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ABSTRACT

This thesis investigated how thirteen experienced, expatriate lecturers in an institute of higher education, Middle Eastern University College (MEUC), in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) perceived the continuing professional development (CPD) offered by their institute. I was motivated by the approach adopted by the institute towards the provision of CPD, an apparent lack of consultation with lecturers regarding their professional growth and comments from colleagues, to investigate personal and professional development. In particular, I wanted to determine how the institute’s approach to the provision of CPD influenced lecturers’ perceptions, beliefs and attitudes concerning institutionally provided CPD, so an interpretive study was selected. Focus groups and semi-structured interviews were conducted to obtain perceptions of, attitudes to and desire to engage with institutionally provided CPD. A further aim was to explore how participants’ tacit knowledge impacted on their perceptions and attitudes of CPD and whether this affected their attitude towards learning. The findings revealed three main themes. First, the mandatory nature, model and content of CPD affected participants’ perceptions of and engagement with CPD. Second, the CPD provided overlooked participants’ experience and tacit knowledge, impacting negatively on their views of CPD and professional identity. Finally, the specific profile of the participants, self-initiated expatriates, was revealed to be an important factor in lecturers’ CPD requirements and professional outlook, with implications for the development of existing theory in this area. Finally, a desire for targeted, personalised CPD was identified, specifically in the areas of pedagogy, professional inquiry and cultural awareness and intelligence.
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## Glossary of abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPA</td>
<td>Annual summative performance appraisal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBL</td>
<td>Blackboard Learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BERA</td>
<td>British Education Research Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAA</td>
<td>Commission for academic accreditation (UAE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>Continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>English for academic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAP</td>
<td>Faculty action plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Higher Colleges of Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Higher Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Higher Education Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IELTS</td>
<td>International English Language Testing System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMS</td>
<td>Learning management system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEUC</td>
<td>Middle Eastern University College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOHESR</td>
<td>Ministry of higher education and scientific research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for economic cooperation and development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIE</td>
<td>Self-initiated expatriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAEU</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZU</td>
<td>Zayed University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Glossary of terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard Learn</td>
<td>Internet based learning management system for the storage of class materials and submission of assignments by students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERASMA</td>
<td>Learning management system for mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenr</td>
<td>Video recording tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Board</td>
<td>Interactive whiteboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1: Introduction and Background

This thesis presents an investigation into the perceptions of institutionally provided continuing professional development (CPD) of thirteen mid-career, expatriate, higher education (HE) lecturers in their place of work, a government institute of higher education in the United Arab Emirates (UAE). The institute will be referred to as Middle Eastern University College (MEUC), which is a pseudonym. The research was conducted between July 2013 and October 2016.

Chapter 1 presents the background to this doctoral study starting with the origins of the research and an explanation of the purpose of the study. The chapter continues with an explanation of the research setting, with particular emphasis on how it contributed to the distinctiveness of this study, and a description of the participants of this study along with their profile. Finally, I discuss how the aims of this study informed the research questions and, subsequently, how the research questions framed the key concepts, which are discussed in Chapter 2, the literature review.

1.1 Origins of the study

I have worked in the UAE for eleven years in government educational institutes, both tertiary and secondary. During this time my interest in CPD has grown as I view it as a crucial vehicle for supporting educators in their professional role and as a motivator for career development. However, having engaged with institutional CPD, I reached the conclusion that the CPD
provided did not always provide the support and opportunity to allow an educator to progress their teaching role or career (see Appendix 1 for a list of institutionally provided CPD).

I was keen to find out if my colleagues had similar perceptions to mine. Having already decided to pursue this Doctorate in Education and being enthusiastic about the importance of CPD for educators, I felt that bringing the two together would be a positive and beneficial experience for the institute, my colleagues and myself. I decided therefore to investigate this area to expand my knowledge of CPD and to explore the underlying theory behind provision of CPD, in particular CPD that adds value to an educator’s skills, knowledge and career capital (Rodriquez and Scurry, 2014) and allows for enhancement of professional learning and autonomy.

The context of this research was highly specific since my colleagues and I all originate from a country other than the UAE, expatriating specifically for professional reasons. In a challenging yet rewarding environment I have learnt a great deal about teaching and learning in an Arab culture and one of my aims was to determine how this environment impacted on educators, within the specific focus of CPD. The focus of this study therefore was to investigate perceptions of CPD held by Western educated lecturers in the particular context of MEUC and, through an analysis of these perceptions, to determine how CPD can best respond to their professional needs and desires for career growth.

This thesis, therefore, explores CPD in the specific context of expatriate lecturers, a context which emerged from the role I have held since 2005 in the UAE. The research took place in my
place of work, a government-funded institute of tertiary education. I have worked for MEUC for a total of eight and a half years, from September 2005 to January 2008 in the Foundations department teaching English to pre-bachelors, post high-school students and from August 2010 to the present day, in the Education and General Studies departments, teaching and supervising trainee early childhood or primary school teachers.

1.2 Purpose of the study

The purpose of this study was to determine how expatriate HE lecturers perceived institutionally provided CPD and to explore how their prior experience and embedded tacit knowledge (Eraut, 2000) influenced these perceptions and attitudes. Given that the participants all had a vast store of tacit knowledge derived from their years of experience it was vital to explore how tacit knowledge contributed to their perceptions and attitudes when engaging with CPD. The role of tacit knowledge is explored in greater depth in Chapter 2.

At the time of this research, the most common model of CPD opportunities provided by MEUC were formal fifty-minute sessions or workshops, the aim of which was to allow lecturers to discover, enhance or acquire technological skills required for classroom teaching. Other opportunities for CPD were available on request, for example the opportunity to present at or attend conferences: however, this type of CPD is outside the focus of this study and is not included in the discussion. To elicit data on the implications of these limited CPD initiatives, mandatory for Foundations lecturers, this study explored participants’ views and perceptions of the CPD provided as well as their views on what they considered would be beneficial CPD for
them personally. A further aim was to determine which attributes of a mandatory, training
model of CPD impacted on lecturers’ views of CPD, the institute and their career development
within that institute.

The primary intended outcome of this study, therefore, was to determine whether and how
lecturers believed institutionally provided CPD, delivered through a mandatory training model
approach, contributed to their ability to employ skills or knowledge acquired from CPD, in the
classroom. The secondary intended outcome was to gain a deeper understanding of the
complex factors that contributed to an expatriate HE lecturer’s perceptions of how s/he learned
in the workplace and how this understanding could enhance subsequent professional learning.
Findings from the secondary intended outcome will subsequently be made available to all
stakeholders, lecturers, management and CPD providers.

These two aims were represented in the initial primary research questions below:

1. How effective do MEUC lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their
   institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role?
2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities?
3. How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their
   perceptions?

The data generated by these primary questions were subsequently analysed to address the
following secondary questions, which are discussed in the findings and discussion chapters.
1. What can be learned about CPD from lecturers’ perceptions?

2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further?

1.3 Context of the Research/Setting

The context of this case was particularly distinctive: the UAE has been a unified federation since 1971 and is therefore a young and developing country, politically, economically, culturally and historically. Until 1971 each emirate was separate and inhabitants required passports to move from one emirate to another and consequently communities grew within each emirate, with their own particular culture and loyalties. At the same time, the creation of the UAE is celebrated enthusiastically on 2 December with a national holiday and numerous events: while it is clear, therefore, that the union of the seven emirates is a source of pride and loyalty to the Emirati people, they are nevertheless a population that has both local and national loyalties and cultures. It can therefore be argued that each emirate has local as well as national characteristics which impact on the management, workforce and students of each college. For example, Suradaf (a pseudonym), the emirate where my institute is situated, is considered the most conservative emirate and consequently lecturers are required to be particularly sensitive when interacting with students whose families are often traditional and conventional.

The formal UAE education system was launched in December 1971 and MEUC, a government-funded institution, providing free tertiary education in English to Emirati post-secondary school nationals, was established in 1988. There were approximately 20,000 students nationwide
attending seventeen colleges throughout the seven emirates (see Appendix 2) at the time of this research. Education at MEUC is segregated, however male lecturers can teach at the women’s college and vice versa. Table 1 gives the number of lecturers and students at Suradaf MEUC, at the start of this study.

Table 1: Number of lecturers and students at MEUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programmes</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>599</td>
<td>2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB Lecturer figures are approximate given hiring of adjunct lecturers throughout the year.
MEUC followed a western model of education and managerial structure, which employed performance and accountability indicators for lecturers similar to those employed in more developed countries. The majority of CPD opportunities were created in response to an institutional need, whether this arose from the government initiative to introduce teaching with iPads (iPads in Education @ HCT, ZU and UAEU, Jan 2014) or to follow assessment procedures in accordance with the accreditation requirements of foreign universities (CAA, Jan 2011, p11). Since CPD at MEUC was standardised, timetabled and mandatory it could, therefore, be viewed as a means to ensure that lecturers had the skills and knowledge to implement government-initiated decisions about what students should know and learn. CPD sessions were held daily and each attended session was recorded on a lecturer’s Faculty Action Plan (FAP), illustrated in Appendix 3. It is important to note that this model of CPD was the only one offered by MEUC: if faculty wished to pursue career development in other formats this was not supported by the institute or included in CPD attendance. The only exception was if faculty wished to present at conferences they could request time and finance, which was granted at management discretion.

There were six departments at MEUC along with Foundations and General Studies (see Appendix 2), each managed by a Chair (see Appendix 4 for management structure). The major responsibilities of a Chair encompassed general management of the department, curriculum and assessment, staffing including interviewing new recruits, allocation and supervision of faculty and student related issues. The Chair was also responsible for ensuring that faculty participated in CPD and contributed on a departmental level to other tasks such as course
development or assessment planning. The CPD along with lecturers’ CPD objectives were documented in the FAP (see Appendix 3), which was part the Annual Summative Performance Appraisal (ASPA). The ASPA also contained feedback from observations and a faculty year end self-appraisal.

At MEUC the academic programmes offered were determined at senior management level in consultation with industry partners. MEUC’s philosophy was based on the MEUC Learning Model (see Appendix 5), which “…sets standards for the design of curricula, gives principles which should be followed in learning and teaching, and guidelines for assessment within the MEUC.” (MEUC, 2016). Course outlines comprised the content to be taught, course learning outcomes, assessment practices and resources available. Pedagogical decisions of how to teach the content were determined at departmental level with the chair deciding how much flexibility lecturers were allowed in the interpretation and delivery of the course outcomes. Foundations lecturers, teaching English in preparation for the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) examination, used similar materials and teaching methods since the final objective was for students to achieve an acceptable examination score. Department lecturers collaborated with colleagues system-wide to create end of semester examinations themselves, based on the course learning outcomes, which they had also written. The latter therefore had a far greater degree of professional autonomy than the former, a significant factor affecting perceptions of CPD. In both General Studies and Foundations, since courses were delivered using common materials and assessments, lecturers were obliged to follow similar modes of teaching. However, in the departments faculty had the freedom to teach as they wished.
A particularity of this research setting is that all faculty were employed on a three-year renewable contract and the results of their evaluation were a major factor in contract renewal. Participation in CPD therefore was non-negotiable if lecturers wished to retain their employment. However, since June 2013, a number of changes have taken place at MEUC, the most significant being the centralisation of management decisions and, significantly for this research, a growing number of CPD opportunities are now offered system-wide in addition to those taking place locally at Suradaf MEUC. These mandatory CPD sessions are offered at the MEUC bi-annual conference and faculty must choose and register for a certain number from the list of options provided prior to the conference.

Mercer (2007), who conducted a study at two different federal institutes in the UAE, focusing on lecturer evaluation and professional development, argued that lecturers accept a teaching environment which offers no job security, limited opportunities for professional development and “a highly evaluative appraisal system” (p285) in exchange for high salaries, state of the art teaching facilities and the experience of living in a different country. While this may have been true at the time of her research, this study revealed a growing feeling amongst lecturers that salaries and benefits had deteriorated. Salaries have stagnated over the past five years and in September 2013 the most precious benefit, the accommodation allowance, formerly paid directly to Emirati landlords by MEUC, was replaced by a monthly payment into salaries. With the disappearance of the security offered by a government organisation, lecturers feared that rents would rise. In addition, as noted, the government renewed its Emiratisation initiative, impacting on the professional situation of the participants. It would appear therefore that this
study took place at a time of significant change that impacted on the financial security and job stability of the participants which, in turn, may have affected their perceptions of the institute and consequently their desire and motivation to invest themselves in CPD opportunities.

Finally, measures recently implemented at MEUC have further complicated the situation: in August 2015 faculty were informed that their educational qualifications, high school certificate, Bachelor’s and Master’s, had to be attested by the UAE Ministry of Foreign Affairs in their home country and in the UAE and then ‘equalized’ by the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research (MOHESR), a lengthy and costly process which many faculty, at the time of writing, have still not completed. Those educators who had not started the process in February 2016 were informed that their contracts would not be renewed and those who had, myself included, had until 30 April 2016 to complete the process, at which time their contract ‘may’ be renewed. At the time of writing, it is not known why this measure was introduced and to date there has been no communication from senior management on this subject. The implications of this measure, the non-renewal of approximately forty educators (Senior Manager, 2016) will only be known at the beginning of the academic year 2016-2017.

At the beginning of this study my intention was to investigate faculty perceptions towards CPD in what I believed was a fairly stable working environment. My initial thoughts were that faculty would be willing to discuss their perceptions of their own professional journey; however, the effects of recent management changes, discussed above, affecting the employment and day-to-day living considerations of the participants, were incorporated into
this research to determine if they had impacted on their desire to engage with CPD. My approach therefore was to remain open to all possible developments throughout the progress of this study whilst continuing to monitor the economic and professional climate of the country and the institute. Whilst, therefore, the focus of this research was lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD, the management changes that took place during the time of this study merited contextual investigation for their effect on the participants.

1.4 The Expatriate Higher Education Lecturer in the UAE

In 2010 the population of the UAE was estimated at just over 8 million with Emiratis accounting for just 13% and the remaining 87% being made up of expatriates as indicated in Table 2 (worldpopulationreview, 2016).

Table 2: Composition of UAE population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emirati</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Asian (Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asians</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western expatriates</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This high level of immigration indicates how reliant the UAE is on expatriates, who are employed in all sectors of the workforce, particularly the private sector. Although MEUC was
part of the public sector, the vast majority of lecturers employed were expatriates. The norm is
for the institute to interview and recruit educators overseas although some are recruited
locally, myself included. At the beginning of this research, of the 171 lecturers employed at
MEUC, 96.5% (165) were expatriates and the remaining 3.5% were Emirati with 75.4% (129)
originating from western countries. This study is concerned almost exclusively with western-
educated expatriate lecturers since they made up the highest proportion in the overall
breakdown based on nationality. Furthermore, apart from one participant originating from
India, of the entire teaching staff only western educated lecturers accepted my institute-wide
invitation to take part in this research. It is important to note, therefore, that the findings were
restricted to this small group of participants’ perceptions and views with their relatively
common educational, professional and cultural background. Lecturers from other cultures such
as North Africa and the Gulf countries may have held different opinions, especially given the
difference in their educational background, professional experience and personal
circumstances compared to those lecturers who took part. The names of all participants and
any information allowing them to be identified were changed or deleted in the transcripts.

Expatriate workers comprised 99.5% per cent of the private sector and 40% of the public sector
in 2013 (de Bel-Air, 2015). The situation was different at MEUC, a government owned tertiary
institute, where faculty were predominantly western educated expatriates and the institute
followed a western model of education. However, a government initiative, Emiratisation,
which aims to ensure a maximum of Emiratis are employed in both public and private sectors
(Abu Dhabi Government, 2013), was recently re-launched. Consequently, the number of
Emirati faculty and faculty in training has increased, thus reducing the number of expatriate faculty which, in turn, is certain to have repercussions for the model of education on offer and the professional circumstances of expatriate lecturers. My request for figures to support this from MEUC Human Resources was denied. The Emiratisation initiative is understandable since the unemployment rate for Emiratis, according to Gulf News, was around 14% in 2013 (Sabry and Zaman, 2013) or higher with the National citing 28% in 2014 (Pike, 2014). Moreover, whilst the public sector accounted for 88% of the Emirati workforce only 0.5% (De Bel Air, 2015) worked in the private sector, with many of these having been employed as a result of the Emiratisation programme. Emirati salaries in the public sector are generally higher than those of expatriates doing the same job and approximately twenty percent higher in the private sector (Haygroup, 2014) whilst government owned privately operated companies often pay a premium to Emirati employees and provide intensive on-site training (Gallacher, 2009).

Interest in expatriate workers has grown considerably over the past fifteen years reflected by an increase in research carried out and literature published in different subjects such as motives for expatriating (Thorn, 2009), career capital accumulation (Rodriquez and Scurry, 2014) and attributes of an expatriate (Cerdin and Selmer, 2014). As this thesis will illustrate, the particular profile and professional background of the expatriate lecturers in this study was a significant factor which influenced how they perceived institutionally provided CPD, its value for them personally and in the classroom. It also influenced their perceptions of their role as lecturers, MEUC students, and their career development. An understanding therefore of the
SIE profile is crucial in identifying the participants’ rationale for engaging with CPD and how they perceived and responded to the CPD provided by MEUC.

Therefore, the context for this study is highly distinctive since the participants all worked within a society which does not allow foreign nationals to achieve citizenship, claim benefits, retire or become integrated into Emirati society with the exception of those marrying Emirati nationals. The security of the expatriate worker in the UAE depends on a renewable labour contract, in the case of MEUC a three-year contract, which “compels the residents to a transient and insecure life.” (De Bel-Air, 2015, p15) and which, according to De Bel-Air, resulted in a variety of different lifestyles and undoubtedly affected the expatriate’s “…perceptions of … agency and resources, of transnational connections, and sense of permanency in the UAE.” (2015, p15). In addition, this lack of security and control over their career, underlined in the recently introduced Emiratisation measure reported above, was bound to impact on the perceptions and attitudes of the participants towards CPD.

1.5 CPD opportunities and requirements at MEUC

At the time of this study, CPD was determined at management level and alternative initiatives were not widely available. This limiting of CPD opportunities is a global phenomenon, a result of government financial cuts, the massification of HE and rising student numbers (UNESCO, 2009). In addition, educators have become increasingly accountable to management for their professional performance and student achievement, which, alongside the widening role of educators in HE, places demands on them to become competent not only in teaching but also
assessment, curriculum design, research and administration. At MEUC the ‘normal’ teaching load was twenty hours per week, leaving little time for other professional responsibilities and even less for development in these areas or personal career growth, especially since the vast majority of CPD targeted technical skills. Consequently, the findings of this study have contributed a further dimension, expatriate lecturers, to global findings on the implications of government funding cuts at the grass roots level of the HE teaching profession.

Two distinct groups of participants emerged during the course of this research, those who employed technology in their teaching as imposed by the institute, Foundations lecturers, and those who did not, lecturers on degree programmes (see Table 1 for numbers of Foundations and subject lecturers). In June 2012 Foundations lecturers were informed by MEUC management that the medium of delivery for all classroom teaching would be the iPad (Gitsaki et al, 2013) and subsequently underwent extensive training to ensure they were skilled to do so for the following academic year. This pivotal decision to employ the most up-to-date technology in the classroom had significant implications for this research since a high majority of institutionally provided CPD focused on how to employ most effectively and efficiently the technology provided, whether it be iPads, Blackboard Learn or a host of other applications for use with the Smart Boards installed in July 2015 (see Appendix 1 for CPD available in March 2016). Lecturers in the degree programmes and General Studies were not required to adopt the iPad for use in the classroom: however, all faculty were required to attend CPD so they could deliver courses using the Smart Board and Blackboard Learn.
The research revealed varying attitudes to CPD, which appeared to be related to the group the participants belonged to, those obliged to attend specific CPD, Foundations lecturers, and those given the choice to attend, content lecturers. A further factor, which impacted on the perceptions of the participants towards institutional CPD, was the mode of delivery, fifty-minute sessions presented by a trainer, a model classified as the training or deficit model (Kennedy, 2014). Finally, the almost exclusive focus on technology, specifically pertinent to Foundations lecturers, resulted in a range of perceptions, which subsequently impacted on attitudes towards institutional CPD.

1.6 Key concepts

I used two key concepts, presented below, to contextualise MEUC CPD, Kennedy’s (2014) range of CPD models and Webster Wright’s (2009) authentic professional learning.

Kennedy’s (2014) range of CPD models

I chose Kennedy’s range as her training model illustrated most accurately the type of CPD offered at MEUC and provided alternative models within the same continuum to exemplify how CPD could be employed effectively for faculty development. Kennedy’s models of CPD are discussed fully in Chapter 2.
Webster-Wright’s (2009) authentic professional learning

I chose Webster-Wright’s authentic professional learning because it represents the type of learning valued by educators that which allows them to grow professionally and personally, and allowed me to situate the CPD provided at MEUC in relation to this model.

I also analysed MEUC CPD within the framework of two pertinent evaluation approaches. The first was Coldwell and Simkins’ (2011) model which acknowledged that the specific circumstances of a CPD initiative as well as the profile of the participants determined how beneficial the CPD was in terms of participant learning and transfer to practice. The second was Pawson and Tilley’s (2004) realist evaluation which asked the question “What works for whom in what circumstances and in what respects, and how?” (p2). I chose Pawson and Tilley’s (1997, 2004) model to extend the discussion into what type of CPD works for an individual since, although Coldwell and Simkins’ model identified the characteristics of beneficial CPD, Pawson and Tilley explored the individual dimension to a far greater extent.

Implicit in both models of evaluation is the assumption that individuals require and desire CPD that differs according to factors such as their level of proficiency, career development and personal interests and these factors are investigated in Chapter 2, the literature review. In addition, Chapter 2 will explore the SIE profile and its potential impact on participants’ perceptions of and desire to engage with CPD. Finally, this thesis will clarify the extent to which participants’ views reflected the assumptions referred to above and the implications of their views for engagement with future CPD. Recommendations based on the findings and the
particular context of expatriate lecturers working at MEUC will subsequently be provided in an executive summary for all stakeholders involved in this research.

1.6.1 Aims of the study in relation to research questions and key concepts

The primary aim of this study was to explore how MEUC lecturers perceived institutionally provided CPD, specifically the mandatory workshops delivered through a training model approach. A secondary aim was to determine the extent to which the participants believed this CPD supported them in the classroom and in their professional role. I therefore formulated the first research question:

- How effective do MEUC lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role?

To frame this initial research question I wished to gain an understanding from the literature of how lecturers learn at work. I, therefore, commenced with workplace learning and lifelong learning and the factors influencing learning within the workplace and throughout life. It soon became evident that this approach was too far-reaching and that I would have to limit the literature review to specific concepts relevant to the situation of the lecturers at MEUC. This led me, therefore, to focus on the type of CPD the lecturers engaged with, provided by the institute, to enable them to employ different types of technology in the classroom. This CPD constituted 50-minute workshops delivered by a trainer to attendees. From the literature, as noted above, I identified the range of models proposed by Kennedy (2014) as an appropriate framework for situating the type of CPD provided by MEUC, specifically classifying it as a
training model. The literature also allowed me to distinguish between the types of learning educators achieve through engagement with CPD. For example, skills-based learning allows educators to gain, in this context, technological skills for use in the classroom with the technology provided such as the learning management system Blackboard Learn or Smart Boards. Whilst these skills offer an important means of saving time and the opportunity to demonstrate to students internet-based resources on the Smart Board, they do not provide educators with the type of learning experience referred to as authentic professional learning by Webster-Wright (2009). On the contrary, the learning experience is the result of a top-down model of CPD, delivering pre-determined learning outcomes to participants expected to transfer the knowledge acquired directly to the classroom.

These two key concepts (Kennedy, 2014, Webster-Wright, 2009), generated the framework from which I explored participants’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD. In addition, to gain an understanding of authentic professional learning, I investigated two models of CPD which allow educators to achieve the type of learning valued and desired by educators, peer learning and professional inquiry (Webster-Wright, 2009).

As I engaged with the literature, it became apparent that a variety of factors can influence how educators perceive CPD and consequently I started to consider the factors which facilitated or hindered learning from CPD for the participants of this study. Through the investigation of models of CPD and authentic professional learning, I located in the literature extensive research into the evaluation of CPD, what is evaluated and the methods employed to determine the
benefits and drawbacks of a particular CPD initiative (Coldwell and Simkins, 2011, Pawson and Tilley, 2004). Evaluation of CPD was relevant since it allowed me to determine which factors influence how participants react to and employ CPD. I therefore formulated the second research question:

- What factors have influenced how the participants of this study perceive the CPD opportunities?

Having identified that the participants had reasons for their perceptions my next step was to find out the origin of these perceptions, where possible. Consequently, the study moved into the professional histories of the participants, through an exploration of their previous work and CPD experience. Given the years of experience each participant held, it was possible that the reasons for their perceptions of CPD would not be easily accessible during discussion and, consequently, a further key concept of this study was the focus on tacit knowledge and how it informs an individual's perceptions, beliefs and attitudes.

The next important concept identified in the literature was how the type of CPD provided can affect the professional identity of an educator (Nicholls, 2001). One of my aims, therefore, was to use the exploration of participants’ professional experience and tacit knowledge to determine whether and how engaging with institutional CPD had impacted on their professional identity and how this was manifested.
The third research question, therefore, was based on the investigation into participants’ professional histories and tacit knowledge with reference to how they viewed their role at MEUC and the impact on their professional identity.

- How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence the participants of this study’s perceptions?

As I engaged further with the literature, I discovered a developing area of research into expatriate workers, which provided a specific profile for the participants in this study, the self-initiated expatriate (Cao et al, 2012). Since the SIE profile of the educators in this study distinguished them from educators who had not left their home country for professional reasons, it represented a crucial concept in the construction of this study.

Having sought the participants’ perceptions of CPD and with reference to the literature reviewed, I anticipated that the data would allow me to make recommendations about how CPD could accommodate most effectively the needs and desires of expatriate educators employed at MEUC. I, therefore, formulated the secondary research questions:

- What can be learned about CPD from lecturers’ perceptions and beliefs?
- How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further?

Figure 1 demonstrates the key concepts employed to provide a framework of investigation for this study into CPD. These key concepts are explored in Chapter 2, the literature review.
Figure 1: Key concepts and connections between them
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CHAPTER 2: Literature Review

2.1 Literature search

In order to situate this study, I needed to engage with a wide range of literature to provide background for the research questions, detailed below:

1. How effective do MEUC lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role?

2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities?

3. How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?

The following secondary questions were addressed in order to offer recommendations for future institutional CPD:

- What can be learned about CPD from lecturers’ perceptions?
- How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further?

I formulated these questions based on my observations of and engagement with CPD at MEUC and my understanding and experience of how tacit knowledge informs learning and perceptions of learning, gained throughout my professional life and whilst studying for a Master’s degree. Engaging with the literature confirmed my observations and experience and, consequently, the crucial change I made, in the
early stages of the literature review, was to separate the research questions into primary and secondary.

I started by looking at the learning environment, specifically workplace learning from a lifelong learning perspective. Within this extensive area, I focused on factors that influence workplace learning such as those represented by Fuller and Unwin’s (2006) expansive/restrictive framework, how an individual learner responds to the elements of this framework and differences between learners. Focusing still on the individual I examined the particular profile of the participants in this study through an investigation of expatriate workers which led to a highly pertinent but limited range of literature into expatriates who initiate their own move overseas, termed self-initiated expatriates (Cao et al, 2012). An additional area examined was professional identity, how it informs teaching and how it is affected by a climate of managerialism and accountability and the subsequent effect on educators’ attitudes towards CPD. The latter two areas, SIEs and professional identity, represented factors which influenced how the participants perceived CPD and, therefore, addressed research question 2. Consequently, they were included in this study: however, workplace learning was excluded as, although it provided a sound background, if offered too wide a perspective.

To frame the specific context of this study, I narrowed the literature to CPD, models of CPD, evaluation of CPD and perceptions of CPD, of educators generally and SIEs. The term ‘development’ within CPD indicates a view that educators require development of their knowledge and skills to attain standards or outcomes as
defined by the institute, implying a gap to be filled or a deficit to be remedied. Therefore, to explore approaches to learning which situate educators as autonomous professionals, capable of determining their own career growth needs and desires, I included Kennedy’s (2014) range of learning models and Webster-Wright’s (2009) professional learning. Kennedy’s models, of teacher learning in schools, from transmission to the transformative, were particularly helpful and, in addition, I explored peer learning, professional inquiry and reflective practice. Webster-Wright’s (2009) professional learning (PL) also provided a valuable perspective of the impact of different models of CPD. Finally, I explored and employed tacit knowledge and learning as a lens through which to explore prior experience and perceptions of CPD.

The search produced approximately 190 articles of which 69 were relevant for this study. I employed a number of strategies in the literature search, searching by key word or phrase in the OU or MEUC databases. For example, in order to address issues around CPD I used the following search terms in the following search engines:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>Search engines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty perceptions of CPD - higher education</td>
<td>Academic Search Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of CPD – education</td>
<td>Education Research Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of tacit knowledge – faculty perceptions/views/attitudes – CPD</td>
<td>ERIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Oxford Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proquest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taylor and Francis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Google Scholar proved to be particularly useful for a first general search, which I followed up in the relevant databases. For more refined research references in the
articles already sourced proved valuable. Finally, Google Scholar, Research Gate and Academia alerts allowed me to stay up to date with the authors most often cited in the study as well as relevant journals.

Whilst the focus of this study was CPD in HE, articles discussing schoolteachers’ perceptions of and attitudes towards CPD were also explored. In addition, those addressing impact, models and evaluation of CPD proved relevant for this study as they indicated the extent to which CPD reinforced compliance with institutional CPD aims in a climate of accountability and managerialism, for both HE lecturers and schoolteachers. Appendix 6 clarifies the range of studies reviewed and their different settings as well as the overlapping themes.

### 2.2 Continuing Professional Development (CPD)

I intentionally cast my net wide in the literature and explored CPD from a number of angles before progressively pinpointing the focus of this study, how expatriate lecturers perceived CPD provided by their employer, an institute of HE in the UAE. This chapter commences with an outline of models of CPD (Kennedy, 2014) and a discussion of CPD opportunities, which educators engage with to further their professional growth, relevant to this study. This is important because it situates the model of CPD provided at MEUC within this range of models, discussing its features, benefits and impact relative to other models of CPD. The chapter continues with an exploration of the various approaches to evaluation of CPD and key conclusions drawn.
This chapter also presents educators’ perceptions of CPD along with those of expatriate lecturers. This is followed by an examination of recent literature regarding the SIE profile of the participants and the extent to which their profile impacted on perceptions of CPD. In addition, it explores the features of this profile that contribute to or detract from professional success in a country where the host culture is different from that of the participants. The experience and tacit knowledge of these mid-career educators are also discussed, in relation to their profile as an SIE and their perceptions of CPD. Integrated within these discussions, this study also questions how participants’ professional identity is affected by and contributes to their experience as an SIE lecturer and subsequently impacts on perceptions of CPD.

The term ‘continuing professional development’ is used extensively in the literature to refer to a number of concepts, which, although related, have distinct or particular meanings depending on how the term is used, the context and who is using it. For example, it can be used to refer to formal, structured ‘taught’ workshops, conferences, self-study such as a Master’s or Doctorate, reflective practice, action research and many more. However, these activities differ considerably both in their intended outcome and consequences for the participant and the institution since they entail differing levels of investment and engagement, which are reflected in the relative benefits of each.

As noted, the phrase ‘continuing professional development’ implies the development of a professional, in this case, an educator, indicating that the educator...
is not sufficiently expert and requires some sort of input to become so. This ‘deficit model’ of development (Skelton, 2005, Kennedy, 2005) describes the compulsory, one-size-fits-all CPD sessions offered at MEUC and suggests that lecturers are not proficient enough to use the classroom technology and that they all have the same initial level of skill. Such assumptions can have implications for how lecturers respond to CPD since those with a deeper knowledge may feel what they know is not acknowledged or valued and those with limited knowledge may feel intimidated by having to learn new technologies, often in a short time.

2.3 Models of CPD

There has therefore been an increase in the use of terms such as ‘professional growth’ or ‘professional learning’, the connotations of which are more positive since they situate the educator as a professional who is able to grow rather than one that requires development. Below a selection of diverse approaches is discussed, which, according to the authors, have professional learning or development as their objective. The CPD model adopted at MEUC, which I would interpret as being the training or transmission model (Kennedy, 2014), is also considered to provide the specific context.

In her seminal 2005 article Kennedy identified nine different models of CPD, “classified in relation to their capacity for supporting professional autonomy and transformative practice.” (p235) within three categories, transmission, transitional or transformative. This range of models, subsequently modified to transmissive, malleable and transformative in 2014 is illustrated in Table 3.
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Table 3: Kennedy's range of CPD models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose of Model</th>
<th>Examples of models of CPD which may fit within this category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transmissive</td>
<td>Training models, Deficit models, Cascade models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malleable</td>
<td>Award-bearing models, Standards-based models, Coaching/mentoring models, Community of practice models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformative</td>
<td>Collaborative professional inquiry models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kennedy, 2014, p693

This range of models acknowledged the distinction between ‘professional development’ and ‘professional growth’ and indicated the extent to which the type of CPD engaged with allows educators to assume responsibility for their own professional learning, link it to their values and beliefs and employ it in their classroom practice. In 2005 Kennedy described the transformative model as an “…effective integration…” (p348) of the whole range of models with the aim of achieving “…transformative practice…” (p348) and proposed five key questions, updated in 2014, to evaluate CPD, determine the type of knowledge acquired and whose agenda the CPD serves.
1. What types of knowledge acquisition does the CPD support, i.e. procedural or propositional?

2. Is the principal focus on individual or collective development?

3. To what extent is the CPD used as a form of accountability?

4. What capacity does the CPD allow for supporting professional autonomy?

5. Is the fundamental purpose of the CPD to provide a means of transmission or to facilitate transformative practice? (Kennedy, 2014, p348).

These questions are addressed in Findings Chapter 4.

2.3.1 Authentic professional learning

Webster-Wright (2009) also differentiated between the type of CPD delivered by trainers and that which she termed ‘authentic professional learning’, a term which implies that some models of CPD do not result in professional learning. She advocated removing the assumptions inherent in the approach of the expert trainer imparting knowledge to the passive participants, to refocus CPD as professional learning. For Webster-Wright professional learning should be seen as a holistic experience in which professionals engage in situated learning experiences, bringing together what is to be learnt and the context to which it belongs. Despite her recommendations, Webster-Wright accepted the difficulties associated with studying learning within context, asserting that endeavours to study learning holistically inevitably break learning down into diverse elements to be subsequently reassembled for analysis.
Despite their differences these approaches to professional learning can potentially contribute greatly to the professional growth of educators. Yet, as both Kennedy (2005, 2014) and Webster-Wright (2009) pointed out, the dominant model for professional development remains a top-down management imposed approach which prioritises the needs of the institution over the individual. The next two sections give examples of authentic professional learning, which are explored in the findings chapters.

2.3.2 Peer learning

Eraut (2007) claimed that the major part of learning occurs in the workplace and that formal learning initiatives work most effectively when put into practice informally (p419). An example would be working alongside others, a process that can generate peer learning through discussion, problem solving and being exposed to “… new practices and new perspectives, to become aware of different kinds of knowledge and expertise, and to gain some sense of other people’s tacit knowledge.” (2007, p409).

Interactions between colleagues can lead to the construction of new knowledge or the refining of existing knowledge and are sometimes referred to as communities of practice (COPs) (Wenger, 2000), which imply a group of people bound by common pursuits and concerns. In contrast, Boud & Hager (2012) call participation in work processes naturalistic development and argue that when educators seek answers to
a query or challenge they approach a peer who is close by, and very often the nature of the knowledge sought determines who is approached (Boud & Middleton, 2003). This type of peer learning is highly contextual, spontaneous and “… can require the crossing of boundaries or workgroups and practices and therefore cannot be adequately captured by the well-bounded notion of communities of practice.” (Boud & Middleton, 2003, p 201).

The fluid and dynamic nature of this learning differs from Wenger’s COP since it is not the result of shared goals and agendas. The metaphors of participation, construction and becoming represent far more authentically this type of learning: by participating in work practices, knowledge is constructed through interaction with peers. Becoming is the notion that learners are constantly in a process of learning, “…people become through learning and learn through becoming whether they wish to do so or not, and whether they are aware of the process or not.” (Hager & Hodkinson, 2009). This type of learning is often tacit and requires skilful questioning of interviewees to make it explicit, an approach adopted to investigate peer learning and which proved fruitful, yielding interesting findings.

2.3.3 Professional Inquiry

MEUC encouraged educators to undertake professional inquiry (Butcher & Sieminski, 2006; Leonard et al, 2005) through publishing research and attending conferences, in their own time. According to Leonard et al (2005) educators undertake doctoral study for a number of reasons, with personal and intellectual development, vocational factors and professional development being cited most often. Benefits
are also diverse but positive with personal and professional development and confidence in research activities cited as the main gains. These benefits are presented as a four-part model comprising *impact on: the academic community, professional self, professional colleagues and professional self-esteem* (Butcher & Sieminski, 2006). Doctoral study therefore, as a form of CPD, is highly beneficial since it can result in growth in a wide array of areas and open up potential new directions.

Of the three models of CPD discussed above, peer learning and professional inquiry offer the opportunity for educators to learn from other professionals albeit in different manners. The interactive and spontaneous nature of peer learning provides educators with professional knowledge which facilitates their daily practice and solutions to issues that arise on a daily basis, therefore responding to authentic, professional questions whilst professional inquiry presents an opportunity for growth and potential new directions. The transmission model of CPD was unlikely to offer such opportunities since it was an institutional requirement with the aim of developing educators’ skills in a specific direction, namely technology in the classroom. Although these skills may be a useful addition to an educator’s skill set, they do not provide the type of personal and ‘authentic’ growth described in Kennedy and Webster-Wright’s discourse. The next section deals with the characteristics of the top-down management imposed approach to CPD, its benefits in terms of professional learning and how it situates educators as learners.
2.3.4 Formal workshops: Transmission Model of CPD

According to Webster-Wright (2009) this approach to CPD has been the focus of much research over the past twenty years: however, despite advances in the understanding of how practitioners learn, it still emphasises the delivery of content rather than improving learning. Webster-Wright further asserted that the acceptance of this conceptualisation of CPD in the research literature perpetuates and reinforces the existing situation in the provision of CPD: practitioners attend CPD sessions which are then evaluated against learning outcomes as defined by the CPD provider even though the skills acquired may never be employed in the classroom, except when educators are observed for accountability.

Kennedy (2005) described the ‘Training Model’ as an approach often associated with the requirement for educators to demonstrate skills defined as desirable at national level, where current thinking views standardisation as a means to enhance teaching and consequently improve student achievement. According to Kennedy, criticisms of this approach to CPD focus on the lack of relevance to classroom practice and the control exerted by institutions or governments over what educators should learn, situating them in a passive role, reducing their capacity to choose their own professional direction, and potentially impacting on their sense of identity, agency and self-esteem. Such top-down delivery models of CPD were also perceived negatively by school teachers (Edmonds & Lee, 2002) who were reported as becoming increasingly aware of the value of their own experience and different approaches to professional development based on reflection, critical thinking and professional discourse (Rose & Reynolds, 2007).
The transmission model of CPD, characterised by workshops and intermittent one-off interventions, places the trainer as the holder of knowledge to be transferred to the trainee and subsequently applied in the work context. Implicit in this approach is the assumption that an individual can separate their own development from the work situation and subsequently bring the two together successfully. Webster-Wright maintained that the ontological, the learner as the receiver of knowledge, and epistemological, objective knowledge that can be transferred from one individual to another are assumptions in this model of CPD. Furthermore, these assumptions have influenced research that has been and is currently being carried out since the majority of literature “… has a focus on programs and content rather than on learning experiences…” (p712). Such CPD, which places the learner as an individual to be developed, taking little account of agency or identity, or the notion of a professional able to engage actively with their own learning, has been termed the ‘deficiency’ model of CPD (Webster-Wright, 2009) referred to earlier.

Alongside the growth of the transmission model of CPD, higher education has been subject to an array of influences over the past thirty years. Rising student numbers, the growth of educational technology, internationalisation, reduced government funding and greater intervention of the state in public education have all contributed to a situation where educators have become increasingly accountable for the quality of their teaching, performance in the classroom and student learning. CPD has been viewed as a means for educators to achieve the competencies and standards established by government bodies, such as those set out in the Higher Education Academy (HEA, 2014). Despite criticism of this model of CPD, it has become the
most widespread approach to professional learning: through western governments’ introduction of standards or competencies CPD now entails a sharp focus on raising student achievement, holding educators accountable for student success and evaluating the performance of educators against a pre-defined set of criteria identifying teaching competence and expertise.

Nonetheless, educators need particular knowledge, or content, to pass to students and they must be able to demonstrate, visibly, their competence in doing so. This notion of “performativity” (Hargreaves, 1998) implies that observable skills take precedence over non-observable skills such as understanding, linking new concepts with existing ones and integrating them into teaching. Not only does this approach further perpetuate the concept of the educator as requiring development, ie the deficit model, it also implies that CPD can “… remedy perceived weaknesses…” (Kennedy, 2005, p239) in educators in order for them to attain a required level of competence.

This tension between government and individual approaches to professional learning has implications (Kelchtermans, 2004): first, since governments provide the financial resources required to fund CPD, it can be expected that they will prioritise their own initiatives over the personal desires of educators. Second, the reliance of educators on institutions, their employer, to provide the time and money for their professional development restricts their ability to choose how they should develop and the purpose of that development which, in turn, impacts on their professional
autonomy, sense of professional identity and, potentially, their self-esteem (Beijaard, 1995).

The type of CPD provided can also be seen as an indicator of the role educators are expected to play in the institution (Groundwater-Smith & Dadds, 2004): for example, MEUC, which emphasised the use of technology in the classroom, clearly prioritised the view of the educator as a skilled user of technical devices that facilitated learning rather than, for example, an individual who responds to student learning needs through social interaction and a personal learning process. Such learning can be achieved through other models of professional growth, as noted by Kennedy and Webster-Wright, and an appealing feature of Kennedy’s range of models is that it acknowledges that not all CPD models have the same benefits for the practitioner, which is significant for this research since the research questions asked participants to evaluate the CPD they engaged with in terms of learning and benefits for their professional role.

A further assumption of this model of CPD is that educators will become more expert and competent through continued, targeted transmission of knowledge from trainer to learner. Moreover, this focus on objective knowledge diminishes the importance of the learning process and its value in professional life, reflecting a potential divide between what institutions perceive as professional development and what educators experience as learning. In addition, organisations which make decisions about employee learning implicitly remove employees’ ability or right to make their own decisions and as individuals align their career progression with the demands of
the organisation, they lose their sense of agency and identity which become subsumed by organisational goals filtered down to them through CPD, policy and management initiatives.

This lack of autonomy, alongside the standardisation of practice through imposed, top-down change, places certain pressures on educators. These pressures, such as lack of time to implement the changes, uncertainty about the aims of the changes and indecision as a result of not being able to implement the changes in line with their own values, reduce the amount of learning available to inform the next phase of CPD. As far back as 1994 Hargreaves stated that this type of change resulting from “… the imposition of singular models of expertise…” (1994, p61) can push educators to deny the values and beliefs constructed over their teaching career since “… it can lead to teacher resistance because of implicit rejections of the worth and value of the rest of a teacher’s repertoire, and of the life and person that has been invested in building it up.” (1994, p61)

It is interesting to note the divide between the model of teaching promoted by MEUC, which emphasised student engagement and agency and the approach adopted when providing CPD. Educators were expected to foster critical thinking, reflective practice, academic independence and student centered learning (MEUC Learning Model, 2016) despite being tied to a CPD training model depicting them as passive and unquestioning learners. As already noted, this approach to learning can impact on an educator’s self-esteem and professional identity, an impact that may be amplified by not being able to reconcile the two approaches. Research question
3, “How do expatriate lecturers’ experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?” explored this area and is discussed in the findings.

2.4 Evaluation of CPD

With the increasing provision of CPD programmes and initiatives, a number of models or approaches have been proposed to determine whether a programme has achieved its aims. However, there is much debate about which model to use and whether it can systematically evaluate CPD provision. Evaluations that do take place often focus on practical details, for example comfort of setting or participants’ satisfaction level, which may inform the design and content of future CPD events. However, such evaluations do not take account of long-term benefits (Muijs et al, 2004, Guskey, 2002) or the effectiveness (Muijs & Lindsay, 2008) of CPD, specifically with respect to benefits to the institute or students, since such benefits are often not detailed in the proposed outcomes (Muijs et al, 2004).

Where evaluation questions whether learning has occurred, evidence can be unclear and even misleading, especially when self-reported by educators who may overstate the effects of CPD, believing they are teaching according to what they have learnt or believe, their espoused knowledge (Argyris, 1976). This inability to differentiate between espoused theory and theory in use represents a significant barrier to learning, what Argyris called single loop learning. For example, Ebert-May et al (2011), after observing faculty who reported a shift to a student-centered approach after engaging in CPD, stated that this was not visible in the majority of the educators’ teaching, indicating a difference in how faculty and the observers
perceived the intended outcomes of CPD. Further, although formal structured CPD is often evaluated, no methodical evaluation yet exists for practice-based professional learning (Guskey, 2002).

Given the concerns mentioned above, several researchers have proposed alternative approaches to evaluating CPD. These are discussed next, starting with Guskey’s (2002) approach, which comprised five interrelated levels:

- Reactions of participants
- Learning of participants
- Institutional support
- Implementation of newly acquired knowledge
- Student learning

Muijs et al (2004) advocated the use of Guskey’s evaluation model for its focus on student learning and its potential for obtaining feedback from all stakeholders, for improving CPD during and after the event. To this they added their own antecedent level comprising individual motivation for engaging with CPD and contextual factors such as the institute’s or participant’s reason for selecting a particular programme.

This approach was extended further by Coldwell and Simkins (2011) who, after having implemented Guskey’s level model in their own evaluation programmes, pointed out two key shortcomings; first they questioned the cause and effect relationship between the CPD and possible learning and, second, the role of “...situational factors associated with individuals and organisational arrangements...” (p146). As a result of their experience using similar evaluation models (Kirkpatrick, 1998; Leithwood & Levin, 2005) Coldwell and Simkins proposed their own approach
based on interventions, antecedents, moderating factors, intermediate outcomes and final outcomes which, although designed to evaluate leadership programmes, is an approach that takes into account individual and contextual factors, namely antecedents and moderating factors.

Having employed Kirkpatrick’s and Leithwood and Levin’s evaluation approaches Coldwell and Simkins (2011) expressed their concern over the lack of theory underpinning CPD concluding that where evaluators draw on theory to support evaluations, they are “...often implicit, ill-specified or overly reductive.” (p143). Consequently, they proposed a theoretical starting point for examining the different models of evaluation to allow evaluators to better understand the purposes and outcomes of the chosen model. This theoretical starting point comprised positivist, realistic and constructivist perspectives and each can be related to the type of evaluation being carried out. For example, from a positivist perspective quantitative data, such as, student grades are gathered to demonstrate how CPD has achieved the stated aims. While there are certainly issues with this view, not least Coldwell and Simkins’ own concerns about the cause and effect relationship between CPD and potential student learning, Muijs et al nonetheless claimed “these types of studies can tell us something about effects of CPD in very limited but highly valid ways.” (p150). The realistic perspective, which they equated to level models of evaluation, emphasised why and how CPD programmes are effective, not just that they are. The final perspective, constructivist, highlighted the interpretation of different individuals and how these diverse views contributed to knowledge.
2.4.1 Reviews of evaluations of CPD

These small-scale studies into the effectiveness of CPD have resulted in a diverse array of findings, which subsequently became the subject of a number of reviews (Steinert et al, 2006; Stes et al, 2010; Coldwell & Simkins, 2011; Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Parsons et al, 2012; De Rijdt et al, 2013). Through examination of these reviews I give a broad view of the current situation, with particular reference to their aims, how the CPD studies selected were evaluated, findings and limitations of the studies reviewed and conceptual perspectives.

The overall aim of four reviews (Steinert et al, 2006; Stes et al, 2010; Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; Parsons et al, 2012) was to synthesise and analyse the diverse approaches found in the existing literature regarding evaluation of CPD in HE and to make recommendations for future research. Two reviews (Steinert et al, 2006; Stes et al, 2010) used a modified form of an existing evaluation model (Kirkpatrick, 1998) whilst three others (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012; De Rijdt et al, 2013; Parsons et al, 2012) proposed their own criteria for assessing the literature. Table 4 summarises the specific purpose of each review whilst Table 5 gives details of what was evaluated and how.
Table 4: Purpose of reviews evaluating CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Reviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stes et al (2010)</td>
<td>Reviewed 36 studies of CPD initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons et al (2012)</td>
<td>Reviewed 108 studies of CPD initiatives, including those reviewed by Stes et al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Rijdt et al (2013)</td>
<td>Reviewed 46 CPD initiatives to determine successful transfer of learning, based on models from HRM, Management and organisational psychology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conceptual reviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coldwell &amp; Simkins (2011)</td>
<td>Conceptual review of level models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed their own model of evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critique of Steinert et al, Stes &amp; Levinson-Rose &amp; Menges reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed an alternative method for evaluating CPD initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Reviews investigating effectiveness of CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review</th>
<th>What was evaluated and how</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Reviews</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authors employed their modified version of Kirkpatrick’s model (1998) which evaluated:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steinert et al (2006)</td>
<td>Effects of CPD initiative on:</td>
<td>• Teacher change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge, attitudes and skills of teachers</td>
<td>• Institutional impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The institution</td>
<td>• Student change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Characteristics of CPD initiatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Methodology of studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implications for CPD initiatives and future research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stes et al (2010)</td>
<td>Level of outcome</td>
<td>Authors employed their modified version of Kirkpatrick's model (1994), (previously modified by Steinert et al,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>• Duration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Format of initiative
- Target group
- Discipline

2006) which evaluated:
- Teacher change
- Institutional impact
- Student change

| Higher Education Academy (2012) | Teachers’ attitudes, knowledge and skills
|                               | Teachers’ behaviour and practice
|                               | Disciplinary or generic programme
|                               | Compulsory or voluntary participation
|                               | Student learning
|                               | Other

Informed by Stes & al’s 2010b review

---

**Conceptual Reviews**

| De Rijdt et al (2013)          | Transfer of learning to the workplace
|                               | Employed Blume et al’s (2010) model to evaluate:
|                               |  Transfer of learning
|                               |  Maintenance of transfer
|                               | Employed Burke & Hutchins (2007) model which presented the following variables:
|                               |  Learner characteristics
|                               |  CPD design
|                               |  Work environment

Authors rejected Kirkpatrick’s model on the basis that it lacked the necessary detail to evaluate transfer of learning.

| Coldwell & Simkins (2011)      | Interventions
|                               | Antecedents
|                               | Moderating factors
|                               | Intermediate outcomes
|                               | Final outcomes

Designed as a result of their research using other approaches and ‘testing’ in real life situations.
Referred to as ‘variables’, each factor influences the final outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amundsen &amp; Wilson (2012)</th>
<th>Evaluated change in the following clusters:</th>
<th>Analysis of the following core characteristics in each initiative:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skills</td>
<td>• Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Method</td>
<td>• Processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reflection</td>
<td>• Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Institutional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Disciplinary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional inquiry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coldwell and Simkins’ review of level models, Amundsen & Wilson’s conceptual review and De Rijdt et al’s investigation into transfer of learning to the workplace have also been included in the following discussion to explore how variables and moderators influence the effectiveness of CPD on a conceptual level.

Each of the reviews employed different criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of CPD. For example, Steinert et al (2006) investigated the effects of CPD initiatives on educator change in the areas of knowledge, attitudes and skills as well as impact on the institution whilst Stes et al (2010) focused on learning outcomes and design of the research, analysing each initiative according to duration, format, and target group. As with the studies being evaluated in the reviews, a lack of consistency in evaluating impact studies made comparison between reviews challenging. Since, therefore, the authors’ perspectives on evaluating the impact of CPD were based on different criteria, they represented different, and at times conflicting, views on how and why the authors believed beneficial CPD should be conceptualised and it was
therefore necessary to evaluate the claims and relevance so I could determine the most relevant and appropriate framework to conceptualise this study.

Although the majority of the studies reviewed were small-scale, some evidence was identified supporting their utility and value, especially in the area which has received the most attention, lecturers’ attitudes, knowledge and behaviours in the classroom (Stes et al, 2010). Of those studies considered sufficiently robust to be included in Parsons et al’s review (2012) evidence was found of lecturers adopting a more student-focused approach to teaching (Hanbury et al, 2008) or lecturers becoming more confident and willing to take risks in their teaching (Butcher & Stoncel, 2012). CPD initiatives of longer duration also appeared more effective in terms of lecturer change in attitude and behaviour with additional training resulting in further positive effects, especially in terms of student-centered learning (Postareff et al, 2007), deeper learning (Trigwell et al, 1999) and improved student ratings (Ho et al, 2001).

Furthermore, Steinert et al (2006), reviewing the literature in the field of medicine, found evidence that CPD initiatives, which impacted positively on faculty attitudes, teaching behaviour, knowledge and skills, cited experiential learning, feedback, peer support and multiple pedagogical approaches as factors which contributed to positive outcomes. As noted, De Rijdt et al’s (2013) aim was to determine which variables and moderators influenced transfer of learning to practice in education. They concluded that a number of variables contributed to positive transfer of learning (see Appendix 7) with certain factors such as when evaluation was carried out and self-reported accounts moderating the results.
Despite these positive reports, the reviews highlighted a number of shortcomings in the studies, previously highlighted by earlier reviews (Levinson-Rose & Menges, 1981; Weimer & Lenze, 1988; Stes et al, 2010). Specifically, criticisms focused on methodology since comparison groups with lecturers not having engaged in CPD were rare, as were pre- and post-tests to determine changes in attitudes and behaviours (Parsons et al, 2012). A further criticism was the lack of consistency between studies in evaluating attitudes and behaviours, adding to the lack of reliability and validity of the studies (Stes et al, 2010a, 2010b).

Furthermore, given that each study had adopted its own particular, contextual framework to assess the impact of CPD, it was difficult to make comparisons across studies or institutions. However, Parsons et al (2012) suggested that large-scale studies could respond to this need as well as serving as a benchmark “…for institutional level evaluation…” (p38), which, in turn, would strengthen theoretical claims. Reliance on self-reported accounts concerning changed attitudes and behaviours and a lack of evidence about transfer to practice (although see De Rijdt et al, 2013) were also identified as weaknesses of the studies. Perhaps most significant in terms of planning for future CPD on an institutional and national level (Parsons et al, 2012), was the lack of evidence concerning long-term outcomes of CPD. Whilst a few studies evaluated the impact of CPD programmes at a later date, for example following graduation or one year later (Butcher & Stoncel, 2012; Postareff et al, 2007) the majority of CPD programmes were evaluated immediately following the course, thereby undermining the methodological strength of the studies.
2.4.2 Conceptual perspectives

Amundsen and Wilson (2012), proposed an alternative model based on six ‘clusters’, skills, method, reflection, institutional, disciplinary and professional inquiry and, allocating each CPD initiative to one of these clusters, they analysed the goals, processes and evidence, taking into account all contextual details of the initiative and asking the question “Is this a reasonable outcome given the design of the initiative?” (p5). This question is highly relevant for the institutionally mandated iPad training for Foundations lecturers mentioned earlier since some of the outcomes were unanticipated, indicating that the training had not taken into account certain crucial elements.

Other evaluation models also took into account the variables of a CPD initiative, for example Coldwell and Simkins’ model (see Appendix 8 for details). As mentioned earlier, the authors questioned the value of a cause/effect approach to evaluation and advocated that “… the complexity of CPD processes and effects and, crucially, of the social world requires a range of approaches, and that – therefore – an approach based on any single model is not enough” (p144). Coldwell and Simkins argued that the complexity of variables interact in such a way that the same CPD initiative can produce different outcomes for the individual, team or institution. So to expect an initiative to succeed based on its intended learning outcomes indicates a simplistic cause and effect model, which takes no account of the variables as discussed above. This was especially of true of this research where the particular contextual elements such as changing HE policy, management changes, changes in employment
conditions and the particular profile of expatriate lecturers presented a complex and unique situation composed of static and dynamic variables.

These more recent approaches to CPD agreed on the necessity to take into account context and the different reasons (variables) why an initiative was effective or not. This emphasis on the different factors that contribute to the effectiveness of an initiative corresponds to both Amundsen & Wilson’s and Coldwell and Simkins’ approaches. In particular, realistic evaluation “… means finding out what actions lead to what outcomes for what people.” (Trigwell, 2012) and so it is necessary to find out how the initiative “…enters the teacher’s reasoning…” (p263). Accordingly, this study sought to determine how and whether institutionally provided CPD resulted in learning for the participants and how this was evidenced in their discourse and in their teaching practice.

This attention to accessing the thinking of a teacher was reflected in Amundsen and Wilson’s aim to understand the “thinking underlying” (p2) the CPD initiatives, in other words, what the organisers were hoping to achieve. So whilst process, context and outcomes remained important, a significant place was made for both CPD organisers and participants to voice their philosophical beliefs. This was also reflected in another way in which variables intervene in the outcomes of an initiative: Coldwell and Simkins found that participant expectations were not necessarily in line with what they called the “‘official expectations” (p150) of the evaluation model design. Those engaging in CPD initiatives often brought their own beliefs and attitudes to the activities thereby modifying them in unanticipated ways.
that then had to be integrated into the evaluation model. This move towards a model of evaluation, which incorporates the underlying beliefs, expectations, motivation and intentions of all those involved, was highly relevant for this research given the qualitative nature of the methodology which sought to access the participants’ perceptions of institutional CPD and to understand their reasoning as to what constitutes beneficial and non-beneficial CPD.

A further approach, Pawson and Tilley’s realist evaluation, sought to understand “What works for whom in what circumstances and in what respects, and how?” (2004, p2) through exploring the context, mechanisms and outcomes of a programme (CMO). In an investigation into the effectiveness of CPD the context would therefore refer to those elements which facilitate or hinder learning, for example the teaching approach employed or the underlying beliefs of the educator. The mechanisms would refer to how the individual engages with the process of learning, influenced potentially by degree of motivation or perceived utility of the initiative while the outcomes correspond to what learners learn and what they do with what they have learnt.

In an investigation into a faculty development programme, Sorinola et al (2014) identified the context as the learning activities and teaching approach, the mechanisms as motivation, engagement and perception of the learners and the outcomes as increased confidence and empowerment in teaching. In investigating their hypothesis, they concluded that the context plus the mechanisms equalled the outcomes. Although this is an appealing approach for theorising and framing this
study, it appears somewhat reductionist equating context plus mechanisms to outcomes. Although individual and contextual elements in this research existed at the beginning of a CPD initiative it is important to note that they may have changed throughout the duration of the initiative, for example an individual motivated to engage with CPD may have become disinterested during the session due to a number of factors such as presenter, content, method of study etc. Therefore, a model of evaluation that allows for static as well as dynamic variables, such as the one proposed by Coldwell and Simkins, represented more accurately the situation at MEUC.

No definitive model has yet been proposed for the most effective method for evaluating CPD. It is no longer sufficient to determine whether the learning outcomes have been achieved since the sheer number of possible differences impacting on the effectiveness (or not) of a CPD initiative is now taken into account, with increasing sophistication of evaluation methods. One major lack, albeit acknowledged, in these reviews is that it is still unclear which features of CPD render it effective (Parsons et al, 2012), whether it is the type of intervention, format, duration or elements contained within the intervention for example experiential learning or micro-teaching. One aim of this research therefore was to determine which features of CPD were most effective at promoting deep learning and most likely to have a lasting impact on professional practice.

Having reviewed the evaluation models above and, despite the acknowledged limitations, two of these approaches were selected to frame this research in a
complementary manner. First, Coldwell and Simkin’s model offered a comprehensive and pragmatic approach to evaluating institutionally provided CPD at MEUC. The authors helpfully reviewed a number of other models and tested them on their own research. Further, they accepted that their model remained a prototype, which required modification each time they evaluated a CPD initiative. Finally, they proposed a sensible sounding theory, which corresponded to concepts already acknowledged in educational research, positivism, realism and constructionism. It is the latter concept, constructivism, which accepts that the perspectives of all those involved in the CPD have value and “… is based on an underlying ontological position that the social world is constructed by the actors engaged in it.” (p152). Given that this research sought the perspectives and attitudes of a group of expatriate lecturers, Coldwell and Simkins’ approach allowed me to represent institutional CPD through the voices of all these participants.

Including these voices in Coldwell and Simkins’ model allowed me to answer the question posed by Pawson and Tilley (2004, p2): “What works for whom in what circumstances and in what respects, and how?” and also to offer recommendations for future institutional CPD. Appendix 8 illustrates how individual and contextual factors relevant to this research are represented in Coldwell and Simkins’ model of evaluation. To summarise this discussion of evaluation models of CPD, see Appendix 6, which illustrates the key research referred to, detailing what was evaluated and how.
2.5 Educators’ perceptions of CPD

During recent decades the majority of European governments have moved towards a model of CPD that is underpinned by standards and accountability (OECD, 2012) whilst researchers continue to assert that the most valuable form of CPD is that which fosters the professional growth of an educator through engaging with concepts that allow them to understand the learning process, through collaboration with colleagues whilst exercising professional autonomy (Swennan, 2013). The overall trend in perceptions of CPD reflects the divide between these two models of CPD with educators reporting feelings ranging from frustration and resentment when required to engage with institutionally mandated CPD (Raza, 2012) to renewed motivation and commitment when their professional needs and requirements are met (Schostak et al, 2010).

Since research conducted in schools supported that of the HE sector, it is referred to here. For example, in contexts where CPD was provided for educators to implement policy decisions or institutional level educational initiatives, researchers found that even if most teachers accepted the school’s particular development needs, they felt resentful that their own professional development was relegated to a secondary role, in terms of time, resources and money (Edmonds & Lee, 2002). However, in contexts where CPD was implemented in response to educator dissatisfaction or educators’ expressed needs, evaluation was more favourable. For example, in South Africa, Lessing and de Witt (2007) took into account teacher needs, prior knowledge and experience and asserted that the positive reaction was the result of paying attention to the “… underlying principles of CPD …” (p62) while in England, according
to Rose and Reynolds (2007, p4) “teachers reported a wide range of benefits…” after having participated in a peer-observation project designed to foster self-evaluation. Overall, there appears to be agreement that perceptions of CPD can be attributed to the nature of learning engaged with. Nevertheless, CPD provided by employers is not universally perceived as negative. Edmonds and Lee (2002) found that although educators would have liked the opportunity to choose their own CPD, they “… were aware of and appreciated the school development needs and priorities…” (2002, p28) since it provided them with skills required for classroom practice.

Since all practitioners hold values and beliefs, not only about the education of students but also about their own learning, it would seem reasonable to assume that if their beliefs and values are validated by a particular form of CPD, this would be the most relevant and appropriate for them. If educators’ professional needs are catered for, therefore, levels of motivation and commitment could potentially increase, impacting positively on the individual, their teaching and the institute overall (Fraser et al, 2007). However, institutions have external constraints, specifically government policy and accreditation bodies that shape how they provide CPD and if these are not satisfied the institution risks losing benefits such as funding or support. For example, MEUC “… has an ongoing commitment to achieving international standards in programmes delivered and levels of graduate skills.” and as such, many departments have achieved accreditation or benchmarking with various Western universities (CAA, 2014). It is understandable that a developing country’s educational institutions would wish to receive the approval and expertise of more established institutions so there was a clear conflict of interest when it came
to providing CPD for those charged with implementing policy as well as achieving educational objectives in the classroom. This is an important context for this study.

2.5.1 Expatriate lecturers’ perceptions of CPD

The limited availability of literature on expatriate lecturers’ perceptions of CPD portrayed an uneven picture; however these findings were highly relevant and significant for this study. On the one hand, lecturers in one study reported a lack of CPD and opportunities that did exist were of limited value due to their formal, passive nature, lack of choice, interest and relevance especially since “... many workshop leaders were often brought in from overseas and did not have a full understanding of instructional challenges these faculty members face” (Chapman et al, 2014, p147).

To some extent, therefore, it would appear that expatriate lecturers’ perceptions of CPD generally aligned with those of non-expatriate educators with respect to top-down management imposed CPD. However, it would also appear that the nature of CPD, in this case the opportunity to interact with the device at their own pace, influenced faculty perceptions. Alternatively, it could be that the level of faculty motivation was higher, what Coldwell and Simkins (2011) refer to as antecedents, “… factors associated with individual participants that affect their ability to benefit from the opportunities offered to them.” (p147).
2.6 Self-Initiated Expatriates

During the course of this research it became evident that interest in expatriate workers in a number of professional domains such as management, international business and academia has grown considerably over the past fifteen years.

Doherty et al (2013), proposed a number of features to define SIEs: they initiate their own move overseas and focus on their own career development rather than that of their organisation, “...exhibiting diffuse individual development goals and valuing the cultural experience and opportunity for personal learning, as opposed to purely work experiences...” (Doherty, 2013, p450). They are also self-financing, motivated by career advancement or adventure, plan the move, do not expect to stay indefinitely in the host country, and find paid employment in any occupational area (Cerdin and Selmer, 2014). Given this profile, it is understandable that an approach to CPD, which prioritises institutional rather than individual development, could result in tension between MEUC lecturers and the institute. An alternative view, Cao et al’s SIE theory (2012) drawn from career capital theory (Inkson & Arthur, 2001), emphasised a different set of criteria based on three main attributes; a protean career attitude, a strong career network and cultural intelligence which they equated to knowing-why, knowing-whom and knowing-how, respectively. An individual with a protean career attitude is described as pro-active, demonstrates agency in career decisions, prioritises their own values over those of the organisation and is more concerned with “... employability and competency accumulation...” (Cao et al, 2012, p163) than remaining in a secure position. A protean career attitude engenders the second two factors, career network and
cultural intelligence, with career network comprising the individuals a person interacts with professionally, in the case of an SIE both nationals of the host country and other expatriates. The third factor, cultural intelligence is informed by knowledge about the host culture and skills, “… the characteristics of individuals that help them to interact in intercultural contexts.” (Cao et al, p165). These three interrelated factors are influenced by the ability to adapt to new cultures and how distant the culture of the host country is from the expatriate’s home country (see Appendix 9 for Cao et al’s conceptual framework).

Although Cao et al’s theory was conceptualised to predict career success, it was important for this study since it contributed to an understanding of the motivation(s) of a person who decides to leave their home country for employment and to consider whether and how this influenced their attitude towards career development and opportunities for professional growth. However, it is not only the decision to expatriate that is significant for SIEs: there may also be differences in individual goals, such as anticipated duration, which may influence attitudes to professional learning. For example, individuals who anticipate staying in the host country for a single contract may engage with CPD but perhaps only to the extent that it will help them with their next assignment. On the other hand, individuals considering a long-term career move are more likely to invest themselves in the type of CPD provided, as this will allow them to operate more efficiently within the institution. It was important therefore to investigate how expatriate lecturers differed in their personal goals and aspirations and how this affected their attitude towards CPD.
Doherty et al’s and Cao et al’s theories both portrayed a positive image of an SIE as a proactive, dynamic individual, able to manage his or her career and make decisions accordingly. However, Richardson and Zikic (2007) found, through their investigation of thirty academics in four countries including the UAE, that there are considerable drawbacks to the SIE career. They identified “transience and risk” as two important dimensions to this very specific career choice.” (p164). The temporary, contractual nature of the work often discouraged academic expatriates from making new friends when they did not know how long the friendship would last. Academic expatriates in Singapore, Turkey and the UAE also referred to the “cultural distance” (p174) from the host country and the difficulties involved in making friends with nationals. This corresponded to Cao et al’s premise that cultural intelligence is required to overcome this cultural distance and to become accepted by nationals and other expatriates in a setting outside of work. Cultural intelligence, however, is not acquired overnight: time is required to become familiar with the host culture, to assimilate aspects that differ from an expatriate’s own and to understand and accept these differences. Consequently, it would appear logical that expatriates who have lived and worked longer in the host culture would achieve a sufficient understanding of the culture to become culturally intelligent which would then be reflected in their attitude towards students, other faculty, the institute and the rationale for the CPD provided.

Recent literature (Cao et al, 2012, Doherty et al, 2013) has contributed a significant element to this study by defining and clarifying what it means to be an expatriate lecturer. The motivation to leave one’s home country reflects certain traits which
are important to consider when investigating expatriate educators’ views of their career, development opportunities and how these affect their professional life. In particular, how these traits influenced participants’ perceptions of the model of CPD provided at MEUC is explored in this thesis.

2.7 Tacit Learning and Knowledge

Polanyi (1966) first employed the term ‘tacit knowledge’ to represent the concept of knowledge we have but cannot express verbally, suggesting that “we know more than we can say” (p4, 1966). It is now generally regarded as knowledge that is difficult to articulate, employed unconsciously in everyday activities and contributes to effective work performance. (Eraut, 2000; Reber, 1989; Polanyi, 1966; Sternberg, 1998). To illustrate how tacit knowledge is conceptualised for this study, the following includes how it is defined, how it can be acquired, how it can be made explicit and its value, implicitly or explicitly for professionals and organisations.

- Tacit knowledge can be defined as knowledge that is difficult to express spontaneously although it can surface through external factors such as another individual or a trigger in the surrounding context. Further, while individuals may not be able to articulate the link between their knowledge and their behaviour, their behaviour may demonstrate tacit knowledge held, especially to others (Tsoukas, 2002).

- Tacit knowledge can be acquired through all types of learning, formal or informal, everyday activities, routines as well as reflection during and after an incident (Eraut, 2007).
• It can be revealed through discussion, especially if intentional prompting or questioning has taken place. It can also be revealed through reflection during and after an event (Matthew and Sternberg, 2009).

• It holds considerable value for individuals and organisations (Yang and Farn, 2009) since it contributes to and informs everyday decision-making and practice, both personal and professional. Further it allows practitioners to perform activities more quickly and efficiently, thereby allowing them to become expert in their domain.

Since Polanyi’s time a number of scholars have expanded the debate into tacit learning and knowledge with some arguing that it has been misrepresented or misinterpreted (Gourlay, 2002; Tsoukas, 2002). For example, Baumard (1999) argued that tacit knowledge can be held both personally or collectively while for Polanyi and Eraut tacit knowledge, or tacit knowing, was strictly personal knowledge. Tsoukas also asserted that all knowledge is personal and cannot be viewed as an independent phenomenon separate from human subjectivity.

Knowledge only exists in the mind of humans and requires human action for it to be communicated, expressed or employed. Despite this Tsoukas argued that tacit knowledge cannot be made explicit: it can only be manifested in what we do and how we do it. Further, if as Yang and Farn (2009) suggested, “…the tacit knowledge determines the behaviour of the knower” (p211) the behaviour of an individual may give some indication of the tacit knowledge deployed: for example, if an individual can ride a bicycle, it is possible to deduce that s/he has mastered the concepts
As noted, tacit knowledge can be acquired from all types of learning including formal, informal, experiential, incidental and reflective and once acquired it has significant influence on how we think, perceive, feel and behave (Eraut, 2000, 2004; Yang & Farn, 2009). Figure 2 shows how all types of learning and knowledge can contribute to an individual’s perceptions and attitudes, in this case towards CPD.

**Figure 2: Relationship between learning, tacit and explicit knowledge and perceptions and attitudes towards CPD**

![Diagram showing the relationship between learning, tacit and explicit knowledge and perceptions and attitudes towards CPD.]

Tacit and explicit knowledge and learning impact on how an individual perceives the world and influence each other in this process, in line with Polanyi’s ‘tacit knowing’ and since all elements are subject to constant change, either from the elements within the process or from contextual elements, the resulting knowledge is fluid and malleable.
Matthew and Sternberg (2009) argued that tacit knowledge is acquired through experience, however it is not the number of years’ experience, rather what we learn from individual experience that builds tacit knowledge. It is procedural rather than declarative knowledge, context dependent and acquired without formal instruction. A significant claim from Matthew and Sternberg was that tacit knowledge underpins practical intelligence, which “… involves individuals applying their abilities to the kinds of problems that confront them in daily life… (p193) and plays a crucial role in determining how successful an individual is in the workplace. Therefore, if tacit knowledge assists us in work practices, it could do so equally for practices intended to enhance our professional performance such as CPD.

Tacit knowledge is also crucial in the creation of explicit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966, p7). In pursuing explicit knowledge, that which we can articulate, we refer to and rely on our store of tacit knowledge, so, for example, in choosing to study and learn a particular concept in a CPD workshop, we are guided by our tacit knowledge and further, we employ tacit knowledge throughout the learning process, first, to make sense of learning and second, to create a personal construct of knowledge that incorporates both our unique tacit and explicit knowledge. “Hence all knowledge is either tacit or rooted in tacit knowledge. A wholly explicit knowledge is unthinkable” (Polanyi, p7, italics in original). To contextualise, explicit knowledge is required for classroom teaching since concepts and ideas must be expressed in such a way that students can learn. However, through experience a lecturer accumulates a vast store of knowledge that informs teaching and as teaching becomes more intuitive, this store of knowledge becomes tacit: in other words, lecturers no longer need to think
explicitly about how to deal with a particular situation, they instinctively know that a
certain strategy will work, operating almost automatically. It is this tacit
automatisation of teaching strategies and procedures that allows lecturers to
become experienced and expert, contributing to their value, in contrast to novice
teachers who rely to a large extent on explicit, codified knowledge (Caspersen &
Raaen, 2013).

know-how and experiences from past actions – is increasingly considered as a
valuable intangible resource that is difficult to imitate and acquire...” (p210). For
Sternberg and Hedlund (2002), tacit knowledge “... is context-specific knowledge
about what to do in a given situation ...” (p147) and since it is personally acquired
through experience it is particular to each individual while Eraut (2000), although
recognising that tacit knowledge may be biased (p121), argued that tacit knowledge,
derived from experience and implicit learning, is crucial for action to become
routinised which, in turn, is essential for practitioners to carry out their daily work.
The view of tacit knowledge as a valuable commodity has prompted much research,
the aim of which is to access and codify tacit knowledge (Eraut, 2000; Nonaka &
Takeuchi, 1995; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000). Eraut suggested that tacit
knowledge could be revealed through interviews focused on an individual’s detailed
description of their daily work routines while Matthew and Sternberg (2009) found
that individual reflective methods enhanced practical problem solving abilities,
despite the challenges they faced measuring tacit knowledge.
The discussion above indicates some agreement amongst scholars about the unique value of tacit knowledge and how it enables practitioners to fulfill their professional role. Consequently, encouraging practitioners to reveal their tacit knowledge may provide insight into their behaviour and attitudes and understanding of how it contributes to or detracts from successful professional practice. A significant point for the participants is their particular profile as expatriate lecturers. Having worked in various countries and accumulated culturally relevant experience, their tacit cultural knowledge may have allowed them to adapt to new and challenging situations more readily than those without this experience. It was important therefore to explore how tacit knowledge contributed to a lecturer’s decisions, attitudes and perceptions when selecting and taking part in CPD activities and also to explore how the cultural knowledge or intelligence they had accumulated allowed them to deal with cultural issues faced at MEUC.

2.8 Conclusion: Impact of literature review on this study

Engaging with the literature allowed me to position the study within the wider background of other published studies, determine the model of CPD provided at MEUC and to evaluate it employing recognised approaches. I also established links between the impact of institutionally mandated CPD and professional identity, particularly when faculty were not provided with the opportunity to pursue their own professional direction. Lecturers’ perceptions were a crucial element in this study, which I was able to align with other educators’ views of CPD both globally and locally. The SIE profile of the participants added a distinctive dimension to the study since research into this area had recently started to attract a great deal of interest.
Moreover, as I researched more extensively it became apparent that working overseas represented an attractive career opportunity for educators, despite the challenges of expatriating and integrating into a new culture: consequently, research into CPD and career growth for SIEs warrants further attention.

The literature reviewed above presented a range of approaches to CPD which varied from the transmissive model, the expert trainer providing content or skills for use in the classroom, to professional learning (Webster-Wright, 2009) the aim of which is to respond to the needs, desires, professional autonomy and career growth requirements of educators. Numerous evaluations of these approaches to CPD have indicated that the model adopted had implications for lecturers’ attitudes, perceptions and desired learning. The literature revealed agreement amongst scholars that the varying elements of each approach should be explored in order to determine whether and how these elements impact on educators’ perceptions of CPD and whether and how they foster learning and positive change in teaching practice. However, limitations of the evaluations were identified as a lack of consistency in the tools employed to assess impact of CPD, self-reported accounts of improvement in teaching practice and a lack of evidence regarding long-term effects of CPD.

The literature also indicated the importance of tacit knowledge to practitioners: acquired through previous learning and experience, its value lies in how it contributes to professional practice, daily decision-making and, for this study, perceptions of CPD. Finally, the literature identified that the participants of this
study had a specific profile, self-initiated expatriates, which, this thesis will argue, influenced their attitudes and perceptions of CPD and subsequently any learning that occurred.

Having engaged with the literature in these areas, it became apparent that the vast majority of literature focused on the personal and professional development of lecturers in the western world. Consequently, given the significant contextual differences between the western world and this setting, as explained in Chapter 1, its relevance to this study was limited. Furthermore, what is known about and is accepted as effective CPD in the literature has not been explored within the context of this study and, whilst I found limited literature about the situation in the UAE and other Gulf countries, again, it was not all directly relevant to the participants and setting of this research. In addition, as noted above, it became apparent that the participants of this research held a profile, which distinguished them from lecturers working in their home country, that of the self-initiated expatriate (Cao et al, 2012), which had the potential to influence their perceptions of, beliefs and attitude towards CPD.

This study, therefore, sought to explore this gap: how self-initiated expatriate lecturers, with their specific profile, in the UAE, perceive the CPD provided by their institute in terms of employability in the classroom and value as a tool for self-development. Having identified this gap in the literature, I restructured the research questions to reflect more precisely the trajectory of this research.
1. How effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC?

2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities?

3. How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?

4. How does the SIE profile impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and their desire to engage with it?

The following secondary questions were addressed in order to offer recommendations for future institutional CPD:

1. What can be learned about CPD at MEUC from lecturers’ perceptions?

2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further for self-initiated expatriates?
Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the methodological design adopted for this research, an interpretive study, which I undertook in three phases. In order to elicit the data to address the modified research questions, listed below, I selected specific methodological approaches, which are discussed next.

Primary questions

1. How effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC?

2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities?

3. How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?

4. How do the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding it impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and their desire to engage with it?

As noted, the following secondary questions were formulated to make recommendations for future institutional CPD:

1. What can be learned about CPD at MEUC from lecturers’ perceptions?

2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further for self-initiated expatriates?
First, I present the qualitative approach adopted for this research, an investigation into perceptions of and attitudes towards CPD. Second, I discuss the rationale for selecting an interpretive study and how it best represents the elements of this study. Next, I justify the methods of data collection selected, focus groups and semi-structured interviews supporting the qualitative approach adopted for this study. Finally, I address ethical issues involved in conducting research in my place of work, with specific reference to my dual role as a researcher and lecturer, and how I ensured rigour in my research.

Since my aim was to explore perceptions and opinions, I selected a qualitative approach comprising focus groups and one-to-one interviews to generate the type of data required. The former gave access to collective as well as contradictory views whilst the latter generated a deeper understanding of lecturers’ opinions. Since lecturers’ opinions were often voiced first in the focus groups I was able to follow up significant points during the one-to-one interviews. To address the research questions qualitative data, numbering 414 pages, were generated by three focus groups and 17 semi-structured interviews with lecturers, (see Appendix 10 for details of the participants) in three distinct phases (see Table 6 and Figure 3 below).
Table 6: Details of focus groups and interviews in three phases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Month/Year</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Interview no</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Year 1 of EdD</td>
<td>June 2014</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Did not respond to interview invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Years 2 and 3 of EdD</td>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed a second time further to literature review findings and to ensure consistency of questions for all participants. L5 not interviewed due to lack of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>First</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L17</td>
<td>First</td>
<td>Did not take part in a focus group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>L12</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td>Both participants had resigned – interview 2 was to determine whether and how dissatisfaction with CPD had contributed to decision to resign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L16</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>End of year 3 of EdD</td>
<td>June 2016</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Third</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed second (L11, L15) and third (L6) to obtain perceptions of latest MEUC CPD initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L15</td>
<td>Second</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 1: Pilot Study

The research was carried out from September 2013 to June 2016 (see Appendix 11). Phase 1, completed during Year 1 of the EdD, consisted of two interviews and one focus group. The aim was to explore and test questions, the interviewing style and to determine if the data obtained would address the research questions. Changes were made to some of the questions in the light of these pilot interviews and the focus group and a more detailed and extensive examination of the literature on CPD. On reflection, of the original research questions the last two could only be addressed through analysis of the first three. I therefore modified the research questions to three primary questions, which were addressed directly by the data, and two secondary questions, which addressed the implications of the findings and are explored in the discussion.

Phase 2

Phase 2, the longest, completed during years 2 and 3 of the EdD, comprised two focus groups and 12 interviews with lecturers. This phase took place over a period of eleven months from January to November 2015. During this time, I reviewed the literature, which led me to invite Lecturer 6, an early interviewee, to be interviewed a second time to investigate areas that had arisen during the research process, supported by the literature, and to ensure consistency of questions for all participants. I also reflected on and modified the focus group and interview questions to allow me “… to pursue emerging avenues of inquiry in further depth.” (Pope et al, 2006, p64).
Phase 3

Phase 3, which consisted of three short interviews with three lecturers, was conducted to explore the impact of a recent CPD initiative introduced by MEUC in January 2016. Since this initiative was announced after the main body of the research was completed, it is presented in Postscript Appendix 17. Each phase of the study informed the following in such a way that I was able to use data obtained from each phase to build and contextualise the research. The process is illustrated in Figure 3.

This study, therefore, sought to access knowledge that expatriate lecturers already held, whether explicit or implicit, through an understanding of the participants’
perceptions, attitudes, views, feelings and dispositions, contextualised by working alongside each other in the same institution. This also led to an understanding of their actions, behaviour and discourse and allowed tacit knowledge, a determining factor in how an individual behaves (Eraut, 2004, Yang & Farn, 2009), to be revealed.

### 3.2 Methodological Approach

I employed a qualitative approach to support the choice of research questions, research design, data collection methods, analysis and presentation of findings. This approach comprised an interpretive study design, focus groups, one-to-one interviews and thematic analysis. The following sections examine these elements, their interrelatedness, rationale for their selection and their impact on the findings of this study. I found Schwartz-Shea and Yanow (2012) to be the most useful authors on the subject of interpretive research for their practical, accessible and straightforward approach. I am aware of and have read other scholars’ work to support my methodology, for example, Silverman (2014), Stake (2010), Holstein and Gubrium (2008) and Schwandt et al (2007). However, I will refer primarily to Schwartz-Shea and Yanow since they proved to be the best fit for the circumstances of my study.

According to Stake (2010) qualitative research “...is investigation that relies heavily on observers defining and redefining the meanings of what they see and hear.” (p36). Knowledge does not exist independently of people’s beliefs and perceptions; rather it is constructed by people recounting their views and observations, “...through a process of interpretation.” (Coe, 2012, p16). In addition, while the role
of the researcher is to report what is said in interviews there is also an element of interpreting the interviewees’ discourse, especially given the interpretive nature of this study. However, before reporting an interpretation consideration should be given to whether it is plausible, supported by other evidence and based on a sufficient range of data (Coe, 2012). In this study the number of focus groups and one-to-one interviews made it possible to compare what participants said and to draw conclusions about the credibility of their discourse. However, it was necessary to adopt a “pragmatic” view (Creswell, 2009) when reporting the data, especially since I was part of the participants’ professional context with knowledge of the institute, their professional lives and perceptions of CPD. According to Schwartz-Shea and Yanow (2012), the aim of interpretive research is not to determine “… the singular truth of the “research world” but its multiple “truths” as understood by the human actors under study … including the potential for conflicting and contradictory “truths”.” (2012, p82). Therefore, as noted above, consistency of views and credibility were achieved by a process of intertextuality (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow), comparing and contrasting focus group and interview responses and also by giving interviewees the opportunity to expand on their views and provide details that supported their discourse. “Analyzing intertextually across evidentiary sources is a long-standing interpretive practice; it is a marker of research quality in interpretive studies” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p88). Despite the challenges involved in reporting a credible, well-supported account of the participants’ views and perceptions, a significant advantage of interpretive research is that it allows for in-depth analysis, which “… is more likely to generate new knowledge and deeper
understandings because it tends to go beyond what everyone already knows.” (Corbin & Strauss, 2008, p51).

3.3 Research Design: Interpretive Study

The aim of this study was to determine how experienced, expatriate lecturers, with a similar cultural and educational background and conditions of employment, perceived institutionally provided CPD opportunities and how their experience and embedded tacit knowledge informed these perceptions. A defining feature of these participants was their status as SIEs working in the UAE. The similarities between the participants, their particular profile, the focus on institutionally provided CPD and their specific professional situation required an approach which would allow me to report all these elements to produce a credible and plausible interpretation of the context and the discourse of the lecturers.

In addition, the common background and culture of the participants, challenges they faced working in a host culture that differed from their own, the setting in which the study took place, recent government initiated changes to working conditions and the focus on how tacit knowledge informs perceptions contributed to this unique context. It was therefore my role to relate these elements in such a way that the resultant account would be viewed as a trustworthy and valid interpretation of the research. Flyvbjerg (2011) emphasised the importance of context for understanding research involving humans since,
“Social science has not succeeded in producing general, context-independent theory and has thus in the final instance nothing more to offer than concrete, context-dependent knowledge.” (p303).

It was crucial therefore to select and report the most relevant contextual details, common to all participants, to represent this study and to provide the thick description (Geertz, 1973) necessary to give the reader a full, rich, detailed and clear picture of the developing research. Figure 4 (below) illustrates the elements of the study with the primary research questions generating perceptions, attitudes and views of the participants, which subsequently informed the secondary research questions. The specific profile of the participants, their common background and employment conditions along with the contextual elements illustrate the distinctiveness of this study. Furthermore, the selection of these elements to represent the study allowed me to restrict the research to participants with the profile of SIE lecturer at MEUC, an HE setting in the UAE and institutionally provided CPD.
Figure 4: Elements of the Interpretive Study

**PRIMARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS**
1. How effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by the institute to be with regard to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC?
2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD and learning opportunities?
3. How do their experience and tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?
4. How do the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding it impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and their desire to engage with it?

**SECONDARY RESEARCH QUESTIONS**
1. What can be learnt about CPD at MEUC from lecturers’ perceptions?
2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop CPD opportunities further for self-initiated expatriates?
The aim of this study was to explore the perceptions, attitudes and beliefs of a group of expatriate lecturers working in an institute of higher education in the UAE. It was therefore necessary to select a research design to frame these perceptions, attitudes and beliefs and to make meaning of them in a coherent manner, relating them to the specific context of the study. An interpretive design was considered the most appropriate approach for a number of reasons. First, supporting the aims of this study, it “… focuses on understanding (interpreting) the meanings, purposes, and intentions (interpretations) people give to their own actions and interactions with others.” (Smith, 2012, p2). In addition, the research questions emerged from and were formulated for the specific context of MEUC, at a time of extensive management change with a specific group of participants and, according to Schwartz-Shea and Yanow (2012), specific circumstances such as these are best investigated by the flexible and responsive design of interpretive research.

Schwartz-Shea and Yanow cited two principal reasons why flexibility is such a crucial element of interpretive research. First, the nature of interpretive research depends on reflecting on what one has learnt and reviewing the situation in light of the new knowledge. The researcher starts the research process with his/her prior knowledge and understandings from the literature, which, if useful, build a larger picture of the research and which, if not, are modified or rejected. The ability to make these decisions is essential and, in this study, it was required on several occasions when I moved from one field to
another in the literature, for example rejecting workplace learning as too broad and focusing on CPD for SIEs.

Second, given that a major aim of interpretive research is to understand and represent the perspective of the participants, they need to retain control of what they say and do, thereby having the capacity to influence the research process. The researcher then needs to accommodate and integrate participants’ views and actions back into the research process in an iterative manner, a process that would not be possible with a restrictively planned, positivistic research design. As Schwartz-Shea and Yanow pointed out, “Interpretive research designs must be flexible due to field realities, stemming from participants’ agency.” (p71). It was essential, therefore, that I remained as flexible as possible to accommodate, understand and make meaning of all opinions, expected or unexpected, attitudes and beliefs of the participants and to incorporate them into the wider context of the study. For example, the data generated from the focus groups provided me with the participants’ initial perceptions of CPD as well as their various professional life histories, hence representing two areas of influence for the interview questions, and requiring me to adapt each interview to take account of both.

There were many other areas throughout this study where flexibility was essential. A further example was with the selection of participants: at the outset of this study the aim was to focus on lecturers employed at MEUC, expatriates or nationals. However, not having received any response from Emirati lecturers at
MEUC, the focus of the study became expatriate lecturers, which led me to search for literature focusing on expatriates and resulted in the discovery (for me) of the SIE theory (Cao et al, 2012), which subsequently became a substantive element of this study.

According to Smith (2012), interpretive inquiry has sought to distance itself from the rules that govern “scientific” research, asserting that knowledge does not exist independently of the people who hold it. Knowledge is not an independent entity waiting to be revealed; rather it is created and constructed through social interaction. In other words, “social and educational reality is always something we make or construct, not something we find or discover.” (Smith, 2012, p3). Schwartz-Shea and Yanow held a similar view. Data are not “given” as in positivistic research; they are generated by the researcher and participants and framed by the research questions since “…the research question is what renders objects, acts and language as evidence – for that specific research question” (p79).

Following this approach, I selected a design which would allow me to make sense of what the participants said, within the particular context of MEUC. The interpretations of reality that participants give are then subject to the interpretation of the researcher, since “the goal of interpretive inquiry is the interpretation of the interpretations people give to their own actions and the actions of others (double hermeneutic).” (Smith, 2012, p4). For me this meant reporting the narratives of the participants with my own interpretation,
supported by the different views, opinions and relevant contextual elements of the research.

Furthermore, the perceptions and descriptions generated by the researcher and participants are always partial, the result of what they view as relevant to the research question (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow). The evidence sought in this study, therefore, was what the participants and researcher perceived as relevant in response to the research questions, in the specific context of MEUC and, therefore, as Schwartz-Shea and Yanow pointed out, cannot be viewed as an objective reflection of the world. Moreover, the researcher’s tacit knowledge and manner of interviewing the participants are bound to affect the data generated in such a way that the data become exclusive to the circumstances of a particular study. Whilst this would be problematic in positivistic research for claims of generalisability or trustworthiness, it is not in interpretive research.

Interpretive researchers look for specific contexts, participants and events which allow them to explore their initial research questions, not just any context or participant. Participants are selected or mapped for exposure (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012) to allow the researcher to explore the research questions. For example, in this study, given the revised research questions, which focused on SIEs, it was then necessary for each participant to be an expatriate lecturer working in the chosen institution. The aim, therefore, was not to adopt a deductive mode of inquiry, from the general to the particular, and thereby making claims of generalisability: rather it was to determine the perceptions of a
small group of participants, in a specific context, in response to the research questions which commenced with my observations about CPD.

The SIE profile of the participants, specific context and limited literature on SIEs’ perceptions of CPD required an exploratory approach, guided by my interest, the context of my research setting and the developing theory generated by the research. This interpretive study, therefore, did not seek to fit in with other studies or contribute to the building of already established generic theory, it was an investigation into the ordinary, daily, lived experiences of SIE lecturers at MEUC and, consequently any claim to generalisation was limited to this specific area.

Whist the research may indicate why lecturers had particular perceptions or why tacit knowledge produced particular phenomena, the aim was not to claim theoretical inference: rather it was to give a voice to a group of expatriate lecturers working at MEUC to express their perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and to determine how experience and tacit knowledge influenced these perceptions, in circumstances particular to them. As Schwartz-Shea and Yanow argued, the interpretivist researcher asks themselves: “Is the research sufficiently contextualized so that the interpretations are embedded in, rather than abstracted from, the settings of the actors studied?” (2012, p47).

It is clear, therefore, that interpretive inquiry generates data that emerges from the researcher and the participants’ subjective, lived experience and, therefore,
cannot be evaluated by the same concepts employed for positivistic research, namely validity, reliability, replicability and objectivity. Nonetheless, it is essential to be explicit about the research process and to be aware of one’s impact on the data as a researcher, which “... requires a heightened transparency about analytic processes, achieved through reflexivity.” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p81). Reflexivity, trustworthiness, the interpretive equivalent of validity, reliability and replicability, and the role of the researcher are discussed in greater depth in sections 3.10 to 3.15.

In interpretive inquiry, once the investigation is underway, it is expected that the participants will have an impact on the direction of the research and that what they say or do will be incorporated back into the research process in an iterative and recursive manner. In this study, an example of this was how I used the data generated from the focus groups ie what I had learnt about a participant’s professional history, perceptions, attitudes or beliefs, to inform and frame the interview questions.

The research questions may also change, as was the case in this study due to the knowledge gained about SIEs during the literature review stage of the study. In addition, what the researcher discovers during the research process may bring him/her to modify the research questions. However, in interpretive research modifying the initial research questions in view of new knowledge is to be expected (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p55) since:
“Some research questions can lead the researcher to discover the most unexpected “answers,” which in turn can lead to revised research questions, also potentially unanticipated, which could not have been posed without having stumbled on the unexpected answer to the initial question.” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p55)

As noted in Chapter 2, in this study, unexpected “answers” were found which led to research questions which I had not anticipated at all at the outset of the research, namely that the participants held a specific profile, already documented in recent research (Cao et al, 2012, Doherty et al, 2013).

As the research progresses it is also possible that what the researcher believes s/he knows about the topic will be modified, impacting on the direction and focus of the research. As Schwartz-Shea and Yanow asserted, a priori or tacit knowledge plays a major role in the research process, contributing to how it is conceptualised and carried out. The origin of the research interest may well be rooted in a researcher’s experience of the workplace, as was the case in this study. Having witnessed varied and beneficial CPD in previous workplaces, on returning to MEUC, I was surprised and perplexed to find that the CPD focused almost exclusively on technology and was delivered in a top-down, transmission model. This was the beginning of what Schwartz-Shea and Yanow described as the puzzle, the starting point of a process of abductive reasoning from which the researcher tries to make sense of the situation s/he is faced with and, consequently, engages in an iterative process of engaging with the literature, the research process and the data concurrently:
“The back and forth takes place less as a series of discrete steps than it does in the same moment: in some sense, the researcher is simultaneously puzzling over empirical materials and theoretical literatures.” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p27)

The choice of research approach reflected how I perceived the research context. The situation was complex with numerous aspects and elements to explore. MEUC mandated that lecturers attend CPD workshops focusing on technical skills and provided a wide selection encompassing various iPad trainings, learning management systems (LMS) and other technology based CPD: from this selection they could choose which applications for iPad were most useful or to deepen their understanding of an LMS. As noted, Foundations faculty were obliged to attend iPad training sessions since this was the mode of delivery of all lessons. CPD was also provided at the twice-yearly MEUC conference on a diverse array of subjects ranging from assessment procedures to how to use Instagram with students. So alongside the institutionally mandated CPD workshops, faculty could select other areas of development. There were therefore two areas of investigation: the effect of engaging with compulsory CPD on faculty’s perceptions and attitudes to CPD and why each lecturer made a particular choice from the CPD provided by the institute and at MEUC conferences. Understanding these choices involved exploring their needs, wishes, objectives, attitudes, dispositions, experience and how each contributed to the person they were at the time of the research. As noted above, it was essential for the participants to retain control of what they said or did so I could access the
multiple and complex elements described above. This led me to adopt an *iterative-recursive* (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow) approach throughout the research process, searching for explanations within the data and the literature. This focus on providing embedded, situated, contextual details or *local knowledge* (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow) is a key component of interpretivist research to gain an understanding of the situation and to ensure readers are able to make their own generalisations about the research to relate it to their own research or experience.

My proposition was that experience and tacit knowledge have a significant effect on an individual’s view of the world and that, although lecturers may not have been aware of how they affected their views, they did, and it was possible to access their tacit knowledge as they described their experience and reflected on it, simultaneously. This view is supported by Schwartz-Shea and Yanow who argue that “Learning experience-near concepts may provide entrée to such knowledge, which for those using the concepts in everyday ways is often tacit...” (p50).

This study required careful examination, description and meaningful interpretation of a number of elements, which included the political, historical, economic and physical context and participants’ perceptions of the phenomenon being studied (Stake, 2005, p447). Therefore, I explored how MEUC lecturers viewed the role learning and CPD played in their working lives within the greater context of learning in general, the socio-political situation of the UAE with
particular reference to the education system, the history of MEUC and where it fitted into the overall educational picture of the country, economic, management and policy issues and how they influenced the functioning of the institute, and the interplay between these related factors. This thick description was essential for a full understanding of the perceptions and opinions of the participants, not only because individuals referred to elements in their environment which needed to be clearly outlined but also because the context and environment shaped the perceptions of the participants and vice versa. Therefore, links between the context and the individual were made transparent, interpreted and made meaningful.

Lecturers at MEUC had a similar profile in that they were predominantly western-educated expatriates and, since all colleges followed the same programmes and student learning model, their teaching responsibilities varied little from college to college: however, I would argue that each institute had its own distinctiveness which was the product of and an influence on how lecturers worked and interacted with colleagues and management. For example, if we accept that each individual was unique due to their background, education, experience and disposition, the resulting mix of those individuals being studied was also unique and constituted a group, which was distinct and different from any other group of individuals. It was therefore essential to make as transparent as possible the contextual elements of this study to ensure that the reader had a full understanding of the daily, situated experiences of the participants. This thick description is a requirement of interpretive research since “The quality or
value of contextualized knowledge (theory) is to be assessed by users, whether academic or other, who decide themselves the extent to which that knowledge fits their circumstances and purposes…” (Schwartz-Shea & Yanow, 2012, p48).

Interpretive research, therefore, prioritises contextual factors and links between them in the overall research process and so was especially suitable for this study. The elements of this interpretive study, illustrated in Figure 4, are reproduced below in Table 7. These elements had varying influences on the study and required thorough exploration to achieve a deep understanding. Table 7 displays how the elements of this study related to one another with the elements in column 1 informing the interview questions and the elements in column 2 reflecting the type of data sought.

### Table 7: Elements of the interpretive study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Elements informing the interview questions*</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Type of data sought*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expatriate lecturers Perceptions, needs, wishes, objectives, attitudes, dispositions of expatriate lecturers. Individual views sought for analysis of similarities and differences</td>
<td></td>
<td>Perceptions, needs, wishes, objectives, attitudes, dispositions of expatriate lecturers. Individual views sought for analysis of similarities and differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed by MEUC Opinions of institutional CPD opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions of institutional CPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecturer profile Opinions of opportunities to use CPD</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions of opportunities to use CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions Opinions of alternative CPD opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions of alternative CPD opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time of institutional change Impact of institutional change</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of institutional change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning culture specific to the Middle East** Impact of learning culture specific to the Middle East**</td>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of learning culture specific to the Middle East**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note these elements do not necessarily relate directly to one another.
This element was taken into account when designing the questions and also emerged as a significant issue during discussions and was explored in greater depth during the one-to-one interviews.

### 3.4 Selection of participants

The aim of the research, to investigate experienced educators’ perceptions of MEUC CPD and to explore how tacit knowledge embedded in previous experience informed their perceptions, defined the criteria for inclusion in the research. I established the criteria therefore as having at least five years teaching experience, western-educated and having completed a full contract at MEUC, which would have allowed participants time to reflect on institutionally provided CPD. Whilst the first of these criteria were achieved, two participants had not completed a full three-year contract at the beginning of the research and one was not Western educated. The sampling procedure is explained below.

I originally calculated that I would have time over the course of this doctorate to carry out five focus groups of four participants and one-to-one interviews with 20 participants. However, of those lecturers approached only 11 responded positively and so, while retaining an element of purposive sampling, I reoriented the rationale for inviting lecturers to take part, basing it on a proportional representation spread from each department as detailed in Appendix 2. Lecturers were therefore invited via a common email request to take part in this research with the aim of obtaining a further nine western-educated expatriate lecturers. Only two more lecturers, neither of whom had completed a full three-
year contract, and one who was not western-educated, originating from India, accepted my invitation and, consequently, the research went ahead with the 13 lecturers prepared to take part. The final sample therefore comprised eight Foundations and five content lecturers. According to Sargeant (2012), participants should be selected on their capacity to respond to and inform the research questions, until data saturation is achieved. Accordingly, in this study, participants were targeted and selected according to how well they could respond to the requirements of the research questions and to ensure that information yielded was utilised to its full extent (Flyvbjerg, 2011, p3-7).

Given the aim of the research, it made sense to target educators in my institution since they had all attended numerous CPD initiatives. However, targeting participants is not the same as recruiting them and pragmatism prevailed as the final sample comprised not only targeted educators but also easily accessible, willing colleagues, who, fortunately, also corresponded to the target profile. I therefore employed purposive and convenience sampling to achieve the full number of thirteen participants, who were sufficient to obtain relevant, rich data to address the research questions, given that all were approached for their cultural and educational background, previous work experience and profile.

A further important factor of the study was to ensure a range of voices would be heard. Since the participants originated from different countries, had different professional journeys, taught in different disciplines (see Appendix 10), and
ranged in age from 44 to 65 with a corresponding number of years of experience. This diversity gave access to the multiple realities rooted in their perceptions, attitudes and feelings (Kamberelis & Dimitriadides, 2005). A further advantage of this diversity was that I was able to view the two participants who did not conform to the initial criteria for inclusion as increased exposure. Increased exposure, in this study, constitutes a wider variety of sources of data, i.e. participants, which allows the researcher to verify and support knowledge claims. Schwartz and Yanow viewed mapping, exposure and intertextuality as the interpretive equivalent of sampling, arguing that more varied sources will result in more trustworthy knowledge claims, “...the wider the map, the more varied the exposure, and the more transparent the account of these, the clearer the researcher's knowledge base and the more trustworthy the claims.” (Schwartz and Yanow, 2012, p86). Those participants, therefore, whose backgrounds were dissimilar to the other participants due to their education and non-completion of a three-year contract, represented a greater source of exposure and allowed me to compare and contrast views, perceptions, attitudes and beliefs intertextually to support these knowledge claims.

As the study developed, management imposed changes occurred which affected the provision of CPD. First, a larger selection of CPD was made available at the MEUC bi-annual conference and second, an initiative to introduce Higher Education Academy (HEA) fellowships as a means of CPD was announced in January 2016. Consequently, two participants were interviewed a second time and one a third time to obtain their views on these developments, specifically
the HEA initiative. The details of the HEA/MEUC agreement and interviews are reported and discussed in Postscript Appendix 17.

3.5 Methods of Data Collection

Having adopted a qualitative approach, I aimed to capture perceptions and attitudes in order to understand how the participants learned and constructed knowledge. This view of knowledge cannot be captured by surveys or quantifiable means, it needs to be revealed, extracted and made explicit and is most effectively achieved by questioning, guiding and eliciting, in focus groups and semi-structured one-to-one interviews. Furthermore, as the principal research instrument, I held substantial insider knowledge of the context so I was able to steer the discussion towards significant issues, to maximise the gathering of rich and relevant data. In addition, I needed to allow for in-depth exploration of issues that arose, which generated an iterative process and allowed me to move backwards and forwards between issues. Consequently, I was able to capture sufficient detail to depict the situation with relevance and richness.

The focus groups and semi-structured interviews comprised an iterative series of stages of data collection, the latter taking place as soon as was practically possible after the former so themes and issues retained relevance and were not forgotten. During the interviews I questioned and prompted the participants about similar relevant areas, based on our mutual understanding of the focus groups. However, since the focus group discussions influenced the choice of questions, they differed slightly from participant to participant. This was an
advantage of the flexibility of an interpretive study since it allowed different perspectives, experiences and narratives to emerge which, in turn, revealed the multiple realities of this complex and potentially problematic phenomenon, a view supported by Silverman who stated, “Indeed, one of the strengths of qualitative research design is that it often allows for far greater (theoretically informed) flexibility than in most quantitative research designs.” (2015, p117).

3.6 Focus groups

The rationale for conducting focus groups was to explore and test the focus of the research, CPD, to develop the research questions and to prepare the participants for the subsequent one-to-one interviews. The focus groups were composed of four participants, to provide time and opportunity for them to express themselves sufficiently, so they felt their voice was of importance and of equal value to the other participants and myself. I decided to invite four participants rather than a lower number to make the best use of the time available for data collection. Five would have been too many to access all views, given the time available, one hour, and also to ensure the group did not become too unwieldy and break out into sub-groups (Cohen et al, 2011). All focus groups started with the same questions and prompts to ensure consistency at the outset, although freedom of discussion was the principal objective so any digressions were absorbed into the discussions where relevant and possible. Focus groups are an excellent way of backgrounding the researcher and “… can facilitate the democratization of the research process, providing participants with more ownership over it…” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p904). This
was certainly the case for these participants since the dynamics of the discussion between participants allowed themes to emerge and develop and my role became that of facilitator of the interaction, asking questions when those that wanted to contribute had done so. Appendix 12, an extract from focus group 3, exemplifies the diversity of topics discussed, comprising mobile learning, expertise in LMSs, changes in teaching, applications, blended learning and alternative forms of CPD, all within the general theme of CPD.

One focus group was carried out whilst I was preparing the research proposal and, therefore, was not included in the data analysis. However, insights gained from carrying out this early research allowed me to refine my research interests, questions and interviewing skills and so were referred to in this respect. I digitally recorded, backed up and transcribed all focus groups and interviews. Although time-consuming this task was less problematic than anticipated, as I was able to understand the vast majority of what the participants said, even when speaking simultaneously and I was able to immerse myself in the data at an early stage. All questions were designed to elicit lecturers’ opinions and perceptions of CPD during their previous and current employment and to encourage them to reflect on the professional learning they had engaged in, to compare, to evaluate and to determine the relative benefits of their learning. Appendix 13 gives the opening list of questions although additional questions were added during the course of the focus groups as the interaction proceeded, both by the participants and myself.
The ultimate aim in addressing secondary research question 2, ‘how can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop CPD opportunities further?’ was to determine whether the CPD provided by MEUC addressed expatriate lecturers’ professional and personal growth, needs and desires, within their specific context of working in an overseas institute with its particular cultural and student related constraints. These constraints are discussed in the findings chapter. Focus groups were selected to start the research process to ascertain whether the interaction between participants would reveal issues I had not previously considered, to explore issues that were relevant to the participants and to inform the main study interview questions. I therefore introduced general topics and allowed the conversation to proceed. I was then able to pursue and develop their views on CPD during the one-to-one interviews and obtain a more personalised view from each lecturer within the context of their individual biographies.

The focus groups served as a platform for social interaction, which occurred spontaneously and naturally between the participants, “…group discussions exploring a specific set of issues.” (Kitzinger & Barbour, 1999, p4), in this instance their perceptions of and attitudes towards CPD. My role was to ask guideline questions and ensure that the discussion did not deviate from the topic so that the interaction produced data to address the research questions and open avenues of relevant, unexplored knowledge. This method of data collection has “…a high level of face validity (Krueger, 1994) because what participants say can be confirmed, reinforced or contradicted within the group discussion.” (Webb
and Kevern, 2000, p800). Group dynamics also influenced participants’ contribution to the discussion with some participants taking longer than others to express their view and, at times, I was obliged to intervene to ensure all participants had the opportunity to contribute. As the data emerged from what was said and the way in which it was said, the interaction became significant since it influenced and guided the content of the discussion as participants reacted to their colleagues’ discourse.

Practically speaking focus groups can be difficult to arrange since participants need to be available at the same time. However, access to the participants was not an issue for me as an insider researcher (Greene, 2014) as I was able to arrange the focus groups in classrooms in the institute during non-teaching time. It can also be challenging to ensure that no one person dominates the focus group and that all participants have the opportunity to speak (Fontana & Frey, 2005), again, not an issue, as I was able to intervene and guide the turn taking. However, it is not possible to know what is left unsaid during a focus group especially in a situation “…where research participants have on-going social relations which may be compromised by public disclosure.” (Michel, 1999, p4). To capture undisclosed information or comments participants did not want to make in public, therefore, I conducted the interviews after the focus groups and I was able to refer back to the focus groups to inform the questions of the one-to-one interviews.
The choice of who to invite to a focus group, sampling or mapping, also requires consideration. As Barbour (2005, p746) pointed out, it was important to consider the effect of colleagues discussing their views in a public forum. Whilst the participants in the focus groups knew one another, some more closely than others, it is always a risk to bring together individuals, albeit at the same institutional level, for discussion of topics related to their professional role, specifically the difference in how Foundations lecturers and subject lecturers (as noted in Chapter 1) experience CPD at MEUC. However, the lecturers were invited to participate and accepted knowing they would be discussing CPD with their colleagues, so I was satisfied that they were aware of any potential issues of confidentiality or the impact the discussion would have on them so by being transparent I was able to mitigate any potential tension.

Despite the ethical issues outlined above, issues arising from group dynamics, disclosing information in front of colleagues and who to invite to the same session, focus groups have a number of benefits, especially when conducted in a complementary fashion with individual one-to-one interviews. For example, they “...facilitate the exploration of collective memories and shared stocks of knowledge that might seem trivial and unimportant to individuals...” (Kamberelis & Dimitriadis, 2005, p903) but which take on importance when participants realise that others hold the same view, which led to them modifying their perspectives through talking to others about shared experiences, (Kitzinger, 2006, p23). This became apparent in focus group 3 when the lecturers discussed the type of CPD they would have liked to engage with at the beginning of their
employment at MEUC, namely how to address cultural issues in the classroom as some had not considered this as a form of CPD.

Knowledge is a fluid and malleable construct that evolves and changes in accordance with the context and the actors involved (Eraut, 2007), and therefore focus groups and interviews were the most suitable research tools as they allowed me to access the kind of knowledge I wished to gain, perceptions and attitudes. In addition, if tacit knowledge is derived from experience (Eraut, 2000; Sternberg, 2005), a reasonable approach to accessing tacit knowledge was through the investigation of experience where prompts and questions could act as a catalyst and allow participants to reveal knowledge, which only became visible and relevant in the particular context of the focus group or interview. Focus groups were therefore a highly beneficial method of “...revealing dimensions of understanding that often remain untapped by other forms of data collection.” (Kitzinger, 2006, p22). One example was a discussion about the challenges of employing institutional CPD in the classroom: specifically, participants referred to the deteriorating behaviour of students in Foundations, which made it demanding to keep their attention whilst they had iPads at their disposal. This previously unstated opinion, for many of the participants, represented a source of untapped knowledge, which then served as a catalyst for further discussion.
3.7 One-to-one Interviews

I selected semi-structured interviews (Silverman, 2011) to obtain opinions, perceptions and attitudes and to retain a large degree of flexibility to pursue avenues that arose during the course of the interviews, by establishing rapport with the interviewees (Silverman, 2011). The questions were designed to obtain participants’ professional life history and how prior CPD had influenced their career direction, professional growth and perceptions of institutionally provided CPD in order to provide data rich in both perceptual and contextual elements. According to Silverman, “… to achieve ‘rich data’, the keynote is ‘active listening…” (p166) and my strategy therefore was to attend as closely as possible to what the participants related to decide the most appropriate follow-up. At times, therefore, the scheduled question was most appropriate to continue the interview and at other times it was necessary to formulate a supplementary question, based on what the interviewee had just related. Consequently, the length and content of each interview varied according to the success and impact of my strategy.

In interviewing expatriate lecturers, I asked them to evaluate CPD from a profoundly personal point of view, to reveal how effective it was for their teaching and professional role, especially since differing opinions became apparent during the focus groups. My professionally situated perspective on the model of CPD provided at MEUC led me to position it as Kennedy’s (2014) Training Model, the purpose of which is to transmit knowledge or skills to the participants. From the range of models Kennedy proposed, the Training Model...
offers the least opportunity for professional autonomy and educator agency. An important aim, therefore, was to determine how this lack of autonomy and agency affected participants and whether this influenced their attitude to CPD in general and their professional role. Consequently, talking to those who engage with CPD and giving them a voice, rather than observing them, consulting CPD providers or asking managers whether CPD has improved a lecturer’s teaching, allowed me not only to obtain their evaluation of the CPD but also whether and how CPD can affect other areas of an educator’s professional life. However, Silverman warned against the naturalistic approach of assuming that what interviewees say is a direct representation of life events since elements such as the relationship between interviewer and interviewee, the setting of the interview, how interviewees present themselves and the difficulty of accessing participants’ private life can all influence the data generated. Silverman also questioned the constructionist approach of attending to the ‘how’ of the interview, suggesting that this might compromise the ‘what’. Therefore, whilst bearing in mind the processes involved in an interview, I adopted an explicit and pragmatic approach to interpreting the data to avoid becoming too focused on deconstructing linguistic features and conventions. Holstein and Gubrium (1997) also warned against overemphasising the social process, the how of interviewing, at the expense of the content, the what of interviewing: my intention therefore was to achieve a balance of what was reported and how it was reported (Holstein & Gubrium, p115).
So whilst the social element of the interviewing process allowed me to deepen my relationship with the participants, I sometimes had to remind myself, and the participants, to stay focused on the content being discussed to obtain the data needed to address the research questions. The transcripts indicated that, on the whole, I was successful at this: however, one interview with a participant I know well became rather unwieldy and digressed from the focus of the study and there were times when participants revealed their own agenda about the subject of discussion, which I had to reroute back to CPD. When this was required participants were happy to return to the main topic of discussion, partly because they were respectful and considerate of their colleagues and myself and partly because the topic was of interest to them.

Nonetheless, the social interaction between interviewer and interviewee, the ‘how’, bears consideration since what is said, how it is said and the context in which it is said are necessarily reported by the researcher within the framework of his/her own perceptions and beliefs. Interviews provided the opportunity for me to engage with the participants, creating knowledge that was the result of a unique moment of interaction in the form of detailed and complex responses. This social encounter (Rapley, 2004) therefore was the source of the knowledge produced, how it was produced and its significance in both the local and wider context (Rapley, 2004).

As noted above, the social encounter also allowed me to achieve sufficient rapport with the participants to move the interview in directions determined by
the research questions and the flow of the interview. The interviews were not therefore merely a question and answer session, they were a springboard for a positive and revealing exchange of ideas and information, between the interviewees and myself based on our collegial relationship, our mutual knowledge of the institute, and the ramifications of insider research, producing highly contextual and specific knowledge and which “...legitimate both interviewer and interviewee as active knowers.” (Koro-Ljungberg, 2008, p431).

Having explored general views of CPD in the focus groups, my main emphasis in the interviews moved from the ‘what’ and ‘how’ to the ‘why’ of individual perceptions “…to understand the varied contexts out of which we ‘draw from experience’ to convey accounts of who and what we are.” (Silverman, 2013, p242). An interview is a conversation between two people (Kvale, 2007): however, it differs from an everyday, casual conversation since it has a specific purpose, to find out how respondents feel or perceive the phenomenon under investigation and to explore and follow up new avenues of knowledge. The phenomenon determines the questions whilst the perceptions of the interviewee and the interviewer shape the knowledge constructed. The quest to find out how MEUC lecturers perceived CPD opportunities was the motivation behind each question whilst participants’ perceptions, along with mine, shaped and influenced what was said and how it was said. The participants and I, therefore, co-constructed versions of events that were specific to our particular context at MEUC, our profile as self-initiated expatriates and at a time of significant management change as,
“The goal of the interview is to examine how knowing subjects (researchers and study participants) experience or have experienced particular aspects of life as they are coconstructed through dialogue.” (Koro-Ljungberg, 2008, p431).

In addition, tacit knowledge that this study sought to reveal played a crucial role in the construction of participants’ accounts since,

“... prior to our conscious interpretation of it, we are always already variously engaged with, and immersed in, the world in ways that inevitably shape interpretation.” (Holstein and Gubrium, 2008, p30).

These elements all contributed to the construction of a narrative, which addressed the research questions, but also created unanticipated knowledge for further exploration, specifically in the area of SIEs.

3.8 Methods of Data Analysis

The aim of the research was to obtain qualitative data to address the research questions below. As illustrated in Table 8 below, the type of data anticipated differed according to the research question, which allowed me to construct the study, the central theme of which was lecturers’ perceptions of CPD, underpinned by the rationale for these perceptions.
Table 8: Research questions and anticipated data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary research questions</th>
<th>Anticipated data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC?</td>
<td>Perceptions, Opinions, Attitudes, Feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities?</td>
<td>Personal elements, Historical events, Contextual elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?</td>
<td>Inferences, Implications, Conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary research questions</th>
<th>Anticipated discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What can be learned about CPD at MEUC from lecturers’ perceptions?</td>
<td>Analysis, Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further for self-initiated expatriates?</td>
<td>Conclusions, Recommendations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then examined and analysed the implications of the data, which led to an understanding of what works for who and in what circumstances (Pawson & Tilley, 2004) in order to make recommendations for future CPD. Coldwell and Simkins’ (2011) level model, based on *interventions, antecedents, moderating factors, intermediate outcomes and final outcomes*, was also employed for
analysis of the data. How the data addressed the research questions within both theoretical frameworks is presented in the findings and discussion chapter.

According to Silverman (2014), focus groups can be analysed in three ways: quantitative content analysis requires the researcher to count the frequency of the categories created while qualitative thematic analysis focuses on the meaning of what participants say, subsequently presented as themes, and constructionist analysis foregrounds the utterance and participant interaction and how they reflect participants’ views. Despite the qualitative approach adopted for this research a pure constructivist analysis approach was not selected since focusing on the utterance and participant interaction would have been a challenge, given the amount of data generated. Moreover, this approach to analysis would not have addressed the research questions nor added any significant value to the findings. However, to guard against simply reporting on perceptions, views and attitudes and to avoid a situation where “…what people tell you is treated as a (more or less accurate) report on people’s perceptions of your topic.” (Silverman, 2013, p53) attention was paid to participants’ possible meanings through the exploration of tacit knowledge. Consequently, it was important to examine what was implied in participants’ accounts by analysing sequences of discourse and how the narrative was constructed (Silverman, 2013) to determine whether and how tacit knowledge was being revealed. How tacit knowledge was revealed and its significance in adding value to participants’ views, are explored in the findings and discussion.
A qualitative thematic analysis approach was therefore selected in order to compare and relate the themes to those emerging from the one-to-one interviews. To facilitate this task, I employed NVivo 10, a qualitative data analysis software. Initially I had considered template analysis for the analysis of the data: however, the research questions sought to determine perceptions and views in different areas of CPD, which lent themselves more readily to themes. In addition, the use of NVivo 10, which allowed me to view and arrange the data more easily, was particularly suited to thematic analysis.

I am aware positivist research employs highly structured methods for data analysis, starting with a hypothesis or general theory to be tested through experimental means, and moving deductively towards the particulars of the research. However, the flexibility and responsiveness of interpretive research cannot be framed by such methods since themes are considered to emerge from the data in response to the research questions and are not imposed, as is the case in positivist research. Consequently, I adopted an inductive approach towards analysis, as

“The primary purpose of the inductive approach is to allow research findings to emerge from the frequent, dominant or significant themes inherent in raw data, without the restraints imposed by structured methodologies” (Thomas, 2006).

The structured methodologies employed in positivist research can result in the researcher missing or reframing themes (Thomas, 2006). Consequently, they are inappropriate for interpretive research, which requires the researcher to become
deeply immersed in the data and the themes that emerge from it, ensuring no themes, or details are overlooked.

According to Thomas, the main aims of an inductive approach to data analysis are to reduce the data to a concise synopsis, to demonstrate justifiable, transparent links between the research questions and the findings and to propose a theory based on the data and the findings (2006). Table 9 illustrates the process advocated by Thomas for an inductive approach to analysing the data.

**Table 9: Steps of the inductive approach to data analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Label for category</td>
<td>Word or phrase chosen to represent the category or node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Description of category</td>
<td>Explanation of the category or node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Text or data associated with category</td>
<td>Examples of coded data clarifying how the category or node is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Links</td>
<td>Links to other categories or nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Type of model in which category is embedded</td>
<td>Reference to theory or emerging theory category or node is associated with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Thomas, 2006, p4.

According to Sargeant (2012), interpretive analysis entails three stages, deconstruction, interpretation and reconstruction. Deconstruction involves reading and rereading the transcripts to break the data down into separate elements for categorisation, in this study into a node in NVivo. Interpretation follows and entails the comparison of categories (nodes) and coded data. It
involves seeking out similarities and differences as well as comparison with other research and theories to shed some light on the links between themes. Divergent accounts are also considered during this stage. Finally, reconstruction entails bringing the constituent elements of the data together to create an understanding of the links made during the interpretation stage. According to Sargeant, one or two themes will emerge as the fundamental concepts of the study, with others supporting or linked to these concepts. In other words, “Reconstruction requires contextualizing the findings, ie, positioning and framing them within existing theory, evidence, and practice.” (Sargeant, 2012, p2).

The following is a summary of the inductive approach adopted for the analysis of data in this study, which incorporated the steps noted above. In addition, I refer to Sargeant’s three stages of analysis, which also informed the decisions made during this process.

The analysis of the data entailed a number of steps, which I have grouped into Sargeant’s three stages, deconstruction, interpretation and reconstruction: during the deconstruction stage I read and re-read the entire transcripts to obtain an overall view of participants’ positions and perspectives, linking similar and noting individual views. The next step was to read through the transcripts and identify themes, labeling them and placing them in nodes in NVivo, which allowed me to achieve a more in-depth and detailed analysis of particular utterances, first to determine the most widespread and frequent perspectives and second to explore the participants’ reasons for their views. Each node or
category was allocated a description to facilitate the adding of subsequent data and for each node an example was selected to ensure subsequent data corresponded to existing data in the node.

The topic, CPD, has been extensively researched which allowed me to envisage possible themes, for example the identification of CPD for institutional or personal objectives. In addition, the research questions structured the themes as, according to Braun & Clarke (2006), “A theme captures something important about the data in relation to the research question...” (p82). Examples in this study would be perceptions, beliefs and attitudes. However, although the identification of *a priori* themes was a useful and timesaving approach, it was crucial to remain open to themes that had not appeared in the literature. For example, Lecturer 6 (L6) related that he could not apply the CPD provided by MEUC in the classroom due to the profile of the students, a surprising but interesting disclosure meriting further exploration and which could be overlooked if the *a priori* themes had been too restrictively developed.

The interpretation stage also entailed a number of steps. Once I had allocated themes to the data in NVivo I read through them for a clear understanding of the relevance of the data in relation to the research questions. However, this more fragmented approach distanced me from the overall picture and so I returned to the full transcript to place what participants had said within the larger context. The interpretation stage of the analysis therefore became an iterative process of moving from individual utterances to the wider context to ensure relevant
details were not omitted. This allowed me to obtain a general picture of the most common views about the effectiveness of CPD. Having already carried out a preliminary analysis of the focus groups to inform the interviews, I returned to them for a deeper analysis and to determine prominent themes in the participants’ interaction. Finally, during the reconstruction stage I examined the data again to impose some structure, arranging it in groups as shown in Figure 5 below, although this developed and grew as I worked through the full data set. During this stage, links were made between the various nodes and then arranged into categories as displayed in Figure 5.

Figure 5: Focus group themes arranged into categories
I then moved onto the interviews, repeating the process and, as noted, the themes (nodes) grew in line with the number of interviews analysed. Once I had analysed ten interviews no new themes were identified and the existing themes grew until all interviews were analysed (see Figure 6 below).

**Figure 6: Interview themes arranged into categories**

Although the intended sample at the outset of this study was 20 expatriate lecturers, analysis of the interviews revealed that new data did not “… shed any further light on the issue under investigation.” (Mason, 2010, p1) after ten interviews. Furthermore, in an investigation into how many interviews were required to achieve saturation, Guest et al (2006) found that when participants...
are selected “... according to predetermined criteria relevant to a particular research objective.” (p61), with a homogeneous sample seeking common perceptions and attitudes, a relatively small sample is sufficient, in this case 13. However, this also depends on the expertise and cultural knowledge of the researcher and “… a certain degree of structure within interviews…” (p75) where participants are asked similar questions. This study reflected the criteria advised by Guest et al and, as such, when the data ceased to produce new themes I was confident that saturation was achieved.

Many of the one-to-one interview themes were similar to the focus groups themes and could simply be added to existing groups: however, a number of new themes arose during the interviews, creating new groups and being placed in more than one group when relevant. Once the groups were relatively stable, I carried out an intensive analysis of small sections of the data to obtain a deeper understanding of what participants said and to formulate some preliminary hypotheses (Silverman, 2014) before returning to an extensive analysis, which included the entire data set. I then verified the deeper understanding gained from the intensive analysis with relevant aspects of the entire data set and modified my hypotheses accordingly (Silverman, 2014).

Thematic analysis offers a flexible and manageable approach to data analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006), allowing themes to be moved around, returned to, expanded and modified as required. It also “…involves a deliberate and thoughtful process of categorizing the context of the text.” (Gibbs, 2007, p3), a
time-consuming but highly beneficial process, which allowed me to become deeply immersed in the data. In addition, having decided to employ NVivo to assist with data analysis in the creation of themes, my decision to employ thematic analysis as the most suitable approach was validated. I then had to make some decisions about which accounts would be represented in the findings, for example whether to emphasise divergent or convergent accounts (Flick et al, 2004). A convergent account would support existing perspectives while a divergent account would provide a new perspective requiring investigation and theoretical explanation and go some way to achieving triangulation (Flick et al, 2004), by considering the data from an alternative perspective. This decision depended, to a great extent, on the research questions and the character of the divergent account, especially if the divergent account could shed some light on the research questions. For example, many of the participants recounted their concerns about the over emphasis on the use of technology in the classroom and the CPD provided to accommodate this. However, other participants appreciated the opportunity to engage with the technology and saw this as adding to their skill set which represented a different theoretical explanation. I therefore had to remain flexible when analysing the data and consider the significance of each piece of data separately and in relation to the overall body of data to avoid “... closing down to one ‘best’ reading too early.” (Huddersfield University, 2014).
Representing differing accounts also allowed me to achieve a level of objectivity and reliability (Wallat and Piazza, 1988) through completeness (Fielding and Fielding, 1986) of accounts. However, it should be noted

“...that some accounts may be more persuasive or valuable than others or merely more relevant to particular research questions.” (Madill et al, 2000, p9)

and this was definitely the case in this study as some participants had stronger and more persuasive views on the role of CPD in their professional lives. I therefore had to take care to attend to all accounts as fairly, objectively and equally as possible by remaining aware of my own biases, views and subjective evaluation and to consider each account for its value and contribution to this research. Comparing and verifying different accounts intertextually in this way was a highly beneficial advantage of an inductive approach as it gave me greater insights into the perceptions, opinions and attitudes of the participants. Moreover, the process of intertextually analysing the data is viewed as the interpretive approach to achieving trustworthiness, discussed in greater detail in Section 3.11, below.

3.9 Ethical Issues

In accordance with BERA guidelines (BERA, 2011), names of all participants, the institution and any information allowing identification of such were changed and all participants were provided with a copy of the transcripts to reassure them that this was the case. All data were kept under lock and key in my private study, inaccessible to third parties. They will be destroyed on completion of the
doctorate. As required by the OU Ethics Committee, I received approval from the Human Research Ethics Committee, and also from MEUC, to conduct this research. The participants were all adults so approval from guardians was not required but they were asked to sign a consent form. In addition, I was responsible for ensuring that the research process did not result in any embarrassment, professional harm or detrimental effects to my participants, however unintentional, either as a result of participating in the study or publication of the final thesis and below I discuss some of the challenges I faced in this area.

3.10 Rigour and implications of qualitative research

Participants’ views were interpreted in relation to the research question and their particular context. As the researcher I was the interpreter and it was my work to represent the participants’ views and perceptions, free of bias and any influences emanating from my own beliefs and to ensure that this research was rigorously constructed, transparently, honestly and ethically. In order to do this, qualitative inquiry is bound to follow certain procedures, which differ from quantitative research in that they rest on ethical, moral and reflexive principles particular to the study of human behaviour (Schwandt et al, 2007).

Traditional, positivistic research employs the constructs of internal and external validity, reliability and objectivity to establish truth-value, however it has long been accepted that these constructs do not serve the social nature of qualitative inquiry. To address this concern Schwandt et al (2007) proposed a set of
corresponding criteria, credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability as a means of establishing the trustworthiness of naturalistic research. In addition, they suggested further criteria to address issues specific to naturalistic inquiry, their “Unique Criteria of Authenticity” (2007, p20). The criteria comprised fairness, ontological, educative, tactical and catalytic authentication as measures to ensure that the research process, product, participants, stakeholders and researcher(s) are all subject to fair, equal and just consideration and treatment, in all areas. The following is a discussion of Schwandt et al’s constructs and how they were represented in this research and Table 10 illustrates the strategies employed to ensure rigour in this interpretive study.

Table 10: Strategies to ensure rigour in the study

(Adapted from Houghton et al, 2013)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired elements of rigour*</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Strategies to ensure rigour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trustworthiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Credibility                 | Construction of true and accurate representation of the research | • Thick description  
  • Triangulation  
  O Different research methods  
  O Member checking |
| Transferability             | Extent to which findings can be transferred to another setting | • Transparency  
  • Detailed, clear and explicit thick description allows reader to consider own experience and achieve transferability |
| Dependability               | Consistency of the data (Reliability in quantitative research) | • Reflexivity  
  • Transparency of decisions  
  • NVivo software |
| Confirmability              | Similar to dependability Accuracy of the data | • Reflexivity  
  • Transparency of decisions  
  • NVivo software |
<p>| <strong>Authenticity</strong>            |            |                             |
| Fairness                    | Representation of all participants’ views, attitudes | • Ensuring all participants’ voices were heard during focus groups |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontological and educative</td>
<td>Sensitising participants to the purpose and implications of the research.</td>
<td>• Thick description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Attention to selection of data during data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalytic and tactical</td>
<td>Motivating participants to take actions or decisions to improve their situation</td>
<td>• Transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not considered advisable given the sensitive context of the research (discussed in 3.12 Authenticity, below)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Schwandt et al (2007)

### 3.11 Trustworthiness

As a lecturer researching my own institute I was deeply immersed in the context of this study, the issues facing the participants are ones I faced also: consequently, this close involvement allowed me to engage intensively over time with the participants and to construct as true and accurate a picture of the research possible, in other words to seek credibility for the study. Triangulation, in this case the use of different research methods, interviews and focus groups, as well as member checking, having participants read over and sanction my interpretations of their views and responses, in other words, “…ensuring that interpretations are consistent with the understandings of research participants.” (Coe, 2012, p43) also strengthened my claims to credibility.

One of the main points of contention in justifying qualitative research was the extent to which I could claim generalisability (transferability) for the research. Lincoln & Guba (1985) argued that generalisation based on inductive logic was not possible or appropriate in qualitative inquiry, but that any generalisation or transferability should be made by the reader from the research to his/her own
experience. Transparency was also required to understand the particularities of this research: participants’ and contextual accounts needed to be sufficiently detailed and provide a thick, rich description but also explicit and clear so the reader can imagine being in the situation of the participants and connect what s/he is reading to existing knowledge and experience. It is this vicarious experience therefore that allows a reader to draw their own naturalistic generalisation (Schwandt et al, 2007). So whilst I acknowledge some researchers believe that claiming generalisation is a worthwhile pursuit, others believe that the reader should be able to generalise and the latter approach was adopted for this study. However, it was my responsibility to report and interpret the events and context in such a way that the reader is able to draw comparisons with their own experience and make their own generalisations, whilst at the same time, focusing on the particularity and uniqueness of this interpretive study, especially given the distinctiveness of the setting. Evidently, there may be a broad range of readers so the interpretation needed to take account of all, from expatriate lecturers for an understanding of their own situation to managers in a position of allocating funding to CPD, wishing to understand the importance of participants’ perceptions and views and the impact these had on their desire and ability to engage with CPD.

However, Schwartz-Shea and Yanow argued that the researcher’s tacit knowledge and prior experience can influence the data and that the research, conducted by a different researcher using the same interview questions, may well produce a different data set. It is essential, therefore, to view the findings
of this research as particular to the circumstances in which it was conducted, the
particular participants, context, setting and researcher. As Schwartz-Shea and
Yanow highlighted

“... the potential existence of such differences among researchers says
nothing about greater or less “accuracy” or “truth” of the data because it
is expected that research participants respond to the particularity of
researchers” (2012, p81).

My position vis-à-vis the participants is described and discussed in greater detail
in Section 3.13, below.

Dependability and confirmability refer to the consistency and accuracy of the
data. Measures taken to ensure the data were consistent and accurate included
starting each focus group and interview with the same set of questions, although
given the qualitative nature of this research flexibility was crucial and therefore
deviation from the questions was acceptable and even encouraged if it allowed
me to delve into areas that would shed light on the research questions.

Houghton et al (2013) also recommended keeping an audit trail “... by outlining
the decisions made throughout the research process... “(p14), and, accordingly,
all decisions made concerning the research process were documented
throughout the course of this study either through the description and
explanation of the research process or by keeping careful notes of transcribing,
coding (in NVivo) and data analysis (see Appendix 14 for an example of coding).

Schwartz-Shea and Yanow also suggested keeping fieldnotes to ensure
transparency, record decisions made during the research process and to support
the writing up process. Accordingly, I noted down events, particularities, reflections and decisions, not only informally but also formally for the progress reports required for this thesis.

3.12 Authenticity

Qualitative inquiry is the study of humans in their natural setting, in this study, the workplace. Studying people poses its own particular issues and I had a duty to ensure that participation in any research did not result in any detrimental consequences, on the contrary that it could assist the participants to understand the nature of the research and how it could be of use to them. Schwandt et al (2007) encouraged researchers to strive for the additional criteria comprised in the notion of authenticity, named above. To do so I had to ensure that the beliefs, values and opinions of all participants were represented equally in the research process to achieve fairness. In addition, it was my role, according to Schwandt et al (2007), to ensure that participating in the research process sensitised my participants to their own situation and experience so that they could evaluate them accordingly; assisted the participants in reaching a deeper understanding of others’ perceptions of the world; motivated them to take action or decisions; and finally inspired them to take action, where appropriate.

Given our equal status in our place of work and the relationship I had with the participants, I experienced no issues in achieving the first three criteria since these were negotiated within the safety of the focus groups and interviews and, evidently, anything discussed was confidential and not divulged except for use anonymously in the final research report. However, despite any professional
I experienced from the participants’ desire to improve their situation through taking action, I had serious misgivings about encouraging them to do so since the outcome may have been detrimental to their employment.

Furthermore, the relationship between the participants and myself was certain to affect what they told me, for example the degree of familiarity, gender, age, mutual understandings could all influence how comfortable a participant felt in divulging his/her life history to me: in other words, the social distance (Hollowell, 2006) may have influenced not only what a participant was willing to recount but also the manner in which he/she recounted and not to take account of this could have led to misinterpretation. It was therefore important for me to develop reflexivity and understanding of how my role as researcher and colleague on the “insider-outsider continuum” (Hollowell, 2006, p483) affected the relationship between myself and the participants and consequently, the research process. On reflection, I was satisfied that the research process had a positive and enriching effect on both the participants and myself since they were willing to discuss all issues from the most pragmatic to the most sensitive in an honest and considered manner. In addition, my relationship with those I knew less well at the beginning of the research has deepened and strengthened, a beneficial and encouraging long-term impact of the study.

3.13 Researcher role

Overall the interviews proceeded smoothly and all participants were happy to share their views and build on those already expressed in the focus group. The
main issue for me as a researcher was expressing my opinion when a participant said something I particularly related to and, from the transcripts, I can identify moments when I should have allowed participants more space to express themselves and remained silent myself. This, however, led me to develop a deeper understanding of how to encourage people to talk about themselves and, specifically, to examine the reasons for their opinions and perceptions and I incorporated this understanding into the later interviews, allowing the participants more space to express their views, whilst responding to the same questions. I also discovered that my interaction with the participants depended to a great extent on how well I already knew them. For example, L10 was expressing particularly negative views and I wanted him to examine why he felt like he did so I ‘encouraged’ him to re-examine his views by asking pointed questions about the technology CPD (see Appendix 15). Knowing this lecturer well I pushed a bit further than perhaps I would have done with a participant I did not know so well, which does have implications, for example, did the data reflect his true views or my view of what I think he really meant? This is only one example of the many interactions that took place during the interviews and, in retrospect, it is easy to understand what I was trying to achieve, to encourage him to make explicit knowledge and feelings that may have become buried and less accessible: however, during the interview I acted instinctively and therefore can only analyse what was said and how the “… interaction produced that trajectory of talk, how specific versions of reality are co-constructed, how specific identities, discourses and narratives are produced.” (Rapley, 2004, p5).

In spite of my novice interviewing skills I felt well prepared, having reflected
critically on the process, so the focus groups and interviews generated an abundance of data, which addressed the research questions fully.

One ethical challenge I had to remain aware of in my dual role as colleague and researcher was the impact of the questions and prompts on the participants and ensuring that the knowledge revealed was valid in the context of this investigation into the participants’ perceptions of CPD, informed by their personal, professional and tacit knowledge. The knowledge that an individual holds at any one time is constantly susceptible to modification, a reflection of the constant changes that take place in the environment, with interlocutors and within an individual’s evolving knowledge base. Consequently, whatever I discovered in this study was highly dependent on the context, time, place, myself as the interviewer and, most importantly, the participant. The interaction between these elements, how they influenced each other and the relationship between interviewer and participant revealed knowledge that may only have been valid at the moment that it was expressed and consequently its importance needed to be assessed within the parameters of what can be considered valid and true.

Control of the interview puts the interviewer in a position of dominance (Kvale, 2006), which raises a number of ethical issues. As summarised by Kvale (2006, p484) the interviewer determines the questions, asks the questions in a one-way dialogue, has a distinct purpose and may even use his or her position to obtain information without disclosing his or her intentions to the interviewee. One of
the aims of this research was to access tacit knowledge, that which an individual knows but cannot articulate, through interpretation of the interviewee’s discourse and behaviour. The extent to which this is ethical is debatable since interpreting discourse is a significant part of qualitative research and any conclusions drawn from the data would be supported with contextual details, reinforcing the truth-value of the data. However, it is an area where I had to tread carefully since over-emphasising the significance of what I believed to be tacit knowledge would undermine the trustworthiness of my claims. Nonetheless, tacit knowledge was a crucial lens through which to explore participants’ perceptions, experience, attitudes and views and if framed within these elements, as was the case in this study, it can reveal important indicators of how and why participants perceived CPD as they did. Therefore, I related what I believed to be tacit knowledge to participants’ personal and contextual factors and, taking a pragmatic approach, supported it with these factors.

A further area of control was the selection of data to analyse and interpret, again reinforcing the dominance of the interviewer in the research process. However, the selection of data was not arbitrary: it was determined by the research questions, which were made explicit to the interviewees at the outset, as well as pertinent theories within the literature reviewed, which underpinned the credibility and trustworthiness of the research. However, an unanticipated finding in this research was the significance of the self-initiated expatriate educator profile in informing the participants’ perceptions of CPD. Given the scarcity of research in this area and the unanticipated nature of the findings, this
aspect was not supported by the literature or represented in the research questions. Its importance and value lie in its originality and how it adds to the body of existing knowledge in this area.

### 3.14 Insider Research

Conducting research within my own institute presented a number of issues for me as the researcher and the methodological approach adopted for the study, in particular my position vis-à-vis the research subjects and my role investigating colleagues. As all participants and myself worked for the same institution we were members of the same group. We could also be defined by elements of commonality and difference. These elements indicated how I positioned myself in relation to the participants and therefore the degree of commonality or difference differed according to the participant. To achieve an understanding of these relationships I compiled Appendix 16, which indicates some areas of commonality and difference, illustrating that I had a closer relationship to some participants than to others. For example, I worked closely with L8 for over two years, we shared a similar cultural background, gender and employment conditions and have socialised outside of work. However, I shared few areas with L15 who originated from an Eastern European country, originally trained as a lawyer, worked in the Business department and was male. Moreover, I knew him only as a distant colleague before the focus group he participated in. Significantly, the sharing of personal and professional information during the interview deepened our relationship to one of informant-friendship (Taylor,
2011), which changed the dynamics of subsequent interviews and interactions as we passed into the second phase of partnership (Dowling, 2008).

The status of insider or outsider researcher has been conceptualised as a continuum (Trowler, 2011), as the extent to which one is an insider researcher depends on the relationship the researcher has with his/her participants. As illustrated above and in Appendix 16, I was closer to certain participants than others, a total insider with some and a partial insider (Chavez, 2008) with others. This positionality, determined by self-selected criteria (areas of commonality and difference), influenced a number of factors. The research methods, interviews and focus groups, were selected to obtain personal narratives, the depth and richness of which could have been influenced by my relational proximity to the participants. The questions asked may also have been received differentially, which could have affected the consistency and trustworthiness of data collected as some participants may have responded to questions positively and fully whilst others may have been less forthcoming. In addition, respondents may have been wary of giving their opinion and simply provided answers they believed to be acceptable to me. However, I could only assume that even the more succinct answers contained what the respondents believed to be the most relevant information. Respondents may also have omitted certain information they assumed I knew, since I had worked for some time with some of the participants: it was therefore crucial to ask questions that made this type of information explicit, (Dowling, 2008) especially as I was seeking deep as opposed to surface responses.
A further ethical challenge presented itself when, during the management changes referred to earlier, all institute directors were replaced with Emiratis. Since I had requested approval to conduct this research from my institute’s previous director, it was necessary to submit a second request to ensure the new management were aware of and satisfied with the aims of the research. I was obliged to remove any comments or statements which could be perceived as negative or critical of the institute. The amended proposal was subsequently approved.

This incident reflected the institutional environment at MEUC where lecturers were wary of and careful not to say or do anything which could be seen as criticising college management. Further, this power dynamic had implications not only for me conducting research in my own institute but also for the participants of my study. It was crucial that the interviews and focus groups remained confidential and that participants could not be identified in any way, specifically in a situation where this research is published. Furthermore, the restrictions placed upon me to refrain from portraying MEUC in an unfavourable light represent a significant ethical dilemma of how power relationships can impact on how research is conducted. However, I am certain that the methodological measures taken in this study were appropriate and sufficient to ensure its integrity. The challenge for me, therefore, is to frame the findings and recommendations in such a way that they are received as evidence-informed suggestions for the improvement of CPD and as a genuine attempt to provide
lecturers with the opportunities to engage with institutionally provided CPD in a more meaningful manner, which would benefit both lecturers and the institute.

3.15 Reflexivity

Qualitative research entails addressing reflexivity “... the recognition that the product of research inevitably reflects some of the background, milieu and predilections of the researcher.” (Gibbs, 2007, p93). My interest in and perspective of CPD at MEUC were the source of my decision to undertake research in this area. Having worked at MEUC for eight years I had intimate knowledge of how MEUC functioned and how expatriate faculty were prepared and supported for their role teaching Emirati students. The CPD provided generally followed a top-down, transmission model as workshops and conferences were arranged by management on topics chosen by management. There was a strong focus on developing skills to use technology in the classroom and while I saw the usefulness of such initiatives, I also noted a lack of consultation with faculty about which skills they would have liked to develop and a lack of support for the improvement of pedagogical practice.

Whilst I did not communicate these observations to the participants, they were certain to influence all aspects of the research, from the methods chosen to the way in which I phrased the interview and focus group questions. It was also possible that my responses during interviews indicated my position. For example, I may have shown support for or agreement with a particular statement by a participant, which may have influenced what, s/he articulated
subsequently. Despite this, I felt it was best to be honest and transparent concerning my views on CPD: however, I may not have been able to be explicit about my views since much of what we believe or think remains tacit and hidden, especially when one has worked for a length of time in one place. It was important therefore that, during analysis of the data, I examined and reexamined my position, how I phrased interview questions and how I responded to and interpreted what the participants said with the aim of establishing a credible, trustworthy and true account of the research findings. Overall, the desire to be honest and transparent was effective since the participants were enthusiastic and forthcoming with their views. Although much of what they said corresponded to my expectations, the data generated also contained important unanticipated elements, which allowed the study to move into new areas so I am satisfied that my views, apparent or hidden, did not significantly influence the participants’ perceptions or views.

3.16 Theoretical considerations

My interest in the importance of tacit knowledge in CPD has grown over the past seven or eight years as I have witnessed how important it is to have a thorough understanding of one’s own working environment and the cultural background. Perhaps this is particularly relevant for western-educated expatriates working in a Middle Eastern, Islamic context where the relevance of what one says and does is highly determined and bound by the context and the cultural constraints therein. It is not only the explicit knowledge communicated by management, colleagues or students that brings understanding of a context but also the
accompanying tacit knowledge, which grows exponentially as lecturers become more immersed in the institutional context, to the extent that what would seem strange on arriving in the UAE becomes accepted as daily practice. In this respect I equate tacit knowledge with cultural intelligence (Cao et al, 2012) since both are accumulated over time and both are crucially dependent on knowledge of a context, experience, attitudes and perceptions (Eraut, 2010; Cao et al, 2012): specifically, for this study, cultural intelligence was revealed as a crucial factor in how participants engaged with and related to students, colleagues and management, within the particular context of MEUC.
Chapter 4: Findings - Institutionally provided CPD

This chapter reports on lecturers’ perceptions of and desire to participate in the mandatory, training model of CPD provided at MEUC, in response to research question 1: How effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC?

In addition, this chapter examines the reasons given by participants for their perceptions of institutionally provided CPD in response to research question 2: What factors have influenced how they perceive the CPD opportunities? It also explores associated aspects of CPD that appeared to intensify negative perceptions of CPD, suggesting that participants viewed these aspects negatively to validate their already poor view of mandatory ongoing professional development.

Foundations lecturers (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13 and 16), who were obliged to deliver lessons using an iPad, were subject to ongoing CPD sessions to ensure they remained up-to-date with the latest applications and iPad related methods for teaching English and Maths. Departmental lecturers (10, 12, 14, 15 and 17) were not obliged to employ iPads in teaching: however, they were expected to employ a Learning Management System such as Blackboard Learn and operate the Smartboard installed in each classroom, as were Foundations lecturers.
As illustrated in Figures 5 (focus group themes) and 6 (interview themes), the data revealed significant negative perceptions of mandatory and semi-voluntary CPD provided at MEUC (I have used the term ‘semi-voluntary’ to describe the menu of CPD offered since choosing from this menu was mandatory). As explained in Chapter 3, I analysed the focus groups first and then the interviews, using NVivo to explore specific narratives and the transcripts to explore the wider context until the categories became stable, indicating saturation of the data had been achieved. The analytic process employed for this interpretative study, explained in Chapter 3, was an inductive approach since themes were considered to emerge from the data, when addressing the research questions.

### 4.1 Mandatory CPD

Six of the eight Foundations lecturers reported their displeasure with the mandatory nature of CPD and the imposition of a number of sessions provoked a strong reaction.

“... but some of it I find is very imposed and it will be better if I could choose for myself ... if you want to do five do five, if you want to do twenty-five, do twenty-five. Do twenty, I don’t like this.” (L16, FG3, lines 513-516).

L6 also felt having to attend twenty sessions of CPD, as specified by the Chair, was simply to tick a box, and stated he “... couldn’t care less whether I get to twenty or not.” (line 106) whilst L8 asserted that she resented having to attend CPD on topics she already felt proficient in.
“I have to go and I find that those, you know, must do ones, and it's possibly me, because I resent having to go, that I, I find I just don't benefit.” (line 210).

Although lecturers were not told to attend specific CPD sessions, they were obliged to attend a certain number, as noted above, and since teaching with the iPad was mandatory, if they did not attend they would not acquire the requisite skills for classroom teaching. L16 found this situation “… highly demotivating…” (Interview 1, line 744) and, aware that his attitude contributed to his discontent, stated,

“ … you go in with the wrong attitude so … you’re not ready to learn anything. This is the problem with being forced. If you can choose … you go in with a little bit of a better attitude and maybe get something from the session …” (Interview 2, lines 107-110).

CPD imposed by the institute removes not only autonomy, a crucial aspect of an educators’ professional identity but also responsibility for one’s own professional development (Boud & Hager, 2012, p17). Furthermore, the requirement to attend CPD placed lecturers in a position whereby their attendance was viewed as participation (Boud & Hager), and participation as a means of career development, resulting in frustration and resentment.

Evidence of this was clear in L16’s comments, which, interestingly, indicated his belief that the imposition of a specific number of CPD sessions was a reflection of the culture and a top-down managerial approach:
“... it’s not about quality, it’s about quantity ... because I know it’s quite an Arab thing it didn’t upset too much, if it had been in England I would have been annoyed by it ... why give me a number, you’re saying, it’s almost like you’re so lazy that you’ve got to do this many…” (Interview 1, lines 735-742).

L10’s frustration with being obliged to learn what the institute mandated was evident in his discussion of previously attended CPD:

“I mean, there’s loads of them and you just think why am I at this again? You know, but we get told to go, it’s not a matter of me choosing those so we just go along and think what is this ... again and again and again and again and, you know, there was one training session where I had to apologise to the trainer cause I just was fed up, you know.” (lines 183-188).

Furthermore, L10 viewed institutionally provided CPD as training and although it addressed his teaching needs, the mandatory nature, constant change and lack of support for his career development could all be viewed as obstacles to professional learning.

“... that’s what I call training, you go in, we’re changing to this, you have to learn this, that’s not PD, that’s being dictated to and yes, it does help me to do my job but it doesn’t actually help my professional development.” (lines 333-336).

Kennedy described this model of CPD as,

“... compatible with, although not always related to, a standards-based
view of teacher development where teachers strive to demonstrate particular skills specified in a nationally agreed standard.” (2014, p338).

This was clearly the case at MEUC where the implementation of technology in the classroom was a government directive. Kennedy described this model as the least likely to provide “… professional autonomy and teacher agency” (p693). Furthermore, as pointed out by L10, it did not provide the opportunity to transform his or her teaching through deep learning. Professional autonomy allows an educator to make his or her own professional decisions. However, mandatory CPD removes autonomy and choice when it tells educators what to learn, how to learn and why they should learn. Furthermore, mandatory CPD can prevent educators from investing time in professional learning they consider beneficial for their career growth, especially if lack of time is already a factor influencing their perceptions of CPD (Webster-Wright, 2009).

The lack of time available to lecturers for CPD in their weekly schedule resulted in some feeling stressed and overwhelmed by the need to keep up with mandatory, technological changes (L6, L7, L9),

“... you go along as a beginner and I need, I need this just to be able to operate in the way the college wants me to operate in.” (L6, interview, lines 61 -62).

“... ‘cos no one has the time to do it ... but then you have to do it and you still have to shoehorn it in which just adds more stress to the whole thing of and turns a lot of people off.” (L7, FG2, lines 37-40)
Obligatory CPD that results in negative and resentful perceptions can also have a number of repercussions such as restricting critical inquiry according to Webster-Wright, who warned that mandatory CPD should not be mistaken for genuine professional learning (2009, p725). She continued that such CPD initiatives are rarely questioned in organisations and, at the time of this research, this certainly appeared to be the case in MEUC, given the predominance of mandatory technology-based workshops.

Section 4.1 highlighted the impact of imposed CPD and related factors on the participants and their desire to engage with and benefit from CPD. The data revealed a variety of concerns regarding the mandatory nature of CPD and the content. For example, some participants, particularly Foundations lecturers, questioned the number of sessions they were required to complete whilst others regarded the CPD as training rather than CPD designed to foster professional growth. In addition, the overemphasis on perceived irrelevant and unnecessary technology led to feelings of stress for some participants, especially since little time was allocated to allow them to assimilate the technology to use it in an effective manner. Furthermore, the perceived lack of planning and needs analysis resulted in lecturers viewing CPD as a formality to be completed. These perceptions are the first stage in building an overall picture of the professional learning context at MEUC. Section 4.1.2 examines the transmission or training model of CPD, its particular properties and the implications for both the participants and the institute.
4.1.2 The training model of CPD

At the time of this research the model of CPD offered at MEUC was predominantly Kennedy’s transmission or training model, reviewed in Chapter 2, with occasional workshops or off-site training available either on request or by invitation.

The requirement that lecturers attend CPD, regardless of prior knowledge resulted in various reactions, for example L12 commented that CPD was aimed at the “…lowest common denominator…” (Interview 1, lines 108) whilst L10 expressed his lack of appreciation for this type of ‘training’, and questioned the expertise of the trainer.

“So you know that kind of thing, going along and being told, you know, by somebody, bluh, bluh, bluh, bluh, who I don’t think actually knows what he was talking about a lot of the time, you know… how long have I got to be here for? And that’s how I feel with a lot of the training.” (L10, lines 202 – 205).

These were unsurprising reactions to CPD introduced to ensure lecturers achieved specific skills in order to teach in a specific manner, thus preventing them from exercising agency and autonomy in the classroom. In other words, as discussed in Chapter 2,

“... the training model provides an effective way for dominant stakeholders to control and limit the agenda, and places teachers in a passive role as recipients of specific knowledge.” (Kennedy, 2014, p339).
It is difficult to determine whether this model of CPD results in learning or if knowledge resulting from this learning is applied in the classroom, as evaluation studies of CPD rarely assess transfer of learning (Muijs et al, 2004). The findings showed that Foundations lecturers no longer wished to attend iPad training since they had already established which applications and methods of using the device were useful to them. In fact, some participants expressed a desire to find their own way of working with technology, relating it to their existing knowledge and deciding how best it would work for them (L11, L16). For example, L16 related that he did not need CPD to learn about technology given his prior experience and knowledge.

“… that's not an app, it's a Web 2, but it's great but you don't really need a PD session, you know. I didn't anyway, I know some people, I'm probably quite good on the techie stuff, a bit more than some people, true, but that…” (Interview 2, lines 48 – 50).

This example underlines the importance of exercising agency and employing prior experience and tacit knowledge to achieve effective and lasting learning.

A further significant point was that those who preferred to work independently had clearly made the decision to accept the imposition of technical skills, in particular iPads for Foundations lecturers, but perhaps to claim back some autonomy they preferred to work in their own way, at their own pace, as illustrated by L11’s comments

“ I haven’t found most of that useful, not because the PDs themselves were not good but because … we’ve already established ways of using
Kennedy proposed a significant and useful framework of questions, introduced in Chapter 2, to determine what kind of learning took place and for whose benefit. The following discussion will consider her framework for evaluating the models of CPD and their underlying agendas, summarised in the following questions:

1. What types of knowledge acquisition does the CPD support, i.e. procedural or propositional?
2. Is the principal focus on individual or collective development?
3. To what extent is the CPD used as a form of accountability?
4. What capacity does the CPD allow for supporting professional autonomy?
5. Is the fundamental purpose of the CPD to provide a means of transmission or to facilitate transformative practice? (Kennedy, 2014, p348)

Addressing Kennedy’s questions in this way allowed me to determine some of the underlying reasons why institutional CPD was generally perceived negatively, to respond to research question 2. As noted in Chapter 2, the type of knowledge acquisition supported by MEUC CPD was procedural for the development of technical skills. However, when CPD focused on topics of interest or professional need to lecturers, especially in the area of pedagogy, they viewed it favourably since it allowed them to acquire valuable propositional knowledge and relate it...
to their role in the classroom.

“So maybe that one was the best, we'll say that one was the best because it was the teachers discussing their problems...” (L16, lines 119-121).

The principal focus of the majority of CPD at MEUC was collective development since all Foundations lecturers were required to attain a similar set of skills to teach using an iPad. Other examples of collective development required lecturers from all departments to engage with CPD to acquire other technical skills such as the LMS BB9. Individual development was rarely encouraged as no needs analysis was ever conducted (L12, researcher’s personal experience) and lecturers’ prior experience and knowledge were not taken into account for CPD purposes (L6, L13). Significantly, the participants were aware that MEUC CPD promoted collective development as L5, L7, L8 and L9 in focus group 1 discussed how the use of technology obliged all lecturers to teach in a similar manner, labeling this “The Macdonaldisation of teaching.” (L7, FG2, line 400). In other words, a top-down managerial approach ensuring all educators learn and teach in a similar manner and align their teaching with institutional goals, removing the possibility of individual and creative teaching strategies in the classroom.

Lecturers were fully accountable to their institute for complying with institutional goals since they had to attend a specified number of CPD sessions (L6, L16), and demonstrate their ability to teach using an iPad during observations. This type of CPD

“... can serve either to equip teachers with the requisite skills to
implement such reforms as decided by others (usually government) …” (Kennedy, p247), as was the case at MEUC. However, those lecturers, mostly content and occasionally Foundations, who were able to choose their CPD, albeit limited offerings, did not find themselves accountable to a higher authority and, unsurprisingly, this was reflected in their more positive attitude to CPD, explored in greater depth in Chapter 5.

In summary, the data revealed lecturers’ concerns about the training model of CPD, with its focus on the acquisition of procedural knowledge and collective development. It also served as a means of accountability and, since lecturers’ were bound to this model of CPD, did not allow for professional autonomy. These concerns were manifested in the data as criticisms of the expertise of the trainer, the relevance of the content and the requirement that all lecturers teach in a similar manner.

4.2 Factors influencing negative perceptions of CPD

The discussion above illustrates how mandatory CPD affected participants’ perceptions of what they were required to learn and their desire and ability to engage with learning. Imposing a number of CPD sessions, therefore, was counterproductive, since feelings of frustration and resentment impacted negatively not only on participants’ view of CPD but also other elements linked to professional development. The factors influencing lecturers’ perceptions are
listed in Table 11 and the impact on perceptions and desire to engage with CPD is discussed below.

**Table 11: Factors influencing negative perceptions of CPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Foundations</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imposed number of CPD sessions</td>
<td>L5, L6, L7, L9, L10,</td>
<td>L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tick box mentality</td>
<td>L14, L16,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required for teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of choice</td>
<td>L6, L8, L9, L11, L13,</td>
<td>L12, L15,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD did not respond to lecturers’ expectations</td>
<td>L16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic not relevant/unnecessary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time for CPD</td>
<td>L5, L6, L7, L8, L9,</td>
<td>L10, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too focused on technology, iPad applications or materials development</td>
<td>L6, L7, L11, L12, L16,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD was not sufficiently personalised – no needs analysis carried out</td>
<td>L16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badly planned</td>
<td>L11, L16</td>
<td>L10, L12, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant change in CPD topics</td>
<td>L5, L7, L9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overwhelmed by the technology</td>
<td>L5, L6, L9,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of CPD and time required caused stress</td>
<td>L7, L8, L9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on professional identity</td>
<td>L5, L6, L9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not address behaviour management issues in the classroom</td>
<td>L11, L16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on technology at the expense of other CPD such as teaching and learning</td>
<td>L6, L7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant for teaching</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much CPD</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetitive</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of pedagogy underpinning CPD</td>
<td>L16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant for MEUC context</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not provide information about students’ professional expectations or the labour market (to inform teaching)</td>
<td>L15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No follow up or support provided</td>
<td>L17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative perceptions of trainer/presenter</td>
<td>L10, L17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 11 illustrates, the main criticisms of CPD were its mandatory nature, perceived lack of relevance, lack of time available to attend CPD and an overemphasis on technology. Other significant negative observations emphasised a lack of planning and the absence of a needs analysis to determine lecturers’ CPD needs and desires. For example, L12, who, having just completed a PhD, commented that he felt,

“... annoyed at them [management] for not taking the time to make sure that these sessions are tailored.” (Interview 2 lines 123-124).

Moreover, this approach to CPD prevented him from conducting research and attending conferences, a significant factor in his decision to leave MEUC in June 2016. (Interview 2, lines 77-94).

The model and content of CPD provided implied a number of assumptions. First, the type of knowledge valued and legitimised was, for the most part, technological, aligning with MEUC’s graduate outcome four (see Appendix 5), technological literacy. However, the number of sessions devoted to applications
for the iPad and technology based CPD was considered too high both locally at the institute and at the MEUC conferences. CPD was also described as repetitive and no longer necessary or beneficial (L5, L6, L11, L16), with L6 asserting,

“... I even like using the iPad in the class and that’s all I use but they went way too far one way with, with technology ...” (Interview 1, lines 136-137).

L12, in particular, was extremely critical of institutionally provided CPD on technology, to such an extent that he did not attend a single session at the bi-annual MEUC conference, stating,

“... the latest PD has been, to my mind, shocking ... an utter waste of my time.” (Interview 1, line 533).

Many felt technological training was prioritised at the expense of other important areas such as teaching special needs students or classroom management. L16 spoke of the increasing number of behavioural problems he was experiencing (Interview 2, lines 8-9), as did L11 who reported behavioural issues resulting, ironically, from students using an iPad in class,

“...the students are extremely distracted by the technology, their attention spans, I feel, have shrunk and that has implications for classroom management and we don't really address that at all....” (Interview, lines 139-141)

She pointed out the contradiction in banning mobile phones in the classroom when students were given an iPad with the same applications they normally used, Instagram and Snapchat, and physical concerns such as headaches and eyestrain, all of which distracted students resulting in a situation where
“...the actual learning and acquisition of language, which is essentially what we're supposed to be teaching them, has suffered.” (Interview, lines 162-164).

In agreement with L16 and L11, L10 expressed the need for CPD on classroom management: however, when provided it addressed successful strategies employed elsewhere and he questioned its effectiveness with MEUC students, stating,

“I don’t want to know about other colleges, I don’t want to go and attend somebody at Khalifa University or UAE, I want to know how it works in this college...” (Interview, lines 359-460).

According to L10 MEUC was unlike other institutes: contextualising learning and applying it in the context of MEUC was therefore fundamental to ensuring the relevance and effectiveness of CPD.

The continual introduction of new technology for use in the classroom was also negatively perceived as lecturers felt they were constantly learning new technologies only for them to be replaced with newer ones. L5, for example, felt overwhelmed by the technology, preventing her from learning,

“..every semester we start all over on something else and I just, you know I don't see it as a learning opportunity, I feel that we have to do it to do our job and I'm not advancing, I don't feel like I'm advancing...” (L5, lines 34-36).
L5 also recounted that she had previously enjoyed the technological CPD provided but the constant changes in technologies required for teaching and repeating the same CPD session to “...prove to our supervisor that we've been doing PD throughout the year...” (L5 interview, line 188) altered her positive view of CPD to a negative one. The following extract illustrates that it was not the technology itself L5 objected to, rather the pace of change, the lack of opportunity to implement what she learnt and how that affected her role in the classroom,

“If we could maybe just slow down with the technology side of things and let us sort of gradually integrate into say the iPad and the Apple Mac ... that would ... help and it would be far more satisfying to, to see your work and see it developing...” (FG1, lines 649-654).

L5’s narrative clearly indicated feelings of uncertainty and anxiety, which prevented her from fully engaging and making best use of the CPD, preventing genuine learning from occurring (Webster-Wright, p720).

Second, institutional goals, teaching through the medium of an iPad, were prioritised over educators’ goals. Even when lecturers at MEUC attended CPD their rationale was not always to engage with it but to comply with institutional requirements.

“It's not generally seen as something that's going to enhance your career prospects, it's something that you've got ... to do to put in your PAP folder ... for your appraisal at the end of the year and for many teachers I think that's how they view it.” (L14, lines 165-168).
Consequently, the pressure on educators to align their learning with institutional goals resulted in changes to practice they would not have voluntarily made, impacting on professional identity (Webster-Wright, 2009, p719). This is highlighted by L10, who, obliged to alter his professional practice as a result of mandatory CPD, commented,

“... you think why should I go to this, you know my Master's in Educational Technology and I'm being made to go to English teaching stuff…”

Furthermore, the obligation to engage with CPD which encompasses institutional goals can result in a lack of time to engage with CPD based on personal goals and values and therefore,

“Not only does the contemporary working context impose challenges related to balancing time and energy for professionals, it may also challenge perceptions of self.” (Webster-Wright, p719).

Perceptions of self were further challenged when lecturers, employing technology in the classroom before having fully mastered it, were unable to assist students in obtaining or using the technology, increasing stress levels even more (L7, L9, FG1, lines 612-619).

As discussed in Chapter 2, the knowledge legitimised by CPD indicated institutional expectations for lecturers to become proficient in technology rather than pedagogical skills (Groundwater-Smith & Dadds, 2004). Furthermore, prioritising proficiency in technology over pedagogical skills situated lecturers as technicians conforming to the demands of ‘performativity’ (Hargreaves, 1998).
and teaching standards, as stipulated by government mandate. Scholars have long warned of the dangers of such an approach to teaching: as noted above, the standardisation of practice through the imposition of technological CPD and the emphasis on institutional goals resulted in a lack of autonomy, feelings of stress due to constant change, lack of time and a denial of personal pedagogical values, which led to tension between what lecturers desired in CPD and what they were mandated to do.

Furthermore, Webster-Wright maintained that legitimising a particular type of knowledge undervalued local and context-sensitive knowledge (p713), a highly relevant point given the context of this research and the desire of lecturers to understand their students and their cultural background more deeply (discussed in Chapter 6).

As noted in Chapter 1, the MEUC climate was characterised by constant managerial change, producing uncertainty and anxiety for many educators, for example L6 spoke of his dissatisfaction and worry following changes to his employment conditions (Interview 1, lines 306-329) whilst L16’s frustration with institutional change contributed to his decision to resign. Perpetual change, related stress and a lack of time can all impact on educators’ perceptions of their role and professional identity and ultimately affect any intended learning from CPD initiatives (Webster-Wright, 2009). Moreover, imposing CPD in these circumstances can lead to a lack of engagement and desire to learn, as reported
by L10 who no longer wished to attend CPD focused on English Language Teaching.

“... because I’m in the English department you get made to sort of go to these English things which I have absolutely no interest whatsoever.”
(lines 164-166).

A further impact of the constant change in topics, reflecting changing institutional goals, was a lack of incentive to learn new technologies since change was inevitable “... so why ... invest all that time and energy when they’re just going to change it?” (L9, FG2, lines 292-293). Moreover,

“... that’s where a lot of the resistance to change comes to iPads or to Macs is ... change fatigue...” (L7, FG2, lines 294-295).

Added to the lack of incentive, perceptions of irrelevance exacerbated negative attitudes of CPD: L9 felt that much of the CPD was inappropriate for use with the technology provided or a learning management system such as BB9,

“... is kind of forced, you have to use your iPad, you've got to use a Mac but at the same time it's not really necessary for what we're using in BB9.”
(lines 46-47).

L11, L12 and L16 all supported L9’s view, especially as it may have been obligatory for the presenter,

“...that’s in no way relevant to anybody in that room but we all sit there politely because somebody’s forced the poor woman to do it.” (L11, FG2, lines 667-668),
while L6 explained that giving CPD to comply with institutional requirements could impact on its relevance and quality,

“You give a PD to say that I've done one for the appraisal thing whereas are you really giving a PD in something that's particularly useful and so you could be out there just giving PDs on just about anything, again just to [get] boxes ticked ...” (L6, FG1, lines 177-179).

Moreover, constant changes to the teaching context, promoting technical over pedagogical skills, and feelings of inadequacy in the classroom impacted on how lecturers viewed their role in the classroom since, as argued by Billot, changes in one’s professional role influence one’s sense of self (Billot, 2010, p712).

The discussion above indicates that mandatory CPD can have a number of detrimental effects on participants. The initial response to being obliged to employ technology in the classroom and attend CPD to gain requisite skills was one of resentment and frustration. Although participants did not explicitly say so, it can be theorised that their feelings were due to the lack of autonomy and inability to make their own decisions about teaching, based on their own extensive experience and pedagogical knowledge. Moreover, the resentment and negativity many of these lecturers experienced appeared to spill over into further areas where they criticised other aspects of CPD, for example stating it was badly planned,

“I think they need to be much better planned ... when I go to these sessions and like this is not what you told me you were going to do I get
really annoyed then and I just walk out cause I’m far too busy to be going
to something that’s not well planned and, or they don’t follow a plan.”
(L12, FG3, lines 575-579).

Others questioned the skills and knowledge of the trainers, who,
“... did it because they, they had to do something and so they were not
very sure of what exactly, how exactly to go about it.” (L17, Interview,
lines 168-170).

Four lecturers (12, 15, 16 and 17) considered that CPD was not sufficiently
personalised. Interestingly, three were content lecturers who were not subject
to ongoing obligatory CPD. L12, in particular, felt that CPD at MEUC could have
responded more effectively to lecturer’s needs, having worked in the provision
of CPD previously.

“... it wasn’t hard, with our technology tools to find out what people
wanted ... if you’re going to spend all this money ... to bring in a guest
speaker from the States ... why not spend the money on ten or fifteen
trainers that are already here in the UAE.” (Interview 2, lines 125-133).

As noted in 4.1, whilst the mandatory nature of CPD was viewed negatively and
explicitly stated by a number of lecturers (5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16 and 17) the
characteristics of CPD discussed above were also perceived as barriers to
learning, preventing lecturers from reaping the intended benefits of CPD. The
data revealed, therefore, that lecturers held a number of concerns about
institutionally provided CPD: the absence of a needs analysis and effective
planning; an over-emphasis on technology which distracted students and
hindered learning; a lack of focus on pedagogical topics; constant change in technologies required for teaching; and finally CPD which did not add value to lecturers’ careers resulting in wasted time, resources and money.

In the context of MEUC, where management imposed CPD, selected the topics and direction and did not allow adequate time either for the sessions or for application of skills and knowledge in the classroom, it was understandable that lecturers felt resentful at being obliged to attend CPD they had not chosen. This training model of CPD, the least likely to result in deep learning (Kennedy, 2005, 2014), removed professional autonomy and relegated lecturers to a passive role removing the right to choose and make independent decisions about their career growth. This potent mix of contextual elements surrounding CPD,

“... is powerful in maintaining a narrow view of teaching and education whereby the standardisation of training opportunities overshadows the need for teachers to be proactive in identifying and meeting their own development needs.” (Kennedy, 2005, p237).

In summary, in response to research questions 1 and 2, the majority of lecturers perceived the CPD opportunities provided at MEUC negatively due to its mandatory nature and the emphasis on technology at the expense of other areas of development they felt were lacking. A lack of personalised CPD, badly planned sessions and continual change in topics were also cited as factors contributing to their negative view.
Chapter 5: Findings - CPD and the role of experience and tacit knowledge

All participants in this study had extensive teaching experience, having been employed in institutes in different countries prior to their arrival at MEUC. This chapter presents positive perceptions of CPD both at MEUC and in previous institutes. It also provides an overview of what experienced educators appreciate and seek in CPD and career development opportunities, in contrast to and to balance the negative perceptions examined in Chapter 4. This overview is then aligned with Coldwell and Simkins’ (2011) evaluation model with the aim of addressing Pawson and Tilley’s (2004) question “What works for whom in what circumstances and in what respects, and how?” (p2), thereby responding to research question 2: What factors have influenced how MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities?

The chapter will end with a discussion of how tacit knowledge is represented in educators’ experience of CPD, its significance and the extent to which it informs their perceptions, attitudes and views of institutionally provided CPD. This discussion will, therefore, address research question 3: How do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers’ experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?
5.1 Positive perceptions of CPD

The findings revealed that a range of criteria, listed in Table 12, contributed to MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of beneficial and desirable CPD. These categories were also arrived at during the data analysis stage referred to in Chapter 4 for Table 11 and explained in Chapter 3.

Table 12: Factors influencing positive models of CPD
(Focus groups and interviews)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Foundations</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and collaboration with colleagues</td>
<td>L5, L6, L8, L9, L11, L13</td>
<td>L10, L12, L14, L15, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning from colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing materials/research with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to teaching</td>
<td>L5, L6, L7, L8, L9, L11, L13, L16</td>
<td>L12, L15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled a particular need, Relevant to professional role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-selected</td>
<td>L5, L6, L8, L9, L16</td>
<td>L10, L14, L16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interest</td>
<td>L6, L13</td>
<td>L10, L12, L14, L15, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presented by an authority on the subject</td>
<td>L8, L13</td>
<td>L10, L12, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An officially, recognised, accredited qualification</td>
<td>L8, L11, L13, L16</td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate use</td>
<td>L13, L15, L16</td>
<td>L14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well planned</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>L10, L12, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed career progression</td>
<td>L8, L13</td>
<td>L10, L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalised/tailored to the educator</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12, L15, L17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on a needs analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Detail</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gave the opportunity for academic study, research or attending conferences</td>
<td>L13</td>
<td>L12, L14, L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included experiential learning</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L10, L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported by the institution in terms of time of financial assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12, L14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant to UAE and MEUC classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td>L10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength based approach</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfortable environment</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available at relevant point in career</td>
<td>L11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilled participants’ expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built on previous CPD (continuity)</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>L17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built on prior knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>L12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Collaboration with colleagues

The most frequently reported factors were discussion and collaboration with colleagues, relevance to teaching and professional role, self-selection and personal interest. Apart from L16 (Foundations), all participants agreed that discussion and collaboration with colleagues represented learning to assist in understanding, acquire new skills or knowledge and take advantage of the experience of colleagues. For example, L11 stated that, when faced with a professional query, her first instinct was to ask colleagues to assist, whilst L12 indicated his satisfaction learning from peers,
“...I totally learn from everybody I work with and that’s one reason that I love being in this profession because I work with other people who are like-minded and willing to share their ideas...” (Interview, lines 483-485).

L10 also felt learning from and supporting colleagues was a valuable source of CPD: significantly, it was not recognised and, as such, resulted in evident frustration when he commented,

“... I’ve passed it on to plenty of teachers but none of that gets registered in here and you just get told you haven’t done PD...” (Interview, lines 244-245).

L14 felt that lecturers with different backgrounds contributed valuable learning and experience to the MEUC community,

“... that’s one of the benefits of having an expatriate team of teachers.... everybody’s had their own previous learning experiences that are entirely different, they bring their own flavour of teaching...” (Interview, lines 419-423).

L14’s appreciation of the diverse experiences of her colleagues and how they contributed to teaching and learning at MEUC underline the importance of the unique knowledge held by SIEs and the context of this study. It can be theorised, therefore, that SIEs require an approach to CPD that takes advantage of and promotes the diffusion of their experience and tacit knowledge. One way of doing so was voiced by L14 who indicated her desire to see a more collaborative approach to CPD through sharing research and that she would,

“... really love to see more sharing of ... academic knowledge so instead of just always just focusing on basic skills ... (Interview, lines 218-220).
Another way was learning from colleagues, which, according to L8, was “... equally as valuable, sometimes more...” (Interview, line 418) than learning from institutionally provided CPD

“because these are colleagues who face the same challenges as I do and therefore they are, I think, the best people to ask.” (Interview, lines 420-422).

As lecturers at MEUC were accorded limited professional autonomy many demonstrated autonomy by engaging with external CPD in their own time. Examples were self-selected conferences (L14, L17), research (L12), formal qualifications such as a Masters (L10), outside workshops (L15) and external courses (L6, L11, and L12) with other academic institutes. The choice of CPD by these participants reflected their professional and career goals. For example, L17 was a biologist originally and continued to attend conferences in her field, as did L12 in his field of Education Technology. All participants had already completed a Masters, a requirement of employment at MEUC. Nonetheless, L10, who had a strong negative attitude towards MEUC CPD, was studying towards a second Masters in an area of interest to him, History. Others had completed a doctorate (L12, L14, L17) and continued to research and publish for a number of reasons.

“... Well, I always loved studying so this is actually my fifth degree that I've got now. I've done so many, I just always seem to be studying and trying to improve myself and so on so if I can align that with my
professional career it seems like the thing to do and I always want to be better at what I do.” (L12, Interview, lines 447-450).

Formal qualifications such as these greatly enhance an educator’s career prospects and they can also result in “...a willingness to try new and innovative approaches and engage in discussion around practice with colleagues…” (Butcher and Stoncel, 2012, p153), reflected in L14’s statement,

“... I think if there was a more open and collaborative feel to the college there’d be much more sharing of academic knowledge, of experience of, you know, even sharing papers, researching together...” (Interview, lines 228-230).

This collaborative approach underlined the finding that all participants, bar one, felt that collegial discussion was the most beneficial form of CPD for professional learning, since it allows educators to share ideas and views, leading them to reflect on, understand and engage in deep professional learning.

In summary, therefore, the data revealed the importance lecturers attached to collaboration and learning from colleagues. It supports and complements formal learning which all lecturers had engaged with extensively prior to or during their employment at MEUC. Furthermore, it is most valuable when employed in a timely and relevant manner (Eraut, 2000, p419). For example, at MEUC, if a lecturer had a query with technology s/he tended to approach a colleague considered having the necessary expertise and so the knowledge solicited would respond to the query, which resided in the context of MEUC. As reported in
Chapter 2, the metaphors of participation, construction and becoming (Hager & Hodkinson, 2009) typified this type of learning: through interaction with colleagues knowledge was sought in order to participate in work practices and the knowledge constructed allowed the lecturer to become an individual able to perform the task.

**5.1.3 Self-selection, relevance and interest**

A number of lecturers felt CPD should be self-selected which mirrored their negative perceptions of imposed CPD. Ten lecturers felt CPD should be relevant to teaching and, whilst many felt there was an over-emphasis on technology in the classroom (L6, L7, L11, L12 and L16), some did appreciate opportunities to engage with technology, if self-selected and of interest. For example, L5 was enthusiastic about the technology CPD provided prior to the introduction of iPads for its usefulness and durability in the classroom,

“He gave a PD on the podcast screen and it’s been absolutely amazing. I still use it now and even though we’ve gone into all this new technology I can still use [it]...” (FG2, lines 237-238).

L13 also appreciated the opportunity to improve her technological skills using iPads and Blackboard in the classroom and was eager to source materials to continue this professional growth whilst L8, who felt she needed support with using technology, indicated that CPD helped her cope with it. Interestingly, L16, a foundations lecturer, viewed being able to teach with an iPad as an asset,
“... I can teach with the iPad, a lot of people still can't do that, you need to be able to do that, I think in this day and age ...” (Interview 1, lines 218-219).

Significantly, all five content lecturers found some technology focused CPD useful for their teaching, for example L12 was enthusiastic about a tailor-made training he had attended for designing mobile phone applications: however, this could be accounted for by the subject he taught, Educational Technology, and the fact that this training had been provided off-site to a limited number of technology specialists. L14 also appreciated technical CPD, summarising the general attitude to technology that if it was useful and interesting and allowed her to develop other areas of her work, it was welcomed,

“... personally I'm really interested in, in continuously developing my teaching materials so if there's something that, that is, specially techie stuff ... I can incorporate it into my teaching.” (Interview, lines 198-200).

Lecturers 15 and 17 employed technology in their teaching and so were happy to engage with this type of CPD. According to L17,

“One may not be used to a certain type of technology, here especially you’re using new technology all the time ... that definitely gives you a chance to learn and adopt it in your teaching and instruction ...” (Interview, lines 88-91).

However, an important point for these lecturers was that technical CPD was not imposed or required for their teaching: they chose to employ it and, as L17
pointed out, she selected her sessions carefully, considering what would be most beneficial for her.

“\text{I was selective in attending the PDs so I only attended the ones that were useful for me ...}” (lines 157-158).

The data revealed, therefore, that despite some lecturers’ negative perceptions of imposed technology related CPD, when self-selected, of personal interest and relevant to classroom needs, it was viewed more positively thereby influencing their perceptions of the CPD provided. This underlines the complexity of providing the most beneficial CPD for educators: whilst some resented institutional CPD, others saw it as useful for their professional practice and, in the case of L16 above, viewed it as career currency.

As noted, almost all lecturers stated that CPD should be relevant and useful to teaching and delivered at the appropriate time (L5, L6, L7, L8, L9, L11, L12, L13, L16). Lecturers 12, 13, 14 and 15 all demonstrated a proactive and positive attitude towards CPD in general and expressed their desire to learn new techniques and concepts which indicated that motivation to learn was a significant factor in how they related to CPD. Moreover, these lecturers expressed what they did and did not want quite clearly, indicating a degree of reflection on the benefits of CPD for their own professional growth and career, as summarised by L12.

“I think the timing is valid but it’s all about, for me, will it help and I think how, how personalised can it be. For example, when I give a lot of PD I
really try to find out, like what do you, Pauline, need to do with, with this...” (FG3, lines 188-190).

L14 expressed her interest and pleasure in engaging with different CPD avenues to broaden her professional thinking, was highly self-directed in having completed a professional doctorate and displayed a positive and proactive attitude to CPD (L14, FG4, lines 327-338) but with the proviso that it was self-selected.

“Well, the lack of choice is, is something that PD, you know, is all about, I mean you should choose your PD, it should be something that you feel is useful and valid.” (L14, FG4, lines 131-133).

L13 was also aware that the effect of engaging with CPD she appreciated made her feel valued by her previous employer which, in turn, had a positive influence on her own attitude towards CPD.

“And they were nice hotels and you just felt like they valued it because the put resources into it, so I think it, the level of professionalism displayed by them in setting up the PD influenced me to do it and also gave me an idea of how it should be if I were to give PD myself.” (L13, FG 4, lines 215-218).

The data further revealed that lecturers valued relevant and professionally planned CPD. To summarise, therefore, if educators are given the freedom to choose their CPD, according to what they perceive as relevant and useful and if it is well planned and supported by the institute, this could build morale and
consequently engender loyalty to the institute. This is significant for expatriate educators, as they have been described as “…following their own career values and targeting subjective career success.” (Cao et al, 2013, p58). Furthermore, Chapman et al found that in the UAE “Neither universities nor many instructors seek or want long-term organizational commitment.” (2014, p141). However, if engagement with valued CPD resulted in loyalty to the institute this could potentially change the perspective of expatriate educators, benefit the institute and impact on the theoretical SIE profile.

5.2 Coldwell and Simkins’ conceptual framework

The discussion above indicates, in agreement with much of the literature reviewed in this study (Eraut, 2007, Boud and Middleton, 2003, Hager and Hodkinson, 2009), a preference for a model of CPD that provides opportunities for interaction and learning from colleagues, particularly if relevant to teaching, self-selected and of personal interest. At the same time, lecturer CPD preferences were extremely varied (see Table 12) and related to individual circumstances and personal goals, for example, L14 was happy to learn about technology when it assisted with teaching but also wished to attend conferences and become more involved with colleagues both for teaching and research activities. L12 wished to follow a similar path in order to strengthen his position as a researcher. However, L16 felt CPD, which targeted classroom management strategies and was of a practical nature, would be most beneficial for him. The diversity of views regarding beneficial CPD was challenging to reconcile and theorise. However, Coldwell and Simpkins’ work on level models (2011) offered
a flexible framework, which allowed all perceptions, expectations and needs of CPD to be represented.

The table below presents Coldwell & Simkins’ conceptual framework, how it relates to the CPD activities provided and how individual and contextual factors can contribute to or detract from the success of any initiative. Whilst compiling Table 13 I selected ‘antecedent’ for any factor which existed prior to engagement with a CPD initiative and ‘moderating factor’ for any which influenced the effectiveness of CPD during or after the initiative. For example, the time available for CPD would be considered an antecedent since it impacted on participants’ motivation to engage with CPD. Relevance to teaching would only be revealed during the CPD session and so was considered a moderating factor, potentially impacting on how participants engaged with CPD. Personal factors related to those variables within the control of or emanating from the individual whilst contextual were within the control of or emanating from the institute.

### Table 13: Coldwell & Simkins’ conceptual framework and MEUC CPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Interventions</strong></th>
<th><strong>CPD activities</strong></th>
<th><strong>Training designed to equip lecturers with technological or pedagogical skills</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Antecedents**   | Factors which influence how participants benefit from CPD initiatives | **Personal**  
Existing perceptions of CPD  
Intrinsic motivation – personal desire to engage with CPD  
Extrinsic motivation – can be influenced by factors listed below  
Time available outside of professional duties |
|                              | Existing level of skill
|                              | Institutional support
| **Moderating factors**       | **Contextual**
|                              | Time provided
|                              | Whether imposed or voluntary
| Variables within an          | Impact of CPD on student learning
| institution which determine  | Impact of CPD on student behaviour
| if and how intermediate      | Relevance to teaching
| outcomes can lead to final   |Extent to which CPD addresses
| outcomes                    | lecturers’ needs/desires
|                              | Perception of trainer
|                              | Perceived level of preparation
| **Personal**                 | Ongoing management changes
|                              | Ongoing changes to conditions of employment
|                              | Rate of change in CPD topics
|                              | Level of personalisation
|                              | Support provided including financial
|                              | Opportunity to transfer
|                              | skills/knowledge to classroom teaching
| **Intermediate outcomes**    | **Classroom/contextual**
| CPD outcomes considered to   | Lecturers employ technological or
| be necessary to produce      | pedagogical skills in the classroom
| final outcomes, specifically | Students are exposed to selected
| concerning participant       | technology or teaching strategies
| behaviour                   | Student use of technology
|                              | **Final outcomes**
| Anticipated outcomes of the  | **Classroom/contextual**
| CPD initiative, specifically | Lecturers employ technological or
| outcomes within the         | pedagogical skills in the classroom
| institution, teachers and   | Students are exposed to selected
| students                   | technology or teaching strategies
|                              | Student use of technology
I also aligned the MEUC CPD context with Coldwell and Simkins’ (2011) level model diagram of interventions, antecedents, moderating factors, intermediate and final outcomes to clarify the relationship between all variables (see Figure 7): only selected variables from Table 13 were included due to lack of space. Those selected were based on the specific context, for example, since the focus of this study was perceptions of lecturers, these were included in the ‘antecedents’. Likewise, an element which impacted on lecturers’ perceptions was the trainer and so this was included in the ‘moderating factors’. The outcomes were also significantly different from Coldwell and Simkins’ model since the strategic objectives of MEUC CPD was lecturer and student competence with technology. However, this study also investigated whether CPD resulted in other outcomes such as professional transformation (Kennedy, 2014) or lecturer autonomy so these were included in the final outcomes.
Figure 7: Coldwell & Simkins' conceptual framework and MEUC CPD

**Antecedents:**
- Lecturers' perceptions of CPD initiative
- Lecturers' expectations and motivations
- Lecturers' perceptions of institute

**Intermediate outcomes 1:**
- Lecturer perceptions of using technology

**Intermediate outcomes 2:**
- Learning and ability to use technology

**Intermediate outcomes 3:**
- Transfer of skills/knowledge acquired to classroom teaching

**Moderating factors:**
- Institutional support for CPD
- Time allocated for CPD and application
- Student behaviour
- Trainer/presenter

**Final outcomes 1:**
- Student use of technology
- Enhancement of student learning through use of technology
- Improved student behaviour

**Final outcomes 2:**
- Career development
- Positive perceptions of CPD initiative
- Lecturer autonomy
- Professional transformation

**Final outcomes 3:**
- Lecturer ability to employ technology
- Peer support in employing technology
- Team ability to employ technology
- Changes in teaching
- Continuing mastery of technology
The model presented in Figure 7 is complex: however, it provides an overview of selected variables in the MEUC CPD context. Coldwell and Simkins reported that their model evolved and became more complex as they applied it in practice, having to modify the variables according to the intervention they were evaluating. The MEUC model therefore follows their reasoning of developing the model heuristically, taking into account the objectives of the initiative as well as the reactions of participants to CPD. This was a key benefit of this model as I was able to employ it effectively to reflect the situation at MEUC and to indicate variables of CPD along with the intended outcomes, for the institute and lecturers. Coldwell and Simkins noted that participant motivation differed and “such motivations could lead to engagement in ways that were inconsistent with the programme’s presumed primary objective…” (p149). This was also the case at MEUC where the programme objectives (competence in technology) differed from some participants’ objectives. For example, as noted, many lecturers were keen to engage with classroom management strategies rather than additional applications for iPads whilst L8’s motivation for attending CPD was the presenter and L13’s was to pursue academic activities.

Motivation, therefore, could also differ from lecturer to lecturer so antecedents equally can differ according to the individual, increasing the complexity of the model and providing input for further development of the model. Coldwell and Simkins reported the importance of how participants’ motivations influenced their engagement with CPD and how this affected their experience of the initiative. As
noted, at MEUC, lecturer motivation, or lack of it, to engage in CPD was crucial to any subsequent learning.

As reported in Chapter 2, Coldwell and Simkins also presented the theoretical underpinnings for their level model, considering positivist, realist and constructivist positions. They argued that whilst positivist evaluation of a CPD initiative can indicate whether it has been successful, it cannot say why it is successful. Realist evaluation, such as that employed by Pawson and Tilley (1997), and discussed in the next section, “... share the ontological position that there are real, underlying causal mechanisms that produce regularities observable in the social world.” (Coldwell & Simkins, p151). Coldwell and Simkins aligned their level model to this theory of evaluation with the proviso that it understated “... the complexity of the social world...” (p151). However, such evaluation theory can indicate why and how a CPD initiative works. The final position, constructivist, sees each CPD initiative as highly contextual with a wide range of variables that require representation within any evaluation. Given the number of variables indicated in the MEUC model depicted in Figure 7, constructivist evaluation lends itself to this study, especially in view of the qualitative approach adopted overall. However, Coldwell and Simkins argued that an approach, which “views learner, context, and learning as inextricably inter-related, and investigates the experience of PL as constructed and embedded with authentic professional practice” (Webster-Wright, 2009, p713), is very different from that represented in level models. However, I would argue that, to promote continuing engagement with CPD, an initiative needs to allow for PL, especially in a scenario
where lecturers are subject to ongoing CPD on specific topics, as was the case at MEUC.

In summary, the data revealed a variety of diverse reasons for the success of a CPD initiative, which I was able to incorporate into Coldwell and Simkins’ model, to illustrate some of the factors that influenced how MEUC SIE lecturers perceived institutionally provided CPD.

5.3 Pawson and Tilley’s Realist Evaluation

Pawson and Tilley took a pragmatic approach to evaluating programmes, in this case CPD initiatives, to determine “What works for whom in what circumstances and in what respects, and how?” (2004, p2). Such a question implies that not every CPD initiative will work for everyone so it is crucial not only to find out what works but also how and why it works for each individual engaging with the CPD. In order, therefore, to answer the question above it was necessary to consult those engaging in CPD since they are best placed to answer what works for them, and why. A key question, raised in Chapter 2, therefore, was whether institutionally provided CPD passed into the hearts and minds of the participants of this study.

Realist evaluation is based on four interrelated concepts, as reported in Chapter 2. These are presented in Table 14 along with their relevance to the MEUC context.
**Table 14: Pawson & Tilley’s conceptual framework and MEUC CPD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How individuals engage with the process of learning, influenced by factors such as level of motivation, perceived utility. “... how subjects interpret and act upon the intervention...” (p6)</td>
<td>Level of motivation&lt;br&gt;Level of engagement&lt;br&gt;Perceived utility of CPD&lt;br&gt;Perceptions of CPD/trainer etc&lt;br&gt;Response to mandatory CPD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Context | Circumstances surrounding the programme “...features of the conditions in which programmes are introduced ...” (p7) | MEUC context<br>Top down mandatory CPD<br>Limited time available<br>Focus on technology<br>Constant change in technology topics<br>Constant management change |

| Outcome | What participants learn and what they do with what they have learnt. : “…intended and unintended consequences of programmes...” (p8) | Intended<br>Technical skills and proficiency<br>Pedagogical skills<br>Transfer to practice<br>Exposure of students to skills for their acquisition<br>Unintended<br>Impact of perceptions of CPD<br>Disengagement from learning<br>Disengagement from teaching |

| Context-mechanism-outcome pattern configuration | Explanation of why initiatives work or do not work. “... models indicating how programmes activate mechanisms amongst whom and in what conditions ...” (9) | Reasons given by participants in this study for the success or otherwise of CPD initiatives at MEUC. |

Pawson and Tilley maintained that those who initiate interventions, policy-makers, believe that the implementation of interventions into existing social systems can bring about changes that will improve the system. However, the multiplicity of
factors impacting on and influencing human behaviour are too great for an intervention to improve all aspects of the system and so,

“A key requirement of realist evaluation is thus to take heed of the different layers of social reality which make up and surround programmes.” (p4).

During this investigation it was necessary, therefore, to identify and understand the elements instrumental in the success or otherwise of institutionally provided CPD. The wide variety of views on CPD initiatives clearly suggested that each participant held a different perception of the type of CPD that would work for him or her, aligning with Pawson and Tilley’s realist evaluation. For example, as the data revealed, what worked for L12 was the opportunity to attend conferences and conduct research in the circumstances of having recently completed a PhD, to reinforce his position as a researcher, through allocation of support and time. However, what worked for L10 was the opportunity to move in a different direction in his circumstances of dissatisfaction as an English for Academic Purposes (EAP) lecturer by pursuing his interests in technology or history through specific training or CPD. All other participants of this study had their own particular circumstances, which determined what would work for them and, significantly, were all able to articulate how and why it would work for them.

Pawson and Tilley pointed out the challenges in reporting the success of an intervention due to the unlimited number of mechanisms and contexts. However, whilst emphasising these challenges, they argued that the results of an evaluation are still valuable if “… we accept that the action of a mechanism makes sense of the
particular outcome pattern observed.” (p16, italics in original). In other words, to understand whether or not an intervention works, it is necessary to understand how the mechanisms and context impact on the outcome. For example, for L8 the trainer was a crucial factor in her perception of CPD and, therefore, needed to correspond to her perception of how a trainer should present the initiative whilst for L6 and L16 CPD needed to be of direct relevance to classroom teaching to work for them. For this study, Pawson and Tilley’s model allowed me to identify how the mechanisms and context influenced the outcomes: in other words, to understand which characteristics of CPD, according to the participants, contributed to or detracted from its success. I was then in a better position to offer explanations for what works and to offer recommendations for improvements to CPD at MEUC (see Chapter 7).

This section addressed positive perceptions of CPD and how these perceptions impacted on lecturers’ desire to engage with CPD. The data revealed that a wide variety of factors influenced how lecturers at MEUC perceived the CPD opportunities provided. As Table 12 illustrates, the most common were the opportunity for collaboration with colleagues, the ability to choose one’s CPD according to one’s interests and whether it was relevant to lecturers personally or for their classroom practice. Other factors cited were if the CPD was planned according to lecturers’ professional needs, allocation of time and the expertise of the trainer. Given the number of different factors cited and the number of participants in this research, the two models discussed above aligned most closely with the findings presented. I, therefore, employed both Coldwell and Simkins’ and Pawson and Tilley’s evaluation
models since they constituted a sound representation of the factors that influenced lecturers’ perceptions of CPD.

5.4 Tacit knowledge

The following section explores the importance and value of tacit knowledge for participants’ professional practice, achieved through discussion and collaboration with colleagues in response to research question 3: How do lecturers’ experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?

The training model of CPD, designed to equip all lecturers with the same skills regardless of existing or previous knowledge and skills, in the absence of a needs analysis, did not acknowledge participants’ previous experience or tacit knowledge. For some participants, this resulted in a lack of fit between CPD and what they required in the classroom. For example, L14, when asked whether she felt CPD at MEUC took account of her existing knowledge and skills, replied,

“No, not usually. They're fairly generic style PD sessions that, you know, if they start at scratch in a big group that you already know half of the stuff, you just have to sit there and listen.” (Interview, lines 116-118).

Like L14, some participants were aware that the CPD did not fulfill their needs and were able to articulate this. For example, L12 attributed his dissatisfaction with CPD to the lack of a tailored fit, a view that was supported by L15 and L17. However, although L10 was clear about his lack of engagement with CPD, he did not explicitly state it was due to a bad fit: nonetheless, this can be inferred from his comments
about CPD he was obliged to attend and that which he would like to attend. So while some participants were aware, some were not: nonetheless it cannot be ruled out that they held a tacit understanding of the lack of alignment between CPD and their professional needs.

The participants in this study all had a considerable number of years teaching experience prior to their employment with MEUC as well as the years within this particular context. Their tacit knowledge therefore could be assumed as being made up of previous teaching experience, previous experience of other overseas contexts and experience acquired at MEUC. All lecturers, bar two, agreed there was a lack of recognition of previous knowledge and experience. For example, L11 pointed out, “… because most of the PDs have been about all the new technology then it hasn’t really built on other things, other experiences and qualifications.” (lines 99-100), and both she and L13 agreed there was an assumption that lecturers already had a “… certain level of understanding and basic skills but… I have rarely felt that something was particularly tailored to where I am.” (lines 104-105).

This particular theme was significant since, as noted, all lecturers came to MEUC with a number of years of teaching experience and post-graduate study and, since no needs analysis for CPD had been carried out, it appears that limited value was attributed to lecturers’ experience and tacit knowledge. The non-use, therefore, of this wealth of pedagogical knowledge almost certainly resulted in frustration and
resentment, impacting on lecturers’ identity as professional educators, as illustrated in the comments above (L10, L12, L16).

L12 indicated that he had assimilated knowledge from a colleague, whose field of expertise was special needs, while they were both attending CPD on the subject “…I sort of, by osmosis, absorbed a lot of special needs [knowledge]…”, (Interview 1, line 97). This, consequently, contributed to his role as an educational technologist and allowed him to strengthen his knowledge in this area to assist other educators with special needs students.

“… people always come to me with special needs requests… I just found that one session was quite well done and very interesting to tie together some of the different strands that I think I was missing.”

It appears, therefore, that tacit knowledge, by osmosis, and experience played a role in the creation of new knowledge in this example. Interestingly, having become aware of the new knowledge L12 was able to articulate it as explicit knowledge whilst recognizing that he had absorbed tacit knowledge to create the new explicit knowledge.

As noted in Chapter 2, a significant attribute, therefore, of tacit knowledge is its role in creating explicit knowledge (Polanyi, 1966, p7). However, according to Sternberg et al (2000), explicit learning may reduce the possibility of tacit knowledge being developed. At MEUC the emphasis on explicit, codified learning such as that provided in the training model of CPD may, therefore, have hindered the development and deployment of tacit knowledge. As noted in Chapter 2, tacit
knowledge serves as a reference base for explicit knowledge, informing it in complex and varied ways and resulting in a unique store of personal knowledge for each individual. Given the experience and skills of these participants it can be assumed that each held a vast store of personal knowledge, tacit and explicit, which informed not only their teaching and professional activities but also allowed them to make intuitive and automatic decisions in the classroom, drawing on their tacit knowledge to resolve challenges as they arose. When faced with a challenge, therefore, it is unlikely that a one-size-fits-all model of CPD would provide the necessary information, knowledge, skills or practical solution sought, for two reasons. First, the model at MEUC was not designed or intended to respond to individual classroom challenges, rather to equip lecturers with the skills to deliver their lessons according to a government mandated initiative. Second, what lecturers sought when faced with challenges was highly contextual and particular to their situation of teaching Emirati students and, therefore, solutions were based on the challenge within this specific context. As L14 pointed out,

“...you try and do the PD that's available to, to help you but, there's a lot of filling in the gaps by yourself if you want to make sure that you can ... meet your needs for the new courses that you've got to teach.”

Moreover, L8’s comment that, when seeking answers, she approached her colleagues since they were aware of the challenges she faced in the classroom (Interview, lines 108-110) illustrates the need to understand how educators support one another and provide invaluable professional development and growth.
The data revealed that institutionally provided CPD did not take account of lecturers’ prior knowledge and experience and, furthermore, did not always respond to their professional needs and desires. As a result, they were obliged to obtain the information required to do their job from a different source, generally colleagues. The data further revealed that all lecturers at MEUC, with the exception of L16, considered collaboration with colleagues a valuable and beneficial form of learning.

The importance of tacit knowledge is, therefore, clear. In sharing existing knowledge and experience lecturers are able to tap into their colleagues’ unique base of tacit knowledge and, as noted in Chapter 2, since tacit knowledge can be revealed through discussion or behaviour (Matthew & Sternberg, 2009), learning activities based on these were crucial to lecturers at MEUC. In approaching colleagues lecturers were seeking answers to questions: however, in answering these questions colleagues were making explicit knowledge they held, very possibly tacit knowledge, since it is likely that they only retrieved the knowledge required for the answer having been asked the question. To summarise, professional learning which responds to specific challenges educators face and which is provided by experts sharing the same contextual challenges is highly valued and, since tacit knowledge is viewed as the basis for all knowledge it is crucial to the building of a highly knowledgeable and skilled workforce (Matthew & Sternberg, 2009).

As noted, all lecturers, bar one, expressed their appreciation of a model of professional learning which allowed for collaboration with colleagues whilst that provided by the institute was a mandatory training model, the characteristics of which were outlined in Chapter 4. The tension between these models resulted in a
number of implications for professional identity, to be discussed in Chapter 6. How an educator views his or her own role in the organisation is paramount to maintaining motivation and desire to engage with further learning (Schostak et al, 2010), in this case, institutionally provided CPD. Being obliged to attend CPD, which does not align with an educator’s pedagogical beliefs and values, creates a tension that must be acknowledged and addressed. Lecturers who were able to acknowledge and deal with this tension in a satisfactory manner were then able to carry out their professional duties without losing motivation. Examples were lecturers 13, 14, 15 and 17 who were all proactive in fulfilling their professional development needs in other areas such as attending conferences, conducting research or engaging with academic study and, consequently, were able to maintain a professional identity which reflected their sense of self. L12, on the other hand, unable to reconcile his professional learning desires with the CPD provided at MEUC and, resentful of devoting his time to what he considered to be substandard CPD, resigned.

In summary, in response to research question 3, the data revealed that experience and tacit knowledge derived from this experience played a fundamental role in shaping lecturers’ perceptions of institutional CPD. Their experience and tacit knowledge allowed them to evaluate and acknowledge the shortcomings of much of the CPD and, accordingly, they compensated for these shortcomings by completing their knowledge base or skills set, as required. The data further revealed the importance of a collaborative approach to learning, which takes account of educators’ professional role, their varied interests and tacit knowledge, accrued
throughout their years of experience, and how lecturers approach colleagues to benefit from their experience and tacit knowledge.
Chapter 6: Findings - CPD for SIEs and cultural intelligence

6.1 CPD for self-initiated expatriates: settled and unsettled expatriates

This chapter reports on the factors influencing lecturers’ perceptions of CPD from their perspective as self-initiated expatriates, in response to research question 2: what factors have influenced how MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities? Of particular interest in this research was the participants’ profile as SIEs since this represents an area of, until recently, relatively unexplored research. Therefore, to determine how the characteristics of this profile influenced lecturers’ views of the CPD provided by their institute I address research question 4, how did the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding this profile impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and their desire to engage with it? In addition, the particular circumstances of being employed as an SIE at MEUC are explored to determine the extent to which they affected lecturers’ desire to participate in CPD on an institutional level. During this study and the exploration of the SIE profile, I identified two types of SIE at MEUC, which I have named settled and unsettled expatriates. I will first explain the differences in the two profiles I have identified and then present data to support my emerging theory.

As noted in Chapter 2, the participants in this research were defined by their distinctive SIE profile (Cao et al, 2012), described as holding individual goals (Doherty, 2013) a protean career attitude, strong career network and cultural intelligence (Cao et al, 2012): in other words, knowing-why, knowing-whom and
knowing-how, respectively. Furthermore, they are considered to prioritise to their own values over those of the institute and, consequently, CPD with the aim of achieving institutional goals did not always respond to their career growth priorities or desires. An example was L12 who, having completed his PhD, wished to engage in professional inquiry but could not envisage doing so since there was minimal support at MEUC.

"Yeah, ‘cos I like it here and I would be, I would stay but I just don’t see a future here for me and with my contract ending and getting my PhD.” (Interview 1, lines 720 – 721).

He subsequently resigned and found a position at a leading Australian university where he could achieve his personal goals.

However, the findings suggest that a number of lecturers, having been employed long-term at MEUC, held more diverse career goals and CPD requirements. Their personal circumstances also appeared to play a role in how they viewed their employment with MEUC and career growth within the institute. L14 had worked in various departments at MEUC over a period of sixteen years whilst L8 had spent fifteen years up to retirement at MEUC and L6 stated explicitly his desire to remain at MEUC until retirement.

“... I really thought what was on offer here was something that I could see out and probably see through to retirement.... ” (Interview 1, lines 290-292).
Financially, MEUC provided an attractive package for lecturers with children since schooling, housing and medical insurance were provided. However, as L6 reported, the employment conditions had deteriorated which profoundly influenced his level of motivation and engagement not only in the classroom but also towards CPD. The following extract illustrates his concerns about his situation,

“...where can I go cos I can't go back to Korea and you know there may be other options around here but the kids have kind of settled a little bit and I really think I've been pushed into a corner ... basically the package is getting whittled away ...I've decided to become an IELTS examiner for professional reasons but also for financial reasons...it's really hurt the way that I feel about the place.” (Interview 1, lines 295-303).

As noted in Chapter 2, Richardson and Zikic (2007) identified considerable disadvantages of the SIE career due to the temporary nature of the employment and challenges faced settling into a new country. However, L6’s narrative indicated there are further disadvantages arising from changes to employment conditions, management structure and classroom responsibilities, which subsequently impacted on his desire to engage with CPD. For educators without family commitments MEUC may still represent an attractive package since any subsequent move to another country is far easier logistically, financially and emotionally, as was the case for L12, married with no children, and L16, who was single. However, for those with commitments, the SIE profile does not appear to capture their motivation, career growth desires and personal situation.
L14 was married to an Iraqi with his own successful business in the UAE. Moreover, they had three children, all schooled in the UAE and paid for by MEUC. As reported, L14 was also highly proactive in pursuing professional growth, having completed an EdD, was actively involved in academic research and attended institutional CPD when she viewed it as relevant and useful. It would appear, therefore, that the personal circumstances of each lecturer were instrumental in how they viewed their employment and career development: as noted in Chapter 2, educators having chosen a long-term career in the UAE appeared to invest themselves not only in CPD provided but also CPD they pursued individually outside of the institute. The findings of this study have therefore identified two groups of SEEs, who, as noted in Chapter 2, differed in their personal goals and values. Since this finding makes a significant contribution to existing theory, I have named these two groups settled expatriates, those who remain in a country for an extended duration of time due to personal, financial or family commitments and, unsettled expatriates, those with fewer commitments and who move around from contract to contract or country to country with much more ease. Figure 8 illustrates the differences in profile between these two groups as well as that identified in the literature (Cao et al, 2012, Doherty et al, 2013).
A major difference between the existing theoretical profile and that of settled expatriates was their expectations about staying in the host country. According to Cerdin and Selmer (2014), SIEs do not expect to stay long-term: however, this study identified a number of SIEs who had spent a considerable length of time in the UAE and, at the time of the research, had no plans to leave, as noted above. The intention to settle or not in the UAE reflected a difference in attitude towards CPD. Those who viewed MEUC as a temporary contract prioritised their own career development goals, which impacted on their desire to engage with institutional CPD. However, those who viewed MEUC as long-term employment made use of institutional CPD to enable them to operate in the classroom. In addition, they
engaged with CPD, which supported their personal goals, bringing them professional and personal satisfaction. For example, L15 who had moved to the UAE from Hungary with his family rated the CPD at MEUC as “... much better...” (Interview, line 196) than his previous institutes and L5 who has been employed at MEUC for 17 years had a similar positive attitude.

“Well I've learnt things here, for example Erasma which I've then used in my classroom and I've used for observations, you know my, my staff evaluation and it was wonderful, it was amazing you know, my supervisor was really impressed with the technology that I was using and I've just found that the PD that I've done here has been so much more useful in the classroom.” (Interview, lines 74 – 78).

In summary, the data revealed that the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding this profile had a significant impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of MEUC CPD. Those who were settled in the UAE with family commitments tended to view MEUC CPD more positively, although some were selective in their approach, whilst of the four lecturers I have identified as unsettled, L10, L12, L13 and L16, only L13 conceded that some CPD was useful.

A further difference between unsettled and settled expatriates was their attitude to cultural constraints, which I have described as culturally aware and culturally intelligent, a difference which is justified in Section 6.2.
6.2 CPD for cultural concerns

Possibly the most significant characteristic of being an SIE, was the requirement to address and accept cultural differences in the workplace and the classroom. Cultural intelligence or knowing how, was evident, to varying degrees, with all participants in this study. Both the focus groups and the one-to-one interviews generated discussions that demonstrated lecturers’ awareness of their responsibility to engage with and support students. The topic of whether expatriate educators had specific CPD requirements due to their particular SIE profile was first introduced in the focus groups and followed up during the one-to-one interviews. The importance accorded to cultural awareness and achieving cultural intelligence by MEUC lecturers became evident and was summarised by L14 who stated,

“We might have a broader scope of what, what we would include in our PD perhaps, if you’ve been in the same environment for, you know, X amount of years you would be very narrowly focused I guess, this is a very general comment but as expatriates we’re possibly used to lots of different challenges, different environments interculturally as well that may make us as individuals more open and looking for different PD opportunities than perhaps if you’d been in the same job all that time.” (FG 4, lines 367 – 373).

The discussions revealed unanticipated views of how the participants related to students from a different culture and their desire to understand how best to fulfill their teaching responsibilities are reported below. Most lecturers perceived a need for CPD for expatriate educators new to the UAE, which could be broken down into
three areas, interaction with students, information about students and aspects of the culture.

First, interaction with students was considered crucial by L14 who asserted,

"... interaction with the students is critical to whether you’re going to ... achieve your goal of learning and developing the students...” (lines 271-273).

L6 pointed out the lack of support provided for special needs students and suggested that CPD could improve lecturer-student relations,

“...those students, you know if you going to take them in, then there needs to be something happening in PD so that you can work better with those students...” (FG1, lines 138-140).

Information about students included the academic level of students and how this impacted on teaching (L13, L17), educational and family background (L16), career prospects (15), the labour market, potential employers and their expectations, and the type of role students were being prepared for. For example, L12 and L13 indicated that information about the cultural background of students, in particular information about students’ lives before they enter and when they graduate from MEUC was not available and stated,

“We're never given advice on what to say to our students about their family life ...” (FG2, L12, lines 357-358)

while L14 suggested that CPD about certain cultural issues such as how to deal with single sex classes, especially for lecturers of the opposite sex, would be useful.
The third area, aspects of the culture, involved being aware of what was acceptable and not acceptable in an Emirati Arabic culture. This was considered essential to avoid challenging and uncomfortable scenarios since L10, L13 and L17 had all experienced unpleasant incidents with students when they first started teaching at MEUC. All three recognised that these incidents could have been avoided had they understood certain of the aspects outlined above, particularly in relation to interaction with students and academic expectations. Lecturers also reported a need to be aware of and sensitive to students’ ‘special’ status in the country as nationals, religion, gender differences, topics of conversation in class and generally to have an understanding of the students’ cultural framework. The participants, therefore, reached a common understanding that, as SIE educators, they could benefit from CPD, which would allow them to understand and engage with the cultural challenges they faced. In addition, they expressed a desire for context specific information that would facilitate their professional role and which could also be presented in institutional CPD.

For example, L15 underlined a lack of information about student career prospects and identified further areas that lecturers needed to be aware of, which he defined as cultural, institutional and national.

“... three areas would definitely helped me, ... what I received as information in bits and sometimes it was rather self developments, it was myself that collected the information. The three areas are the cultural areas, the national areas and the institutional areas.” (FG 4, lines 398 – 401)
Since information about these areas was unavailable he had researched them himself and whilst the former was addressed through talking to other lecturers and students, he identified a lack of explicit information about the curriculum, assessment and institutional structure. In addition, he indicated that information about the national labour market would be useful, a significant point given that the labour market in the UAE is subject to an Emiratisation policy, the aim of which is to ensure a maximum of Emiratis are employed in the public and private sectors. Understandably this lack of information raised questions for the participants, clearly expressed by L10.

“...I've been working with the engineering for many years now, about eight years now and we've had female engineers go through and you think there aren't jobs for all of these people, it's impossible, where do they go? No idea. What are we really training them for?” (FG4, lines 431-435).

This last point illustrates the significance of the particular context of this study: in a country of 8.5 million non-Emirati residents and 1 million Emiratis (Snoj, 2015), with an unemployment rate of 23.1% for under twenty-fives (CIA, 2016), the role of the educator in government funded HE is crucial to ensuring that Emiratis are ready for the workforce. However, the lack of information available about where students become employed, the labour market and associated cultural issues clearly had an impact on how MEUC lecturers perceived their role, ability to engage with students and professional growth needs.
6.2.1 Cultural intelligence and cultural awareness

Although it can be argued that educators generally wish and need to have enough information about their students to tailor their courses effectively, the distinctiveness of the MEUC context, the difference in cultural norms and general lack of information all contributed to a unique situation for MEUC lecturers. As argued by Cao et al (2012) and noted in Chapter 2, cultural intelligence is a prerequisite for success in a country where the host culture is different to one’s own. The participants of this study indicated their cultural awareness: however, I would argue that cultural awareness and cultural intelligence are two different concepts, although they could be perceived as points on a continuum. For example, cultural awareness might be awareness that the host culture has a different religion from one’s own or that certain behaviours customary in Western society, such as drinking alcohol or certain forms of dress, are not acceptable. Cultural intelligence, on the other hand, I would define as knowing what to do when faced with a challenge rooted in the cultural norms of the society. For example, as noted above, lecturers, 10, 13 and 17 had all been subject to such challenges at the beginning of their employment with MEUC. L13 narrated how her approach changed when she started working at MEUC.

“… before I came to the UAE I was very used to just saying whatever I wanted to say, you know, with some self-censorship but not all that much at all and then it was a culture shock for me to, to come here and to start at the women’s college especially and I had a bit of a shocking experience in my first few weeks…” (Interview, lines 430-433).
Having tried a creative story-telling approach in her teaching, she was disappointed and shocked to discover that her students had complained to the Director of the institute, blaming her for their low marks. From that point on she became cautious of what she could do and not do within the culture she was new to. This experience, which represented a cultural awakening for L13, allowed her to learn quickly and informally what was acceptable in the classroom, which contributed to the knowledge she used, to inform her teaching.

“...so in the women’s college I was very, very careful and I feel like I restricted what I said a great deal because I, I felt like the alien in that situation ...” (Interview, lines 467-469)

Since informal learning informs tacit knowledge (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000) it is plausible to suggest that this incident resulted in L13 acquiring tacit knowledge, which, subsequently, allowed her to achieve sufficient cultural intelligence to address challenges embedded in the culture of her students. Since tacit knowledge underpins cultural intelligence it is difficult to separate them: consequently, both are required to teach students in this culture.

L8 represented a further example of having acquired tacit knowledge and cultural intelligence during her fifteen years at MEUC. She recounted how, at the beginning of her employment, she

“... was scared to say boo to these young ladies and I did have problems with classroom management because I was scared ...” (Interview, lines 313-314).

However, at the time of interviewing her approach to classroom management had become far more direct, stating,
“... it's almost a mantra with me the minute they come through the door, I say, morning ladies, phones off, in the bag, bags on the floor. And I say that every single lesson because they are such distractions for them.” (lines 350-352).

The acquisition of tacit and cultural knowledge over time at MEUC allowed L8 to “… successfully adapt to, select, or shape real-world environments.” (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2000, p104). I would further argue that a number of elements are required to gain cultural intelligence. Experience in the host culture, reflection about what is acceptable in the culture, time to consider different approaches in the classroom and tacit knowledge gained as a result of these elements as well as an openness to the culture are all crucial to becoming culturally intelligent. Hence, the longer one remains in the host culture, as was the case with L8, the more likely one is to gain cultural intelligence: consequently, I have added this aspect to the profile of settled SIEs in the emerging theory proposed and illustrated in Figure 8, above.

L8’s and L13’s experience demonstrated the crucial need for MEUC educators to achieve a sufficient level of culture intelligence to operate successfully in the classroom and the environment in which they found themselves. However, as argued above, the CPD provided by MEUC did not acknowledge or employ lecturers’ tacit knowledge, hence creating a tension between the knowledge required to operate in the classroom and the knowledge provided. In other words, the very knowledge lecturers needed to teach students effectively and enjoyably was lacking.
In such a challenging professional environment educators need particularly acute powers of reflection, awareness and proactivity. Some educators were able to accept or manage the changes to practice required as a result of engaging with the CPD provided, possibly due to their confidence in their own identity, experience and value such as L15 who researched information he needed to support him in his teaching or L14 who prioritised engagement with students and ensuring she knew and did not cross cultural boundaries.

L14’s discourse illustrated clearly her awareness of how her own background, beliefs and values informed her teaching approach, stating

“...it's in the context of your own background, your own teaching experience, your own beliefs, your own, you know, not, not just your own general beliefs about teaching but your own religious beliefs, your own political beliefs, your own social beliefs, all of these are packed into who you are and how you approach your teaching and, you know, these may be way away from your students or they may be very close. (L14, lines 553-558).

Despite being aware of the impact of her own background she acknowledged that her role was to engage the students and to “… put yourself on hold and try and find out about your students…” (lines 560-561) whilst at the same time challenging them to broaden their views without taking them out of their comfort zone. It would appear therefore that L14 was able to separate her own concept of self from the role expected from her at MEUC by putting herself on hold. She prioritised her students
and their cultural identity: however, she used certain elements of her own professional and cultural identity to expose them to different views and perspectives. It would also appear that she employed her professional identity to support her students as she made particular efforts to engage with them by running the debating club and accompanying them to extra-curricular events. According to Beijaard (1995) experienced educators view certain parts of their professional role such as engaging with and commitment to students as constructive which impacts positively on their professional identity, which, in turn, outweighs the negative aspects of their institution. It would certainly appear to be the case with L14 whose personal ideology of teaching and commitment to students allowed her to disregard what she perceived as negative at MEUC to achieve what she felt was important, stating,

“There are ways, do it, take them [students] out, that’s what I do a lot with the MUN [debating club] girls ... we go to embassies, we go to conferences and I just, you know, I can sit in a coffee room and they’re doing whatever they’re doing, I think it’s really important that we allow them to do this.”

However, for other educators, professional identity and its underpinning values may have been compromised by the particular teaching context of MEUC when they felt obliged to put themselves on hold. It may even have acted as a barrier to engaging with the students: for example, both L10 and L13 admitted to having had various issues with students at the beginning of their employment at MEUC, ranging from student requests to change marks, (L10) feeling intimidated by students (L10), mobile phones in classrooms (L8), bullying (L10), classroom management (L16) to
avoiding certain topics of discussion (L13). Whilst this phenomenon is not exclusive to the UAE the emphasis on cultural sensitivity in the UAE prevented many lecturers, especially those newly recruited, from addressing these classroom issues, potentially resulting in feelings of powerlessness and detrimentally affecting professional identity.

Therefore, educators unable or unwilling to engage fully with students or the culture could find themselves in a situation where the cultural constraints became barriers not only to their success in the classroom but also in applying the CPD provided within the classroom. In the context of MEUC, given participants’ extensive experience of working in different cultures and the importance they accorded to cultural awareness, as noted above, it is reasonable to suggest that some were unwilling rather than unable to make the effort to accommodate cultural constraints and the challenges they posed. For example, L6 narrated how, despite the enthusiasm he encountered in his colleagues, his motivation was undermined by the lack of success he encountered in the classroom,

“... but honestly, you know, I, I just can't keep doing that because I just keep getting frustrated and I'm at that the point now, I think it doesn't matter what I do, they're, the students are not going to respond ...” (Interview 2, lines 348-350)

However, this participant, as noted earlier, had reported his concerns regarding his employment at MEUC and his future plans due to the uncertainty brought about by recent management changes and the devaluation of his original employment package. Consequently, the pressures of uncertainty and change had impacted not
only on his attitude to his professional role but also on his attitude to CPD, which he described as *jaded* (Interview 1, line 128).

Despite the induction provided at the beginning of employment, the above discussion points to the need for some expatriate lecturers to benefit from CPD which would provide support and advice on how to accommodate the culture, student behaviour and the implications of management change. This view is supported by Richardson and Zikic (2007), who found,

“Although it is relatively common for institutions to provide induction programs the findings presented here suggest that some form of ongoing support is equally important.” (p182).

This chapter has addressed the impact of the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding it on lecturers’ perceptions of and attitude towards institutional CPD. The data revealed that the SIE profile can vary according to the personal circumstances of each educator: whilst all lecturers could be described as having specific individual goals, which, in many cases, overrode those of the institution, their personal circumstances influenced their attitude to their teaching role as well as the extent to which they engaged with institutional CPD. Those without family commitments had more freedom to move from one contract to another; hence there was less pressure on them to invest themselves in their work and institutional CPD. For example, L16’s goal, like L12, was to work in an area for which there was limited opportunity at MEUC so he resigned.
However, those with family commitments were more likely to invest themselves in their role and related CPD. These lecturers, therefore, pursued their goals alongside their professional commitments; lecturers 14, 15 and 17, all married with children, attended external CPD events during their own time and at their own expense whilst lecturers 5, 6, 8, and 11 engaged with institutionally provided CPD but on their own terms, taking away what they perceived as beneficial and disregarding what they perceived as irrelevant. Only L10 perceived minimal value in institutionally provided CPD: however, as reported, he attributed his negative attitude to his experience of having his requests to move into other areas of teaching or to engage with desired CPD refused. The data also revealed that management changes impacting on the employment package at MEUC played a significant role in the attitude of some lecturers towards their engagement with CPD: L6, in particular, spoke of his disillusionment with the institute, which impacted heavily on his attitude towards institutional CPD.

In summary, in response to research questions 2 and 4, the data revealed that the personal circumstances of the lecturers played a significant role in how they related to and engaged with institutional CPD. I identified a number of lecturers as settled SIEs since, due to family, financial or practical commitments in the UAE, they had spent a number of years working at MEUC. These lecturers generally had a more positive attitude to CPD, engaging with it selectively when they perceived it as relevant or useful in their professional role. I also identified some lecturers as unsettled SIEs, who, due to the lack of personal commitment in the UAE, were able to expatriate to a different country more easily than their colleagues. These
lecturers held a more critical view of institutional CPD since they felt it did not allow them to grow professionally or they viewed it as irrelevant to their professional role. As noted above, since this area of research has not yet been explored in the literature, I view this emerging theory as a significant contributor to the theory and practice of education. For this reason, it merits further investigation to determine if SIEs in other institutes or countries can be similarly defined as settled or unsettled SIEs.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

7.1 Reflection on the study: primary research questions

The aim of this research was to determine how MEUC expatriate lecturers perceived institutional CPD opportunities, the subsequent impact on perceptions of career growth and the factors contributing to their perceptions. These factors were identified as embedded in their prior experience and tacit knowledge at the outset of this study and, consequently, significant attention was paid to the narratives of the participants’ experience of CPD both at MEUC and prior to joining the institute. During the course of this research it became apparent that the specific profile of the participants as self-initiated expatriates played a substantial role in their perceptions and attitudes towards institutional CPD and, accordingly, the research questions were modified to reflect this. The modified research questions are addressed below.

In response to research question 1, “how effective do MEUC self-initiated expatriate lecturers perceive the CPD opportunities provided by their institute to be with regards to the impact it has on the teaching and professional role at MEUC”, the findings revealed overall that those obliged to engage with CPD, in particular to gain technical skills, responded negatively to the imposition of CPD and felt it had limited effectiveness for their classroom practice and professional growth. Furthermore, these contagious negative perceptions influenced how participants viewed other aspects of CPD, namely the technological nature of the content delivered through a training/transmission model. Lecturers who were able to select their own CPD were generally satisfied with the knowledge and skills gained, viewing institutional CPD
positively since they were able to select CPD according to their teaching needs, and, consequently, were able to employ it in the classroom.

To address research question 2, which sought the factors that influenced how lecturers perceived institutional CPD opportunities, the focus groups and interviews yielded a wealth of data. These factors resulted in both negative and positive perceptions, detailed in Chapters 4 and 5. The most cited characteristics of negatively perceived institutional CPD were the mandatory nature, an overemphasis on technology, irrelevance of the content, lack of time, lack of planning and the constant change in technology required in the classroom. However, these negative perceptions were balanced by positive views focusing on relevance to lecturers’ professional role, fulfilling a particular need and the opportunity to employ the technology in the classroom. Whilst the negative and positive perceptions may appear to contradict one another, it is important to reiterate that negative perceptions were generally held by Foundations lecturers, who were obliged to employ the technology in the classroom, and, consequently, CPD was mandatory. However, lecturers working in the departments were able to select their CPD and, therefore, held a more favourable view of its characteristics.

A further aim was to determine how experience and tacit knowledge impacted on participants’ perceptions of CPD to address research question 3, “how do their experience and embedded tacit knowledge inform and influence their perceptions?” The majority of participants felt that their experience and existing skills were unacknowledged or under-utilised. This was unsurprising since a training model of
CPD assumes that participants all possess a similar level of knowledge and skills (Webster-Wright, 2009) and no needs analysis was conducted. Consequently, the lack of opportunity to employ previously acquired skills or experience resulted in feelings of frustration and resentment. Finally, the non-acknowledgement of experience and tacit knowledge resulted in a lack of alignment between institutional CPD and that which lecturers needed or wished to engage with, which, in turn, had a varying impact on lecturers’ perceptions.

The final primary research question, “how do the SIE profile and the circumstances surrounding it impact on MEUC lecturers’ perceptions of institutionally provided CPD and their desire to engage with it?” was addressed through the exploration of the participants’ profile, a factor which revealed itself to be an important indicator of their attitude towards institutional CPD. I identified two profiles of SIE, in contrast to the literature, and, whilst the two profiles retained elements of the SIE profile described by other researchers (Cao et al, 2012), I added a number of elements which allowed me to define the two profiles more authentically for this research. As detailed in Chapter 6, I propose two categories, settled and unsettled SIEs, the former referring to lecturers who held family or financial commitments in the UAE and the latter to lecturers who did not and were able to move from contract to contract with more ease. Settled SIE lecturers generally held a more positive attitude towards engaging with institutional CPD, viewing it as beneficial for classroom practice whilst following their own career goals. However, unsettled SIE lecturers were more critical of MEUC CPD. It would appear, therefore, that lecturers who had made the decision to remain for a length of time in the host country were
more disposed to invest themselves in institutional CPD, with the proviso that it was relevant and beneficial.

7.2 Reflection on the study: secondary research questions

In addition to responding to the primary research questions, the findings revealed a number of factors, which allowed me to respond to the secondary research questions, detailed below.

1. What can be learned about CPD at MEUC from lecturers’ perceptions?

2. How can this knowledge be used to enhance and develop professional development opportunities further for self-initiated expatriates?

Positive perceptions of CPD were revealed in certain areas not directly addressed by the primary research questions; for example, collaboration with colleagues was highly appreciated, as was the opportunity to engage in professional inquiry, although for most lecturers this was conducted in their own time. The findings also identified a desire for CPD aligning with participants’ needs in the areas of pedagogy, classroom management and cultural awareness. The latter area was particularly relevant and valuable, given the specific profile of the participants as SIEs, especially at the beginning of their employment at MEUC.

Nevertheless, the interplay between negative perceptions, mandatory CPD, lack of acknowledgement of lecturers’ prior experience and tacit knowledge within the
context of the specific profile of the participants and their institute constituted a unique situation which is outlined next.

Figure 9 illustrates how the various personal and contextual elements, unique to MEUC, influenced lecturer learning: these are represented in a deficit model of CPD. Lecturers, supported by their experience and tacit knowledge, were negatively influenced by the surrounding elements, a mandatory, training model of CPD and lack of time to implement learning or collaborate with colleagues. These, in turn, impacted on their perceptions of CPD.

**Figure 9: Deficit model of CPD at MEUC**

A number of elements, listed below, had a fundamentally negative effect on lecturer learning.

- Mandatory technological CPD
• Training model of CPD
• Lack of time for collaboration with colleagues
• Constant change in CPD topics, especially technology
• Lack of time to engage with CPD
• Lack of time and expertise to implement learning in teaching
• Lack of alignment between experience/tacit knowledge and institutional CPD

Despite findings from research that effective learning should be “... continuing, active, social, and related to practice...” (2009, p703), Webster-Wright maintained, as noted in Chapter 2, that the focus of CPD remains programmes and content rather than experiences of learning. This was the case at MEUC since the elements listed above characterised an atomistic approach which took scant account of lecturers’ prior experience and knowledge, contextual factors, the need to embed learning within practice and a continuing, social and active approach to learning: consequently they represented barriers to achieving authentic professional (Webster-Wright, 2009) or transformational learning (Kennedy, 2014). Participants were acutely aware of what constituted positive learning experiences and how they supported their professional responsibilities. This awareness, whether tacitly held or explicitly acknowledged, allowed them to critically assess the CPD provided, resulting in negative perceptions of learning opportunities that may have acted as barriers to learning. In order to remove these barriers to learning, therefore, it is essential to address negatively perceived characteristics of CPD and make a space for professional, transformational learning. In agreement with the literature (Boud and Middleton, 2003; Boud and Hager, 2012), collaboration and discussion were
identified as significant facilitators of learning for MEUC lecturers: as outlined below, a major step in enhancing the existing programme of CPD should be to provide time and support to allow lecturers to make their own decisions about how to enact learning, whether from institutionally provided or externally selected CPD and to provide an opportunity for informal learning to exploit and support formal learning (Eraut, 2000). Of course, as Webster-Wright pointed out educators cannot be forced to learn: however, as noted above, the provision of time and support are more likely to result in professional learning,

“Although PL cannot be controlled, in that no one can make another person learn, professionals can be supported to continue to learn in their own authentic ways while taking into account the expectations of their working contexts.” (P727).

Crucially, for educators wishing to engage in learning which allows them to grow in their career, choice and autonomy are paramount: as Kennedy highlighted “... to make real progress, teachers do need to have autonomy and the ability and space to exert agency.” (2014, p691).

The exploration into the characteristics of the SIE educator, revealed that educators working overseas are likely to have particular developmental needs, specifically related to integrating into the host culture, and understanding student attributes and expectations. CPD with the outcome of promoting cultural awareness and, ultimately, cultural intelligence was identified as desirable and even necessary by some participants, in the specific context of SIE lecturers working with Emirati students at MEUC.
Since the career aspirations of unsettled and settled expatriates in this study differed, consideration should be given to their diverse CPD needs and desires. Some settled expatriates did not pursue personal CPD; however, of those that did pursue personal CPD such as professional inquiry only one could be classified as an unsettled expatriate. L12, married with no children, resigned due to the lack of opportunity to attend conferences and grow his professional profile, having recently completed a PhD, demonstrating his desire to engage with valuable professional learning, which he could not achieve at MEUC.

For unsettled expatriates, lecturers with fewer commitments and therefore more likely to move to another institute, despite their negative perceptions, CPD provided them with specific skills and knowledge for classroom teaching and allowed them to employ technology as mandated by the institute.

However, settled expatriates, whilst engaging with institutional CPD for classroom needs also demonstrated a more personal CPD agenda through pursuing or expressing the desire to pursue professional inquiry, attend conferences and engage with external CPD.

Settled expatriates, lecturers who viewed their employment at MEUC as long-term, had much to offer the institute. Having been employed for a number of years they had an intimate knowledge of the institutional context and demonstrated their openness to the culture and ability to build positive relationships with colleagues and students. As argued in Chapter 6, their long-term experience at MEUC allowed
them to build the tacit knowledge and cultural intelligence required to operate successfully in the institute, with students, colleagues and management. It is therefore vital that these lecturers are supported in their career development and given the freedom to follow their own professional trajectory since their value to the institute cannot be overstated.

The recommendations below focus on two strands of CPD. First, institutional CPD, which served its purpose of equipping lecturers with skills required for classroom teaching and second, personalised CPD, which would allow lecturers to pursue professional learning which they view as relevant and beneficial. Proposing change does not mean rejecting the existing system of CPD, especially as the technological trajectory adopted at MEUC for teaching and learning is unlikely to be reversed. However, within these constraints it is vital to consider the views of MEUC lecturers who, with their extensive experience and knowledge, are best placed to understand what works for them, as argued earlier.

Whilst I cannot propose a quick fix solution to remedy the cynicism and negativity many participants felt about MEUC CPD, I was able to identify some of those features (listed above) that contributed to these perceptions. As underlined by the literature and the findings of this study, in addition to the characteristics of effective learning noted above, attention must be paid to educators’ desire for autonomy, agency and, ultimately, their wish to educate rather than deliver materials through the medium of technology. Furthermore, a top-down, performativity model of CPD, which promotes technological skills for the delivery of materials, relegates lecturers’
pedagogical and personal skills to second place, thereby deprofessionalising them and destabilising their professional identity. Whilst CPD programmes such as that seen at MEUC, and elsewhere in the world, continue

“... to tie them up in bureaucratic, managerial knots that squeeze out autonomy and instead seek to reward compliance and uniformity.” (Kennedy, p691)

autonomy and agency cannot be exercised. Whilst this model of CPD may result in the acquisition of skills for evaluation against institutional goals, it cannot lead to professional learning since that which is acquired and evaluated does not represent professional learning.

7.3 Professional recommendations

The recommendations below outline how MEUC can enhance the impact of existing CPD and align future CPD with lecturers’ professional needs and desires.

1. The data revealed that compulsory CPD resulted in negative perceptions of the emphasis on technology, the constant change in technological topics, planning and other elements such as the trainer. CPD should, therefore, not be compulsory: if lecturers are bound to a model of teaching which requires them to employ an iPad or other technology in the classroom, they should have the opportunity to attend institutionally provided CPD or to select the type of CPD they wish to engage with to acquire and/or enhance their skills. Moreover, since the data further revealed that collaboration with colleagues was highly valued, lecturers should be provided with time and support for collaboration with peers, for example working in pairs or groups, to promote
active, situated and continuous learning. Furthermore, time should, therefore, be allocated to lecturers for collaboration with colleagues on work related projects or research.

2. The data revealed that when self-selected, relevant, useful in the classroom and of personal interest, lecturers viewed it in a more positive light. Consequently, lecturers should have the option to engage with CPD which they consider to be the best fit for their previous experience, professional profile and role. Included in this could be professional inquiry through research, sharing of their research at conferences, both internally and externally, and relevant external CPD.

3. Consideration should be given to how CPD is presented to lecturers: an active, social and embedded approach is required to enhance the training model currently on offer.

4. The data identified a desire for targeted, more personalised CPD, specifically in the areas of pedagogy, professional inquiry and cultural concerns. Future plans should include establishing a needs analysis procedure to determine the professional needs and desires of lecturers and to inform them of what is available to them, at MEUC or externally.

5. The data revealed that experience and tacit knowledge were fundamental to lecturers’ perceptions of CPD. It also revealed that lecturers’ experience and tacit knowledge were not taken into account when providing CPD; consequently, as mentioned in point 4, a crucial and beneficial initiative would be the introduction of a needs analysis when planning institutional CPD.
6. Finally, the data revealed that the SIE profile and circumstances surrounding that profile shaped lecturers’ perceptions of institutional CPD. Since the professional needs and desires of settled and unsettled SIEs differed, it is important, therefore, to take account of these differences when providing CPD. Furthermore, as the data revealed a desire for CPD to support lecturers, specifically newly recruited lecturers, in adjusting to the culture and host country, CPD focusing on cultural challenges lecturers may face should be provided.

7. To ensure relevance of CPD to both the institute and the participant, once lecturers have selected CPD, approval should be sought with the programme chair.

8. For institutional accountability purposes all selected CPD should be included in lecturers’ annual appraisal for evaluation of professional learning and its impact on classroom teaching as well as other professional responsibilities. This should be carried out in collaboration with the department Chair to avoid simply listing CPD attended.

Figure 10 presents a preliminary overview of how CPD could be organised to ensure both institutional and personal developmental and career goals are achieved. The three models of CPD are designed to be complementary, allowing both settled and unsettled SIEs opportunities to acquire skills required for classroom teaching or to engage with professional learning in other areas, as required and desired. Despite the recommendations below, it should be borne in mind the limitations of any CPD initiative and the impact of individual characteristics on the success of the initiation.
Consequently, it is prudent to take into account Pawson and Tilley’s advice when implementing a CPD programme:

- Initiatives can work in very different ways
- Methods of implementation can differ
- Initiatives can be more effective with some participants than with others
- The context will impact on the success of the initiative
- There are always “… intended and unintended consequences…” (p19)
- Results are not long-term (Pawson and Tilley, 2004, p19)
Figure 10: Proposed models of CPD for MEUC lecturers

**Institutional CPD**
- Training/transmission model
- Self-selected technology CPD

**Personal CPD**
- Collaboration with peers
- Professional inquiry

**External CPD**
- Conferences
- Networking

**Characteristics**
- Selection from mandatory menu
- Limited to technology
- Scheduled
- Teachers and students employ technology

**Characteristics**
- Employs experience/tacit knowledge
- Relevant
- Supports formal learning
- Supports professional identity
7.4 Contribution to the theory and practice of education: CPD, unsettled and settled expatriates

This primary aim of this research was to determine how a group of self-initiated expatriate lecturers, working in an institute of higher education in the UAE, perceived the CPD opportunities provided by their employer. Research into the provision of institutional CPD has increased significantly on a global scale, in line with an increased emphasis on lecturer accountability over the past several years. The findings of this study have added to this body of research, supporting findings that compulsory CPD, focusing on content rather than the process of learning, is the least effective model of CPD (Kennedy, 2014). Furthermore, the findings underlined, supporting existing research, the importance of professional autonomy for maintaining commitment and motivation when pursuing CPD. This study, therefore has contributed a crucial element to the theory and practice of education by providing evidence that lecturers’ CPD needs and desires, in the specific and unique context of MEUC, align with those of their counterparts elsewhere in the world.

There has been substantial interest in expatriate workers during recent times (Cao et al, 2012, Doherty et al, 2013) resulting in the identification of the category of self-initiated expatriates, those who initiate, plan and organise their move overseas for professional purposes, in contrast to those whose arrangements are organised and assumed financially by the company which employs them. This study has revealed that the SIE profile is more complex and dynamic than previously reported in the literature and the characteristics of an SIE have been expanded and developed throughout this research. The identification of settled and unsettled SIEs, therefore,
represents a significant contribution to existing theory, which merits further investigation. Future research on how both settled and unsettled expatriates can be developed professionally most appropriately and beneficially for the individual and the institute is required and in Section 7.5 I present possibilities for future research into this area of emerging educational theory and practice.

7.5 Possibilities for future research and dissemination

Two main areas of study emerged from this thesis which will form the basis of future research: first, the focus on institutional CPD along with other forms of relevant, self-selected CPD to support professional growth and second, the more recent area of interest, self-initiated expatriates. Within the area of CPD I envisage researching how CPD has evolved at MEUC and the impact on lecturers. Specifically, I refer to the recently introduced initiative for MEUC lecturers to obtain HEA fellowships. This initiative was announced towards the end of this study and my aim is to determine whether lecturers perceive an HEA fellowship as a worthwhile endeavour, given their professional role and status as SIEs. For those who have already commenced the process of working towards an HEA fellowship, it would be valuable to determine their views and perceptions of the process and the professional benefits of the award.

The second area, in which I identified the two profiles of settled and unsettled SIE, warrants further research for a number of reasons. First, this is a relatively unexplored field of research, which is becoming increasingly relevant due to the rising numbers of academics expatriating, not only from the UK but also from other
countries worldwide. Second, as noted in the recommendations of this study, it is important that institutes employing SIEs become aware of their specific profile and the CPD requirements they may have, particularly in terms of adjusting to a new culture and host country. Third, institutes should also be aware that the attributes, which drive academics to expatriate, and which can impact on their desire for professional satisfaction and growth, could be exploited to benefit both the institute and the individual. This area of research is of particular interest to me and I have already been in contact with the editor of the *Journal of Global Mobility*, who has invited me to submit a manuscript for publication.

There are a number of possibilities for disseminating this research. First, as noted above, I intend to modify and submit relevant parts of my thesis to academic journals publishing in the fields of CPD and SIEs. Second, on completion of this EdD, I will prepare an executive summary of the research and recommendations noted above to submit to the Executive Dean, Chair of my department (Education) and the CPD coordinator for MEUC system-wide. I will also present the findings to interested colleagues and peers. I will then be in a position to apply for funding from the professional development fund at MEUC to support future research, as outlined above. The final possibility is to disseminate online parts of the thesis within the format of a blog, which would allow me to publish, communicate with other researchers and provide an immediate and continuous outlet for research being carried out.
7.6 Constraints and limitations of the research

An important constraint at the start of this study was the requirement to obtain ethical approval from MEUC management. Since this research was investigating CPD provided by MEUC, it was necessary to pay attention to how this CPD was described and presented in the research proposal requested by the ethics committee. As noted, my first request was rejected and I was obliged to remove any negative reference to MEUC in the proposal. On completing this task, my request was granted.

A further constraint was in the selection of participants: my initial aim was to obtain twenty participants but the response to my request only yielded the thirteen lecturers who participated. Twelve of these participants were western educated and the thirteenth was educated in India and, consequently, the sample did not represent the more international profile of lecturers employed at MEUC. This signifies a limitation of the generalisation of this study since it cannot claim to represent the views and perceptions of all MEUC lecturers; however, it does claim to represent the views of the lecturers who took part in this study. Furthermore, given the interpretivist nature of the research, it is anticipated that the reader will link the views and perceptions of the participants to his or her prior research and experience. Consequently, the research, conducted in a highly specific context with a small group of participants generated findings that reflect only the views, perceptions and attitudes of the participants of this study. However, as discussed above, the findings regarding CPD support research conducted elsewhere in the world and, therefore, represent a significant addition to the existing body of knowledge.
Time also proved to be a limitation to this research: having employed focus groups and interviews to obtain data, the findings represent exclusively the perceptions and views of the participants of this study. With hindsight, a potentially beneficial avenue of inquiry might have been interviews with a wider range of lecturers. For example, L12 recounted a positive approach to CPD in the Computer and Information Science department whereby one individual had been appointed, by the department chair, to establish the specific needs of each lecturer. According to L12 (Interview 1, lines 150-157) this approach was highly successful: consequently, with more time to pursue this line of inquiry I may have found a more balanced view of CPD at MEUC. This represents an opportunity for me to conduct future research into CPD opportunities at MEUC.

Reaching the end of this thesis has been a significant milestone for me in terms of personal and professional growth. Particular gains were enhancing my communication skills in writing, presenting my research and gaining the confidence to do so. I also feel that I have achieved a sound knowledge of why professionals engage in career development activities, either provided by their institute or independently, which will allow me to investigate thoroughly the types of learning I wish to engage with in the future and to monitor opportunities for deployment of this knowledge in my institute. Two areas of this thesis have been particularly enriching and satisfying: first, the opportunity to delve more into the area of tacit knowledge which I remain convinced is under-researched and neglected as a source of expertise and intuition for professionals; second, the discovery (for me) that professionals who expatriate have particular developmental needs which, if not met,
can result in frustration and lack of commitment. Through this research I have been
privileged to know and understand the perspectives of a small group of educators
and since this research was about them, the findings will be made available to them
so they become aware of the importance of their role in my own personal journey
and to validate their views and perceptions. Finally, by far the most satisfying part of
the past four years has been the opportunity to work alongside true professionals,
my doctoral supervisors, and benefit from their experience, expertise,
encouragement and faith in my ability to achieve something of immense and lasting
value. For me this is what CPD should be: genuine, sustained and invaluable
professional learning.
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# Appendix 1: Institutionally provided CPD (local) March 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sem 2</th>
<th>Week 9</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackboard Learn Training: Building Content</td>
<td>Advancing Literacy with Handmade Books</td>
<td>Storyline 2: Working with Question Editor</td>
<td>Using e-texts to Enhance Student Engagement</td>
<td>Using e-texts to Enhance Student Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackboard Learn Training: Creating Test</td>
<td>English Central (For Foundation Faculty)</td>
<td>Storyline 2: Working with Pictures and Characters</td>
<td>iPads in the classroom-Part 1</td>
<td>iPads in the classroom-Part 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackboard Learn Training: Creating Test</td>
<td>Storyline 2: Adding &amp; Editing Media</td>
<td>iPads in the classroom-Part 2</td>
<td>iPads in the classroom-Part 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Storyline 2: Adding Interactive Objects.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Student and Lecturer Numbers at MEUC nationwide and by department at SMEUC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number of students (enrolled in Sept 2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi Men's College</td>
<td>2,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abu Dhabi Women's College*</td>
<td>2,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Ain Men's College</td>
<td>714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al Ain Women's College</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubai Men's College</td>
<td>2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubai Women's College</td>
<td>3,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujairah Men's College</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujairah Women's College</td>
<td>1,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madinat Zayed Men's College</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madinat Zayed Women's College</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras Al Khaimah Men's College</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ras Al Khaimah Women's College</td>
<td>1,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruwais Men's College</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruwais Women's College</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharjah Men's College</td>
<td>954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharjah Women's College</td>
<td>2,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seven emirates of the UAE
## Student numbers by department at SMEUC

### STUDENT NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>MEUC Women’s College</th>
<th>MEUC Men’s College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communications</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Technology</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2540</strong></td>
<td><strong>1007</strong></td>
<td><strong>3547</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LECTURER NUMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>MEUC Women’s College</th>
<th>MEUC Men’s College</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Applied Communications</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer &amp; Information Science</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education/Liberal Studies</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>134</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NB** These figures are subject to constant change due to hiring of lecturers throughout the year.
### Appendix 3: Faculty Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Origin</th>
<th>Goal Statement (Specific, measurable, achievable)</th>
<th>Processes Involved</th>
<th>Support Group</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Expected Outcomes</th>
<th>Methods of Assessment</th>
<th>Year end Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Departmental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Management Structure at MEUC

Chancellor
Vice Chancellor
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Executive Dean of General Education
Chairs

NB Chairs are responsible for faculty professional development and appraisal
Appendix 5: MEUC Learning Model

(This document details MEUC’s approach to educating Emirati students.)
The UAE government is committed to 21st century nation-building through the provision of cutting edge education to all Nationals who want to develop their potential.
The MEUC aims to be a key educational pillar on which the modern nation is built. The MEUC learning model is a strategic framework through which the MEUC mission is attained. The learning model provides a framework within which MEUC students receive their education. The model is consistent with the MEUC mission and offers a means by which the MEUC mission is attained.
The MEUC Learning Model is based on the following professional values:

- Innovative practice
- Continuous improvement
- Professional integrity
- Efficiency and effectiveness
- Responsiveness to the needs of stakeholders.

It sets standards for the design of curricula, gives principles which should be followed in learning and teaching, and guidelines for assessment within the MEUC.
The learning model defines the MEUC’s educational philosophy and identifies eight graduate outcomes:

- Graduate Outcome One: Communication and Information Literacy
- Graduate Outcome Two: Critical and Creative Thinking
- Graduate Outcome Three: Global Awareness and Citizenship
- Graduate Outcome Four: Technological Literacy
- Graduate Outcome Five: Self-Management and Independent Learning
- Graduate Outcome Six: Teamwork and Leadership
- Graduate Outcome Seven: Vocational Competencies
- Graduate Outcome Eight: Mathematical Literacy
## Appendix 6: Literature reviewed

### Studies reviewed in higher education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>HE based research focus</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Models of CPD</th>
<th>Evaluation of impact of CPD</th>
<th>Expatriate lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Butcher &amp; Sieminski (2006)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butcher &amp; Stoncel (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerdin &amp; Selmer (2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Rijdt et al (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doherty et al (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebert-May et al (2011)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargis et al (2014)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho et al (2001)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levinson-Rose &amp; Menges (1981)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons et al (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postareff et al (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raza (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson and Zikic (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose &amp; Reynolds (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skelton (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorinola et al (2014)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stes et al (2010a, 2010b)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigwell (2012)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster-Wright (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weimer &amp; Lenze (1988)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Studies reviewed in schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>School based research focus</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Models of CPD</th>
<th>Evaluation of impact of CPD</th>
<th>Expatriate lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coldwell and Simkins (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edmonds &amp; Lee (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraser et al (2007)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guskey (2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy (2005, 2014)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leithwood &amp; Levin (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessing and de Witt (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muijs &amp; Lindsay (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swennan (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Studies reviewed in the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Workplace based research focus</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Models of CPD</th>
<th>Evaluation of impact of CPD</th>
<th>Expatriate lecturers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boud &amp; Hager (2012)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller &amp; Unwin (2006)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hager &amp; Hodkinson (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkpatrick (1998)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenger (2000)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Tacit knowledge</th>
<th>Reflection</th>
<th>Workplace</th>
<th>Cultural intelligence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyris (1976)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baumard (1999)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gourlay (2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew &amp; Sternberg (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonaka &amp; Takeuchi (1995)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polanyi (1967)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reber (1989)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternberg (1998)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternberg &amp; Grigorenko (2000)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sternberg &amp; Hedlund (2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsoukas (2002)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yang &amp; Farn (2009)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 7: Summary of variables for transferring learning from CPD initiatives to the workplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influencing variables</th>
<th>Moderating variables</th>
<th>Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learner characteristics</td>
<td>Time lag</td>
<td>Generalisation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention design</td>
<td>Measure of transfer</td>
<td>Maintenance*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>Open or closed skill</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab or field context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Published or non-published</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- De Rijdt et al defined *generalisation* as effective transfer of learning, with *maintenance* as continued use of the skill.
Appendix 8: Definitions terms employed in evaluation of CPD initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interventions</th>
<th>CPD activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antecedents</td>
<td>Factors which influence how participants benefit from CPD initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating factors</td>
<td>Variables within an institution which determine if and how intermediate outcomes can lead to final outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes</td>
<td>CPD outcomes considered to be necessary to produce final outcomes, specifically concerning participant behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final outcomes</td>
<td>Anticipated outcomes of the CPD initiative, specifically outcomes within the institution, teachers and students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Coldwell & Simkins (2011).
Appendix 9: Cao et al’s 2012 Conceptual Framework (adapted)

Career Capital

- Career network size
- Protean career attitude
- Cultural intelligence
- Cultural adjustment
- Career success
- Cultural distance
### Focus Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Current situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L7*</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L9*</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>L8**</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L11</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L12**</td>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Employed (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2015</td>
<td>L13**</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Employed (Dominica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L14</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L15</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L16**</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>Employed (UK)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Focus group attended</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>25/6/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>26/6/14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Interviewed a second time on 19/1/15 and a third time on 6/6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L8**</td>
<td>22/1/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L10</td>
<td>28/1/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L11</td>
<td>20/1/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviewed a second time on 14/6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L12**</td>
<td>21/1/15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Interviewed a second time on 22/6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L13**</td>
<td>26/1/15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L14</td>
<td>27/1/15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L15</td>
<td>21/1/15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interviewed a second time on 20/6/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L16**</td>
<td>22/1/15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Interviewed a second time on 23/6/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L17</td>
<td>18/1/15</td>
<td>L17</td>
<td>Indian General Studies Did not attend a focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management interviews</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 9/9/2013</td>
<td>M1**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 9/9/2013</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 18/11/15</td>
<td>SM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview 1/2/16</td>
<td>SM1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not accept interview invitation

** No longer employed at MEUC
Appendix 11: Dates and duration of interviews and focus groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer No</th>
<th>Interview Date</th>
<th>Interview Length</th>
<th>Checked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-Jun-14</td>
<td>28 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25-Jun-14</td>
<td>29 mins</td>
<td>4 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>26-Jun-14</td>
<td>40 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29-Jun-14</td>
<td>34 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18-Jan-15</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>19-Jan-15</td>
<td>41 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20-Jan-15</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>21-Jan-15</td>
<td>48 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21-Jan-15</td>
<td>69 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22-Jan-15</td>
<td>35 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>22-Jan-15</td>
<td>68 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26-Jan-15</td>
<td>44 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>27-Jan-15</td>
<td>51 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>28-Jan-15</td>
<td>62 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>No interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22-Jun-15</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td>2 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>23-Jun-15</td>
<td>15 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 1</td>
<td>4-Sep-14</td>
<td>24 mins</td>
<td>2 interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair 2</td>
<td>4-Sep-14</td>
<td>16 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 1</td>
<td>18-Nov-15</td>
<td>30 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager 1</td>
<td>21-Feb-16</td>
<td>14 mins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 38 mins

Did not interview lecturers 1, 3 & 4. They only took part in pilot FG.
## Focus Groups 1, 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturers</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 7, 9</td>
<td>May 2014</td>
<td>61 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8, 10, 11, 12</td>
<td>12-Jan-15</td>
<td>53 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13, 14, 15, 16</td>
<td>15-Jan-15</td>
<td>46 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>51 mins</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did not interview 7 or 9 - neither responded to my email.
Appendix 12: Extract from Focus Group 3

12 January 2015 – Lecturers 8, 11, 12 and 16

L12 I think what's interesting is that the devil's in the detail, so many of these PDs we go to, these mobile learning days and so on, I read it and I go wow that's interesting and I go there and it's not what it said, and they're often dumbed down to, and you go in there and it's like so what are discussion boards anyway and what, I know that. I want to know some new interesting techniques.

L16 Yes, I find that.

L12 It's not the general, that's the thing where they fall down in the detail.

L16 You see, we always get told that in Foundations that at the college we are at the top of the game in doing this, this, this and this and I just think, yeah, right. And you go there and it seems that maybe this is the case, maybe we are doing all these different amazing things with Blackboard and discussions because you go and they give you this basic here's how you set up a discussion and we've been using them for six years, you know. So maybe, I don't tend to believe, I tend to think it's just, you know, trying to make us feel better about ourselves.

L11 I do think the last ten years have been interesting times and there's a reason...

L16 Yes, yes.

L11 we do such a lot of PD is because, in many ways, teaching’s changed out of all recognition from twenty years ago, twenty years ago, in fact in some places you could still find yourself stood in front of a black board with a piece of chalk, then your students have got a bit of paper if you're lucky and a photocopier's a luxury to all this technology and we're expected to be able to utilise it and the way, not only
that, the listening thing, all those sort of different approaches and methodologies have changed to keep up with that.

L16 But nobody's giving us PD on that.

L11 No.

L16 They just say, here's an app.

L11 So I mean, blended learning, since I've been teaching it was all communicative and then it was all, almost learning by doing, what did they call it, can't remember, something else and then it was all blended learning and now I don't know what it is because I've been here for five or six years, what it is anymore, but the methodologies, the way that we teach has changed to keep up with the technology and the changes.

L12 The problem with teaching, not the problem, but the issue with it, why we need so much PD as opposed to profess, to other people to how to do something, like when we're in the classroom teaching how to do it, we're not doing it, so we're not like a carpenter or experimenting and building every day, we’re in the classroom, so that's why they go to teaching practice. It would be great if one of our PD was go teach for, we should be able to have a semester off to remind ourselves what is it like to be in a high school classroom or even worse in an Early Childhood classroom.
Appendix 13: Opening List of Questions for Focus Groups

1. Would you please tell the rest of the group about your professional background?

2. Keeping in mind that you are expatriate educators, could you now describe the kind of professional development that you’ve engaged with in previous institutions and give your overall opinion of it?

3. In general, which factors do you think influence the effectiveness of CPD? For example, the person attending the CPD, the presenter, the material, the place, the timing etc.

4. Do you think expatriate teachers have CPD needs that are different from teachers that stay in their own country and, if so, how are they different?

5. Looking back over your teaching career where do you think you learnt or improved your teaching practice the most? It could be teacher training college, observing, studying, PD sessions such as we have here or teaching itself or something different. Or your own self-directed studies?

6. Of the CPD you’ve just discussed, if you were the person to be able to make changes, what would you change in the CPD that you’ve attended? You can be specific about a particular session or just talk generally.
Appendix 14: Example of coding in NVivo

Reference 1 - 1.20% Coverage

L14 We might have a broader scope of what, what we would include in our PD perhaps, if you've been in the same environment for, you know, X amount of years you would be very narrowly focused I guess, this is a very general comment but as expatriates we're possibly used to lots of different challenges, different environments interculturally as well that may make us as individuals more open and looking for different PD opportunities than perhaps if you'd been in the same job all that time.

Reference 2 - 5.51% Coverage

L15 Yeah, I would say that three, three areas would definitely helped me, would have been helping me, what I received as information in bits and sometimes it was rather self developments, it was myself that collected the information. The three areas are the cultural areas, the national areas and the institutional areas. The culture, that's the obvious one right? So coming to a different culture that's, that, that, that needs even a training not just a, not just a PD what we have had here it was rather just a PD, just talking to students who were here, it was my previous boss Mr Young who was there and some, some current students who were there just to talk about these issues, of course the, the one coming, the induction process by the HR. It was, it was, it was helping for the cultural issues. The institutional issue is like if you're familiar with the UK higher education that's a completely different grading system, the curriculum is different, the whole structure is completely different. Here the higher education is based on the US community colleges, that was the main idea of the MEUC when it was established 25 years ago as far as I understand, as a result of a visit by the previous XXXXXXX Sheikh Ali and so it's a, it's a different, different, different thing so what, what is done by a committee or a board in the UK it is done by one person here and vice versa, it's, it's a different issue and I'm not even mentioning the Prussian, German influence which is wholly, completely different but I can imagine to say there is an Australian or a, a Canadian whatever colleagues coming from a completely different country, they would have also some sort of challenge to understand why we're doing this, what is the receipt, what is the make up, why don't, all these kind of, tiny little issues but it helps, and the third one as I mentioned, as I call it as a national level because in higher education we're mostly helping people to get into the labour market so having information about the country's labour market, what is it what I'm telling in the classroom, is it really useful
or not some basic information about it that is, that is definitely helpful and I'm saying just basic information like training opportunities.

Reference 3 - 1.09% Coverage

L13 **We don't get feedback on even about who are, whether, what students we're going to be getting, you know like there are bigger forces which impact, like with the whole national service thing, we're not trained up on where the students are going, where they're coming, where they're coming from you know, are they coming back from national service, it's a, it's a big sort of silent area isn't it to do with the outside world and our students.**

Reference 4 - 0.44% Coverage

L10 L15’s point about national, we don't really, haven't got any national, I mean, even just bringing in students who've graduated to talk about what they've done would be handy.

Reference 5 - 2.06% Coverage

L14 It's saying it's like a disconnect between us and the students that we're teaching, there's a disconnect between us and where they go and where they're coming from, like you were saying, so as expatriate teachers that is something that we do experience differently, we have, we don't have that continuum that you would have with students in your own country, you would know, you would know of, of them before they came and what they were like culturally because you would be of that culture and there'd be a connection, an understanding but as here, as we were saying, as we come from so many different countries and so many different educational backgrounds, so many different expectations, our own experiences feed into that and yet we don't get any information about, so there is a difference in the PD that we need as expatriates.

Reference 2 - 0.92% Coverage

L11 If, the only thing is, people who are expatriates perhaps move more often, therefore the resources available to them might be different so you'd have to learn to use or to learn to stop using certain things, which is perhaps not the case of non-expatriate teachers, but generally no, I think, I think the PD we get reflects the changes that are happening all over the world, not just here or there but then I might be wrong.
L12 Someone who'd only been here a year, they might have a different answer. But in my experience, going back to Canada for the two years, it was still the same idea in the case of what PD was and new technologies coming in, trying to adapt to new methodologies and so forth but kind of translates around there might be a little bit about how do you deal with all women as opposed to teaching all men campuses you might not get at home.

Reference 4 - 0.46% Coverage

L16 Generally no, but I think obviously there are some situations like that I could see that I probably wouldn't need it for teaching a group of French kids in Sheffield but I feel that we could do with some here.

Key for coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Suggestions for SIE CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Characteristics of SIEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue</td>
<td>Difference in opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I So tell me... ok, this actually did come up in another interview, so do you think that the PD that is provided by the college can be used in the classroom?
L10 As in... ok, let's take for example, CG's community of practice thing and some XXXX things in there, absolutely no way, it might be marvellous with school children in America, in Harlem, tough, tough schools or whatever they manage to make a success of it, try and run some of that at the men's college.
I What do you mean by communities of practice?
L10 Well you know they have the group and they handle, say you're going to go off and write about this and report back to the group what you've done in class. But you know, and it was all based round again, XXXX book, this is the thing about having respect for people who actually, just get one book that's about teaching kids in Harlem, ok we're going to make everyone in the UAE do this, duh? So yeah, so I dropped out the community of practice thing.
I Ah, so it was a community of practice that you joined which was you're all coming together to learn about teaching strategies that were, people were using in America and which they believed could be transferred to the UAE. And you don't, you didn't agree?
L10 Some of it but the problem is that I think it would be far more effective if the book had never even been mentioned but this continual, and the book, it's like, you know, give me a break. What do you know about here? I don't want somebody keep banging on about some book that's used in some other country, you can forget about that, that doesn't impress me. So you've got a PhD and you know one book, right.
I Ok, so that PD was not useful. What about the technology ones? Are they useful in the classroom?
L10 Are the technology ones useful in the classroom? Well, I mean, yeah.
I OneNote for example, do you still use that?
L10 OneNote, yes but I guess we won't be now we've got these new boards.
I Aw no, it has OneNote on it.
L10 Does it, ok.
I Cause it's Windows, yeah.
L10 Does it have a touch pad on the screen? No it doesn't, does it.
I You get your little laser thing, don't you.
L10 Does it let you write on the board.
I Yeah, of course.
L1 All right.
I It's a Smartboard as well.
L10 Yeah, ok, we didn't see that.
I Did D not show them to you?
L10 XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
I Ok. Oh yes, I get that. All right, so, the technology ones, are they useful in the classroom? A little bit?
L10 Yes, yes, I'll say yes.

Key: XXXXXXX – incomprehensible
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lecturer</th>
<th>Areas of commonality</th>
<th>Areas of difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL (past)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL (past)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>EFL (past)</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>EFL (past)</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>EFL (past)</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>EFL (past)*</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>EFL (past)*</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL (past)*</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL (past)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EFL (past)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Department (past)*</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department (past)*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>First language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of participants with areas of commonality with researcher (by area)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFL Past</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural background</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment contract</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Latest developments in CPD at MEUC**

On 5 January 2016 the invited guest speaker at the MEUC Spring Conference was the Chief Executive Officer of the Higher Education Academy (HEA). A Memorandum of Understanding was signed between MEUC and the HEA establishing MEUC as a Middle Eastern centre for recognition of CPD. MEUC lecturers could therefore work towards an HEA fellowship by demonstrating their commitment to teaching, learning and professionalism in HE. Expatriate lecturers must pay fellowship fees whilst Emirati nationals have their fellowship fees reimbursed by MEUC (SM, line 33).

According to the SM, the rationale for this new CPD initiative was three-fold: first, it was a means of recognising the experience and qualifications of faculty; second, it was to allow Emirati faculty in training to obtain international recognition of their experience within the framework of the MEUC Academy for developing Emirati faculty (HADEF); third, linking MEUC to the international reputation of the HEA was considered a beneficial move.

Of the three lecturers interviewed regarding this initiative L6 and L11, who were Foundations’ lecturers, expressed no interest in becoming an HEA fellow as they felt it would add little value to their career prospects, primarily because it was not recognised by any English Language teaching association. As one explained:

“...because they were not affiliated with any of the big language institutions where we get our qualifications, to us they were a bit pointless, cause they are not in line with, or associated with any of, any of the other qualifications
Conversely, L15, a department lecturer, was enthusiastic about the initiative, as he believed it would allow him to create links with British academia, improve his career prospects and remuneration and allow him to network in new areas.

“The other thing is, and this is the more important one, is the learning for networking and networking for learning because within the HE academy it would give me prospects, new avenues to potentially follow, finding out new areas.” (lines 21-24)

Therefore, once again, supporting the findings of the research, expatriate lecturers’ views of institutionally provided CPD depended on their motivation, perceived benefits and individual circumstances.

It is too early to assess the impact of this initiative on MEUC expatriate lecturers; however, along with the provision for funding for international conferences it had appeared that CPD opportunities (albeit not free) were taking on a more professional dimension, which would give lecturers the opportunity to have their experience, prior and future learning accredited by an internationally recognised fellowship. This focus on personal career growth rather than institutional needs was a significant development. However, in light of the lack of communication between MEUC management and expatriate lecturers concerning the HEA initiative (L6, line 47) and given that one Emirati in my department has already gained an HEA
fellowship, the focus of the initiative appears to be Emirati faculty in training. Whilst gaining a fellowship might “…cover for any inadequacies elsewhere…” (L6, line 39) or allow management “…to justify the fact of moving them on into higher positions.” (L11, lines 37-38), it was undoubtedly a positive development for Emirati faculty in training who are young and inexperienced and, consequently, require the structure of working towards such recognition of their experience and professional qualities. However, for expatriate faculty, at the time of writing, nine months after the HEA initiative was announced, the opportunity to work towards an HEA fellowship has not materialised.

The nature of CPD provided has implications for an institute. If it does not correspond to educators’ personal expectations it can lead to resentment and demotivation or, if it obliges educators to unwillingly change their teaching practice, the changes can influence their feelings of professional worth. Billot (2010) stated that “It is axiomatic that as the sector and context alters, then so must the individual’s identity.” (p712). The challenge therefore is to ensure that educators are able to absorb change brought about by CPD initiatives and to incorporate them into their everyday roles. This research suggests that, although this is not currently happening at MEUC, the recent collaboration with the HEA might offer more promising CPD opportunities to those interested in developing their career on a more professional and international scale, if it was available to all. This provides an opportunity for further research in the future.