# CHANGING TEACHING PRACTICE: STRATEGIES AND BARRIERS[1]

Christopher Knapper, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada

## Abstract

There is now a considerable amount of empirical research on teaching and learning in higher education that should provide a guide to effective teaching practice. In particular there is an impressive body of evidence on how teaching methods and curriculum design affects deep, autonomous, and reflective learning. Yet most faculty are largely ignorant of this scholarship, and instructional practices and curriculum design are dominated by tradition rather than research evidence. In particular, teaching is largely didactic, assessment of student work is often trivial, and curricula are more likely to emphasise content coverage than acquisition of lifelong and life-wide learning skills. A recent study of excellent teaching departments in 11 research-intensive universities world-wide shows how good teaching can be encouraged and led, despite formidable barriers to embedding change.

## Faculty Conceptions of Teaching and Learning

University professors who are critical of efforts to improve teaching often challenge educational developers by asking what information and techniques we can offer that might have a tangible effect on the quality of instruction. Assuming every university teacher *did* receive some training, would it really make any difference? After all, despite years of mandatory training for elementary and high school teachers, there is still widespread criticism of the quality of Canadian schools. This raises an intriguing question. If you as a faculty developer or educational researcher had the attention of *all* the teachers in your institution for, say, half a day, just what would you tell them? For me the answer is quite simple: I would try to raise the issue of how students learn, beginning by having faculty consider what they know intuitively from half a lifetime of learning themselves, and ending by encouraging them to become familiar with some of the seminal research from the past 30 years that helps explain how the way we teach affects the quality and effectiveness of student learning.

The act of teaching is of course meaningless without a corresponding act of learning. Yet a great irony of much university teaching is that, although professors have themselves excelled as learners, the insights gleaned from this experience are often abandoned as soon as the instructor ascends the classroom podium. Instead of reflecting on their own experience, supplemented by relevant research about effective practices, many faculty base their approach to teaching upon an uncritical adoption of the model that comes most readily to hand – their own professors.

---

[1] Paper presented at *Taking stock: Symposium on teaching and learning research in higher education,* University of Guelph, Ontario, April 25, 2008.

Consequently, it is not surprising that teaching methods have remained largely unchanged since medieval times when lectures predominated largely because of a scarcity of printed books. In addition to being the most popular method among faculty, the lecture is also preferred by a great many students (see Knapper and Cropley, 2000, for a review of relevant research). This is despite the fact that the higher education literature has for some time stressed the importance of student-centred learning (see Barr & Tagg, 1995), and there is increasing empirical evidence from a variety of international settings that prevailing teaching practices in higher education do not encourage the sort of learning that contemporary society demands, and indeed that most university professors claim they would like to see. What does the research on learning in university suggest about good teaching practice? What is there such a disparity between the evidence for good practice and teachers' classroom behaviour? And is there any hope that these disparities might be corrected?

**Evidence-based teaching**

It is increasingly accepted by educational developers that effective teaching – meaning *teaching for effective learning* – has to be based on sound empirical evidence about the sort of teaching methods and approaches that produce particular learning outcomes. Unfortunately, one consequence of the fact that few faculty members receive any explicit training in teaching is that we tend to approach the task in a rather amateur fashion – in both the good and bad sense of that term. Indeed most faculty and university administrators are unaware that there is a considerable body of research on effective teaching practice, much of it specific to the special context of higher education. The most interesting and influential line of research over the past 25 years has focussed on the factors that promote cognitive development in students – not simply acquisition of information that is generally measured by traditional examinations and tests, but more generic skills, such as problem-solving, critical thinking, and what the researchers have termed "deep" learning. We now know a good deal about what promotes effective learning in undergraduates, and furthermore this substantial body of research offers many pointers to the way we might best organise teaching to promote deeper and more independent learning.

The emphasis here is not so much on *how much* students learn, but on *changes in learning processes*, and how these are affected by instructional interventions (teaching) and departmental (or institutional) learning climate. Investigators have identified different learning approaches, measured changes in learning approaches over time, and tried to discover the determinants of such change. This research derives from a number of individuals working in different countries – but relying greatly on a cross-fertilisation of findings and methods of inquiry. The work is associated with the names of scholars such as Marton and Säljö in Sweden, Entwistle and Ramsden in England, and Biggs, Kember, Trigwell, and Watkins in Australia and Hong Kong.

These researchers have identified and described different learning approaches, beginning with the classic papers by Marton and Säljö (1976a, 1976b), who first used the terms "deep" and "surface" approaches to learning, later renamed by Entwistle and

Ramsden (1983) "meaning orientation" and "reproducing orientation". Deep learning refers to an approach that emphasises the pursuit of meaning and understanding for its own sake, and deep learners appear to be intrinsically motivated. For them the act of learning is its own reward, and the major goal of such learners is to integrate new learning and ideas with their existing understanding. Surface learners on the other hand are primarily motivated to meet minimum task requirements (e.g. to get through the course and pass the exam), and they see learning as mainly a matter of reproducing information without any particular interest in its meaning.

Of course all of us frequently engage in surface learning just to get through the many tasks we face in our everyday lives, and surface learning may indeed be appropriate for many routine matters. But to meet the challenges of change and complexity in modern society, university students inevitably need to use learning approaches that stress depth – in the sense of conceptual understanding and integration of new knowledge with existing ideas, to solve complex and often novel or unanticipated problems.

What sorts of learning approaches are used by university students, and how are they affected by characteristics of the department or institution, especially by teaching methods? An early study at the Australian National University by Watkins and Hattie (1981) reached some pessimistic conclusions. It involved an ambitious longitudinal investigation of 540 students as they proceeded through their undergraduate programs, with approaches to study measured by both questionnaire and personal interviews. The research revealed that students' learning orientations in fact became progressively more surface over the three years of their university studies, and Watkins and Hattie attributed their results primarily to the examination system which, they concluded, discouraged adoption of deeper learning approaches.

More optimistic conclusions can be drawn from an investigation by Ramsden and Entwistle (1981), who studied over 2,000 British university students enrolled in 66 different academic departments in the humanities, social sciences, sciences, and engineering. There was no universal pattern of change in learning orientation over time, but some departments, across all the disciplines studied, did foster adoption of deeper learning approaches by their students. Such departments were characterised by "good teaching", "greater freedom in learning", and "avoidance of overloading". Good teachers were defined by Ramsden and Entwistle as instructors who tried to understand student difficulties, were ready to give help and advice on study methods, and took care to pitch material at an appropriate level. The authors defined "freedom in learning" as allowing students a choice of tasks to complete course requirements, and a choice of learning methods to accomplish these tasks. Other characteristics that appeared to promote deeper learning included setting clear goals and standards for academic work, vocational relevance (perceived links between what was being studied and students' later lives and careers), social climate (good relations between students and teachers), and less emphasis on formal teaching (attending classes) compared to a stress on the importance of individual study.

Several years later, Bertrand and Knapper (1991) did a partial (and much more modest) replication of the Entwistle and Ramsden study in three academic departments at the University of Waterloo (Canada), using questionnaires adapted from the 1981 research. Student learning approaches in the three departments were found to differ markedly in the predicted directions, and persisted over time. They were also associated with aspects of teaching and academic climate identified by Ramsden and Entwistle (Knapper, 1995).

Kember has also shown links between the orientation of individual teachers and a change in their students towards deeper learning approaches. Kember developed a scale to measure teaching values and beliefs, and distinguished, following Barr and Tagg (1995), between "subject-orientation" at one end of a continuum, and "student- or learning-orientation" at the other. Teachers holding more learning-centred orientations, and who encourage more active learning and interaction with students, appear to promote deeper learning than teachers who hold more subject-centred values (Kember & Gow, 1994).

Although the work cited above has been done mainly with student populations in Europe, Australia, and Asia, the findings about links between teaching methods and learning outcomes receive some support from American research that has adopted quite different methodologies. For example, Astin (1993) in a massive project that involved 20,000 students, 25,000 academic staff, and 200 institutions in the USA, showed that the characteristics and behaviour of teaching staff had major implications for student development. In particular, opportunities for student-faculty interaction had "positive correlations with every self-reported area of intellectual and personal growth" (p. 383), and there were similar positive effects associated with opportunities for interactions among students themselves. In contrast, sheer number of hours devoted to teaching was unrelated to cognitive development, suggesting it is the *quality* of teacher-student contact, not the quantity, that is of critical importance.

Pascarella and Terenzini (1991) analysed the results of over 2,600 empirical studies dealing with the impact of higher education on student learning and development. They concluded that student learning is "unambiguously linked to effective teaching, and we know much about what effective teachers do and how they behave in the classroom" (p. 619). Such behaviours include the instructor's ability to establish rapport with students, interpersonal accessibility, feedback to students, active learning strategies, opportunities for students to interact with their peers, and "a curricular experience in which students are required to integrate learning from separate courses around a central theme" (p. 619). Writing about the implications of their research for policy and practice, Pascarella and Terenzini conclude that academic departments should strive to "create environments that attract and engage students in both intellectual and interpersonal learning" (p. 653).

This research is largely unknown to most academics outside of educational development centres. Nonetheless the concept of deep learning is intuitively appealing to most teachers as a sensible goal for undergraduate education. At the same time, many of instructional practices and curriculum planning processes work against

achieving a move to deeper learning.  Elsewhere (Knapper, 2004) I have attempted to provide a simple overview of research relevant to teaching and learning in higher education and suggested a set of guidelines for good practice.

**Leading university teaching: the Oxford study**

In 2005-2007, Graham Gibbs, Sergio Piccinin and I were involved in a research project at the University of Oxford Learning Institute that focussed on what we termed "leadership of teaching" in 11 research-intensive universities in Europe, North America, and Australia, including such prestigious institutions as MIT, Stanford, the University of Edinburgh, and the University of Sydney[2].  Each participating university nominated two academic departments that had a demonstrated record of excellent teaching, using criteria that included results of student evaluations and graduate exit polls, data from departmental reviews or quality audits, number of faculty members with teaching awards, and whatever other indicators might be available – which varied according to the institution and national system concerned.  Although we focussed on major research universities for our case studies, we believe that the findings summarised below are broadly applicable to a wide range of universities.

We visited the 22 departments in 2005 and 2006, and prepared a series of case studies based upon extensive review of relevant documentation, and interviews with the department head and other key faculty members, with students, and in some cases with other stakeholders.  The cases embraced a wide range of disciplines and professional programs.  In each case our focus was not just upon teaching and learning in the department, but on the *drivers* of good teaching – which people were involved, and what were the strategies they used to encourage an emphasis on quality teaching.  This is what was meant by the term "leadership of teaching".

We are still analyzing the data from the case studies, but here are some of our conclusions to date.

- **Teaching approaches.**  Teaching in research universities is often quite traditional and (paradoxically) unsupported by research evidence of good practice – in part because major time constraints imposed by faculty research commitments seems to discourage innovation and change in teaching approaches.  However, there are some outstanding counter-examples of innovative and effective teaching and curricula.

- **Teaching and change.**  Good teaching almost always seems to involve change in teaching methods, in organisation of curricula, and in learning outcomes.

- **Crisis-driven change.**  Change is often the result of a crisis or opportunity, in many cases driven by external pressures.

---

[2] The official title of the project is *Departmental leadership for quality teaching: An international comparative study of effective practice*, and it was funded by the Leadership Foundation for Higher Education (UK) and the (British) Higher Education Academy.

- **Professional programs.**  Innovative teaching and changes in teaching are more common in professional programs where there are close links to practitioners, and hence greater concerns with transfer of learning from university to the workplace.

- **Leadership of teaching.**  Good teaching and changed practice does not happen accidentally, but requires leadership.  Leadership of teaching may not always come from the nominal head of the unit, though support from the head is usually crucial.

- **Distributed leadership.**  In most examples of successful innovation, leadership is distributed among several – sometimes all – members of a department.

- **Models of leadership.**  There is no single model for leading good teaching practice: leadership can be manifested and distributed in many different ways, both formal and informal, though effective leaders of teaching do have some characteristics in common.

- **Consultation.**  Most examples of changed practice involve extensive consultation with multiple stakeholders, including faculty and non-academic staff, students, and employers.

- **Vision, communication, and decision-making.**  Effective change in teaching and curricula requires articulation and acceptance of a clear vision for learning (often in the form of agreed, broadly stated, learning outcomes), shared goals, open and frequent communication with all stakeholders, though not complete unanimity in decision-making.

- **Recognition and rewards.**  For teaching to change, and good practice to take hold, there must be a climate of recognition and celebration of teaching efforts and successes, both within the department and usually beyond.

- **Sustainability and resources.**  To bring about and sustain changed practice there must be adequate support, including provision of time and resources (space, money), and leaders often play a major role in obtaining such support.

- **Evidence-based teaching.**  The outstanding examples of change to good teaching practice were all evidence-driven.  This implies teaching approaches consistent with the research literature on effective practice as well as ongoing efforts to gather data about teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes.

- **Recidivism.**  Even when changed practice has been shown to be effective, there is a slippery slope of recidivism to the traditional in teaching.  Sustaining innovation and good teaching practice requires careful advance planning and constant vigilance.

The Oxford study shows that, despite the obstacles and constraints, quality of learning and teaching is valued in some of the world's most prestigious research-intensive universities.  But it is also true that there is a constant battle to sustain even those instructional innovations that have proved effective, let alone convince most of our colleagues that we could do better by studying the implications of student learning research for the way we teach and plan curricula.

**Developing a scholarship of teaching**

The idea that there is a respectable body of research that could inform good instructional practice has resulted in calls for university teaching to be more professional.  University teaching is one of the very few professions where practitioners receive almost no formal preparation for their work, where there is no process for the accreditation of minimum competence, and where involvement in continuing professional education is uncommon – although the growth of educational development centres has begun to change this to some extent, and in many parts of the world (for example Australasia and Scandinavia) the professionalisation of university teaching is well underway.  Boyer and Rice (Boyer, 1990) use the term "scholarship of teaching" to describe the process of undertaking research on instructional practice and using teaching methods that reflect the insights from such scholarship.  Over the past 15 years many academics have embraced the notion of teaching scholarship as a means of encouraging a more systematic approach to university teaching.  But there is a danger that that the term will be used simply as a slogan, and that the any scholarship of teaching will always be second-best to the "scholarship of discovery" or empirical, discipline-base research.

If we are to base a scholarship of teaching on established scholarly traditions then this would have some of the following implications.

- Teaching should be **informed** and **evidence-based**.

- Teaching activities and achievements should be **documented**.

- Teaching approaches should in general be **replicable** by others, in the sense that someone should be able to understand enough of a teacher's approach to try it for themselves.

- Teaching should have some **conceptual underpinnings**, in the sense that there should be a reason why we do what we do as teachers.

- Teaching should involve some **assessment of process and outcomes** so that we can tell whether our teaching approaches are effective, in particular in promoting particular types of learning.

- Teaching should involve some sort of **reflection** that might lead to change and improvement.

- Teaching should build on such reflection to effect **change** (hence the idea that scholarly teaching is dynamic and even creative).

Interestingly, these characteristics were present in almost all the successful examples of good practice we observed in the Oxford case studies.

At one level, making teaching more scholarly might simply mean becoming informed about teaching in higher education through reading, discussion with colleagues, attending workshops, etc. (what most other professions do as a matter of course).  But we also have to gather evidence about our teaching, for example from students and alumni (through questionnaires, classroom assessment techniques), by measuring learning outcomes, identifying the products of good teaching (e.g. exemplary student projects), through action research, and sometimes with controlled experiments.

**How research might produce better learning: What needs to change**

I have spent most of this paper of examining one aspect of the teaching-research interface – the issue of how empirical research on teaching should inform and change educational practice.  Despite the difficulties of undertaking scholarship in this area (because of problems of controlling all the relevant variables in a complex environment), there is now an impressive and convincing body of research that shows how the way we organise teaching affects student learning processes and outcomes.   We know that how students are taught, what learning tasks and experiences they encounter, and how instruction and curricula are organised have a profound effect on generic learning approaches.  But has this had in fact produced any real changes in educational practice?

In my view there is little doubt that teaching has changed considerably since I began my academic career in the early 1960s, and started work as a full-time educational developer in 1976.  That is to the good, since the teaching methods of 45 years ago would be inadequate to deal with the students and educational pressures of the early 21st century. The range of teaching and learning methods now in use is much broader, there is much greater awareness of ethical and diversity issues in dealing with students, and teaching is regularly documented and evaluated at both the individual and institutional level.  Perhaps more important, there is more conversation and reflection about teaching, more concern about teaching practices and effects on learning, in part due to the establishment of educational development centres, which have acted as catalysts for discussion and innovation.

At the same time, there is a great deal about university teaching that remains problematic, and which stubbornly resists the precepts about good practice that developers have been preaching for several decades.  Specifically:

- Teaching remains overwhelmingly didactic and reliant on traditional lectures; assessment methods are often trivial and inauthentic;

- Curriculum development relies far too much on disciplinary tradition and faculty interests, rather than student and societal needs;

- There is still a "tyranny of the academic disciplines" which mitigates against integration of knowledge and insights from different fields;

- Evaluation of teaching effectiveness and learning outcomes is often superficial.

Moreover, there are factors that suggest things may get worse before they get better. For example, in 2008, classes are generally much larger and teaching is more depersonalised than it was 20 or even 10 years ago. And because students spend an increasing amount of their disposable time in formal classes compared to the past, listening instead of processing and reflecting, there is often little time or incentive for them to engage in the independent learning that the modern world demands and most faculty members support. There is increased use of educational technology, especially for distance education, but all too often this emulates traditional didactic teaching and testing instead of promoting student curiosity and autonomy. In other words, there is too often a poor alignment, to use a term coined by John Biggs (1999), between what is taught and the competencies students will need in their later lives and work settings.

A major challenge for universities, especially at a time of resource constraints, is to organise teaching so as to maximise learning effectiveness. As I have argued earlier, a major barrier to change is the fact that most faculty members are not trained for their teaching role and are largely ignorant of the research literature on effective pedagogy. The need for change is urgent, and a number of commentators have offered suggestions on how this might be done (e.g. Biggs, 1999; Kember, 1997; Prosser & Trigwell, 1999; Weimer, 2002). Ideas include:

- Teaching methods that stress student activity and task performance rather than just acquisition of facts;

- Opportunities for meaningful personal interaction between students and teachers;

- Opportunities for collaborative team learning;

- More authentic methods of assessment that stress task performance in naturalistic situations, preferably including elements of peer and self-assessment;

- Making learning processes more explicit, and encouraging students to reflect on the way they learn;

- Learning tasks that encourage integration of information and skills from different fields;

- Curriculum planning that focuses on realistic student learning outcomes rather than disciplinary traditions and faculty preferences.

For example, both problem-based and inquiry methods encourage active learning, meaningful interaction with a teacher, team learning, reflection, authentic assessment, and integration of knowledge from different fields. And even traditional research tasks, such as the undergraduate thesis have the great advantage of encouraging students to take ownership of their own learning, with the teacher as facilitator and guide as well as subject-matter expert. The universities that have undertaken such initiatives can take credit for encouraging teaching based on evidence of good practice – even if in some cases they perhaps did so inadvertently!

Despite some achievements in making teaching more scholarly and more effective, clearly there is much more to do if teaching is to be practised in a way that is as professional and systematic as our approach to research. This certainly involves efforts by individual teachers, but it also requires structural changes that can only be brought about by academic leaders – including hiring practices reward structures that recognise the importance of teaching expertise, quality assurance approaches that measure learning processes and outcomes in a much more sophisticated way than has been customary, support for research in university teaching and learning, and changes in the way we accredit universities and prepare new entrants to the profession.

Finally I think there is an important role for senior administrators in higher education to become more involved with the university teaching function, to familiarise themselves with what is known about effective practice in teaching, learning, and curriculum planning, and to speak to the community at large about universities not just as managers, fund-raisers, or institutional boosters, but as *educators*. Higher education world-wide has changed profoundly over the past 50 years of my own involvement. While some of these changes have been for the better, I am not sure that the student experience of higher education has improved as much as many of us would like. For me, student learning, now as then, lies at the heart of the higher education enterprise, and any attempts to link research and teaching more closely should have effective and meaningful learning as the major goal.

**References**

Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barr, R. B., & Tagg, J. (1995). From teaching to learning: A new paradigm for undergraduate education. *Change, 27* (6), 13-25.

Bertrand, D., & Knapper, C. K. (1991). *Contextual influences on students' approaches to learning in three academic departments.* Unpublished honours thesis, University of Waterloo.

Biggs, J. (1999). *Teaching for quality learning at university: What the student does.* Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Boyer, E .L. (1990). Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professoriate. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Entwistle, N. J., & Ramsden, P. (1983). *Understanding student learning*. London: Croom Helm.

Kember, D. (1997). A reconceptualisation of the research into university academics' conceptions of teaching. *Learning and Instruction, 7,* 255-275.

Kember, D., & Gow, L. (1994). Orientations to teaching and their effect on the quality of student learning. *Journal of Higher Education*, *65*, 58-74.

Knapper, C. K. (1995). Understanding student learning: Implications for instructional practice. In W. A. Wright (Ed.), *Successful Faculty Development: Strategies to improve university teaching.* Bolton, MA: Anker.

Knapper, C. K. (2004, May). *Research on college teaching and learning: Applying what we know.* Background discussion paper prepared for the Teaching Professor Conference, Philadelphia.

Marton, F., & Saljo, R. (1976a). On qualitative differences in learning: I – Outcome and process. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *46*, 4-11.

Marton, F., & Saljo, R. (1976b). On qualitative differences in learning: II – Outcome as a function of the learner's conception of the task. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *46*, 115-127.

Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students: Findings and insights from twenty years of research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999*). Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in higher education*. Buckingham, UK: Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press.

Ramsden, P., & Entwistle, N. J. (1981). Effects of academic departments on students' approaches to studying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *51,* 368-383.

Watkins, D. A., & Hattie, J. (1981). The learning processes of Australian university students: Investigations of contextual and personological factors. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51*, 384-393.

Weimer, M. (2002). *Learner-centered teaching: Five key changes to practice.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.