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Abstract

This hermeneutic phenomenological study explored the role of disjuncture in influencing teacher identity and practice in higher education. I adopted Peter Jarvis’ (2006) concept of disjuncture, a state whereby individuals experience a sense of unknowing or questioning generated from within and often prompted by their interactions in the social world. I examined the phenomenon of disjuncture from the perspective of ten 3M National Teaching Fellows from across Canada. The Fellows participated in individual and group interviews. They were asked to reflect on the emotions, cognitions, and actions they experienced during moments of disjuncture and together we interpreted how their teaching and identities changed as a result. Each Fellow’s disjuncture experience was contextualized in a short biographical narrative. The purpose of the narratives was to offer background on who they are as a learner and a teacher and to serve as fixed examples of the phenomenon of disjuncture.

I analyzed the data using Jarvis’ theoretical learning framework, *The Transformation of the Person through Learning*, and focused on identifying the nature of Fellows’ learning from disjuncture. The nature of learning is described as the Fellows’ emotions, cognitions, actions during disjuncture and how their teaching and teacher identities changed as a result. The data are presented through four hermeneutic windows, which provide structure to describe these essential dimensions of learning from disjuncture.

The findings indicated that using a scaffolded guided reflection process involving conversational prompts about episodes of disjuncture evoked reflection on and identification of shifts in both practice and teacher identity. The Fellows in this study described learning about students, learning about teaching, and learning about themselves as teachers. This study resulted in a modified definition of disjuncture called *pedagogical disjuncture* which better reflects the
teacher and teaching experience. As a result of this study, I have integrated the findings into a discussion of the features of new pedagogy of disjuncture for teacher development that has both theoretical and practical applications in higher education. The study concludes with suggestions for future research that deepens our understanding of teacher development from learning perspective of teaching. Such research would ideally explore the centrality of learning in teachers’ experiences of teaching and teacher identity development.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Some might say that earning multiple degrees and a professional certification in the field of education would make me a good teacher. But they do not. They are only part of the picture of who I am as a teacher. I am proud of my credentials and I would not diminish them as they are reifications of my growing expertise, skills, and knowledge in education. Nevertheless, I recently realized that these hard-earned credentials are, at most, an indication of what I can do. A Bachelor of Education indicates that I am certified to teach in K-12 contexts; my graduate degrees signify that I can also think widely and deeply about teaching and learning and can conduct educational research. But what do they indicate about who I am as a teacher, or as an educational researcher for that matter? And does ‘who I am’ matter?

I have never thought about myself solely in terms of what I do, nor do I believe the students and faculty with whom I work think my credentials imply I am an effective teacher. In an earlier article written by Darling-Hammond and Youngs (2002) they argued, “Teachers matter for student achievement, but teacher education and certification are not related to teacher effectiveness” (p. 13). My multiple credentials indicate little about the approaches, beliefs, attitudes, and assumptions that might make me effective at engaging and connecting with students and faculty members in my teaching and educational development work. The educators with whom I work expect that I am a competent instructor and that I will use approaches and techniques and share content knowledge that will help them learn about teaching – everything my credentials might indicate I would do as a certified teacher. However, I am growing increasingly convinced that they look for more when it comes to their engagement in learning.

Research on teacher effectiveness has shown that when students perceive teachers as caring, understanding, and fair they report higher engagement in learning (Peart & Campbell,
1999; Stronge, 2018). Such qualities have also been linked to teachers’ capacities to teach effectively (Intrator & Kunzman, 2006). Furthermore, teachers who know students both academically and socially (in appropriate settings outside of the classroom) are likely to create constructive learning environments that draw on students’ prior knowledge, consider their interests and thus make a positive impact on students’ achievement and motivation for learning (Stronge, Ward & Grant, 2011; Stronge, 2018). Similarly, researchers concluded that teachers who expressed positive perspectives on life and are highly motivated to teach their subject matter also inspired students to engage in learning in their classes (Darling-Hammond & Youngs, 2002; Mitchell, 1998; Rowan, Chiang, & Miller, 1997; Stronge, 2018).

Care, understanding, positive perspectives, and motivation are but a few of the innumerable ineffable qualities that are personal and unique to an individual teacher. These qualities are also component parts of what Palmer (1998) referred to as the inner landscape of a teacher’s life – at the heart of which is the identity and integrity of the teacher. However, I have learned that the questions about who professors are as teachers or how they develop qualities that students find engaging for learning are rarely explored in higher education research and in approaches to higher education teacher development.

Why is who I am important to my teaching? One possible answer to this question is drawn from psychology and suggests humans have a fundamental human need to maintain and enhance our identities. This phenomenon is known as identity recognition (Bracher, 1999). Identity motivates our actions in the classroom (Bracher, 1999; 2006). Identity maintenance theories suggest that the most fundamental human motivator is the need to maintain and enhance one’s identity through gaining and controlling appreciation, validation, and/or acknowledgment from others (Bracher, 2009; Steele, 1999). Bracher claimed, “Identity is a function of the most
stable, underlying structures and contents that determine and govern one’s relationships with other people and the world in general” (2009, p. XXI).

Bracher (2006) argued that professors need to pay attention to how their own need for recognition in teaching—the most “profound identity support” (p. 137)—influences their interactions with students. Transference is an example of directed, recognition-seeking behaviour and occurs in a classroom situation when “Students seek recognition from authority by adopting certain alien identity contents they believe the authority approves of and abandoning, suppressing, or rejecting elements that are integral to their selves but that they believe the authority disapproves of” (Bracher, 1999, p.80). Likewise, the presence of student transference can have a reciprocal effect and work to satisfy the professor’s identity needs at the same time. Accordingly, transference can have a negative influence on students’ identity development when they are behaving, responding, or even adopting certain perspectives for the sole purpose of gaining recognition from their professor or maintaining an identity they think they should uphold (Bracher, 1999).

Bracher’s explanation offers some clarity that who I am and what my identity needs are have an impact on my teaching and students’ learning in ways that can be either extraordinarily positive or unfortunately disadvantageous to their development as individuals. Moreover, understanding identity needs—the need for recognition, identity maintenance, and factors that enhance or threaten identity—can help professors become better facilitators of student learning and development (Bracher, 1999).

Another answer to why who I am is important to my teaching comes from a philosophical stance, which influences my motivations for engaging in this study. Two decades ago, Parker Palmer (1998, p. 1) professed, “We teach who we are.” And his message is timeless. Amidst
changing political climates, ongoing innovations in post-secondary teaching, and advancements in our understanding about student learning, Palmer’s adage points to the glaring reality that, teachers themselves, matter – especially with respect to student learning and development. Knowing our inner lives Palmer also said, “. . .is as crucial to good teaching” as knowing our students and our subjects (p. 3). And who I am—my identity—is multidimensional, including those learned beliefs, values, and assumptions that shape my teaching practice and inform my intentions behind those practices. The key to my understanding of identity is the word learn. I am interested in how the learned and learning of behaviours shape professors’ practices and their identities in the classroom, and in particular the contexts and events that provoke meaningful learning leading to shifts in teacher identity.

I consider identity to be both a psychosocial and intersubjective phenomenon (Smith & Sparkes, 2008). I conceptualize identity as an individual’s sense of self as shaped by the intersection of biological, cognitive, and social forces. More specifically, I see identity as located primarily in the individual—in their subjectivity and personal experiences—and it is also intersubjective in that it is socially and culturally shaped (Smith & Sparkes, 2008).

I acknowledge that identity is, ultimately, a learned phenomenon and can it be a potential outcome of disjuncture. Disjuncture is a state whereby individuals experience a sense of unknowing or questioning generated from within and often prompted by their interactions in the social world (Jarvis, 2006). When we experience disjuncture—a gap between our biographies and our consciousness of the world around us—we feel a sense of unease because we can no longer cope automatically with our situation and our harmony with the world is disturbed. We make choices about how to act to resolve disjuncture including ignoring it and learning from it.

The quest to resolve disjuncture and restore harmony to our experiences is often a
catalyst for learning, which means we are changed in terms of developing new knowledge, skills, experience and/or sense of self (Jarvis, 2006). Jarvis defined learning as

the combination of processes throughout a lifetime whereby the whole person – body (genetic, physical and biological) and mind (knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses) – experiences social situations, the perceived content of which is then transformed cognitively, emotively or practically (or through any combination) and integrated into the individual person’s biography resulting in a continually changing (or more experienced) person. (p. 134)

When we learn from disjuncture situations, we experience new outcomes (e.g. values, beliefs, knowledge, attitudes, skills, emotions etc.) and subsequently commit the outcomes of learning to memory

The experience of disjuncture offers the potential for meaningful learning which is particularly important for identity formation. Resolving disjuncture by choosing to learn rather than ignoring the disjuncture is connected to identity in such a way that the outcome of learning is incorporated into our biography/our sense of who we are. Similarly, Tett (2012) argued learning can be the primary means of creating a new self; it is not simply about acquiring new tasks but about changes in people’s identity. In other words, identities can change or (re)form when we learn from disjuncture (Jarvis, 2006). For example, Erichsen’s (2011) research with international students demonstrated that when studying abroad, they experienced numerous incidents of disjuncture associated with situations where they faced events that were counter to their previous experiences and/or expectations. The students reported that they engaged in deep, reflective learning as part of their efforts in the moment they experienced disjuncture to adjust and make sense of their experiences. They also reported using reflection as part of their
participation in Erichsen’s research study. Accordingly, the students reported, “A growing sense of confidence, a willingness and ability to integrate aspects of both cultures into various dimensions of their lives, and a more developed sense of self [emphasis added] and voice” (p. 122).

Anthropologist Tim Ingold (2011) argued that we constantly construct who we are through movement and he conceptualized identity as being through movement. He theorized that as we move through our lives, we actively construct a meshwork of lines that represent our experiences. The lines are not conjoined at particular points but interwoven to make up a web of experiences (or a life story). I appreciate this theory because it accounts for the complexity of our everyday lived experiences and that we do not always make sense of them and incorporate them into our life story in a linear pattern— as if we must make sense of one experience before we move on to the next one.

Ingold’s theorizing about identity also made me think more deeply about the role of learning as a part of disjuncture and our development of our identities as teachers. If identity involves being through movement, then a teacher is who she has learned to become along the way as she moves through her career having numerous experiences of disjuncture and subsequent learning and interweaving them into her life story and identity. Crafton and Albers (2012) accurately stated, “Learning to teach and improving one’s practice are ultimately a process of becoming” (p. 226). To me, this means that we are not born teachers; we learn to be them. The teacher I am is always in becoming as I construct a web of learning experiences, some of which come from disjuncture, and I am convinced that journey and what I learn along the way matters to my teaching.

A Learning Perspective on Teaching and Research
I began teaching in K-12 private international schools immediately after I graduated with a Bachelor of Education degree. After six years, I was ready for new challenges. Soon after returning to Canada, I found a niche and a passion for working with adult learners and with other educators. Despite the obvious differences in age range between my K-12 students and the adult learners with whom I continue to work with today, I can trace a consistent thread across all my teaching experiences. Regardless of context or the age of my students, I wanted to engage people in meaningful learning experiences and help them to find value in what they were learning.

While my teaching terrain has shifted over time, the aspirations that I had for students in my early teaching years remain consistent in my current work with educators in higher education contexts. I am constantly pushed as a learner—in my teaching and research—to articulate what I know about teaching. Simultaneously, I continue to gain self-awareness from practice, research, and collaboration with others of what I do not know about teaching. I am perpetually humbled by the enigmatic unknowns about teaching that always have the potential to be unveiled through my teaching and research experiences.

I am an educator who defines my overarching philosophy of teaching and my view on educational research through a learning perspective. A learning perspective requires a conceptual joining of learner and teacher and coming to know the everyday learning experiences of professors as learner-teachers and the role their learning plays in their teaching and identity formation. Dirkx (1997) expressed a similar learning perspective with the notion that learning is not simply a way people prepare for life but rather that learning is life; learning is the experience of living. Therefore, “Coming to know ourselves in the world and how we experience and make sense of the others within this world are critical aspects of learning” (Para 11). Pedagogically, I aim to encourage other educators to question and discover who they are as learner-teachers. I want to support them
in attempting to uncover the ineffable and hard-to-quantify beliefs, values, assumptions and attitudes which are inherent in their learning histories and that have shaped their development as learner-teachers.

My philosophy of practice is fused with my research perspective on teaching in higher education. It is a fusion represented through the questions I ask about teaching and how I engage in research methods, reflect on teaching as a phenomenon of study, and interpret and describe the teaching and learning experiences in which I study. van Manen (1997, p. 1) described this as a phenomenological research perspective and eloquently articulated it as to “stand in the world in a pedagogic way.” van Manen argued that phenomenological investigations take us deeper into what it means to experience teaching and to be a teacher from the perspective of ourselves – those who teach and learn. I conceptualize my views on learning, teaching, and research as interpretive (hermeneutic) with an understanding that we use narrative form to cognitively construct our experiences and develop our sense of who we are (Bruner, 2004; Kerby, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1991; 2005) and what we do as teachers (Clandinin et al., 2006). I also believe that our stories can act as mirrors that reflect our perceptions and conceptions of our personal realities, including our inner landscapes of our lives, or our identities (Palmer, 1998).

**Disjuncture in PROF 508: A Narrative about Learning and Teaching**

*What am I doing with this assessment? This piece of paper – a checklist followed by a detailed, but oh so dictatorial rubric that screamed: THIS IS WHAT LEARNING SHOULD LOOK LIKE! Why would I create such an assessment in the first place? I can’t give this to them today.*

It was the middle of June. The room was balmy. I was sitting at a table at the front of my class of 56 teacher candidates (or “TCs” as they are called in the B.Ed. Program) in
a course called *PROF 508: Teaching Grades 7 & 8*. I positioned myself slightly off to the side of the projector screen so I could better access to the computer to advance PowerPoint slides for my colleague, Jason, who had come to my class to talk about assessment. He was sitting on the opposite side of the table from me. We both had a good view of the table groups of TCs in front of us.

Jason ran the class like a conversation and the TCs loved it. He began by inviting them to describe their recent practicum experiences – what had they seen in the classroom that they agreed with? Disagreed with? At the same time, he skilfully leveraged their personal teaching experiences into a conversation about assessment. Jason talked about alignment between how a teacher truly views learning, how they want to support learning and how assessment communicates a teacher’s values and beliefs about learning. I continued to advance the slides.

*Stop squirming in your seat. Focus, Launa, and just advance the slides. Stop picking up the rubrics.*

On one slide, he showed the TCs an assessment rubric he had used in his own teaching. Instead of the typical rubric that rates students at a predefined level and communicates what they are missing in terms of demonstrating their learning, Jason took a different approach. He had added additional columns for each level for students themselves to write how they might challenge themselves in a particular area of learning. The voice of the rubric was the student voice (using statements such as “I am progressing toward…”) rather than the teacher’s voice. His simple, but rich, sample rubric communicated that assessment was indeed a conversation between students and teachers, a conversation that the student played a role in directing.
I found myself constantly glancing at my own rubrics in front of me, incessantly setting the stack of paper down on the table then picking it up again. As Jason talked to the TCs, a word he said repeatedly sunk in for me: alignment. A sick feeling formed in my stomach. Intuitively, I knew something was not right. The assessment rubrics I had in front of me were not an accurate depiction of what I valued about assessment and learning nor did they support my aspirations for my students’ learning. The rubrics did not represent who I am as a teacher or who I wanted to be either – a facilitator of learning rather than a transmitter of what learning should look like. I ruminated over this realization for the rest of the class.

*This assessment is terrible. It is not in alignment with what I aspire to do in my course or how I hope to inspire teachers to think about teaching, learning, and assessment. Nor is it what I value in terms of giving student teachers feedback on their learning as developing teachers. This assessment will not help to facilitate their learning; it would simply reinforce a dreadful deficit model of learning. It would tell teachers what they had done right and wrong in the development of their own design projects. Very little about this rubric involves facilitating further learning.*

Truthfully, I felt that I was giving the TCs what I thought they wanted by offering them an itemized list of what was required for the final product for the course. They told me they wanted to know what they needed to do; they wanted an example of what the final project should be. But I didn’t want the final project to have to be any *one* thing. Instead, I wanted TCs to create something new, innovative and demonstrate empathy and responsiveness to their future students’ needs. That was the whole point of me leading them through the Design Thinking process and for them creating their own curriculum
designs in the course. I felt that I had failed when it came to how I was attempting to assess them.

As I sat at the table, I realized that I never once asked them about what they needed from me in an assessment. Where was the student voice in this conversation about learning? My sense of failure came from the realization that I was completely contradicting the learning perspective I bring to my practice: meet people where they are in their learning and use assessment as feedback to facilitate further learning. But I was afraid of what they might think if I admitted I had made a mistake with their assessment rubrics.

*Stand-up. Say something to them. They are expecting the rubrics at the end of class!*

I felt scared to admit that I had made a mistake because I did not know how to handle the situation if the students got upset about a delay in receiving their assessments. But I also knew in my heart that I had to embrace the fear in that moment and do the right thing. So, I stood up in front of my friend and colleague and all 56 TCs and humbly declared that what I had in my hand was not in alignment with what I thought they might need at this point in the course and in their development as new teachers. I reiterated my beliefs about the purpose of assessment in this course and that the rubrics I had in hand were not in alignment with that purpose. I got the sense that they understood that I made the connection to what Jason had been talking about for the whole class. What a teachable moment! Then, as a class, we brainstormed a list of what they needed from me in the assessment – we had a real conversation about *their* learning needs. Much of what
they desired was feedback, based on my experience as a classroom teacher and suggestions for how they might go forward and try things in their own future classrooms.

***

That feeling of fear and uncertainty about what to do that I had in the presence of my students and colleague stopped me dead in my tracks, so to speak. The fear was a significant indicator to me that giving them that original assessment rubric would likely have hindered their learning in some way. How did I know? I listened to the TCs reactions to Jason’s prompts and to their responses they shared about assessment with him and I took notice of feelings that were bubbling up inside of me as I sat there at the front of the room. This whole class was a mirror for me; it reflected a contradiction between what I believed and valued about assessment as facilitating a conversation about learning and feeling that I did not want to hand out a rubric that reflected just the opposite. This experience was a moment of disjuncture (Jarvis 2006/2012b).

I chose to resolve the disjuncture I experienced in my class by consulting with the TC’s and my colleague and subsequently changing the focus of my assessment. At the end of class, I literally tossed the rubrics in the recycling bin as I walked out the door. I immediately went home and contemplated about how to assess the TC’s from where they were in their learning at that point in the course. I used their feedback from our discussion in class as a springboard to design new rubrics that reflected their processes of development as new teachers.

When the TC’s submitted their final design projects, I wrote specific feedback that acknowledged the characteristics of the design approaches they used to develop curriculum. I also encouraged them to make extensions and think about future opportunities for using design thinking with their own students. Standing in front of my students on the day of Jason’s
presentation, I was living an experience disjuncture. All I kept thinking while staring down at the rubrics in my hand was: *these do not reflect who I want to be as a teacher.*

Dirkx (1997) argued that knowing ourselves is one of the “critical aspects of learning” (Para 11). According to Jarvis (2006), when a person resolves disjuncture by choosing to learn, a potential outcome could be a change in self (i.e., identity, self-confidence, self-esteem and so on). Identities can change or (re)form when we learn from disjuncture, specifically, when we incorporate the outcomes of our learning into our biography or our story of who we are (Jarvis, 2006). This argument suggests that identity is narratively configured as a series of stories of our memories of past experiences (Polkinghorne, 1991; Kerby, 1991) and also that identity is learned. I brought this argument forward into my study.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of disjuncture in influencing professors’ teacher identity and practice. Stemming from the above research purpose, my study was guided by the primary research question: What is the nature of learning for professors who experienced disjuncture in their teaching? Subsequent to this question was the following facilitating question: How have moments of disjuncture shaped their teacher identity and practice? The nature of learning referred to professors’ emotions, cognitions, and actions they experienced during moments of disjuncture and how their teaching and identities changed as a result. I adopted Jarvis’ (2006) learning model, *The Transformation of the Person through Learning* (see Figure 2.2 in Chapter 2) as a framework for learning and to help focus the analysis on identifying and describing the nature of learning when professors described their experiences of disjuncture.

I conducted this study with ten higher education professors who have been successful in their teaching and explored how they interpreted the learning that accompanied experiences of
disjuncture in their teaching lives. I defined professors who are successful in their teaching as those who have received a 3M National Fellowship award for excellence and leadership in teaching in Canadian higher education (Ahmad, Stockley & Moore, 2013). With this study, I contribute to the literature on disjuncture and learning and address research and theoretical gaps that exist within teacher development in higher education. My study characterizes the richness of learning that professors experienced when they faced disjuncture in their teaching lives. By taking a learning perspective and using disjuncture as a prompt to examine learning and teaching, the professors in this study also described the nuances of the connection between who they are as learners and who they are as teachers. Specifically, the study also helped to illuminate the effects of learning from disjuncture on changing teaching practices and senses of self as teacher.

Terminology

Throughout this dissertation I refer to my study participants interchangeably as 3M Fellows or Fellows. I use the term professors when I reference higher education literature or discuss teaching directly in the context of my study. Finally, I use the term teacher at points when I reference my own teaching, K-12 teacher education and teacher development literature and also in the context of teacher identity as part of my study findings.

Rationale

There is a strategic focus in higher education on improving the quality of teaching for the purpose of enhancing student learning experiences (Biggs & Tang, 2011). Universities today are taxed with the role of producing the future generation of skilled professionals that are needed to keep global market economy alive and flourishing (Cranton & King, 2003; Glisczinski, 2007).
The changing demands of the labour market requires that higher education graduates acquire more than the content knowledge and technical skills associated with their disciplines for success in future employment roles. Researchers also indicated that 21st century graduates also need to be reflexive and reflective problem-solvers (Cullingford & Blewitt, 2013). According to Hainline et al. (2010) the challenge for higher education is “to provide a career-relevant education that also produces critical, enlightened thinkers and lifelong learners” (para. 9).

Given the current accountability paradigm in higher education, many institutions have increased efforts to transform their teaching and learning cultures to promote learner-centered teaching and the development of transferable skills (Henard & Leprince-Ringuet, 2008). Such cultural shifts require institution wide buy-in—from administration, staff, faculty and students—to improve teaching practices that have traditionally been didactic and based on positions of subject expertise and which conceptualize teaching as a form of knowledge transfer (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999; Phillips, 2005). Yet, in a study by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO), Britnell et al. (2010) reported that many university professors still have little or no formal training as teachers to meet these student-centered learning goals. The study indicated 93% of all faculty surveyed reported learning how to teach through “trial and error” or a “learn by doing” approach (p. 20). These statistics are corroborated by the reality that many universities prepare scholars for research careers during graduate programs but preparation for teaching is limited (Scott & Scott, n.d.). Knapper (2010) argued that many professors rely on knowledge of instruction gained from observing their past academic mentors in graduate school, which are often not evidence-based approaches to teaching. In such cases, it is plausible that professors’ teaching methods could be related to the limitations of their teaching skills and not necessarily reflective of what they believe or value about teaching and learning (Loughran,
The above findings are problematic when considered within the current climate in higher education and set against earlier studies that show relationships between professors’ approaches to teaching and the quality of students’ approaches to learning (e.g., Kember & Gow, 1994; Kreber, 2010; Ramsden, 1992). This research about the general lack of teacher training in higher education accentuates the need to examine current approaches to helping professors to develop their teaching.

Over the past two decades, studies on improving teaching have shifted from examining teaching practices to focusing on professors’ conceptions of teaching and learning and the influence of those conceptions on personal practice (Åkerlind, 2008; Entwistle & Walker, 2002; Pratt, 1998; Taylor, 2003; Trigwell & Prosser, 1996). Seminal research in this area showed that teachers’ personal conceptions of teaching and student learning are strongly influenced by their underlying beliefs and values (Brookfield, 1995; Kember, 1997; 2010). Likewise, identity research in post-secondary contexts explored the notion that the deeper, conceptual underpinnings of teaching and learning are linked to faculty members’ multiple identity roles (Åkerlind, 2011; Olsson & Roxå, 2012; Sinatra & Pintrich, 2003). Some of these identity roles included teacher identity which is a sense of one’s self in a teaching role (e.g., Kreber, 2010; Palmer, 1998), academic identity (e.g., Åkerlind, 2011; Kreber 2010) reflecting the numerous communities—at local, national and international levels—to which many academics belong, and professional identity which is comprised by the narrative thread—including time, place, and other people—that an educator draws on to make sense of themselves and their practice (e.g., Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). The above body of research shared similar assumptions that teachers’ conceptions about teaching and learning are difficult to change and that the change process happens internally for each individual teacher.
A plausible explanation for teachers’ difficulty in changing their current conceptions is that they are deeply rooted in teachers’ individual learning histories (Berry, 2004; Knapper, 2010; Loughran, 2006). For example, Taylor (2003) explored how post-secondary adult educators’ prior positive learning experiences involving teachers and peers, influenced positive conceptions they held of themselves as teachers, how they saw their students as learners, and the expectations they had of students (see also, Knowles & Holt-Reynolds, 1991; Sexton, 2004). Similar research also indicated that teachers’ negative impressions of past teachers influenced their conceptions of the kind of teacher they wanted to avoid becoming (Connelly & Clandinin, 1994). Many of these studies explored teachers’ reflection processes and subsequent learning about themselves as teachers when they examined their prior learning experiences in formal, K-12 contexts.

Research that focused on teachers’ learning from experiences in their teaching lives is highly concentrated in the teacher education and K-12 research contexts (e.g., Berry, 2004; Cabaroglu & Tillema, 2011; Clandinin & Connelly; 1994; Cole, 1999; Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Loughran, 2006; Roblin & Margalef, 2013). There is a clear gap in research in this area in higher education and a need for similar research that focuses on professor’s learning from past teaching and learning experiences. Moreover, I have not found studies to date that utilized disjuncture as a lens to examine learning and teaching. Such research could specifically illuminate the influence of learning from disjuncture on changing professors’ teaching practices and their teacher identities.

Berry (2004) noted in K-12 teacher preparation “Student teachers commonly enter their teacher education with a view of teaching as simple and transmissive. They believe that teaching involved the uncomplicated act of telling students what to learn” (p. 1301-1302). These beliefs
are not unlike beliefs that teaching is a form of knowledge transfer, which is sometimes perpetuated in higher education (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999; Phillips, 2005). Like other scholars (see for example, Knowles & Holt-Reynolds, 1991; Sexton, 2004; Taylor, 2003), Loughran (2006) concluded that teachers learned such beliefs about teaching and learning from their past experiences of learning in school. He argued that teachers’ past learning experiences must be made explicit and purposefully linked to current learning in three key areas of their development as teachers: learning about their subject matter; learning about the process of learning; and learning about the practice of teaching. Loughran’s argument contributes to the rationale behind the concentration of studies in K-12 and teacher education that focus on teacher learning experiences. Researchers in these areas have recognized that teachers can use such biographical information (i.e. their learning histories) to prompt reflection and to make the kinds of connections that Loughran suggested, which are pivotal to their development as teachers. On the contrary, we know little about professors’ learning histories, so it is not surprising that the research that positions professors as learner-teachers to explore their own learning and their teaching is limited.

The above empirical findings are examples of prior research that frames the rationale for my study about professors’ learning when they experience disjuncture and the influence this has on their teaching. The research on teacher learning from experiences in their teaching is replete in K-12 and teacher education contexts. However, there has been limited recent research about teacher learning processes in higher education faculty development research and programming (see for example, Duit & Treagust, 2003; Guskey, 2002; Osslon & Roxå, 2012). While some prior research documented the impact of other individuals (e.g. past teacher role models) on what teachers learned about the practice of teaching and their teacher identities, it did not give an
informative account of what teachers thought about themselves as learners and the influence this had on their teaching and teacher identities. This missing piece is an important one that I consider in my study, from the theoretical perspective that identity is learned from experiences of disjuncture (Jarvis, 2006). I argue there has yet to be a significant study that takes a learning perspective of higher education teaching by deliberately leveraging professors’ biographical stories and highlights the learning that results when professors encounter disjuncture in their teaching lives. My goal is to position higher education teachers as learner-teachers to gain a greater understanding of the relationship between who teachers are and how they teach.

**Dissertation Structure**

There are six chapters in this dissertation. In Chapter 2, I outline the literature in teaching development that frames this study and further explores learning from disjuncture. I set the theoretical foundations for Jarvis’ (2006) learning model, *The Transformation of the Person through Learning*. I used the model to help describe the nature of professors’ learning—the emotions, cognitions, and the actions—involved in their moments of disjuncture and how their teaching and identities changed from these experiences. Following, I discuss hermeneutic phenomenology as the central methodology for this study, describe the primary data collection methods and subsequent data analysis processes using Jarvis’ model, and provide an overview of my study participants in Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, I present the data in narratives that contextualize 3M Fellows’ disjuncture experience and offer biographical snapshots of who they are as learners and teachers. In Chapter 5, I revisit my research questions and present the findings from individual interviews and group interviews with the ten 3M Fellows. I describe the findings through four hermeneutic windows, which allowed me to interweave my perspective, the Fellows’ perspectives, and various viewpoints from the literature into interpretations of the
nature of Fellows’ learning when they experience disjuncture in their teaching lives, including the impact that exploring these moments has had on their teaching and teacher identities. The sixth and final chapter outlines the key findings and presents the key features of a pedagogy for teacher development in higher education that captures the learning perspective that I bring to this research. This chapter concludes with limitations, extensions and suggestions for future of this research arising from key findings from this study.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this chapter is to frame the scholarly conversation in higher education teacher development in which my study is situated. This chapter is divided into three main sections. The first section discusses themes in higher education teacher development research related to improving faculty teaching. In the second section I draw on relevant literature to argue that adopting a learning perspective toward teacher development requires placing greater focus on professors’ past learning experiences. Specifically, this literature speaks to sources for learning about teaching and for shaping teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, values about teaching and learning which influences teacher identity. The conclusion of this chapter focuses on Jarvis’ (2006) learning model as a framework for teacher development in higher education and the foundation for this present study.

Teacher Development in Higher Education

Conceptual Change and Skill Development

Research that investigates university teaching from professors’ perspectives has gained prominence in higher education over the past two decades. These studies demonstrated an evolution in approaches to improving teaching from solely examining teaching methods, to helping teachers build new conceptions of teaching and learning (Kember, 1997; Trigwell & Prosser, 1996). Much of the earlier empirical research on teachers’ conceptions of teaching and learning has informed approaches to improving teaching based on the premise that how faculty understand teaching is embodied in their practice (e.g., Dall’Alba, 1991; Entwistle & Walker, 2002; Martin & Ramsden; 1992; Pratt, 1998; Trigwell & Prosser, 1996) and related to their perceptions of student learning (e.g., Åkerlind, 2003). Kember (1997) argued that, “Measures to enhance the quality of teaching should take account of teaching conceptions if they are to be
effective, as teaching approaches are strongly influenced by the underlying beliefs of the teacher” (p. 255). However, more recent evidence suggested that conceptions of teaching could be more sophisticated than faculty members’ skill sets allow them to enact (Loughran, 2006). For example, translating conceptions into particular teaching strategies (i.e. those that may be more student centred) may be difficult to achieve if faculty have not mastered their new roles in the learning environment, or if they perceive they are already responding to student needs (Vermunt, 2010; Donche & Petegem, 2011).

Approaches to teacher development in higher education have evolved to support teachers’ conceptual change and skill development concurrently (Bell, 2001; Duit & Treagust, 2003; Olsson, Mårtensson, & Roxå, 2010; Osslon & Roxå, 2012; Sinatra & Pintrich, 2003). Similar studies are prevalent in research in teacher education where a more robust literature base on teacher learning exists (see for example, Darling-Hammond & Richardson, 2009; Loughran, 2006; Richardson, 1990). According to Richardson (1990), “…a strong focus should be placed on teachers' cognitions and practical knowledge in a teaching change project, and these should be considered in relation to actual or potential classroom activities” (p. 13). Richardson’s point highlights the strong impact that reflection has on teacher learning and awareness, specifically when they make connections between their conceptions of teaching and learning and their teaching skills for the purpose of change and development.

Argyris & Schön’s (1978) theories of action theoretical framework has reflection at its core. Their framework has been frequently used by researchers for teacher development studies in higher education (see for example, Biggs, 1996; Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002; Menges & Rando, 1989; Olsson and Roxå, 2012). The premise of this framework is, through various reflective practices, teachers can make their implicit theories of action explicit by making their
espoused theories and theories in use congruent (Argyris, 1980). Schön (1983) described *reflection-in-action* (e.g. reflection and making decisions about practice while teaching) and *reflection-on-action* (looking back on teaching experiences to make meaning of experiences) as two primary modes of thinking deeply about teaching, which can be utilized for conceptual change. To date, numerous studies have resulted in identifying useful reflective practices including critical reflection on assumptions, beliefs, and values that influence teachers’ practice (Brookfield, 1995), participating in reflective group dialogue through inquiry communities (Roblin & Margalef, 2013) or communities of practice (Harnett, 2012), and participating in teaching observations (Bell, 2001; Menges & Rando, 1989; Olsson & Roxå, 2012). Through using such reflective practices and articulating implicit theories of action, teachers can possibly develop new conceptions of practice to consider in light of the approaches they use or may wish to use in the classroom (Argyris, 1980).

Duit and Treagust (2003) argued that the gap between teachers’ conceptions and skills in their teaching practice is related to cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957). Cognitive dissonance, like disjuncture, occurs when a person encounters new knowledge, attitudes, behaviours or values that are not in accord with their current knowledge and values/belief systems. Osslon and Roxå (2012) suggested that when teaching, professors might experience a dissonance between their conceptions of teaching and learning and the teaching skills they enact in practice. With their empirical *pedagogical competence* model for conceptual change and skill development the authors argued for professors’ own observations of teaching and learning activities to be “the single most important factor to disclose dissonance and promote conceptual change” (p. 213) combined with pedagogical practice, theory, and planning. The key feature of this model is the self-directed nature of teacher learning in their own conceptual change through observing other
teachers, reflecting on their teaching practice using pedagogical theory, and planning future practice.

By drawing on seminal scholarly literature that supports teacher reflection (e.g., Argyris, 1980; Argyris & Schön, 1978; Kreber & Castleden, 2009; Mezirow, 1991), Osslon and Roxå (2012) argued for the necessity and learning potential of reflection as a critical part of helping faculty to develop pedagogical awareness. When a faculty member engages in iterative cycles of reflection and analyses, observation, incorporating theory and practicing teaching they work towards building pedagogical competence. They argued:

A professional teacher should continuously observe and reflect on the teaching practice and its effect on student learning. Based on theoretical knowledge and observations, the professional teacher analyses his or her teaching practice in relation to students’ learning and draws rational conclusions and makes plans for continued development – the teacher thereby demonstrates pedagogical competence. (p.217)

However, it is unclear from their model how teachers are supported in focusing their reflections on practice during systematic and structured observations and other stages of their learning. An important omission from their model involves the forms of guidance faculty experience (outside of optional consulting services) that help to facilitate their learning. van Manen (1997, p. 78) asserted that people need to grasp the pedagogical essence of their own teaching experiences, which entails “… reflecting phenomenologically on experiences of teaching . . . as a teacher” rather than as a psychologist, chemist, historian, or whichever discipline in which an academic associates their subject expertise. van Manen’s sentiments hint at the notion that professors benefit from guidance on how to use reflective practices to examine their teaching. The findings
in my study also point to the value of other people as guides for professors in their processes of reflecting on teaching and learning about teaching.

Problem solving is an example of a specific skill that educational researchers have used for focused reflection and guiding faculty through exploring relationships between conceptual change and skill development. Substantial research on teacher problem solving when they experience teaching dilemmas can be found in K-12 research (e.g., Achinstein, 2002; Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999), teacher education (e.g., Cabaroglu & Tillema, 2011; Windschitl, 2002) and, to a lesser degree, in higher education (e.g., Roblin & Margalef, 2013) as an effective approach to capturing teachers’ views on pedagogy. More specifically, this collection of literature has provided insight into the linkages between teachers’ conceptions of teaching and their problem-solving skills in teaching (Cabaroglu & Tillema, 2011; Kane, Sandretto, & Heath, 2002; Roblin & Margalef, 2013).

Roblin and Margalef (2013) found that university teachers who engaged in critical reflection with colleagues (as part of their participation in an inquiry community) and were exposed to new teaching strategies, questioning, and alternative viewpoints often revised their personal beliefs on teaching and learning as a result. Brookfield (1995) argued that to be a critically reflective teacher, one needs to examine their teaching from multiple vantage points. Colleagues’ perspectives are one of the four lenses he suggests—along with our autobiographies, students’ perspectives, and scholarly literature—through which we can engage in critical reflection and revise teaching conceptions and behaviours. This notion of revision of conceptions and behaviours indicate how a person can begin the learning process and potentially lead to change (Jarvis, 2006).
The above studies each suggested that critical reflection on pedagogical dilemmas was the key to making the dilemmas explicit and subsequently enabling teachers to take a critical perspective on their beliefs about teaching and learning (Achinstein, 2002; Roblin & Margalef, 2013). It was reported in these prior studies that teachers made changes in their teaching practice (i.e., introduced new techniques) and their conceptions as a result of engaging in critical reflection. However, this body of research offered little indication as to whether these changes were sustained over the long-term and incorporated into teachers’ repertoire of instructional techniques, or to their identities as teachers.

**Focusing on Identity**

Current studies on identity and teacher development in higher education help to provide a more holistic picture of the individual learner-teachers at the heart of teacher improvement efforts in higher education. Scholars have studied various conceptions of identity such as teacher identity (e.g., Kreber, 2010; Palmer, 1998), academic identity (e.g., Åkerlind, 2011), and professional identity (e.g., Connelly & Clandinin, 1999) to name a few.

Åkerlind (2011) studied teacher development initiatives with attention to academics’ teacher identities and academic identities. Specifically, she interviewed 28 academics to explore the connections between their experiences of developing as academics and developing as teachers. She argued that traditional emphasis on teaching development typically “separates academics’ development according to their distinct roles” (p. 191). However, her study concluded “Academics may have a more complex understanding of their development as a teacher when it is seen as part of their overall development than when it is regarded as for teaching purposes alone” (p. 194). Åkerlind’s findings indicated that not all academics identify as teachers, which is perhaps what many previous studies and approaches to faculty development
assume. Her assertions can help to problematize van Manen’s (1997) perspective on studying teaching from the perspective of being a teacher in that it assumes that people identify as teachers. Yet, it is frequently the case that people who work in higher education hold multiple identity roles (see for example, Åkerlind, 2011; Connelly & Clandinin, 1999; Kreber, 2010; Palmer, 1998) including researcher, practitioner, academic and so on and may not necessarily see themselves as teachers. Åkerlind’s (2011) findings also connect with her earlier assertions (see Åkerlind, 2008) that teachers and researchers cannot disregard the ways of thinking about teaching that underlie the methods that they use in the classroom – ways of thinking that are embedded in the multiple roles faculty assume and the identities they construct.

Kreber (2010) highlighted the nature of teachers’ identity construction and its interrelation with teaching practice and student learning and development. Kreber examined nine academics’ conceptions of their identities as teachers and the connection this had to the pedagogies they employed. She examined the personal and contextual factors that influence teachers’ identity construction and how they defined themselves as authentic teachers. Kreber articulated the places where there were inconsistencies between teachers’ conceptions and their practice. She described “a disjunction with some academics between their espoused educational goals and pedagogy” (p. 180). However, in her study, disjunction was not explored as an experience teachers had as a catalyst for learning; it was simply highlighted as a predominantly conceptual-level gap that existed between espoused goals and teaching practice. It is possible that disjunction could be have been explained by inconsistencies between teachers’ conceptions and their skill levels (e.g. Loughran, 2006; Olsson, Mårtensson, & Roxå, 2010; Richardson, 1990).
Explanations for inconsistencies between conceptions and skills could be sought by examining where professors learned about teaching for the purpose of uncovering possible origins of their teaching conceptions and their pedagogical skills. An alternative approach to Kreber’s (2010) work might involve exploration of the disjuncture professors experienced to explore the nature of their learning. Their reflections could subsequently be used as prompts to learn more about professors’ teaching practices, conceptions and identities.

Many previous studies on teacher development in higher education do not adequately explore the centrality of significant learning from disjuncture experiences that I argue influence professors’ teaching and teacher identity development. Darling-Hammond and Richardson (2009) echoed this theory in the world of teacher education, and assert, “The design of professional development experiences must also address how teachers learn” (p. 48).

The research in teacher development in higher education has clearly evolved to embody an increasingly sophisticated understanding of ways to support professors in learning about teaching that are theoretically sound and practically relevant for those individuals who identify as teachers. Current approaches to teacher development might suffice for supporting professors in learning the pedagogical content and techniques of effective teaching; however, I argue we can improve our approaches to helping them to learn more about who they are and how this influences their teaching. Who we are matters to our development as teachers and ultimately to how we support students in their learning and development (Bracher, 2009; Palmer, 1998). Many studies that aim to understand more about teachers’ identities, conceptions, and practices have focused on examining professors’ current practices. To build on this body of research, my study demonstrates the value of research and approaches to teacher development that help professors deconstruct the significance of past disjuncture experiences that have may have influenced who
they are as learner-teachers. I will argue that past anchor points, or key situations in a person’s life narrative, is where professors can situate their understanding of their current conceptions and their practices. It is critical that future approaches to higher education teacher development supports professors with contextualizing what they have learned (about teaching and learning), from whom they have learned, and quite possibly illuminate the influence these experiences have on who they become as both learners and teachers.

**Adopting a Learning Perspective on Teacher Development**

Maya Angelou once said, “I have great respect for the past. If you don't know where you've come from, you don't know where you're going” (as quoted in Johnson, 2014). To believe that there is a connection to *we teach who we are*, requires us to look back, to consider the stories of how we came to be, knowing that what happens in the present is influencing our ongoing and future becoming as teachers.

To adopt a learning perspective on teacher development requires positioning professors as learner-teachers. Placing greater focus on past learning experiences can facilitate a deeper understanding of how experiences shape conceptions, assumptions, beliefs and values about teaching and learning. In the brief literature overview that follows, I am not arguing that all faculty learn about teaching in the same way. I aim to establish a common starting point that frames my study to examine the nature of professors’ learning experiences when they experience disjuncture in their teaching. I explore literature that grounds my own understanding of where teachers *learn about teaching*, and how this might influence the *teachers they become*. I draw on research literature to argue that teachers learn practices, behaviors, perspectives, and habits that become their default practices in times of challenge. During such situations, when they might not know how to respond in their teaching, it can be common for professors to adopt certain
approaches because it is what they know rather than evidence-based practices that might help them to engage students in learning (Knapper, 2010). Leaving these past experiences unexamined diminishes viable opportunities for teachers to change their conceptions and shape their development.

**Learning about Teaching from Early Personal Experiences**

The research literature in K-12 education indicates that understanding the origin of teaching beliefs and how they relate to practice are significant to teachers’ learning and development (e.g. Loughran, 2006; Richardson, 1996). Richardson’s (1996) comprehensive review of the teaching belief literature categorized three types of experiences that influence teachers’ beliefs and knowledge about teaching and learning. I argue that these experiences all can be developed independent of teacher education programs and thus could be applicable to framing our understanding of how higher education professors develop their beliefs about teaching and learning as well. The literature that follows explores the examples included in Richardson’s list:

a) Personal experience (e.g. life experiences that contribute to shaping a worldview, including the role of schooling, relationships with others and cultural understandings)

b) Previous schooling and instruction (e.g. exposure to different teacher models)

c) Experience with formal knowledge (e.g. conceptions of subject matter knowledge held by former teachers; pedagogical knowledge having to do with teachers’ role and specific practices) (Adapted from Richardson, 1996, p. 105)

**Past childhood learning experiences.** Studies in adult education are consistent with K-12 literature and suggested that when teachers examine their past learning experiences they can make connections between their prior learning about teaching and learning, their current beliefs
and practices, and how they see themselves as teachers (Gauthier, 2013; Richardson, 1996; Taylor, 2003). Taylor (2003) investigated adult educators’ past school experiences and their present beliefs about teaching adults. He focused on significant learning experiences from childhood and adolescence and the influence that key individuals, such as teachers and peers, had on adult educators’ present beliefs about themselves as teachers. He concluded that positive qualities of past teacher models are typically reflected in adult educators’ present descriptions of ideal teachers and how they see themselves as teachers (see also Richardson, 1996). Adult educators’ past positive learning experiences were related to their present understanding and definitions of learning and of themselves as learners. In the same way, these conceptions from past learning experiences were also connected to adult educators’ expectations of their adult students (Taylor, 2003).

In my previous study with a professor of adult education, I explored how his physical environment and the social class tensions that he experienced in his pre-academia work years played a significant role in shaping the fundamental purposes of his teaching (Gauthier, 2013). Fundamental purposes of teaching are akin to what Brookfield (2006) referred to as a critical rationale. A critical rationale for teaching is a person’s organizational vision of teaching based on a set of values, beliefs and assumptions about the practice(s) and purposes of teaching. My participant and I purposefully went a step beyond by articulating his critical rationale to determine how his beliefs, values, and assumptions about learning and teaching were shaped by his unique entanglements in both formal and informal learning experiences over his lifetime (Gauthier, 2013).

Using guided reflection and storytelling, we uncovered an overarching fundamental purpose of his teaching. The professor described his teaching as a vehicle through which he
supported students’ flourishing as lifelong learners. He drew conclusions about how his upbringing in a middle-class family in rural Alberta and his experiences as a social worker had shaped his perspectives on learning. He believed people are all fundamentally learners who are entangled with one another across various social circumstances. When he described learning (and seeing oneself as a learner) he claimed, “we can, through our self-conversations, begin to shift our entanglements…and build worlds [we] choose” (Gauthier, 2013, p. 18). To him, learning was an effective lens for a person to envision their own life circumstances and the broader social circumstances that exist in the world today. In this professors’ classes, he described he aimed to get “people to become critically conscious of their entanglements so that they can forge contexts where people are more open and able to create a life where they’re flourishing (p. 18). By enhancing students’ capacities to think critically about their positions in the world and to become aware of their connectedness with other learners, he found he could have a significant impact on learning and how students develop as individuals.

Brookfield (1995) claimed that when teachers reflect on their previous experiences as learners or teachers, they can “become aware of the paradigmatic assumptions and instinctive reasoning that frame how we work” (p. 30) and in turn adjust their teaching approaches. A common finding from both studies above is that reflection can also help teachers to identify significant prior educational experiences for exploration to develop both their conceptions about teaching and learning and their teaching skills (Gauthier, 2013; Taylor 2003). This prior research is an antecedent to my present research on professors’ experiences of learning from disjuncture and ultimately of my philosophical learning perspective on teacher development in higher education.
Experiences in higher education. As I mentioned in Chapter 1, a study by the Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (HEQCO) indicated 93% of all faculty surveyed reported learning how to teach through a “trial and error” or a “learn by doing” approach (Britnell et al, p. 20). This result is consistent with learning theory that claims that skilled problem solvers will often try different solutions to problems until they discover one that works in a given situation (Berliner, 2001; Jarvis, 2012a). Researchers reported that disciplinary experts (faculty in this case) have built knowledge structures over time that make them skilled in ways of thinking and seeing problems in their disciplines that make them faster problem solvers compared to non-experts (Berliner, 2001; Palmer, Stough, Burdenski, & Gonzales, 2005). Similarly, Jarvis (2012b) contended,

Often, however, our learning occurs in more than one domain at the same time and through self-directed learning we can work out many of our own solutions but when we cannot, we can often discover the answers either by asking others or by being told by someone else who knows – who may be a teacher or a parent. (p. 13)

Jarvis’ ideas are indeed common to learning about teaching because one approach to learning is by imitating or copying, a type of non-reflective learning whereby we watch other people’s behaviours and learn skills to replicate these behaviours which have gained widespread social approval in order to fit into our situation (Jarvis, 2012b). Jarvis’ theorizing adds credence to Knapper’s (2010) assertion that it is not common practice for higher education faculty to reflect on their own learning experiences when it comes to learning about teaching. Knapper commented:

The act of teaching is of course meaningless without a corresponding act of learning. Yet a great irony of much university teaching is that, although professors have themselves
excelled as learners, the insights gleaned from this experience are often abandoned as soon as the instructor ascends the classroom podium. Instead of reflecting on their own experience, supplemented by relevant research about effective practices, many faculty base their approach to teaching upon an uncritical adoption of the model that comes most readily at hand—their own professors. (Knapper, 2010, p. 230)

Lortie (1975) argued that many pre-service teachers are adept at the apprenticeship of observation which according to Loughran, (2006, p. 105) is “extensive exposure to teaching and learning that has subconsciously shaped their thinking.” While Lortie (1975) applied this phenomenon to K-12 teachers, who spend many hours observing students and teachers during practicum experiences, it could also be applicable to professors. Professors, as undergraduate and graduate students, have observed many faculty over numerous years in higher education teaching contexts and have become enculturated into their disciplines via disciplinary signature pedagogies that are prominent in the disciplines.

Shulman (2005) defined signature pedagogies as “the types of teaching that organize the fundamental ways in which future practitioners are educated for their new professions” (p. 52). Shulman asserts that signature pedagogies include surface structures or actual teaching practices, deep structures or a set of assumptions about how to communicate disciplinary subject matter, and implicit structures, or the beliefs about attitudes, values and dispositions indicative of a profession. Dirkx et al. (1999) found that teachers “approach curriculum integration largely through the lens of their respective disciplines, a position which both reinforces and is reinforced by the organizational structures within which they practice” (p. 99). Evidently, the cultural conventions of a discipline shape its members’ pedagogies and these accepted methods can become the default teaching methods for many academics.
Considering the research outlined in the above sections, I suggest that knowing who we are as teachers involves knowing about our own past learning; that is, how we have come to learn the values, beliefs, assumptions and attitudes, and practices that shape our teaching. In the following section I describe Jarvis’ (2006) theory on learning from disjuncture, which is the framework for the learning perspective that I propose for higher education teacher development.

**Learning from Disjuncture**

I adopted Jarvis’ (2006) learning model in this research as a theoretical framework for interpreting and describing the nature of learning from disjuncture in professors’ teaching lives. In this study, the nature of learning referred to professors’ emotions, cognitions, and actions they experienced during moments of disjuncture and how their teaching and identities changed as a result.

Jarvis’ model is a strong philosophical model developed and refined through his detailed studies of adult learning in practical contexts (Illeris, 2017). His earlier versions of the model (see Jarvis 1985; 1986) were founded on Kolb’s (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle (see Figure 2.1). The Experiential Learning Cycle consists of four learning experiences (labeled on the outer circle) that a learner must go through to effectively create new knowledge through transformation of their experience. The four learning styles (labeled in the four quadrants inside the circle) represent the preferred choices or “patterned, characteristic ways” (Kolb, Boyatzis, & Mainemelis, 2001, p. 4) learners decide to enter and proceed through the learning cycle. Kolb (1984) argued that learners can enter the cycle at any point but they must go through all 4 types of experiences to complete a cycle of learning.
To explore Kolb’s model, Jarvis (1985) conducted ten workshops with over 200 participants. Participants worked together in groups and were tasked with sharing learning incidents in their lives and to contrast these incidents with other group members. Subsequently, they were asked to map their experiences on to Kolb’s learning cycle and invited to add to or adapt Kolb’s model to reflect their learning stories and make meaning from them. Jarvis’ workshop participants demonstrated that Kolb’s model was limited and did not adequately capture the variety and complexities of the participants’ learning experiences. Figure 2.2 depicts Jarvis’ (2006) final iteration of the model which illustrated a more holistic learning process that accounts for the interplay of thoughts, emotions, and behaviours that learners described in his research. Jarvis reported that the person transforms their experiences, be it through thinking (Box 3) feeling/emotions (Box 4), and or acting (Box 5) and thus is changed as a result.
Learning from Disjuncture

A person’s potential for learning can be seen in terms of how they relate to the social world in everyday life. According to Jarvis’ (2006; 2009) research, there are fundamentally two states we can experience in everyday life: harmony or disjuncture. At times, when we are in harmony with the world, we often presume that the strategies we use to cope with certain situations will remain consistently useful for future encounters. Jarvis (2006) noted that in this state, there is not likely a push to learn or to change the situation in any way. Conversely, disjuncture is a state whereby individuals experience a sense of unknowing or questioning generated from within and often prompted by their interactions in the social world (Jarvis, 2009). When we experience disjuncture—a gap between our biographies and our consciousness of the world around us—our biographical repertoire is no longer able to cope automatically with our situation and our harmony with the world is disturbed and we feel unease. Jarvis (2006) categorized three states of disjuncture:
• When we are at ease with our disjuncture (thus we ignore it)
• When we feel that the outside world is putting pressure on us (external pressure);
• When we wish to change our world in some way (internal pressure)

(adapted from p. 27).

Like Jarvis (2009; 2012a), Festinger’s (1957) theory of cognitive dissonance proposed that the tension from the dissonance that individuals experience is a driving force for change. For instance, Erichsen (2011) reported that international students who were moving to the United States for further education experienced a form of disjuncture, a questioning of the quality of their current educational circumstances, which prompted their desire to want to move. The study showed that participants were motivated by a gap in what they were experiencing and the kind of education they wanted for themselves. The participants in this study attempted to resolve their disjuncture by relocating to study abroad and engage in new, challenging educational experiences.

Resolving Disjuncture: Learning and Meaning Making

Jarvis (2006) argued that both social interaction and disjuncture provide conditions for learning. However, it is a person’s response to disjuncture that indicates whether they learn and become changed in the process (see next section below). For instance, as one example of disjuncture, in a problematic situation in the classroom, teachers are “continuously challenged to make decisions about possible courses of action” (Roblin & Maralef, 2013, p. 19). Jarvis (2006) contended that a person can respond by choosing to ignore the disjuncture or to learn from it. In both cases, the person would restore a sense of harmony to their biographies. Thus, a teacher’s response to a problem in their teaching might be to ignore it, perhaps by defaulting to a teaching mode with which they are comfortable and continue teaching as if nothing happened, thereby
restoring a sense of harmony. Alternatively, when a teacher experiences disjuncture, she might be prompted to find answers to questions such as: Why did this happen? How did this happen? What does it all mean? What do I do next? Asking such questions would be an attempt to embrace disjuncture and to resolve the disjuncture through learning and being open to being transformed or changed in the process (Jarvis, 2006).

**Resolving Disjuncture: Learning & Change**

The quest to resolve disjuncture and restore harmony is often a catalyst for a person to learn, which means they become changed in some way (Jarvis, 2006). Specifically, learning from situations of disjuncture can lead to the following:

a) Changes in self (i.e., identity, self-confidence, self esteem)

b) Changes in knowledge, skills, attitudes, emotions, values, and beliefs

c) Changes in experience (e.g. able to cope with similar situations and problems because of the learning that has occurred; become more intelligent (i.e. experienced teachers likely know more about teaching). (Jarvis, 2006; 2012b)

It is important to note that Jarvis acknowledged that *incidental learning*, or preconscious learning, can always happen at any stage of our experiences; that is, we may learn something without intending to do so. Conversely, *intentional learning* “occurs when we have an experience, an encounter with the world in which we live, through which we are changed in some way as result” (Jarvis, 2006, p. 25). Jarvis indicated that in situations of disjuncture, the primary forms of intentional learning include non-reflective learning and thoughtful and reflective learning.

**Non-reflective learning.** Jarvis (2012b) suggested that some of the fundamental, non-reflective learning processes include copying or imitating others, trial and error, being instructed
by experts, and memorization of skills. For instance, a professor might decide to take a workshop on how to incorporate more technology into her classes or she might read the latest tips and tricks teaching blog recommended to her by a colleague and experiment with a new active learning technique. Jarvis (2006) contended that with non-reflective learning, people are often content that they learn skills that have gained widespread social approval. However, the more they perform the skills the more they take for granted that they can rely on this skillset in future situations. There is also no guarantee that by copying others’ approaches or memorizing skills that any conceptual change would occur.

Jarvis’ theory suggested that people are motivated to live in harmony with the social world around them, so taking a particular skillset for granted (i.e. being able to use a particular technology in the classroom) is acceptable until the ever-changing classroom dynamics require a different teaching approach, perhaps due to an event causing disjuncture. Thus, the potential for disjuncture in teaching is always high given that our teaching environments, student populations, access to technology, advancements in disciplinary content areas and so on are constantly changing.

**Thoughtful and reflective learning.** Professors who engage in thoughtful and reflective learning, carefully consider the knowledge, skills, beliefs, and values that they are presented with and make decisions about whether or not to accept them. According to Jarvis (2012b) the fundamental learning processes that individuals employ involve thinking, reflecting, planning, exploring, and investigating (e.g. problem solving). Jarvis (2006) argued that we may not necessarily accept the input we receive from external sources, instead,
we read or hear the input with an expectation that we will reflect upon it, disagree with some of it and that we will arrive at new knowledge and so on that will be integrated into our biographies, but it will certainly not be the same as the input. (p. 30)

For example, a professor could receive some advice from colleagues about how to improve his practice; yet, he may not agree that their suggestions are the best approaches for him to use in the classroom. Upon reflecting on their advice and his own beliefs about teaching and learning, he could realize that their suggestions contradict what he fundamentally believes about how learning happens in the classroom and how he can best support his students. The result from thoughtful reflection can be that the professor not only discovers areas in which to build new skills but also opportunities to confirm or revise her conceptions of teaching and learning. Boyd and Fales (1983) synthesized several early empirical studies on reflection and learning and clearly defined reflection as an experiential process that has conceptual change at its core. They claimed, reflective learning is, “the process of creating and clarifying the meaning of experience (present or past) in terms of self (self in relation to self and self in relation to the world) … [where] the outcome of the process is changed conceptual perspective” (p. 39).

When people are at ease with the feeling of disjuncture, it is unlikely that any intentional learning will happen (Jarvis 2006). Thus, often people will reject or not consider the feeling of disjuncture because they feel relatively at ease with the external world around them and they do not seek to resolve the feeling/situation right away. Jarvis argued that sometimes this reaction is simply due to not having enough time to consider the disjuncture situation and as a result, we ignore it. Arguably, the reaction could come from not knowing what to do or a gap between conceptions and skills (Loughran, 2006). Alternatively, fear of the unknown may also be a driver for professors to avoid or ignore disjuncture. For example, Achinstein (2002) argued that when
teachers suppress conflict (a potential form of disjuncture), they do so in order to maintain harmony. They may attempt to avoid or reduce the uncertainty generated by new teaching activities by choosing not to implement them into practice. On the other hand, Achinstein (2002) found that when teachers adopted an embracing stance to conflict caused by problems in their teaching, they also displayed behaviours indicative of critical reflection, such as acknowledging divergent beliefs, exploring alternative viewpoints, and reflecting on the implications of alternatives for their own practice. This practice is akin to what Jarvis (2006/2009) suggests that individuals do when they seek to resolve disjuncture through thoughtful reflective learning.

Jarvis (2006) claimed that in situations when people ignore/reject disjuncture they often carry on, preferring to do things the way they have always done. People can still learn incidentally from the situation but this may not directly influence their teaching approaches in the classroom.

**Why Disjuncture?**

In my study, I purposefully incorporated Jarvis’ (2006) learning model, *The Transformation of the Person through Learning*, because it offered an open heuristic of three potential lenses for examining learning in this study. These lenses included rejection and non-consideration (ignoring disjuncture), non-reflective learning, and thoughtful reflective learning. The model provided a language for articulating professors’ responses to disjuncture through the categories of emotions, cognitions, and actions that characterize the complexities of learning about teaching and teacher identities.

In considering alternative theoretical frameworks for my study, I initially explored transformative learning theory (Cranton, 2002; Mezirow, 1991) to conceptualize my perspective
on learning. The theory offered two concepts that had potential relevance to my study: critical reflection and disorienting dilemmas.

There are several examples of foundational perspectives of transformative learning theory that have been studied and critiqued widely in the theoretical and empirical literature (see Daloz, 1986; Freire, 1970; Mezirow, 1991). Mezirow’s (1991) theory of perspective transformation is among the most well-known transformative learning theories that is often referred to in higher education literature (e.g., Cranton, 2002; Mezirow and Taylor, 2009).

Mezirow (2003) defined transformative learning as perspective transformation and specifically as “learning that transforms problematic frames of reference—sets of fixed assumptions and expectations (habits of mind, meaning perspectives, mindsets)—to make them more inclusive, discriminating, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change” (p.58-59). He understood perspective transformation to be an individual’s process of making meaning of their experiences through critical reflection. The author named three interconnected components that are central to the process of perspective transformation: the centrality of experience, critical reflection, and rational discourse. Essentially, engaging with discourse is the opportunity for learners to reflect critically on their experiences and question their assumptions, beliefs, and values that are embedded in those experiences. According to Taylor (2000), when these three components are present, individuals can revise their interpretations of experiences or form new interpretations – this process can lead to transformation.

Cranton (2002) added that when through some event, an individual becomes aware of “holding a limiting or distorted view” there is potential for transformative learning (p. 64). Cranton referred to an individual’s system of beliefs, values, assumptions, and attitudes which need to be critically examined for the individual to be open to alternatives and to potentially
change the way they understand the world in which they live. She argued that this process “can be provoked by a single event—a disorienting dilemma—or it can take place gradually and cumulatively over time.” (p. 36).

The phenomenon of disorienting dilemmas is closely related to the experience of disjuncture that Jarvis (2006) described. A disorienting dilemma stimulates critical reflection, which is specifically a key catalyst for transformative learning (Cranton, 2003). A disorienting dilemma involves, “Being confronted with knowledge that directly contradicts previous accepted knowledge, particularly knowledge acquired from an authority figure, [which] leads us to question what we thought we knew” (Cranton, 2006. p. 62). She argued, encountering unfamiliar social norms, experiencing large social and political events, or even going through a personal life crisis can also be considered disorienting events. This is similar to Jarvis’ (2006) notion that disjuncture involved some kind of prompt from our interactions in the social world. Each phenomenon is described as a situation where an individual is faced by a contradiction or a gap between their expectations, including beliefs and values about what should occur, and the signals they are receiving from the social world around them.

I interpreted both disorienting dilemmas and disjuncture as prompts for potential learning. Yet, disorientating dilemmas are specifically linked to critical reflection— a particular set of cognitive processes that can lead to transformation of a person’s perspective or how they see themselves in the world (Mezirow, 1991). Learning processes involved with resolving disjuncture are not always considered to be critically reflective; some can be non-reflective and simply involve imitation or copying others (Jarvis, 2012b). Essentially, disjuncture was a theory from which I chose to explore learning in a more holistic manner, beyond the cognitive domain. I chose to explore the phenomenon of disjuncture and learning instead of disorienting dilemmas
and transformation because my study was about exploring professors’ learning by not predetermining that their learning would indeed be reflective or transformative.

Disjuncture is a common, human experience and when we look at teaching and learning contexts, these situations arise—for both teachers and students—as Jarvis (2006) contended as a part of everyday life. In this dissertation, I share experiences from ten 3M Fellows who have been successful in their teaching and are renowned for their teaching excellence and educational leadership. Their stories about disjuncture and learning illustrate who they are as learner-teachers. The Fellows also illustrated the emotions, cognitions, and actions involved in their learning processes during the time they experienced disjuncture in their teaching. Their retrospective accounts of their learning involved descriptions gaining new skills and knowledge that improved their teaching methods but many of them also described learning new insights about their identities as teachers and the influence this has had on their teaching.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The overall purpose of this study was to explore the role of disjuncture in influencing teacher identity and practice. More broadly, this hermeneutic phenomenological study was an exploration of my curiosity about the relationship between one’s learning and teaching. A hermeneutic phenomenological inquiry is a “research methodology aimed at producing rich textual descriptions of the experiencing of selected phenomena in the life world” (Smith, 1997, p. 80) by focusing on “illuminating details and seemingly trivial aspects within experience that may be taken for granted in our lives” (Laverty, 2003, p. 24), and doing so “in such a way that the effect of the text is at once a reflexive reliving and a reflective appropriation of something meaningful: a notion by which a reader is powerfully animated in his or her own lived experience” (van Manen, 1997, p. 36). In this study, I examined the details of professors’ reflections on notable moments of disjuncture in their daily lives. I aimed to describe the nature of learning from everyday experiences of disjuncture, including the emotions, cognitions, and actions professors experienced and how their teaching and identities changed as a result. I asked the overarching research question: What is the nature of learning for professors who experienced disjuncture in their teaching? In addition to this question was the following facilitating question: How have moments of disjuncture shaped their teacher identity and practice?

My aspirations to further explore my early curiosity with idea of we teach who we are and my learning perspective on teaching, learning, and research led me to framing this study through the lens of learning and disjuncture. Additionally, my personal and professional interests and my experiences of learning from disjuncture have led me to adopt hermeneutic phenomenological study.
Hermeneutic Phenomenology

*Phenomenology* is the study of a person’s everyday experience in the life world (van Manen, 1997). Jarvis (2006; 2012) understood the life world as the social context in which we learn. To approach qualitative research from a phenomenological perspective requires offering rich descriptions of a phenomenon derived from the meaning that an individual gives to their lived experiences of that phenomenon (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, phenomenological researchers aim to get a deeper understanding of what an experience is like, as lived by a person (Laverty, 2003). The focus of phenomenological endeavours is on pre-reflective, immediate impressions of experiences rather than how experiences are conceptualized, classified, or reflected upon (Ajjawi & Higgs, 2007; Husserl, 1952/1980).

Unlike traditional phenomenology, *hermeneutic phenomenology* is both a descriptive (phenomenological) and interpretive (hermeneutic) approach to research about human experience (van Manen, 1997). In this study, I aimed to be attentive to both terms through my intent to describe the experiences of disjuncture as they occurred in professors’ teaching lives, and to interpret what it meant for them to experience disjuncture, including how disjuncture prompted learning in their lives. The interpretive dimension of hermeneutic phenomenology makes it a more suitable methodological orientation for studying learning and disjuncture than a traditional phenomenological approach which focuses on pre-reflective experiences. Examining learning that occurred when professors experienced disjuncture allowed me to describe what these experiences were like for professors. Additionally, their current reflections and our interpretations of these thoughts were critical to helping me to answer my second research question about how exploring moments of disjuncture impacted their teaching and teacher identities.
Hermeneutic phenomenology, according to van Manen (1997, p. xiv), “employs a heuristic of discovery: we discover possibilities of being and becoming.” Consequently, a hermeneutic phenomenological approach to my inquiry provided a framework for insights into the nature of professors’ learning resulting from experiencing disjuncture in their everyday teaching lives. I filtered these insights from within the present moments where I spoke with professors and read supporting literature (including their own texts), and from reflections on past insights based on my own life experiences (van Manen, 1997). This added dimension of contextualized, interconnected interpretation moves hermeneutic phenomenology beyond simple description of and reporting on a phenomenon to the explanation and creation of meaning (Smith, 1999).

Hermeneutic phenomenology stems from the premise that all understanding involves interpretation, which is not free from presuppositions – be it our anticipations (Heidegger, 1962) or our prejudices (Gadamer, 1976). Heidegger (1962) acknowledged the influence of historicality on interpretation and argued that we cannot objectively distance ourselves from our experiences, or our interpretations of those experiences. Interpretation is influenced by our perspectives on our life worlds and these perspectives are determined by culture, history, language, age, and our education (Grodin, 2016). Jarvis (2006) contended that internalizing the external culture in our life world makes it “our ‘second nature’ [and thus] it becomes the basis for our own interpretation of our experiences and for our giving them meaning” (p. 61). In my research, I specifically asked 3M Fellows to explicitly contextualize their lived experiences of disjuncture and learning in their own biographies as learner-teachers. Through purposeful and scaffolded questions during each interview, I got a sense of some of their concrete lived experiences as learners and teachers over time. Some of these contextualizing experiences
included how they saw themselves as learners and teachers and understood their conceptions and assumptions about teaching and learning which underpinned how they acted in the classroom (see Appendix A for examples of biographical questions from the individual interview).

Gadamer (1976) wrote that questioning is

an essential aspect of the interpretive process as it helps make new horizons and understandings possible: Understanding is always more than merely re-creating someone else’s meaning. Questioning opens up possibilities of meaning, and thus what is meaningful passes into one’s own thinking on the subject. (p. 375)

The short biographical vignettes that I wrote of each professor’s disjuncture story served as “fixed examples” (van Manen, 1997, p. 87) of their lived experiences and another layer of contextualized reflection to represent what learning at times of disjuncture was like for each of them. The vignettes help to bridge the gap between their meaning and my understanding to illuminate new, shared understanding of their experiences (Jarvis, 2006).

**Research Design**

The following section gives a detailed account of the qualitative methods I used to carry out this study and capture 3M Fellows’ descriptions and interpretations of the nature of their learning when they experienced disjuncture in their teaching lives. I discuss (a) a process for obtaining ethical clearance, (b) a participant profile of the 3M Fellows, (c) criteria for participant selection, (d) data collection methods, and (e) data analysis. To conclude, I address my own role as researcher in this study.

**Ethical Clearance & Consent to Participate**

I received ethical clearance for this study from the General Research Ethics Board (GREB) at Queen’s University in January 2016 (Appendix H). Once this approval was received,
I recruited 3M Fellows to participate in my study. A Letter of Information and Consent Form (Appendix G) was distributed to the Fellows and submitted back to me via email. I also provided a verbal explanation and information statements to each Fellow before each of the individual and group interviews. Verbal consent was also audio recorded at the start of each interview.

**Participant Profile: 3M National Teaching Fellows**

The focus of this research was to explore the role of disjuncture in influencing teacher identity and practice in higher education. Participant selection was informed by grounding principles of hermeneutic phenomenology. Purposefully, I selected participants who have experiences of the phenomenon of the study, who would be willing to describe their experiences, and who were “diverse enough from each other to enhance possibilities of rich and unique stories of the particular experience” (Laverty, 2003, p. 29). I conducted my research with ten professors who have been successful in their teaching and are renowned for their teaching excellence and educational leadership. To find professors for this study, I looked to a unique group of individuals—3M National Teaching Fellows—who have been nationally recognized for demonstrating excellence in teaching and educational leadership.

**The 3M national teaching fellowship.** The 3M National Teaching Fellowship (3MNTF) is recognized as the top award for excellence and leadership in teaching in Canadian higher education (Ahmad, Stockley & Moore, 2013). The 3MNTF was established through a partnership between 3M Canada and the Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE) and has a long-standing history in Canada. Each year a selection committee comprised of members of the STLHE and past 3MNTF award recipients (or 3M Fellows), select ten individuals, through a rigorous adjudication process, to join the Fellowship. New Fellows do not receive any financial incentives as part of the 3MNTF but they are offered a lifetime membership
in the STLHE and the opportunity to attend a four-day retreat with members of their cohort. Ahmad, Stockely and Moore (2013, p.184) defined the retreat as “the cornerstone in building a community of practice” around teaching excellence and educational leadership in higher education and part of what makes the 3MNTF unique from other national teaching awards. The retreat has also been regarded by some Fellows as, “an important moment in their teaching careers, as it was one of the first times that they were surrounded by people who were just as invested in teaching as they were” (Smith et al., 2017, p. 389). At the time I was writing this dissertation, there was a total of 318 Fellows from a variety of disciplines at more than 80 universities (3M National Teaching Fellowship, 2016). Together, the Fellows make up a vibrant community of educational leaders who continue to work toward influencing teaching and student learning in their own institutions and beyond (Ahmad, Stockley & Moore, 2013).

**Telling stories of learning, teaching, and leadership.** One of the prominent features of the 3MNTF application process is that participants, with support from their current institutions, prepare extensive nomination dossiers to help narrate their unique stories of teaching, learning, and educational leadership. The Dossiers include a collection of letters of nomination and endorsement; evidence of teaching effectiveness such as course evaluation data, course materials, other teaching-related awards; and evidence of educational leadership. These artifacts help to demonstrate candidates’ accomplishments and serve to make up part of a picture of who they are as excellent teacher-leaders. However, it is the candidates’ own written reflective pieces that bring their identities as learners, teachers, and educational leaders to life on the page. In many cases, the dossiers present such a rich description that nominees rise from the pages (The Criteria and Beyond, 2016). In the 3MNTF Nomination Dossiers, candidates are asked to articulate their philosophies of teaching and educational leadership in such a manner that elicits
the deep-seated perspectives, assumptions, beliefs, and values that undergird their approaches to
teaching and leading change initiatives be they at the classroom, institutional or disciplinary level
(Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, n.d.).

The process of having to prepare these stories of learning, teaching, and leadership made
the Fellows ideal participants for my research. They were familiar with having to articulate their
core conceptions and philosophies of teaching and learning, not to mention highlighting how these
were enacted in their teaching practices. Some past publications created by Fellows themselves
also suggested that such deep reflection on their own learning and who they are as teachers is also
a common feature that many 3M Fellows hold (see for example, Lerch, 2005; Warland, 2008).
Furthermore, as part of my efforts to get to know the Fellows’ teaching backgrounds for my study,
I read their 3M Nomination Dossiers (when available) solely for the purposes of gaining
background information to get a picture of each Fellow as a learner-teacher. The dossiers were not
used for analysis purposes. I noticed that while the Fellows are not asked specifically to write about
themselves from the perspective of being learners, the Dossiers read as reflections on deep,
professional and personal learning. From my perspective going into this study, I saw the 3MNTF
experience itself as one that asked each professor to actively engage in thinking about themselves
as learners.

**Recruiting 3M Fellows**

According to van Manen (1997, p. 63), the focus of phenomenological research is to
“borrow” other people’s experiences and their reflections on their experiences in order to better be
able to come to an understanding of the significance of an aspect of human experience, in the
context of the whole human experience. Researchers gather descriptions of other individuals’
experiences in order to be enriched by them and come to terms with the full significance of its
meaning (van Manen, 1997). I recruited ten 3M Fellows for this research from across four Canadian universities in Western Canada, Central Canada, and Eastern Canada.

I established a list of potential participants from master list of 3MNTF recipients on the STLHE website. I selected institutions in provinces where there were at least six Fellows (they each had between 6-12 Fellows) for the purpose of recruiting at least 2 participants from each institution. Having Fellows at the same institution was important for conducting group interviews as part of data collection plan (see methods section below). My goal was to select ten participants in total. In order to participate in the study, the Fellows agreed to the following selection criteria:

1. Provide a copy of their 3M Nomination Dossier, teaching dossier or a recent CV.
2. Participate in a 1 hour individual interview (via Skype, telephone, or in person)
3. Participate in a 1 hour group discussion with me and other 3M fellows at their institution who were taking part in the study

Table 3.1 below depicts the various demographics that were represented in the 3M Fellows who participated in this research. The Fellows represented a range of disciplinary backgrounds, year of induction into the 3MNTF, and various experiences with institutional leadership around teaching and learning.

Table 3. 1 3M Fellow Participant Demographics (N=10)
I collected a copy of a teaching dossier or a 3MNTF Nomination Dossier from each Fellow in the study for the sole purpose of providing background information for the individual interviews. I read the dossiers before each interview to get an initial picture of each Fellow as a learner-teacher. The dossiers contained information that complemented the teaching and learning stories that the Fellows told in their interviews but were not used for analysis. I sent an introductory email to a main list of Fellows, which included the Letter of Information and Consent Form (Appendix G). The letter outlined the study purpose, guidelines for participation,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th># Fellows</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographical Representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Canada</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Canada</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disciplinary Representation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural sciences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3M Award Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Demographic Information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus/Emerita</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current leadership position (department or senior administration)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holds/has held teaching-related institutional leadership role</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and statements about confidentiality and procedures involved with withdrawing from the study. Fellows who were interested contacted me through email and I followed up with a subsequent email that outlined the next steps for participation: scheduling an individual interview with me via Skype or phone; providing dates for availability for a group interview at their institution; and submitting their dossiers and the study consent form (Appendix F). In total, the Fellows were expected to dedicate 2 hours for interview time and any time they chose to spend reviewing their interview transcripts at a later stage.

Data Collection Methods

As is characteristic for studies conducted from a hermeneutic phenomenological perspective, I aimed to gain a deeper understanding of 3M Fellows lived experiences; in this case, the learning that they experienced when they encountered disjuncture in their teaching. I was inspired by Richardson’s (2000) definition of “crystallization” which suggests there are many sides from which to approach research and to interpret data that represents participants’ lived experiences. Richardson wrote, “…the central imaginary is the crystal, which combines symmetry and substance with the infinite variety of shapes, substances, transmutations, multidimensionalities, and angles of approach” (p. 522). After reading the Fellows’ 3M teaching dossiers to gain background information from each Fellow about their teaching, I used two main forms of data collection to give me access to their learning: individual semi-structured interviews and group interviews.

Individual Interviews

The process of collecting information of people’s experiences within qualitative research is dependent upon in-depth interviews (Creswell, 2007). Given the nature of this hermeneutic phenomenological study, the purpose for the one-on-one interviews was to gather experiential
narrative information from 3M Fellows on their experiences to support a deeper understanding of the learning they underwent when they encountered disjuncture in their teaching. The second purpose was to establish a conversational interaction with the Fellows about the meaning of their experiences of disjuncture within the context of their own learning and teaching. van Manen (1997) asserted that interviews help the researcher stay close to both the research question(s) driving the study and to the “experience as lived” (p. 67). I interviewed each 3M Fellow via Skype or telephone for approximately 1-1.5 hours. The interviews were audio recorded for later transcription. Additionally, each Fellow was assigned an agreed upon pseudonym which I used to distinguish among them.

I used a semi-structured set of questions to explore Fellows’ experiences of disjuncture and learning and discuss how they conceptualized their identities as learners and teachers (see Appendix A). A main source of information and inspiration for the interview guide was the theoretical framework for this study which included descriptions of the types of learning and change that people can experience as a result of disjuncture (see Jarvis, 2006; 2012b). I included additional questions aimed at helping 3M Fellows deconstruct their perceptions of themselves as learners and as teachers as a way of contextualizing the disjuncture experiences across their broader sense of self as a learner-teacher. These questions were important to my inquiry because they helped the Fellows narrate a fuller picture of the interplay of who they are as learners and who they are as teachers. The disjuncture stories they shared were units of analysis for articulating such connections and helped to give form to their experiences of the phenomenon in this study (van Manen, 1997).

In preparation for the first interview, I sent each Fellow a series of question prompts to support their reflections on a story about disjuncture they experienced in their teaching lives (see
Appendix D). The prompts were designed with Jarvis’ (2006) theory in mind and to support the Fellows in staying as close to the disjuncture experience by recounting concrete and specific details (van Manen, 1997). For instance, I asked them questions about the context of the experience, other individuals involved, their feelings and emotional, cognitive and physical responses, and how they attempted to resolve the feeling of disjuncture. In addition to the prompts, I provided a definition and examples of disjuncture for the Fellows’ reference (see Appendix E). I deliberately sent a non-teaching example of disjuncture because I did not want to influence the types of disjuncture stories that Fellows chose to share with me. I aimed to limit the influence of my own bias and the potential for Fellows to think that I was looking for them to tell a particular type of disjuncture story from their teaching.

When I asked the Fellows about how well the definition and examples of disjuncture supported their understanding of the phenomenon, their responses highlighted the importance of using salient examples when prompting disjuncture stories with faculty. None of the Fellows had heard of disjuncture before but by reading the example I provided, many were able to liken disjuncture to other theories they were familiar with (such as cognitive dissonance, and disorienting dilemma in transformative learning). During my second interview, I had a conversation with a Fellow about the definition I provided and his ideas about how disjuncture could be a positive or negative experience. He made the intuitive point that faculty might naturally think of disjuncture as something negative and he encouraged me to revise the definitions that I sent to the rest of the Fellows in my study. He said, “You have to counteract the fact that we naturally think of the dissonance as being a thing that was a negative thing. It’s almost that somehow dissonance sounds like negative.” Based on my conversation with him, I modified the definition of disjuncture to include more specific language around disjuncture being
perceived as either a positive or a negative phenomenon. During the subsequent interviews, I also pointed out that examples in the literature also refer to positive disjuncture experiences that seem more like a pleasant surprise or “magic moment” rather than a negative feeling. Overall, most Fellows found the examples specifically helpful for stimulating their thinking about the prompting questions about disjuncture and learning in their own lives. One Fellow commented,

Examples were helpful because that finally gave me something concrete because by reading the prompting questions wasn't enough for me because again I come from natural sciences, I don't usually think—even though I do think about teaching and improving teaching on an ongoing basis—in these terms so this is really new for me.

**Group Interviews**

In the spirit of hermeneutic phenomenology, I held group interviews to gain a deeper understanding of how various disjuncture stories might inform a fuller, holistic understanding about disjuncture, learning, and teaching in the lives of professors in higher education. I had two purposes for facilitating group interviews in my study. First, I wanted to further expand Fellows’ understanding of disjuncture as it relates to teaching and learning by bringing them together to compare, contrast, and articulate the opportunities, unknowns, and the dilemmas that arose in their disjuncture experiences. Next, I wanted Fellows to reflect on the experiences of telling their disjuncture stories they shared with me in the first interview and see if there was any further learning that came for them after having engaged in this deep, reflective thinking about their own learning and their teaching.

I held the group interviews after the Fellows had participated in a one-on-one interview. I facilitated four group interviews; one at each university at which each group was located. Each group interview lasted between 1-1.5 hours and was audio recorded for later transcription. Two
groups were comprised of two Fellows each and two groups had three Fellows each. Group interviews were held in a common meeting space at the university of affiliation.

Each group interview began with the Fellows describing the disjuncture story they shared during their one-on-one interview so that the other Fellow(s) was/were familiar with their experiences. The remainder of the session was semi-structured and guided by the following questions:

1. What have your thoughts been about your first interview (about disjuncture in your life, teaching, learning, who you are as a learner/teacher?)
2. By reflecting on this experience of disjuncture, what did you discover about yourself as a learner? As a teacher?
3. What were some of the qualities of the disjuncture (that you experienced)?
4. How do you know if an experience has impact?
5. What might be the potential impact of knowing about disjuncture, your own learning, and your teaching on your students?
6. We teach who we are. Have you thought about this before? What does this mean to you?

The synergies and learning that came from engaging in group conversations with the Fellows about disjuncture, learning, and teaching are discussed in greater detail in Chapter 5.

**Data Analysis Methods**

**A Philosophical Approach to Analyzing the Data**

Research activities in a hermeneutic phenomenological study are “discovery oriented” (van Manen, 1997, p. 29) and the approach allows for creativity and inventiveness to be entertained throughout the ebb and flow of the research endeavor. Koch (1995) stated that with hermeneutics, "Understanding occurs through a fusion of horizons, which is a dialectic between
the pre-understandings of the research process, the interpretive framework and the sources of information” (p. 835). Specifically, I worked with the ten Fellows in my study through individual and group interviews to bring to life their experiences of disjuncture, learning, and teaching through the processes of reflection and imagination, my own reading and writing, and the hermeneutic circle.

During the research, analysis was an ongoing process of meaning making from the very beginning. Laverty (2003, p. 29) explained that with hermeneutics, “interpretation arises from pre-understandings and a dialectical movement between the parts and whole of the texts of those involved.” I devised interpretations and pre-understanding of learning from disjuncture by reading theoretical and research literature. I also kept a journal for biographical writing and ongoing meaning making, similar to the writing in the first chapter of this dissertation.

The Fellows were introduced to the phenomenon of disjuncture through a series of prompts and definitions from the literature, which they were asked to reflect on prior to our interviews. Likewise, we also shaped their interpretations of disjuncture and learning through the experience of engaging in conversations in interviews and through making sense of their own experiences through hearing their peers’ stories about learning and disjuncture. Between interviews, Fellows were encouraged to reflect on any new learning that emerged from individual conversations and I invited them to share their new learning and reflections during the group interview. This series of guided reflective processes were aimed at deepening Fellows’ interpretations of the phenomenon both as it relates to them as an individual but also to the whole of the experiences of learning and disjuncture that was collectively shared by the group.

**The hermeneutic circle.** The hermeneutic circle and dialogue of question and answer during the interviews and later with the interview transcripts were two key strategies drawn from
the hermeneutic literature that I incorporated into this research. Within the hermeneutic phenomenological tradition, the interpretive process that the Fellows and I is to be understood through the metaphor of the hermeneutic circle. The process involves an ongoing movement between layers of interpretation from parts (e.g. the data) of an experience, to the whole of experience, (e.g. evolving understanding of the phenomenon) spiraling deeper into understanding of the texts (or experiences) with which one is working (Grodin, 2016; Laverty, 2003). In my study, each layer gave meaning to the other making the understanding of disjuncture iterative. The example of revising interview prompts was an example of iteration between individual experience and group experiences and understanding and the process of defining and refining conceptions of disjuncture. This dialogue with the data enabled understanding to emerge and interpretation to gradually unfold (Laverty, 2003).

Interpreting through the hermeneutic circle also obligates our attention to the detail of experience of a phenomenon that, in turn, shapes understanding of the whole phenomenon, in context (Laverty, 2003). Throughout this research, I have come to understand interpretation—the interplay of parts and whole— as a way of achieving a level of coherence between the individual stories about disjuncture and a greater purpose of theory building to support teacher development in higher education – an agreement or “necessary unity of purpose” (Grodin, 2016, p. 4) to any hermeneutic phenomenological endeavour.

**Analyzing the Individual and Group Interviews**

Along with reading literature and auto/biographical writing and the hermeneutic circle, the interview transcripts were another source of information that represented the Fellows’ reflections on their lived experiences. I focused on Fellows’ lived experiences, adding meaning
to those experiences through coding and identifying common lived experiences through the development of themes (van Manen, 2014).

**Wholistic reading of the data.** To begin my analysis, I listened to the audio recordings of the individual and group interviews in order to get a broad sense of the entire data set. After transcribing the interviews, I used a wholistic reading approach, attending to the interview data as a whole and noting some initial patterns in Fellows’ narratives that emerged across their stories (van Manen, 1997). I used NVivo software to help organize the individual and group interview data.

**Using Jarvis’ theory to analyze the data.** After reading my data as a whole, I analyzed Fellow’s disjuncture stories and their subsequent learning using the following series of steps, which correspond with Jarvis’ (2006, p. 23) learning model:

1. The disjuncture experience (Box 2 of Jarvis’ Model)
2. Emotional, cognitive and behavioural responses to disjuncture (Boxes 3, 4 & 5 of Jarvis’ Model)
3. Reflection on Learning & Change (Box 7 of Jarvis’ model)
The Transformation of the Person through Learning (Jarvis, 2006, p. 23)

I first analyzed the disjuncture experiences by isolating parts of the interviews that focused on each Fellows’ disjuncture story. The purpose for reading each of these stories independent from the rest of the data was to get a broad understanding of the disjuncture experience, including what prompted disjuncture for each Fellow. At this point, I also constructed brief narratives of each Fellow’s disjuncture experience as context for Chapter 5, and for discussing the findings of this dissertation. The narratives also serve as “fixed examples” (van Manen, 1997, p. 87) of the phenomenon of disjuncture and highlight what the experience was like for each Fellow.

My intentions for data analysis was to get a fuller picture of the nature, quality, and content of the learning that Fellow’s interpreted from experiences of disjuncture in their teaching (van Manen, 2014). Specifically, the data were analyzed with close attention to the emotions, cognitions, and actions they experienced during moments of disjuncture and how their teaching and identities changed as a result. As I read through the Fellows’ disjuncture stories from both individual and group interviews, I tracked some initial themes that corresponded with Jarvis’ learning model (boxes 3, 4, & 5). Appendix H shows the preliminary analysis I did to initially visualize some of the connections I saw across Fellow’s disjuncture experiences including the disjuncture prompt, the emotions they felt, and their cognitive and behavioral responses.

I interpreted noticeable emotional expression in Fellows’ descriptions of their disjuncture experiences and subsequently deconstructed their initial, verbatim emotional expressions using a list of common primary emotions and associate subcategories of emotions from the literature (see Shaver et al. 2001). Jarvis’ (2006) theory was limited in that it did not offer a useful account
of the role of emotions in disjuncture experiences. Given the prominence of emotions that Fellows’ described, I decided to use the lists of emotions described by Shaver et al. (2001) as a guide for interpreting and categorizing the Fellow’s emotional responses to disjuncture. I describe the categorization of these emotional responses in more detail in Chapter 5. This part of the analysis was critical to being able to draw connections across Fellows’ stories and revealed important findings about disjuncture and emotions in teaching, which I discuss in Chapter 5.

**Process coding.** Process coding (Saldaña, 2012) was a useful approach for identifying the behavioural and cognitive responses that Fellows described in their disjuncture stories. By reading the data with the intention of identifying ongoing actions and interactions that Fellows’ took in response to disjuncture, I could discern some of the decisions that they made about how to resolve the disjuncture in the moment and after it had occurred. Jarvis’ (2006) argued that common responses to disjuncture included ignoring it, seeking to validate or “normalize” it through social sources, and by reflecting on it. Through examining Fellow’s cognitive and behavioural processes during and after disjuncture, I found clear evidence of each of these themes in the Fellows’ stories and I chose to represent them as prominent findings in this study.

In the final stages of coding both sets of interviews, I examined participants’ reflections on their disjuncture and their learning, including learning that occurred in the interviews with their peers and me. I examined their reflective responses in light of Jarvis’ (2006/2012b) description of three ways that people can be changed by learning: (1) change in self (e.g. identity, self-confidence, self-esteem), (2) change in knowledge, skills, values, beliefs, emotions, and (3) change in experience (e.g. level of expertise). I represented each of these “changes” that Fellows’ described as themes about learning, which I describe in detail in Chapter 5. van Manen (1997, p. 87) described themes as “an aspect of the structure of lived experience.” In keeping
with van Manen’s (1997) framing of how themes relate to the meaning of lived experience, the themes that I discuss in Chapter 5 were chosen because they best describe the content or what it means to professors to learn from experiences of disjuncture in their teaching.

**The Role of the Researcher**

Rigorous qualitative research requires that the researcher’s role be critically self-examined. Throughout this study, I practiced what van Manen (1997) referred to as hermeneutic alertness, namely, I took time to reflect on the meanings of situations in my research (including while reading the data) rather than allowing my pre-conceptions and initial interpretations to drive my understanding. Thus, reflexivity was an important dimension to my processes of designing, implementing, and analyzing data in this entire study. I wrote through my thinking, my processing, and my understanding in a journal that I kept throughout the duration of my research. On occasion, I shared pieces of my writing (my developing interpretations) with my supervisor and other trusted colleagues and their feedback often helped to illuminate the essence of my ongoing meaning making, including my assumptions about the data. I chose not to include direct quotations from my research journal because I preferred to integrate them with the Fellows’ interpretations and the literature to discuss and interweave different perspectives on the main themes and findings in this work. Fellows’ interpretations and information that is drawn from literature are reflected through direct quotations or referenced directly as part of the writing.

I cross-checked my developing interpretations with the interview data—going back and forth between my own writing and the transcripts—aiming to retain the authenticity of the participants’ descriptions and ensuring to ground my interpretations in their data (Lincoln & Guba, 2009). Furthermore, I invited participants to review the transcripts before I did any
analysis in order to ensure their experiences were accurately represented in the transcripts (Patton, 2002). The Fellows were given the option to provide any feedback on the transcripts or to make any changes that they wished to their data. Out of ten Fellows, two people replied to me with some suggested additions or changes. In one case, a Fellow wanted to add more context to his disjuncture story, which helped considerably when it came time for me to write some of the background for his individual narrative description of his disjuncture experience. The other Fellow contacted me with the request to redact a couple of comments that they made in the interview that were slightly tangential to the purpose of our conversation. The absence of these comments did not impact the analysis or the reporting of this research in any way whatsoever. Their verbatim responses were also used in developing the findings for this study to assure credibility or the “correspondence between participant’s views of their experiences and the researchers’ reconstructions and representation of the data” (Patton, 2002).
Chapter 4: Presentation of the Data

3M Fellows’ Disjuncture Experiences

In keeping with the goal of phenomenological writing to richly portray the phenomenon being researched, I wrote short narrative descriptions of the Fellows’ disjuncture experiences. In this chapter, I present the Fellows’ narratives which include brief biographical sketches that describe their teaching and set the context for their respective disjuncture experiences. These biographies were written using data that the participants shared with me or the group as well as my own reflections about their contributions to the research. The Fellow’s first order constructs (that is, their own words and conceptualizations) are retained as much as possible in the narratives. The purpose is to provide vivid examples of disjuncture in teaching to contextualize the subsequent findings and discussions about learning from disjuncture and the influence that the Fellows described these moments had on their teaching and teacher identity.

Amy

“It was just one colleague asking me what do these experiences mean to me...”

Amy followed a straight path from undergraduate to academia and was a self-defined “type A” student – she learned by listening to lectures, memorizing content and she worked hard to achieve and maintain an A grade. When she began teaching at the university level, she remembered that she “often took for granted that what motivated me as a learner would be what motivated my students. I naturally aligned myself with the ‘A’ student because I understood how those students think.” Amy defined herself as a “sage on the stage” teacher back then. She said, I naively thought good teaching meant you were a really entertaining lecturer, which I had received feedback prior to that in my career that that’s indeed was what I was. So, I
thought I had this teaching thing in the bag… students liked my lectures so I must be a good teacher. Well clearly there’s more to good teaching than that.

Amy never told her students or her colleagues that she had been doing improv for over eleven years. She called it her parallel life. She said, “I didn’t want people to pass judgement on me for what they might have interpreted as a frivolous, nonproductive hobby.” Yet, she appreciated improv as an art form in and of itself. She purposefully kept her teaching and academic life separate from her life as a comedic improviser until a colleague said to her: Do you ever do improv in your classroom? Amy recalled the situation vividly,

I'm sure I was in a teaching circle [called] Teaching on the Edge. It was in a relatively public setting; there was a bunch of us, as there always are, around the table. And [my colleague] just turned to me and just asked me if I used an improv approach in my teaching and I sort of snapped at him: "No, why would I do that!?" And then the conversation went elsewhere; it just naturally progressed but I didn't stop there. I didn't remember what other people were saying because I was thinking well, why don't I improvise and should I? It was just one colleague asking me what do these experiences mean to me and it put me in a bad mood for that moment. And then I had a moment of fear because I thought, I know how to improvise but I don’t know how to improvise when I teach.

Amy said this experience stayed with her for the next year as she reflected more on bringing parts of her two worlds together – improv and teaching. She took small steps to begin incorporating some improv rules into her teaching such as, “taking a collaborative approach and being supportive and living in the moment and saying ‘yes’.” It took a couple years before she
was more comfortable using improv techniques in her teaching and before she accepted it as a part of her teaching identity. Now she describes herself differently:

I am not that sage from the stage anymore and I love not being that person. I am more of a facilitator of learning and I much prefer that role and it feels so much more genuine to me; it's more me I think. By no means am I a pioneer. But I pioneered myself to do it, which was a big move for me.

Travis

“This is clearly going sideways pretty early...it has not been our experience up until this time”

Travis has been a university biology teacher for nearly 30 years and described progressive shifts in his conceptions of himself as a teacher over that time:

In my early years, I was sort of like this travelling salesman where I would get a bunch of stuff and wheel it all into class in my little cart and I'd start giving out all these cool things to students and think, isn't this amazing? But it didn't take long and I just ran out of stuff and got very depleted. I was just giving it full blast for ten years but then I went to a retreat in Banff for a week around reflecting on our teaching and I could re-imagine myself as more of a conduit. I could just plug one hand in the discipline and the other hand into the class and just let it flow through. That worked for another ten years and then I think I just became much more of a facilitator of learning.

Travis had become adept at trying out new learning activities and technologies in his classes. His personal pursuit of making his classes engaging and setting the stage for learning to emerge led him to the question: What could you not do in one hour with 800 people to help?

At one time, Travis was co-teaching a class on synthetic biology to hundreds of first year biology students. Together, he and his colleague decided to build on past successes of their
experiences of whole class collaborations and “up the ante” by having students offer live
responses to questions they posed during class. Students had to use an online tool called Todays
Meet, which operated like an online bulletin board. Students could log in, post live responses that
could be viewed in real time during class.

All students had to do was login – one member per group.

Cue a few off task-posts

All they had to do was create a nickname for the group.

Cue a few silly names

All they had to do was say “Hi” in a language other than English.

Cue various forms of “hello”

Then…

Cue the profanity and the verbal insults

Travis recalled this moment of fear and not knowing what to do:

The stream of posts is rushing, nothing remains visible for long but it is clearly not an
aggregated, thoughtful response to our provocative question. It is a runaway open sewer.

While several students try to calm the situation, several opposing Trolls and Numpties are
feeding a stream of inane and profane bickering with a distinct smell of homophobia,
misogyny, racism, and any other nastiness they can think of in a moment (p. 3 from
Travis’s personal reflection). There's profanity aimed directly at us. So, this is clearly
going sideways pretty early and we don't know what to do. This is not our vision of what
the class culture is. It hasn't been our experience up until this time.
While his colleague stood watching the screen in astonishment, Travis began teaching “like a madman,” inviting Clicker responses to his questions, pointing out important information and hoping that by “flipping into teacher mode” he would detract from “the show” on the big screen. In the aftermath, Travis wrote his own reflection on the situation which speaks to how he was processing his reactions to what had happened:

Upon reflection after class, the knot of fear in my stomach tightened.

It was clear how I had failed. I introduced an unfamiliar technology into a civilization that put the civility of their culture at risk. I didn’t have the functionality to control it nor the presence of mind to shut it off when it became a liability. (p. 6, from Travis’s personal reflection)

He shared this experience with another class shortly after on that same day. The students reassured him that they had seen this behaviour with younger students in residence and that their approach is always to remind people, “Is this who you really want to be here?” Travis recalled taking the students’ advice and posing a similar question to his class the next day. He said, “And that change in perspective really gave me a little ray of hope. So, my learning can come from students; that they have stuff to teach me.” He and his colleague also posted an apology to the class and found out that many the students had been shocked by the incident as well. In response, over 100 students responded with apologies to their professors. Travis explained that this whole incident reinforced his collaborative relationship with students and that “this [disjuncture] experience “was kind of the seminal experience to it. They [the students in that class] were a valuable resource.” For Travis, the disjuncture seemed to illuminate some previously, unthought-of conceptions about students as partners in the learning process.
Sandra

“I was shocked by my need to tell the truth while also encouraging good teaching on the other hand.”

Sandra felt her calling as an English professor from her early experiences as undergraduate teaching assistant. She remembered, “the moment I began to talk about this wonderful play, I felt like myself somehow; I felt really, really good.” She has always had the inclination to take a structured, organized approach to her classes, which she described as an “absolute template” and continues to “map out the 50 minutes carefully” in her classes today. It gives her a feeling of control; yet, she admits that she’s learning more about how good teaching often requires a compromise between what is “ideal” and what is “possible” in any teaching and learning situation. She said,

it's the balance between what I give them or the framework I build for them and what I insist they do for themselves. Because I can't just show up in this class with no roadmap for them, with no plan but I can't over plan either so, somewhere in-between those two.

She grappled with this same compromise many times in her work as a faculty developer as well. Sandra was leading a teaching dossier workshop for new faculty on one occasion when a colleague asked her about how much a good teaching dossier mattered. Would tenure and promotion committees really pay a lot of attention to it? Sandra recalled her position on this question very clearly:

The truth is, from my experience on tenure and promotions committees, [teaching] is not seen as important. People will look at the numbers vaguely but there's no real conversation about it. So how do I give proper advice to young faculty under the circumstances? The kind of campuses that I want are ones in which new faculty will be really devoted to their teaching, or at least as devoted as they are to scholarship. I want
them to be good university civilians by serving the university in a reasonable capacity.

But I was pretty sure that the truth of the matter was, attend to your CV, get as many publications and you won't have any trouble. There's my disjuncture. I can't give false advice, but I still need a way to reframe that advice because I feel a responsibility to the university and the way I want universities to be.

Sandra was conflicted with how to answer this question from the very moment it was asked. She remembered being “shocked by the need to tell the truth while also encouraging good teaching on the other hand.” The only way to resolve the feeling of being pulled in both directions was to say both things at once. Yet, this contradiction between what she believed is the ideal position and how she feels she should respond in those conversations has led her to still grapple with this disjuncture to this day.

I'm still really frustrated! I want to solve it; I want it to be settled. Maybe the learning would come from recognizing this is a system I didn't choose and I must find the best way to work in it. Maybe there's a parallel between the coach and judge problem that we have in the classroom and that we have for new faculty? So maybe it's just recognizing that there's a tension there.

Mia

“That warning that I got that was vocalized by somebody outside of my head was quite important.”

Mia has been teaching and researching in natural sciences for over 13 years. She knew for a long time that she wanted to be a teacher “because it was such a positive experience from the get-go, I really loved it and I continue to love it to this day.” Much of what she learned about teaching came from her early days as a TA and through observing a fellow co-teacher. “This
other co-instructor was very enthusiastic about the subject, he was very knowledgeable but he
was also very enthusiastic and that rubbed off on students in the course.” She explained she had
enthusiasm for teaching, a respect for the subject and for the students that she is teaching, “from
the get-go and still to this day.”

Mia regularly felt the pressures associated with working at a research-intensive
university. Fully aware of the requirements of a pre-tenured professor on a research stream she
knew she was “supposed to focus on research and forget about teaching because that’s how
you’re evaluated down the road for tenure.” She knew of the research requirements for tenure but
her love for teaching prompted her to focus on it as much as she could. “I knew how the game
was played and, I knew that there was a disproportion of what I want to do and what [my
institution was] imposing on me.”

Mia had collaborated with other faculty from education and some other multi-media staff
to update material for an online version of an introductory course in her department. She
remembered that the opportunity to collaborate outside of her discipline was a great experience.
Over time, she learned about teaching and learning grants available at her institution to support
innovation in teaching. When she thought about applying for a grant to support a new teaching
project, she felt conflicted about dividing her time between research and teaching. “And I was so
stoked about the idea [of applying]. I was so keen to do that but I was also concerned that that's
the right thing to do.”

Mia approached a trusted friend and colleague about the contention she was feeling. Her
friend outright warned her against pursuing the teaching grant and reminded her about the
expectations for focusing on research that should be her priority. Mia recalled the conversation:
She basically vocalized everything that I knew. She didn't tell me anything surprising or new but hearing it from somebody else really crystalized in my mind this disparity between teaching and research which I knew was not right.

Mia applied for the teaching grant and won it, despite her colleague’s advice. This success helped to build her confidence and led her to undertake several teaching projects over the years. Yet, it still took about five years for her to feel confident about her choices to devote time to teaching projects. Mia said,

and even though I continued applying after that one grant, I kept them under the lid until I got tenure. But I still know it's not right for us university professors to be in a position like this because, yes research is important and research does feed the teaching, but we are also interacting with students and our role is bigger and different than just being researchers. If we are instructors at post-secondary institutions, we do have to be good teachers.

She recalled that this experience gave her the confidence to set the path for her own trajectory in focusing on teaching in her career:

That warning that I got that was vocalized by somebody outside of my head was quite important and then so too was the fact that I didn't quite listen to the advice. I'm happy that I didn't [listen] because at the end of the day, you have to be true to yourself and find how you fit in whatever is the name of the game or the rules according to which you will be valued or assessed and find your own path for better or worse.
Malcolm

“I'm troubled by even one person not getting it and actually recognizing the need to kind of step up to it.”

Malcolm had criticisms of the education system since his early experiences in medical school in the 90s. He started doing curriculum development in medical school and was often the “education voice on residency committees.” He received his first teaching awards during that time and started taking more workshops on teaching. He said with certainty, “by the time I finished my residency, it was quite clear that I wanted to do internal medicine and I also wanted to pursue Medical Education for my career trajectory.”

Medicine is a profession that has high stakes and it is important that students “get it.” Malcolm has referred to educational theory for many years to inform his teaching and to support students in clinical practice to develop as doctors with capacities to offer quality care. He said, “I'm not focused on just the core knowledge that they're supposed to learn, I'm focused on their identity formation and who they are becoming as physicians.”

Dialogue is a critical component of Malcolm’s teaching approaches when he works with small groups of trainees in clinical settings. He said he focuses on, “finding ways to engage learners in conversations so they can feel that this is an opportunity for learning and not a threat to self-esteem.”

When he was a junior faculty member working with trainees, he had a student that he was worried about because, “His clinical skills weren't up to par; his attitude was really crappy and ultimately I thought there was a professionalism issue.” Malcolm had conversations with the student on several occasions over his two-week rotation, discussing the student’s progress and areas for improvement. Malcolm’s goal was to use feedback as a co-constructed dialogue with students to problem solve and to help them to recognize their own limitations. He said when
students are in trouble or experiencing big challenges the goal is to “get them to actually recognize and want to work on it then you actually have the possibility of actually co-creating a different path.”

But with one trainee, the lines of communication broke down. Malcolm recalled the scenario:

We'd been together in a meeting where we had a conversation with the patient about their goals of care. He was on call overnight and the patient had a deterioration. The problem was totally treatable for but his interpretation was, oh well we said that he was DNR [do not resuscitate] so I'll do nothing. And he just kept the patient comfortable and let them die. And it was a drug side effect! We had actually started a medication and it was a known side effect which we had an antidote for!

This was “a travesty” because the patient died and their life could have been saved. Malcolm met with the student to debrief and he was astonished by the student’s lack of responsiveness to critical mistake that he had made. He recalled that conversation went something like this:

Student: Well we had the goals of care and that was the decision we made.
Malcolm: No you don't understand, think back on the conversation. What did we talk about? What was his quality of life beforehand? When this happened, why didn't you call for support?
Student: Well I knew what to do, I could handle it.
Malcolm: Well this is a problem. And the problem is you do not recognize the limits of your level of training and your ability and that makes you unsafe.

Trust is crucial in this context because patient care can often be matters of life and death. Malcolm said, “you can have people who don't have the full ability but they know to ask for
help. And help is always there.” This experience came into conflict with Malcolm’s drive to help all students to succeed; it is something he continues to grapple with.

I'm better at finding that right combination of getting them and kind of shaping them and helping them to become . . .but I can't get them all. And I'm troubled by even one person not getting it, not being able to see what this is and recognizing the need to kind of step up to it.

Malcolm reflected on this experience and said, “there’s been a theme” and that he could connect it to his drive to constantly challenge himself in his work with trainees who are struggling in their learning. He is determined to support them through offering further coaching so they can work to identify what can help them to be better doctors.

**André**

“It was the first time in a class that I found myself with bubbling emotions that I was struggling to control.”

André struggled as a learner in university, and attributed this to his upbringing in a small place where he had been homeschooled and spent a lot of solitary time outdoors on his family farm. He claimed he was a “terrible student” in terms of conforming to the regular routine of attending lectures and labs which were “utterly contrary” to his way of thinking. He recognized very quickly in his undergraduate classes that “very little of the approach to teaching that was being forced on them [he and his peers] had any relevance to the way they needed to be able to process information in order to learn it.” His transition to university was difficult but he said it influenced him to, “[make]a lifelong commitment to be interested in transitions of all kinds for people and [understanding]how difficult they can be.”
André began his teaching career when he was around 23 years old. He has taught medical students, dental students, science students, and veterinarians across programs at the university level. André maintained that through his entire career traditional, lecture-based approaches to teaching and learning never appealed to him because, “You were expected to teach one subject… and it’s completely at odds with the way the world works – I was teaching topics that were clearly interdisciplinary.”

Years ago, he co-developed an interdisciplinary program where he could facilitate small groups working on interdisciplinary problems. He said that others deem him as having a coaching style as a teacher and “that fits perfectly into being a facilitator in the small groups; a facilitator of the process of learning rather than a conduit for disseminating information.” Yet, in some cases he still found himself lecturing to bigger classes.

On one occasion, he encountered a student in the class who could not avoid sticking up her hand and asking a question every few minutes. In the moment, he recognized that she seemed to need information right away but André also saw her behaviour as disruptive to his teaching and his other students. He recalled:

I liked being interrupted and people who are engaged but it was very clear that this level of engagement was disruptive to my thinking and presenting material and to the rest of the class. You could tell they were rolling their eyes and generally making fun because she was asking another question. For the first time ever, it made me stop and literally say to myself ’don't lose your rag here, you've got to find another solution, this is clearly not working for anybody.' It was actually the first time...the only time EVER in a class that I found myself with bubbling emotions that I was actually to control.
To resolve the situation, André met with the student immediately after the class ended to discuss her behaviour and participation in the class. As a starting point, he asked her about what she did prior to returning to school and learned that she had been an air traffic controller. Immediately, a light went on for him:

Her life as an air traffic controller was I need information in this minute because it's life and death. Her whole experience of the process of taking in information came from this and she had not realized that transferring that approach, whilst it was serving her needs, was contrary to everybody else’s needs.

For André, the disjuncture moment illuminated a belief that was central to his teaching:

I spent all this time knowing in my heart that people needed to use different approaches to learning; I had tried to bend the system a little in order to accommodate or improve the tracks that people could use but here was a woman showing me that actually the system is completely fucked and that being in a factory is the wrong way of dealing with individuals and their different learning styles.

**Fionnula**

“That is probably the greatest situation of disjuncture that I have encountered in my teaching career.”

Fionnula’s teaching career spans the K-12 and university contexts and she spent several years in Canada’s Northern territories working in the areas of special education, administration and teacher education. Her teaching “has always been about relationships but it’s also about life histories and our own ability to shape our lives, to be people who change the world.” A significant focus in her teaching had been in teacher education and Indigenous education specializations. She has often taught small groups of about 35 students at a time and takes the
liberty to really get to know who her students are as individuals. She said, “and that’s the way I teach them how to teach.” Teachers’ emotional, physical, intellectual and social needs are all a part of what Fionnula takes into consideration to inform her teaching approaches.

Fionnula uses writing, arts-based pedagogies, and engages students in experiential learning while often making use of various Indigenous pedagogies such as “circles.” She believes teachers should be “open” and get to the heart of who they are, including the issues they are dealing with on a personal level because there is no denying that “their past is going to surface in their teaching and in the interaction in the classroom.”

Establishing a supportive community in the classroom is an integral part of relationship building with and amongst the students. She said,

it’s not about me getting to know them; it’s about the interaction between us and their colleagues, which deepens their self-understanding so that by the end of the course, the community that’s created can be a very caring community that can give feedback to each other… these are often enduring communities.

But there was a particular class where Fionnula remembered it as “a splintered community” and a few students’ behaviours instigated a great deal of conflict in the class.

It was a very interesting course with only about 12 students. I think it was the Integrating Indigenous Themes Across the Curriculum. There were two cliques and they would fight and insult each other in class, sometimes rather nastily, which I was totally unused to because I was kind of used to people rolling with things. I mean, we're in Indigenous education class talking about long-term trauma and these kinds of things and to have people make light of some of it was not very nice and it was difficult for me.
Fionnula described her approaches to trying to resolve this conflict within her classroom including doing “a fair number of circles with them to try to resolve some of these differences” and putting in an “extra sweat lodge so that our elder could work with the group.” Yet despite her best efforts to get to know students’ background stories and work with them to resolve the issues that were coming in class, she was surprised by “an anger in several of the students . . .” Her disjuncture experience revealed that “they were carrying very large issues. and I wonder if my presence didn't allow that anger to grow to see if I'm open.” Her learning had a lot to do with resilience in her teaching and “never to be afraid.” Fionnula learned:

To continue to be fearless. That regardless of who the students are, our role is to be able to interact with them fully, not to dismiss them, not to write them off but to understand them in the deepest possible way.

Ben

“I just didn’t understand what the hell was going on.”

Ben has taught in various contexts at the university throughout his long career as a biology professor – from lectures and labs to field work and online courses. Early on as teaching assistant, he enjoyed teaching because, “It was a way to learn more yourself… and there is the thrill of discovery and sharing something new.” For years, Ben was involved in teaching field courses in a province-wide field program which brought together students from multiple universities, studying various topics in biology. He said he loved these kinds of teaching and learning experiences because being in the field with students gave him instant feedback on what they were doing and learning in the course. He recalled:
It was very much learning by doing. In the field, you're busy doing things, and you can see people—what they're doing and not doing—and they have to do a seminar and they have to write a report so you don't need an exam.

Even in an online writing course that he currently teaches, he strives to create conditions for students experience learning by doing and interacting with one another. Ben said what matters for learning is,

being able to say to somebody 'I'm really not sure this is worded as well as it might be or to have somebody not think you must not like me because you're criticizing. To me, it's doing a valuable service because I don’t think that a lot of biology student get much of that.

Trust is a foundational principle of his teaching philosophy. He builds trust by forming solid relationships with students and helping them to take ownership of their learning experiences. He described a fundamental element to building trust is to ensure “the control is sliding more towards the student and more away from you…and you try to get people to do things they want to do.” For example, in his current teaching he explained, “I get these essays on Thursday and I have them back by noon on Friday…if you want people to use the feedback they need timely responses.” But also, Ben explained that by modelling that he is also a learner, he builds trust with his students. He said, “If somebody asks me something, I say I don't know but I'll find out. People are going to ask you and I think that as soon as you start teaching that's got to hit you right in the face.”

Ben regularly worked with students on their PhD committees – another domain where trust between students and faculty is paramount. He knows a lot about how to support students in these vulnerable and significant learning moments. He commented,
when somebody is defending their PhD thesis it's something they're fairly proud about but are probably a bit uncertain about. You're trying to find out in the exam do they really know their stuff and did they do the work but you're not trying to reduce the person to tears. You lead somebody up unto the edge of saying, 'I don't know' because you're interested in whether they have the courage to say, 'I don't know'. And it's all very civilized— there's rules, there's things you do and don't do.

Early in his career he had a memorable experience on a student’s PhD defence that was very different from any other defence he had been a part of before. Two external committee members were attacking the student’s work and continuing to push the student with questions that were beyond her knowledge and the scope of her work. Ben remembered feeling astonished by his colleagues’ behaviours – it was nothing he had experienced before in a PhD defence:

It was worse than bullying… because when you start asking somebody questions and you get to the edge and you realize that they don't know, you just back off. I think it was just completely inappropriate behaviour. And I just didn't understand what the hell was going on. I found that profoundly disturbing because it seemed to me against everything that I thought was supposed to be happening. And so, perhaps my response was to realize how you try very, very hard to be fair to other people, to encourage students and try not to back people into corners.

Ben recalled that he “if he was chairing the exam, he would have stopped it,” and he took a course of action that he believed to be right and went to his Dean to talk about the situation that arose at the defense but he reported that there were no repercussions for the other two faculty members involved. For Ben, this disjuncture situation impacted his decisions in future situations where he decided to recuse himself from PhD committees where he noticed a mismatch between
his perspective and students' research. He said he is careful about these situations because, “I
don't want to get into a defence and have to say, 'I think you're entirely wrong about this.' So
why not just step out of it before you get to there?”

**Derrick**

“*And I just froze; it had never happened to me*”

Derrick came from a family of teachers, many of whom had a performing arts
background. Getting up in front of people and teaching business students was never a big
challenge for him since the beginning of his career.

[Teaching] was something I looked forward to and the early part of the career I would say
teaching was the more enjoyable part because the research part takes a while to get going.
I've always been an interactive teacher in terms of class discussion; it has always been
something I really enjoy.

When Derrick talked about learning, he mentioned he’s a lifelong learner who is open to
new things, “whether it's just facts or new approaches or whether it's understanding how to deal
with people. I just like learning and that's the fun part about being a teacher is that you learn as
much as the [students] do half of the time.” And when he described how he learns he said, “It's
trial by fire and failure is your best teacher. I've failed at quite a few things so that's good
learning.” Derrick described an example of a time when he felt this failure at one time when he
was a graduate student. He recalled a significant disjuncture:

It was in second year of grad school and it was the comprehensive exams. I had done the
first two years of classes. I wouldn't say that I was particularly a good student; I was ok.
But I went into a final in an Econ exam and I just froze; it had never happened to me. I
knew the stuff, and it wasn't like I had never prepared; I had studied a tonne. I knew it but in the first 10-15 minutes I was sitting there, I couldn't get started, I couldn't put pen to paper. And basically, I had an anxiety attack at that exact moment. I got up and walked out of the exam – just like 'I'm out!'. That was uncharacteristic for me. I'm one of these type A, perfections type, a ‘get everything done’ person. I had always been successful in school.

In the aftermath, he described that he still felt a great deal of anxiety about the situation. Several his trusted confidants tried to help by distracting him and taking him out of the city skiing, as he said, “just to get me to refocus.” But this didn’t really do the trick for Derrick. He explained,

it was really coming to an understanding that I had focused too much in on the one aspect of life and denied other aspects whether it be physical health, relationships, playful interests and the types of things that everyone needs to do to be mentally balanced.

At the time, he deemed this experience in his exam as a failure but, it was “pretty fundamental in terms of qualifying ability and where one sits in the grand scheme, which was useful, in the end. When you're going through these things it was not pleasant but things in hindsight always look better.” Derrick explained that having gone through this experience himself has had a positive impact on his teaching today. He felt he is certainly more empathetic for his students’ circumstances. He said,

when I look at my career, I’ve actually leveraged that experience with respect to teaching. I've been able to spot situations that are very parallel to mine… and understanding that there's huge variation in terms of students and their' ability to cope with the challenges that they might face.
Grant

“I thought of myself as a helpful and fair teacher, but this experience contradicted that quite dramatically.”

Grant began his teaching career as a high school English teacher – a formative role for him in that shaped his perspectives on learning and teaching in higher education. He said, “Never, when you walk into any room of learners, assume they’re onside just by virtue of the subject, by virtue of you…” Grant explained that he learned to put a lot of time into getting students engaged in the classes.

His first experiences teaching in higher education were as a TA during his masters degree. He purposely chose a program where he would have the opportunity to teach at the university level which, he said he “turned out to love.” He had a TA supervisor who took his job “very seriously” in terms of mentoring TAs in their learning about teaching. Grant was inspired to do a PhD in psychology, in large part so he could continue teaching at the university level.

Grant loves working with small classes and described himself as very skilled at facilitating learning in those contexts. He said, “because the machinations of small group learning fascinate me, I was always motivated to try to read a room well.” Grant was also accustomed to teaching large first year classes early in his career. He described teaching large classes as akin to broadcasting because “to broadcast well means large numbers of people know what you’ve just said, they’ve listened to it and it’s affected them somehow.”

In one instance, early in his university career, Grant was teaching a large social psychology class. It was his first chance to teach above first year and he was anxious about giving the mid-term exam. He recalled:

It consisted of some multiple-choice questions and essay questions. I especially wanted the essay questions to be clear and fair, yet challenging enough so that they took the
student who had prepared properly to the right part of the course to get the answer. To
word them, I took exact phrases from sub-headings in the textbook and lecture outlines.
However, students did poorly on the questions, often going to an essentially irrelevant
place in the course to answer the question. In reviewing the exam with them, I made the
point that the questions were designed to take them to specific, clear places in the
course. I put up the questions, and beside them the sub-titles related to them. I thought
this would make clear why they had not done well. Unfortunately, that is not what
happened. I was met with a lot of anger from the class. And the more I tried to show the
similarity between the language that I both used in lecture was used in the textbook and
the language of the question, they more saw me as trying to defend an exam that was
poorly written. So that class ended and we all staggered away. I thought that even in the
early days, teaching was something that was going to be one of my strengths. It was
difficult to take.

He remembered that he felt angered by what had happened in the class. It is possible that
the anger stemmed from the situation bringing his identity into question. He said, “I thought of
myself as a helpful and fair teacher, but this experience contradicted that quite dramatically.”
Grant ruminated over this experience for days. He deemed himself a reflective practitioner so he
also knew the dangers of giving into a “negative inner voice” and stopping doing what he was
doing, just because something went in an unexpected direction. Instead, he took a different
approach. He offered students more direction before the exam about what they could expect in
terms of the questions and phrases that would guide them in crafting their answers. Students
exam scores were better. Grant learned the value for both himself and his students of being more
transparent in his teaching – “there’s simply no reason not to be.”
Chapter 5: Findings

In this chapter I discuss the research findings from individual and group interviews with the ten 3M National Teaching Fellows, a total of fourteen interviews. The findings that follow provide a significant picture of the Fellows’ learning and teaching that add depth to my understanding of the two research questions that guided this study: (1) What is the nature of learning for professors who experienced disjuncture in their teaching? and (2) How have moments of disjuncture shaped their teacher identity and practice? By using disjuncture as a common lens through which to reflect on their learning and teaching together, both the Fellows and I could infer several meaningful connections between their identities as learner-teachers and their teaching practice.

Interpretation of Meaning through Four Hermeneutic Windows

Gadamer (1976) viewed interpretation of meaning as a fusion of horizons. In research, I understand this fusion as a dialectical interaction between the presuppositions held by the interpreter—the researcher—and the meaning of the text. A ‘horizon’ is “a range of vision that includes everything seen from a particular vantage point” (Laverty, 2003, p. 375). The fusion of horizons pertaining to disjuncture, learning, and teacher development in higher education can also occur for readers as they interact with the interpretations I produced as a result of this study.

Through the hermeneutic windows (Sumara, 1996) I use in this study, it is possible for others to engage in their own interpretation of a phenomenon (Gelfuso, 2013). Hermeneutic windows “give us access to horizons of understanding that were not previously there – that is [they] help us see what we had not been previously able or willing to see” (Sumara, 1996, p.128). I constructed four hermeneutic windows which provide structure to focus on the essential
dimensions of learning from disjuncture. The essential dimensions included the emotions, cognitions and actions Fellows experienced during moments of disjuncture and how their teaching and identities changed as a result. I have titled these windows as follows: (a) emotional responses, (b) in-the-moment cognitive and behavioural responses, (c) post-disjuncture responses and, (d) learning. The four hermeneutic windows allow for a focused viewing of the themes that best depict the nature of each Fellow’s learning from disjuncture experiences, including the influence their learning has had on their teaching and teacher identity.

The horizons presented through these four windows connect the experiences of the ten Fellows who participated in this study, literature that supports or expands upon these experiences, and my own reflections on the data. My reflections and thoughts are integrated with the Fellows’ interpretations and the literature in the discussion of the main themes and findings in this chapter. Fellows’ interpretations and the explanations that are drawn from literature are represented either through direct quotes or referenced in the text. I have revisited these windows several times to add detail, context and deepened connections.

**Hermeneutic Window One: Emotional Responses**

In the first hermeneutic window, I describe the vivid emotional dimensions of disjuncture described by the Fellows in their individual and group interviews. This window focuses on the primary emotional signals that Fellows described when they spoke about the disjuncture they experienced in their teaching. Using emotionally laden language, the Fellows illustrated authentic accounts of highly emotional disjuncture experiences.

Although I intentionally asked each Fellow to reflect on their feelings in the moment of disjuncture as part of the pre-interview reflection and the individual interview protocol, I was surprised by the extent to which they all used emotional language to describe their memories to
their peers. I presumed that it might be too risky for them to disclose their feelings and emotions about difficult teaching situations with peers with whom they did not regularly interact. Researcher Brené Brown (2015) argued that academics do not easily show emotions and vulnerability when it comes to our work as we are taught very early in our careers that we must wear a “pedantic label like an academic suit of armor” (p. 12). Her research suggested that emotional accessibility is a common shame trigger because it threatens an academic’s sense of who they should be and how they ought to act in academic positions.

Contrary to Brown’s argument, the strong emotional dimension of the Fellows’ disjuncture experiences became apparent in the first group interview with Mia, Grant, and Derrick. As an example, Derrick described that his experience of misjudging his abilities to perform in an exam situation was “surprising.” Grant responded to Derrick by replying, “One of the things that strikes me about that story you told is how it kind of caught you by surprise; that fascinates me.” Initially, I questioned whether Fellows might have emphasized the emotional dimensions of their experiences to make their stories seem more exciting and to make an impression on their peers. After I reviewed Derrick’s individual interview data, I found he emphasized similar emotions when telling his story to me; he gave comments like, “it had never happened to me” (emphasis added, to represent the expression of surprise in the recording). As I reviewed all responses from the individual and group interviews, I specifically examined how they told and then retold their disjuncture stories. I discovered that their openness towards sharing the emotional dimensions of the disjuncture was consistent across both interviews for each Fellow.

Dominant Primary Emotions
According to Jarvis (2006), when disjuncture occurs, “The first emotion… is one of being in disharmony, dissonance, unease with ourselves and our environment…[and] other emotions also set in at this time” (p.182). Each of the ten Fellows unequivocally remembered what the disjuncture experience felt like, first and foremost. They each described the feeling of disjuncture as a memorable emotional response. Grant articulated this sentiment directly when he said, “I knew that in front of that class it was awful. I knew it was a big emotional moment.”

Fellows recalled a wide range of emotions when they recounted their disjuncture experiences. For example, Ben said, “I was just completely astonished [emphasis added] by what I considered to be egregiously bad behaviour” indicating that there was an element of surprise in his experience. André felt anger in the moment of disjuncture:

For the first time ever [the experience] made me stop and literally say to myself ‘don't lose your rag here, you've got to find another solution, this is clearly not working for anybody.’ It was the only time ever in a class that I found myself with the sort of bubbling emotions that I was struggling to control.

I interpreted the emotionally laden-language the Fellows used when they told stories about disjuncture as expressions of one or more five dominant primary emotions: fear, anger, sadness, surprise, and/or joy. I used a list of primary emotions and associated subcategories of emotions as described by Shaver et al. (2001) as a guide for interpreting and categorizing the Fellows’ verbatim expressions of their emotional responses to disjuncture. It was beyond the scope of my study to examine the intensity or the hierarchy of emotions (see Shaver et al., 2001) that Fellows described. There were likely other emotions at play as well during disjuncture (Jarvis, 2006); however, my intention is to articulate some of primary emotions as a starting point for reflection for other professors to consider disjuncture in their own teaching. Table 5.1
below represents these dominant emotional responses Fellows felt during their moment of disjuncture.

Table 5. Fellows’ Expressions of Primary Emotions Associated with Disjuncture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Emotion</th>
<th># Fellows</th>
<th>Subcategory of Primary Emotion</th>
<th>Verbatim Expressions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fear</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>“I was concerned that that’s the right thing to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern</td>
<td>“We were fixated”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>“It was profoundly distressing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disturbed</td>
<td>“I had just froze; I couldn’t start”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distracted</td>
<td>“I’m troubled by even one person not getting it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Excessive worry</td>
<td>“We don't know what to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shock</td>
<td>“It’s going downhill; going sideways; getting away from us”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Troubled</td>
<td>“I was particularly anxious”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertainty</td>
<td>“I had a hard time figuring it out”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was worried about that”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anger</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Irritated/Annoyed</td>
<td>“I was irritated and angry actually”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appalled</td>
<td>“I sort of snapped at him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>“It was disruptive to my thinking”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I do not get angry in terms of visible way [but] this is [was] a problem.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I was appalled that neither of these people would have thought of that”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It put me in a bad mood for that moment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surprise</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Unexpected</td>
<td>“Things were going weird”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Astonished</td>
<td>“I remember begin shocked by my need to tell the truth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disbelief</td>
<td>“I didn't remember what other people were saying because I was thinking…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disoriented</td>
<td>“I was just completely astonished”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I couldn't believe how they wandered into a course…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sadness</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Failure</td>
<td>“I saw anger in students…and my presence allowed it to grow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Despair</td>
<td>“My inability to…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disproportion</td>
<td>“In the ditch; In the sewer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disappointment</td>
<td>“It was difficult to take”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Defeated</td>
<td>“Hearing it…really crystallized the disparity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joy</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relief</td>
<td>“Only a 9-week course, thanks be to god”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>“So that moment though, it was complete”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Instantly, I could understand why she needed information”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first two columns in the table represent my interpretation and categorization of the primary dominant emotions and the number of Fellows who described these emotions. The last two columns show the associated subcategories of the primary dominant emotions and some examples of Fellow’s verbatim expressions of their emotions. Fellows’ verbatim expressions are illustrations of how they explained these emotions and could be valuable reflective prompts for other professors as a starting point for deconstructing disjunction in their own teaching.

The feelings of fear, anger, sadness, surprise, and/or joy manifested in different ways for each Fellow. For some Fellows, there was a strong primary emotion in the moment, coupled with or followed by subsequent emotions. For example, Travis’ description of disjunction indicated he felt both fear and subsequent sadness when he experienced disjunction while teaching his class of 800 students. Travis said, “This is clearly going sideways pretty early and we don't know what to do. It hasn't been our experience up until this time and it's going sideways” (fear/worry) and “It was just horrible. The class was just a complete disaster and a bust” (sadness/failure).

Fear and control. In both individual and group interviews, all ten Fellows described feeling some sense of fear when they experienced disjunction. As indicated by Table 5.1, Fellows expressed their feelings of fear in different ways, including as forms of anxiety and excessive worry, concern, distress, disturbance, distraction, shock, feeling troubled, and uncertainty. For instance, Mia felt a sense of concern when she applied for her first teaching grant at her research-intensive institution and she said, “I really liked the idea. I was so keen to do that but I was also concerned that that's the right thing to do.” On the other hand, I interpreted Travis’ sense of fear to have more elements of urgency perhaps stemming from the anxiety he described when conditions in his classroom grew tense. Travis recalled, “This is clearly going sideways pretty early and we don't know what to do.” Conversely, Amy explicitly described the
fear she felt immediately following the disjuncture prompting question from her colleague about using improv in her teaching. Amy recalled, “And then I had a moment of fear because I thought, I know how to improvise but I don’t know how to improvise when I teach.” I chose to highlight these three examples of fear from Fellow’s disjuncture stories because they illustrated a common fear amongst them of *not knowing what to do* in a teaching situation.

In my analysis of the data, I linked Fellow’s descriptions of fear of not knowing what to do to the concept of *control*. The connection between fear and control emerged from several interviews. Fionnula and Sandra agreed during their group interview that control is a “huge element in teaching…as teachers, we have to be in control whether it’s visible or not” (quote from Fionnula). In his individual interview, Ben said, “I have a theory about control and teachers like to have control. That partly means reading the manual, it means following the directions (which students sometimes find is aggravating) and yet, somehow, things must happen when they're supposed to happen.” Not knowing what to do in a teaching situation would likely prompt fear of lack of control for many teachers, perhaps over the quality of education experience (Mallinger, 1998) and content in their courses (Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008). It is possible that the fear Fellows felt in their disjuncture experiences is likely a universal feeling for professors in higher education, stemming from expectations for how they should be and act as academics set out by academic cultures in which faculty teach and learn (Brown, 2015; Gurung, Chick, & Haynie, 2009; Palmer, 1998).

Ben also spoke great deal about his efforts to share more control with his students in the classroom (Mallinger, 1998), specifically by giving them more choice in their assessments and learning activities in his class. When I reviewed the group interviews to look for evidence of this theme about control in teaching and learning, I noticed that André and Amy came to a shared
realization in their conversation together about allowing students to have more control in the classroom and what this means in practice. André shared his experience about moving from a lecture format in his teaching to having students work in small groups. This is the highlight of their conversation:

André: I think for me the difference is giving them [students] the permission and responsibility of learning.

Amy: Yep. So, much of what you said resonated. My disjuncture really was, as you eloquently put it, was take the emphasis off me and what I wanted to teach and instead what I want students to learn. So, it was a complete reframing.

There is ample literature that explores emotions and learning and indicates that the two should not be separated when seeking to understand learning (e.g. Goleman, 1996; Jarvis, 2006; Trigwell, Ellis & Han, 2012). Jarvis (2006) also argued, “The more we learn to control and manage our emotions, the more we can learn from our experiences, and moreover, the more that we will be able to use our memories in future learning” (p. 182). Jarvis’ work was not predominantly focused on the emotional aspects of learning but rather he considered emotions, attitudes and beliefs to be equally valuable in understanding “the whole person who learns” (p. 182). The Fellows’ rich descriptions help to deepen our understanding of the variety of emotional responses or signals in professors’ experiences of disjuncture and learning. The findings about dominant primary emotions confirms the argument that emotions cannot be separated from learning. My findings suggest that emotions can be recognizable and relatable prompts for reflection for professors who experience disjuncture in teaching and I argue that emotions deserve significant attention in higher education teacher development.
Not every Fellow felt each of the emotions listed in Table 5.1 above; however, each Fellow described an emotional response involving a primary emotion and often subsequent emotions when they experienced disjuncture. Despite the Fellows’ stories being fixed examples of the emotional dimensions of disjuncture, I acknowledge that while emotions are clearly memorable, they are not static and it is likely that Fellows’ emotions about the disjuncture have changed over time. André hinted at this when he thought about the details of the disjuncture experience and that he might have had “rose coloured spectacles on” when he recalled the story and his journey as a teacher since that time.

Through all the Fellows’ self-awareness and their willingness to articulate the emotional dimensions of disjuncture, they expanded the essence of learning from disjuncture with their peers and with me during our interviews. The hermeneutic window of emotional responses revealed the prevalence of emotions during disjuncture in teaching. The emotional dimensions of disjuncture may seem obvious, on the surface. For instance, experiences of fear and control are common themes in research in academia and teaching (Brown, 2015; Palmer, 1998). However, if greater attention could be paid to helping professors to recognize, accept, and work through emotions involved with disjuncture in their teaching, it may help to mediate feelings of shame and fear of vulnerability that have been reported as common in academic teaching cultures.

**Hermeneutic Window Two: In-the-Moment Cognitive and Behavioural Responses**

Jarvis (2006) suggested that when people seek to make sense of a disjuncture experience, to resolve it, and thus transform the experience, we do so emotionally, cognitively, and behaviorally through actions. Once I became aware that the Fellows were conscious of the emotional dimensions of their disjuncture experiences I was curious about what they thought at the time, and how they acted, or reacted to resolve the disjuncture in their respective teaching
situations. Flowing from the insight that I gained from the 3M Fellows’ descriptions about the initial emotional dimensions of their responses to disjuncture, the second hermeneutic window examines the in-the-moment cognitive and behavioral responses that they described in this study. In some cases, Fellows described simultaneous emotional, cognitive, and behavioural responses and in other cases it appeared emotions occurred before the other responses. I did not ask Fellows to specify the order of their various responses; instead, for this study, I conceptualized their emotional, cognitive, and behavioural responses as interlinked.

**Ignoring Disjuncture**

Jarvis (2006) explained that rejection, or ignoring disjuncture, can offer people a sense that harmony has been restored to their experience. As a result of a perceived feeling of harmony, they move on in ignorance, sometimes in disaccord with the social world around them. A prevalent, cognitive and behavioural in the moment response to disjuncture that Fellows had was to initially ignore, and thereby, reject the disjuncture. In this study, the distinctive ways that the Fellows ignored disjuncture was by either attempting to control or dismiss the situation.

An important revelation about professors’ initial responses to ignore disjuncture originally came from Travis’ story. He said:

> We didn't have the presence of mind to shut it down because we were so fixated on harvesting the ideas about what organism we were going to build. Our whole lecture series was based on getting that information from the class. I think, in the moment, we didn't want to be shut down by trolls so we kept it open. So, we took it off the big screen and I start teaching like a madman.

Travis and his colleague were driven by their original plan and it meant they did not have the “presence of mind” to choose a different path when tensions escalated in the classroom. Instead
of abandoning the technology altogether, Travis switched into teacher mode and started, “teaching like a madman” out of fear of being “shut down by trolls.” Travis’ experience illustrated how emotions (especially fear) can distract us or “get in the way of our ability to think and plan” (Goleman, 1996, p. 80). I found it compelling that the disjuncture situation caused him to resort to what he alluded to as a default teaching mode as a way to regain control in the situation. Travis’ experience was another example of the sentiments expressed by Fellows who talked about how having to remain in control is a strong, driving motivation for why some professors think and act in particular ways in their teaching.

Controlling. For a few Fellows, disjuncture brought out their need to control the situation, including the content or quality of the teaching and learning experience (Emanuelsson & Sahlström, 2008; Mallinger, 1998). Travis explained when students responded negatively in his class he “started competing with it [student responses], just teaching like a fiend–stuff that would be testable and just trying to get their attention back” feeling that his “only tool in that moment is flipping into teacher mode and trying to compete against that distraction.” Similarly, Grant expressed his experience of controlling students’ responses in his class when they were confronting him angrily about the exam he had given them. He said,

you don't really want to hear within minutes of getting a poor mark that was all your fault and as a teacher, I did very well and you did very badly. I shouldn't be surprised that I was met with anger in the class. And the more I tried to show the similarity between the language that I used in lecture, what was used in the textbook, and the language of the question, the more they saw me as trying to defend an exam that was poorly written. And they were blunt about it.
Both Travis and Grant’s experiences of trying to exert some control over students’ responses could be evidence of a threat to their teacher identities. In Palmer’s (1998) description of the student from hell in his chapter on academia as a culture of fear, he asserted that we sometimes interpret the non-verbal, verbal and behavioural signals that our students send to us as personal attacks on who we are. In circumstances that involve control, such as the ones Fellows described above, Palmer suggested that we risk losing “more than a debate: we risk losing our sense of self” (p. 38). For instance, in her conversation with Fionnula, Sandra described how she sometimes interprets disruptive situations in the classroom. Sandra shared,

I felt all these things as personal slights or attacks on my authority or that kind of thing. There are still times when I think ‘you're texting and I've told you not to text in class’ and therefore it's me, not you.

Palmer theorized that teachers have “fearful hearts” (p. 48) and suggested we fear feeling irrelevant in the eyes of (perhaps) much younger students. As a result, we end up interpreting their signals, or behaviours as in Sandra’s case above, as judgments about our teaching and, perhaps worse, about who we are and what we value. The above Fellows’ experiences illustrated Bracher’s (2009) and Steeles’ (1999) notion that one of the fundamental human motivators is the need to enhance one’s identity through controlling appreciation, validation, and/or acknowledgement from others. It is plausible that professors, like the Fellows above, might feel a threatened sense of self when they experience disjuncture. In such situations, their aim to control the situation might not only be to restore a sense of calm to the situation but more so to restore a sense of harmony to their experiences and their sense of self (Jarvis, 2006).
**Dismissing.** Some Fellows who did not try to overtly control the disjuncture still ignored it by dismissing it in the moment. For instance, Ben chose not to act in accordance with what he believed about how faculty should behave in PhD defences:

In any of these PhD [defences], the examiners are asked that if they have serious concerns they should communicate them to the Dean. At the time, if I were chairing the exam, I would have just stopped it because it was so bad. I've chaired quite a few exams and I've never seen an exam like this before. I was so upset by it. I didn't even take these two guys aside afterwards and say, ‘what the fuck do you think you were doing?’

Amy and Derrick shared disjuncture stories in their respective individual interviews that demonstrated how they each chose to dismiss the situations that prompted disjuncture for them. Rather than choosing not to act, Amy and Derrick used dismissive responses that seemed more defensive. One possible explanation is that both Fellows were motivated to use what psychologist call *defensive adaptations* to protect their perceived self-worth and self-integrity (Sherman & Cohen, 2006). In Amy’s experience, she remembered when a colleague asked her about improvising in her classes. She was in “a relatively public setting; there was a bunch of us around the table” and when her colleague asked the question she quickly dismissed it by sharply replying, “No why would I do that…what are you talking about?” and then she recalled “the conversation went elsewhere.” While Amy dismissed her disjuncture situation by stopping a line of questioning from her colleague and remained in the situation, Derrick dismissed his disjuncture by physically leaving the situation altogether. He remembered, “I got up and left the room and just freaked out at that point.”

Recall from both Fellow’s disjuncture stories in Chapter 4 that they each had experiences that disrupted their own sense of how they saw themselves. For a long time, Amy kept improv
and teaching separate and she saw them as two different parts of herself. She said, “improv sort of flies in the face of that sage from the stage thing, which is what I had been really good at. I'm a really good lecturer.” Derrick’s disjuncture experience challenged how he saw himself as “one of these type A, perfections type, a ‘get everything done’ person [who had always] been successful in school.” They both held certain beliefs about themselves and their abilities but the disjuncture disrupted these beliefs and arguably, their teacher identities. Dismissing the disjuncture by attempting to defend their identities was one way these Fellows could have been protecting their identities and shielding themselves from “the conclusion that their beliefs or actions were misguided” (Sherman & Cohen, 2006, p. 4).

**Embracing Disjuncture**

Working within the norms of institutional and academic cultures was a challenge that surfaced out of many Fellows’ stories in this study. Across their stories, there was a strong theme of clashes between personal values and those espoused by the institutions at which they worked. While dismissing disjuncture was a defensive response that some Fellows chose in the moment, others responded by firmly situating themselves in the disjuncture and confronting their feelings of dissonance almost immediately. Some Fellows who embraced the disjuncture reinforced their own beliefs and values about their respective teaching and learning contexts.

When Sandra described giving advice to new faculty about focusing on teaching for tenure, she recalled feeling a significant conflict between her beliefs and the reality of tenure and promotion processes in her institution. She said:

I configured my role as an educational developer as an advocate for good undergraduate teaching, [and this role] was in conflict with the other role of giving practical advice to
new faculty. The only way to resolve it was to say both things at once. Here are the good reasons for doing this but here is the situation in which you find yourself.

Her resolution was one to find ways to adhere to both her beliefs and also the expectations and cultural narratives that perpetuated around teaching, research, and tenure within her institution. Yet, despite Sandra’s efforts at managing the conflict, she revealed that she continues to grapple with this same tension to this day (see her narrative in Chapter 4).

Similarly, I saw Mia as an outlier in this study who embraced disjuncture. For example, she said, “I got the advice but I ignored it and I went ahead and applied… even though this [wasn’t] right for potential success in my career but it was right for what I believed in.” Mia embraced disjuncture in the moment by choosing to act in accordance with her own beliefs which were contrary to the conventions of her institution, her broader discipline, and her friend’s advice. She argued,

I still know it’s not right for us university professors to be in a position like this because yes research is important and research does feed the teaching but we are also interacting with students and our role is bigger and different than just being researchers. If you are instructors at post-secondary institutions, we do have to be good teachers.

Mia’s choice to apply for a grant eventually led to a positive resolution and she received the money to support her teaching projects. Grant helped to make an important connection in the group interview when he compared Mia’s example of disjuncture to his and Derrick’s:

One difference in your story from mine and maybe from Derrick’s is what happened to me and to Derrick rocked our sense of who we were and we questioned who we were. Whereas when your colleague gave you advice on what to emphasize, I would say you solidified who you were rather than. It’s quite different.
Mia agreed and Grant probed further and asked, “Why is that? Because that's who you know, and there's this sense of real clarity around who you are? Or is it stubbornness... what is it?” Mia responded,

I guess both. Somehow, I realized I wanted to be a university professor not because of research but because of working with students. I thought I have something to contribute to their learning. It [the disjuncture] really did solidify ‘do what I know’ and I knew the name of the game that’s really where who I am doesn't quite fit in academia.

In Mia’s case, it appeared that the disconnect between her beliefs and values and those espoused by her colleague and her institution, helped to strengthen her own beliefs and values about who she is and who she wants to continue to be as a university teacher. When I read the above conversation between Grant and Mia, it struck me that Mia also embraced her disjuncture.

Achinstein (2002) found that when teachers adopted an embracing stance to conflict caused by problems in their teaching, they also responded through critical reflection, such as acknowledging divergent beliefs, exploring alternative viewpoints, and reflecting on the implications of alternatives for their own practice. For Mia and Sandra, it is plausible that their abilities to embrace the situation itself was connected to their willingness to reflect on what was happening in the moment, recognize that there was a disjuncture and identify what the disjuncture was or at least what was causing it.

In this second hermeneutic window, a finer perspective on the responses that Fellows had to disjuncture becomes visible. Their responses illustrated the tensions that can exist during those disjuncture moments that lead them to choose to ignore or embrace their disjuncture. While many Fellows chose to ignore the disjuncture, a few of them acknowledged that they consciously embraced disjuncture and were specific about why they chose to do so. Building on the previous
window, disjuncture in teaching can be significant emotional moments that make an impact on the teacher and the students in the classroom. If such moments are leveraged for the purposes of learning, it might be possible for professors to recognize disjuncture in their teaching in the future and adopt an embracing stance toward disjuncture rather than ignoring it.

**Hermeneutic Window Three: Post Disjuncture Responses**

This third window focuses on Fellows’ responses in the aftermath of their disjuncture experiences. Through descriptions of validating or normalizing the disjuncture within the cultures in which they worked, and/or by actively reflecting on their experiences, Fellows illustrated key aspects of their learning processes involved in resolving disjuncture.

**Normalizing**

As I reviewed Fellows’ responses to one another’s disjuncture stories in their group interviews, I noticed their curiosities around knowing about how their peers handled their respective disjuncture situations. I noticed the first example of this in the group interview among Derrick, Grant, and Mia. Derrick asked Grant, “Did someone else help you to get that [the disjuncture] figured out, or did you do it all yourself?” Grant replied, “I know I had help. I had a couple of really good mentors.” It seemed there were multiple layers of meaning making happening within the groups that involved validating how they responded to their disjuncture experiences.

I recognized two scenarios in which validation of the disjuncture experiences was involved. One scenario occurred when Fellows sought validation at the time they experienced disjuncture as they described in their actual disjuncture stories. The second scenario where validation of disjuncture experiences was evident was hidden in plain sight in the group conversations themselves. I recognized the very act of reliving and retelling the disjuncture
stories as another way in which the Fellows validated their disjuncture experiences through conversations peers in the group interviews (Cranton, 2003). Malcolm’s astute comment about Travis’ retelling of his story made me think more about Fellows’ post disjuncture responses as acts of validation, or what Malcolm called “normalizing”:

But that part of the story to me is not the full story. The full story goes that you actually went and got support from other people who in fact had some expertise who could then normalize it for you and in fact help you identify a response that was a novel way you wouldn't have thought of on your own.

One of the ways that Fellows attempted to respond to disjuncture through problem solving was by attempting to normalize the experience after it occurred. I defined acts of normalizing as the Fellows’ attempts to make sense of the disjuncture by seeking external validation for what had happened. I also interpreted normalizing in Fellows’ attempts to gain more information from others to resolve disjuncture and restore a sense of harmony to their experiences (Jarvis, 2006). Fellows sought to normalize the disjuncture and validate their experience by referring to the conventions and beliefs associated with broader cultural narratives at their institutions and their respective academic disciplines. In this study, the broader cultural narratives were mainly presented by the people—superiors, colleagues, experts, and students—who formed the culture in which the Fellows worked.

**Looking to broader cultural narratives.** Cultural narratives offer people a repertoire of language, historical conventions, ideologies, and patterns of beliefs and value systems upon which to draw to make sense of who they are in the world (Polkinghorne, 1991). These narratives also provide people with a framing context through which to situate and organize personal isolated actions and experiences (Kerby, 1991; Polkinghorne, 1991). According to
Polkinghorne (1991), an individual’s sense of self is formed and developed through the processes of affirming, rejecting, or restructuring cultural narratives to suit their own sociopolitical and historical cultural environments. Narratives also play a normalizing function (Abbott, 2008).

Universities and wider academic cultures have a repertoire of broader dominant narratives that typically consist of traditional stories and retold stories about these cultures. These dominant narratives serve to both enculturate individuals and to sustain the culture (Somers & Gibson, 1994; Stephens & McCallum, 1998). For example, Mia experienced disjuncture when she realized that there was a gap between her beliefs and values about teaching and learning and the dominant narrative at her research-intensive university that prioritized research over teaching. She described this gap as follows:

I knew those were the requirements and I also knew that I really like to teach and I want to put more effort into teaching than research. So, I knew that there is a disproportion of what I want to do and what [my institution] is imposing on me.

In response to feeling this internal disjuncture, Mia approached a trusted colleague who ended up reinforcing the institutional expectations for focusing on research and she retold that cultural narrative to Mia. Mia recalled the conversation with her colleague:

I was telling her about this opportunity to apply for a teaching grant...and [she] said, ‘No, you shouldn’t do this, this is really dangerous at your stage of your career, you should be focusing on research and this will take your efforts and time away from that; it won’t be valued.’ She didn’t tell me anything surprising that I didn’t know already but it was hearing it from somebody else, that really crystalized in my mind this disparity between teaching and research.
Checking in with others. Stephens and McCallum (1998) claimed that dominant narratives enculturate and serve “the function of maintaining conformity to socially determined and approved patterns of behaviour, which they do by offering positive role models, prescribing undesirable behavior, and affirming the culture’s ideologies, systems and institutions” (p. 3-4). It is common for people to respond to disjuncture by checking in with other people to confirm that their responses—their feelings, thoughts, and actions—associated with disjuncture are socially acceptable thereby normalizing their experiences according to the social contexts in which they live and act (Jarvis, 2006). For example, like Mia, a few Fellows approached colleagues, students, or administrators within their academic cultures to seek validation and normalize their disjuncture experiences. In two cases, Fellows approached department administrators and recounted disjuncture situations where they experienced serious tensions in their respective teaching and learning contexts. Travis remembered, “I talked to my Associate Dean and he just said, ‘Well I guess you won’t do that again!’ So, the Dean expected the just walk away response.” Jarvis (2006) contended that we may not necessarily accept the input we receive from external sources, instead,

we read or hear the input with an expectation that we will reflect upon it, disagree with some of it and that we will arrive at new knowledge and so on that will be integrated into our biographies, but it will certainly not be the same as the input. (p. 30)

Ben also recalled, “I don’t know what other people thought who were in the exam. I know I wrote to the Dean afterwards.” Malcolm remembered “a discussion with other powers” around whether the trainee he was working with should fail, given the trainee’s inability to make the proper decision and ask for help when he should have. Malcolm recalled not being supported to fail the student and this was “a major dilemma” that he was even asking for such a course of
action in the pass/fail assessment culture of his department. His request would have been contradictory to the “failure to fail” phenomenon in medical education (Dudek, Marks, & Glenn, 2005).

Some Fellows responded to disjuncture by checking in with students who were present during the disjuncture experience to get a sense of their perspective. Two Fellows made deliberate attempts to consult with students to help them make sense of the disjuncture that occurred in their respective classes and identify novel responses to the disjuncture. Travis recollected,

I went into the Education course and said, 'Oh my god this is what happened’ and it was a couple of students in that course that said, 'Yeah, we see this all the time in residence; it's just low impulse control… and we just ask people, is this really who you want to be? André’s response to his disjuncture experience was to meet, one on one, with the disruptive student from his class to resolve the situation. He remembered,

We talked and the discussion wasn't going very well. So, to change the tenor of the discussion, I asked her how she got into vet school… And she said, 'I've always wanted to be a veterinarian but I failed to get the grades to get in and so I took the only job I could do which was to be an air traffic controller.

In each situation, checking in with students helped the Fellows make sense of the disjuncture from another perspective, and each of them expressed a change in their own perspectives about the situation as a result. In both scenarios, the students’ responses gave the professors a sense of what they needed to do next to continue to resolve the disjuncture:
That change in perspective really gave me a little ray of hope and that's essentially what I said to them when I went back to class the next day was, "If you're tempted to behave this way, just ask yourself if that's really what you want to do? (Travis)

Immediately a light went on! Her life as an air traffic controller was, I need information in this minute because it's life and death. Her experience of the process of taking in information came from the channel of, I need this information now. We had an interesting discussion about how we could overcome that and work together so that she could get the information she needed but not in a disruptive way. (André)

For Travis and André, it is plausible that once their disjuncture experiences were normalized within their teaching cultures (e.g. through validation from students in their classes), they could then make decisions about how to proceed next – in accordance or discordance with how they intended to “be” in the social world around them (Jarvis, 2006; 2012b).

**Explicit Thoughtful Reflection**

Jarvis (2006) theorized that one of ways in which people can respond to disjuncture is to choose to learn from it by engaging in thoughtful reflective learning. According to Jarvis (2012b), the fundamental learning processes that individuals employ involve thinking, reflecting, planning, exploring, and investigating (e.g. problem solving). Each of the Fellows in this study used thoughtful, reflective learning approaches at some point in their quest to resolve disjuncture.

I purposefully avoided asking leading questions that would prompt Fellows into describing reflective responses to disjuncture. Given that my first research question was focused on exploring the nature of their learning, I chose to examine how Fellows would describe changes in their teacher identities and their teaching independently of any specific
prompts that mentioned reflection. Therefore, I purposefully asked the interview questions, “What did you do to resolve this situation?” I wanted to avoid the presumption that all responses to disjuncture and subsequent learning were indeed thoughtful, critically reflective in nature. Thus, in this section, I focused on excerpts from Fellows who explicitly described thoughtful and critical reflective responses to the disjuncture.

While Fellows all reflected retrospectively during their interviews, my data revealed that only a few Fellows chose to explicitly describe thoughtful critical reflection as an approach they adopted to resolve the disjuncture. Travis described “I wrote about it afterwards sort of to make sense of it for myself.” A couple of Fellows also mentioned thinking more about their teaching and asking themselves questions, perhaps attempting to close the gap between their expectations and what had happened and then moving forward in their teaching. For example, Amy said, “I just watched myself teach and I watched myself improvise and I thought there are so many things I could do differently in my teaching that I do pretty well as an improviser and why don’t I do it?” Grant stated that he examined his own thoughts and actions that provoked the disjuncture and then asked himself direct questions as a process for resolving his disjuncture. In describing his internal dialogue during reflection, he said:

It was my own reflection that got me to the point of [realizing], I just [shared information with students] after the fact instead of before the fact…but then kind of calmly and positively saying back to myself ‘You've got a final, you've got other things to do. What are you going to do? Because you can't just barrel through. You can't just assume that every exam is going to go this way.’ So, I did get that real benefit to get back on the horse.
Both Amy and Grant seemed to share a similar desire to move forward from disjuncture and did so by changing their thoughts and their behaviours in their respective teaching situations. Grant described a strong sense of accountability, owning up to the thoughts and behaviours that he held before he experienced disjuncture, which was evident when he said to himself, “you’ve got a final, you’ve got other things to do.”

Travis also showed an element of accountability in his story:

It was irresponsible of me to take this tool into class without the ability to kick trolls off and keep it away from people who were abusing it and to just pause it. I mean, I went into class with the free version of the software and it didn't have any controls.

In Fellows’ own ways, they had to come to terms with how the disjuncture situation brought to light aspects of their identities that may have been in conflict with the teaching approaches they were attempting to use in their classes. Reflecting on the disjuncture seemed to contribute to restoring a sense of harmony to their experience and arguably, their sense of self (Jarvis, 2006).

Interpreting the data through this third hermeneutic window deepens our horizons of understanding about Fellows’ responses to disjuncture in their teaching. For each Fellow, normalizing the experience consisted of engaging in different approaches to investigating, exploring and resolving the disjuncture situation (Jarvis, 2012b). Their responses seemed to be unique to their respective situations; yet, normalizing the disjuncture was a common response for all Fellows in this study. I return to the theories mentioned above for possible explanations for why Fellows opted to resolve the disjuncture which was to act in accordance with how they wanted to “be” in social world (Jarvis, 2006; Stephens & McCallum, 1998). Regardless of
their approaches to normalizing the disjuncture, I understand their responses to be a part of the fundamental learning processes in which they engaged to resolve their disjuncture.

**Hermeneutic Window Four: Learning**

It was disjuncture because it was completely against everything that I was accustomed to.

How did it change me? I think it changed me, perhaps, it just reminds you like a whack across the head that these things are important. (Ben)

This fourth hermeneutic window presents a focused view on learning. The data represented in this window includes Fellows reflections on what they believe they learned about their teaching and themselves as teachers as a result of their disjuncture experience. A significant dimension about learning from disjuncture is also captured through the Fellows’ engagement in guided reflective processes and learning with and from others.

**Learning from Disjuncture**

Fellows in this study described learning that resulted in change in all three dimensions of Jarvis’ (2006) theory: changes in self; changes in knowledge; and changes in experience (Figure 5.1, Box 6). I describe these changes in the following sections by discussing them through three themes about learning: learning about students, learning about teaching, and learning about self as teacher.
Learning about Students

Change in perspective about students. Meeting the needs of learners involves getting to know students more holistically, including how they prefer to learn but also the prior experiences and value-laden perspectives and motivations that students bring to their learning (Ambrose et al., 2010). Brookfield (1995) referred to the student lens, as an important perspective from which teachers can examine their teaching, and as a source for feedback on the approaches to teaching and learning they take into the classroom. To Brookfield, the student lens can reveal “those actions and assumptions that either confirm or challenge existing power relationships in the classroom (p. 30). When some Fellows reflected on what they learned from disjuncture in their teaching, they recounted learning more about their students from students themselves. First, the disjuncture experience had an impact on Fellows’ empathy for student mental health and the impact that students’ personal lives have on their learning. Secondly,
some Fellows articulated how students played a valuable role in providing insight into their disjuncture experience and they learned from students in ways that changed their teaching.

**Empathy for students.** When Ben described what he learned from his disjuncture experience in an aggressive PhD defence, he said with certainty “I just think, it probably makes me more concerned even more that I'm fair.” He reiterated his opinion that words and actions in teaching can have great impact on students’ mental health. He maintained, “The student has to know that they can come and ask you about something and you’ll give them a square answer and if you're wrong you'll say, 'I was wrong' and you fix it.” During his individual interview, Derrick spoke about the positive ripple effect of his disjuncture experience on his teaching.

Student mental health was a theme that Derrick described as well. He said:

I've been able to spot situations that are very parallel to mine. Unless you have experienced some mental illness, it's hard to understand. The empathy factor would be the most important thing that came out of that in terms of the teaching front and understanding that there's huge variation in terms of students’ abilities to cope with the challenges that they might face. It certainly gave me more of a taste for the variance of the senior students and the need to be reminded that they might have issues beyond what you just see in the classroom and trying to dig a little deeper in terms of understanding why some are succeeding and some are not.

Fionnula expressed another dimension of empathy for students. In all her classes, she purposefully devoted significant time to getting to know her students including their stories, and the “issues” they brought to their teaching. Her disjuncture experience revealed that she “had a hard time getting their backgrounds out of them” as “they were carrying very large issues.” Her
learning had a lot to do with resilience in her teaching and “never to be afraid.” Fionnula learned:

To continue to be fearless. That regardless of who the students are, our role is to be able to interact with them fully, not to dismiss them, not to write them off but to understand them in the deepest possible way.

**Students as teachers.** André’s learning was prompted by his discussions with the disruptive student he described in his disjuncture story in Chapter 4. He recalled:

The dysphoric moment was: I had spent all this time knowing in my heart that people needed to use different approaches to learning. I had tried to bend the system a little to accommodate or improve the tracks that people could use but here was a woman showing me that actually the system is completely fuc**ked and that being in a factory is the wrong way of dealing with individuals and their different learning styles.

André’s reference to “a factory” was the culture of transmission models of teaching and learning that is often used in large higher education classrooms (Phillips, 2005). In André’s experience this model placed the professor standing in front of the class “pontificating on a subject” and students would passively receive the information and regurgitate it on a test – and the cycle would repeat. His experience with the disruptive student highlighted for him that his own behaviours had been contradictory to his beliefs about how students should be engaged in learning in the classroom.

After experiencing disjuncture in his class of 800 students, Travis explained that talking to students about the experience helped him to understand what he needed to do next to resolve the situation. Not only did he realize that students “were shocked at how quickly a civil society can break down,” he learned from students what he could do to resolve the situation. He
approached another group of students and told them about the experience in his prior class and they reassured him that it was common behavior they saw often with the student body. These students offered him the advice of, “We just ask people, is this really who you want to be?” Travis reflected on that and noted that he experienced a “change of perspective” that “gave me a little ray of hope.” He said, “My learning can come from students; they have stuff to teach me” and it “reinforced the way I'm tilting in recent years toward a much more collaborative relationship with students and that [the disjuncture experience] was kind of the seminal experience to it. They were a valuable resource.”

**Learning about Teaching**

**Ability to be resilient in future situations.** Researchers suggest that experts can quickly see problems in their disciplines, which make them faster problem solvers than novices (Berliner, 2001; Palmer, Stough, Burdenski, & Gonzales, 2005). This descriptor of expertise fits 3M Fellows well, given they are experienced teachers and renowned for teaching excellence and educational leadership. Grant specifically said, “that when things do get rocky, I'm going to be more public about the willingness to explore the possibility that I am at least partly responsible for this.” Travis shared an experience that indicated sometimes learning from disjuncture can have immediate (or near future) implications for teaching. He described the disjuncture happening during a Monday class and by his Tuesday class (where he met another section of the course) he decided on how to change his approach to doing the same lesson with a second group of students. As described in the previous section, Travis spoke to a group of senior students in another class to get advice on how to proceed with the class. The disjuncture experience and his subsequent approaches to reflecting on the experience and then
gleaning important advice from students paved the way for a smoother teaching experience the next day. He said,

this all went down on a Monday and I’ve got the other half of the class that I'm meeting on Tuesday and they all know about it from social media and residence. We came back into class on Tuesday and when I said, 'Ok so sign in and say hello' and I just said 'if you feel like you need to create some kind of racist or misogynist username or you need to post something like that, just ask yourself if that's really who you want to be here? That's all I said and it worked perfectly.

It is possible that Travis’ decision to reflect on his experience immediately after the class, by writing and discussing with his co-teacher, helped him to make decisions about this teaching approaches in the next class. This argument is connected to the literature about cultural narratives in a previous section on “normalizing” as a response to disjuncture. Thinking through the experience via writing, or writing to learn, and engaging in discussion with a colleague and his students offered Travis socially acceptable resolutions to his situation. On a practical level, his resolution involved asking a question at the beginning of the class that changed both the tone and set his expectations for student behaviour from the outset. On a much deeper level, there could have been an identity shift for Travis as his conceptions about students changed from consumers of the learning experiences to partners in the teaching and learning dynamics in the classroom.

In Ben’s case, the implications of the disjuncture experience on his resiliency were not as immediate as Travis’. Interestingly, it was only in his interview for this research that Ben made the connection between two similar situations of working on two different students’ PhD committees. He remembered, “These two were probably early 80s. The other one was
probably early 90s. And I hadn't even thought of it until this minute [that] it could be it was the ghost of that that led me to behave that way.” The past that Ben refers to here is the PhD defence that he described in his disjuncture story. The interesting piece regarding his learning from that disjuncture experience is that he continued to talk about how in a future situation (the reference to the 90s) he chose to excuse himself from a PhD committee that was fraught with fundamental disagreements between him and the doctoral student. In Ben's words:

I spoke to the supervisor and I said, ' _____ and I are not on the same channel and I should be off the exam because we keep having the same arguments and nothing changes.' There can be a whole bunch of reasons you would recuse yourself [from a committee] but a good one is, is that there's just a fundamental disagreement. It could well have been the ghost of that [prior PhD defense] that led me to behave that way.

As Ben directly articulated it when I asked about the influence of disjuncture on his teaching, “It changes your behaviour.” Learning from disjuncture for the Fellows above certainly involved changes in their resiliency in future teaching situations and for some, their learning from students could have even contributed to shifts in their identities.

**Conceptual change and adopting new teaching approaches.** When Fellows described how their disjuncture experiences influenced their teaching, a prevalent theme for many of them was that the disjuncture prompted learning that led them to adopt new teaching approaches and/or change their conceptions of teaching and learning. During their group interview, Amy and André had the shared experience of a fundamental change to how they conceptualized and structured their teaching and course curriculum, and supported student learning.
André described transforming his teaching program from large class lectures to small group learning as “a complete change.” He recalled,

that’s where the first-year seminar program comes from because it [the disjuncture] made me sit back and say, what are the real issues that you want to encourage in people? They are an independence to learn, a willingness to be able to move across borders between disciplines, an understanding of different disciplinary ways of thinking and investigating, and an ability to synthesize all that information and to practice it. The following year I removed all the lab work and the lectures. I split the class of 100 into groups of 8 and we then had scheduled time where I would meet with the groups and go through the whole class over the period of time.

The disjuncture he experienced from the incessant questions from the former air traffic controller in his class “helped to cement the sense” that he needed to change his teaching to meet students’ different learning needs. In Amy’s experience, she recalled a light bulb going on for her when she began to conceptualize her teaching as “traditional theater [and] students are passive, they’re just sitting there; they’re watching me as though I’m an actor on stage.” Instead, learning to incorporate improv into her teaching meant joining with students as co-creators of curriculum, much like an audience in improv theater where there is, as Amy said, “no fourth wall, there’s nothing separating me the improviser from the audience. The audience tells us what they want the scene to be about.” In very small ways, Amy began to introduce improv techniques into her classes. She said,

I would build in activities or exercises for very brief moments in a class that would allow students to inform some of the stuff that I was lecturing and then that’s grown
over the years. I incorporate lots of different activities where students co-create the curriculum with me.

Amy said she now has learned to adopt one of the cardinal rules of improv in her teaching “which is say yes” and not to block herself and that she “realized that, in a real meta way [she] was blocking [her] teaching and blocking learning by not saying yes to improvising in the classroom.” Amy described a significant conceptual shift for her, which she connected to her disjuncture experience in the following way:

My disjuncture really was take the emphasis off me and what I wanted to teach and instead what I want students to learn or what should students be able to know. So, it was a complete reframing.

Other Fellows adopted new teaching approaches by making more immediate changes in their respective teaching contexts. Fionnula described, “Instead of taking field trips to some of the communities, I put in an extra sweat lodge especially for this group so that our elder could work with the group.” For Grant who “learned the value of increased transparency” in his teaching, he followed up with the students who were in the class where he experienced the disjuncture. He described how he changed his approach to sharing exam questions and was more open with students about the structure and phrasing of future exam questions and his expectations of them. Sandra spoke about how her realization about needing to navigate between doing what is ideal and having to compromise what she wants to do or say – a key takeaway from her disjuncture experience with giving teaching advice to faculty. Sandra said that feeling as if she has to navigate the tensions between the ideal and the compromised positions influences her teaching quite often. She commented,
there are some things that I would like to do and looking at them and realizing that will be too much marking for me in this term. So, in my own teaching I suppose I'm making that kind of compromise. If I have to get all of these things done then I have to do the best possible job under the circumstances rather than the idealized one.

Travis described taking a different approach with using the same technology in class that had caused such a disastrous response from students in his class. In a subsequent class, he incorporated student volunteers to monitor their peers’ use of the tool in class. He said, “We turned Todays Meet into a backchannel and we had student volunteers responding to questions. So, it turned into a tool that was used to support civil society and peer-to-peer helping.” Not only did Travis learn to see his students as partners in his teaching but he began working with them as partners as well by including them as collaborators in his teaching.

**Learning about Self as a Teacher**

The most significant learning described by Fellows was a change in a sense of self. Notably, they expressed changes in self-confidence and their identities as teachers.

**Increased self-confidence.** Some Fellows said they experienced an increase in self-confidence stemming from their learning associated with their disjuncture experience. André explained that his disjuncture experience gave him the confidence to make the substantial changes in his practice that he had always thought were necessary to make. He remembered,

I had tried to bend the system a little… and I just needed to screw my courage to the sticking point and get on and do something utterly different because that was what people really wanted when they were trying to learn… In fact, it [the disjuncture] was what made me sit up to say, ‘Oh my god stop thinking that this is wrong or that this isn’t working or it could be better in this way and actually do it!’
André’s disjuncture situation seemed to confirm for him his longstanding beliefs about supporting learners in his classes and after his interaction with this student he knew he had to make significant changes to his teaching.

Amy also described her disjuncture experience as a catalyst for increased confidence in exploring a variety approaches in her teaching over time. She thinks she has become a better teacher since she started incorporating improv techniques in her classes and she commented:

I teach a lot less content than I ever did. I’m feeling increasingly confident that I understand where students are at those different levels and certainly engaging lecturer continues to be sort of a hallmark that I think I’m known for, but there’s just so much more to me now.

Mia explained her learning in terms of growing greater confidence in herself and trusting her beliefs and abilities to self-assess her circumstances within the context she worked. Recall that Mia got advice from a colleague to avoid applying for teaching grants but Mia applied anyway. She said she learned,

you do have to listen to your gut and your own sense of what's right but you also have to be aware of the circumstances that you are in. You have to position yourself in such ways between those circumstances so that you don't completely destroy your chances of succeeding yet following your heart or sense of direction. I only applied for one grant and, under the circumstances, my assessment of my own situation was I can do one teaching grant in addition to other research projects.

Mia’s comment about the role of circumstances surrounding disjuncture is a salient learning point for her. She experienced disjuncture as a pre-tenured professor who was balancing
a desire to focus on teaching with the pressures associated with the institutional requirements for tenure. However, when she was granted tenure and her circumstances changed she said,

I [could] do whatever I wanted within the certain norms and pursue it [teaching grants] more actively. I started from that point on, not keeping the lid on how many grants I applied for. By that time, I had quite a bit of experience in educational innovative projects and people wanted to collaborate. So, it just exploded! It worked out for me even though I didn't listen to the advice of my friend. I just kind of did my time.

Although Mia experienced increased self-confidence as a result of disjuncture, she was insistent that her confidence grew over time. In her story, she shared that she gradually started applying for more grants and focusing on teaching because she felt she had struck an acceptable balance between her desires, beliefs and values the expectations in the culture of her workplace.

**Illuminated an identity conflict.** When reflecting on their learning, some Fellows explicitly revealed how the disjuncture illuminated an identity conflict. For instance, Amy described the disjuncture situation as a point that triggered her realization that she was a “sage from the stage” figure.

All I ever learned from were sage from the stage people … so when I was discovering who I was as a teacher, I felt the need to model myself after that because that’s all I knew. As I was teaching more and improvising more, I realized that isn’t who I am. I’m not a sage from the stage. I think probably the biggest, most important turning point was that very simple innocent naïve question from my colleague.

Grant articulated the change he experienced in his classroom disjuncture situation as a shock to his sense of who he thought he was as a teacher. He recalled, “I thought of myself as a helpful and fair teacher, but this experience contradicted that quite dramatically; it was difficult to take.”
Derrick also had a similar experience but focused on his abilities as a teacher as he said, “it was a reality check on abilities and that overflowed into teaching” and that it highlighted a significant personal theme for him that “there's always ways that you can improve; you're never as good as you think you are. So that was humbling and that carried forward.”

Sandra spoke about identity in a similar manner and described conflicts in the roles she plays in higher education. She said,

I think that my role as an advocate for good undergraduate teaching—which is how I configured my role as an educational developer—was in conflict with the other role that I had at that moment which was as somebody giving practical advice to new faculty.

In Sandra’s experience, this is a conflict in values with which she continues to encounter. It is plausible that she has not fully resolved the disjuncture for herself and, as Jarvis (2006) theorized, continues to live with the disjuncture. Her unresolved disjuncture was unlike the other Fellows’ experiences described throughout this chapter. For example, Amy, André, Grant, Mia, and Derrick’s experiences show that when professors resolve disjuncture in their teaching, it can lead to positive changes in conceptions of teaching and learning, sense of self, and teaching approaches.

Box 6 of Jarvis’ Learning Model above illustrates circumstances like Sandra’s when she “fails to resolve the disjuncture and lives with disjuncture.” Yet, Sandra expressed a great deal of frustration about her disjuncture: “I want to solve it; I want it to be settled!” I conclude from Sandra’s experience that living with unresolved disjuncture does not necessarily mean that a person accepts it; rather, Sandra’s story indicated “living with it” can mean knowing how to deal with it in a productive way – an act of resilience.
**Confirmed strengths.** When prompted in their interviews to think about what they learned from their disjuncture experience, some of the Fellows described how they saw their strengths in the classroom differently from when they experienced disjuncture. I cannot say from the data that there was a direct relationship for all Fellows between the disjuncture experience and a change in how they saw their strengths as teachers. However, some Fellows commented that their disjuncture experience was a seminal experience for them to confirm their teaching strengths in the classroom. For example, Malcolm articulated his understanding of his strengths as a coach. He said,

it's hard to know how that [disjuncture experience] impacted me. I'd say that type of experience was one that drove me further to constantly challenge and work with trainees who are challenged. And there has been a theme – I've developed a coaching program [where] you can self-identify or be identified by the program and I've trained faculty to work with trainees who are challenged. I'm renowned for being quite good at that [coaching others] but it probably was because it didn't always work for me and I had to work at it.

Amy and Mia both described a change in beliefs about their strengths as collaborators. Mia explained,

Another thing this confirmed for me is that I also have capability for successful collaboration in different kinds of things. That was something that I didn't know when I started teaching, simply because I never really tried doing it.

When Amy was prompted to think about incorporating improv in her teaching, she contrasted improv practices that she currently does in her classes with her prior “sage on the stage role” saying she realized, “I improvise and that’s all about collaboration and teamwork and I don’t do
any of that in my classes!” Similarly, André described a change from seeing himself as a traditional sage on the stage teacher at the time of his disjuncture experiences to taking on a facilitating role in the classroom. André explained, “The transformation from being the sage from being a facilitator has been the most important thing that has happened to me. I feel way more comfortable being the facilitator than I do the sage.”

For Travis, a key learning about himself that came how he described his learning from disjuncture through his perspective on emergence and his role of setting the stage for teaching and learning in his classroom. He said,

If you create an environment toward a particular outcome, it's pretty likely that's what will happen and that all this other stuff that could have happened won't. You won't be surprised by anything. I try to skate this middle ground by saying, I'm going to create a stage and I'm pretty sure a play is going to happen on this stage but I don't know what it is going to be. So, then I go back and ask what was it about that stage that allowed such a disastrous thing to happen? I think it comes down to the control. The learning for me is that I didn't have as much control over this tool as I needed to. When this thing started to emerge, I wasn't able to attend to it. So, how does that change the future? I need to be aware that my ability to be responsive and emergent in the classroom was diminished.

**Learning to Teach Who We Are**

The Parker Palmer quote implies that there's an identity and we have some awareness of it and that identity influences, whether we want it to or not, who we are and how we teach in the classroom. And I buy that totally. (Grant)

One of the fascinating aspects of the adage, we teach who we are, is the generativity it holds in its inherent subjectivity. Palmer explored this adage through themes such as identity,
fear, and connectedness within ourselves and with our students. I came to this study with presuppositions about its meaning from my prior research (Gauthier, 2013) and my teaching experiences. I explain my understanding of the adage it in a way that is similar to how Derrick did in an interview when he said, “Teaching draws certain aspects of the individual that's going to show up at some point.” Not only does my personal baggage—the emotional, mental, and physical issues I might experience—influence what I do, say, and prioritize in the classroom but so too do my strengths, passions, and aspirations. Who I am drives my teaching insofar as my identity informs my decision making which can ultimately either help or hinder student learning. It is an overwhelming thought; yet, I am comforted by knowing I have the agency to self-reflect and make choices about what I do, say, and promote in my teaching. Who I am matters to my teaching and to the greatest responsibility I have as an educator – to influence the lives (and identities) of others.

In this study, the Fellows and I analyzed their interpretations of Palmer’s adage by thinking about it through the lens of their own learning from disjuncture. Each of their disjuncture experiences has made up a part of who they are as teachers, be it learning that led to changes in perspectives about students, changes in skills and knowledge in their teaching, and/or, changes in their sense of self as a teacher. The specific conversation where I asked Fellows to comment on the what the adage means to them occurred toward the end of the individual interviews and revisited in the group interviews. By that point in the interviews they had already had the chance to reflect on their biographies with respect to their learning and their teaching. I purposefully scaffolded the interview questions so Fellows would have the opportunity to reflect on their learning and their teaching separately. I hoped that they would bring their own notions of who they are a learner-teachers to their discussion about their disjuncture experiences and
subsequently to analyze the relationship between learning and teaching in Palmer’s adage. We revisited the adage again, in the group interviews where Fellow deepened the meaning of the adage through defining it together.

**A bi-directional relationship.**

The causal direction is actually bi-directional and that my identity is so defined by being a teacher that it's almost like I am how I teach. And so that helps define who I am as much as who I am, defines how I am as a teacher. (Grant)

Similar to Grant’s reference to “we teach who we are” being a “bi-directional” relationship, Crafton and Albers (2012) reflected on Palmer’s (1998) notion of “undivided self” and explained, “We seek to find ways in which the personal and the professional are fused and, in the process, identities are shaped and transformed – our own as well as those whom we teach” (p. 218). I carried this connection into my research and chose not to separate data related to Fellows’ learning and data related to their teaching.

In several group interviews, the Fellows confirmed that the relationship between their learning and their teaching as interlinked. Mia’s expression confirms this connected relationship as she said, “Well of course, it's interlinked; it's absolutely impossible for me to separate the two. I mean, what comes in through my own learning one way or the other comes out in the teaching.” Derrick expanded on Mia’s comment and referred to the relationship as a “continuum of experiences” whereby “all experiences make you who you are and shape your perspective and some of the experiences, or the disjunctures, are very direct in terms of your teaching and others further away but they all shape you as an individual.” Ben commented that the two are “interchangeable” in that, teaching influences his learning and his learning in general affects his teaching. Fionnula mentioned a specific example of this where her experience of being taught by
a certain teacher who was “a loving and caring man” has shaped who she became as a teacher. Fionnula’s example is consistent with other educational studies that suggest past teachers have a significant influence on the beliefs about teaching and learning and the practices of individuals who become teachers (e.g. Gauthier, 2013; Knapper, 2013; Loughran, 2006; Richardson, 1996; Taylor, 2003).

**Influence of learning on teaching approaches.** When several Fellows reflected on their learning and their teaching, they articulated examples of how their own learning preferences and approaches were connected to the decisions they made about the teaching approaches they used in the classroom. André gave a direct example of this relationship when he made the connection for himself in our interview and realized, “To some extent, it's true! I teach in an interdisciplinary manner because I think in an interdisciplinary manner.” Similarly, Sandra admitted, “I know why I stay away from lecture because I hate them as a learner! I know that is part of the reason I have explored as many experiential learning or active learning possibilities.” Likewise, Amy made a revealing connection about her approaches to learning and her approaches to teaching. She said, I realize now that I was a superficial learner. I didn’t know that. Throughout my undergrad, I had to regurgitate a lot of information and I was very good at that, but did I really understand what I was learning? I kind of brought a bias with me into my teaching that it’s all about just taking notes and learning stuff off by heart. So, I took a superficial approach to my teaching just as I had taken a superficial approach to my learning.

To this day, Amy now says she teaches a new version of herself because her awareness of who she is as a teacher has changed over time. Recall that her disjuncture experience included learning about the value of incorporating another part of herself, as an improviser, into her teaching including using improvisational techniques in her classes. Although it took several
years for her to see her teaching in a new light and not be the “sage from the stage” anymore, she has changed her conceptions of what makes her an effective teacher. She said in our individual interview, “I think I’m a better teacher. I teach a lot less content than I ever did. It’s true, as you move on in your career, you’re going to be teaching less content and more about teaching your students how to learn.”

Some Fellows described connections between their learning preferences and approaches to their teaching, but Malcolm expressed that he saw a different connection between these two. He said he is “cognizant of the fact that [his] approach to learning is not the only approach to learning.” For example, he explained:

There are people who are more watchful and less active experimenters in their learning.

There are people who need more time to pause and reflect and then come back to the dialogue. I'm sharp, I'm quick, I'm able to really do it all in the moment and I recognize that other people need time to digest and think and then to come back.

A similar angle to this perspective was apparent in Travis’ data. Unlike the other Fellows above who described the similarities between their learning preferences and their teaching approaches, Travis described that the opposite was true for him:

The part of my mind that is an educator understands the value of collaboration so that's the way I tend to work. But the part of my mind that is a learner would prefer more solo and more control of my interaction with other people. I don't think I'm putting people into really high stress situations, but I have a whole spectrum and I'm sure some of those students are uncomfortable. I am quite aware that I'm not creating learning environments that I would prefer to learn in.
Both Malcolm and Travis articulated a significant point through the above examples that examining our learning has a ripple effect on students, including how we are able to relate to them as learners. Malcolm explained that for him, reflection on his learning and teaching “means constantly forcing myself to look at them [students], who they are, and not try to transpose who I am and what I think is necessarily ‘the way’. There isn't one right way.”

Malcolm and Travis’ examples above highlight the responsibility that professors have in teaching contexts to consider how their approaches support or hinder student learning and identity development as learners and developing professionals in our disciplines (Bracher, 2006). Bracher (2006) insisted that professors pay attention to how their own need for recognition in teaching—the most “profound identity support” (p. 137)—influences current teaching practices. He stated that professors should identify such practices that “(a) are not helpful to students but that we pursue because of the identity support they offer and (b) practices that would be helpful but that we do not engage in because they appear to offer us no identity support” (p. 137). The author contended that by reflecting on these practices and identifying our “identity investments” (p. 145) we are, in fact, embarking on the process of figuring out whether the practices that we gravitate towards and use in the classroom that help us to maintain our identities also help students to develop their identities. It is possible to reimagine an explanation for the responses that some of the Fellows offered when they talked about the teaching practices they choose (or chose) to use in the classroom and those that they avoid (or avoided). Like Malcolm’s comment above, Travis’ remarks about how he often creates learning environments that he would not prefer as a learner is an example of Bracher’s suggestions for reflecting on teaching practice.
Learning in other parts of life. Travis was explicit that he did not think that he created learning environments that matched his own learning preferences; however, when he compared his disjuncture experience to other types of “breakdowns” in life, he articulated a connection:

I've never been in that situation in a classroom with 800 people before, but I've been in relationships that have gone in the ditch before so in that sense, how do you react to breakdown in relationship? That's just the way I would react in any breakdown situation—I'm not going to walk away. I think this is sort of where the learning part comes in.

Ben commented that his own zest for learning his subject matter influences his teaching, “because I'm always trying to find an example of something new and exciting, something different.” When asked about her learning outside of academia Mia immediately connected her learning as a competitive swimmer to approaches she uses in her teaching. She explicitly described the sequential steps involved in learning to swim and that this logic applied to how she teaches. She said,

I'm fully aware that lots of things that I learned from swimming I apply in my teaching role. I try to find individual components of large, complex concept and then go one-by-one from the simplest one to the most complex. You put many different elements together before you can really, properly even race. And, constantly you are encouraged by your coaches that you have to persevere and move forward, and you will get better. And lots of those things I do apply in my teaching.

Teaching influences teachers’ learning. Just as scholarly reading, writing, and social interactions with students and colleagues help professors to develop their knowledge, teaching is a vehicle through which teachers learn as well (Brookfield, 1995). The complementary direction
that the “we teach who we are” relationship manifests was described by the Fellows as an experiential, learning by doing relationship – as they teach, they continue to learn. For instance, in our interview, Derrick was prompted to reflect on his learning which he described in terms of its relationship to his teaching style. He said,

I like the style of learning as I am the style of teacher. I like a storyteller, so I guess it matches parallel, which isn't surprising. I like to be taught the way I like to teach. I like to listen and learn like that because that's the same way I would do it.

In the context of our one-on-one interview, Derrick’s reference point for describing his learning was his teaching. Arguably, helping Fellows to reflect on their learning using examples of disjuncture in their teaching was an important purpose of my interview methods. However, I did not prompt Derrick to articulate a direct connection between his teaching “style” and his learning “style”. Instead, he made this comment toward the end of our interview, after a long discussion about the influence that learning and disjuncture has had on his teaching. The reflection he did in our conversation prompted him to make extensions in his own thinking about the bi-directional nature of who he is as a teacher and a learner.

I found evidence of similar extensions in thinking for most Fellows in this study and I offer a few other examples of how they conceptualize the influence of teaching on their learning. Amy discussed how her transition from using surface approaches to learning to adopting deeper approaches to learning evolved as her teaching approaches developed from transmission approaches such as lectures, to more collaborative approaches such as co-creating curriculum with her students. She said,

I finally am at the point where I’m confident that I am a deeper learner. Part of the fact is that I’ve been teaching for several years and I now appreciate that I don’t have to rush to
learn everything; I can sort of let concepts wash over me and just think about them and embody them or integrate them into my matrix the way that I see fit at the time that I think is right. I’m more thoughtful and intentional about how I’m teaching and therefore more thoughtful and intentional about how I put courses together. It’s not about memorization anymore in my courses. So, at the same time that my teaching has become deeper, my learning’s become deeper.

Mia offered her reflection on how teaching influences her learning and said, “I always like to learn and there is a sense of curiosity. I also realize that trying to explain concepts to others helps me learn but also there is that excitement when you see that other person understood it.” Similarly, André described the link between his learning and his teaching is also in his drive to teach to “empower other people to not only be the best they can, but to push the boundaries on being that person.” Teaching is a personal learning experience for him because “In doing so, I'm learning a lot about them and I'm learning a lot about human interaction that I inevitably find endlessly fascinating.” The Fellows’ reflections are examples of how through teaching, we learn about our own learning (including learning preferences) and our teaching. In addition, we can observe changes in ourselves over time and learn about others (especially students) as we teach.

An Embodied Relationship

What I say about the way I used to teach is that it never felt quite right. Students liked it, that’s the key thing. Did they learn? No, but they liked me a lot. But it felt fake, it felt disingenuous. (Amy)

This quotation from Amy indicates a powerful dimension of the *we teach who we are* relationship, expressed through the feeling of approaches that fit (or do not fit) who we are as learner-teachers. Sandra explained the feeling in a slightly different manner with the foresight
that if she were to use certain teaching approaches, such as online teaching, that she would not be “most useful as a teacher.” She explained the connection of this feeling to her identity as teacher:

The me that would go into that classroom would be limited because I'd be trying to focus myself in a way that isn't myself. It feels like my spontaneity and energy wouldn't come through there. I have colleagues who thrive on online teaching, but I think that their selves fit that better.

From the perspective of Jarvis’ (2006) theory, Amy and Sandra could be describing a feeling of misalignment or gap between what they believed and valued about learning and teaching and the teaching approaches they used in the classroom. For Amy, the way she “used to teach” was a transmission approach of delivering entertaining lectures, which has since transformed (through disjuncture and subsequent learning) into a more collaborative endeavor with her students. In Sandra’s case, the potential misalignment or feeling that she would not be herself in the classroom sees to prevent her from using online teaching approaches in her classes. I recognize that an alternative explanation in each case could be a gap between the Fellow’s skillsets and her desire to adopt certain approaches in her teaching; however, to draw a valid connection would require further research.

**Expression of aspirations.** In separate interviews, both André and Sandra articulated some clear examples of how their own aspirations as learner-teachers have had influence on their aspirations for their students’ learning and development. When André discussed his drive to empower people through his teaching, he saw this as “the piece that links those together [him as a learner and a teacher].” When we explored this drive more deeply, André described his aspirations for the learner he wants to be, and the learning experiences he co-creates with students. He commented,
I think I teach who I would want to be. I would like to be an effective learner because I don't think I am good at it and I like to encourage students to be better. I teach in an interdisciplinary manner because I think in an interdisciplinary manner. But I still think it's this yearning because I know I'm not pleased with that in myself. Or, I wasn't, and I've become better by learning how to learn.

Sandra remembered her joy for introducing new poetry to her English students and that one of greatest excitements about her teaching is being, able to be the one to introduce students to something… I suppose that's something that I want my students to be able to do as well. I want them to have that thrill of finding something and then introducing and becoming the "expert" on it and mastering it and being able to share that with others.

In each case above, the Fellows articulated how aspects of their “selves” showed up in their teaching in the drive or motivations that influence the aspirations they have in their teaching, including how they want students to think and skills they hope students will build. It is notable that neither Sandra nor André talked explicitly about aspirations derived from their respective disciplines. Instead, they both described personal aspirations that come from their own desires (for learning and teaching) as individual teachers. There seemed to be an inherit motivation to be generative in both of their situations, in terms of sparking students’ interest in learning itself and modeling what it means to engage in learning that is meaningful and developmental. This kind of generativity and desire extends far beyond disciplines and seems to have more to do with individual teachers who seek to model their personal beliefs and values about learning and their teaching (Gauthier, 2013).
**Expression of values.** When I asked Ben about whether he thought there was a connection between his own learning and his teaching he said, “I’d say ya, it’s probably true” and explained his response in terms of a statement about his values. He described the foundation of what he wants students to learn and value in his writing courses:

It's a whole business of enjoying it and not taking it so seriously and learning by doing…that's [doing] a lot of writing and speaking about what you've written but it also means helping other people with their writing. Those are all things that are important to me. You need to be able to help other people; you need to be able to interact with other people.

André replied to that same question in a separate interview with more certainty and said, “I think I probably lived that” and described his own undergirding values about learning. He said,

Life is learning. I am utterly intrigued by understanding how things work – politically, socially, culturally. I don't think I ever stop thinking about issues but they’re really opportunities to learn. I fundamentally believe that's the goal of being in a position as a faculty member, is to get other people to be like that; to encourage in students, the idea that there isn't anything they can't do; there isn't anything they can't learn; there isn't anything they shouldn't be trying.

Conversely, in different interviews Fionnula and Malcolm spoke less overtly about the connection between their learning and their teaching but agreed there is a connection. It appeared there were some influential value-laden statements in their language that suggested the connection. Malcolm said:
at my fundamental core, I teach professional students and I see teaching as much about identity formation as it is about any core piece of knowledge. So yes, I teach who I am in the sense that I do have a sense of what that identity, by necessity, has to be.

Fionnula commented:

I think that when I teach, it's not just about relationships with students but it's also about life histories and our own ability to shape our lives, to be people who change the world. I have a very deep belief that if we don't have our own shit together then we can't be teachers that are very effective.

The quotations above are only four examples of the ten Fellows who each shared similar connections between their teaching and their learning. Through their teaching, they model who they are as learners and simultaneously teach students about how to learn. The Fellows’ aspirations, values, preferences, and learning from past disjuncture came through in their teaching. As André alluded to above, to “live” something—a value in his case—meant that it drives your teaching; it is enacted in what you do and say in the classroom.

**Guided Reflection & Learning with and From Others**

When prompted through a guided reflection process the Fellows in this study could use disjuncture to frame and understand their teaching practice and their teacher identities. The guided reflection process I designed for this research involved opportunities for reflection at four different stages: 1) prior to the individual interviews; 2) during the individual interview; 3) after the individual interview, and 4) during the group interview. Table 5.2 outlines these stages, including the opportunities for prompts and reflection at each stage.
### Table 5. 2 Four Stage Scaffolded Guided Reflection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Prompts</th>
<th>Reflection &amp; Learning Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prior to individual interview</td>
<td>• Prompts about the disjuncture experience (Appendix D)</td>
<td>• Opportunities to reflect on teaching and learning prior to interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Definitions and examples of disjuncture (Appendix E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual interview</td>
<td>• Scaffolded biographical questions focused on self as learner and self as teacher (Appendix A)</td>
<td>• Opportunities to reflect during the interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Similar questions from email prompt about the disjuncture experience</td>
<td>• Meaning making of the experience through retelling through a new lens (disjuncture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Making new connections and extensions (self as learner, self as teacher, and teaching practice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post individual interview/before group interview</td>
<td>• N/A</td>
<td>• Reflection on individual interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities to make further connections and extensions in their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group interview</td>
<td>• Scaffolded prompts (Appendix B)</td>
<td>• Reflection and articulation of new learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Retelling of individual disjuncture stories</td>
<td>• Comparisons across disjuncture stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sharing of new learning since first interview</td>
<td>• New understanding about disjuncture and the impact of learning on teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peer-to-peer questions and discussion</td>
<td>• Confirmation of experiences by group/socially accepted responses and new learning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This guided reflection process intentionally supported the Fellows in interpreting and describing their experiences of disjuncture and learning that has influenced their teaching.

Each Fellow was given a series of scaffolded prompts before and during an individual interview to reflect on biographical information including their own learning, their teaching,
and a significant disjuncture experience. In subsequent group interviews, the Fellows briefly described their disjuncture experiences to their peers. They continued the discussions about disjuncture and learning by asking questions about each other’s experiences. In every group interview this exchange deepened the Fellow’s conversation to a level where they could compare their disjuncture experiences and co-create new meanings of their respective experiences, including deepening their understandings of disjuncture.

Guiding the Individual Interviews

Prompting stories about disjuncture. A few Fellows began their individual interview by saying they struggled to think of an example of disjuncture in their teaching. These Fellows did not actually have a story about a disjuncture experience to share straight away; instead, through several additional prompts and having Fellows tell other stories about their teaching, they described disjuncture experiences without initially realizing it. Interestingly, all Fellows admitted to having experienced disjuncture in their teaching; however, they were not familiar with the concept of disjuncture and thus not accustomed to looking for examples of this in their teaching. As Grant indicated in a group interview, “I'm of the belief that you can have one of those events in your life and not think about it.” For example, when asked to share a disjuncture experience, Malcolm said, “I really struggled and I could not figure out anything that I felt was a disjuncture of that type and so I was quite paralyzed actually to figure out well, what story do I tell you?” He was referring to trying to tell a similar story to the examples and definitions that I sent to him prior to our interview (see Appendix E). The definition I provided was as follows:

Disjuncture occurs when individuals are in a situation and they realize that they do not know, cannot understand, and may not have the ability or skills to do what they desire to resolve the situation. Disjuncture is a state whereby individuals experience a sense of
unknowing, questioning, or surprise generated from within and often prompted by their interactions in the social world. (Jarvis, 2006)

To continue to guide Malcolm through a conversation, we returned to his teaching experiences and what he believed and valued about teaching and learning. He commented on some of his motivations for his teaching: “If there are two or three people who didn't really get it, it's just like ahhh dammit! What can I do different to get them, to engage them?” I asked him about challenges he faced in his teaching when students just “didn’t get it” and could he point to examples when this happened. Malcolm replied with his detailed story about a difficult trainee who failed to ask for help and a patient died (as captured in my version of his narrative in Chapter 4). In the end, Malcolm made the connection to disjuncture himself and commented, “This was a travesty. I still remember it now. I wasn't thinking of it until you kind of pushed me!”

When other Fellows struggled to think about what experiences constituted disjuncture in their individual interviews, I aimed to steer the conversations to their stories about their teaching, based on biographical information that they had shared at the start of the interview. Similar to my work with Malcolm, an entry point for me to help Fionnula to reflect on disjuncture was to build on her theme of community that she shared as we talked through some of her biography related to her learning and teaching experiences. For example, I asked her, “I'm really interested in your idea of community in the classroom. I'm wondering if you could tell me a story about any time when the community was working well. What did it look like?” Fionnula replied, “I'm going to tell you a different story. I'm going to tell you about where the community didn't work because that could have been a disjuncture.” As is indicative in her narrative in Chapter 4 she did have a disjuncture story to share with me in our individual
interview. For many of the Fellows in this study disjuncture was not an obvious experience that they remember going through, but it was undeniably a common experience they had in their teaching and learning contexts.

My study methods revealed that it was easier for Fellows to remember challenging experiences or negative disjuncture moments in their teaching over positive moments. Despite mentioning in my prompts before the interview that disjuncture can be positive or negative, all Fellows chose to tell stories about challenges, which indicated that they initially interpreted disjuncture as a negative feeling at the time it occurred. I did not ask Fellows why they chose the stories they shared. Challenging experiences may indeed be more memorable and easier to prompt than other everyday experiences; yet, it may not be the type of disjuncture experience itself that matters most when talking about learning. In this study, it was going through the reflective process of making connections between an experience, their learning from that experience, and then the influence this has had on their teaching that showed influence on the Fellow’s learning during their participation in this research.

**Learning With and From Others**

Adult learning research shows that learning that is linked to improved practice and student achievement, does not happen when teachers work in isolation (Breidenstein, Fahey, Glickman, Hensley, 2012). This research is supported by literature on teachers’ participation in inquiry communities (Roblin & Margalef, 2013), communities of practice (Harnett, 2012), or in teacher development programs with peer feedback experiences (Osslon & Roxå, 2012). By making meaningful connections to other people, teachers can learn and increase student engagement (Intrator & Kunzman, 2006). The results of my study indicate there is a vital connection between professors’ prior learning and their teaching but that other individuals can
play a significant role in helping to prompt these connections for the purpose of learning about teaching.

The Fellows engaged in learning experiences with their peers that involved meaningful dialogue about learning and teaching, which indicates shared meaning making was a key feature of their learning and development as teachers. At the beginning of this chapter, I wrote that not all Fellows came to their individual interview directly conceptualizing their disjuncture experiences as learning experiences; however, the conversations with others offered additional opportunities for discussion and reframing their stories to help deepen their learning about the role disjuncture has in influencing their teaching and teacher identities. Notably, I found that Fellows could expand their understanding of their disjuncture experiences by comparing and contrasting to other people, raise new possibilities for each other’s explanations of disjuncture, and come to some shared understanding of what disjuncture means in teaching.

The groups’ willingness to share openly and honestly about the emotional dimensions of their disjuncture experiences became an important part of the learning that happened within the group interviews. In one group interview, there was a strong sense of relatability between Ben and Malcolm when Ben shared his story about his distressing disjuncture experience on a PhD committee that was “completely against” everything he was accustomed to. When Ben talked about what he learned from the situation about how “these things are important and you don’t do that,” it prompted Malcolm to relate his own learning from a similar distressing oral defense situation. Malcolm responded, “You know I had one of these experiences and it changes the way I prep my students for them [oral defenses]. I can imagine that being something, whether you recognize it or not, you start to think about.”
In another group interview between Mia, Grant, and Derrick Grant made a deeper connection to the “surprise” Derrick described in his disjuncture story. Their conversation went as follows:

**Grant:** There have been times when I've been set to walk into a classroom and my own anxiety and apprehension swells. It doesn't catch me by surprise so much now, but it did and that was what rocked me. It wasn't just that I felt suddenly quite unsure in the future. It seemed very foreboding. But where did that come from? Was the surprise a big piece for you? Or in retrospect maybe it wasn't that surprising?

**Derrick:** It was surprising because I just wasn't used to the game. So, the notion of being in an exam and seeing the situation where I thought I had prepared so well and thinking that it was a regular exam that you scored an 80 on. I just was blown away by the fact that I completely misjudged. I wasn't an econ major and I wasn't used to that approach.

**Grant:** And it sounds like it's not an approach you adopt in your own assessment strategies.

**Derrick:** No, if that makes sense?

**Grant:** Oh, it makes great sense.

In that conversation, Grant’s connection and follow-up story and question prompted Derrick to elaborate further on his disjuncture experience and make connections to his current assessment practices. The data from all four group interviews serves as credible evidence of the Fellows making connections between their disjuncture experiences and elements of their current teaching practice.

As a listener who sat on the periphery of these group conversations, and as researcher with the privilege to make meaning from all the data afterwards, I noticed how the Fellows found
familiarity with each other’s disjuncture experiences through the language of emotions. Fellows related to the feelings that their peers felt, when they described the emotional dimension of disjuncture in their respective stories. Furthermore, the subsequent dialogue between Fellows that flowed from the sharing of these emotional experiences were generative and often prompted them to make connections to other teaching and learning experiences.

**Reflections on Disjuncture from Group Interviews**

From the beginning of this research, I was curious about how Fellows would define disjuncture, and describe the qualities of it from their own experiences. I knew deepening my own understanding of how professors themselves described disjuncture would be important to eventually using disjuncture with other professors as prompts for developing their teaching. Table 5.3 below illustrates examples of Fellows’ responses to one of the prompts that I asked them during group interviews about naming the qualities of disjuncture in their teaching experiences.

Table 5.3 Fellows’ Responses about the Qualities and Definition of Disjuncture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Quotes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complicated</td>
<td>*one word answers, no full quote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying (Positive)</td>
<td>“It can be clarifying to feel a threat to your identity.” You can force you to go back to your own first principles and say, okay, what clear away everything else. What are the principles that I believe in that unshakable”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unexpected (Positive)</td>
<td>“You thought you were entering something that you were really going to struggle with, it wasn't gonna go all that well and we're just going to get through this and then it turns out to be fantastic.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You've harbored these thoughts internally for a long time, and now suddenly the train has hit you to say, &quot;For God's sake do it! Change! Listen to what your heart is telling you;&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Warning “That warning that I got that was vocalized by somebody outside of my head was quite important”

Questioning “Disjuncture for me, is by its very nature impactful. It's where I go, Wait! What am I doing? Why am I doing this? What just happened? Those moments hit me.”

“It's, wait a minute this isn't all fitting together; the puzzle doesn't feel right and I have to go after that more deeply”

Signal “Something that stands out as being different that gets your attention and if you're interested; it's often something that comes up in a completely different way of doing something.”

The thing that pops up as being novel or different that catches our attention.”

Shift But for me, at that point, there was a big pivotal shift

Seminal Moment “Well there's lots of seminal moments and turning points, I picked one that was pretty fundamental in terms of qualifying ability and where one sits in the grand scheme, which was useful, in the end.”

Turning Point “I also liken it to a disorienting dilemma. I thought of a time where it was a real turning point in my teaching and what were the circumstances around that turning point

One of the results from asking Fellows to discuss the qualities of disjuncture is that I realized that their conceptions of disjuncture in teaching were much richer than Jarvis’ (2006) definition included. In Chapter 6, I will introduce a modified definition of disjuncture for higher education teacher development which is based in the data in Table 5.3.

A Generative Process

Discovering a past disjuncture experience during our reflective interviews had an impact on several Fellows after their initial conversations with me. When I asked Fionnula and her colleague at the beginning of a group interview if they had any new thoughts since we last talked, Fionnula said,

It was so unexpected that that would even come up. I have dwelled on it quite a lot. I've done analysis of it. I've really started to wonder about those students, and I figured out some things about them… I have more empathy. I kind of corrected myself. I obviously
was favoring these other two younger women and I was trying to battle with these guys to just be more positive. I also don't think I was being a particularly effective person in terms of conflict resolution. [I] kind of don't think it fully changed me, but I think it changed me now because I had time to think about it more deeply.

For Fionnula, the activity of discussing the details of her disjuncture experience with me and her peer seemed to have prompted her to contemplate and simultaneously vocalize her meaning making of her past experience during the course of the interview.

Travis expressed a similar experience of prompting further learning about his disjuncture experience from our interviews and said, “After talking to you [Launa], what’s really kind of struck me is that it was actually students who saved me from that. So, my learning is that my learning can come from students; that they have stuff to teach me.” In an earlier section of this chapter I explained Travis’ learning in terms of his change in conceptions of students’ roles in the teaching and learning process. If what Travis expressed about our interview conversation is indeed true for him then it is possible to say that the reflection processes he was guided through in this study had an influence on his teacher identity.

Several Fellows had new realizations about their teaching, their learning, or their disjuncture experience during both interviews. During the group interviews, the Fellows naturally compared their stories with their peers, adopting their colleagues’ perspectives to view their teaching (Brookfield, 1995). Derrick’s response, “I never, until this question, thought that it impacts the way I teach” shows an element of how being prompted in the interview provided an opportunity to look at his teaching from a different lens – how an experience of past disjuncture has influenced his current teaching. Mia commented to her peers
that the opportunity to reflect on a disjuncture experience was a meaningful learning opportunity:

I don't reflect often and if I do reflect it's about some other things. It also made me think about that particular disjuncture that we talked about and that I didn't realize that was as important as after the interview. I was happy that somebody stirred me to get going and thinking about that. Any opportunity to reflect on teaching I welcome that because I don't think we have many of those as, as teachers in academic settings and I think they are useful and there should be more of them. The interview made me think about how significant events in your life can influence how you see your profession and made me reflect a little bit on how I evolved to where I am.

My study demonstrated that reflecting on experiences of disjuncture was a generative experience and, when prompted, Fellows could use it to reflect on their teaching beyond their individual interviews. This was precisely one of the purposes behind having both individual and group interviews—to reflect on the experience of telling their disjuncture stories they shared with me in the first interview and see if there is any further learning after having engaged in this deep, reflective thinking about their own learning and their teaching. The role of the four stages of reflection about disjuncture was significant to the Fellows’ learning experiences over the course of our interviews. As Fionnula noted, “I think these are major insights because if you take that disjuncture and you analyze it and nail it and think about it quickly, then you solve a lot of issues, earlier. That's a valuable teaching lesson.” A likely explanation for the value of this process is that it enabled Fellows to use a prompt that was meaningful for reflecting on their tacit knowledge and articulating their practice (Loughran,
Mitchell & Mitchell, 2003) and it offered vocabulary and scaffolded prompts in the interviews for organizing their thinking and emerging knowledge (Fostaty Young, 2012).

I conducted this study because I wanted to learn more about the nature of learning that occurred for professors who experienced disjuncture in their teaching and to use this research to further articulate my learning perspective on teacher development in higher education. This fourth window added further meaning to nature of learning by focusing on the ways in which Fellows’ teaching and teacher identities changed as a result of disjuncture and the significance of learning with and from others to learn about disjuncture in teaching. Not all Fellows came to their interviews directly conceptualizing their disjuncture experiences directly as learning experiences but the data presented in this window revealed that when prompted, they could: (a) tell a story about a disjuncture experience, (b) deconstruct their learning associated with disjuncture and (c) articulate interpretations of the adage, “We teach who we are” (Palmer, 1998, p. 1) through the lens of their own learning and teaching.

Concluding Thoughts

When combined with my own analysis and the literature, the data that emerged from this study can be explored in the four hermeneutic windows: (a) emotional responses, (b) in-the-moment cognitive and behavioural responses (c), post-disjuncture responses and, (d) learning. These hermeneutic windows were a “binding, a boundary, and a map” (Sumara, 1996, p.60) through which I represented my interactions with the Fellows, the interview data, and the contexts within which such interactions were created. In this study, it is my experience of the 3M Fellows’ described experience of disjuncture and learning that I analyzed and from which meaning was created.
While the data do not provide a direct road map to the possible horizons that can be perceived through these windows the data provide some anchor points towards a learning perspective on teacher development centred on disjuncture and learning about teaching and teacher identity. I anticipate that through these windows, readers will arrive at their own conclusions by engaging in a process of interpretation and create their own understandings about disjuncture, learning and teacher development as a result of this study.
Chapter 6: Concluding Discussion

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of disjuncture in influencing professors’ teacher identity and practice. In order to achieve this research goal, I examined the phenomenon of disjuncture from the perspective of ten 3M National Teaching Fellows who participated in individual and group interviews. I contextualized each Fellow’s disjuncture experience in short biographical narratives which also offered background on each Fellow as a learner and a teacher. During the research interviews, I introduced the Fellows to disjuncture as a reflective prompt to help them adopt a learning perspective on their teaching and thereby interpret their responses to disjuncture and their subsequent learning about their teaching and their identities as teachers.

At the beginning of this chapter, I briefly revisit the findings from my study and discuss their pedagogical relevance to faculty development in higher education. In the remainder of the chapter, I integrate these findings into a discussion about the beginnings of a theoretical and practical framing of teacher development for higher education that I call, a pedagogy of disjuncture. A pedagogy of disjuncture for teacher development in higher education refers to the purposeful structuring of inquiry into professors’ experience of pedagogical disjuncture, a form of disjuncture which reflects the professor and their teaching. I will introduce the pedagogy of disjuncture as a holistic learning perspective with theoretical and practical applications in higher education. To do so, I discuss of some preliminary key features of this pedagogy including guidelines for scaffolded guided reflection processes; the necessity of adopting a learning perspective; and attending to the learner-teacher at the heart of higher education teacher development. Each section includes implications that can be applicable to both educational developers and others who support teaching development programs and for professors
themselves. I conclude this chapter by discussing some of the limitations and extensions of my study and recommendations for future research for teacher development in higher education.

**Major Findings**

In the previous chapter, I used a series of hermeneutic windows to show interlinked layers of interpretation of the Fellows’ interview data. There were several significant findings that emerged from the analysis:

a) Fellows consistently reported that conversational prompts about episodes of disjuncture evoked reflection on and identification of shifts in both teaching practice and teacher identity.

a) Through scaffolded, guided conversations with their peers, Fellows could both validate and extend their understanding about disjuncture, teaching, learning, and identity.

b) Fellows frequently described a variety of emotional responses to disjuncture and I interpreted fear as a common primary dominant emotion that all Fellows felt during their disjuncture experiences.

c) Several Fellows responded to disjuncture in the moment by ignoring it, including dismissing or controlling it, while fewer Fellows embraced their disjuncture.

d) It was common for Fellows to normalize a disjuncture situation by seeking external validation from others within the institutional cultures in which they worked.

e) “We teach who we are” (Palmer, 1998, p.1) was interpreted by Fellows as a bi-directional and embodied relationship that entails a vital connection between teachers’ own learning and their teaching.

A challenge with much of the previous research into supporting professors’ teaching has been a neglect of the role of disjuncture—a fundamental catalyst for learning—in professors’
teaching and identity formation. It is well established in teacher development literature that improving teaching at the individual level involves going beyond helping professors to acquire a repertoire of evidence-informed best practices. For instance, there are ample studies that suggested that improving teaching also involves supporting professors to uncover, articulate, and/or often revise their conceptions of teaching and learning (e.g., Duit & Treagust, 2003; Kember, 1997; Olsson, Mårtensson, & Roxå, 2010). Prior research about learning processes that professors use when they are developing their teaching have advanced the design of more purposeful teacher development initiatives that both help faculty to build new skills and, depending on the individual faculty member, can lead to conceptual change (e.g., Guskey, 2002; Osslon & Roxå, 2012). Identity research has also contributed a critical dimension to framing teacher development initiatives often highlighting that professors’ conceptions including their beliefs, values, and assumptions, are inextricably linked to a teacher’s identity (Åkerlind, 2011; Kreber, 2010). However, professors’ identity formation, including the factors that influence their identities as teachers such as the cultural narratives stemming from the institutions in which they work and their past learning experiences cannot be isolated from faculty development initiatives.

The results of my study extend and refine the work of previous faculty developmental approaches in higher education. Disjuncture was a meaningful prompt for the Fellows to examine and articulate the tacit aspects of themselves and how their beliefs and values corresponded or, in many cases, conflicted with their thoughts and behaviours in their respective teaching contexts. My findings deepen my original argument that who we are matters to teaching and that professors can learn more about teaching and teacher identity by deliberately reflecting on the phenomenon of disjuncture from the perspective of being learner-teachers.
The hallmark of the approach I took with the Fellows in my study was that it was a meaningful way for helping them to “stand in the world in a pedagogic way” (van Manen, 1997, p.1) and thereby grasp the pedagogical essence of their disjuncture experiences. As result of these study findings, I have devised the beginnings of a theoretical and practical framing of teacher development for higher education that I call, a pedagogy of disjuncture. A pedagogy of disjuncture for teacher development in higher education refers to the purposeful structuring of inquiry into professors’ experience of disjuncture. A pedagogy of disjuncture includes how professors experience disjuncture, learning, and teaching and addresses intimate questions regarding how identity—“what they think about, how they look at the world…and most importantly how each [professor] is a unique person” (van Manen, 1994, p. 139)—influences teaching and how teaching shapes a teacher’s identity.

**A Pedagogy of Disjuncture for Higher Education Teacher Development**

When I began this research, I speculated about how reflecting on disjuncture experiences in teaching could be a meaningful, developmental approach for professors to learn about themselves as learners and how their learner-selves influences their teaching. This necessarily led to investigation of teacher identity and the influence of disjuncture on the evolution of identity. The meaning of a pedagogy of disjuncture became clearer as the research process evolved and my interpretations of the Fellows’ experiences in the research process became more refined. Specifically, a pedagogy of disjuncture is an approach to inquiry where professors work through pedagogical disjuncture.

**Pedagogical Disjuncture**

The information I garnered from the Fellows in this study about disjuncture helped to refine the meaning of disjuncture in teaching. For example, in Chapter 3 I recounted my decision
to revise Jarvis’ (2006) definition to better represent the possible forms of positive or negative disjuncture because it was causing confusion for some Fellows. Additionally, Fellows’ interpretations and definitions of disjuncture that I presented in Chapter 5 solidified the need to modify Jarvis’ definition. As an outcome of this research, I have crafted a new, working definition called *pedagogical disjuncture*. Pedagogical disjuncture is defined as follows:

A state when a teacher experiences a dominant emotional signal (from any range of emotions) coupled with a sense of unknowing, questioning and/or novelty which is often generated from within because of a conflict between one’s expectations (driven by beliefs, values, and assumptions) about the processes of teaching and learning and one’s actual interactions in a teaching and learning context.

This definition of pedagogical disjuncture reflects the professor and their teaching and is at the centre of a pedagogy of disjuncture. The definition expands Jarvis’ (2006) original term because it reflects a deepened understanding of what disjuncture means in pedagogical contexts for teachers. In the final section of this chapter, I discuss the limitations of Jarvis’ definition in greater detail.

**A Holistic Learning Perspective with Practical Applications**

A pedagogy of disjuncture offers a holistic, learning perspective on teacher development that has practical applications in higher education. It is holistic because the precise definition of learning that guides this pedagogy is Jarvis’ (2006) notion that the *whole person* learns through interactions in the social world. The whole person involves “body (genetic, physical and biological) and mind (knowledge, skills, attitudes, values, emotions, beliefs and senses)” (p. 134). Adopting a pedagogy of disjuncture in practice involves using reflective processes, such as
the four stages of guided reflection I described in Chapter 5, to examine experiences of pedagogical disjuncture, including the learning that can come from these experiences.

A pedagogy of disjuncture is also considered holistic because it assumes that a teacher’s learning across their life can influence their teaching and teacher identity. In practice, the pedagogy involves attending to the teacher-as-learner and leveraging their biography to prompt disjuncture for the purposes of reflection and learning about the bidirectional relationship between their teaching and their learning. Through such reflection, professors can begin to see and make explicit any potential contradictions among their beliefs, values and practice that might exist. Of equal possibility, they might also be able to confidently solidify who they are/who they have become as teachers. Below, I will discuss practical applications for adopting a pedagogy of disjuncture for higher education teaching development.

Given the richness of the data from the Fellows’ stories about pedagogical disjuncture and their engagement in reflective processes in this research, I have identified key practices involved in enacting a pedagogy of disjuncture:

1. Examining pedagogical disjuncture with specific inquiry into the associated emotions, thoughts, and behaviours that teachers experience.
2. Asking biographical questions to deconstruct professors’ experiences of learning and teaching over time.
3. Providing guided reflection opportunities among professors to allow them to compare and validate their experiences and for the possibilities for new understandings about the disjuncture, teaching, and learning to emerge.

**Using a Scaffolded Guided Reflective Processes**
My study demonstrated that reflecting on experiences of disjuncture was a generative experience and, when prompted, Fellows could use it to reflect on their teaching beyond their individual interviews and with their peers within group learning contexts. A key finding was that each Fellow engaged in learning about their teaching and their teacher identities through using four stages of guided reflection—a scaffolded, reflective, peer-involved process. In the section below, I offer greater detail about the scaffolded guided reflection process that I outlined in Table 5.2 in Chapter 5 as it a critical component to practicing this pedagogy.

**Examining pedagogical disjuncture.** A pedagogy of disjuncture makes disjuncture, and its causes, objects of reflection by professors, and from that reflection can come their necessary engagement in learning about their teaching and their teacher identities. The Fellows, like all learners, were motivated by the quest to resolve disjuncture and to restore harmony to their experiences and their identities (Jarvis, 2006; 2012b). 3M Fellows, like all learner-teachers, had stories of disjuncture to tell and potentially from which to learn about themselves and their teaching.

Breidenstein, Fahey, Glickman, Hensley (2012) suggested that those who support adult learning “need to understand not only different ways of knowing, but also how the different structures, approaches, and formats that they might use, will be experienced by the different learners who exists in every school” (p. 7). 3M Fellows are considered reflective practitioners, successful in their teaching, and educational leaders in their respective institutions and beyond (Ahmad, Stockley, & Moore, 2013). The Fellows in this study were each also accustomed to articulating their core conceptions and philosophies of teaching and learning, not to mention highlighting the ways in which this is enacted in their teaching practices. Yet, thinking about
interconnections between disjuncture, learning and teaching was a new way to think about teaching for all of them.

My study findings indicated that professors need the opportunity to reflect on a disjuncture story before they are invited to deconstruct the experience, including what they may have learned about their practice and their teacher identities. In preparation for a one-on-one follow-up discussion, professors should be encouraged to think about a time in their teaching where they experienced disjuncture and to consider the thoughts, emotions, and behaviours associated with their experience. Along with a definition of pedagogical disjuncture and an example of disjuncture in a classroom setting (see Chapter 4), the following guiding questions can help this process:

1. At what stage of your career were you (when the disjuncture occurred)?
2. What happened when the disjuncture occurred?
3. Where were you? Describe your surroundings at the time. What was going on?
4. Who else was there? How were they involved? How did they respond? How did you respond to them?
5. What did it feel like when the disjuncture occurred?
6. How did you react? What was your immediate response?
7. What did you do to resolve this situation?
8. What was unique about this experience, compared to other teaching experiences you have had?

**Asking biographical questions.** The subsequent reflective stage is for the professor to engage in a one-on-one discussion with an educational developer, researcher, or a colleague who can guide them through deconstructing the disjuncture experience and drawing connections
between their learning, teaching practice and teacher identity. There are three categories of questions for this stage of reflection aimed at (a) soliciting biographical information about learning and teaching, (b) describing the disjuncture experience, and (c) making meaning from the disjuncture experience. Sample questions for this stage of reflection include:

Biographical Background

1. *How long have you been at _____ university?*

2. *What has your movement been, in terms of your career?*

3. *Tell me about yourself as a teacher, when you first started teaching in higher education.*
   - *How did you think about teaching at that point?*
   - *How did you think about learning?*
   - *How does this differ from what you think about teaching and learning now?*

4. *How do you see yourself as a learner? How do you learn? (Barriers? Supports?) How do you decide what you need to do to learn?*

5. *What role does learning play in your professional and personal life?*

The Disjuncture/Learning Experience

*Tell me a story about the time in your teaching where you experienced a sense of disjuncture.*

*Remember that disjuncture can be a positive experience or it can be a more negative experience and it could have been prompted by something inside of you (an internal feeling) or something external, in the context in which you were at the time. Note everything you remember about the experience.* (The additional prompts for this question are the same questions as above, which would be shared with professors before the one-on-one discussion)

Making Meaning from the Experiences

1. *What did you learn by responding in the way you did? From the experience altogether?*
2. *How did having this experience impact your beliefs about yourself as a teacher? How you see yourself as a teacher?*

3. *In what ways did you become more experienced as a teacher?*

4. *By reflecting on this experience, what did you discover about yourself as a learner? As a teacher?*

5. *Describe for me the connection for you between who you are as a teacher and a learner?*

The above questions were designed to prompt Fellows to conceptualize and articulate their stories as learning experiences. In addition, their answers to the above questions offered relevant information for us to refer to at times when some of them struggled to think of a disjuncture experience. Importantly, these questions helped to reveal the nature of learning from their disjuncture experiences—the emotions, cognitions, and actions involved and how Fellows’ teaching and identities changed as a result.

After a one-on-one discussion, professors should be encouraged to continue to reflect on the disjuncture experience, including any new insights that come from having discussed the experience. The additional opportunities to reflect during the one-on-one discussion offer professors ample prospects for making meaning of the experience to their learning, their teaching, and their identity through retelling a story about it through the new lens of disjuncture.

**Guided reflection with peers.** Finally, a culminating group or peer-to-peer discussion should involve professors retelling their disjuncture stories, sharing new learning since their first discussion, and prompting their peers to further deconstruct their respective disjuncture and learning experiences. The following questions from Chapter 5 are significant to helping build rapport within a group setting and to facilitate professors’ conversations with one another:

1. *Introductions*
   - *Name*
2. What have your thoughts been about your first interview (about disjuncture in your life, teaching, learning, who you are as a learner/teacher?)

3. Describe the experience of disjuncture that you shared in your individual interview.
   - What did these experiences mean to you back then?
   - What does the experience mean to you now?

4. By reflecting on this experience of disjuncture, what did you discover about yourself as a learner? As a teacher?

5. How do you know if an experience has impact?

6. What were some of the qualities of the disjuncture (that you experienced)?

7. What might be the potential impact of knowing about disjuncture, your own learning, and your teaching on your students?

8. We teach who we are. Have you thought about this before? What does this mean to you?

The above set of questions helped to facilitate a discussion with the Fellows whereby they compared and contrasted their experiences of disjuncture. As I discussed in Chapter 5, new understandings about the disjuncture, teaching, and learning and identity emerged through these conversations.

**Adopting a Learning Perspective on Teaching**

A pedagogy of disjuncture for teacher development requires a learning perspective on teaching. I liken the conceptions of a learning perspective that I have discussed throughout this research to a *growth mindset* (Dweck, 2015; 2016). According to Dweck, an individual who has a growth mindset believes that they can develop their talent whereas those with fixed mindsets hold beliefs that their talents are natural and thus a fixed part of who they are and how they
behave. Dweck (2016) also clarified that most people have a mixture of the two mindsets and that one mindset may dominate over the other in any given situation.

I understand growth and fixed mindsets in terms of an individual’s beliefs about learning. For instance, if a professor holds a fixed mindset during an experience of disjuncture in the classroom, they might react defensively perhaps with anger or in ignorance about what is happening. These reactions could potentially be at the expense of hindering students’ learning. Alternatively, in that moment a professor holding a growth mindset might accept the emotions and thoughts that arise, reflect on them and approach resolving the situation with an openness to learn. Mia’s and Sandra’s examples of embracing disjuncture, which I discussed in Chapter 5, could have certainly been as a result of having a growth mindset. If we can support professors in using growth mindsets, especially among the tensions that arise in teaching, it might be possible for them to recognize disjuncture in the future and adopt a learning perspective whereby they embrace pedagogical disjuncture rather than ignore it.

I argue that adopting a learning perspective requires openness to entertaining explanations for the causes of pedagogical disjuncture that may provoke emotional responses in the classroom. There is a danger that teachers can conveniently explain classroom situations by creating *cover stories* (Clandinin & Connolly, 1996). Clandinin and Connolly argued that teachers use cover stories to “portray themselves as experts . . . whose teacher stories fit within the acceptable range of story of school being lived in the school” (p. 25). Cover stories are often told and retold in public spaces so that “lived stories” (p.25) which may challenge norms are kept hidden. An issue with ignoring pedagogical disjuncture and/or creating cover stories is that professors could become distracted from learning about what may be really going on in their
classroom. Unfortunately, this approach does not make anyone a better teacher nor does it reduce the likelihood that the situation will occur again.

Paying attention to the emotional signals that are present in teaching is a key factor for professors in developing a learning perspective. Dweck (2015) asserted that teachers can feel anxiety and an internal voice that tells them to ignore the situation. She advised teachers to watch carefully for when fixed mindsets show up in the classroom – potentially during times when we feel fear, incompetence, defeat, and/or anger amongst other emotions. Sharkey (2004) suggested If I can reflect on the moments of silence, especially those linked to fear, and critically analyze those contexts, I am better able to reevaluate the types of classroom spaces I construct, I am more aware of the subject positions open (and closed) to students in my classrooms. (p. 509)

Although I did not specifically ask the Fellows about fixed or growth mindsets in this study, their reports about feeling fear and ignoring disjuncture are similar to Dweck's (2016) findings about fear when fixed mindsets are triggered in challenging teaching situations. Dweck (2016) suggested that staying in touch with feelings and situations that trigger fixed mindsets can be an effective means of opening ourselves to acting with growth mindsets in teaching.

**Attending to the Learner within the Teacher**

Adopting a learning perspective to enact a pedagogy of disjuncture for higher education teacher development requires acknowledging that most professors are both expert disciplinarily learners and novice teachers. Loughran’s (2006) argument that linking teachers’ past learning in their subject disciplines about the process of learning and the practice of teaching is pivotal to their current learning about teaching is important here. When professors are enculturated into their disciplines, it entails learning the signature pedagogies and habits of mind associated with
their disciplines (Shulman, 2005). Although professors might be regarded as experts at learning
their disciplinary content, skills and signature pedagogies, they still may incur difficulties
concerning how to enact new pedagogical theories and teaching practices that may be novel in
their respective teaching contexts. Fostaty Young (2012) argued that limitations with learning
transfer were common for novice teachers in her study. She explained these limitations as, “This
inability to detect similarity and divergence in context and conceptual congruence” which likely
interferes with “novices’ abilities to recognize the conditions under which proffered best
practices might and might not work” (p. 189-190).

For educational development to be truly developmental, our responsibility is to attend to
professors as learners, no matter their stage of development or expertise. I argue that professors
need support in ascertaining whether theories and approaches fit who they are as teachers,
including their values and aspirations for teaching and student learning and where they are at any
given moment in their conceptual and skill development as teachers. Fostaty Young (2012)
argued that approaches to educational development should invite teachers to make purposeful
decisions about their teaching practices. For learning to be meaningful, faculty must consider
new practices within their teaching contexts and in light of their intentions for using those
practices and the values they wish to enact through their practice (Fostaty Young, 2012).

The transfer from theory to practice involves fit, which was a concept that was present in
my study and it was explicitly illustrated by Fellows like Amy, André, and Sandra. Each Fellow
described approaches that did not fit their aspirations for and values about teaching and learning.
I encourage educational developers to consider how to support professors to reflect on whether
approaches or theories fit who they are, who they want to be as a teacher and what their
aspirations are for teaching and student learning.
Attending to the learner-teacher also entails acknowledging that part of professors’
development as teachers also involves being able to normalize their practices within the broader
contexts in which they work. Wenger (1998) argued that the ways in which individuals align
their own biographies with certain dominant cultural narratives can provide a sense of belonging
in a particular culture. In Chapter 5 I argued that, in higher education, alignment requires
individuals to control and direct their energy toward a collection of commonly held motivations,
beliefs, and values around research and teaching. A reason that individuals retell dominant
narratives about teaching and learning might be to achieve a sense of alignment, or belonging, in
their respective faculty, department, or in the university more broadly. Wenger warned that one
of the trade-offs to alignment is that it can be disempowering for an individual or group of
people. He argued, “It can be an unquestioning allegiance that makes us vulnerable to all kinds
of delusion and abuse…it can be a prescriptive process that removes from communities their
ability to act on their own understanding and to negotiate their place in the larger scheme of
things” (p. 181). In a university, the very same phenomenon can lead to groups of individuals
who identify as teachers to become marginalized. Alignment with dominant narratives thus can
act as a powerful censoring tool, pressuring individuals to tell certain stories over others
(Clandinin & Connolly, 1996). Wenger (1998, p. 181) claimed that alignment, “… can be a
violation of our sense of self that crushes our identity.”

Broader academic cultural narratives could serve to make professors feel like there is a
predestined karma or way that they should be as teachers and scholars in higher education. But if
professors can better understand “who I really am” apart from being a disciplinary expert, a
scholar or certain type of teacher one can ask oneself: What do I want to accomplish with my
teaching? The Fellows in my study have been dedicated to teaching and improving their teaching
throughout their careers but learned over time that they have agency—the capacity and the free choice—to bring who they are and who they want to be into their teaching. The results of my research illustrated the value of using disjuncture as a pedagogy for working with professors to help them to bring about this level of consciousness related to the inter-linkages between themselves and their teaching, and the larger political structures of the universities and disciplines within which they work.

**Leveraging professors’ biographies.** Attending to the learner within each teacher also means recognizing and leveraging the unique learning experiences that influence each professors’ teaching and teacher identity. It is plausible that past anchor points or key situations in professors’ life narratives are where they could situate their current conceptions and practices to help contextualize what they have learned (about teaching and learning), from whom they have learned, and quite possibly illuminate the influence these experiences have had on who they are as learners and teachers. Leveraging professors’ biographies—through the guided reflection process above—may contribute to their realization of their agency as teachers in broader academic cultures that promote narratives about how faculty should “be” as teachers.

Inviting professors to tell and retell their stories and using those as units of analysis and prompts for deeper learning about teaching can be an impactful learning experience. For instance, Clandinin et al. (2006) explained how storytelling can be a learning process. They suggested that retelling and reliving stories are how teachers re-story their identities and that this process can result in a change in their teaching practice. They concluded that when teachers become more aware of their identities through storytelling, they shift their stories and their actions in the classroom at the same time. Upon retelling and reliving these stories, both the meaning of the story and the meaning of the world in which the story refers are reshaped
(Clandinin & Connelly, 1999). Some of the Fellows’ experiences related to that research as well. Their stories of learning from disjuncture were useful units of analysis for examining past situations of disjuncture and learning in light of their current conceptions of teaching and learning and their current teaching. The types of biographical questions that I outlined in the above section could be purposefully and creatively incorporated it into teacher development activities such as workshops, consultations and even larger faculty development programs.

**Limitations, Extensions and Directions for Future Research**

Jarvis’ theoretical model, *The Transformation of the Person through Learning*, presented several windows through which I could view learning and teacher development in a holistic manner. Likewise, it provided language for discussing how professors respond to disjuncture—emotionally, cognitively, and behaviourally—and offered framing to describe how they changed through learning. Yet, throughout my research, it was apparent that there were limitations to using Jarvis’ model, which I decided to circumvent in order to conduct deeper analysis on the data. For example, the model offered the language to speak about emotions involved in learning; however, it was limited to the degree in which it helped me to understand the scope of emotions that were prevalent signals in the Fellows’ learning processes. I consulted an alternative framework in the literature (i.e., Shaver et al., 2001) to circumvent this limitation in Jarvis’ learning model.

Emotions are not static; yet, I found that they are memorable signals for professors when recalling pedagogical disjuncture experiences and necessitate greater attention in a definition of disjuncture. When I compared Jarvis’ notion of disjuncture and learning with a similar theory about human meaning-making and understanding, the references to emotions across theories were vague and limited in their scope for interpreting my data. For example, McManus Holroyd
(2007, p. 9) explained when “we find ourselves in a world that no longer fits the customary order of things…[it] becomes a trigger of sorts that motivates the individual to start to question” the phenomena we encounter. Her definition of a prompt for meaning making is akin to Jarvis’ (2006) definition for disjuncture that I cited previously in this dissertation. Jarvis contended that disjuncture arises from within and people experience a sense of questioning, unknowing or surprise as a sense of *emotional unease*. On the other hand, McManus Holroyd (2007) contended that these experiences often arise from *disappointment* (emphasis added). In the former case, Jarvis’ (2006) description of emotional response to disjuncture was far too vague and slightly misleading when considered alongside the findings about the prevalence of emotions in my research. He acknowledged that multiple emotions are at play during disjuncture but never adequately explored the range of emotions that one might feel in such moments. In the latter case, McManus Holroyd’s (2007) definition limited emotions to a singular type (disappointment) and her conjectures do not appear to be grounded in empirical findings. Both theories offered definitions that were inadequate for my study to the extent that they do not speak to the role that various emotions play as signals during times of disjuncture and meaning making from those experiences.

Building on my findings, future research could expand Jarvis’ theory by exploring in greater depth the complexities of the emotional, cognitive, and behavioural responses that professors use to transform pedagogical disjuncture as part of their learning. A modification of Jarvis’ (1986) original study that I referenced in Chapter 2 would be a fascinating approach to learning more about how professors respond to pedagogical disjuncture. Rather than mapping experiences on to Jarvis’ learning model (as participants did with Kolb’s model in Jarvis’ original study), it appears a more effective approach would be to use the model as a prompt with
professors for conceptualizing their learning in pedagogical situations. Professors could deliberately deconstruct their disjuncture stories according to their various responses – thoughts (Box 3 of Jarvis’ model), emotions (Box 4), and actions (Box 5). Two questions that I was not able to answer in the data was why each Fellow decided to follow the path that they did to normalize the disjuncture experience and how normalizing the disjuncture influenced their sense of identity. Future research using Jarvis’ model could specifically involve professors deconstructing specific normalizing behaviours to gain a better understanding of these aspects of their learning processes.

The definition of pedagogical disjuncture that I described in the beginning of this chapter was a necessary modification of Jarvis’ definition to include explicit reference to emotions. In Jarvis’ definition, emotional responses are implied through his use of the term unease and drastically limited by his singular reference to “surprise.” The term unease as a descriptor was vague and somewhat irrelevant for Fellows who were attempting to interpret the totality of their responses and the learning that they experienced from their disjuncture experiences. Instead, Fellows could describe distinct emotional dimensions that were highly relatable to other professors and relevant as prompts for designing pedagogical interventions for working with faculty to develop their teaching. In future research, I propose including interview questions or pre-interview prompts, perhaps using the Fellows’ verbatim examples in Chapter 5, that included specific reference to emotional signals associated with disjuncture. Such questions could build on the findings of this study and possibly allow for deeper exploration of the continuum of emotions experienced by teachers at times of disjuncture.

Jarvis’ original definition was too broad for prompting disjuncture stories in pedagogical contexts and thus it necessitated revision to increase its relatability for professors. For example, a
few Fellows in my study struggled to think of a disjuncture story related to their teaching. In Chapter 3 I mentioned that Fellows felt some uncertainty or confusion around the meaning of the term in relation to applying as a lens to reflect on their teaching. In retrospect, I acknowledge that I made assumptions to think that it would be an automatic transfer for people to apply a brand-new concept and theory to their past teaching experiences.

Fostaty Young (2012) encouraged educational developers to be mindful of the limitations of learning transfer when faculty are developing their understanding of theories and practices in teaching. Her research showed that when learning new concepts, theories, and approaches, developing teachers need examples that are closely associated to their own contexts or at the very least examples that are generalizable across contexts. The Fellows in my study were all expert learners in their disciplines and successful, skilled, knowledgeable teachers but disjuncture was a novel concept for everyone. In future research, a definition of pedagogical disjuncture and some teaching specific examples of disjuncture could help to bridge this gap between the theory and professors’ abilities to relate to their own teaching situations.

In future research, a useful approach would be to modify Jarvis’ framework by using pedagogical disjuncture as a starting point for selecting experiences upon which to engage in the four stages of guided reflection. A subsequent study could also involve exploring how adapting this definition could be used to deliberately circumvent participants’ tendencies to describe only negative disjuncture stories (as was the case in my study), and learn more about what types of disjuncture stories they chose to tell. Similar research that examines positive disjuncture experiences and the learning that results could be framed through an appreciative inquiry perspective and build on what professors perceive as successful teaching and learning situations.
The very act of reflecting on past disjuncture situations in teaching could have encouraged some Fellows to construct false attribution stories at any point during their interviews. A few Fellows caught themselves in mid-story during their interviews when they recognized that they may have been changing their memories as they were retelling their experiences to me and their peers. Sharkey (2004) explained that “because narratives such as autobiographies are social practices produced in specific sociohistorical and political contexts, we learn how to tell stories that others will listen to” (p. 507). A longitudinal study with multiple professors, about what and how they learn from disjuncture in their teaching, could potentially circumvent the issue of false attribution stories. Future research that reframes professors as learner-teachers and integrates their biographies into data collection and learning more about teaching could involve the following:

- Using recent teaching situations as contexts for examining both positive and/or negative disjuncture
- Observing the professors’ course (s) across an entire semester, or academic year
- Engaging in numerous iterations of the 4 stages of guided reflection I used in my study, to discuss professors’ teaching practices in light of their biographies and their present teaching situations (including any disjuncture situations that may arise over the duration of a course or of an entire semester)
- Collecting regular student feedback to provide the student lens on teaching

It would be interesting to see the extent to which professors, who engage in exploring how who they are impacts their teaching, are willing and able to make immediate changes in their teaching and to capture the kind of impact that this may or may not have directly on student learning experiences. A variation of such a study could also involve working with professors
with various levels of teaching experience and expertise as a point of comparison to my current study with successful award-winning teachers. This expansion across multiple levels of experience and expertise could add richness and depth to the pedagogy of disjuncture that I propose for teacher development in higher education throughout this chapter.

The findings from my study invite re-examination of teaching and teacher development in higher education—and arguably in other teaching contexts such as K-12 and preservice teacher education—from a learning perspective. Specifically, future research is still needed that deepens our understanding of teacher development from learning perspective of teaching. Such research would ideally explore the centrality of learning in professors’/teachers’ experiences of teaching and teacher identity development. In higher education, the challenge with much of the previous research into supporting professors’ practices has been a neglect of identity formation and the role of disjuncture. Thus, the reframing of teacher development, by adopting a pedagogy of disjuncture squarely prioritizes these generative aspects of teacher learning and development.
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Appendix A: Guide for Individual Interviews

The questions below were used as a guide and I asked additional questions to follow the flow of conversation and to prompt the participants to recollect and proceed with their stories.

The purpose of my interview with you is to discuss significant moments of disjuncture in your teaching and their learning and also talk about who you are as a learner and a teacher. As you probably read in the prompt I sent you, disjuncture is: [refer to definition sent via email]. How helpful did you find that document, in terms of giving you information about what disjuncture is? [Refer to the definition of disjuncture from the literature a bit more, if necessary, but remind them that I am curious about their experience of disjuncture and how they understand it].

As a reminder, you don’t have to answer a question if you don’t want to. Just let me know, you can just indicate you’d like to move to a different topic. You are also free to stop the interview at any time by just telling me you’d like to do so. Are you ok with this being audio recorded?

Biographical Background:

6. How long have you been at _____ university?
7. What has your movement been, in terms of your career?
8. Tell me about yourself as a teacher, when you first started teaching in higher education.
   - How did you think about teaching at that point?
   - How did you think about learning?
   - How does this differ from what you think about teaching and learning now?
9. How do you see yourself as a learner? How do you learn? (Barriers? Supports?) How do you decide what you need to do to learn?
10. What role does learning play in your professional and personal life?

The Disjuncture/Learning Experience(s):

Now, I’m going to ask you think about a time, in your teaching where you experienced a sense of disjuncture. Remember that disjuncture can be a positive experience or it can be a more negative experience and it could have been prompted by something inside of you (an internal feeling) or something external, in the context in which you were at the time.

1. Tell me a story about that experience. Note everything that you can about the experience.

Prompts:
- What happened?
- Where were you? Describe your surroundings at the time. What was going on? (Context)
- Who else was there? How were they involved? How did they respond?
- What did it feel like?
- How did you react? What was your immediate response?
- What stage of your career were you at?
- What did you do to resolve this situation?
- What did you learn by responding in this way? From the experience altogether?
Making Meaning from the Experiences:

6. How did having this experience impact your beliefs about yourself as a teacher? How you see yourself as a teacher?

7. In what ways did you become more experienced as a teacher?

8. By reflecting on this experience, what did you discover about yourself as a learner? As a teacher?

9. Describe for me the connection for you between who you are as a teacher and a learner?

Additional Questions:

1. What does it mean to you—your identity—as a teacher to have won the 3M National Teaching Fellowship?

2. Is there anything that I haven’t asked that you would like to add before we end our interview?
Appendix B: Group interview Protocol

1. Introductions
   - Name
   - Faculty
   - Year of 3M Fellowship
   - Something about you as a teacher that your students would say about you

2. What have your thoughts been about your first interview (about disjuncture in your life, teaching, learning, who you are as a learner/teacher?)

3. Describe the experience of disjuncture that you shared in your individual interview.
   What was it like?
   What happened?
   Who was there?
   What did these experiences mean to you back then?
   What does the experience mean to you now?

4. By reflecting on this experience of disjuncture, what did you discover about yourself as a learner? As a teacher?

5. How do you know if an experience has impact?

6. What were some of the qualities of the disjuncture (that you experienced)?

7. What might be the potential impact of knowing about disjuncture, your own learning, and your teaching on your students?

8. We teach who we are. Have you thought about this before? What does this mean to you?
Appendix C: Initial Recruitment Letter

Dear ________:

I hope my email finds you well. My name is Launa Gauthier and I am a Ph.D. Candidate in the Faculty of Education at Queen’s University and an Educational Development Associate at Queen’s Centre for Teaching and Learning. I’m writing to invite you, as a 3M Fellow, to participate in my doctoral research this Fall.

My goal for research and the educational development work I do in higher education is to help educators across disciplines and at all levels of experience, to develop as mindful teacher-learners. Specifically, I want to explore successful professors’ (3M Fellows) experiences of disjuncture and how these experiences have shaped their identities as learners and teachers. In case you’re not familiar with the term, disjuncture is an internal state or feeling that can be a surprise, an overt question or sense of unknowing, or a tension that is prompted in a particular social situation. It is disjuncture that potentially sparks learning.

In brief, your participation in the study would entail:

1. Providing me with a copy your 3M Nomination Dossier or your Teaching Dossier
2. Participating in a 1 hour individual interview with me (via Skype or in person, depending on scheduling)
3. Participating in a 1 hour-long group discussion with me and other 3M fellows at your current university (this session would occur at ________, after the individual interviews have been completed, at a date and time that is agreed upon by all participants)

If you are willing to participate in this study, please let me know by responding to this email. I am aiming to recruit between 3-5 3M Fellows who are currently at ____________ but I welcome more participants, should there be the interest.

The attached Letter of Information has more information about the study that may help you decide whether or not to participate. I am happy to answer any further questions you may have about the study and would ask you to note that participation is completely voluntary and all data is confidential.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Warmest Regards,
Launa
LinkedIn Profile: https://ca.linkedin.com/in/launa-gauthier-33043261
Educational Development Profile: http://www.queensu.ca/ctl/contact-us/educational-development-associates
Appendix D: Email Prompts for Disjuncture Stories

Dear ____,

I hope my email finds you well. I’m looking forward to our conversation on ____

In preparation for our talk, I’m going to ask you to think about a few things below. By no means do you have to do anything other than think about the prompts. When we talk, I’ll ask you to tell me the story, and we’ll go from there to talk about your experiences and your learning and teaching (I’ll have some prompts to guide us through this conversation).

Think about a time, in your teaching where you experienced a sense of disjuncture- either a positive or negative experience. Think about everything about the situation that existed (thoughts, feelings, emotions, sensations (5 senses), other people, etc.). Here are some questions that might help prompt your thinking:

- What happened?
- Where were you? Describe your surroundings at the time. What was going on? (Context)
- Who else was there? How were they involved? How did they respond? How did you respond to them?
- What did it feel like?
- How did you react? What was your immediate response?
- What stage of your career were you at?
- What did you do to resolve this situation?
- What was unique about this experience, compared to other teaching experiences you have had?

Please refer to the short document attached to this email for more explanation, including examples, of disjuncture (both internal and external disjuncture). Remember that disjuncture can be a positive experience or it can be a more negative experience and it could have been prompted by something inside of you (an internal feeling) or something external, in the context in which you were in at the time.

Thanks again for your time and for your support!

Talk to you soon,

Launa
Appendix E: Examples of Disjuncture and Learning

**Disjuncture:** When we are no longer in harmony with our world we experience what Jarvis (2006) terms disjuncture, which is more commonly known as *cognitive dissonance* in social psychology (Festinger, 1957). Disjuncture occurs when individuals are in a situation and they realize that they do not know, cannot understand, and may not have the ability or skills to do what they desire to resolve the situation. Disjuncture is a state whereby individuals experience a sense of unknowing, questioning, or surprise generated from within and often prompted by their interactions in the social world (Jarvis, 2006). Disjuncture can be a positive or negative experience. How people approach resolving disjuncture is an indication of whether or not they learn from the situation (Jarvis, 2006).

“Our experience occurs at the intersection of the inner self and the outer world and so learning always occurs at this point of interaction, usually when the two are in some tension, even disharmony [or disjuncture],” (2006, p. 7).

The following examples of internal and external disjuncture are from a study (Erichsen, 2011) of international students who moved the United States for higher education.

**Internal Disjuncture:** Internal disjuncture is when we are no longer in harmony internally within ourselves. It is at this point that we often seek change in our lives.

Example: One interviewee, after having visited the U.S. for work-related training explained:

_That very first trip to the U.S. also prompted me to think that I really needed to further my level of education, as what I knew and learned during college back in Laos barely helped me interact with people coming from different parts of the world. I really felt a deficit in my body, so I began to dream about obtaining a graduate degree in the U.S. My dream continued to grow and grow until the point that whenever I closed my eyes I would see myself walking around on a big campus or sitting in a huge library. My mind and my heart at that time were always in the U.S. with the growing desire of receiving a graduate level education._

The student experienced a form of internal disjuncture which motivated them to study abroad in order to change their life, as a means of dealing with the internal feeling of disharmony or disjuncture.

**External Disjuncture:** External disjuncture is experienced as an external cause for learning, where something or an experience within our external surroundings triggers our need to reestablish harmony with our lifeworld.

Example: _The major external disjuncture that is experienced by international students is that all of their familiar, taken-for-granted knowns and contexts have suddenly been replaced. Their lives of harmony, where they can rely on past experience and accumulated knowledge to function in their everyday surroundings, does not apply in most daily situations in their new foreign context. They find that they struggle with language, daily routines, finding palatable food, finding health care, adjusting to work, getting assistance_
and so on. (Erichsen, 2009).

References


Appendix F: Follow-up Recruitment Email: Scheduling

Dear ____

Thanks so much for kindly replying to my email and for agreeing to participate in my study. I’m thrilled that you’re willing to be involved! I’m looking forward to visiting ______ in October and to meeting you in person as well. Here are the next steps for you to help me to set up our work together.

Dates that I need to schedule with you as soon as possible:

1. A group interview at XXX with the other 3M Fellows in this study (exact location TBD). Please clink on this link, enter your name, and select the dates and times work best for you http://doodle.com/poll/ugx56yhcxt8tkhdt

   Alternatively, if you prefer, you may simply reply to this email and tell me your availability on ___ or ___

2. Your individual interview. This must occur before the group interview. If you are willing to do a Skype interview, I will suggest the week of ___ or the week of _____. Please email me with a date and time (we will need approximately 1 hour) that work best for you during those weeks.

   Alternatively, if you prefer an in person interview I will work with you to schedule this as soon as we know the time and date of the group interview.

Finally, if you can submit to me one of the following via email:

1. Your 3MNTF Nomination Dossier; or
2. Your Teaching Dossier

If you do not have a teaching dossier or cannot access your 3MNT Nomination Dossier, then I’m happy to accept the most recent CV you have. If you do not have an electronic copy I can arrange to get a paper copy from you when we meet at XXX in October.

Consent form:

If you can sign the attached LOI and consent form (electronic signature, or print and scan is appropriate), that would be helpful. If you prefer to submit this in person, when we meet in October that is fine as well.

Please let me know if you have any questions at this stage.

Thanks again,

Launa
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Appendix G: Letter of Information and Consent Form

Professors’ learning, teaching, and identity: Developing a pedagogy of disjuncture in higher education

This research is being conducted by Launa Gauthier (Faculty of Education) at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario under the supervision of Dr. Rebecca Luce-Kapler. This study has been granted clearance by the General Research Ethics Board according to Canadian research ethics principles (http://www.ethics.gc.ca/default.aspx) and Queen's University policies (http://www.queensu.ca/urs/research-ethics).

What is this study about? The purpose of this study is to understand successful professors’ experiences of disjuncture and how these experiences have shaped their identities as learners and teachers. Disjuncture is an internal state or feeling that can be a surprise, an overt question or sense of unknowing, or a tension that is prompted in a particular social situation. It is disjuncture that potentially sparks learning. My study is guided by the primary research question: How do professors interpret disjuncture in relation to their identities as learners and teachers? Subsequent to this question are the following facilitating questions: 1. How has disjuncture created a space for learning in these professors’ lives? 2. How has this learning influenced their identities as learners and teachers?

What is involved to participate in this study? If you choose to participate, you’ll be asked to consent to two interviews and provide me with a copy of your teaching dossier. The first interview will be one-on-one with me (either by Skype or in person) and will last for approximately 1 hour. The purpose of this interview is to discuss significant moments of disjuncture in your teaching and your learning and also reflect on your identities as a learner and a teacher. In order to prepare for this interview, I will send a copy of the interview questions to you in order to allow sufficient time for you to reflect on your stories in preparation for our conversation. The second interview will be a 1-hour group interview with me and other 3M Fellows from your current institution. The purpose of the group interview is to help flesh out the phenomenon of disjuncture as it relates to teaching and learning in higher education. I will coordinate a time and date for this group interview with consideration for each participants’ schedule and availability.

Is participation voluntary? Your participation is completely voluntary and choosing not to participate will not result in any adverse consequences. You are free to choose, without reason or consequence, to withdraw from the study. If you choose to withdraw, simply send me an email (contact information below) and indicate whether or not you would like for your data to be removed from the study. I will send a confirmation email back to you acknowledging your request to withdraw from the study. There are no known physical, psychological, economic, or social risks associated with this study.

What will happen to my responses? Your responses will be kept confidential. Only me and my supervisor, Dr. Rebecca Luce-Kapler, will have access to the data. All electronic files will be password protected. Any hardcopy data will be secured in a locked cabinet in my home office. I will maintain copies of the transcripts for a minimum of 5 years and may use the data (with names removed) in subsequent research. Confidentiality will be protected to the extent possible.
None of the data will contain your name or the identity of your place of work. To protect your identity a pseudonym will replace your name on all data files and in any dissemination of findings. This research may result in publications of various types, including journal articles or other professional publications.

What if I have concerns? Any questions about study participation may be directed to Launa Gauthier at launa.gauthier@queensu.ca or 613-650-7993, or my supervisor, Dr. Rebecca Luce-Kapler at rebecca.luce-kapler@queensu.ca. Any ethical concerns about the study may be directed to the Chair of the General Research Ethics Board at chair.GREB@queensu.ca or 613-533-6081.

Please sign one copy of this Letter of Information/Consent Form and return to the researcher.
Retain a second copy for your records.

I have read the statements above and have had any questions answered to my satisfaction.

I agree to participate in the individual and group interviews and that they can be audio recorded (Circle one)

Yes   No

I agree to maintain the confidentiality of all group participants, including the information that is discussed in the group interview.

Yes   No

I agree to submit a copy of my 3M Nomination Dossier/Teaching Dossier/CV to the researcher.

Yes   No

Participant’s Signature: ____________________________________________________________

Date: __________________________ E-mail address: ________________________________

☐ Please indicate, by checking the box, if you would like to receive a copy of the results of this study, via email.
### Appendix H: Initial Analysis of Disjuncture Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fellow</th>
<th>Predominant Emotional Responses</th>
<th>Fellow’s Expression</th>
<th>Behavioural and cognitive responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>Fear, Joy</td>
<td>Anxiety, Uncertainty, Shock, Distracted, Relief</td>
<td>Compete, Focus on teaching, Struggle to control situation, Defend self &amp; protect students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Fear, Anger, Surprise, Sadness</td>
<td>Distress, Disturbed, Appalled, Astonished, Unexpected</td>
<td>Suppressed beliefs, Ignore inner conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malcolm</td>
<td>Surprise, Sadness, Anger</td>
<td>Astonished, Disappointment, Frustration</td>
<td>Dialogue, Questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>Anger, Surprise, Fear</td>
<td>Irritated, Annoyed, Unexpected, Shock</td>
<td>Dismiss, Ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>André</td>
<td>Anger, Surprise</td>
<td>Annoyed, Frustration</td>
<td>Compete, Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fionuula</td>
<td>Anger, Surprise, Sadness, Joy</td>
<td>Frustration, Unexpected, Disbelief, Failure, Relief</td>
<td>Dialogue, Students circles &amp; meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Sadness, Fear</td>
<td>Despair, Disproportion</td>
<td>Suppressed Beliefs, Ignore inner conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derrick</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Anxiety, Shock</td>
<td>Ignore, Escape, Remove self from situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>Ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mia</td>
<td>Sadness, Fear</td>
<td>Despair, Disproportion, Disappointment</td>
<td>Ignore, Act in accordance with own beliefs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Copy of Ethics Clearance Letter

January 26, 2016

Ms. Laana Gauthier
Ph.D. Candidate
Faculty of Education
Queen’s University
Duncan McArthur Hall
511 Union Street West
Kington, ON, K7M 5R7

GREB Ref #: GEDUC-792-16; Romeo # 6017488
Title: "GEDUC-792-16 Learning from Disjuncture in Teaching: Professors’ problem solving, learning, and development as teachers in higher education"

Dear Ms. Gauthier:

The General Research Ethics Board (GREB), by means of a delegated board review, has cleared your proposal entitled "GEDUC-792-16 Learning from Disjuncture in Teaching: Professors’ problem solving, learning, and development as teachers in higher education" for ethical compliance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (TCPS 2 (2014)) and Queen’s ethics policies. In accordance with the Tri-Council Guidelines (Article 6.14) and Standard Operating Procedures (405.001), your project has been cleared for one year. At the end of each year, the GREB will ask if your project has been completed and if not, what changes have occurred or will occur in the next year.

You are reminded of your obligation to advise the GREB of any adverse event(s) that occur during this one year period (access this form by signing at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html; click on "Events"; under "Create New Event" click on “General Research Ethics Board Adverse Event Form”). An adverse event includes, but is not limited to, a complaint, a change or unexpected event that alters the level of risk for the researcher or participants or situation that requires a substantial change in approach to a participant(s). You are also advised that all adverse events must be reported to the GREB within 48 hours.

You are also reminded that all changes that might affect human participants must be cleared by the GREB. For example you must report changes to the level of risk, applicant characteristics, and implementation of new procedures. To submit an amendment form, access the application by signing at http://www.queensu.ca/traq/signon.html; click on “Events”; under "Create New Event" click on "General Research Ethics Board Request for Amendment of Approved Studies". Once submitted, these changes will automatically be sent to the Ethics Coordinator, Ms. Gail Irving, at the Office of Research Services for further review and clearance by the GREB or GREB Chair.

On behalf of the General Research Ethics Board, I wish you continued success in your research.

Sincerely,

John Freeman, Ph.D.
Chair
General Research Ethics Board

e: Dr. Rebecca Luce-Kapler, Faculty Supervisor
Dr. Liying Cheng, Chair, Unit REB
Ms. Erin Wicklam, Dept. Admin.