НАУЧНАЯ АРТЕЛЬ
АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОЕ ИЗДАТЕЛЬСТВО

16+

ISSN (p) 2411-7161
ISSN (e) 2712-9500

№ 4/2025

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
«IN SITU»

Москва
2025

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ «IN SITU»

Учредитель:
Общество с ограниченной ответственностью «Издательство «Научная артель»

ISSN (p) 2411-7161
ISSN (e) 2712-9500

Периодичность: 1 раз в месяц

Журнал размещается в Научной электронной библиотеке elibrary.ru по договору №511-08/2015 от 06.08.2015

Журнал размещен в международном каталоге периодических изданий Ulruch's Periodicals Directory.

Верстка: Мартиросян О.В.
Редактор/корректор: Мартиросян Г.В.

Учредитель, издатель и редакция
научного журнала «IN SITU»
Академическое издательство «Научная артель»:
+7 (495) 514 80 82
https://sciartel.ru
info@sciartel.ru
450057, ул. Салавата 15

Подписано в печать 27.04.2025 г.
Формат 60x90/8
Усл. печ. л. 11.80
Тираж 500.

Отпечатано
в редакционно-издательском отделе академического издательства «Научная артель»
https://sciartel.ru
info@sciartel.ru
+7 (495) 514 80 82

Цена свободная. Распространяется по подписке.

Все статьи проходят экспертную проверку. Точка зрения редакции не всегда совпадает с точкой зрения авторов публикуемых статей.

Авторы статей несут полную ответственность за содержание статей и за сам факт их публикации. Редакция не несет ответственности перед авторами и/или третьими лицами за возможный ущерб, вызванный публикацией статьи.

При использовании и заимствовании материалов, опубликованных в научном журнале, ссылка на журнал обязательна

Главный редактор:
Сукиасян Асатур Альбертович, к.э.н.
Редакционный совет:
Абидова Гулмира Шухратовна, д.т.н.
Авазов Сардоржон Эркин угли, д.с.-х.н.
Агафонов Юрий Алексеевич, д.м.н.
Алейникова Елена Владимировна, д.гос.упр.
Алиев Закир Гусейн оглы, д.фил.агр.н.
Ашрапов Баходурджон Пулотович, к.фил.н.
Бабаян Анжела Владиславовна, д.пед.н.
Баишева Зиля Вагизовна, д.фил.н.
Булатова Айсылу Ильдаровна, к.соц.н.
Бурак Леонид Чеславович, к.т.н., PhD
Ванесян Ашот Саркисович, д.м.н.
Васильев Федор Петрович, д.ю.н., член РАЮН
Вельчинская Елена Васильевна, д.фарм.н.
Виневская Анна Вячеславовна, к.пед.н.
Габрусь Андрей Александрович, к.э.н.
Галимова Гузалия Абкадировна, к.э.н.
Гетманская Елена Валентиновна, д.пед.н.
Гимранова Гузель Хамидулловна, к.э.н.
Григорьев Михаил Федосеевич, к.с.-х.н.
Грузинская Екатерина Игоревна, к.ю.н.
Гулиев Игбал Адилевич, к.э.н.
Датий Алексей Васильевич, д.м.н.
Долгов Дмитрий Иванович, к.э.н.
Дусматов Абдурахим Дусматович, к. т. н.
Ежкова Нина Сергеевна, д.пед.н.
Екшикеев Тагер Кадырович, к.э.н.
Епхиева Марина Константиновна, к.пед.н., проф. РАЕ
Ефременко Евгений Сергеевич, к.м.н.
Закиров Мунавир Закиевич, к.т.н.
Зарипов Хусан Баходирович, PhD.
Иванова Нионила Ивановна, д.с.-х.н.
Калужина Светлана Анатольевна, д.х.н.
Канарейкин Александр Иванович, к.т.н.
Касимова Дилара Фаритовна, к.э.н.
Киракосян Сусана Арсеновна, к.ю.н.
Киркимбаева Жумагуль Слямбековна, д.вет.н.
Кленина Елена Анатольевна, к.филос.н.
Клещина Марина Геннадьевна, к.э.н.,
Козлов Юрий Павлович, д.б.н., заслуженный эколог РФ
Кондрашихин Андрей Борисович, д.э.н.
Конопацкова Ольга Михайловна, д.м.н.
Куликова Татьяна Ивановна, к.псих.н.
Курбанаева Лилия Хамматовна, к.э.н.
Курманова Лилия Рашидовна, д.э.н.
Ларионов Максим Викторович, д.б.н.
Малышкина Елена Владимировна, к.и. н.
Маркова Надежда Григорьевна, д.пед.н.
Мещерякова Алла Брониславовна, к.э.н.
Мухамадеева Зинфира Фанисовна, к.соц.н.
Мухамедова Гулчехра Рихсибаевна, к.пед.н.
Набиев Тухтамурод Сахобович, д.т.н.
Песков Аркадий Евгеньевич, к.полит.н.
Половеня Сергей Иванович, к.т.н.
Пономарева Лариса Николаевна, к.э.н.
Почивалов Александр Владимирович, д.м.н.
Прошин Иван Александрович, д.т.н.
Саттарова Рано Кадыровна, к.биол.н.
Сафина Зиля Забировна, к.э.н.
Симонович Николай Евгеньевич, д.псих. н., академик РАЕН
Сирик Марина Сергеевна, к.ю.н.
Смирнов Павел Геннадьевич, к.пед.н.
Старцев Андрей Васильевич, д.т.н.
Танаева Замфира Рафисовна, д.пед.н.
Терзиев Венелин Кръстев, д.э.н., член РАЕ
Умаров Бехзод Тургунпулатович, д.т.н.
Хайров Расим Золимхон углы, к.пед.н.
Хамзаев Иномжон Хамзаевич, к. т. н.
Хасанов Сайдинаби Сайдивалиевич, д.с.-х.н.
Чернышев Андрей Валентинович, д.э.н.
Чиладзе Георгий Бидзинович, д.э.н., д.ю.н., член РАЕ
Шилкина Елена Леонидовна, д.соц.н.
Шкирмонтов Александр Прокопьевич, д.т.н., член-РАЕ
Шляхов Станислав Михайлович, д.физ.-мат.н.
Шошин Сергей Владимирович, к.ю.н.
Юсупов Рахимьян Галимьянович, д.и. н.
Яковишина Татьяна Федоровна, д.т.н.
Янгиров Азат Вазирович, д.э.н.
Яруллин Рауль Рафаэллович, д.э.н., член РАЕ

Dương Thuý Hường, Nguyễn Thị Thảo 44
A REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN TERTIARY EDUCATION

Meredova S., Guyjova G. 49
EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING: UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEDAGOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Nguyen Thi Cuc 51
THE PENETRATION OF ENGLISH VOCABULARY INTO CONTEMPORARY VIETNAMESE: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

Saparmedova N., Sahetmyradova S. 56
THREE MODERN METHODS OF TEACHING FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Shodieva N.A. 59
THE USAGE OF COLLOQUIAL VOCABULARIES IN ABDURRAHMAN JAMI`S POETRY

Azimova U.A. 61
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ПРОСТОГО БУДУЩЕГО ВРЕМЕНИ В ТАДЖИКСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Султонов А.А. 64
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ МОРФОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ОСОБЕННОСТЕЙ НЕКОТОРЫХ МЕЖДОМЕТИЙ В ТАДЖИКСКОМ И КИТАЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

ЮРИСПРУДЕНЦИЯ

Суханбердиева О., Моминов Н. 69
ПРОБЛЕМЫ НЕСОВЕРШЕННОЛЕТНИХ В ЮРИДИЧЕСКОЙ ПСИХОЛОГИИ

ПЕДАГОГИКА

Garryyev A., Yoldashov G., Guvanjova N. 73
THE INTEGRATION OF TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION

Myratdurdyyev N., Abayev M., Atayeva A. 74
THE ROLE OF PEDAGOGY IN EDUCATION

Nguyen Truong Dong, Thai Viet Hung 76
ТЕНДЕНЦИИ ВЫБОРА ВИДОВ СПОРТА В ПРОГРАММЕ ФИЗИЧЕСКОГО ВОСПИТАНИЯ СТУДЕНТОВ

Vu Thi Huong Giang 81
ВЫБОР УПРАЖНЕНИЙ ДЛЯ РАЗВИТИЯ ОБЩЕЙ ФИЗИЧЕСКОЙ ПОДГОТОВКИ У СТУДЕНТОК-ПЕРВОКУРСНИЦ ХАНОЙСКОГО УНИВЕРСИТЕТА ГОРНОГО ДЕЛА И ГЕОЛОГИИ

Гильманова А.Р. 85
НРАВСТВЕННО-ПАТРИОТИЧЕСКОЕ ВОСПИТАНИЕ СТАРШИХ ДОШКОЛЬНИКОВ

Давлетшина Э.Д. 87
ОЗНАКОМЛЕНИЕ ДЕТЕЙ СТАРШЕГО ДОШКОЛЬНОГО ВОЗРАСТА С НАРОДНЫМИ ТАНЦАМИ

ФИЛОЛОГИЯ

2. Ghazal, R. A. (2018). Multilingualism and Science: A Critical Look at the Role of English. International Journal of Multilingualism, 15(4), 35-50.
3. Pennycook, A. (2017). The Global Spread of English and its Impact on Scientific Discourse. Language and Education, 31(5), 450-467.

© Akmyradova A., Atayeva M., 2025

Dương Thuý Hường
Nguyễn Thị Thảo
Hanoi University of Mining and Geology

A REVIEW OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN TERTIARY EDUCATION

Abstract

Professional Development (PD) in tertiary education plays a crucial role in enhancing teaching quality and supporting the continuous growth of faculty members. However, given the wide range of academic disciplines, faculty roles, and institutional contexts, there is no one-size-fits-all approach to PD. This paper reviews key PD models commonly used in higher education, classifying them into three main categories: traditional models, collaborative models, and technology-driven models. Each approach is examined in terms of its strengths, limitations, and applicability within university settings. Traditional PD models, while common, often provide short-term, one-off experiences that may lack long-term impact or adaptability to specific institutional needs. Collaborative models, such as Professional Learning Communities and peer coaching, emphasize ongoing engagement and peer-driven learning, fostering both individual and collective development. Technology-driven PD models offer flexibility and broader access, but their success is contingent upon institutional support and digital competence. This paper provides a comprehensive analysis of diverse PD models and their relevance in a rapidly evolving educational landscape. The findings of the study provide valuable insights for university leaders, academic developers, and policymakers, advocating for a blended PD strategy that integrates traditional, collaborative, and technology-enhanced methods to enhance faculty development and institutional advancement.

Keywords:

PD, tertiary education, collaborative learning, technology-driven PD.

1. Introduction

In the rapidly growing landscape of higher education, the Professional Development (PD) of academic staff has become a vital component in enhancing teaching quality, student learning outcomes, and institutional innovation. As universities respond to increasing demands for responsibility, digital transformation, and pedagogy, the need for effective, sustainable, and context-based PD models has increased. Unlike the school sector, where structured PD frameworks are often mandated, tertiary education presents unique challenges and opportunities due to its diverse disciplines, autonomous work cultures, and varied faculty roles. Consequently, PD in this context must be both flexible and strategically aligned with institutional priorities.

This paper offers a comprehensive review of key PD models commonly applied in tertiary education, categorizing them into three broad types: traditional models, collaborative and reflective models, and

technology-driven models. Traditional approaches such as workshops, seminars, conferences, and formal courses provide foundational learning experiences, while models like Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), Lesson Study, Peer coaching and mentoring emphasize sustained collaboration and reflective practice. In parallel, technology-enhanced PD, including online platforms, blended learning, and digital professional networks, has introduced greater accessibility and adaptability to academic development. By analyzing different approaches to professional learning, this study aims to provide insights into best practices for enhancing educator competencies and fostering a culture of continuous improvement in educational institutions

2. The Concepts of Professional Development

Professional Development is a multifaceted and ongoing process that aims to enhance individuals' knowledge, skills, and practices in their professional roles. PD is crucial for teachers to stay current with advancements in pedagogy, subject knowledge, and instructional technologies. It also fosters their ability to respond effectively to the evolving needs of learners and educational institutions. Various scholars have defined PD from different perspectives. Day (1999) describes it as "*all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities that are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group, or school, which contribute to the quality of education in the classroom*" (p.4). This definition highlights both formal and informal learning opportunities and their impact on teaching and learning outcomes. Guskey (2000) defines PD as "*those processes and activities designed to enhance the professional knowledge, skills, and attitudes of educators so that they might improve the learning of students*" (p.16). His definition underscores the connection between teacher learning and student outcomes, emphasizing that the ultimate goal of PD is to improve educational quality. Kennedy (2014) provides a broader perspective by categorizing PD into nine distinct models, each with specific theoretical and practical implications. She emphasizes the complexity of PD, noting that its design and delivery must align with contextual goals and the power dynamics between teachers and external stakeholders. Darling-Hammond et al. (2017) define PD as "*structured professional learning that results in changes in teacher practices and improvements in student learning outcomes*" (p.2). This definition emphasizes the structured and intentional nature of PD, along with its dual focus on teacher practices and student achievement.

Definitions of PD offered by various scholars highlight both shared goals and unique perspectives. A common thread among these definitions is the central aim of PD: to enhance teaching practices and, in turn, improve student learning outcomes. Scholars like Guskey (2000) and Darling-Hammond (2017) emphasize this outcome-driven approach, underlining the importance of linking PD directly to student achievement. Others, such as Day (1999) and Kennedy (2014), offer broader views that reflect the complexity and diversity of PD in practice. Day (1999) acknowledges that professional growth can occur through both formal and informal experiences, recognizing the many ways educators learn. Meanwhile, Kennedy’s framework highlights the importance of aligning PD approaches with specific educational contexts, reinforcing the idea that effective professional learning must be adaptable and responsive to individual and institutional needs.

3. Models of Professional Development in Education

PD models have been widely studied, with scholars emphasizing the importance of structured and collaborative learning approaches (Guskey, 2002; Desimone, 2009). PD models can be categorized into three main types: traditional, collaborative, and technology-driven.

3.1. Traditional Models of Professional Development

Traditional PD models, such as *workshops*, *conferences*, and *seminars*, have long been used to enhance educators’ skills and knowledge. These models typically involve structured, expert-led sessions that provide theoretical and practical insights into specific teaching methodologies or subject areas. Workshops and seminars offer educators opportunities to gain new knowledge within a short time frame, and they are

effective in introducing new concepts. *Course-based PD*, such as degree programs, enhances content knowledge but requires substantial time and financial investment (Avalos, 2011). *Conferences* foster networking and knowledge exchange, though their long-term impact depends on implementation strategies. However, traditional models often lack sustained follow-up and practical application. They can be passive and may not lead to long-term changes in teaching behavior (Guskey, 2002).

3.2. Collaborative Models of Professional Development

Collaborative PD models focus on peer interaction, shared learning experiences, and ongoing support among educators. These models foster deeper engagement and provide opportunities for collective problem-solving and reflection. *Professional Learning Communities* (PLCs) involve educators working together to analyze student performance, refine teaching strategies, and reflect on instructional practices (DuFour & Eaker, 1998). PLCs foster a sense of community, promote sustained inquiry, and align closely with school goals. They support job-embedded learning and collective responsibility for student outcomes. However, effective PLCs require time, trust, and strong leadership. Without a collaborative culture, PLCs may become superficial or dominated by a few voices (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). *Lesson study*, a model originating from Japan, allows educators to collaboratively design, teach, and analyze lessons for continuous improvement (Lewis, 2002). *Peer Coaching and Mentoring* models involve experienced educators providing guidance, feedback, and support to their peers. Peer coaching allows for real-time reflection and adjustment of teaching practices, leading to improved classroom effectiveness (Hargreaves & Fullan, 2012). Mentoring, particularly for new faculty members, helps ease the transition into academia and fosters a culture of professional support. Peer coaching allows for contextualized learning and continuous feedback. However, success depends heavily on the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship and institutional recognition of mentoring efforts.

3.3. Technology-Driven Models of Professional Development

The rapid integration of digital technologies into education has given rise to technology-driven PD models, which offer flexible and accessible learning opportunities for educators.

With advancements in digital learning, technology-driven PD has become increasingly common. Online courses and webinars provide flexible learning opportunities through platforms like Coursera and EdX. E-coaching and virtual mentoring offer real-time feedback from experts worldwide (Knight, 2011). Social media and Professional Learning Networks (PLNs) enable educators to engage in ongoing discussions, access new research, and share best practices. While these models offer accessibility and scalability, they require self-discipline and digital literacy for effective implementation. Table 1 below shows the synthesis of different PD models.

Table 1

An Overview of Professional Development Models

PD Model Type	Description	Examples	Strengths	Limitations
Traditional Models	Expert-led, structured learning sessions.	Workshops, seminars, formal courses	Clear objectives, expert guidance, institutional recognition	One-size-fits-all, limited customization, often passive learning
Collaborative Models	Peer interaction and shared learning experiences.	PLCs, peer coaching, mentoring, lesson study	Active engagement, professional dialogue, cultural change	Time-intensive, facilitator-dependent, needs institutional alignment
Technology-Driven Models	Flexible learning using digital tools and platforms.	Online courses, webinars, e-coaching, PLNs	Accessible, cost-effective, scalable, self-paced	Requires digital literacy, risk of shallow learning, limited contextualization

4. The Application of Professional Development Models in Tertiary Education

PD in tertiary education is increasingly recognized as a critical factor in enhancing teaching quality,

academic leadership, and institutional effectiveness. While PD has long been emphasized in school settings, its application in higher education requires context-based models that account for the diverse roles, workloads, and disciplines of academic staff. Traditional PD models such as workshops, seminars, conferences, and course-based learning have formed the foundation of many institutional strategies. However, evolving educational demands and technological advancements have prompted a shift toward more collaborative, reflective, and technology-integrated approaches. An effective application of PD in tertiary education demands a balanced integration of various models to address both individual faculty needs and broader institutional goals.

Traditional PD models retain certain advantages in the university context. Workshops and seminars, for instance, offer focused, short-term learning on specific topics such as curriculum design, assessment, or digital tools. They are relatively easy to organize and can engage a wide audience (Desimone, 2009). Conferences provide exposure to cutting-edge research and enable faculty to connect with peers globally, thus fostering academic networks and scholarly engagement (Kennedy, 2016). Course-based PD, such as postgraduate certificates in teaching and learning, allows for deeper engagement and credentialing, which can support career development (Avalos, 2011). However, these models often lack sustained impact due to their episodic nature and limited opportunities for contextual application, particularly when they are not embedded in day-to-day academic practice (Garet et al., 2001). Furthermore, faculty may experience time and workload constraints that hinder participation, reducing the long-term effectiveness of these traditional approaches.

In contrast, collaborative and reflective models such as Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), Lesson Study, Peer coaching and mentoring have emerged as more sustainable and context-responsive forms of PD. These models promote continuous learning, peer interaction, and reflective dialogue, which are essential for meaningful pedagogical change (Vescio et al., 2008). PLCs, for example, allow university departments or cross-disciplinary groups to engage in collective inquiry around student outcomes, curriculum innovation, or inclusive teaching practices (DuFour, 2004). Similarly, peer coaching and mentoring foster reciprocal learning relationships, which can be particularly beneficial for early-career academics navigating complex institutional environments (Trowler & Knight, 2000; Hobson et al., 2009). Lesson Study, though less common in higher education, offers a structured and evidence-based process for improving teaching through collaborative lesson planning and analysis (Lewis et al., 2006). Despite their promise, these models require significant institutional support, including time allocation, leadership confirmation, and capacity-building for facilitators to ensure effective implementation.

Technology-driven PD models further expand the scope of faculty development by offering flexibility, personalization, and scalability. Online learning platforms, webinars, and digital communities of practice provide asynchronous, accessible learning opportunities tailored to faculty interests and availability (Dede et al., 2009). Blended models, which combine face-to-face learning with digital components, have been particularly effective in promoting sustained engagement and contextual application in higher education (Owston et al., 2008). Moreover, social media and online professional networks enable academics to connect globally, share resources, and engage in continuous learning beyond institutional boundaries (Trust et al., 2016). Nevertheless, disparities in digital literacy, limited institutional support for online PD, and a lack of structured design can undermine their impact. Effective use of technology-driven models in tertiary education requires alignment with pedagogical goals, robust instructional design, and recognition of informal learning pathways.

In summary, the effective application of PD models in tertiary education depends on a strategic and integrated approach that aligns with the complex roles and needs of academic staff. Traditional models offer foundational learning opportunities, while collaborative, reflective, and technology-driven approaches foster

deeper, sustained engagement. Institutions must adopt a holistic view of PD that blends multiple models, supports institutional culture, and provides structural conditions, such as time, leadership, and resources, that enable faculty to engage meaningfully in their professional growth. Only through such an integrated approach can PD in higher education contribute to improved teaching quality, student outcomes, and institutional innovation.

5. Conclusion

The paper has highlighted the evolving landscape of PD in tertiary education, underscoring the need for a multidimensional and responsive approach to faculty learning. Traditional models such as workshops, seminars, conferences, and formal courses continue to offer structured and accessible formats. However, their limitations, particularly in sustainability and contextual relevance, have prompted a growing interest in collaborative, reflective, and technology-driven alternatives. Models like PLCs, Lesson Study, Peer coaching and mentoring emphasize professional collaboration, inquiry, and practical application, aligning well with the complex pedagogical and institutional demands of higher education. Likewise, technology-enhanced PD offers increased flexibility and reach, although its effectiveness depends on thoughtful integration and adequate support systems.

The effective implementation of professional development in tertiary education requires careful attention to the unique characteristics of each institution such as its culture, workload expectations, and the diverse disciplines of its academic staff. Since no single PD model can meet all needs, a well-balanced combination of strategies is necessary. This blend should be supported by strong institutional leadership, adequate time for participation, and continuous evaluation to ensure its relevance and impact. To truly improve teaching quality, student outcomes, and drive innovation, universities must adopt a holistic approach to PD, one that integrates professional learning as a core, ongoing part of academic life. Future efforts should aim to build a strong culture of ongoing learning while exploring professional development practices that are practical, adaptable, and suited to the specific needs and challenges of higher education institutions.

References:

1. Avalos, B. (2011). Teacher PD in teaching and teacher education over ten years. Teaching and Teacher Education, 27(1), 10-20.
2. Boud, D., & Brew, A. (2013). Reconceptualizing academic work as professional practice: Implications for faculty development. Studies in Higher Education, 38(2), 214-227.
3. Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). Effective teacher PD. Learning Policy Institute.
4. Day, C. (1999). Developing Teachers: The Challenges of Lifelong Learning. Falmer Press.
5. Dede, C., Ketelhut, D. J., Whitehouse, P., Breit, L., & McCloskey, E. M. (2009). A research agenda for online teacher professional development. Journal of Teacher Education, 60(1), 8–19.
6. Desimone, L. M. (2009). Improving impact studies of teachers' PD. Educational Researcher, 38(3), 181-199.
7. DuFour, R., & Eaker, R. (1998). Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best Practices for Enhancing Student Achievement. Solution Tree.
8. DuFour, R. (2004). What is a professional learning community? Educational Leadership, 61(8), 6–11.
9. Garet, M. S., Porter, A. C., Desimone, L., Birman, B. F., & Yoon, K. S. (2001). What makes professional development effective? Results from a national sample of teachers. American Educational Research Journal, 38(4), 915–945.
10. Guskey, T. R. (2000). Evaluating professional development. Corwin Press
11. Guskey, T. R. (2002). PD and teacher change. Teachers and Teaching, 8(3), 381-391.
12. Hargreaves, A., & Fullan, M. (2012). Professional capital: Transforming teaching in every school. Teachers

College Press.
13. Hobson, A. J., Ashby, P., Malderez, A., & Tomlinson, P. D. (2009). Mentoring beginning teachers: What we know and what we don't. Teaching and Teacher Education, 25(1), 207–216.
14. Kennedy, M. M. (2014). How does PD improve teaching? Review of Educational Research, 84(4), 512-545.
15. Knight, J. (2011). Unmistakable impact: A partnership approach for dramatically improving instruction. Corwin Press.
16. Lewis, C. (2002). Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional change. Research for Better Schools.
17. McKenna, L., & Hughes, H. (2015). Improving university teaching: The teacher's perspective. International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 27(1), 26-35.
18. Owston, R., Sinclair, M., & Wideman, H. (2008). Teacher study groups: Impact of online professional development on teacher practice and student achievement. Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 40(3), 267–284.
19. Steinert, Y., Mann, K., Centeno, A., Dolmans, D., Spencer, J., Gelula, M., & Prideaux, D. (2016). A systematic review of faculty development initiatives designed to improve teaching effectiveness in medical education. Medical Teacher, 28(2), 497-526.
20. Trowler, P., & Knight, P. T. (2000). Coming to know in higher education: Theorising faculty entry to new work contexts. Higher Education Research & Development, 19(1), 27–42.
21. Trust, T., Krutka, D. G., & Carpenter, J. P. (2016). Professional learning networks for teachers. Computers & Education, 102, 15-34.
22. Vescio, V., Ross, D., & Adams, A. (2008). A review of research on the impact of professional learning communities on teaching practice and student learning. Teaching and Teacher Education, 24(1), 80–91.

©Dương Thuý Hường, Nguyễn Thị Thảo, 2025

Meredova Senem, student.
Guyjova Guljemal, student.
Turkmen National Institute of World Languages named after Dovletmammet Azadi.
Ashgabat, Turkmenistan

EFFECTIVE TEACHING AND LEARNING: UNDERSTANDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PEDAGOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY

Abstract

Pedagogy and psychology are two intertwined fields that greatly influence educational practices and outcomes. Pedagogy, the art and science of teaching, draws extensively from psychological theories and principles to enhance the learning experience. This article explores the relationship between pedagogy and psychology, focusing on how psychological insights contribute to effective teaching methods, learning strategies, and student development. It examines key psychological theories and their applications in the classroom, including behaviorism, cognitive psychology, and social learning theory. Furthermore, the paper discusses the role of psychological assessments, motivation, and emotional well-being in education. The integration of pedagogy and psychology not only improves instructional practices but also supports the holistic development of students, fostering academic success and personal growth.