

A strength-based approach to teacher professional development

Rosanne Zwart, Fred Korthagen en Saskia Attema-Noordewier

Words: 6.716

1. Introduction

Many teachers leave the field within the first five years (Fischer, 2011; Helms-Lorenz, Sloft & van der Grift, 2012). According to Minarik, Thornton, and Perrault (2003), the rate at which teachers leave the profession is significantly higher than the departure rate in other professions (see also Ingersoll & Perda, 2012; Borman & Dowling, 2008). Factors contributing to this low retention rate are feelings of stress and burnout due to unsatisfying working conditions, work overload (de Jonge & de Muijnk, 2002), undesirable student behavior (Geving, 2007), lack of support and supervision in the first years in the profession, frustration with respect to not achieving one's own teaching standards and lack of administrative support (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008; de Jonge & de Muijnk, 2002). These problems point towards a need for studies focusing on factors related to the prevention of burnout and teacher turnover, for example through an emphasis on job satisfaction, teacher efficacy and engagement (Pas, Bradshaw, & Hershfield, 2012).

The latter aspect has recently received much attention in the field of work and organizational psychology. Following the more general trend in psychology towards a focus on strengths and positive emotions (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000), characteristic of the approach of positive psychology, scholars in this field have become increasingly interested in employees' optimal functioning and positive experiences at work (Van den Broeck, Vansteenkiste, De Witte, & Lens, 2008). Instead of focusing on problematic and troublesome issues related to work, much more attention is currently being paid to personal qualities or strengths of people, and to work engagement (Schaufeli & Dijkstra, 2010). Research shows that being attentive to personal and positive aspects of work is more effective with respect to performance than focusing on the prevention of negative aspects such as stress and burnout (Schaufeli & Van Rhenen, 2006). Analyzing positive emotions, traits, and institutions, positive psychologists have focused on identifying situations in which humans thrive and flourish (Seligman, 2011; Woolfolk Hoy, Hoy, & Kurz, 2008). Such an environment is precisely what most educators would like the classroom to be. A difficult question, however, is how to organize such environments. How can we create working environments in which both teachers and students can thrive and flourish, environments in which teachers are genuinely engaged, in which they believe they can make a difference to the academic performance of their students, and in which they feel capable of overcoming difficulties and responding to problems with resilience and perseverance?

These questions inspired Korthagen and Vasalos (2008) to develop a professional development approach (the 'Quality from Within' (QfW) approach) focusing on growth, starting from and building on the inner potential of teachers and students. Following the *broaden and build* model (Fredrickson, 2002), teachers' qualities and inspiration are taken as the starting point for further development. Different from most innovations, the approach does not aim at a specific outcome in

terms of how teaching should be. The assumption is that if teachers connect with their inner strengths and inspiration as well as those of their colleagues and students, they may start to find their own approaches to effective education. In addition, it is assumed that connecting to inner strengths increases teachers' sense of self-efficacy, a factor often related to burnout (Fisher, 2011).

Although the approach has been implemented many times in many different countries (e.g. The Netherlands, Belgium, the US) and is often regarded as very successful (Korthagen, Kim, & Greene, 2013), more evidence-based understanding seems needed of the impact on the professional learning of teachers and schools. The study reported here systematically explores the impact of the 'Quality from Within' approach on the professional development of participating teachers of six primary schools in the Netherlands.

2. Conceptual framework

The development of the QfW approach could be described as an ongoing process of integrating practice and theory. While working with teachers in schools, it became apparent that something needed to be done in order for teachers to be able to thrive and flourish. It was also clear that the traditional professional development programs did not seem very successful in accomplishing meaningful and sustained teacher professional growth (see also Holmes, 1998; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009). Reasons for this vary from dismissing political and organizational aspects of schools (Fullan, 2001; Van Veen, Zwart & Meirink, 2012), ineffective leadership with top-down approaches and fixed goals creating a feeling of external pressure in the teachers (Korthagen, 2007), a focus on deficiency instead of growth and the neglecting of the teacher as an active and collaborative participant in designing his or her own professional learning (Van Veen, et al, 2012).

Related to this is the fact that educational experts and teachers do not really take each other seriously, and that teachers reject innovations, regardless of their potential benefits to their teaching practice (Elliot, 1991). As a result, teachers often respond by showing patterns of fight (active resistance), flight (attempts to escape from the pressure), or freeze (becoming tensed up). This can lead to emotional exhaustion (burnout, mental fatigue) and a distancing attitude towards the innovation or one's own work (cynicism) (Maslach, Schaufeli, & Leiter, 2001). In order to avoid this, teacher development programs need to focus more on ways in which teachers can prevent or cope with stress, which implies a focus on the underlying psychological mechanisms supporting teacher motivation for (continued) engagement and growth (Chong & Kong, 2012, p. 264). These psychological mechanisms are at the core of the QfW approach.

The essence of the approach is to make teachers aware of their core qualities and inspiration, and to support them in enacting these in practice and deal with the obstacles hindering them from doing so. The underlying idea is that professional behavior becomes more effective and fulfilling when it connects to the qualities and deeper values within a person, particularly if they are in harmony with other aspects such as knowledge and beliefs, but also the (work) environment (Korthagen & Vasalos, 2005; Meijer, Korthagen, & Vasalos, 2009). In a multi-layered model (the 'Onion model', Korthagen, 2004), six such aspects (or levels) are distinguished: (1) environment, (2)

behavior, (3) competencies, (4) beliefs, (5) identity, and, (6) personal mission (or, spirituality). This sixth level represents personal ideals. Research has shown that the loss of ideals, in other words a disconnection with this sixth layer in oneself, is characteristic of many cases of burn-out (Edelwich & Brodsky, 1980, p. 14; Freudenberger & Richelson, 1980). In Figure 1, questions are formulated to clarify each layer.




Figure 1: The Onion Model (Korthagen, 2004)

The core qualities refer to character strengths that people possess (such as courage, trust and patience) and that function as a driving force in people’s thinking, wanting, feeling and acting. In other words, core qualities are considered a driving force in aligning the inner and outer layers of the model. The example below illustrates how the six levels and their alignment can play a role in teaching.

Kim is a teacher in the fifth grade (environment). She feels she contributes to the world by bringing out the best in children (mission). Hence, Kim sees herself (identity) as a teacher whose main task is to stimulate children’s learning and their growth. Today, she teaches geography and believes it is important for her students’ motivation to start by looking at their own geographical area (belief). Therefore, she uses her skills to guide her students in making a map of the route they take from their homes to school (competencies and behavior). While doing this, she uses her core qualities of inspiration and trust.

This example also demonstrates how *alignment* between the levels can be achieved. Korthagen and Vasalos (2005) assume that a harmonious connection between the outer and inner levels of the model (thus between aspects situated within the person and aspects related to the external environment) results in an experience of *flow* (a concept coined by Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Ryan and Deci (2000, 2002) call this interaction between a person and the environment a *positive organic-dialogical process* resulting in a high degree of fulfillment of the three basic human psychological needs, being the need for autonomy, for competence, and for relatedness. *Autonomy* refers to the need of experiencing the self as the source of one’s own behavior and the need of expressing one’s authentic self (Ryan & Deci, 2002). The personal will and clear decision-making

based on personal values are central to experiencing autonomy (Hodgins, Koestner, & Duncan, 1996). *Competence* refers to feeling effective in personal, ongoing interactions in the social environment. It implies that humans are born with the need to use their capabilities to influence their surroundings (Ryan & Deci, 2002; Baumeister & Leary, 1995). The need for *relatedness* refers to a longing for positive relations and engagement with others i.e. to care and be cared for by others, by belonging to a group or community (Ryan, 1995; Ryan & Deci, 2002). If a person responds to the demands of a situation in such a way that the three basic needs become fulfilled, this is also personally fulfilling. It means that environment and person become connected in a positive sense. If the outer layers conflict with the inner layers, disharmony (or non-alignment) results. This non-alignment or incongruence is often related to experiences of stress and if this lasts a long time, it may result in burnout (Korthagen, 2004).

Essential in the QfW approach is, therefore, the promotion of reflection in individuals on the relation between the various onion layers, in order to increase their awareness of their flow or non-flow states. This is called *core reflection* (Korthagen, Kim, & Green, 2013). Core reflection is aimed at:

1. Promoting awareness of ideals and core qualities related to the situation reflected on, in order to strengthen awareness of identity and mission;
2. Identifying internal obstacles to acting out the ideals and core qualities;
3. Promoting awareness of the cognitive, emotional and motivational aspects embedded in ideals, core qualities, and obstacles;
4. Promoting awareness (cognitively and emotionally) of the friction between 1 and 2, and the self-created nature of internal obstacles;
5. Developing trust in the process that comes from within the person;
6. Supporting inner potential within the situation under reflection;
7. Developing autonomy in using core reflection.

In sum, essentially, core reflection develops an awareness of core qualities and ideals, supports acting on these qualities and ideals, as well as overcoming obstacles.

3. The professional development program

In this study, the implementation of the QfW approach was examined in six primary schools between June 2008 and June 2009. The teachers learned to use a reflection and coaching method starting with acknowledging their own core qualities and inspiration and those of their students, and promoting development from there. Moreover, the teachers reflected on their pedagogical views, based on their experiences with this new method. It was assumed that, by using this method, the teachers would become better facilitators of learning for their students and their colleagues. An intervention was implemented at each school, in which a combination of principles was used (for more details, see Attema-Noordewier, Korthagen, & Zwart, 2011):

1. Building on the needs and concerns of the participants

In three one-day group meetings centered on a pedagogical approach based on the concept of “realistic teacher education” (Korthagen, Kessels, Koster, Lagerwerf, & Wubbels, 2001), concerns, which participants encountered in their work, were taken as the starting point of the learning process and were addressed according to the principles of core reflection.

2. *Practicing in authentic situations*

Teachers practiced the methods of core reflection with their students, in their real work situations. This was partly coached by the trainers (through coaching-on-the job in the classroom or by working with students in the group meetings).

3. *Promoting individual reflection*

Personal reflection by the participants was constantly encouraged, in order to realize deep learning. This reflection was about several topics, for example, recent situations in the teachers' work, their ideals and beliefs, their core qualities, the obstacles they encountered, and so forth.

4. *Enhancing/Promoting transfer*

Transfer was enhanced/promoted by encouraging participants to continuously apply what they had learned to their teaching practice, both in their work with their students, as well as with each other. Moreover, participants practiced inter-collegial coaching in pairs, kept logbooks for reflecting on their experiences and shared them with the trainers and their colleagues, and they read a few Dutch articles on core reflection. In addition, a developmental group was formed, which monitored, guided, and supported the development within the school. The group consisted of two, up to five, teachers.

5. *Promoting engagement at the team and school level*

Participants were stimulated to reflect on and discuss the collective educational identity and mission of the school as a team. The development of a common language was essential in this process, a language supporting the team's discussions on the relationship between theory, vision, and practice at the school level, and also deepening individual reflections. Moreover, the participants were stimulated to make public the learning processes that were taking place, for example by organizing an information afternoon for parents, other schools, the educational inspectorate, and so forth. This helped them formulate a sharper definition of the educational identity of the school, and to critically reflect on what had been achieved and what still had to be achieved.

In sum, what made the difference was not just three days of training, but the whole ongoing process, with meetings of the developmental group, inter-collegial coaching, and so on. Finally, in order to fully realize these characteristics of the approach, it is important to mention that the trainers were experienced teacher trainers who for several years had been specifically trained in guiding the learning process using core reflection and the pedagogy of realistic teacher education.

4. Method

4.1. Research questions

Recent empirical studies (Meijer, Korthagen, & Vasalos; 2009; Hoekstra & Korthagen, 2012) suggest that awareness of the role of the different levels of the onion model and especially of the alignment between those levels is important for education. These studies focused on individual teacher learning, which provides a modest 'proof of concept' and a starting point for further exploration of the process of teacher professional growth in the context of the QfW approach, which is the focus of this study. The present study was guided by the following research questions:

1. What do the participants perceive as the outcomes of the project (for themselves, their students and the school as a whole), and how do these outcomes – according to the participants - take form in daily practice?
2. Does their sense of self-efficacy, autonomy, competence or relatedness increase after having taken part in the QfW project?

Insights from this study may be useful for other schools when designing interventions for professional learning.

4.2 Design of the study

During a period of 17 months, this study monitored six primary schools implementing the QfW approach. A mixed-method design (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004) approach was adopted, which means that both quantitative and qualitative data were combined to study the outcomes of the program as well as the factors hindering or promoting these outcomes. The method was chosen for reasons of triangulation, complementarity, and development (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 22). Quantitative data consisted of a questionnaire on the perception of work, and qualitative data were collected using reflective reports of the participants and semi-structured interviews.

4.3. Participants

Participants in this study were 93 primary school teachers from six schools located in six different, small to middle-sized cities (three in the East and three in the middle of the Netherlands). The schools ranged from small (one school with 5 teachers) to large (30 teachers and two locations). The teachers taught from Kindergarten through Grade 6. Teaching experience ranged from novices to teachers with 25 or more years of experience. Of all participating teachers (93), only 61 filled out the questionnaire twice (pre-test and post-test). Hence, the quantitative part of this study is based on the data of these 61 teachers. With respect to the qualitative data, they were collected from a subsample of 24 teachers from four schools. The selection was based on a representative distribution of teachers over categories ranging from highly to less enthusiastic about the approach.

4.4. Data collection

Table 1 below provides an overview of the variables, data collection instruments and number of participants.

Variable	Instrument	Measurement moment	n (teachers)
Fulfillment of basic psychological needs	Questionnaire	Before and directly after the project had ended.	61
Self-efficacy in coaching others	Questionnaire	Before and directly after the project had ended.	61
Perceived learning outcomes	Semi-structured interview;	1) half-way through the project, 2) directly after and 3) six to eight months after the project had ended.	24 20 14
	Reflective report	Twice during the project (after each workshop-day).	14

Table 1: Overview of the variables, instruments and measurement moments

Fulfillment of basic psychological needs and self-efficacy in coaching others

In order to assess the teachers' needs fulfillment and their perceived self-efficacy regarding coaching others, a questionnaire was administered before and immediately after the project. The questionnaire consisted of four sub-scales: (1) fulfillment of the basic psychological need for *competence* (example item: The people at work tell me I am good at what I do), (2) fulfillment of the need for *relatedness* (example item: I feel I have a bond with my colleagues), (3) fulfillment of the need for *autonomy* (example item: I feel I can decide for myself how to do my work), and (4) self-efficacy regarding the principles of coaching central to the QfW approach. The first three scales were derived from a study by Evelein (2005), who presented evidence of the validity and reliability of these scales. The fourth scale measures the teachers' self-efficacy regarding their own coaching competencies illustrating the QfW approach. This scale consisted of 10 items (an example: When I coach other people, I can deal with personal aspects) and All items were answered on a seven-point Likert-scale ranging from (1) *not true at all* to (7) *very true*.

Perceived outcomes of the QFW approach

To get more insight into the perceived outcomes of the QfW approach, data were also collected using reflective reports and semi-structured interviews. The teachers wrote two reflective reports during the time span of the project. The reports focused on perceived learning outcomes and how these would affect the teacher's daily practice. In addition, teachers were asked to write about aspects that supported or hindered their learning. The reports were both written directly after a training day and emailed to their own colleagues and the trainers.

As for the interviews, a subsample of teachers was selected based on the content of their reflective reports. An analysis of the reports showed that the teachers in the study represented several categories, namely, teachers who:

- A: were positive about the project and seemed to be learning;
- B: were not enthusiastic about the project and seemed to be learning little;
- C: did not write a reflective report.

Since the interview results should reflect all types of teachers, two teachers from each category were selected randomly. In one school, not one teacher fitted in category C. Hence, in that school, teachers were chosen from categories A and B. This resulted in a selection of 24 teachers (A=12, B=7, C=5). The teachers not interviewed belonged primarily to category A. Unfortunately, however, due to job changes, holidays and sickness, only 14 teachers could be interviewed at all three measurement moments (halfway through the project, directly after the project had ended and six to eight months later) (A=7, B=6, C=1). Therefore, statements with respect to the more longitudinal outcomes of the project are based on data from these fourteen teachers. Data from the other teachers were used to provide additional meaning to the results.

The interviews focused on perceived (learning) outcomes of the project. The part of the interviews that focused on the outcomes of the QfW approach followed the onion model. The most important questions of the interview were: What personal outcomes resulted from your participation? Do you notice any changes with respect to what you know, what you do, what you desire, feel or want for yourself, for your colleagues or your students? Do you notice any changes in the students? What aspects of the project influenced and determined the outcomes?

To get an insight into what actually happened during the training days and the coaching on the job experiences, the trainers were asked to fill in an *intervention report* in which they were asked to identify: 1) characteristics of the specific intervention in the school; 2) their opinion about the development of the teachers in the school, and (3) their opinion about what was essential in the intervention to make this development possible. These data provided background information for the interpretation of the results.

4.5. Data analysis

For the quantitative analysis, a pre-/post-test design was selected. Respondents included 61 teachers at six schools (i.e. observations (N=122), nested within teachers (N=61), nested within 6 schools (N=6)). We included teachers of whom we had both a pre-test and a post-test score. To assess whether the participants showed an increase in the fulfillment of the three basic psychological needs, and/or an increase in their perceived capacity to facilitate colleague and student learning, a multi-factor analysis of variance was computed (Bickel, 2007). We were interested in a fixed effect (of time), but had to take other effects into account, too (e.g. it was possible that some teachers or schools performed better than others right from the beginning, or that teachers within one school were more alike than teachers in other schools). Therefore, we tested multiple models and the best fit proved to be the model in which the random intercept was chosen at the teacher level. We discovered a school-

effect for the autonomy scale only, although not significant. Therefore, the results can be interpreted as effects of the group of teachers.

The analysis of the interviews followed an inductive approach and was carried out in eight consecutive steps (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2010, p.472). First, pseudonyms were assigned to the teachers and the schools in order to ensure confidentiality. Second, four interviews were transcribed verbatim (two from category A and two from category B) and scanned to generate categories of learning results. Sensitizing concepts were formulated around the six layers of the multi-level learning model (see Figure 1). Third, relationships were sought between these categories, and working summaries were written on the basis of the data. Fourth, more transcripts were added to refine the scoring categories. Fifth, with the aid of the final scoring model, one researcher and two research assistants independently analyzed two additional interviews. The obtained results were then compared and found to differ in only a few cases, which were then discussed until agreement had been reached (Cohen et al, 2010). Sixth, negative and discrepant cases were deliberately sought to modify and provide more meaning to the theory emerging around the outcomes and promoting and hindering aspects of the QfW approach. Seventh, to be able to enumerate and report on the different categories, the six levels of the onion model were then condensed into three layers by combining adjacent levels into one scoring category (i.e., 1. Identity, motives and core qualities; 2. Insights and beliefs, and 3. Behavior and competencies). The categories of learning outcomes of the approach were only reported when mentioned by at least 50% the participants in at least one interview. This was done to increase the representativeness of all participants in the results. Eighth, and finally, to describe whether the teachers reported learning outcomes at one level of the condensed onion-model or more, the reports of learning outcomes were coded with a code 1, 2 or 3. An example, when a teacher reported that she had become more aware of her own motives for teaching in a particular way, but did not mention in what way this increased awareness connected with changed behavior and/or changed beliefs, this reported outcome was coded 1, meaning a learning outcome at one-level only. When, on the other hand, the teacher mentioned a subsequent impact of this learning on changed behavior, this was coded 2, i.e. a learning outcome at two levels.

5. Results

In the sections below, we will first provide an overview of the results from the quantitative analysis of the questionnaire data. Next, the results of the qualitative analysis of the interview transcripts will be presented.

5.1 Fulfillment of basic psychological needs and self-efficacy in coaching

Analysis of the questionnaire data showed an increase for the whole group of teachers of the scores on the scales Autonomy and Self-efficacy in coaching between the pre-test and post-test ($p < 0.01$), a small but statistically significant effect (R^2 is .06 and .04 respectively) (see Table 2). What this means is that teachers feel an increase in the experience of ownership of their behavior. They feel that they have more opportunities to make personal choices, but also feel greater endorsement of others for

those choices. In addition, the teachers perceive themselves as more successfully enacting the principles of the QfW approach when coaching students or colleagues.

Scale	Pre-test		Post-test		Time		
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	b	se	p
Autonomy	5.11	.87	5.39	.71	.275	.08	.001**
Competence	5.64	.74	5.75	.71	.116	.08	.159
Relatedness	5.51	.71	5.63	.58	.117	.07	.114
Self-efficacy in coaching	4.74	.89	4.96	.78	.231	.08	.006**

(** p < 0.01)

Table 2: Means on the pre-test and post-test for the four scales of the questionnaire

With respect to the scores on the scales Competence and Relatedness, we note that these scores did not significantly increase at the group level. An explanation might be that these scores were already relatively high to begin with.

5.2 Self-reported learning outcomes

Individual learning outcomes

Table 3 summarizes teachers' perceptions of individual outcomes of the project. Percentages show the total of teachers mentioning these outcomes.

Perceived outcomes	Illustrative examples	Interview		
		1 (n=24)	2 (n=20)	3 (n=14)
Increased coaching skills (regarding coaching of students and colleagues): Stronger focus on the emotional and motivational side of learning; more structured coaching.	“I ask the children more about how they feel, and what they think. I have noticed that the children are then able to come up with their own solutions”. In conversations with my student teacher, I ask her to describe her experiences and ideas about the situation instead of telling her myself what went right, and what went wrong, and how she should solve this”.	75%	85%	79%
Feedback on core qualities (to students, colleagues, parents).	“I give more and more conscious feedback on core qualities”	63%	55%	71%
Increased awareness of certain coaching skills.	“I became aware of the difference between giving a compliment and	58%	45%	29%

	giving feedback on core qualities”.			
New and/or renewed insights into and ideas about learning.	“One learns from positive feedback”. “It is better to focus on strengths than on problems.”	75%	80%	64%
Increased awareness of one's own motives.	“I want to contribute to the well-being of the children” “I know better now why I do what I do”.	71%	30%	64%
Increased awareness of one's own professional identity	“ I feel there is more appreciation for me, that my experience really matters.”	54%	55%	57%
Increased awareness of one's own core qualities like commitment, care, calmness, enthusiasm, honesty.	“I now have tools for looking completely differently at myself and a situation (...) I now decide consciously to get in touch with quality of care, and to look at the positive side of the situation. In this way I see much more, and I feel a much lighter kind of energy.”	63%	70%	50%

Table 3: Categories, examples and percentages of reported outcomes at the individual level

With regard to the learning outcomes at the individual level, Table 4 shows that a perceived increase in coaching skills is mentioned most in the interviews. The reported outcomes are rather similar for the first and second measurement moments and still ring true seven to eight months after the end of the project. An exception is the category *‘increased awareness of one's own motives’*, which is reported considerably less in the second interview (directly after the project ended). Furthermore, one outcome that is remarkably less mentioned three months after the project had ended is *‘increased awareness of certain coaching skills’*. One explanation could be that when teachers have been participating in the project longer, they are not only aware of these coaching skills, but are also feeling more competent regarding these skills, and mention just this latter fact. For example, half-way through the project, teachers reported things like, *‘I know now that I can give feedback on core qualities, but I find it hard to practice it in the classroom’*. At the second and third interview, they reported that they were actually doing this more frequently in the classroom and therefore it might be that there was no need to report their awareness of it.

Aligned individual learning outcomes

With respect to the alignment demonstrated in the teacher reports of their learning outcomes, Table 4 shows that most teachers reported learning at all three levels of the condensed ‘onion-model’.

Alignment of the reported outcomes at:	Interview		
	1 (n=24)	2 (n=20)	3 (n=14)
Three levels	75%	70%	58%
Two levels	12,5%	25%	36%
One level	12,5%	5%	7%

Table 4: Number of levels aligned in the reported learning outcomes

When analyzing the data more closely however, striking differences were found between enthusiastic teachers and those who were less enthusiastic (categories A and C, respectively). These differences seem to be related to their attitude towards learning in general. When they had an open, learning-oriented attitude, they were more enthusiastic about the project and seemed to learn more from it. Those who had a less open attitude seemed to ‘close up’ already at the beginning, although the positive experiences of colleagues and their enthusiasm almost always started to influence these less enthusiastic teachers after a while. Sometimes, however, this made them more positive on the one hand, but on the other hand still not very open towards the possibility that they themselves could learn something. An example was a teacher who was convinced that, through her many years of experience in communicating with people in a previous job, the content of the project had little to offer her.

Learning outcomes regarding others

Table 5 shows the most important perceived outcomes of the project regarding the students, the team and the school principals, mentioned by more than half of the teachers in at least one interview.

Learning outcomes regarding others	Illustrative examples	Interview		
		1 (n=24)	2 (n=20)	3 (n=14)
Increased work and communication skills and attitude of the students: better attitude to working and learning; better group work; more independent problem-solving; more understanding of each other’s feelings; giving more positive feedback to each other.	“At days that I use it [core reflection] I notice that the children are working quite well and that their attitude is much better, and their concentration as well.” “I believe that this positive approach will lead to better learning outcomes, because if they get this trust they will also use it.”	67%	60%	71%
Teachers experience more	The barrier to be open	75%	65%	64%

openness, safety and a deeper engagement in school.	to each other has really lowered.” “We have grown closer together.”			
Better management and coaching skills of the school principal.	“When I had a problem and talked to the principal about it, she immediately worked it out with me through core reflection. (...) After five minutes I was ready and knew how to solve it. That was nice.” “The principal is much more decisive.”	50%	45%	57%

Table 5: Categories, examples and percentages of reported outcomes regarding others

Table 5 demonstrates that similar to the individual outcomes, reported outcomes with respect to ‘others’ vary little between the three measurements.

6. Conclusion and discussion

The focus of this study was to get more insight into the processes of teacher professional growth in the context the QfW approach. The essence of the approach is, firstly, the acknowledgment of the interrelatedness of cognitive, behavioral, emotional and motivational aspects, and secondly, the assumption that professional behavior becomes more effective and fulfilling (with respect to the three basic human psychological needs; Deci & Ryan, 2002) when it connects to the deeper values within a person, particularly if they are in harmony with other aspects within the person, such as beliefs and competencies, and with the (work) environment.

Although the number of participants was limited, we believe that our study shows significant outcomes of the QfW approach. Firstly, with respect to the learning outcomes, findings indicate a statistically significant increase in feelings of autonomy and self-efficacy in coaching others. Also, increased coaching skills, (re)new(ed) insights into and ideas about learning and increased awareness of one’s core qualities were reported. In addition, most learning outcomes showed alignment of two or three levels of the condensed ‘onion-model’, which means that teachers reported related changes to occur in more than one domain of what Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) call ‘the teacher’s world’. The promotion of such multi-layered changes in individuals is one of the key features of the QfW approach.

Regarding the increased sense of autonomy, it is interesting that the competence scale and the relatedness scale did not show significant effects. An explanation for this could be that the scores on these scales were already high to begin with. Another explanation can be found in the fact that the questionnaire measures a general feeling of competence and not a specific coaching competence or other competence directly related to the project. This more specific coaching competence is measured by the self-efficacy in coaching scale, which did show an increase. A similar explanation could be applied to the fulfillment of the need for relatedness. Future research should delve more deeply into

processes and outcomes related to competence and relatedness, as basic need satisfaction has been found to relate positively to vigor and dedication, whereas it has related negatively to emotional exhaustion (Vansteenkiste, Neyrinck, Niemiec, Soenens, De Witte, & Van den Broeck, 2007). Hence, these psychological needs may play an important role in teacher turnover and burnout.

As for the increased self-efficacy in coaching, this means that teachers perceive themselves as more successfully enacting the principles of core reflection when coaching students or colleagues. The qualitative analyses of the interviews show a similar result, especially when it comes to experiencing the effectiveness of paying attention to the role of emotions in learning. In almost all examples shown in Table 3, the teachers express this focus on positive emotions, strengths, positive experiences or feelings in general as being important aspects of their learning. "I feel that there is more appreciation for me, that my experience really matters" and "It is better to focus on strengths than on problems" are just two of these examples. Although a few teachers found this focus on strengths and feelings awkward, and even the idea of giving attention to feelings and emotions sometimes created resistance in some teachers, the results of this study align with research within other contexts showing the surplus value of being attentive to personal and positive aspects of work (Schaufeli & Van Rhenen, 2006). As Cowie (2011, p. 236) puts it: "The evidence from the education field is that how teachers deal with emotions can have a great impact on their personal growth, and the kind of emotional support that they receive from their colleagues and institution can be a major factor in their personal development as a teacher". Similar results are found in recent research on work engagement. Factors explaining best why some people experience high levels of vigor, dedication and absorption (i.e. the characteristics of work engagement, see Salanova, Liorens, & Schaufeli, 2011) and others do not, are shown to be related to daily events such as supportive interaction with colleagues, the daily experience of autonomy and positive feedback (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe & Ryan, 2000). These are precisely the aspects that the QfW project focuses on.

Lastly, in the interviews factors were mentioned that either promoted or hindered teacher learning within the context of the project. Important aspects that were found to promote teacher learning were that the project should be in line with the school development and culture, and that attention should be paid to the project during the school weeks. The most often mentioned aspects hindering the outcomes were lack of time and being busy, which is a structurally recurring limiting aspect in almost all professional development endeavors. One explanation for this might be that schools are first and foremost organized for student instead of teacher learning. Within the daily dynamic of teaching students, time and space for reflection is difficult to find. Optimally attending to teacher learning in schools "requires schools to take structural and cultural possibilities and constraints for teacher learning in the entire organization into consideration" (Van Veen, et al, 2012, p. 23). This seems highly important considering the fact that most factors related to teacher retention have to do with school organizational conditions such as unsatisfying working conditions, work overload, lack of support and supervision in the first years and lack of administrative support (Blase, Blase, & Du, 2008; de Jonge & de Muijnck, 2002).

Finally, did the QfW project contribute to teacher retention? We do not have specific quantitative data providing evidence that this is indeed the case, but both the above mentioned data

from the questionnaires and the interviews showed increases in factors of which it is known that they correlate positively with job satisfaction and teacher retention and negatively with teacher burnout and loss of ideals. A few quotes from the interviews may further illustrate these positive effects:

- Eliciting inspiration for teaching and naming what goes well and identifying core qualities. [...] That helps us get out of the negative spiral.”
- “This is also important for team building. You get to know each other better, and that creates a better atmosphere.”
- “Things go more smoothly in the team and with the children.”
- “I became a better human being. I feel more valuable, more knowledgeable. I discovered that I can mean something to others, to children.”
- “I developed more self-confidence. You grow as a person.”
- “I can make a difference.”

We have to realize, however, that these results were not acquired easily. The QfW approach is not a simple, straightforward, traditional approach to teacher development. It is a combination of various innovative perspectives and strategies (cf. section 3), and trainers need an in-depth training to prepare them for using this approach. The most salient aspect of the QfW approach is that it does not aim at a specific outcome in terms of teaching competencies, but starts from the existing potential in the participants and from their ideals. This may in itself represent an interesting and innovative view of teacher education, a view that is in contrast with most existing approaches in this field. Perhaps the time has come to realize that the problems of teacher turnover and teacher burnout cannot be solved by putting more emphasis on simple interventions aimed at the development of the ‘right’ teacher competencies. We believe that re-creating flow in teachers and schools is first and foremost a matter of taking people and institutions seriously, and starting from the potential that is already present. The QfW project shows that from this flow, many positive effects emerge, also in terms of competencies, and even in the students involved. This means that the main problem of educational change may not lie in influencing teachers and schools, but in changing the perspectives and beliefs of those responsible for choosing the aims of projects for professional development.

References

- Attema-Noordewier, S., Korthagen, F., & Zwart, R. (2011). Promoting quality from within: A new perspective on professional development in schools. In M. Kooy & K. Van Veen (Eds), *Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 115-142). London/New York
- Baumeister, R.F., & Leary, M.R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529. Routledge.
- Blase, J., Blase, J., & Du, F. (2008). The mistreated teacher: A national study. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46(3), 263-301.
- Borman, G.D., & Dowling, N.M.(2008). Teacher attrition and retention: A meta-analytic and narrative review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*,78, 367-408.
- Chong, W.H., & Kong, C.A. (2012). Teacher Collaborative Learning and Teacher Self-Efficacy: The Case of Lesson Study. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 80(3), 263-283.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2010). *Research Methods in Education*. London, Routledge Falmer.
- Cowie, N. (2011). Emotions that experienced English as a Foreign Language (EFL) teachers feel about their students, their colleagues and their work, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 235-242.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Clarke, D., & Hollingsworth, H. (2002). Elaborating a model of teacher professional growth. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, 947-967.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Edelwich, J. & Brodsky, A. (1980). *Burn-out*. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Elliot, J. (1991). *Action research for educational change*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Evelein, F.G. (2005). *Psychologische basisbehoeften van docenten in opleiding*. [Basic psychological needs of student teachers]. PhD Thesis. Utrecht: IVLOS.
- Fisher, M. H. (2011). Factors Influencing Stress, Burnout, and Retention of Secondary Teachers. *Current Issues in Education*, 14(1). Retrieved from <http://cie.asu.edu/>
- Fredrickson, B. L. (2002). Positive emotions. In: C.R. Snyder & S. J. Lopez (Eds.), *Handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 120- 134). Oxford, etc.: Oxford University Press.
- Freudenberger, H. J. & Richelson, G. (1980). *Burn-out*. Garden City: Anchor Press.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The New Meaning of Educational Change* (3rd ed.). New York/London: Teachers College Press/RoutledgeFalmer.
- Geving, A. M. (2007). Identifying the types of student and teacher behaviors associated with teacher stress. *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies*, 23(5),624-640.
- Helms-Lorentz, M., Slof, B., & van de Grift, W. (2012). First year effects of induction arrangements on beginning teachers' psychological processes. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, december 2012.
- Hodgins, H.S., Koestner, R., & Duncan, N. (1996). On the compatibility of autonomy and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(3), 227-237.
- Holmes, M. (1998). Change and tradition in education: The loss of community. In A. Hargreaves, A. Lieberman, M. Fullan, & D. Hopkins (Eds.), *International handbook of educational change* (pp. 558-575). Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer.
- Ingersoll, R. & Perda, D., (2012). *How high is teacher turnover and is it a problem?* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Pennsylvania.
- Jonge, J.F.M. de, Muijnck, J.A. de (2002). *Waarom leraren de sector verlaten. Onderzoek naar de uitstroom uit het primair en voortgezet onderwijs*. Zoetermeer / Den Haag: EIM / SBO.
- Korthagen, F.A.J. (2004). In search of the essence of a good teacher: Towards a more holistic approach in teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20(1), 77-97.
- Korthagen, F.A.J. (2007). The gap between research and practice revisited. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 13(3), 303-310.
- Korthagen, F.A.J., Kessels, J., Koster, B., Lagerwerf, B., & Wubbels, T. (2001). *Linking practice and theory: The pedagogy of realistic teacher education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Korthagen, F.A.J., Greene, W.L., & Kim, Y.M. (Eds.) (2013). *Teaching and Learning from Within. A Core Reflection Approach to Quality and Inspiration in Education*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Korthagen, F., Vasalos, A. (2008). *Quality from Within as the key to professional development*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Maslach, C., Schaufeli, W.B., & Leiter, M.P. (2001). Job burn-out. In S.t. Fiske, D., Schacter, & C. Zahn-Waxler (Eds), *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397-422.

- Meijer, P., Korthagen, F.A.J., & Vasalos, A. (2009). Supporting presence in teacher education: The connection between the personal and professional aspects of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 25*(2), 297-308.
- Minarik, M. M., Thornton, B., & Perreault, G. (2003). Systems thinking can improve teacher retention. *Clearing House, 76*(5), 230-234.
- Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*, 419-435.
- Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2002). Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic dialectical perspective. In E.L. Deci & R.M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-determination research* (pp. 3-33). Rochester: The University of Rochester Press.
- Salanova, M., Llorens, S. & Schaufeli, W.B. (2011). Yes, I can, I feel good and just do it: On gain spirals of efficacy beliefs, affect and engagement. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 60*, 255-285.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & Dijkstra, P. (2010). *Bevlogen aan het werk* [Engaged at Work] Zaltbommel: Thema.
- Schaufeli, W.B. & van Rhenen, W. (2006). Over de rol van positieve en negatieve emoties bij het welbevinden van managers: een studie uitgevoerd met de Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS) [About the role of positive and negative emotions in manager's well-being: a study using the Job-related Affective Well-being Scale (JAWS)]. *Gedrag & Organisatie, 19*, 223-244.
- Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. New York: Free Press.
- Seligman, M. E. P. & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 5-14.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Neyrinck, B., Niemiec, C. P., Soenens, B., De Witte, H., & Van Den Broeck, A. (2007). On the relations among work value orientations, psychological need satisfaction, and job outcomes: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 251-277.
- Van den Broeck, A., Vansteenkiste, M., De Witte H. & Lens, W. (2008). Explaining the relationships between job characteristics, burnout and engagement: The role of basic psychological need satisfaction. *Work & Stress, 22*, 277-294.
- Van Veen, K., Zwart, R. & Meirink, J. (2011). What makes teacher professional development effective? A literature review. In M. Kooy & K. Van Veen (Eds), *Teacher learning that matters: International perspectives* (pp. 115-142). London/New York: Routledge.
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., Orphanos, S. (2009). Professional learning in the learning profession: *A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX. National Staff Development Council.
- Woolfolk Hoy, A., Hoy, W.K. & Kurz, N.M. (2008). Teacher's academic optimism: The development and test of a new construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 24*, 821-835.