views on how the development of this area of study ought to proceed.*

INTRODUCTION

When I first became a primary school teacher in the 1970s I was very much what Hoyle (1975) identifies as a 'restricted' professional. I was conscientious and hard-working, thoroughly enjoyed my work, and had a high level of commitment to it. I was generally considered by colleagues to be an extremely competent practitioner, but, being a 'restricted' professional, I operated mainly at an intuitive level, with very little rationality underpinning my work. I considered educational theory to be entirely irrelevant to classroom practice. I attended in-service courses—but only those of a practical nature—and I was not in the least bit interested in undertaking long, award-bearing courses, even though I had left college with only a teacher's certificate.

Fifteen years later I left teaching to become an academic. In the interim I had acquired, through part-time study, an advanced diploma in mathematical education, a B.Ed (Hons) degree, and an MA in education, and I was later to go on to attain a doctorate. In my final teaching post my practice had become so innovative that teachers from neighbouring schools came to see my classroom and watch me working. I chose to become an academic so that I could continue, as part of my job, to do what I had enjoyed so much on my degree courses—research. I left teaching because I felt frustrated and constrained by the irrationality which underpinned most of the decision-making in the schools where I worked and because the values and educational ideologies that I held were seldom shared by colleagues; particularly senior colleagues.

Clearly, my own story is one of teacher development. Yet, my own development occurred so gradually and imperceptibly that it took me unawares. I would not find it at all easy to identify precisely what events and circumstances influenced it. I do not believe it was simply effected by the influence of the courses I attended; there was more to it than that. I can recall, for example, finding parts of my first degree course boring

ISSN 0305-4985 print; ISSN 1465-3915 online/02/010123-15 © 2002 Taylor & Francis Ltd
DOI: 10.1080/03054980120113670

and irrelevant and I distinctly remember, towards the end of the course, disputing with a fellow student that courses of its kind made one a better teacher. By the time I completed the MA course, though, I had been converted. But the process that transformed me from a 'restricted' to an 'extended' professional is still unclear to me, although I am inclined to attribute it, at least partly, to the influence of key colleagues whose professionality (a term that appears to have been introduced by Eric Hoyle (1975) and which I examine briefly below) was, at the time, more 'extended' than mine.

Teacher development has emerged over the last decade as a recognised area of study. There is a journal dedicated to the subject, several books on the topic (e.g. Fullan & Hargreaves, 1992; Hargreaves & Fullan, 1992; Darling-Hammond, 1994a; Day, 1999) and masters level modules or even entire degree courses focus on teacher development. A group of key researchers and analysts in the teacher development field—those who clearly label their work—has also become identifiable.

Much of the literature in the field has made valuable contributions to our understanding of teachers' working lives. The teacher development literature has served to disseminate information on and ideas for improving teachers' and, by extension, schools', performances. It has provided the forum for discussion about the future of the teaching profession and the nature of teaching as a job. Yet, there remains much within this field of study that is unclear or imprecise. In particular, the concept of teacher development is relatively unexplored and, largely as a result of this, the parameters of the field of study are ill-defined and the teacher development process is not clearly identified. This article examines the concept, the parameters and the process of teacher development.

EXAMINING THE CONCEPT

The concept of teacher development is unclear. Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) comment on 'how little systematic attention has been devoted to understanding the topic' (p. 1), and point out that 'it is only in the last few years that teacher development as a concept has come under scrutiny' (p. 8). 'Our overarching conclusion,' they write, 'is that teacher development must be conceptualized much more than it has been.' Definitions of teacher development are almost entirely absent from the literature: even those who are generally considered leading writers in the field do not define precisely what they mean by the term. Darling-Hammond (1994b), Leithwood (1992, p. 87), Fullan and Hargreaves (1992) and Hargreaves and Fullan (1992), for example, all fail to offer definitions of teacher development or of professional development. Indeed, Fullan and Hargreaves (1992, pp. 8–9) state in a footnote:

> We will not attempt to define the term teacher development at this stage of the chapter. As will become clear we use it both to refer to specific developments through in-service or staff development, as well as to more thorough advances in teachers' sense of purpose, instructional skills and ability to work with colleagues.

The extent to which the concept of teacher development is scrutinised in the literature varies. In some cases, conceptual analysis takes the form of presentation and examination of explicit interpretations, or descriptions, of teacher development. In other cases, interpretations are implicit in the arguments and discussions presented. There are also many cases where no interpretations are offered or implied.

Darling-Hammond (1994b) offers no definition of teacher development, nor, despite her book's focus on it and her incorporation of it into the book's title, of professional development. Her interpretation of professional development is implicit in her outline of the purpose, function and nature of the Professional Development Schools that are the subject of her book. Her references (1994b) to: the expansion of the teaching profession's knowledge base (p. 1; p. 2), 'new structures and approaches for deepening and sharing knowledge for teaching' (p. 4), 'restructuring teaching knowledge' (p. 3), and the amalgamation of practitioners' experientially-acquired knowledge and the knowledge generated in higher education institutions (p. 6); as well as 'teaching's transition from a bureaucratised occupation to a profession' (p. 3), the importance to professions of 'colleagueship and the development of shared standards of practice' (p. 8), 'building the foundation of a profession' (p. 10), and the need to sustain professional growth by encouraging 'both state-of-the-art practice and an inquiry ethic' (p. 10) imply an interpretation of what Darling-Hammond calls professional development as a process of enhancing teaching's professional status by expanding the knowledge base upon which the profession draws and increasing teachers' epistemological awareness. However, since Darling-Hammond fails to make explicit her interpretation of professional development it is only possible to make assumptions. It is not clear whether she does, in fact, consider professional development to be a process, or whether she regards it as a product. Neither is it clear what, precisely, she means by 'professional growth', and, in particular, whether she uses 'professional growth' and 'professional development' interchangeably, or whether she interprets the one as a tributary, or a constituent, of the other.

In respect of this last issue, Keiny (1994) is more explicit. He presents a conception of teachers' professional development that involves teachers investigating their practice to construct their own theories of teaching. Nevertheless, the closest he comes to defining teacher development is to offer an interpretation of professional development: '… professional development can be seen as a process of professional growth' (p. 158), which, since it incorporates no explanation of what is understood by 'professional growth', still falls short in relation to conceptual clarity.

Some writers focus on describing the situations and circumstances that they consider to have been the vehicles for specific cases of teacher development. Grossman (1994, p. 58) writes of the professional development of experienced teachers: 'This has taken a number of different forms, including workshops, study groups, fireside chats, a district-wide colloquium for middle school teachers, action research projects, and conversations with the professor-in-residence …'. Whitford (1994, p. 86) identifies planned seminars and workshops, and 'acting in new ways in schools'. She explains:

> Perhaps the most powerful professional development happened as those in PDS (Professional Development Schools) sites planned and experimented with innovative arrangements. As they talked about what they wanted to do, as they designed and refined, they encountered questions and problems. That prompted a great deal of professional reading and conversations with other educators. Thus, much professional development occurred in a learning-by-doing approach.

Miller and Silvernail (1994, pp. 40–42) identify what they refer to as 'three professional development activities': 'training for cooperative teachers', 'videotaped observation process', and 'the presence of interns'.

None of these writers, however, provides an explicit definition of teacher develop-

ment. Grossman (1994 p. 50) refers to 'helping teachers grow' without explaining the nature of such growth, but she does provide clues that imply an interpretation of professional development as the acquisition of different perspectives and ideas and the incorporation of a wider vision of what teaching involves. Referring to the professional development of members of the University staff, she writes: 'all instructors acquire new knowledge and perspectives from interactions in planning and teaching the class' (p. 59). She continues (p. 61): 'the changes made … concern school culture … greater collegiality, professional responsibility, and communication'. She also refers to teachers' new understandings of their role, and to 'teachers' expanded vision of their professional roles and their awareness of broader issues in education' (p. 61). Grossman's implicit interpretation of professional development bears many similarities to a transition from 'restricted' towards 'extended' professionality, as identified by Hoyle (1975).

How Whitford (1994) interprets teacher development is less clear, since she provides fewer clues. My best guess, that she equates professional development to the acquisition of knowledge, is based on her description of a process occurring in Professional Development Schools (p. 86):

> Perhaps the most powerful professional development happened as those in PDS sites planned and experimented with innovative arrangements. As they talked about what they wanted to do, as they designed and refined, they encountered questions and problems. That prompted a great deal of professional reading and conversations with other educators. Thus, much professional development occurred in a learning-by-doing approach.

Miller and Silvernail's (1994) interpretation seems, by implication, to focus on teacher reflectivity, introspection, self-analysis and inquiry. They quote the Wells Junior High School mission statement (p. 28):

> The staff at Wells … are committed to the practice of continual inquiry. They use the knowledge from research and theory to examine both their instruction and practice and the structure within which they work in order to continually improve the education program for their students, but they understand that the answers to educational questions must ultimately come from within their educational community.

Their implication that professional development involves teachers' seeking and communicating the rationale underpinning their practice (p. 41): 'Because interns ask naïve questions about teaching and learning, they challenge practising teachers to give reason for what they do', again parallels progression towards Hoyle's (1975) 'extended' professionality.

Bell and Gilbert (1994) provide more elucidation. They do not define teacher development but they describe very clearly what, as they interpret it, it looks like (p. 493):

> Teacher development can be viewed as teachers learning, rather than as others getting teachers to change. In learning, the teachers were developing their beliefs and ideas, developing their classroom practice, and attending to their feelings associated with changing.

They identify and describe 'three main types of development': personal, professional and social:

> The process of teacher development can be seen as one in which personal, professional, and social development is occurring, and one in which develop-

> ment in one aspect cannot proceed unless the other aspects develop also. (p. 494)

They also describe what they consider to be key features of the teacher development process (p. 494):

> Teacher development can be seen as having two aspects. One is the input of new theoretical ideas and new teaching suggestions.... The second is trying out, evaluation, and practice of these new theoretical and teaching ideas over an extended period of time in a collaborative situation where the teachers are able to receive support and feedback, and where they are able to reflect critically.... Both are important if all three aspects of teacher development—personal, professional, and social development—are to occur.

Implicit in this description is an interpretation of teacher development as a comparatively longitudinal process of teachers' behavioural change that is guided by, and focused upon, practical application of suggested innovations. It appears to be a process involving, sequentially: the generation of ideas that may be applicable to teaching; trying out these ideas; discussing in collegial contexts the viability and implications of the ideas as they emerge as potential practice; and, adopting new practices that emanate from the ideas. There is no evident consideration of the possibility that teacher development may also occur in less systematic and unplanned ways: incidentally, or accidentally. In both this respect, and that of the tripartite nature of their criteria for teacher development: that it requires personal, professional and social development and, moreover, that this, in turn, renders it product-, rather than process-focused, Bell and Gilbert's interpretation appears to be narrow and restrictive.

Leithwood's (1992, p. 87) 'multidimensional description of teacher development' incorporates three dimensions: the development of professional expertise; psychological development; and career-cycle development. It is unclear whether Leithwood accepts these three dimensions as independent criteria for teacher development. Certainly, his diagrammatic representation (Leithwood, 1992, p. 88) presents them as interrelated, but this does not necessarily preclude their being independent of each other as teacher development criteria. On the one hand, his reference (p. 94) to the importance of school principals' 'attending to all three dimensions' suggests that he perceives them as each being capable, independently, of effecting teacher development, as he interprets it, since a perception of their being, in some way, dependent on each other, would obviate the need to emphasise the importance of attending to all three. On the other hand, this implies a perception that teacher development is dependent upon all three of its dimensions. Without a clear definition, though, or even an explicitly presented interpretation, of teacher development, Leithwood's (1992) examination of it, despite its valuable contribution to the body of knowledge in this field, leaves many conceptual issues unexplored.

This outline review of what represents both the most analytical of teacher development-related literature and the work of those considered to be most prominent in this area provides an indication of some of the conceptual difficulties that prevail. It highlights the lack of conceptual clarity pervading this area of study and underscores the need for clearer definition of what is meant by teacher development. Defining, or at the very least, formulating clear interpretations of, key concepts is an important feature of all study, since it allows conceptual parameters, dimensions, constituents and features to be identified, which, in turn, facilitates recognition of what does and does not constitute, and, therefore, represent, the concept(s) being studied. Conceptual

distinction of this kind is essential to examination and understanding of processes and influences, which, by providing the key to formulating implications for policy and practice, constitute the rationale for study.

In the field of teacher development definitional precision is particularly important because it appears, so far, to have been considerably neglected. It is also important because, as an emergent area of study, its knowledge base is still underdeveloped and inadequate compared with those of more established areas and, therefore, needs supplementing. For these reasons, and because of the implications for the status of teacher development as an area of study that emanates from them, I believe it is important that those whose work is in this field, and particularly those who consider themselves to be principal contributors to it, now turn their attention towards examination of what teacher development is. As Leithwood's (1992, pp. 100–101) observation implies, there is still much to be discovered about the teacher development process, and conceptual coherence will facilitate discovery:

> Only when we have clearly conceptualized, coherent images of both teacher and principal roles and how they develop will we realize the combined contribution toward student learning of those in both roles. Much of the knowledge required for this task is already in hand. Although more knowledge will be helpful, using what we already know constitutes a crucial and immediate challenge.

Similarly, Hargreaves and Goodson (1996, p. 4) refer to a lack of conceptual clarity in the context of a specific sub-area of teacher development study: teacher professionalisation:

> What it means to be professional, to show professionalism or to pursue professionalization is not universally agreed or understood.... what counts as professional knowledge and professional action in teaching is open to many different interpretations.

What may be categorised as actual definitions, rather than interpretations or descriptions of the features, of teacher development are hard to find. One of the very few available is Day's (1999, p. 4). He presents it as a definition of professional development, rather than teacher development, but it could just as easily be the latter.

> It is the process by which, alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to the moral purposes of teaching; and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives.

I believe there is a need for more definitions of teacher development. Those who have something to say about teacher development ought to follow Day's lead and make it clear precisely what they understand by the term.

THE NEED FOR A DEFINITION

The reason why the concept of teacher development needs clarifying and defining is the need for shared understanding. The absence of shared understanding is a problem that manifests itself as: threatened construct validity, difficulties in establishing the parameters of the field of study, and difficulties in identifying the teacher development process.

Construct validity involves consensual acceptance and understanding of specific terms. It is threatened when researchers and research subjects do not share the same interpretation and understanding of key constructs. In my work on teacher morale, job satisfaction and motivation I have highlighted the difficulties that may occur, and that have, indeed, occurred when key terms, such as job satisfaction, are neither defined nor clarified (Evans, 1997; 1998). Because the term 'satisfaction' is ambiguous, since it may relate to what is satisfactory as well as what is satisfying, asking teachers to identify sources of job satisfaction poses potential problems. If the term is not clarified, some teachers may identify factors that are satisfactory, some may focus only on factors that are satisfying, and some may include both. Moreover, this diversity of interpretation may remain unnoticed and unchecked, posing a threat to the research's construct validity. In the same way, since teacher development may mean different things to different people, threats to construct validity in research in the field will be considerably reduced if researchers define the term.

Not only would definitions of teacher development increase construct validity, they would also generally add clarity and reduce confusion by establishing shared meanings between those wanting to communicate ideas on the subject and those with whom they communicate. As Freidson (1994, p. 15) writes, in relation to professionalism, theory development is dependent upon conceptual clarity:

> Because we seem to be no nearer consensus than we were in 1915, and because usage varies substantively, logically, and conceptually ..., some analysts have given the impression of condemning the very practice of seeking a definition. But surely such condemnation is inappropriate. In order to think clearly and systematically about anything, one must delimit the subject-matter to be addressed by empirical and intellectual analysis. We cannot develop theory if we are not certain what we are talking about.

I certainly do not consider it essential that, in any field of educational study, unanimity be reached in relation to definition, or interpretation, of key concepts. Indeed, disagreement and representation of different perspectives is likely to foster the kinds of discussion and exchanges from which may emanate meaningful, in-depth conceptual analyses, which may promote conceptual rigour and develop conceptual clarity. What is, I believe, essential, though, is that, individually, researchers define or, at the very least, offer explicit interpretations of the key concepts in their fields of study. I believe this to be essential because, without it, there is no commonality in relation either to language or understanding, and so the meaningfulness of the research is diluted, its credibility undermined and the applicability of its findings questionable. Moreover, these factors contribute towards impoverishing the quality and lowering the status of educational research. Methodological rigour is dependent, in part, upon conceptual clarity. It is difficult to see how researchers may accurately identify and measure something if they are unsure how they conceive it and if the conceptual frameworks that they apply to their research are underdeveloped. As I argue elsewhere (Evans, 1997; 1998, pp. 54–55), in relation to the study of job satisfaction, it is not necessary that researchers and research subjects share key constructs, but it *is* necessary, if construct validity is to be achieved, that researchers are able to recognise, and apply data collection and analysis techniques that reveal, evidence of what falls within the parameters of their own constructs. If researchers' own constructs are, indeed, sufficiently developed to enable them to recognise and to examine evidence of them—even if, as is likely, these constructs may be modified, sometimes repeatedly, throughout the

research process—then, in reporting their research, they ought to make those constructs, as they appear at the time, explicit.

Defining—or, at the very least, interpreting—teacher development is essential to those who are concerned to categorise work in the field within clear parameters. Establishing the parameters of what may be considered to constitute teacher development work is impossible to do without a clear understanding of the concept of teacher development. In order to decide, for example, whether Halsey's work (1995) on the gradual proletarianisation of academics in the UK may be categorised as a teacher development study, it is necessary to establish, first, whether academics should be categorised as teachers and, second, whether the proletarianisation process could be categorised as development-related. Similarly, categorisation of studies of educational leadership and management as teacher development work is predicated on acceptance of an interpretation of the term 'teacher' to include those who—even though their day-to-day work may involve little or no regular teaching—are considered and would consider themselves to be members of the teaching profession and who are members of the staff of schools, colleges or other institutions whose function is to teach children or adult students.

The rationale for establishing and sustaining teacher development as an area of study must be founded within the view that teacher development is desirable to achieve and, therefore, that understanding how to achieve it is potentially beneficial to the education system. Yet, understanding the teacher development process is dependent upon clear understanding of what teacher development is. Again, Freidson's (1994) comments on conceptual clarity in relation to professionalism and professionalization are pertinent:

> Without *some* definition of profession the concept of professionalization is virtually meaningless, as is the intention to study process rather than structure. One cannot study process without a definition guiding one's focus any more fruitfully than one can study structure without a definition.

A field of study that is focused on identifying how teachers develop therefore needs definitions of teacher development in order to facilitate meaningful communication about, and dissemination of insight into, the process.

MY INTERPRETATION OF TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

My response to the conceptual imprecision that I encountered has been to formulate my own interpretation and definition of teacher development. In defining teacher development, as in much of my work, I have been influenced by Hoyle's (1975) identification of two distinct aspects of teachers' professional lives: professionalism and professionality. Hoyle does not define these two terms, but he explains his distinction as being between status-related elements of teachers' work, which he categorises as professionalism, and those elements of the job that constitute the knowledge, skills and procedures that teachers use in their work, and which he categories as professionality. Professionality is neither a widely-known, nor a widely-used term and, after extensive consideration and analysis, I have defined it as: *an ideologically-, attitudinally-, intellectually- and epistemologically-based stance on the part of an individual, in relation to the practice of the profession to which s/he belongs, and which influences her/his professional practice.*

I interpret teacher development as a process, which may be on-going or which may have occurred and is completed. I do not imply that teacher development in its entirety may ever be considered to have been completed in a finite way: rather, that teachers

may be considered to have developed in some way, which does not, by any means, preclude their developing repeatedly, in different ways, or resuming their development in a way in which they have already developed. My reference to teacher development being *completed* therefore implicitly incorporates recognition that the completion may often be transient. I also consider teacher development to be a subjective or an objective process, or both. It may be thought of as an internalisation process on the part of teachers, or it may be an externally applied process, directed at teachers, but effected by external agencies. In the latter case, it may not necessarily be successful but, since I interpret it as a process rather than a product, I would nevertheless categorise unsuccessful, or partially successful, efforts as teacher development; but these would be teacher development processes that failed, or partially failed, to be completed.

My interpretation of teacher development also reflects my view that it may enhance the status of the profession as a whole, exemplified by the evolution of an all-graduate profession, and it may improve teachers' knowledge, skills and practice. I define it as: *the process whereby teachers' professionality and/or professionalism may be considered to be enhanced.* My interpretation of 'teachers' is wide and extends to all who carry out professional, recognised teaching roles, including those who work at pre-school level and in the post-compulsory education sector.

Range of Applicability

My interpretation of teacher development incorporates consideration of its having a range of applicability that extends from an individual to a profession-wide level. It may be applied to variously formed professional groups or units, such as: individual teachers; the staff of an institution, or a department in an institution; teachers who hold a common role (eg. primary headteachers, mathematics teachers, further education (FE) teachers) and the profession as a whole.

Elements and Dimensions of Teacher Development

Within my definition I currently identify two constituent elements of teacher development that relate fundamentally to individual teacher development: *attitudinal development* and *functional development.* Each element reflects specific foci of change. I define attitudinal development as: *the process whereby teachers' attitudes to their work are modified* and I define functional development as: *the process whereby teachers' professional performance may be improved.*

I currently perceive attitudinal development as incorporating two constituent change features, or foci of change: *intellectual* and *motivational.* These respectively refer to teachers' development in relation to their intellect and their motivation. A teacher who becomes more reflective and/or analytical, for example, would be manifesting intellectual development and one who becomes more highly motivated in general or in relation to specific aspects of her/his work would be manifesting motivational development.

I currently perceive functional development as incorporating two constituent change features, or foci of change: *procedural* and *productive.* These respectively refer to teachers' development in relation to the procedures they utilise and what and/or how much they 'produce' or 'do' at work. A teacher who, for example, changes her/his way(s) of carrying out some aspect—no matter how small—of her/his job would be manifesting procedural development, and one who starts to work longer hours and

produce more resources—who begins to 'do' more—would be manifesting productive development.

It is worth emphasising that, as I point out above, the two constituent elements of teacher development that I identify lie within my definition of teacher development. This means that they, and the foci of change that relate to each of them, must—if they are to constitute teacher development—effect what may be considered to be the enhancement of teachers' professionalism and/or professionality. Change that may be considered detrimental to teachers' professionalism and/or professionality would not therefore constitute teacher development. So the teacher who becomes demotivated, for example, or whose output falls, would be manifesting motivational and productive *change*, but not *development*. Of course, not all cases would be as clear-cut as these two examples. What is also apparent, I believe, is that teacher development, as I interpret it, incorporates—though it does not consist exclusively of—change that would generally be categorised as learning. Functional development can include learning new ways of working; learning how to apply new processes within one's practice, for example, or how to be more productive, and the intellectual change focus within attitudinal development may incorporate the enhancement of understanding or the increase of knowledge which are generally accepted as products of learning. A further point is that my inclusion within my definition of teacher development of the words 'may be considered to be' is deliberate, to incorporate consideration of subjectivity in relation to views about what actually constitutes development. What the government, for example, may consider to be teacher development may be quite different from teachers' own views, which may also conflict with parents' or school governors' views.

I also identify two dimensions, or forms, of teacher development which represent a combination of range of applicability, to which I refer above, and either or both of the constituent elements. These are: *role development* and *cultural development*. Once again, within my over-arching definition of teacher development, I define each of these. Role development is: *the process whereby the accepted parameters, remits and responsibilities of specific recognised specialist professional roles may be redefined and/or modified*, and I define cultural development as: *the process whereby teachers' professional culture is redefined and/or modified*.

PARAMETERS OF THE FIELD OF STUDY

I believe that work that potentially contributes to increasing understanding of how teacher development—however it may be defined—occurs ought to be categorised within this field. As Leat (1999) points out, 'teacher development is built on a variety of interconnected knowledge bases and is moulded by a variety of forces'. There is a vast amount of other work that, even though it is not explicitly labelled 'teacher development', could very easily be considered to contribute much to the study of how teachers develop. This includes areas of study such as education management, teacher thinking, and those relating to post-compulsory education, including initial teacher education (ITE). Without clear parameters, though, it is difficult to determine whether or not this work ought to be categorised as what has come to be identified as 'mainstream' teacher development work.

The field could potentially include many areas of study that may not generally have been associated with it. Since some of these are likely to be more centrally located within other recognised fields they may constitute a category of contributory areas of study that distinguishes them from mainstream teacher development work. How they

are categorised is not the most important issue; what is important is that their potential for increasing understanding of teacher development is not overlooked.

Work that lies within the parameters established by my interpretation, and based upon my definition, of teacher development is that which contributes towards the teacher development-related knowledge base by increasing understanding of how teachers' professionality and/or professionalism may be considered to be enhanced. It may relate to one or more of the elements, dimensions or constituent change features that I identify, and its applicability may be narrow or wide in range.

THE TEACHER DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

The teacher development *process*—the understanding of precisely what we need to do if we want to develop teachers—remains unclear. As Russell and Munby (1991, p. 164) point out:

> Ask any teacher or professor, 'How did you learn to teach?' As likely as not, the response will be 'by teaching' or 'by experience', and little more will follow, as though the answer were obvious and unproblematic. While there is an implicit acknowledgement that actions and performances can be learned through or by experience, there is little understanding of how this comes about.

As an area of study, teacher development is dominated by examination of issues, while methods, on the other hand, are comparatively underexamined. In this respect it is quite distinct from most other key areas of educational study. The studies of special educational needs (SEN), education leadership and management, primary education, and assessment, for example, as well as subject-based specialisms, all include extensive examination of methods—of *how* SEN children, or primary school children, ought to be taught; *how* schools and their staff ought to be managed; *how* assessment ought to be carried out. These areas of study have focused on key processes as well as key issues, and their knowledge bases include suggestions, ideas and tried-and-tested blueprints for what works and what does not. They incorporate consideration of how—based, for the most part, on psychological perspectives—children learn, or teachers are led successfully, or specific assessment procedures provide information on progress, so that those who wish to may apply this knowledge, through understanding the processes involved. In the field of teacher development, though, processes are, in general, more neglected. Certainly, there are models available of the stages and/or dimensions involved in professional development (e.g. Drefus & Drefus, 1986, in Day, 1999; Leithwood, 1992), but these tend not to identify the precise process whereby teachers progress from one stage to the next. It is one thing to identify the characteristics of teachers who may be categorised as being at any one of several points of professional growth; it is quite another thing to identify what creates those characteristics and how they may be effected.

Yet identifying the characteristics or features of professional development provides a starting point for formulating the teacher development process, and several analysts—particularly those who work in the field of teacher thinking—have contributed much to this initial stage. Day, for example, drawing on Benner's work (1984, in Day, 1999, p. 53), suggests that professional growth is dependent upon testing and refining propositions, hypotheses, and principle-based expectations in actual practice situations, and engaging in sustained reflection on and about these. Similarly, Russell and Munby

(1991) present illustrative cases of teacher development occurring through a process of reframing puzzles arising from practice: 'Reframing involves "seeing" or "hearing" differently' (p. 165); 'Reframing of experience facilitates the use of pedagogical knowledge acquired in course, workshops, and conferences. Reframing also mediates between theory and practice, revealing new meanings and new strategies for practice.'

Reflecting contextual and biographical differences, teacher development is, of course, an individualised process. While one teacher may be prompted to develop her practice in the light of knowledge acquired on an in-service course, another may remain unmoved by the same course, but may find his attitudes influenced through discussions with a colleague. Yet another may change her practice after reflecting on pupils' responses. Moreover, referring back to the two constituent elements that I identify, functional development may be achieved by quite a different process from that prompting attitudinal development. Nevertheless, despite this inevitable individualisation, there must exist a teacher development process that is universally applicable when described in terms of the lowest level of decontextualised commonality; it is not the process that is individualised, just the catalyst for it.

From the literature that does provide clues about how teachers develop, several potential identifiable stages of a teacher development process emerge. One of these is recognition of weaknesses in some aspect of one's practice, though I suggest that this recognition may, in some cases, occur retrospectively and does not necessarily have to precede development. Sometimes it is only when improvements occur that the deficiencies that they replace become apparent. A teacher may not be aware of the weaknesses in his/her approach to teaching decimals, for example, until s/he happens inadvertently to stumble upon an approach that then becomes clearly recognisable as superior.

I believe it is quite likely that the teacher development process shares some stages in common with what I have identified as the process whereby individuals achieve job fulfilment, presented as a model and explained in detail elsewhere (Evans, 1998, 1999). This involves eight stages, including: stage 1—awareness of an imperfect job-related situation; stage 2—formulation of remedial action strategy; and stage 3—effecting remedial action. As I emphasise in my detailed explanation of the model (Evans, 1998), most frequently these stages will represent unconscious experience on the part of individuals and they will nearly always be unplanned and unpremeditated. Several stages in my model of the job fulfilment process focus on rectifying perceived (even if the perception is retrospectively applied) inadequacies and I suggest that the process whereby teachers develop incorporates the same, or very similar, stages. It seems inevitable that some degree—no matter how small—of dissatisfaction is a prerequisite of teacher development because satisfaction with a way of working obviates the perceived need for development. To this reasoning I apply the same qualifications relating to consciousness and premeditation, referred to above, as I apply to stages 1–3 of the job fulfilment process; self-development is likely to take people unawares more often than it is planned. Nevertheless, acknowledged self-development incorporates recognition of some degree of improvement on and, by extension, of dissatisfaction with some aspect of, the pre-developed self.

What seems quite apparent from the literature available is that the teacher development process in its entirety will be very difficult to identify, not least because elements of teacher development—as I interpret it—often involve learning and the process whereby people learn is by no means clear. Nevertheless, it is important that those who work in the field attempt to uncover as much as possible about precisely how teachers

develop because it is only by uncovering—or at least shedding light on—the process that reliable strategies for effecting it may be formulated. Those who are concerned to develop teachers—the government; school leaders, managers and governors; and the teaching profession itself—need to know whether, and with what varying degrees of success, teachers are likely to be developed by, for example: sending them on courses; imposing reforms on them; mentoring them; placing them within a particular professional culture or climate; or presenting them with problems and challenges. Of course, as I have argued already, the relative success of each of these, and other, policies will depend on individual circumstances, so it is unlikely that a generally applicable blueprint will emerge. But identifying the teacher development process—as far as it is possible to do so—will contribute much towards understanding what works with one kind of teacher and what works with another, and why.

CONCLUSION

Conceptual clarity is a developmental feature of areas of study. Just as, in the contexts of individual studies, constructs may be refined and concepts redefined as the work progresses, so too, on a larger scale, does conceptual clarity take time to achieve within emergent fields. The process of achieving conceptual clarity is dependent upon accumulated knowledge. As an area of study, teacher development is now sufficiently well developed to have accumulated a considerable amount of knowledge. I believe it has now reached such a stage in its development that, if it is to establish itself as a credible area of study and move forward, rather than stagnate, greater conceptual—and, through that, methodological—rigour needs to be applied to examining and understanding that knowledge. It appears that, hitherto, very little attention has been directed at addressing seriously the question: what is teacher development? This question, since it is fundamental to understanding the nature of so many of the key issues within the field—such as how teacher development occurs, what its relationship to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction is, and whether there are different kinds of teacher development—should now appear at the top of this area's research and scholarship agenda. If it is not addressed these, and other, key teacher development issues will remain inadequately examined and the credibility of teacher development as an area of study will be undermined.

In particular, because they provide important identifiable frames of reference for the categorisation that is central to the process of constructing knowledge, definitions of teacher development need to appear, to be discussed, and to be accepted, rejected or amended. In the case of knowledge about teacher development, that process of knowledge construction involves addressing questions that underpin issues (such as those identified above) which are important because of their potential to inform and influence policy and practice. Such questions include:

What constitutes teacher development?
What factors influence teacher development?
What does the teacher development process involve?
What are the effects on the education system of teacher development?
How might the teacher development process be effected?

These provide a framework for a research agenda that needs to be followed if teacher development, as an area of study, is to fulfil its potential for developing theory that will make a real and meaningful contribution to policy and practice.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank the two anonymous referees whose comments on the first submission of this article have contributed much to its improvement.

REFERENCES

BELL, B. & GILBERT, J. (1994) Teacher development as professional, personal, and social development, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10, 5, pp. 483–497.

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (Ed.) (1994a) *Professional Development Schools: schools for developing a profession* (New York, Teachers College Press).

DARLING-HAMMOND, L. (1994b) Developing Professional Development Schools: early lessons, challenge, and promise. In: L. DARLING-HAMMOND (Ed.) *Professional Development Schools: schools for developing a profession* (New York, Teachers College Press), pp. 1–27.

DAY, C. (1999) *Developing Teachers: the challenges of lifelong learning* (London, Falmer).

EVANS, L. (1997) Addressing problems of conceptualisation and construct validity in researching teachers' job satisfaction, *Educational Research*, 39, 3, pp. 319–331.

EVANS, L. (1998) *Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation* (London, Paul Chapman).

EVANS, L. (2000) *Examining Teacher Development.* Paper presented at the CEDAR international conference, University of Warwick, March 2000.

FREIDSON, E. (1994) *Professionalism Reborn; theory, prophecy and policy* (Cambridge, Polity Press, in association with Blackwell Publishers).

FULLAN, M. & HARGREAVES, A. (1992) Teacher development and educational change. In: M. FULLAN & A. HARGREAVES (Eds) *Teacher Development and Educational Change* (London, Falmer), pp. 1–9.

GROSSMAN, P.L. (1994) In pursuit of a dual agenda: creating a middle level Professional Development School. In: L. DARLING-HAMMOND (Ed.) *Professional Development Schools: schools for developing a profession* (New York, Teachers College Press) pp. 50–73.

HALSEY, A.H. (1995) *Decline of Donnish Dominion* (Oxford, Clarendon Press).

HARGREAVES, A. & FULLAN, M. (1992) *Understanding Teacher Development* (London, Cassell/New York, Teachers College Press).

HARGREAVES, A. & GOODSON, I. (1996) Teachers' professional lives: aspirations and actualities. In: I. GOODSON & A. HARGREAVES (Eds) *Teachers' Professional Lives* (London, Falmer), pp. 1–27.

HOYLE, E. (1975) Professionality, professionalism and control in teaching. In: V. HOUGHTON *et al.* (Eds) *Management in Education: the management of organisations and individuals* (London, Ward Lock Educational in association with Open University Press).

KEINY, S. (1994) Constructivism and teachers' professional development, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10, 2, pp. 157–167.

LEAT, D. (1999) Rolling the stone uphill: teacher development and the implementation of Thinking Skills programmes, *Oxford Review of Education*, 25, 3, pp. 387–403.

LEITHWOOD, K. (1992) The principal's role in teacher development. In: M. FULLAN & A. HARGREAVES (Eds) *Teacher Development and Educational Change* (London, Falmer), pp. 86–103.

LITTLE, J.W. (1992) Teacher development and educational policy. In: M. FULLAN & A. HARGREAVES (Eds) *Teacher Development and Educational Change* (London, Falmer), pp. 170–193.

MILLER, L. & SILVERNAIL, D.L. (1994) Wells Junior High School: evolution of a Professional Development School. In: L. DARLING-HAMMOND (Ed.) *Professional Development Schools: schools for developing a profession* (New York, Teachers College Press), pp. 28–49.

RUSSELL, T. & MUNBY, H. (1991) Reframing: the role of experience in developing teachers' professional knowledge. In: D. SCHÖN (Ed.) *The Reflective Turn* (New York, Teachers College Press).

WHITFORD, B.L. (1994), Permission, persistence, and resistance: linking high school restructuring with teacher education reform. In: L. DARLING-HAMMOND (Ed.) (1994) *Professional Development Schools: schools for developing a profession* (New York, Teachers College Press), pp. 74–97.

Correspondence: Dr Linda Evans, Teacher Development Research and Dissemination Unit, Institute of Education, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL, UK.