



ISSN: 0267-1522 (Print) 1470-1146 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rred20>

The development of university teachers' professional identity: a dialogical study

Raquel Antunes Scartezini & Carles Monereo

To cite this article: Raquel Antunes Scartezini & Carles Monereo (2016): The development of university teachers' professional identity: a dialogical study, *Research Papers in Education*, DOI: [10.1080/02671522.2016.1225805](https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1225805)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1225805>



Published online: 31 Aug 2016.



Submit your article to this journal 



Article views: 5



View related articles 



View Crossmark data 

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=rred20>

The development of university teachers' professional identity: a dialogical study

Raquel Antunes Scartezini^a and Carles Monereo^b

^aInstituto de Psicología, Universidade de Brasília, Brasília, Brazil; ^bDepartamento de Psicología Básica, Evolutiva y de la Educación de la Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether changes can occur on indicators of teachers' professional identity (TPI) when teachers and students share representations about what happens in class during an academic term. TPI is a process of constant negotiation between the different I-positions of teachers at the personal, social and cultural levels. The main indicators underlying this identity are: teachers' representations and perceptions of their own academic roles; their concepts of what it means to teach, learn and assess the courses they teach at university; and the feelings they associate with their duties. Teachers' education based on critical incidents could be appropriate to analyse teachers' self-positions, reflect about them and evaluate the possibility of changing any indicators of a TPI. The participants of this study were four university teachers and their students. Data were constructed employing electronic media. Questionnaires were created essentially using open questions. The findings have indicated that the methodology of shared reports was an effective educational tool that can foster changes in teaching and classroom management strategies and has the potential to foster the development of TPI. For further studies, in addition to a longitudinal project, it is also necessary to implement the method herein employed using a broader sample.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 19 October 2015
Accepted 27 July 2016

KEYWORDS

Higher education; teacher education; teachers' professional identity; dialogical self; critical incident

1. Introduction

'What happens in the minds of individuals – teachers, students, and training participants – when they participate in educational settings that affect and address the intimacies of their personal selves' is a question asked by Hermans (2013, 81) in a special session about the dialogical self in education. In the classroom, teachers face others – real and reconstructed within the domain of the self – and they need a well-developed dialogical capacity that enables them to go beyond familiar perspectives.

The self is a dynamic field in which different I-positions are always in motion, repositioning and transforming. Changes are dependent on contextual situations that involve several elements, such as 'personal and cultural history, future perspective, and people and tools one may come into contact with' (Ligorio 2012, 442). In each context, where the self is found, it is always in pursuit of a meaningful organisation for stability of the subject.

Teachers' dialogues involve real and imagined others, people, characters and institutions, as well as material and immaterial aspects (Ligorio and Tateo 2007). The self always implies others and, therefore, the position as a teacher is built through the interaction with students and other characters from the

educational scene. Teachers' professional identity (TPI) is interdependent and shaped by a teacher's perception of himself, and also by how he is perceived by others. Each educational context provides elements to generate specific I-positions and learning opportunities; learning, in this context, is seen as the teacher's ability to adjust his positions or to create new positions as he participates in shared practices. In this sense, when teachers' professional development is addressed, teachers must consider the development of their self-system and therefore their identities as a fundamentally dialogical activity that allows the analysis of learning activities in a particular context.

From the point of view of the dialogical self, being a teacher is a process of continuous negotiation of multiple I-positions, in such a way that a more or less consistent sense of self is maintained throughout his professional life (Akkerman and Meijer 2011). Teachers' professional development is usually represented by an inner struggle trying to accommodate the different I-positions to make them consistent and continuous. One way to contribute to teachers' professional development, from the dialogical perspective, is to look more closely at the issues, dilemmas and uncertainties that they experience in daily educational institutions and in classrooms. Research on teachers' self-dialogues and their dialogues with students and other actors of the educational scene, is a valuable means of gaining access to their representations and perceptions and contributing to their transformation and development.

1.1. The dialogical approach on self and identity

Hermans and Hermans-Konopka (2010, 81) distinguished self and identity based on the dialogical self theory, and defined the self as a 'dynamic multiplicity of positions or voices in the landscape of the mind, with the possibility of relationships between these positions or voices.' Drawing on this concept of self, they differentiated three types of identity: (1) personal identity, seen as a dynamic multiplicity of personal positions; (2) social identity, defined as a dynamic multiplicity of positions and social roles; and (3) cultural identity, given as a multiplicity of cultural positions. These three forms of identity are closely related and make up different aspects of the same dialogical self.

Studies on self and identity can only be performed if the individual, local and global levels are taken into account. Some key concepts are crucial for understanding the connection among these levels: the other-in-self as opposed to the self-sufficient individualism and the emotions arising from the contact among people. The other-in-self represents the alterity that comprises the self and allows a person to be considered with their subjective world. When the real other starts to exist in the self, it stops being real and becomes one other constructed as one other-in-self. Thus, the real other, as someone who differs from the self, participates in the creation of the uniqueness of the subject, is absorbed by the self and tends to fade away or, at least, to merge with the other-in-self (Grossen and Orvig 2011).

One of the fundamental principles of the dialogical self theory is that people are always involved in relationships and, thus, going through positioning and repositioning processes, as regards both others and themselves. The notion of self in the external environment leads to understanding that the self is composed of both inner elements and positions outside the teacher himself (my students, my colleague, for example). Moreover, the other is also absorbed within the self as an imagined other.

Relationships, both in different positions within the domain of the self and with others in the external environment, are established by means of dialogues. Therefore, they should be thought to occur both in the inner domain of the self and between internal and external positions. Dialogue favours the creation of a 'dialogical space' (Hermans and Gieser 2012; Hermans and Hermans-Konopka 2010; Salgado and Hermans 2005), where the existing positions are developed and new positions may emerge. It also implies a learning process that confirms, innovates or develops existing positions. Additionally, dialogue has the potential to set the self into motion and take it to higher levels of awareness and integration.

1.2. Professional identity of university professors

TPI is considered to be a process of constant negotiation between the different I-positions of teachers at the personal, social and cultural levels (Akkerman and Meijer 2011; Hermans and



Hermans-Konopka 2010). An I-position is an associate combination of beliefs, proceedings and emotions that can be activated in the same kind of contingency. It can be conscious to a greater or lesser degree. When they reach a certain degree of consciousness, we could be dealing with conceptions, strategies and feelings that could be also explained in terms of competence. Professional identity is the constellation of I-positions that a person builds to confront the contingencies of his/her professional context. In that sense, people have multiple identities in the different spheres of activities and contexts where we interact.

In line with this definition, the main indicators underlying this identity are: teachers' representations and perceptions of their own academic roles (Monereo, Weise, and Alvarez 2013); their concepts of what it means to teach, learn and assess the courses they teach at university (Trigwell and Prosser 2004); and the feelings they associate with their duties (Vloet and van Swet 2010).

Traditionally, university professors play four roles in the academic realm: expertise teacher in their field, researcher of their field of study, professional who teaches in their area of expertise and academic manager (Badia, Monereo, and Meneses 2011). Each of these roles leads them to interact with real others (students, university staff, labour market representatives, academics in their area of research, for example) and imagined others (what each of these others expects from them, in addition to social expectations and policies as to what being a good teacher means).

Although all these roles are duties of university professors, the latter usually prioritise one of them, and this choice has implications for their practice. Teachers' representations and perceptions of their role include what Kelchtermans (2005) called teachers' perception of their self-understanding, which the professionals themselves believe is important for their work and the tasks they consider significant (Lamote and Engels 2010; Vähäsantanen et al. 2008).

The way teachers perceive their roles, implement teaching and learning activities, and feel while fulfilling their duties will give them a sense of self-efficacy that will impact their job satisfaction, motivation and occupational commitment (Canrinus et al. 2012). The way teachers see themselves, based on how they interpret their constant interaction with the context, impacts these indicators and gives meaning to their TPI.

1.3. Aim and research questions

The main aim of this multiple case study was to discover whether changes can occur on indicators of TPI when teachers and students share representations of what happens in the classroom during an academic term in different Brazilian public universities. There are four research questions:

- (1) Is there any congruence between the perception of students and teachers about what happens in class?
- (2) What strategies are used by teachers to cope with situations that involve strong emotional burden?
- (3) How do teachers react when they know their students' point of view about their teaching?
- (4) Could the fact of knowing the students' point of view promote reconfigurations in any indicators of TPI?

2. Methodology

A potential route to educate teachers by addressing their TPI is based on the assumption that a change can occur through the reconfiguration of the self-system that was destabilised during the action of the self. The need to build a new position in the self-system or adjust the existing positions to a new situation will only exist if the subject's stability is disturbed by unknown and conflicting situations in which their selves are not prepared to intervene. Depending on the repertoire of versions of the subject's identity, a self that is poorly adjusted to the new situation can be triggered automatically, or a dialogue can be set to search a new order within the self. This hypothesis and the discussions on the

productive impact of tensions on the development of TPI (Admiraal, Korthagen, and Wubbels 2000; Brown 2006; Dang 2013; Meijer 2011; Pillen, Beijaard, and Brok 2013; Tateo 2012; Timoštšuk and Ugaste 2010) have encouraged further research in this field by addressing critical incidents.

The proposal for research based on critical incidents was introduced in the educational field by Tripp (1993). As far as teaching is concerned, a critical incident is defined as an unexpected situation that challenges TPI. It is a situation perceived as conflicting by teachers, who, as a result, feel surprised, identify the conflict, react to it, but acknowledge that their conduct may have been inadequate. These moments cast a great deal of doubt and are natural, emotionally charged triggers that foster teachers' reflection. These conditions alone are conducive to bringing about some sort of change.

A critical incident, i.e. a tension-charged situation that involves a surprising or unexpected circumstance, which, in turn, takes emotional control away from the subject, differs from other contingencies that may occur in the classroom. Most of the time, for a teacher with previous teaching experience, a classroom consists of routine and expected situations which do not involve any kind of emotional impact. In addition to routine, a teacher may experience positive or negative events, which could be described as surprising and unexpected situations; however, a teacher should be able to keep emotional control when dealing with them and, therefore, would not have to deal with any sort of conflict. There are also situations which, although unusual in the educational environment, can still create conflict for teachers by shaking them emotionally.

The proposal for teacher education based on critical incidents draws on precious moments when teachers are faced with a situation that encourages them to reflect on an event and respond to it. These moments could also be timely for teachers to analyse their I-positions, reflect on them and consider changing them. However, it is known that reflection itself does not ensure change, although change may occur. Ideally, teachers should take this fruitful situation as an opportunity and share it with peers (other teachers) and/or their students. That is one of the first conditions for teacher education based on critical incidents, that is, incident analysis takes place along with other people. A proposal for teacher education in those terms focuses on teachers' narratives as well as gives voice to the other actors and seeks to foster knowledge of their views and feelings about the incident, in pursuit of the different interpretations of the same event. These multiple representations enable the reconstruction of the problematic context and understanding of other points of view, and promote flexibility of thought and empathy, which consequently affect the representations and identities of the subjects and encourage changes to them.

2.1. Participants

Participants of this study were selected non-probabilistically for the sake of convenience. Teachers from different Brazilian universities were invited by email. Those who accepted the written invitation were selected as participants. An inclusion criterion was that at least five students from the same teacher also agreed to participate in the research. Thus, the group of participants of this multiple case study was composed of 4 university teachers of psychology working in Brazilian public universities (Table 1) and 42 students of theirs (Table 2).

Table 1. Characterisation of psychology teachers, working in Brazilian public universities, participants in the present research.

Case	Teacher	Age range (years)	Academic degree	Years of teaching experience in higher education (years)	Years of teaching experience at current university (years)
1	A	30–40	Master's degree	4–10	4–10
2	B	30–40	Master's degree	4–10	0–3
3	C	40–50	PhD	11–15	4–10
4	D	30–40	Post doctorate	11–15	0–3

Source: Prepared by the author.

Table 2. Characterisation of undergraduate psychology students in Brazilian public universities, participants in the present research.

Case	Academic term	Participants (no.)
1	3rd	8
2	3rd	10
3	3rd	11
4	4th	13
Total		42

Source: Prepared by the author.

2.2. Instruments and procedures

All data for the present research were gathered using questionnaires administered electronically and made available to participants through links that were emailed to them. Several researchers adopt and discuss the use of the Internet as a means of online data collection in qualitative research. Many of them have highlighted the advantages of such practice: (1) participants can be asked questions over long periods of time; (2) larger data-sets can be dealt with; (3) exchanges are more open and heated; (4) there is lower cost and greater efficiency; (5) there is greater flexibility of time and space, which provides deeper reflection on the issues being discussed; (6) it fosters a non-threatening and comfortable environment, and favours the discussion of difficult and sensitive issues; and (7) it can be used as an option to access groups which may be marginalised (Creswell 2013).

For an overview of the socio-economic data of teachers, their views on the role of university professors, the meaning of teaching and learning, strategies and procedures applied to teaching, as well as teaching-related feelings and the following instruments were used initially: (1) a socio-economic survey questionnaire; (2) a questionnaire about views of their role(s) as university professors; (3) an approaches to teaching inventory (Trigwell and Prosser 2004); (4) a questionnaire on the semantic differential, including a set of pairs of adjectives that reflect possible feelings teachers associate with their teaching (Burke and Stets 2009).

Three other instruments have been created in the form of questionnaires for conducting the pilot study (Monereo, Panadero, and Scartezini 2012) and then revised for use in this research (Panadero and Monereo 2014): (1) questionnaire about the teachers' and students' representations and perceptions of class dynamics; (2) questionnaire about the teachers' reactions to the students' comments and the students' reactions to the teachers' comments; (3) questionnaire about perceptions of changes in the teachers and students.

Both teachers and students were sent the questionnaire on the representations and perceptions of students and teachers, respectively. This questionnaire was reapplied five more times on a weekly basis. Two weeks after the application of the last questionnaire on representations and perceptions, the students were sent the answers to the questionnaire that teachers responded over six weeks. The teachers also received responses from all the students about their classes. Then, the teachers were told to answer a questionnaire about their reactions to students' comments, and the students answered a questionnaire about their reactions to teachers' comments. After two weeks, the answers to the questionnaires about reactions were exchanged between participants once again, so that teachers could read what the students had responded in terms of reactions and vice versa. Subsequently, the participants were asked to answer the questionnaires on perceptions of change in the teachers and the students, respectively.

2.3. Data analysis

The researchers conducted the content analyses of all data in three steps. First, the data were analysed inductively, from more particular results to more general perspectives (codes and categories). Next, deductive work was carried out in order to support the codes and categories; then, the analysis was made at different levels of abstraction. Finally, the entire database was reviewed, aiming to associate

the answers to the questionnaires with the codes built from the analysis of the material (emerging categories), as well as those arising from the theoretical field (predetermined categories). All the encoded material was submitted to validation by three raters. There was 99.37% compliance between the analyses performed by the researchers and other encoders. Instances of disagreement were discussed for consensus.

Reports were compiled on each of the case studies, whose data are presented from the participants' perspective. The reports were reviewed by the respective teachers involved. Afterwards, the analysis was focused on specific issues of each case (within-case analysis), in order to shed light on their complexity. Next, all the data were analysed to identify common themes that go beyond specific cases, and then a thematic analysis was conducted among cases (cross-case analysis).

3. Results

3.1. Case study 1

Professor A considered that of all purposes of university, the main one should be that of producing relevant knowledge through research. His identity as a university professor was based on the fact that he felt he was a researcher who teaches. Professor A said that the duty he felt more at ease in doing was research. He thought his strongest point was his ability to help students establish relations between the content learned in the course and research projects.

Although Professor A interacted with students by discussing the course contents and enabling students to restructure their prior knowledge, he reported that, during much of the time, he tended towards teacher-centred education and content transmission. He sought to provide students with the greatest amount of information available and particular references that they should read. He thought the objectives of the course should be clearly defined and related to the formal assessment, and his classes should be organised to provide students with the information they needed to succeed in such assessment.

As for the feelings associated with motivation for teaching, Professor A felt integrated into his work environment, had a good relationship with his students as part of his teaching practice, saw himself as a professional who enjoys his work and was moderately motivated to teach. He deemed his classes as dense, difficult and complex, assuming that they were not very pleasant to students. Moreover, he considered himself to be demanding and inflexible.

He showed great concern for the quality of his teaching, even though it is not the activity that he most identifies with in the academic environment. Therefore, over the six-week period, he described himself both as an expert in his field and as a research-oriented professional. He recognised the relevance of the course that he teaches, and reported that he puts a great deal of effort into having his students acknowledge that as well. Another concern that was recurrent in his answers was students' 'quality of learning.' In his opinion, the course content is important and places him at the centre of the teaching and learning process, as he attempts to convey the pleasure of getting acquainted with learning and mastering such content.

The analysis of data collected with Professor A showed that the students and the teacher have a consistent perception of the classroom atmosphere. Professor A started his narrative by stating that class atmosphere was good and conducive to learning. In the second week of research, he began to realise that something was wrong and classified the classroom atmosphere as reasonable. From the third week onwards, he changed his mind because he clearly realised that something did not work well with the group, and began to doubt his own teaching to try to solve the detected problem. As he spent more class time with the group of students, he understood more clearly how the group worked, hence his perception was more similar to that of students.' In addition, he recognised his active role in students' development.

Professor A sought to look into the whole educational process, i.e. his interaction with students and their relationship with one another, learning of the course content, and his own teaching. This

was not his usual behaviour, as confirmed when he received the report with his students' answers after six weeks of research. He analysed all aspects therein described, and not only those that were directly related to his actions or that could be considered as an assessment of his own practice.

As for the student-teacher relationship, Professor A's perceptions can be said to be connected with those of his students, although the teacher always came up with a term that relativised his comments, even as time went by: 'My relationship looks good' (Week 1,); 'It seems good and friendly.' (Week 2,); 'My relationship is apparently good and friendly.' (Week 3); 'Apparently, it's very good.' (Week 4); 'My relationship seems to be good. I think some students don't like me or the course.' (Week 6) (emphasis added in all examples). This relativisation suggests that Professor A believes that there are other impressions about the process (students' impressions) other than his own.

Professor A was already aware of his students' main criticism. One student highlighted that the teacher was adamant, and at the beginning of this research, the teacher himself had mentioned that he lacked flexibility. When data on teacher's and the students' perceptions were exchanged, and the teacher became aware of the criticism made by one of his students, he was able to work on this personality trait. He listened to his students, reflected on their comments and, finally, in the 10th week, he proposed to change some of his strategies, as he concluded that he had to find ways to dialogue with his students, so they could all reach a compromise.

As for course progress, the teacher's and students' perceptions were also similar. All the students recognised the complexity of the classes, and their level of motivation varied. Over the weeks, Professor A described his classes as good, even though he also considered them to be discouraging or tiring in a few particular weeks. The students also described his classes as good, although difficult and discouraging at times, with complex and difficult content.

Professor A has not faced any emotionally charged situation during the period of this research, nor has he reported the occurrence of any critical incident. However, he said he had felt some positive tension during the research process, and he was relieved, surprised and happy to be well liked by his students. His identity was clearly strengthened, as the representations and perceptions of his academic roles were confirmed and positively assessed by students, thus directly affecting his feelings about teaching.

3.2. Case study 2

In Professor B's opinion, the main purpose of university is that of providing quality knowledge through teaching. His identity as a university professor was grounded in the fact that he essentially felt he was a teacher, an expert in the field that he taught. This conviction, throughout the six-week period when he answered the questionnaire on teachers' representations and perceptions, was associated with the fact he recognised himself as a teacher with professional experience. Therefore, he can give good examples about the class contents. Among the typical duties of a university professor, Professor B said that he felt more comfortable about supporting professional practices. He was primarily focused on making his students understand what he explained.

It can be said that Professor B's classes, at that point in his career, were mostly teacher centred and content oriented. He thought his students should study what he suggested; thus, he made students aware of what he thought they should learn in the course and offered them all information available. Professor B also made a point of clearly defining the objectives of the course and relating them to the formal evaluation. In his classes, he addressed similar questions to those of the formal assessment and, thus, he helped students prepare. Also as a sign of teacher-centredness, Professor B stated that he should be prepared to answer all of students' questions. Additionally, he thought he should talk to students about the class contents and use some class time to discuss their ideas and key concepts of the course, thereby enabling them to restructure their prior knowledge.

With regard to the feelings associated with motivation for teaching, Professor B said he likes his work, is motivated to teach and has a good relationship with students. Also, he finds it easy to teach and sees his teaching as pleasant and participatory.

Professor B expressed different positions about himself in the narratives. When answering the initial questionnaires, he described himself as an expert in the field he taught. During the research, for five consecutive weeks, he considered that he had professional experience in the course he taught, which enabled him to exemplify the course topics. However, in the sixth week, Professor B wondered: 'I have theoretical knowledge, but I am not sure if I am an expert. By combining this knowledge with my practical experience, I can work on the course content pretty well' (Professor B, week 6). When asked to reflect on what made him stand out above the other teachers, Professor B said it was his ability to help his students establish relationships between the contents learned in the course and the research projects. Since he is a young professor at the beginning of his career, his TPI is clearly still fragile, ranging between different positions (I-expert, I-professional, I-researcher); however, there is not enough coherence between them.

Professor B and his students viewed the class atmosphere differently. During most of the research, he believed that the atmosphere in his class was pleasant and conducive to learning. His view contrasted sharply with that of his students; nearly all of them reported that the class setting hindered both learning and students' academic development. Professor B did not identify the problems faced by the group. Even after getting acquainted with the students' answers to the questionnaires, he was not attentive to the problem pointed out by the students.

All participants viewed the teacher-student relationship similarly. Both Professor B and his students said to have a positive relationship. Such remark by the students showed that their dissatisfaction with Professor B's teaching (an aspect pointed out by all the participating students) did not affect the quality of the relationship between them. Students were clearly able to tell apart Professor B's personal characteristics from his conceptions and teaching strategies.

However, Professor B and his students had different perceptions of course progress. He thought that the classes progressed smoothly, and only required minor adjustments to the schedule and the assessments, whereas the students gradually lost interest in the classes as the term progressed; however, Professor B did not realise that.

Neither the students nor the teacher described any occurrence of critical incidents in the classroom. Nevertheless, within what was regarded as class routine, Professor B reported that many students missed one of his classes to study for a test of another course. However, in his written answers, there were not any signs of dissatisfaction or annoyance with this event.

When he realised the students' opinion about his classes, he was surprised by their negative comments. Faced with the tension generated by this event, he adopted emotion-based coping strategies, using tactics such as avoidance ['(...) I will try to talk strictly about the theoretical contents.' (Week 10)] and minimisation ['Maybe it was a special day.' (week 8)], deeming the situation as helpless ['(...) it's hard to be the perfect teacher' (week 8)]. In the eighth week, a student assumed that Professor B probably realised that his classes were not so pleasant because he commented that the students were inattentive and often left the classroom. When the analysed data were interpreted, though, it was clear that he had not made any connection between the students' inattentiveness and the quality of his classes. However, awareness of the students' opinion prompted a change in his teaching strategies, as he said that he was going to seek to reduce the number of slides in his presentation files and give reading assignments and expect students' participation in the class from then onwards.

The method of sharing perceptions and representations deliberately favoured the dialogue between Professor B and his students. The analysis of the case study showed that the dialogue they engaged in about the teaching strategies used in the classes, by itself, brought conflicts to Professor B, who was surprised by his students' views. This event, alone, can be considered as a critical incident, as it leads to Professor B's internal dialogue about his self-representations. Faced with the perception of real others, the teacher said he had 'mixed' feelings, which reminds us of Brown's (2006) warning: being aware of the perception that others have of our *self* can be surprising. At the beginning of the research, Professor B explained that he found it easy to teach, but this perception was undermined throughout this study, and it certainly destabilised his self-system.



At this point, it is timely to refer back to the data on Professor B's conceptions of teaching, learning and assessment. As can be seen from the initial instruments and explained in the introduction of this case study, Professor B's teaching was focused on himself and on the transmission of content, rather than keeping the focus on students and on conceptual change. This finding was corroborated by his students' testimonials, which possibly conveyed the mood that prevailed in the classes; they always mentioned that the classes were teacher-centred. Additionally, all of them stressed that his classes were based on reading the content of presentation slides.

About 18 months after the completion of data collection, Professor B received the report with the data gathered through his participation. When invited to comment on issues that he deemed pertinent, he addressed a few particular points. First, he reaffirmed that he believed his participation was important for the research: 'As I said before, I think this research is important for my development as teacher, since teacher education is not always valued in academia.' He also suggested that the study could have gathered data from a bigger number of students. He justified the use of slides in class by explaining that the course did not include practical classes. However, he stressed that the classes were admittedly monotonous. He concluded his comments by rephrasing the statement he had made in the 10th week, i.e. students' individual opinions do not represent the opinion of the whole class. According to Professor B, 'This answer shows that it is not easy to receive negative feedback from students and, therefore, comments may be defensive.' On that occasion, he reconsidered his earlier comment and stated that 'Every student has the right to have an opinion, regardless of what it is.'

3.3. Case study 3

When Professor C answered the initial questionnaires, he stated that the major purpose of higher education is to foster knowledge building through research. His identity as a university professor is based on view of himself as a research that teaches. Doing research was the job duty that he felt most comfortable with. In his opinion, being a university teacher means being very fond of studying, researching, changing opinions/methods, teaching, advising, writing and publishing papers and producing knowledge. In comparison with his colleagues, he considered his strength to be the fact that he helped students establish relations between class contents and research projects.

Professor C reported that he focused his teaching on students and appreciated their proactive behaviour, and helped them understand class contents. However, he also indicated that he focused his teaching on himself and on the contents because he thought students should be attentive to his suggestions for readings, and sought to share as much information as possible with them so that they realised what they should learn in the course. Conversely, Professor C reported that he believed students should build their own knowledge. For this reason, he consistently discussed previously addressed themes with students for them to restructure their previous knowledge. Furthermore, he allowed students to suggest changes in the course, which was indicative that he wanted students to take an active role.

Generally, teaching hardly motivates Professor C, who prioritises research. He finds himself in conflict over the requirement to teach and claims that the role of teaching is not difficult but of minor importance, personally. In his opinion, his relationship with his students is quite superficial, although pleasant and empathetic.

Professor C's and his students' perceptions of the class atmosphere seem coherent. He expressed his opinion about his students based on general characteristics of youth. He commented on his students' inattentiveness, and their diverse worldviews, as also reported by students themselves, who also commented about the fragmentation and inattentiveness of the class and indicated that the group is composed of young individuals who tend to form subgroups according to their interests.

Some students thought that there should have been greater integration among classmates, but Professor C did not see the need for any change in the class. One student said that he was not going to make any suggestions because the teacher did not use to be open to dialogue with students about class issues.

The information provided by students and by the teacher about the student-teacher relationship also indicated that they had similar perceptions in this respect, and defined it as positive. The students

recognised Professor C's dedication, good mood and teaching ability, and they saw him as studious, intelligent, demanding and able to earn respect. By contrast, Professor C made it clear that he saw the relationship as strictly professional: a temporary contract for a teacher–student relationship defined by clear rules and goals. According to his account in the first week, he had what might be called a normal teacher–student relationship, since he did not consider the students to be his friends.

Professor C reported one critical incident during the academic term: he felt very angry when facing a tense situation, and he proposed the dialogue as a path to find a solution. Two of his students reported moments of tension, although such moments differed, and they expressed their own points of view. It was confirmed that a critical incident is only considered as such by its protagonist, i.e. the one who senses the incident as critical.

In this case study, when he commented on his students, Professor C always seemed to refer to a generic student profile. For example, when asked what he would change in class in the first week, he said that he would not change anything, and then he went on to comment on the 'Brazilian university student' and the 'education system in Brazilian universities.' In the fifth week, when describing the attitudes that he expects from his students, he stated that his wishes were the same as those of any other teacher. Statements like these suggest an impersonal relationship with the students.

By stating, back in the first week, that his students were apathetic toward theoretical problems, he evaluated them generally, and explained that it was not a serious problem because it represents the context and the type of culture experienced by students nowadays. Students, overall, agreed that the contents, the debates and the texts introduced by the teacher were too dense. However, they seemed to feel positively challenged. As regards course progress, Professor C showed demotivation because of the (mis)match between the idealised student and the real student. He felt that he was more engaged in teaching than students were engaged in learning and, try as he might, students seemed unresponsive. At a moment when he commented negatively on the characteristics of the Brazilian university system, he concluded that, in Brazil, learning is more an effect of the teacher–student relationship than students' actual relationship with knowledge.

Getting acquainted with students' views about his performance seems to have been helpful to Professor C. Interestingly, this happened not because he had read his students' opinions, but because he was faced with his own perception. He stated he was a little bothered about having made more negative than positive remarks about his students, while the students identified several positive points in the teacher's performance. As a result of sharing perceptions with his students, Professor C agreed that he could have used a wider range of teaching strategies.

3.4. Case study 4

Professor D believes that the major purpose of university is to transmit knowledge through teaching. His identity, as a university professor, is based on the fact that he is a professional, with previous work experience, who teaches. Professor D stated that among the typical tasks of a university professor, teaching is what he feels more comfortable doing. In a comparison with his colleagues, he believes that he stands out for being able to help educate good professionals in his field of research and practice.

As regards teaching, Professor D maintained a balance between his role and that of students in the teaching–learning process: he addressed his responsibility for students' learning while he also expected students to be actively involved in building their own knowledge. He carefully planned his classes in order to help students succeed in formal evaluations, provided them with the greatest possible amount of information and clarified their questions. He also thought that students should focus their studies on the contents he recommended, and he sought to allocate class time to discuss the target themes and key concepts of the course with students, so that they could restructure their previous knowledge and find a new way to acquire the class contents.

As regards feelings associated with teaching, Professor D showed to be highly motivated to teach. He also reported having a good relationship with his students. As far as the implementation of teaching is concerned, he deemed his action as moderately complex, difficult and demanding, although nice and friendly.

The perceptions of Professor D and his students about the class atmosphere were generally very similar. Everyone mentioned that the classmates were good and responsible students, willing to complete class assignments. The students commented on the tension prior to evaluation activities, which was not mentioned by the teacher. The participants made few suggestions for implementing changes to the class.

The same consistency was observed in perceptions of the teacher-student relationship and the course progress. The participants thought they had a positive relationship and that classes progressed smoothly. According to the students, Professor D's classes were difficult, although quite motivating. The students said to believe that their participation was at the centre of the learning process. This is in line with the results of the initial data collection instruments, whereby Professor D reported he pursued the goal that students should have an active participation in building their knowledge. Some students commented that sometimes they would like to have a 'traditional class' and explained that a minority of them could not understand the metaphors used in the debates. One student argued that sometimes he would like to have a 'normal class,' and another one stated it would be interesting if Professor D used the class board to explain theoretical concepts. In later narratives, the same students stressed that he taught a lesson along these lines, which suggested that he was aware of the students' demands.

He and the students had different perceptions of critical incidents in the classroom. The only event that Professor D pointed as a source of tension was the situation of the forthcoming teachers' strike, which was not particularly related to the classes with that particular group of students, the subject of this research. All the students mentioned that a critical incident was the fact that they had not read the texts assigned by the teacher for two consecutive lessons. A student was surprised to realise that in the second class in which students had not read texts, Professor D found the class to be satisfactory and even praised the potential of the group. This student reported that he expected him to be frustrated at the fact that students had not read the assigned texts.

By contrast, Professor D reported that they had a great lesson discussing the content of the assigned texts, and the students recognised the importance of this activity for their education. This position clearly shows that there was no tension in the classroom for Professor D. Probably due to his experience, he already knew how to handle situations like that, and must have developed an approach that allowed the students to experience that episode as their responsibility. The students, in turn, felt tense because they did not accomplish something that Professor D had expected from them.

Sharing answers between Professor D and his students was an event that produced positive tension. All participants were pleased to see how much harmony there was among them. Although Professor D did not think that change was necessary because of the process of sharing representations and perceptions, he considered all the suggestions made by his students about their classes as relevant and stated that he would take them into account while planning the next academic term. Students, in turn, also demonstrated intentions of changing their attitude while performing their role, such as reading more, engaging more and keeping up with what is proposed by their professor.

Professor D commented on the existence of positive emotions as he got acquainted with the students' views. He was cheerful and glad that they recognised his dedication to teach them and had similar perceptions to his. He thought that awareness of his students' views can promote changes to his practice, which he prioritised in his classes. In terms of changes in teaching strategies, Professor D reported that he would like to find ways to provide the students with what they had been missing in their classes.

3.5. Cross-case analysis

In this section, a thematic analysis was made of the cases introduced previously (*cross-case analysis*) in order to analyse themes that were present in all cases. The most relevant themes refer to contingencies in the classroom and critical incidents, and to teachers' responses to unforeseen circumstances and changes in the indicators of TPI.

3.5.1. Critical incidents and classroom contingencies

The results of this study confirmed the findings of a pilot study (Monereo, Panadero, and Scartezini 2012) and the research conducted with Spanish and Mexican samples (Panadero and Monereo 2014), which revealed that a critical incident is related to the role of the educational actor, be it a student or a teacher. The critical incident makes sense to the narrator who realises that he is affected by the situation, usually in conflict with his personal goals. For this reason, no correspondence was currently found between students and teachers in terms of perception of critical incidents in the classroom. With respect to other contingencies occurring in the classroom (routine and positive or negative events), as noted, the perceptions of the different participants were more similar.

When the students and the teacher answered questions about various aspects of the classes, and not only about the occurrence and the description of a critical incident, they provided insights into the classroom atmosphere and the relationship between those who interact in class. This scenario allowed reflection on distinct episodes that occurred and were reported by students and the teacher.

Based on the analysis of data collected in all case studies, there seems to be no association between how students perceive the class atmosphere and whether or not they indicate the occurrence of a critical incident. In the classes of Professors A and B, students reported a bad classroom atmosphere, although only one student indicated a critical incident relative to the evaluation process and Professor A's inflexible character. Professor C reported a critical incident and explicitly stated that it shook him emotionally. No student made any mention of this event, which certainly did not affect them. Professor D indicated no critical incident, although all of his students perceived the same event as a source of discomfort and tension. This situation was probably expected by Professor D, who already had well-defined strategies on how to handle it.

Professor B, the fact that his students did not attend his class in order to study for the test of another course was not a critical incident. Was this situation expected? Or something unexpected that did not bother him? If the researcher had asked Professor B how he felt about this event and how he reacted, could the event have turned into a critical incident?

Monereo, Weise, and Alvarez (2013) drew attention to the fact that a critical incident is never considered as such a priori and usually calls for subjective reflection. The existence of conflicts and critical incidents should not be seen as something negative to be avoided at all costs. These moments of tension and/or discomfort have a great potential to produce significant changes and promote the development of new teaching skills. However, as recalled by the authors, inexperienced teachers that are insecure about their practice and show apparent optimism, tend to avoid some critical incidents.

The critical incidents reported in this paper are in line with previous studies of Contreras, Monereo Font, and Badia Garganté (2010) and Monereo and Domínguez (2014), who found that the most frequent critical incidents in university educational practices include: (1) management of students' complaints, which had to be faced by all the teachers participating in the present study and particularly by Professors B and C; (2) quality management of all classes and their impact on learning, a situation faced by all the teachers of the sample; and (3) management of motivation in class, which all groups analysed in this paper had to deal with.

3.5.2. Responses to unforeseen circumstances

When reflection on students' and teachers' perceptions was shared, the participants responded to the unusual situation of getting acquainted with the view and the perception of others on the same event experienced together. Martín Díaz, Jiménez Sánchez, and Fernández-Abascal (2000) introduced a typology of responses that a subject may have to an unexpected situation, which led to the categorisation shown in Table 3.

Based on this response typology, it can be said that Professor A showed a strategic resolution for the difficult situation that arose because in the eighth week he proposed to explain his inflexibility in certain respects. Apparently, he used the information available in the self-assessment, which occurred along this study, to foster his own personal development. He mentioned that he might make changes to the assessment and the classes in the next academic term.

Table 3. Typology of responses to a critical incident.

Type	Mode	Discourse
Avoidance	Denial	It's normal ... Actually, nothing extraordinary happened. That happens
	Temporary problem	It will go away
	Detachment	That's none of my business
	Unsolvable problem	There's nothing I can do ... There's no solution. It's beyond my control
	Disconnection	It's a good thing that the weekend is almost here ...
Response	Aggressive	What have you thought about it? ... Think? ... You're brainless! Please leave the class!
	Expressive	I'm fed up with you!
	Conformist	They can do whatever they want ... I just have to put up with it for one more hour
	Elusive	You can explain that to the principal and your parents when you are expelled from school
Decision	Resolution strategy	Let's try and do something, try and support the opposite of what we think; it's a game called RPG (<i>role-playing game</i>)
	Emotional strategy	(I'll count up to ten. He'll have forgotten about that by tomorrow ...)
	Contextual strategy	(Toni Always arrives late) 'Every day now, a different group will give Toni a summary of what he has missed.'
Evaluation	Rational analysis	Who, what, when, how, why, what happened ...
	Personal development	(Hey, what happened is an excellent learning opportunity.)
	Social support	I'll take it to the 'crisis office' ...

Source: Prepared by the author based on data from Martín Díaz, Jiménez Sánchez, and Fernández-Abascal (2000).

Professor B showed avoidance responses, denied the problem that arose in his class, and suggested that it may have occurred on a 'special' day. He also disconnected himself from the situation by stating that he was going to try to dwell only on theoretical contents. He defined the problem as unsolvable, and explained that it was hard to be the perfect teacher.

In the fifth week, when reporting a critical incident in his class, Professor C described the emotion he experienced at the time. He explained that he expressed a reaction of anger because he was greatly annoyed with what had happened in class. Furthermore, he predicted what his response would be if the same situation happened again in the future. He planned a resolution strategy, asserting that he would attempt to discuss the problem with his students to find a solution together. Still, he considered that he might lose his emotional control and feel angry again.

When Professor C learned about the perception of his students about the situation in the classroom, he reflected on the negative feedback to his classes and agreed that it was probably difficult for students to pay attention to class at times. He also adopted a strategic decision by planning changes in his usual practices; for example, he used new media and made more objective interpretations. However, the recognition of his own perception led him towards a different feeling because he found that, in his remarks, there were more negatives aspects, while his students found more positive aspects and reinforced them. Professor C signalled that he was assessing that situation, which could favour him when making a rational analysis or using that information for his personal development.

Professor D, although highly approved of by his students, also received suggestions for improvement of his classes. When he got acquainted with such suggestions, he genuinely considered the need to review his practice and set out to do so by adopting a resolution strategy, ensuring that he intended to follow the students' recommendations and carefully look into the points they had mentioned.

4. Discussion

The present study aimed to find out if changes can occur on TPI indicators when teachers and students share representations of events in the classroom during an academic term in different Brazilian public universities. To meet this overarching goal, some partial goals had to be achieved beforehand.

The first partial goal was to identify whether the perceptions of students and teachers are consistent about classroom atmosphere, teacher-student relationship, course progress and critical incidents in the classroom. The results of this study confirmed that the teachers' and students' perceptions of critical incidents are not similar. An incident is perceived as such by those who suffer its effects at the emotional level.

By contrast, as far as the first three topics are concerned, the results of this study showed that perceptions may be similar even in a very high degree, depending on how the teacher relates to his teaching role. Although some teachers do not consider the teaching position as a priority, they can be highly attuned to events in their classroom and to their students. This happens when teaching has a well-defined status and is balanced with other activities in the dialogic space of their TPI. As noted, this was the case of Teachers A and D. Teacher D, whose perceptions were the most similar to those of students, considered teaching as his primary activity. The I-teacher position clearly prevailed in the configuration of his TPI. As a result, he was always aware of what happened in the context of the classroom; he identified students' needs and attempted to find alternatives to meet them. For Professor A, in turn, the predominant position in his self-system was I-researcher. However, the I-teacher position had a recognised space in that system, although without the same emphasis of the I-researcher. After being accepted, the teaching position was valued and enabled him to strive to convey to his students the true object that he really appreciated: knowledge. His affectionate relationship with knowledge was transferred to the relationship with his students; although the latter considered the content to be difficult, they said they were going to put more effort into attending his classes because they realised 'in his "speech" how important it is' (Student 1, week 8).

Cases of dissimilar perceptions were identified in situations where the configuration of the self-system had not yet found a balance, or where the teaching position was not a part of the defined configuration. The lack of balance in the self-system occurred to Professor B. He switched between two main positions (I-expert and I-professional) and gave no apparent signs that he reflected on his identification with the profession. In addition, he seemed to be very self-centred; therefore, the object of knowledge and his students seemed to disappear on the horizon of the teaching process, disrupting the didactic triangle – teacher, student and content (Stenberg et al. 2014). By doing so, Professor B was isolated in his apex of the triangle.

The case of Professor C illustrates the situation where the teaching position was not allowed to remain in the current configuration of TPI. The I-researcher position was sustained with emphasis, but it did not allow the teaching position to coexist in the same system. Thus, the value given to the object of knowledge was seen as inaccessible to such unprepared young people. If the student's relationship with knowledge is deemed unfeasible, again there is no basis for the construction of the didactic relationship.

The second and third objectives were to identify the strategies used by teachers to deal with emotionally charged situations that occurred both in the classroom and when representations were shared with students, and to assess the teachers' reactions about students' views on their performance. To achieve these goals, positive emotions had to be told apart from negative ones, both of which are important in the process of TPI development (Timoštšuk and Ugaste 2010).

In this perspective, the teachers who faced strong negative emotional charge when sharing representations and perceptions with their students were those who were oblivious to their surroundings, a situation experienced by Professors B and C. Professor B used an emotion-focused coping strategy, relying on avoidance and detachment strategies (Admiraal, Korthagen, and Wubbels 2000; Martín Díaz, Jiménez Sánchez, and Fernández-Abascal 2000). Although he became aware of a problem that affected him, he showed little understanding of it.

Professor C, in turn, was surprised to recognise the dissimilarity between his view and that of his students about the same object: his class. He did not appear to be emotionally involved with that task. It is assumed that he acknowledged his detachment from both his students and the teaching activity. Based on the data collected in this research, it was inferred that Professor C assessed his actions. There were three options of strategies that he could have chosen: rational analysis, personal development or social support (Martín Díaz, Jiménez Sánchez, and Fernández-Abascal 2000), but his choice could not be identified back then. Professor A and D experienced positive emotions. According to Fuller, Goodwyn, and Francis-Brophy (2013), being recognised by others for one's skills and competencies positively contributes to TPI.

Although they were quite connected with what was happening around them, these teachers also got acquainted with their students' perceptions, which indicated suggestions for their classes. Upon

learning of such views, the teachers had the opportunity to reassess their practices and implement changes by taking their students' perceptions into account.

5. Conclusion

This study tried to assess whether the teachers' awareness of their students' representations could promote changes on TPI indicators, favouring the development of their professional identities. As could be confirmed, the methodology of shared reports was an effective educational tool because when feelings relative to the teaching practice can potentially motivate teachers to reflect on their teaching practices, on what they find relevant for their work and on the tasks that they consider significant, they can foster changes in their teaching and classroom management strategies.

As could be seen, the methodology was efficient to destabilise the self-system when it fails to recognise the fundamental alterity of the educational process. On the other hand, it could also strengthen a stabilised TPI. As discussed, these teachers' understanding or perception of their work, while in constant interaction with their students, was connected to the sense of self-efficacy, job satisfaction, motivation and commitment in educating these teachers (Canrinus et al. 2012). Since these factors are indicative of the meaning of TPI, it can be concluded that the methodology has the potential to foster the development of their professional identities.

This is a low-cost, easy to implement and effective methodology for continuing teacher education. It can also be a good system to evaluate teaching, in replacement of the typical questionnaires that students fill in at the end of the course. The use of this methodology has proved effective for teachers and students to better adjust to one another, producing better academic results while the term is in progress.

As this study focused on a particular period of time and was developed for one academic term only, a follow-up of the trajectory of the participating teachers could not be performed. Further research should not only be longitudinal but also use a larger sample, preferably the whole group of students. Additionally, it seems advantageous to monitor the participants more closely, promoting more direct interventions in order to increase students' motivation about the research and hence prevent losing participants of the sample.

These results also suggest that it would be useful to introduce 'another voice' (the researcher performing the role of mediator) that could make inquiries (e.g. when Professor B reported a negative event that could be considered a critical incident) and welcome situations where the methodology itself can generate a critical incident involving participants (e.g. tensions generated by the answers shared between Professor B and one of his students). Moreover, the mediator could help participants find more viable solutions to a negative event or critical incident and, thus, enhance teachers' professional development.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Coordination for Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES), which granted a scholarship (Case No. BEX 5070/11-2). This organisation has not participated in study design, collection, analysis and interpretation of data, report writing or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Notes on contributors

Raquel Antunes Scartezini has a PhD in Psychology and is a professor of Educational Psychology at the National University of Timor-Leste. She is also the general coordinator of the Teacher Education Program and Portuguese Language Teaching in Timor-Leste, sponsored by the Coordination for Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES/Brazil). Her areas of research include teacher training, teachers' professional identity and dialogical self theory.

Carles Monereo has a PhD in Psychology and is a professor of Educational Psychology at the Autonomous University of Barcelona (Spain). He is also the general coordinator of the quality research group SINTE (Inter-College Seminar of Research on Learning Strategies) and coordinator of the Doctoral Program in Educational Psychology at the Autonomous University of Barcelona. His areas of research include teaching and learning strategies, teacher training and teacher identity, authentic assessment and psychoeducational counselling skills.

References

- Admiraal, W. F., F. A. J. Korthagen, and T. Wubbels. 2000. "Effects of Student Teachers' Coping Behaviour." *British Journal of Educational Psychology* 70: 33–52. doi:[10.1348/000709900157958](https://doi.org/10.1348/000709900157958).
- Akkerman, S. F., and P. C. Meijer. 2011. "A Dialogical Approach to Conceptualizing Teacher Identity." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27: 308–319. doi:[10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2010.08.013).
- Badia, A., C. Monereo, and J. Meneses. 2011. "University Teacher: Professional Identity, Conceptions and Feelings about Teaching." In *Educación, aprendizaje y desarrollo en una sociedad multicultural*, edited by J. M. Román Sánchez, M. A. Carbonero Martín and J. D. Valdívieso Pastor, (pp. 5647–5661). Madrid: Ediciones de la Asociación Nacional de Psicología y Educación.
- Brown, T. 2006. "Negotiating Psychological Disturbance in Pre-service Teacher Education." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 22: 675–689. doi:[10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2006.03.006).
- Burke, P. J., and J. E. Stets. 2009. *Identity Theory*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Canrinus, E. T., M. Helms-Lorenz, D. Beijaard, J. Buitink, and A. Hofman. 2012. "Self-efficacy, Job Satisfaction, Motivation and Commitment: Exploring the Relationships Between Indicators of Teachers' Professional Identity." *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 27: 115–132. doi:[10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0069-2).
- Contreras, C., C. Monereo Font, and A. Badia Garganté. 2010. "Exploring in the Identity: How do University Professors Face the Critical Incidents that Occur in the Classrooms During the Education of Future Teachers?" *Estudios pedagógicos (Valdivia)* 36: 63–81. doi:[10.4067/S0718-07052010000200004](https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-07052010000200004).
- Creswell, J. W. 2013. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dang, T. K. A. 2013. "Identity in Activity: Examining Teacher Professional Identity Formation in the Paired-placement of Student Teachers." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 30: 47–59. doi:[10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2012.10.006).
- Fuller, C., A. Goodwyn, and E. Francis-Brophy. 2013. "Advanced Skills Teachers: Professional Identity and Status." *Teachers and Teaching* 19: 463–474. doi:[10.1080/13540602.2013.770228](https://doi.org/10.1080/13540602.2013.770228).
- Grossen, M., and A. S. Orvig. 2011. "Dialogism and Dialogicality in the Study of the Self." *Culture & Psychology* 17: 491–509. doi:[10.1177/1354067X11418541](https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X11418541).
- Hermans, H. J. M. 2013. "The Dialogical Self in Education: Introduction." *Journal of Constructivist Psychology* 26: 81–89. doi:[10.1080/10720537.2013.759018](https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2013.759018).
- Hermans, H. J. M., and T. Gieser. 2012. "Introductory Chapter: History, Main Tenets and Core Concepts of Dialogical Self Theory." In *Handbook of Dialogical Self Theory*, edited by H. J. M. Hermans and T. Gieser, 1–22. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M., and A. Hermans-Konopka. 2010. *Dialogical Self Theory: Positioning and Counter-positioning in a Globalizing Society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kelchtermans, G. 2005. "Teachers' Emotions in Educational Reforms: Self-understanding, Vulnerable Commitment and Micropolitical Literacy." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 21: 995–1006. doi:[10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2005.06.009).
- Lamote, C., and N. Engels. 2010. "The Development of Student Teachers' Professional Identity." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 33: 3–18. doi:[10.1080/02619760903457735](https://doi.org/10.1080/02619760903457735).
- Ligorio, M. B. 2012. "The Dialogical Self and Educational Research: A Fruitful Relationship." In *Handbook of Dialogical Self Theory*, edited by H. J. M. Hermans and T. Gieser, 439–453. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ligorio, M. B., and L. Tateo. 2007. "Just for passion': Dialogical and Narrative Construction of Teachers' Professional Identity and Educational Practices." *European Journal of School Psychology* 5: 115–142.
- Martín Díaz, M. D., M. P. Jiménez Sánchez, and E. G. Fernández-Abascal. 2000. "Estudio sobre la escala de estilos y estrategias de afrontamiento (E3A)." *Revista Electrónica de Motivación y Emoción*, 3. Obtained from <http://reme.uji.es/articulos/agarce4960806100/texto.html>.
- Meijer, P. C. 2011. "The role of Crisis in the Development of Student Teachers' Professional Identity." In *Navigating in Educational Contexts*, edited by A. Lauriala, R. Rajala, H. Ruokamo, and O. Ylitapio-Mäntylä, 41–54. Rotterdam: Sense.
- Monereo, C., and C. Domínguez. 2014. "The Teaching Identity of Competent University Teachers." *Educación XXI*, 17, 2, jul-dec, 2014, 83–104. Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia. Madrid, España.
- Monereo, C., E. Panadero, and R. A. Scartezini. 2012. SharEVents. "SharEVents. Using Shared Critical Incidents Reports for Teachers' Training." *Cadernos de Educação* 42: 45–67. Obtained from <http://periodicos.ufpel.edu.br/ojs2/index.php/caduc/article/viewFile/2148/1965>.
- Monereo, C., C. Weise, and I. Alvarez. 2013. "Changing University Teacher's Identity: Training Based on Dramatized Incidents." *Infancia y Aprendizaje* 36: 323–340. doi:[10.1174/021037013807533043](https://doi.org/10.1174/021037013807533043).

- Panadero, E., and C. Monereo. 2014. "Using Shared Reports to Explore the Nature and Resolution of Critical Incidents Between Higher Education Teachers and Students." *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology* 12: 241–262. doi:10.14204/ejrep.32.13121.
- Pillen, M., D. Beijaard, and P. Brok. 2013. "Tensions in Beginning Teachers' Professional Identity Development, Accompanying Feelings and Coping Strategies." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 36: 240–260. doi:10.1080/02619768.2012.696192.
- Salgado, J., and H. Hermans. 2005. "The Return of Subjectivity: From a Multiplicity of Selves to the Dialogical Self." *E-Journal of Applied Psychology* 1: 3–13. Obtained from <http://ojs.lib.swin.edu.au/index.php/ejap/article/viewFile/2/189.pdf>
- Stenberg, K., L. Karlsson, H. Pitkaniemi, and K. Maaranen. 2014. "Beginning Student Teachers' Teacher Identities Based on Their Practical Theories." *European Journal of Teacher Education* 37: 204–219. doi:10.1080/02619768.2014.882309.
- Tateo, L. 2012. "What Do You Mean by "teacher"? Psychological Research on Teacher Professional Identity." *Psicología & Sociedad* 24: 344–353. doi:10.1590/S0102-71822012000200012.
- Timoštšuk, I., and A. Ugaste. 2010. "Student Teachers' Professional Identity." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 26: 1563–1570. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2010.06.008.
- Trigwell, K., and M. Prosser. 2004. "Development and Use of the Approaches to Teaching Inventory." *Educational Psychology Review* 16: 409–424. doi:10.1007/s10648-004-0007-9.
- Tripp, D. 1993. *Critical Incidents in Teaching: Developing Professional Judgement*. London: Routledge.
- Vähäntanen, K., P. Hökkä, A. Eteläpelto, H. Rasku-Puttonen, and K. Littleton. 2008. "Teachers' Professional Identity Negotiations in Two Different Work Organisations." *Vocations and Learning* 1: 131–148. doi:10.1007/s12186-008-9008-z.
- Vloet, K., and J. van Swet. 2010. "'I can only learn in dialogue!' Exploring Professional Identities in Teacher Education." *Professional Development in Education* 36: 149–168. doi:10.1080/19415250903457083.