



11-22-2019

You Learn When You Teach: A Narrative Pedagogy for Faculty and Doctoral-Level Student Teaching Assistants

Lauren A. Acosta MS, RN, PhD Candidate
College of Nursing, The University of Arizona, heller@email.arizona.edu


Penny M. Overgaard PhD, MSN, RN
College of Nursing, The University of Arizona, overgaard622@gmail.com

Natalie M. Pool PhD, RN, BSN
College of Nursing, The University of Arizona, nataliepool@email.arizona.edu

Susan M. Renz PhD, DNP, RN, GNP-BC
University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing, srenz@nursing.upenn.edu

Janice D. Crist PhD, RN, FWAN, FAAN
College of Nursing, The University of Arizona, jcrist@email.arizona.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr>

 Part of the [Geriatric Nursing Commons](#), and the [Quantitative, Qualitative, Comparative, and Historical Methodologies Commons](#)

This Article has supplementary content. View the full record on NSUWorks here:
<https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss11/14>

Recommended APA Citation

Acosta, L. A., Overgaard, P. M., Pool, N. M., Renz, S. M., & Crist, J. D. (2019). You Learn When You Teach: A Narrative Pedagogy for Faculty and Doctoral-Level Student Teaching Assistants. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(11), 2891-2902. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2019.3626>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the The Qualitative Report at NSUWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Qualitative Report by an authorized administrator of NSUWorks. For more information, please contact nsuworks@nova.edu.



Qualitative Research Graduate Certificate
Indulge in Culture
Exclusively Online • 18 Credits
LEARN MORE

NSU
NOVA SOUTHEASTERN
UNIVERSITY

NOVA SOUTHEA

You Learn When You Teach: A Narrative Pedagogy for Faculty and Doctoral-Level Student Teaching Assistants

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to understand the meaning of online co-teaching for PhD faculty and teaching assistants (TAs). Narrative pedagogy underpinned the inquiry, which was designed to advance the discourse on mentorship of PhD future faculty. A faculty member and TA authors kept concurrent weekly journals or after-the-fact written reflections. The authors analyzed data as a team using a five-phase interpretive phenomenological analysis process to interpret the meaning of co-teaching for faculty and TAs. Lines of inquiry, central concerns, exemplars, shared meanings, and paradigm cases supported the overall interpretation, "You Learn When You Teach." Co-mentorship should be a requirement for nursing faculty preparation programs. Five strategies for ensuring success of PhD nursing students' development as professional nurse scholars are recommended. Doctoral programs (e.g., PhD; DNP) would benefit from a unified approach to faculty preparation, guided by theories such as narrative pedagogy.

Keywords

Narrative Pedagogy, Doctoral Education, Graduate Teaching Assistants, Mentoring

Creative Commons License



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/).

Acknowledgements

Acknowledgement to Dr. Linda R. Phillips with early recommendations on literature review.

You Learn When You Teach: A Narrative Pedagogy for Faculty and Graduate Teaching Assistants

Lauren A. Acosta, Penny Morgan Overgaard, and Natalie M. Pool
The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA

Susan M. Renz
University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA

Janice D. Crist
The University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, USA

The purpose of this study was to understand the meaning of online co-teaching for PhD faculty and teaching assistants (TAs). Narrative pedagogy underpinned the inquiry, which was designed to advance the discourse on mentorship of PhD future faculty. A faculty member and TA authors kept concurrent weekly journals or after-the-fact written reflections. The authors analyzed data as a team using a five-phase interpretive phenomenological analysis process to interpret the meaning of co-teaching for faculty and TAs. Lines of inquiry, central concerns, exemplars, shared meanings, and paradigm cases supported the overall interpretation, "You Learn When You Teach." Co-mentorship should be a requirement for nursing faculty preparation programs. Five strategies for ensuring success of PhD nursing students' development as professional nurse scholars are recommended. Doctoral programs (e.g., PhD; DNP) would benefit from a unified approach to faculty preparation, guided by theories such as narrative pedagogy. Keywords: Narrative Pedagogy, Doctoral Education, Graduate Teaching Assistants, Mentoring

As part of a long-term plan to increase the number of nurses in the workforce, the American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN) is leading efforts to increase the number of graduate prepared nurses available to fill faculty vacancies (AACN, 2017). The current demand for qualified nurse faculty requires that graduate level nursing programs adequately prepare students to enter a faculty role upon graduation. Early evidence showed limited emphasis on teacher preparation in nursing doctoral programs and nursing faculty often teach as they were taught; but for educators, it is important to evaluate alternate pedagogies in terms of their impact on the learner outcomes (Oermann, 2007). Focused preparation for the teaching role, including mentoring during the course of doctoral studies, was an important factor needed in creating nurse educators that were better prepared to educate both baccalaureate and graduate nursing student. Lack of teaching and mentoring about teaching could force novice faculty to utilize a trial and error approach to teaching (Bartels, 2007). Other evidence was that most graduate programs do not adequately prepare students for a teaching role (Aldebron & Allan, 2010). In a later study on nurse faculty preparedness, only 38% of sampled clinical faculty reported exposure to pertinent training on pedagogical strategies during graduate school (Suplee, Gardner, & Jerome-D'Emilia, 2014). The preparation of nurse educators has continued to be inconsistent, complex, and challenging since nursing and education are two distinct disciplines (Booth, Emerson,

Hackney, & Souter, 2016). Recent research indicated that conventional pedagogies in nursing education were not adequate to meet the needs the nursing graduate in current practice (Culyer, Jatulis, Cannistraci, & Brownell, 2018). Thus, it was important to explore teaching assistants' (TA) and faculty's mentoring experiences in nursing PhD programs as an important aspect of the faculty development process. Two recent interactive online PhD courses co-taught with TAs presented an opportunity to study doctoral teacher training in real time, reported here.

Study and Researcher Context

The context for the current study was the teaching practicum requirement for doctoral nursing students enrolled in the Nurse Faculty Loan Program (NFLP). This program is offered by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) to graduate nursing programs within accredited schools of nursing and is designed to increase the number of doctorate-prepared nursing faculty in the United States (HRSA, 2016).

The experienced faculty member (referred to as "faculty" in this paper) has been teaching in the PhD program at her current institution for over 18 years. She received significant mentoring herself both as a PhD student and as a novice faculty member, thus growing to appreciate the positive impact of this process on her own professional development and acculturation into nursing academia. She has purposefully sought out mentoring relationships with PhD students such as the teaching assistants (TAs) featured in this paper. The TAs came from a variety of clinical and academic backgrounds. During the TAs' co-teaching experiences with the faculty author, teaching experience in formal nursing degree programs was as follows. Two with Master's degrees were currently teaching in undergraduate in-person courses; one with a DNP was teaching in a masters and a DNP program; and one did not have teaching experience. The four TA co-authors were unified in their shared interest in further developing their teaching-learning skills through the mentoring process.

Purpose and Research Question

Based on a narrative pedagogical approach to education, the authors reflected on their experiences as faculty member or TA for two online doctoral nursing research courses. The purpose of this study was to explore the meaning for PhD faculty and TAs of co-teaching in online PhD programs in order to advance the discourse on mentorship of future PhD-prepared nursing faculty. A secondary purpose was for the TAs in collaboration with their faculty mentor, to apply the interpretive phenomenological data analysis process they had learned in the qualitative course they had all take and that some of them co-taught, to analyze the narratives. The question for this inquiry was, "What is the meaning of faculty's and teaching assistants' experiences in co-teaching online PhD nursing research courses?" In this article, the authors address mutual learning that occurs for faculty and TAs in online doctoral courses.

Method

Narrative Pedagogical Framework

Narrative pedagogy framed this inquiry. This nursing education approach was developed through phenomenological research conducted with online nursing faculty and

nursing students by Diekelmann and Ironside (Diekelmann, 2001; Ironside, 2005). An important tenet was that through open dialogue and listening to others' perspectives, including those from novice instructors, new learning and improved teaching practices could emerge. This type of pedagogy emphasizes "teaching the practices of learning and thinking as well as teaching content and skills" (Ironside, 2005, p. 484). Narrative pedagogy research has focused on pre-licensure nursing education, including examination of simultaneous learning for faculty (Ironside, 2014). This framework has informed the faculty member's general teaching approach as well as interventions in previous research (Crist, Pasvogel, Hepworth, & Koerner, 2015) over the previous two decades.

Participant Recruitment, Characteristics, and Consent

Over the course of four years, the faculty agreed to mentor four TAs who volunteered, either for practice teaching without credit or specifically to fulfill 1-6 credits of mentored teaching as required by the NFLP. The TA co-authors enrolled for 0-3 units of mentored teaching with the faculty co-author within the previous 4 years. Although experienced nurses, most of the TAs described themselves as novice educators who had a range of 0 to 4 years of experience teaching online didactic courses in either undergraduate or graduate nursing programs. All four of the TAs were interested in the specific courses in which they were mentored as they pertained to some facet of their own dissertation work or clinical practice. The faculty and the first two TAs initiated this study, and then invited three previous TAs to join the endeavor; two agreed. Because there were no participants beyond the authors, they did not contact the university's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Study Design

In 2016, the two most recent TAs (thereafter referred to as TA 1 and TA 2, respectively) and the faculty decided to keep weekly journals to summarize discussions and reflect on their teaching experiences throughout the semester, and to meet by telephone weekly to clarify assignments, discuss any student issues, and explore reflections from the previous week to enhance the mentored teaching experience. Based on the richness of their own teaching experiences emerging from the weekly journals and telephone calls, they later sought out the perspectives of the previous two TAs (TA 3 and TA 4) to further enhance the study.

Initial meetings between the faculty and each of the TAs were conducted in person, by telephone, or via Skype. To illustrate how narrative pedagogy informed this inquiry, at the beginning of each course, the faculty and TAs met to talk about mutual expectations, general procedures, and specific areas of interest or skills represented in the existing course work. This is in direct contrast to other types of mentoring approaches in which the mentor singularly determines the mentees' tasks and roles. Seeking collaboration and agreement from the TAs is consistent with narrative pedagogy's learner-centered approach to education (Brown, Kirkpatrick, Mangum, & Avery, 2008). TAs were encouraged by the faculty member to select teaching activities that were deemed most meaningful and beneficial to their personal learning needs. For example, if the TA expressed a desire to review and practice scoring students' written work, she created a plan to facilitate this skill under the guidance of the faculty. Certain TAs also chose to assist the faculty with improvements in course design and content. Each chose to serve as important peer-resources for students. All TAs chose to participate in activities similar to the faculty such as grading, lecturing, and providing feedback, with the faculty having the ultimate responsibility of assigning actual grades. Students, the faculty member, and the TAs introduced themselves and clarified their

respective roles at the beginning of each course to set the stage for human-to-human co-learning as per narrative pedagogical principles (Ironsides, 2003).

Setting

The setting was an online PhD program in a college of nursing in a large public university in the southwestern United States. The two courses in which all four TA co-authors participated were offered as part of the larger PhD program. One was a required core course on qualitative research and the second was an elective course on gerontological theory and research. Each course had 1-2 TAs serving at a time: TAs 1 and 2 simultaneously assisted with the qualitative methodology course in Fall 2016 (students totaling 18); TA 3 assisted with the gerontological course in Fall 2015 (students totaling 4); TA 4 assisted with the qualitative methodology course in 2015 (students totaling 18).

Data Collection

The authors used a non-traditional method of data collection, using reflexive journaling, similar to that used during auto-ethnography studies (Benoot & Bilsen, 2016; Douglas & Carless, 2013) and weekly telephone conferences. The weekly journals and telephone conferences of the faculty mentor and TAs 1 and 2 initially constituted the data. As means of confirming the emerging data, TAs 3 and 4 were asked to produce written reflexive accounts based on memories of their previous mentored teaching experiences with the faculty. All five authors agreed from the beginning to keep journal entries, telephone conversations, and reflexive accounts private and confidential. Team members did not read each other's raw data journals. Participants were encouraged to provide accurate and honest accounts of their experiences, including any challenging or negative experiences, without fear of retribution from the involved faculty member. Efforts were made to create a safe environment in which open and unrestrained dialogue could occur by refraining from making any assumptions or assigning value to any of the textual data during this period (Ironsides, 2014). Thus, no coercion to participate and/or to only include positive comments was evident, although this is difficult to confirm. At the end of the semester in which they completed their mentored teaching, the faculty and TAs 1 and 2 compiled data from their own three journals and added the two reflexive accounts from TAs 3 and 4 to more fully explore their mentored teaching experiences.

Data Analysis

The authors analyzed data as a team using the five-phase interpretive process for analysis of interpretive phenomenology, which was taught in the interpretive phenomenology module of the qualitative course (Crist, 2005). Procedures followed this published data analysis method for interpretive phenomenology, which had been co-published by the faculty mentor and her previous phenomenological mentor (Crist & Tanner, 2003). A summary of the process is as follows.

During Phase 1, the faculty and TAs 1 and 2 reflected on their own individual journal entries and/or course experiences to identify early emerging themes that required further exploration or team discussion, or "lines of inquiry." These "lines of inquiry" were a focus to subsequently consider while journaling and during weekly discussions and continue to examine in all journal narratives. For example, early in the semester, one journal entry indicated awareness of one of the four student discussion groups having awkward and sporadic dialogue, rather than the daily pattern more conducive to fully engaged online

learning. After the current team addressed this, analysis including attending to journaling and weekly discussions about this issue.

During Phase 2, the faculty and all four TAs identified “central concerns” during review of their own journal entries and reflexive accounts, and during collaborative discussions. “Central concerns” are important, meaningful matters identified from each participant’s individual story (Crist & Tanner, 2003). “Central concerns” are somewhat parallel to “data bits” used in other methodologies, but usually contain more words to retain the overall context and are not distinguished between “open” and “selective or theoretical” coding. An example of a central concern was “Collaboration and two-way learning”: The TAs and faculty collaborated about one student group that was struggling with interpersonal clashes; together, they determined how to divide the student group, and which other student groups might best accommodate additional students from the original group. The collaborative decision and actions resulted in better performance by the individual students who had struggled; and the groups that had accommodated additional members continued to perform well.

Additionally, “exemplars” in the form of excerpts or short stories that demonstrate specific “central concerns” were noted during Phase 2 (Crist & Tanner, 2003). An exemplar was TA 4 comparing the central concern “learning through teaching” to reviewing for academic journals in an effort to keep one’s own writing sharp. Also, during this phase, authors identified or confirmed “paradigm cases,” which are stories that appear, in no certain order, taken from any narratives that vividly illustrate the interpretation of the whole. For example, gaining insight about how papers were assigned a quantitative score within the grading rubric was a new way to collaboratively learn through teaching.

In Phase 3, the authors identified “shared meanings” in the form of common concerns across participants. These patterns of meanings were common to the whole group. For example, “Learning through Teaching” was the culmination of common reflexive journal entries that reported faculty’s and TAs’ sense of growth in their own teaching abilities and performance.

During Phase 4, the authors discussed and finalized the “final interpretation,” supported by the shared meanings and demonstrated by exemplars and paradigm cases. This process occurred during the authors’ iterative processes of “interpretive writing” (Van Manen, 2016) with simultaneous communications among authors and final pursuit of final lines of inquiry. “Interpretive writing” occurred individually and through sharing the evolving draft report of findings. The iterative interpretation process included input from and collaborative revisions in response to reviewers’ questions and comments.

Phase 5 is dissemination of the interpretation. The final interpretation is unending, occurring within the readers (Crist & Tanner, 2003).

Trustworthiness

To establish trustworthiness the authors addressed three key criteria: reflexivity (Jootun, McGhee, & Marland, 2009), credibility, and dependability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The first three authors used reflexivity to assure minimal researcher bias. This was accomplished by discussing emerging findings and alternate views as they arose regarding their weekly journals, and during the weekly phone conferences. The authors debriefed with one another to attenuate bias, preconceptions, and assumptions. Credibility was established through peer reviews and comparisons of central concerns to ensure accuracy of data used to generate shared meanings. The authors addressed dependability through (1) frequent discussions to resolve interpretative discrepancies and achieve consensus, (2) prolonged engagement with the data, (3) triangulation of the various data sources (journals, reflexive

account, and debriefing meetings), and (4) the maintenance of a decision trail in the form of the authors' many meeting notes and drafts of the manuscript. The authors remained cognizant of power differentials inherent in the faculty-RA relationship by maintaining mutual respect and ensuring that all ideas were treated equally. The first three authors addressed confirmability with member checking to ensure that the central concerns adequately represented their experiences; when central concerns did not adequately represent the experience, the authors adjusted the central concerns until there was consensus that was accurate and resonated for all. Later, all authors collaborated by phone and email to confirm separately identified shared meanings and to collectively agree upon the emerging overall interpretation.

Results

Early in the data analysis process, the authors suggested the overall interpretation: "You Learn When You Teach." As the authors identified the central concerns (originally 10) which were abstracted into "shared meanings," and identified exemplars and paradigm cases, the interpretation continued to ring true as the overall meaning of their experience of co-teaching online PhD nursing research courses. "You learn when you teach" was non-linear and all participants (faculty and TAs alike), grew in their skills and professionalism as they taught. This interpretation was supported by three shared meanings across informants' 10 central concerns. The shared meanings were (1) Learning through Teaching, (2) Validation of Reciprocal Learning, and (3) Developing as a Professional.

Learning through Teaching

The first shared meaning represented "progressing in teaching skills" through the process of teaching. "Learning through teaching" meant that through the act of either mentoring teaching (for the faculty) or practicing teaching (for the TAs), all team members felt like they were advancing their teaching skills. For example, in a telephone meeting, TA 2 identified that some student groups demonstrated challenging dynamics: they seemed incompatible, with different work schedules and learning approaches, and were not progressing as expected. The TA suggested restructuring the groups. The faculty and TAs discussed forming new groups and ways to inform students about the changes. A faculty journal entry was, "This was an interesting dialogic of both backing off, asking questions, and promoting students problem-solving in a communal way, and when dialogues and practice were over, being more objective in giving grades that were earned." Through this experience, the faculty and TAs learned that assessing particular student qualities and needs led to the formation of more productive groups.

A paradigm case that embodied "learning through teaching" was a dialogic about grades on students' papers. Some TAs, using the grading rubric, recommended lower grades than the faculty. Discussions about whether low grades would act as incentives for students' under-performing at the doctoral level (the TAs' initial perspectives) or whether constructive comments without a lower grade were more effective in getting students' attention (the faculty's perspective) and were helpful to the faculty' and TAs' gaining insight about their grading actions. These discussions resulted in negotiations between the TAs and the faculty concerning the grade. A lasting result was that this experience sensitized participants to the meaning inherent to the process of assigning grades to student's submitted work.

Validation of a Reciprocal Process

The team identified “validation of a reciprocal learning process” as a second shared meaning. Through teaching, team members gained content knowledge as well as approaches pertaining to teaching pedagogy. For example, the faculty gained new insights about qualitative methodologies or gerontology that the TAs brought from their own literature searches and then shared with students. An exemplar offered by TA 1 was

As a TA you get to read people’s papers, which is not often the case as a fellow student...You get that first ‘small taste’ of the rewards of teaching, and you get to see the direct results of your feedback and guidance (in the best case scenarios).

It was rewarding to be treated as a peer by the lead faculty. “When the faculty has a tendency to treat us as if we have expertise (even when we don’t!) that gives us the confidence to gently critique or guide other people’s work.” Likewise, the TAs learned from the students in the courses who brought in new topical information about the two content areas: “They taught me—not only about their areas of interest, but also to look at sometimes familiar content, e.g., methodologies, classic readings, etc., in a new light” (TA 4).

For the faculty, it was satisfying to observe the TAs impart insight and content knowledge correctly and clearly in online discussions and feedback on students’ papers. At the same time the faculty was reassured, after being discouraged by some students not progressing as quickly as past students had, when TAs reminded her that “coaching” rather than “giving the right answer” was consistent with narrative pedagogy principles and her typical teaching style. This validation by TAs was reassuring as was a TA’s insight that some groups of students needed more specific direction while others evolved in the expected direction with less faculty or TA guidance.

Most validating for the faculty and TAs was the critical learning that occurred when students taught each other. The TAs’ reflective accounts suggested that reciprocal learning was evident in the interactive discussion postings in which students explained concepts “to each other,” cited new methodological publications, and gave examples of qualitative research experiences. TAs 1 and 2 noted (and others agreed) that she preferred a “facilitator” and coaching teaching style that encouraged students to delve more deeply into topics to “find the answer” by offering formative feedback and asking questions that challenged students to think about phenomena and methods from various perspectives. This peer exchange of ideas, overseen by the faculty and TAs, enhanced student learning and thus validated the appropriateness of this teaching style. Team members agreed that both this teaching style and the encouragement of reciprocal learning were consistent with narrative pedagogy principles, such as supporting new thinking, identifying shared experiences, and interpreting nursing content in novel ways (Ironsides, 2014).

Developing as Professional Nurse Scholars

All participants’ teaching skills included adjusting expectations and addressing social dynamics in the online learning environment as part of their development as professional nurse scholars. Adjusting expectations sometimes required team members to modify idealized impressions of doctoral learning and teaching, or to be flexible in teaching methods. For example, TA 1 identified learner-directed vs. faculty-directed education as a central concern. She noted that she had expected all students to be highly motivated and willing to learn independently, but she came to realize that while this was true for some students, a few

students or groups did not demonstrate independent motivation. Through reflection and discussion with team members, she decided to give students the opportunity to initiate discussions and engage their peers, rather than directly providing information or correcting erroneous statements. The team tried to pose stimulating questions and offer different perspectives in group forums as well as to reach out to individuals via email when students did not participate for prolonged periods. As the semester progressed, some students became more actively involved while some others remained unengaged despite the team's efforts to encourage participation and enhance understanding. Ultimately, team members found that they had to accept that these students were making a conscious choice not to participate fully. The TAs learned—and the faculty was reminded—that some students did not place highest priority or have the ability to pursue maximal engagement in the topic or course. This resulted in acceptance and learning to recognize when to “let go.”

“Developing as a professional nurse scholar” also encompassed learning new skills such as addressing social dynamics in the online learning environment. For example, at the beginning of each semester, the faculty had asked students to form groups of three to five based on their own preference. The faculty shared with TAs that she had found that groups that formed quickly and decisively were often the strongest groups. As time went by, TA 2 began to understand that part of the success of the groups that had self-identified was related to the more proactive students' ability to address the social dynamics within groups and the ability to identify academically strong students who enhanced their learning or shared core learning values. This informed the teaching strategy by giving both the faculty and TAs a “heads up” that groups that were slower to form might potentially need more guidance.

The collaborative teaching experience allowed the faculty and each TA to evolve as professional nurse scholars through coaching and mentorship. This became clear when the participants reflected on the meaning of the content as it related to nursing and being a faculty nurse. A paradigm case was TA 2's noting that this experience reminded her that as a doctorally-prepared nurse, “I am responsible for developing my professional voice and the professional voice of other nurses.” The experience of being mentored by an experienced faculty member, and in turn mentoring fellow students, strengthened the TAs own professional development and sense of confidence as instructors.

Discussion

Findings supported the use of narrative pedagogy “as a framework for nursing education. Narrative pedagogy allows the convergence of nursing, teaching, and research as ways of learning” (Diekelmann, 2001, p. 484). Narrative pedagogy provides focus on key educational processes including teaching, interpreting, critical thinking, and analysis (Brown et al., 2008). As the team members met and reflected on their mentored semesters, it became clear that the concepts of narrative pedagogy provided an excellent framework for organizing the mentored teaching experience.

The TAs noted that they found it satisfying to have the opportunity to engage in a teaching practicum that would allow them to further their knowledge about qualitative research methodologies or gerontological theory and research, as well as learn new skills about how to facilitate learning among predominately self-directed doctoral students. As former students in these courses, they had experienced an environment rich with interpersonal dialogue and interaction, which continued during their TA roles. These interactions often challenged the TAs' initial understanding of course content. Also, mentorship from the faculty had provided scaffolding and guidance as the TAs worked to improve their understanding of the material. This process is consistent with narrative

pedagogy's emphasis on teaching both content and the learning process as essential to successful mastery and student growth (Ironsides, 2005).

The faculty had a tradition of meeting with all of her students individually mid-semester in person, by telephone, or electronically. This practice is consistent with the stance in narrative pedagogy that reflexivity about personal actions and responses is critical. The act of student and professor reflecting together promotes an educational maturity that improves future actions and responses, and facilitates learning (Sherwood & Horton-Deutsch, 2012). Although the TAs did not have a role in these individual meetings, this was a demonstration of a best practice in alignment with narrative pedagogy that the faculty modeled for the TAs. The authors recommend that the faculty mentor, and other faculty mentors, include TAs in these one-one-one meetings, as part of this best practice.

The TAs agreed that the teaching practicum became a collaboration that was more focused on the experience of teaching and was less focused on grades or credit earned for the practicum. The practicum resulted in learning that was facilitated and reciprocal rather than a linear non-contextual transfer of knowledge. This type of learning is consistent with other PhD students' experiences being mentored through "modeling the way" and "enabling others to act" (Hill et al., 2014, p. 405). These collaborative experiences with a shared vision for co-teaching resulted in critical, transformative learning for PhD students and their mentor.

Teaching Implications

Five specific recommendations for graduate programs participating in the NFLP, or other faculty preparation programs, can be gleaned from the co-teaching process: journaling, co-grading, regular meetings, requiring mentored experience, and identifying a school-wide pedagogy. (1) Keeping a weekly journal should be a requirement for faculty and TAs to ensure reflexivity in the teaching process. Journaling creates opportunities for cognitive and professional growth, provides structured opportunity for reflection, and facilitates sharing reflective experiences with others (Daroszewski, Kinser, & Lloyd, 2004). The faculty found similar benefit from keeping a weekly journal as did the TAs. (2) The faculty and some of the TAs found it helpful to grade the same papers. How the team chose papers to co-grade varied: either random choice, faculty request for co-grading of struggling or excelling students' papers to form an objective scoring range, or avoidance of grading papers of friends or mentees. The co-grading process again established consensus and consistency in the grading process, a valuable skill for developing faculty to gain. (3) Regular faculty-TA meetings were found to help facilitate team engagement and collaboration. These meetings allowed for pedagogical discussion, clarification of concepts, and a clear distribution of activities. (4) The authors recommend requiring mentored teaching experience as a curricular requirement for all nursing students in PhD programs. The TAs found that the mentored experience was valuable in framing both pedagogical insight and promoting the benefits of mentoring, which enhanced their overall experience as PhD students and better prepared them for subsequent roles as academic nurses. (5) Finally, the identification of a focused pedagogy added greatly to understanding the experience of faculty and TAs. The narrative pedagogy framework fits well with the participant's experiences as well as the "You Learn When You Teach" final interpretation of this inquiry. These recommendations could be generalized to similar online PhD programs in other schools, particularly those with a focus on development and acculturation of PhD students into the faculty role.

Research Implications

This study should be replicated with a larger sample, including courses with multiple faculty mentors. Additionally, measuring mentees' self-reported growth and mentors' teaching evaluations in future studies would also inform what is known about faculty-TA co-teaching. Replicating this study to include other faculty-TA dyads in both on-line PhD and Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) courses would enhance understanding about the teaching process, TA mentoring, and the bi-directional process of teaching and learning. Findings in DNP courses would be especially interesting because of the difference in focus of courses; that is, practice leadership rather than research.

Limitations

The team did not conduct this inquiry as a typical interpretive phenomenological study. Rather than analyzing data from the usual transcripts of open-ended interviews, the authors read and further reflected upon journal entries about teaching experiences. Journaling occurred either weekly during the semester as the faculty and TAs 1 and 2 co-taught, or as a one-time reflexive account after completion of the mentored experience from TAs 3 and 4. The authors therefore applied trustworthiness criteria in a tailored way, as described in the previous trustworthiness section.

Additional limitations include a small and somewhat inconsistent data pool. Not all of the TAs were able to participate equally in the data collection and analysis processes due to the sequence of courses or time constraints. Also, for some TAs, an ongoing academic relationship with the faculty outside of the mentored teaching experience (such as the faculty being a committee chair) could influence the proclivity towards established consensus and consistency in the grading process, a valuable skill for developing faculty to establish.

Conclusion

The interpretation, "You Learn when You Teach" was congruent with the co-learning principles of narrative pedagogy. The recognition of the role of a specific pedagogical framework is important in a learning environment that is constantly changing (Brown et al., 2008). The authors recommend that even if schools or colleges of nursing do not choose narrative pedagogy to inform their teaching and teaching mentorship practices, nursing leadership should choose a school-wide pedagogical philosophy with guiding principles so that all faculty members, TAs, and students are working within a shared vision of learning. Although some faculty may resist welcoming TAs into their teaching practice (Gormally, Sullivan, & Szeinbaum, 2016), this inquiry demonstrates the positive effect the mutual experience can have on faculty, doctoral-level TAs, and, potentially, PhD nursing students.

References

- American Association of Colleges of Nursing (AACN). (2017, April 26). Nursing faculty shortage fact sheet. Retrieved from <http://www.aacnnursing.org/News-Information/Fact-Sheets/Nursing-Faculty-Shortage>
- Aldebron, J., & Allan, J. D. (2010). Resisting the downward pressure on nursing faculty qualifications. *Journal of Nursing Regulation, 1*(1), 21-25.
- Bartels, J. E. (2007). Preparing nursing faculty for baccalaureate-level and graduate-level nursing programs: Role preparation for the academy. *Journal of Nursing Education, 46*(4), 154-158.

- Benoot, C., & Bilsen, J. (2016). An auto-ethnographic study of the disembodied experience of a novice researcher doing qualitative cancer research. *Qualitative Health Research, 26*(4), 482-489.
- Booth, T. L., Emerson, C. J., Hackney, M. G., & Souter, S. (2016). Preparation of academic nurse educators. *Nurse Education in Practice, 19*, 54-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2016.04.006>
- Brown, S. T., Kirkpatrick, M. K., Mangum, D., & Avery, J. (2008). A review of narrative pedagogy strategies to transform traditional nursing education. *Journal of Nursing Education, 47*(6), 283-286.
- Crist, J. D. (2005). The meaning for elders of receiving family care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 49*(5), 485-493. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2648.2004.03321.x
- Crist, J. D., Pasvogel, A., Hepworth, J. T., Koerner, K. M. (2015). The impact of a telenovela intervention on use of home health care services and Mexican American elder and caregiver outcomes. *Research in Gerontological Nursing, 8*(2), 62-76.
- Crist, J. D., & Tanner, C. A. (2003). Interpretation/analysis methods in hermeneutic interpretive phenomenology. *Nursing Research, 52*(3), 202-205.
- Culyer, L. M., Jatulis, L. L., Cannistraci, P., & Brownell, C. A. (2018). Evidenced-based teaching strategies that facilitate transfer of knowledge between theory and practice: What are nursing faculty using? *Teaching and Learning in Nursing, 13*(3), 174-179.
- Daroszewski, E. B., Kinser, A. G., & Lloyd, S. L. (2004). Online, directed journaling in community health advanced practice nursing clinical education. *Journal of Nursing Education, 43*(4), 175-180.
- Diekelmann, N. (2001). Narrative pedagogy: Heideggerian hermeneutical analyses of lived experiences of students, teachers, and clinicians. *ANS: Advances in Nursing Science, 23*(3), 53-71.
- Douglas, K., & Carless, D. (2013). A history of autoethnographic inquiry. In S. H. Jones, T. E. Adams, & C. Ellis (Eds.), *Handbook of autoethnography* (pp. 84-106). New York, NY: Routledge
- Gormally, C., Sullivan, C. S., & Szeinbaum, N. (2016). uncovering barriers to teaching assistants (TAs) implementing inquiry teaching: Inconsistent facilitation techniques, student resistance, and reluctance to share control over learning with students. *Journal of Microbiology & Biology Education, 17*(2), 215.
- Hill, N. L., Yevchak, A., Kolanowski, A. M., Penrod, J., Milone-Nuzzo, P. F., Sawyer, A. M., . . . Therrien, B. (2014). What it takes: Perspectives from developing nurse scientists. *Journal of Nursing Education, 53*(7), 403-409.
- Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA). (2016). Nurse faculty loan program (NFLP). Retrieved from <http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/nursing/grants/nflp.html>
- Ironside, P. M. (2003). New pedagogies for teaching thinking: The lived experiences of students and teachers enacting narrative pedagogy. *Journal of Nursing Education, 42*(11), 509-516.
- Ironside, P. M. (2005). Using narrative pedagogy: Learning and practicing interpretive thinking. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 55*(4), 478-486.
- Ironside, P. M. (2014). Enabling narrative pedagogy: Inviting, waiting, and letting be. *Nursing Education Perspectives, 35*(4), 212-218.
- Jootun, D., McGhee, G., & Marland, G. R. (2009). Reflexivity: Promoting rigour in qualitative research. *Nursing Standard, 23*(23), 42-46.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Oermann, M. H. (2007). Approaches to gathering evidence for educational practices in nursing. *The Journal of Continuing Education in Nursing, 38*(6), 250-255.
- Sherwood, G., & Horton-Deutsch, S. (2012). *Reflective practice: Transforming education*

- and improving outcomes*. Indianapolis, IN: Sigma Theta Tau.
- Suplee, P. D., Gardner, M., & Jerome-D'Emilia, B. (2014). Nursing faculty preparedness for clinical teaching. *Journal of Nursing Education*, 53(3), S38-S41.
- Van Manen, M. (2016). *Phenomenology of practice: Meaning-giving methods in phenomenological research and writing*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Author Note

Dr. Acosta and Dr. Overgaard recently graduated with their PhDs and Dr. Pool is Clinical Assistant Professor in the Integrative Nursing Faculty Fellowship (INFF) and Continuing Professional Education Programs, at College of Nursing, The University of Arizona. Dr. Renz is Director, Adult-Gerontology Primary Care Nurse Practitioner Program and Advanced Senior Lecturer A, at the University of Pennsylvania School of Nursing. Dr. Crist, Associate Professor, conducts community-based participatory research with narrative pedagogical interventions with Mexican American family caregivers. She teaches the required PhD qualitative research course and doctoral gerontological elective course. Correspondence regarding this article can be addressed directly to: jcrist@email.arizona.edu.

Acknowledgement to Dr. Linda R. Phillips with early recommendations on literature review.

Copyright 2019: Lauren A. Acosta, Penny Morgan Overgaard, Natalie M. Pool, Susan m. Renz, Janice D. Crist, and Nova Southeastern University.

Article Citation

Acosta, L. A., Overgaard, P. M., Pool, N. M., Renz, S. M., & Crist, J. D. (2019). You learn when you teach: A narrative pedagogy for faculty and graduate teaching assistants. *The Qualitative Report*, 24(11), 2891-2902. Retrieved from <https://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol24/iss11/14>
