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The rise of sessional staff

- PT department, HVS
  - 8 tenured, over 100 sessional (92%)

- HVS
  - 212 tenured, over 1000 sessional (82%)

- Criticism
  - too many lectures, organization (Schram)
2016-2021 Strategy of the University of Iceland

- The quality of teaching and learning environment given greater weight and support in the operations of the University

Support for sessional teachers increased and framework for sessional teaching strengthened
Research question

• What are the similarities and differences between sessional teachers and tenured faculty with respect to needs, identity and motivations?

• Can we predict with modeling what will increase teacher identity and openness to improvement in teaching? Will it be the same model for sessional teachers and tenured faculty?
Tenured faculty emails from HI website

Sessional mails collected from departments

Sessional emails from Payroll

1024 emails

161 duplicates or invalid emails

863 valid emails sent out
  212 tenured faculty
  651 sessional teachers

298 responses – 35%
  78 tenured faculty – 37%
  160 sessional teachers – 25%
  60 incomplete demographics
Survey Development

96 line items representing:

1) Validated scales on intrinsic motivation and identified regulated motivation of physicians to teach (SDT) (Dybowski, 2015), and identification with teaching (Jones, 2010)*

2) Developed scales for: a) perceived connectedness, b) need for appreciation to improve teaching, and c) an open attitude towards reflection/diverse teaching methods for improvement

3) Items assessing prior experience with pedagogy, attitudes towards responsibilities of teacher, participation in faculty development

4) Faculty needs assessments in health sciences

*Validated scales
- Intrinsic motivation – personal enjoyment and interest
- Identified regulated motivation – values you have adopted
- Identification with teaching - the extent to which you value teaching as a part of your self
## Scales – reliabilities/examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale name</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Item example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identification with teaching (ID)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>It matters to me how well I do in my teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic motivation (IN)</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I enjoy teaching most of the time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identified regulated (IR)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am convinced that it is a health professional's duty to pass on his/her knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness (CO)</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Members of my HI department frequently share teaching practices they have found to be successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation (AP)</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would be motivated to try a new teaching method if I was shown appreciation for enhancing my teaching methods (Also included compensation, feedback from supervisor, student evaluations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to improve (OP)</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>It is part of my responsibilities as a teacher to reflect on my teaching skills and how I can improve my teaching</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS - COMPARISON
Average line item score for scales

ID - identification with teaching; IN - intrinsic motivation; IR - identified motivation; CO - perceived connectedness to department; AP - motivated to improve by appreciation; OP - openness to improvement
Summary of Comparison

How are ST and TF similar?

- Similar intrinsic motivation (IN)
- Similar professional values (IR)
- Similar value of teaching as a part of their self (ID)
- Similar openness to improvement (OP)

How are ST and TF different?

- ST perceive less connectedness (CO)
- ST desire more appreciation (AP)
- ST want more pedagogy
- ST are not participating in faculty development
- ST want digital formats
MODELING – PREDICTING ID AND OP
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

- Confirmed that ID, AP, CO, and OP scales were distinct factors that correlated
- Were unable to distinguish between ID, IN, IR
**Structural Equation Modeling (SEM)**

- Take various theoretical models that hypothesize how sets of variables define constructs and examine how these constructs are related to each other
- Measures how well the study data supports the theoretical model
- Natural progression of factor analysis and regression
- Predictive, NOT causal
Theory – Teacher identity (van Lankveld et al 2017)

- Systematic Review: Teacher identity comes from:
  - A sense of appreciation
  - A sense of connectedness
  - A sense of competence (that is recognized)
  - A sense of commitment
  - A future trajectory
Figure 1 - Proposed Model

- Appreciation
- Connectedness
- Identification with teaching
- Open to reflection/diverse teaching methods to improve
RESULTS - SEM
Contingent teachers (n=118)

- Appreciation
  - Q 53 \( \rightarrow \) .48
  - Q 55 \( \rightarrow \) .65
  - Q 57 \( \rightarrow \) .83
  - Q 58 \( \rightarrow \) .58

- Connectedness
  - Q 5 \( \rightarrow \) .70
  - Q 9 \( \rightarrow \) .82
  - Q 14 \( \rightarrow \) .70

- Identification with teaching
  - Q 5 \( \rightarrow \) .70
  - Q 9 \( \rightarrow \) .82
  - Q 14 \( \rightarrow \) .70

- Open to reflection/diverse teaching methods to improve
  - Q 25 \( \rightarrow \) .73
  - Q 27 \( \rightarrow \) .63
  - Q 49 \( \rightarrow \) .66

- Statistical measures:
  - \( \chi^2 (71) = 89.90 \)
  - RMSEA = .05
  - CFI = .96
  - AGFI = .99
  - SRMR = .06

- Correlations:
  - Q4 \( \rightarrow \) Q10 \( \rightarrow \) Q12 \( \rightarrow \) Q15
  - \( r = .51 \), \( r = .67 \), \( r = .83 \), \( r = .90 \)

- p-value:
  - .21, p = .052
Tenured teachers (n=66) NOT BEST MODEL
Appreciation

Identification with teaching

Open to reflection/diverse teaching methods to improve

Tenured teachers (n= 66) BETTER MODEL

Q 53 \( \rightarrow .49 \)
Q 55 \( \rightarrow .79 \)
Q 57 \( \rightarrow .88 \)
Q 58 \( \rightarrow .77 \)

Q 5 \( \rightarrow .71 \)
Q 9 \( \rightarrow .86 \)
Q14 \( \rightarrow .69 \)

Q 4 \( \rightarrow .68 \)
Q 10 \( \rightarrow .48 \)
Q 12 \( \rightarrow .69 \)
Q 15 \( \rightarrow .90 \)

Q 25 \( \rightarrow .77 \)
Q 27 \( \rightarrow .63 \)
Q 49 \( \rightarrow .58 \)

\( \chi^2(71) = 81.20 \)
RMSEA = .05
CFI = .97
AGFI = .96
SRMR = .08

\[ .51^{**} \]
\[ .32^* \]
\[ .64^{**} \]
Models for predicting ID and OP were not the same. Why?

Connectedness perceived differently?

Hypothetical quotes

TF – “I am a teacher (job description) and want appreciation for my efforts to be a better teacher. I improve when other teachers in my department share what works for them” (connectedness **within**).

ST – “I value being a teacher but am not sure I am a ‘real’ one as I don’t feel I am noticed for what I contribute or don’t feel part of my department” (connectedness **to**).
Limitations

• One health science school
• Not sure if sample representative of sessional teachers
• Did not address issue of salary
What do comparisons and modeling suggest for increasing teaching identity and improvement?

**Tenured faculty**
- Increased appreciation for teaching – predict identity
- Increased connectedness **within** a department – predict improvement

**Sessional teachers**
- Find our sessional teachers
- Faculty development with digital formats
- Increased connectedness **to** department – predict identity

**ALL TEACHERS**
- Increased teaching identity – predict improvement
- Reinforce enjoyment, values, identity
Application

• Tenured faculty
  – Ongoing discussions of ways to appreciate and reward excellence in teaching
  – “Pedagogical support for academic staff increased, e.g. through strengthening the Centre for Teaching and Learning, and hiring teaching experts in every school” – HI strategy 2016-2021
  
  **How about making teaching experts in every department?**

• Sessional teachers
  – Focus groups to explain results. How can we meet pedagogy needs while improving connectedness? What about appreciation?
Thanks!

• Questions?